

A Tale of Two Shrews: Recovering the Repertory of the Lord Pembroke's Players

Elizabeth E. Tavares
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

When we talk about anonymously written plays, we often regard them as stuck out of time; we have no author, fallible or otherwise, on which to hang their intentions. One way of recovering a sense of those intentions is to place anonymous plays amongst their peers. Repertory study, or the method of analyzing the set of plays owned by a single playing company, is an old theatre history method for recovering our sense of the place of lost and anonymous plays within their historical moment, and now gone out of fashion. The anonymous *A Pleasant Conceited Historie called The taming of a Shrew* owned by the Lord Pembroke's Players is one such text. Referred to as either a source or competing performance text in relation to William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, an analysis of the preferred manner of playing evident in the Pembroke repertory can situate the play in its moment rather than as derivative of the Shakespeare canon. By first sketching the some of the presentation strategies privileged by Pembroke's Players, and then assessing the variations between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* (with attention to their framing devices), my aim is to fill in some of the picture about what exactly about this shrew narrative made it competitive enough to warrant two in the same theatrical marketplace.

The Taming of a Shrew (1592) was one of a number of shrew-taming entertainments circulating in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Theater historians now concur that this anonymous

play, along with Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* (1593), both derived from an ur-*Shrew* play.¹ Additional allusions to domestic reform literature of the period that counseled against unseemly, physical domination, and early 1580s ballads like the anonymous *A merry Ieste of a shrewde and curst Wyfe* (c. 1580) have also been linked to these plays.

The shrew trope continued well into the seventeenth century with John Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize, or the Tamer Tamed* (c. 1607), John Lacy's *Sauny the Scot* (1698), and the ballad *The taming of a shrew: or The Onely way to make a bad wife good* (c. 1624), and even into the eighteenth century with David Garrick's long-running *Catharine and Petruchio* (1754). Film versions were developed in 1929 and 1967 as vehicles for Hollywood couples with contestatory public personas: Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford first, then Richard Burton and Elizabeth Taylor. These undertakings did rather poorly in relation to their budgets, unlike Gil Junger's *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999), which made \$53.5 million at the box-office. Of all these versions, only Shakespeare's *The Shrew* and the anonymous *A Shrew* ask audiences to step out of the action with the framing induction of Christopher Sly.

The first dramaturgical question a company must address with either of these plays is what to do about Sly. Based on the ancient motif of "The Sleeper and the Waker" where, like *The Arabian Nights*, a lord tricks a commoner,² should the induction be kept or cut? If kept, will the part of Sly and the Lord be doubled with other parts in the play or not? Will he remain on stage throughout the performance or disappear in act two after his last interjection? Cole Porter's *Kiss Me Kate* (1948), for example, addresses these questions by removing Sly and shifting his metatheatrical work to the rehearsal space of the play, itself a frame device for a musical. In general, however, because the frame device in Shakespeare's version has no obvious bookend—Sly never returns to close his telling—the majority of adaptations choose to remove the Sly frame altogether.

One could argue that there is a closing to *The Shrew's* induction, but it simply does not include Sly. Shakespeare's play opens with a Lord concluding his hunting activities for the evening by praising his five male dogs—Meriman, Clowder, Bellman, Echo, and Silver—as well as one unnamed female. Of Silver he says he "would not lose the dog for twenty pound" (Induction.1.17).³ Just before they are redirected to kidnap the drunk and sleeping Sly,

the Lord directs his huntsman to two tasks: to “sup them [the dogs] well” (Induction.1.24) and to “couple Clowder with the deep-mouthed brach” (Induction.1.14), referring to a bitch hound with a deep baying voice. In hunting, to couple meant to leash together, but in the context of the play, it implies Clowder is a kind of Petruchio, being knotted to a loud female partner as a reward to either procreate or restrain her into good behavior by being locked together. At the wedding feast of the play’s final act, the grooms make a wager on whose wife will come first when called. Petruchio repeats the sum of the Lord from the induction: “Twenty crowns! / I’ll venture so much of my hawk or hound / But twenty times so much upon my wife” (5.2.71-73). That Petruchio wins this “bitch bet” provides us with two veins for interpreting the gender politics of *The Shrew*: either Kate has been successfully tamed and rendered a shell of a character, a mere mouthpiece for sixteenth-century spousal reform tracts;⁴ or Kate has carved out a space to exercise her agency by doing more than was asked, bringing her resistant sister to heel, thus coopting her husband’s power by taking others’.⁵

