These details of difference suggest a final perspective on the gendered language of these two debates. Labé, writing as a woman in an elite male-centered coterie, could allow herself a certain degree of satiric mockery, but to be read or published at all, she had to demonstrate her humanist erudition in a decorous way. She balances the fantasy of her imagined dialogue with pithy bons mots and allusions to writers as various as Plato, Lucian, Virgil, Dante, Leone Ebreo, and Erasmus. Nonetheless, through her displacement of her political views onto Mercury arguing on behalf of Folly, she fiercely criticized the social hierarchies she was challenging as a woman of the middling sort bent on creating herself as a serious writer.

Greene, however, was beginning a lifelong struggle to live by his wits as an underemployed university graduate, in a city where livelihoods were hard to come by and sharp official ears were cocked for criticism of the social order. Translating Labé, he occupied a doubly subordinate position, dependent on both his publisher and the prior French text. But his *Debate* masters Labé's *Débat* in powerful ways: by omitting Labé's name, reducing its length, effacing its irreverent comedy at the expense of men, downplaying its praise of women, pulling out its political teeth, and reworking its precise, restrained phrasing in ways that called attention to his own roaring boy's rhythmic hullabaloo. In this translation, Greene, a masterless and placeless man, made a place for himself: a court of historical and allegorical subjects over whom he held linguistic sway.

Translators may or may not be traitors, but in Greene's *Debate*, he was spectacularly loyal to himself.

Translation and Homeland Insecurity in Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew:* An Experiment in Unsafe Reading

MARGARET FERGUSON

> Indeterminacy means not that there is no acceptable translation, but that there are many.
> —W. V. O. Quine, "The Behavioral Limits of Meaning," 1984

The play text first printed in 1623 as *The Taming of the Shrew* has an indeterminate number of translations woven into its highly malleable text.[1] It also figures the process of translation in a dizzying multitude of ways. Chief among these are the play's explorations of translation as a transformation of character with social, economic, sartorial, and (perhaps) ontological results; and as the dramatization of a humanist exercise in translating ("construing") Ovid in act 3, scene 1. Finally, the play is laced with examples of the rhetorical trope that ancient rhetoricians called "translatio." Quintilian called this the "most beautiful" of figures in *De Institutio Oratoria* (ca. 95 CE); and he explained that it translated the Greek word "metaphora."[2] Modern scholars often explain that both terms signify "a carrying or bearing across." There is no doubt that the spatial image of crossing from one place to another has been central to discourses of translation in the West. But the Greek prefix "meta" means not only "across" but "beyond"—and other things too.[3] This seems significant to me not because something was lost in translation but rather because the existence

of both "metaphor" and "translation" in English underscores Quine's point in my epigraph: indeterminacy, in the sense of an uncertainty that cannot be solved, arises from the multiplicity of possible translations. Although the idea of a translative couple has dominated discourses about translation in the West, as I shall discuss in what follows, *The Taming of the Shrew* invites us to look beyond the couple to scenes of translation occupied by a crowd.

The play is a rich case study for my purposes because its story of the strange courtships and eventual marriages of two sisters—Katherina Minola, the "shrew" of the play's title, and her apparently docile younger sister Bianca—is also a story about two households in which female characters are distinctly unsafe. These households, in and near the Italian university town of Padua, belong respectively to Baptista Minola—a rich merchant and a weak master in several ways—and to Petruccio, who eventually marries Baptista's eldest daughter against her will and cruelly "tames" her in his country house ("for her own good," some critics believe). These households are the key settings for the drama, but it begins and ends in neither of these places. It begins on the cold ground outside of an alehouse with a character initially called "Beggar" cursing a Hostess for having ejected him from her site of hospitality;[4] it then moves to the "fairest chamber" in the great house of an unnamed English lord, where the drunken beggar, now revealed to be Christopher Sly, is pressed into service as an actor/spectator in the lord's evening entertainment, which involves making Sly think he is a "Lord" watching a play about Italian shrew taming next to a servant boy dressed up as his wife. The "Italian" play is performed by a troupe of traveling actors who are what one might classify as "working guests" in the Lord's home.