To situate Sly as the locus for who is being tamed in these plays, the remainder of this talk will focus first on the theatrical strategies and preferred manner of presentation—what we might call a “house style”—of Pembroke’s Players in order to situate the anonymous *A Pleasant Conceited Historie called The taming of a Shrew* within its larger repertory and cultural milieu. Second, rather than reading *A Shrew* as a source, derivative, or competitor to Shakespeare’s *The Shrew*, I will provide a reading of the reception implications of *A Shrew* as the only version of the shrew-taming narrative where the subject of instruction, Sly, remains and even interjects all the way through the action. In doing so, my aim is to use Pembroke’s strategies to articulate the communal politics at work in the shrew trope—a subject of debate seemingly heated enough to warrant two versions in the same theatrical marketplace.

“Loud ‘larums, neighing steeds and trumpets’ clang”

Pembroke’s players come to us in what Andrew Gurr describes as a “farrago” of speculation.⁶ From the paratextual evidence, theatre historians concur on only a few aspects of their existence. The company formed around 1591/92 as a splinter group from Strange’s Men with eleven principal actors,⁷ one of whom was named Will Slie and some of whom were incarcerated for a brief

period after the maiden performance of *The Isle of Dogs*.⁸ We know of ten plays in their repertory, of which one is lost, one survives only as a plot,⁹ four are alternate or serial versions by Shakespeare of plays already existing in the repertory, which likely consisted of several more comedies.¹⁰ Formed at the height of plague season, where death counts ranged from 150 to 1100 per week,¹¹ the company performed at inn-yards as well as the Rose and Swan theaters, but was primarily on tour outside of London in the time we know of their existence (c.1592-1600).

This history has been complicated by the collision of the gendered implications of the play with editorial machinations privileging Shakespeare over anonymous contemporaries. From the 1960s through the 1980s, scholarship of Pembroke's players was deployed either to hypothesize what Shakespeare was up to during the lost years between his disappearance from Stratford and reappearance in London, or to determine the intertextual relationship between his "good" and the "bad" versions of similar plays by contemporaries. The underlying question of these debates is worthy of merit, however: where do we ascribe agency to the changes between duplicate plots. Critics have posited forms of individual agency like piracy and memorial reconstruction, forming a historiography that attests to the pervasiveness of authorship and the need to ascribe texts and their changes to a single, stable subject.¹² Assumptions underlying these studies include Shakespeare's inherent supremacy, one which clearly needed no incubation or training; it is becoming increasingly clear now that his role in Pembroke's players was most likely as apprentice and reviser. As one critic put it in a bloated biography, had "Shakespeare been with Pembroke's, he could certainly have helped them produce better texts than they did" but having laid low was ready to give the Chamberlain's Men a hit when the plague abated.¹³

This privileging not only of biography, but of Shakespeare's male biography, has had additional implications for the shrew plays, centered as they are on forms of masculine domination. In her seminal study *Unediting the Renaissance*, Leah Marcus uncovers gendered strategies, distortions, and "textual conservatism,"¹⁴ including a prostitution of the "true" text by the "bad" quarto through a "language of transgression" wherein "textual errors register as education or spoliation."¹⁵ In *A Shrew* "women are not as satisfactorily tamed as they are in *The Shrew*," making the

Shakespeare text more “manly” than the anonymous one.¹⁶ The history of editorial energy spent on *The Shrew* and *A Shrew* has been to hermetically seal one from the other, the latter having “been perceived as an affront to the editors’ own manhood.”¹⁷ With this springboard of editorial historiography, the next logical step in recovering *A Shrew* is to assess the play in its historical context and on its own merits without Shakespeare as its *raison d’être*.

Amongst its repertorial peers, *A Shrew* includes a number of hallmarks of the Pembroke’s house style. Roslyn Knutson surmises it included “generic variety, serial drama, their own version of popular stories, and theatrics such as onstage violence, sexually provocative moments, traffic with the supernatural, and challenges to hierarchical structures with which to entertain London and provincial audiences.”¹⁸ Of their touring practices, their “provincial stops took them to towns where their patron was influential, where players had traditionally been welcomed, and where their rewards were the average or higher.”¹⁹ Together, the character of their repertory and touring practices suggests that “whatever the cause of the company’s reported collapse” around the end of the century, “the fault does not appear to lie with its repertory or touring schedule.”²⁰ Their War of the Roses plays, shrew plays, and *Titus Andronicus* speak to imitation, duplication, and serialization as compositional norms of the period.²¹ Their presentational strategies—such as the frequent staging of beheadings and piked heads;²² coordinating the food smells of the inn-yard with dramatic content to pit “playgoers’ innate desire for food” against “regulating principles of morality”;²³ and drawing on shared memories of unsavory and violent native history—worked to implicate audiences ideologically and sensorially.

In my assessment of the playtexts theatre historians agree were owned and performed by Pembroke’s players up through the 1590s, I would like to propose two additional strategies endemic in their repertory: specialized trumpet calls and factional blocking. The first records of a troupe patronized by Henry Herbert, the second earl of Pembroke—patron of Fulke Greville and Philip Sidney, and close friend of Robert Devereaux, the earl of Essex²⁴—are harpers²⁵ and minstrels.²⁶ While each of these only has one payment record, there are significantly more of an Earl of Pembroke’s trumpeters,²⁷ especially in the late 1580s and early 1590s, up until a playing troupe of the same name enters the

records.²⁸ While there are no firm accounts of the relationship between these two troupes aside from a familiar patron, the systemic employment of trumpet calls and trumpet allusions in their repertory far outstrips their competitors. Their repertory deploys five distinct calls in a nuanced example of a playing company capitalizing on a specialized resource. The density of the soundscape, especially in *The First Part of the Contention*, *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, and 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, clue us in to the fact that varied trumpet calls were tied to specific semantic work that enabled stagings with a particular political resonance.

The work trumpet calls do to construct the landscape of a scene is consistently tied to arranging bodies within the stage action in order to visualize their political allegiances. Excursions, flourishes, sennets, alarums, colors and drums clutter up the stage directions of this repertory, facilitating, I argue, a specific kind of social relationship through blocking; that of factionalism, or the fractious governance produced by clusters of competing and dissenting peers orbiting around a monarch. The plays stage not only factionalism in action but also suggest the conditions necessary for the formation of factions amongst the peerage. Some of the flashier examples include the three suns descending from the Heavens mechanism to portend the necessary unity of the three sons of York; the two tents set up on either side of the stage in which Richmond and Richard III are visited by ghosts the night before the battle of Bosworth Field; and the plucking of red and white roses from a temple garden, drawing blood in the choosing of sides between Lancaster and York.

As I have discussed elsewhere in detail,²⁹ these visually spectacular moments become emblematic cores to these plays; suns, ghosts, and roses become important symbols for the nature of factional tension. For our purposes, it is important to note that both *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* deploy the complex trumpet calls in the induction and wedding scenes. In *The Shrew*, to the group of men, having banded together as a faction in order to get Kate married so they can again vie against one another for Bianca, Petruchio says,

Have I not in a pitched battle heard
Loud 'larums, neighing steeds and trumpets' clang?
And do you tell me of a woman's tongue,
That gives not half so great a blow to hear
As will a chestnut in a farmer's fire? (1.2.195-99)

Here not only is Kate made a trophy of siege warfare, her voice analogized as battle calls of “trumpets’ clang,” but in the military context “blow” carries connotations of both a horn and the back of a hand. So while both plays share this multisensory technique, *A Shrew*, in its casting requirements and inclusion of a final bookending scene to the induction, maximally facilitates factional blocking to implicate audiences as part of a culture that problematically authorizes female censure through non-physical violence.