The Lord's metatheatrical "jest," as he calls it, sets up various comparisons and contrasts between the Induction and the Paduan play. But that latter drama, unlike an alternate version of the shrew-taming play first printed in 1594, does not end up returning us to England and to Christopher Sly's story. Instead, the 1623 play text (nicknamed *The Shrew* to distinguish it from the 1594 play text nicknamed *A Shrew*) ends in yet another Paduan house: the perhaps temporary lodgings of Bianca's new husband, Lucentio, during a banquet celebrating his marriage. From that setting, in which both Petruccio and Katherina act like rude guests, we see the play's most famous image of a house: one in which a singular husband is said to rule his wife as a prince rules his subjects (5.2.161ff.).

Katherina envisions such a house in a speech that ostensibly demonstrates her own newly acquired quality of wifely obedience, and many critics have

shared Julia Reinhard Lupton's view that "the play's interpretation turns on how one reads (or performs, or reads Katherina as performing) Kate's final speech."[5] I do not agree with that judgment, although I find Lupton's reading of Katherina's speech and the whole play sophisticated and provocative. Like Barbara Hodgdon, I question a critical practice that reads the play "backwards" through one speech and that by so doing detaches it from a scene that "troubles comic form and cultural custom." Why? Hodgdon ascribes the troubling effect to the fact that the scene sets Katherina—however her role is interpreted and performed—"against two conventional (perhaps even misaligned) couples who represent the status quo."[6] I argue, however, that the other two couples do not represent a status quo with respect either to what we can reconstruct of contemporary English society or to what most Shakespearean comedies present as an old, overly rigid society in need of being renewed by comic mimesis. On the contrary, the formation of those other two couples, which begins in the middle of the play (3.1) in a scene often shortened by directors and overlooked by critics, arguably makes them just as unconventional as Katherina and Petruccio are—or, perhaps, just as conventional. The problem, for me, is that the play offers no clear image of a status quo or a status quo ante in any of its multiple households.

The plot about Petruccio's efforts to improve his fortunes by wooing, marrying, and taming a rich wife whose unruliness makes her an undervalued commodity on the Paduan marriage market has dominated critical discussions of the play. Debate has focused with particular intensity on the ethical and political questions raised by Petruccio's treatment of Katherina as if she were a wild animal in need of domestication—and on her responses to that treatment.[7] The intricate subplot having to do with the courtship of Katherina's younger sister Bianca by four suitors—Hortensio, Lucentio, Gremio, and Tranio—has stayed in the background of both critical and performance histories, as has Bianca's clandestine marriage to Lucentio after they arguably negotiate its terms by means of joint mistranslations of a passage by Ovid from one of his least famous poems. In the past fifteen years, however, there have been several critics who have reread Bianca's story to make strong cases for why her plot should not be neglected. The "Bianca" critics disagree among themselves about the play's ideological take on marriage as a social institution and on whether females should "naturally" be subordinate to males in private and public spaces. The critical debates about Bianca's courtship and marriage are crucial to my suggestion that *The Shrew* makes multiple and unharmonized statements about the importance of procreative marriage to the

well-being of the body politic. All of the statements that the 1623 play text and its indeterminate number of intertexts make about marital couples are inflected, I argue, by the hybrid institution that produced the play as a theatrical and printed property that was jointly owned by a "company" to which William Shakespeare belonged and in which he held shares. Behind the spousal couple celebrated by romantic comedy is an awareness of the workings of medium-sized groups (the actors, but also the annotators and other "close contrivers" that Paul Werstine analyzes in his work on the "nameless collaborators" who produced early modern plays). Behind that "awareness," which includes a hypothesized authorial intentionality but does not assume that the author was singular or fully in control of the materials—is the image of a potentially unruly crowd that is represented, if only partially, by the mixed-status paying audience in a public theater.[8]