“Better than a sheepe”

In addition to changes in character names, there are four major differences between the plots of *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*, aside from the extended induction: in the former, (1) three sisters are on the marriage market (and the youngest is presumed best); (2) not just Ferando (the Petruchio figure), but also Kate beats servants, two in fact; (3) Kate believes that Ferando is her ideal match in an aside before his taming program begins; and (4) Kate’s putting her hands under her husband’s feet is made explicit by a stage direction. Within the induction itself, however, there are five differences: (1) Slie interrupts the action not once, but four times; (2) the Lord becomes an actor, playing the role of a serving man; (3) a boy actor, not a page, cross-dresses as a female companion for Slie, taking it as a professional challenge that Slie is convinced he’s a woman; (4) the hostess is instead a male Tapster; and (5) the “bitch bet” that stands in to bookend Shakespeare’s version is here only metaphor, and the play ends with Slie’s reawakening. For my purposes, I will attend only to the gendered implications of the variations in the inductions.

The version of Slie in *A Shrew* doesn’t actually seem capable of distinguishing between the real and imagined. The play opens with the Tapster booting him out of the alehouse, but Slie doesn’t really mind, finding the ground feels like “a freshe cushion” and makes for “good warm lying” (43).³⁰ When kidnapped, he is wholly taken in by the illusion that he is now a lord, that the boy actor beside him is a lady, and that the boy actors playing Kate and Valeria are “two fine gentlewomen” (57). This is true so much so that the Lord, under his servant pseudonym, Simon, has to remind Slie “this is but the play, theyre but in jest” (81). Slie does not express any interest in the characters except for the servants Valeria, Phylotus, and the “fool” Sanders (57). Concerned over

their possible arrest, Slie interrupts the action to say, “Why *Sim[on]* am not I *Don Christo Vary*? Therefore I say they shall not go to prison” (80-81); the play continues once he is assured they have successfully run away and he is placated with more drink. Despite the posh clothes, wine, and high characters, Slie’s communal associations with the low plot wins out: once he is sure they are safe, he falls asleep for the rest of the play.

Slie and the disguised Lord, Simon, interrupt the play no fewer than four times, the last of which is merely an expression of boredom on Simon’s part. While not seemingly malicious like Shakespeare’s lord figure, his ploy to improve Slie seems to have failed miserably. The disguising is no longer fun when the subject of taming, entirely taken in by the illusion, sleeps through the climax of the play and is seemingly unchanged by the experience. He summons his servants to remove the sleeping Slie, “put him in his one apparell againe, / And lay him in the place where we did find him, / Just underneath the alehouse side below” (83). His removal occurs just before the “bitch bet,” or in this case, the “backfired bet.” Aurelius, feeling confident after having tricked his father into blessing his marriage to the youngest of the daughters, challenges his brothers-in-law to see “who will come soonest at their husbands call . . . for a hundred pound” (83). Ferando’s response alludes to the opening induction, which in this case did take place after a day of hunting, but included no hounds:

Why true I dare not lay indeede;
A hundred pound: why I have laid as much
Upon my dogge, in running at a Deere,
She shall not come so farre for such a trifle,
But will you lay five hundred markes with me, (84)

The Shrew builds an explicit scene out of what is merely metaphor in *A Shrew*. Not only does Ferando win the wager, but the stage directions suggest that Kate does tricks for him on command, like a well-trained dog, hawk, or horse, all of which she is likened to in the play (68). When commanded, according to stage directions, “*She takes of her cap and treads on it*” (86) and literally “*laies her hand under her husbands feete*” (88). In *The Shrew*, Kate gets the last word with her long speech of wifely acquiescence. In *A Shrew*, both her sisters rebuke her afterwards. Philena chides her “for making a fool of her selfe and us” (86), and Emelia doubly so by using the incident to correct her new husband that having “a shrew”

for a wife is “better then a sheepe” (88). The sisters, in a show of female community, respond to and correct the illusion of wifely obedience presented in Kate as a vacuous animal who does tricks rather than engage as an embodied subject. We can say then that within the action and within the frame, which is to say for both Slie and these sisters, the didactic performance of the taming of Kate fails to take with its watchers.

Two Shrews

How we read the Slie induction is important to the gender politics of the play because without him to extirpate us from the narrative, the pressure is placed on Kate’s reformation, not on the audience’s assessment of whether physical abuse is the only kind of abuse that should be censured in domestic life. Without an intensely sardonic portrayal of her final conversion speech and in light of the opportunities available in *A Shrew*, Shakespeare’s *The Shrew* is all the more incommensurate with twenty-first century feminisms; it unsettlingly vindicates behavior like that of Ray Rice, the NFL player who was caught punching his then-fiancé now-wife, Janay, in an elevator last September, and then made *her* apologize for it at a press conference. The prominence of Shakespeare as a brand, however, ensures this version will be the one that circulates. When Sly remains, however, as in the anonymous *A Shrew*, the play is not only more dramaturgically coherent, but offers opportunities for critique that Elizabethans (and in re-mountings, we ourselves) participate in a cultural tradition that, Emily Detmer argues, “accepts coercive bonding and oppression as long as they are free of physical violence.”³¹

The history of Pembroke’s shrew plays gives us not only two versions and two possible subjects in need of taming, Kate or Slie, but also three models of what we as audiences are supposed to do with our new knowledge by play’s end: how to tame a shrew. The Duke, Aurelius’ father, encourages us to reject the notion that identity is communally constructed for us and outside our control. Encountering Ferando and Kate on the road to Athens (trying to convince him the sun is the moon) he mutters to himself:

What is she mad to? or is my shape transformed,
That both of them persuade me I am a woman,
But they are mad sure, and therefore Ile be gon,
And leave their companies for fear of harme, (78)

This is in direct opposition to Slie, who *is* easily tricked that a man is a woman (and so perhaps should we be that the boy playing Kate is a shrew). Waking from his “brave” dream, Slie’s first instinct is to go to his “wife presently and tame her too,” now knowing “how to tame a shrew” (89). It is a horrifying surprise to find the simple drunk is married. What exactly are we to believe Slie to take as appropriate shrew-taming considering his consistent misreading of the play, sleeping, and drunkenness?

It would be a frightful place to leave audiences if not for the Tapster. Upon discovering Slie still on his doorstep, Slie asks the Tapster, “Whats all the / Plaiers gone: am not I a Lord?” (89). The Tapster replies: “A Lord with a murrin,” referring to a general cattle blight like mange or plague. *Murrain* was often associated with sheep,³² recalling Emelia’s retort that it is better to be a shrew rather than a mewed, acquiescing ovine. This would suggest that we as audiences are discouraged from blindly giving over to the didactic effects of performance, like Slie, and look at the taming of Kate with a critical eye skeptical of those who merely follow. Noting Slie’s insistence to “tame” his wife, the Tapster’s response is to call him back:

Nay tarry Slie for Ile go home with thee,
And here the rest that thou hast dreamt to night. (89)

The Tapster’s desire to hear Slie’s recounting of his transformation validates the instructive power of theatre to a point. Accompanying the drunk back into his domestic space is a kind of communal policing, which we hope will distract and protect Slie’s wife with the presence of a witness in a model of public, group advocacy. For the moral instruction of theatre to take, as it were, it needs to be mediated through a group environment. As playgoers, *A Shrew* audiences are put in the position to accept or resist the taming instruction of the drama, implicated in the ethics of domestic violence depending on whom we decide, as a group, is more socially aberrant: independent Kate or drunken Slie. Situating *A Shrew* within the larger Pembroke repertory, the play can be understood as presenting us with three factions, emblemized by the Duke, Slie, and the Tapster as models for approaching the problem of the historically pervasive association of masculine violence with female agency.

Notes

1. On the complex history of dating these two plays in relation to one another using player records, see James J. Marino's "The Anachronistic Shrews" in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 25-46.

2. Jonathan Burton, "Christopher Sly's Arabian Night: Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* as World Literature," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 14, no. 3 (2014): 5.

3. William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts*, ed. David Bevington (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996). In-text citations to Shakespeare's *The Shrew* refer to this edition.

4. Gary Schneider, "The Public, the Private, and the Shaming of the Shrew," *SEL* 42, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 251.

5. Holly A. Crocker, "Affective Resistance: Performing Passivity and Playing A-Part in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 155.

6. Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 270.