<p style="text-align:center">ↀ</p>

The image of a crowd in which no single person has more than temporary mastery over the others is part of the critical construction this chapter makes by yoking translation with the phrase "homeland insecurity." The critical construction attempts to respond both to textual and historical evidence in and around the 1623 text of *The Taming of the Shrew* and to aspects of my own situation in the post-9/11 era: a geotemporal period in which the U.S. government launched a war in Iraq soon after creating a Department of Homeland Security in 2002. With a requested budget of $38.2 billion for 2015, the department has an official mission of "secur[ing] the nation from the many threats we face."[9] Situated in a nation that reacts to insecurity by increasing it at home and abroad, I reread *The Shrew* with new eyes. I noticed its obsession with houses and its status as the only one of Shakespeare's plays that disrupts the dramatic fiction of a location outside of England by bringing the entire non-English site into the home of an unnamed English lord who evidently lives and enjoys hunting in Shakespeare's own county of Warwickshire. No other Shakespearean drama has a short play within the play that both engulfs the main plot and is, as it were, forgotten by it, since in the 1623 *Shrew* text, as I have noted, there is no concluding return to the frame story and thus to the fiction of a stable "meta" location in England.[10]

My experiment in unsafe reading of *The Shrew* is a product of my own situatedness, which is a phenomenon I do not fully grasp. I borrow the term from David Simpson, who argues that it designates "an instability or obscu-

rity in the language describing our way of being in the world. It is meant to preserve rather than to resolve the tension we experience between being in control and out of control, between seeing ourselves as agents of change and as passive receivers of what is already in place. . . . Situatedness can be read as the designation of an antinomy or aporia."[11] But that does not mean that one gives up on the project of historical understanding. It means, rather, that one proceeds with it without security, without being removed from care. As John T. Hamilton points out in his important book *Security: Politics, Humanity, and the Philology of Care*, "security" translates a Latin word with three key components, the prefix *se-* (apart, aside, away from), the noun *cura* (care, concern, attention, worry), and the suffix *-tas* (a condition or state of being).[12]

"Translation" and "homeland insecurity" might be provisionally understood as *sites* (with a pun on "cites") in a network that puts the present and the past into conversation in a quest for a certain kind of historical understanding. Starting from Walter Benjamin's provocative statement (translated from the German) that "historical materialism conceives historical 'understanding' as an after-life of that which is understood, whose pulse can still be felt in the present," I attempt to yoke translation and homeland insecurity in a critical narrative that allows "the past and the now [Jetzzeit]" to "flash into a constellation."[13] That borrowed formulation gives my "experiment in unsafe reading" more melodrama than it warrants; but Benjamin's thinking about the pursuit of historical understanding without a master narrative of historical continuity or teleology—without, therefore, a secure grounding in the version of "historical materialism" usually if debatably associated with Marx—is important for my project. The phrase "unsafe reading" is devised to suit particular aspects of Shakespeare's play text and its intertexts. But the phrase "unsafe reading" also signals my theoretical and methodological debts to many other scholars who work, and have worked, under the sign of skepticism and against the grain of common sense, which so often, though not always, sustains orthodox thinking.

Intellectual critique, according to a German anthropologist named Helmuth Plessner, is a form of "Entsicherung," a "'desecuring' that vividly removes the 'safety catch' (*Sicherung*) of false authority and dogmatic, reifying patterns of thought."[14] It is of course possible that those undertaking desecuring projects are blind to their own "reifying patterns of thought"; and some writers working the veins of deconstructive critique have explicitly included their own authority in the circle of that which must be doubted, often through versions of the Cretan liar's famous paradox: "All Cretans are liars; I

am a Cretan." My experiment in unsafe reading accompanies a writing practice that attempts to acknowledge, at least intermittently, that the author lacks authority.

I cite Helmuth Plessner "through" Hamilton's recent book, through the lens of his concern with the radical ambiguity of the concept "security." My experiment in unsafe reading entails a writing practice that allows that citation is a risky business that can reveal as well as conceal the mediated and fragmentary nature of a writer's knowledge. Citation, especially when it involves leaving the comfort zone of one's first language, is full of gaps that signal different things to different readers; it is also full of mistranslations and misrepresentations. It is, in short, a site of indeterminacy, uncertain in extent, amount, or nature.