7. Scott McMillin, "Casting for Pembroke's Men: The *Henry VI* Quartos and *The Taming of A Shrew*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1972): 149.

8. "The Isle of Dogs," *Lost Plays Database*, June 4, 2015, http://www.lostplays.org/index.php/Isle_of_Dogs_The.

9. Scott McMillin, "The Plots of 'The Dead Man's Fortune' and '2 Seven Deadly Sins': Inferences for Theatre Historians," *Studies in Bibliography* 26 (1973): 243.

10. These include Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II*; William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus*, *2 Henry VI*, and *3 Henry VI*; Thomas Nashe and Ben Jonson's *The Isle of Dogs*; and the anonymous *The Taming of a Shrew*, *The Dead Man's Fortune*, *The True Tragedy of Richard III*, and *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*.

11. Siobhan Keenan, *Acting Companies and their Plays in Shakespeare's London* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), 129.

12. The literature surrounding Pembroke's players is swallowed by debates regarding "bad" Shakespeare quartos and the company's "breaking" or failure, promoted by A. S. Cairncross, M. P. Jackson, Mary Edmond, and David George, among others. In the last two decades, these claims have been problematized and refuted by Scott McMillin, Roslyn Knutson, Leah Marcus, and Janet Claire.

13. David George, "Shakespeare and Pembroke's Men," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (Autumn 1981): 307.

14. Leah S. Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 101.

15. *Ibid.*, 102.

16. *Ibid.*, 108.

17. *Ibid.*

18. Roslyn L. Knutson, "Pembroke's Men in 1592-3, Their Repertory and Touring Schedule," *Early Theatre* 4, no. 1 (2001): 135.

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*

21. In both Knutson's monographs, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001) and *The Repertory*

of *Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991), Pembroke's War of the Roses plays are key pieces of evidence to support her claim that necessary features of the vitality of the London marketplace that developed were imitation, cooperation, and variety in company repertory.

22. Knutson, "Pembroke's Men in 1592-3," 133.

23. Sally Templeman, "'What's this? Mutton?': Food, Bodies, and Inn-Yard Performance Spaces in Shakespearean Drama," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 31, no.1 (March 2013): 89-90.

24. Penry Williams, "Herbert, Henry, second earl of Pembroke (*b.* In or after 1538, *d.* 1601)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/view/article/13028>.

25. *Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto and London: The British Library and University of Toronto Press, 1979-2002), *Sussex*, 47.

26. REED, *Shropshire*, 140.

27. REED, *Oxford*, 576 and 383; *Cambridge*, 584.

28. There are 18 individual recorded payments to Pembroke's players on tour outside of London: REED, *Kent*, 270; *Somerset*, 15; *Coventry*, 338; *York*, 455; *Sussex*, 136; *Oxford*, 240; *Somerset*, 17; *Bristol*, 150 and 152; *Coventry*, 353; *Kent*, 485; *Coventry*, 353; *Heref/Worc*, 362; *Norwich*, 113; *Bristol*, 154; *Newcastle upon Tyne*, 131; *York*, 491; *Bristol*, 155.

29. In April 2015, I presented a paper entitled "Drum and Trumpets, and to London all: Sound, Social Blocking, and the Lord Pembroke's Players" at the Early Modern Reading Group's annual conference in Urbana, IL. It articulates in a detailed survey of the company's repertory these related strategies of factional blocking and trumpet calls in an effort to contextualize *The Isle of Dogs* within a larger set of plays. Arguments from that paper and this constitute a chapter, "Sounds and Sennets: Factional Politics and the Lord Pembroke's Players, 1597-1591," in my dissertation project, "Acts of Imagination: Curating the Early Elizabethan Repertories, 1582-1594."

30. *A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The Taming of a Shrew*, Shakespearean Originals: First Editions, ed. Graham Holderness and Bryan Looughrey (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield, 1992). All in-text citations for the anonymous *A Shrew* refer to this edition.

31. Emily Detmer, "Civilizing Subordination: Domestic Violence and The Taming of the Shrew," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (Autumn 1997): 289.

32. "murrain, n., adj., and adv.," *OED Online*, June 2015, <http://www.oed.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/view/Entry/123953>.