How does one register uncertainty in a way that is not merely tedious for the educated reader? The use of scare quotes is one tactic for signaling doubt about one's terminology, but what are the principles determining which terms are placed in quotes? Why are nouns and verbs more often set off in (deconstructive) quotation marks than prepositions are, despite the fact that a sophisticated "grammar of the mind" such as John Locke's holds that knowledge "consists in prepositions"?[15] How does skepticism about the very concept of "evidence" (from "videre," to see), widely shared though it is, come to receive sustained and productive attention?[16] I do not have answers to these questions, but they underpin my effort (experiment, essay) to explore how the indeterminacies of translation "in" Shakespeare's shrew-taming play provide an occasion for thinking against the tendency to instrumentalize language—and a narrow conception of translation—in the world we live in now.

Mixing Species of Translation

In an article written in 1959, Roman Jakobson puts "translation proper" in the second of three categories. First, there is intralingual translation or "rewording," an "interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language"; second, there is interlingual translation—the dominant meaning of the word: "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language"; and third, there is intersemiotic translation or transmutation, "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems."[17] *The Shrew* provides examples of each of these species of translation in the course of the play, as we shall see; but it does so in ways that show the three

species metamorphosing into one another unpredictably, creating numerous occasions for misunderstanding. Although Jakobson's categories are useful in that they pluralize the commonsense understanding of translation, Shakespeare's text destabilizes Jakobson's categories in ways that anticipate Jacques Derrida's critique of Jakobson for assuming that the language in which "intralingual" translation occurs is a fundamentally homogeneous entity.

In *Aporias*, Derrida writes: "The border of translation does not pass among various languages. It separates translation from itself, it separates translatability within one and the same language." He elaborates the point in *The Ear of the Other*: "If the unity of the linguistic system is not a sure thing," he writes, "all of this conceptualization around translation (in the so-called proper sense of translation) is threatened."[18] This is an idea-complex that runs across Derrida's writing and has also been explored in texts by commentators and Derrida's own translators, with whom he often collaborates.[19] Shakespeare anticipates it and also, arguably, sometimes extends it, especially in scenes in which intralingual translation games reveal the existence of a distinction "within" the domain of English inflected by the social differences among characters who have been educated in Latin and those who have not. A character like Grumio, for instance, who is Petruccio's chief though not only manservant, clearly lacks the cultural capital of a grammar school education: when Petruccio and his friend Hortensio speak a couple of lines of polite Italian to each other in the scene where Petruccio first arrives in Padua (1.2) (just enough to create a joke about the metatheatrical fiction that all of the characters in the Paduan parts of the play are native Italian speakers)—Grumio hears their exchange as something they are "alleging" in Latin (1.2.28). The joke is doubly funny since a version of French was the language of the law in early modern England.

Grumio's example shows, however, that chasms "within" the supposedly unified native language can open not only around a grammar school Latin education as a mark of social distinction that creates a situation linguists call "diglossia." Chasms also open around regional linguistic differences that tend to show differences in the historical "state" of English at a given time. Grumio resists his master's first command in the play—significantly, a command to make a signal to open a gate to a closed house—by pretending not to understand Petruccio's initial command, "Here, sirrah Grumio, knock, I say" (1.2.5), which is followed by a clarification that uses an "archaic" dative construction, that is, a form of English that shows its Germanic rather than Latin ghosts: "Villain, I say, knock me here soundly" (1.2.8).[20] Grumio interprets

Petruccio's "me" not as a dative in a sentence something like "knock [this gate] for me firmly," but instead as a direct object that effectively and provocatively substitutes the person of Petruccio for the house gate he desires opened. Grumio does not bow to Petruccio's will to make what Amanda Bailey persuasively interprets as an ostentatious display of status by a "country rube who has just recently come into a sizeable enough but by no means impressive inheritance."[21] Though I am not certain that anything Petruccio says about his status is to be taken as the truth, Bailey is right that the scene dramatizes the "precarious nature" of Petruccio's station. Petruccio farcically asserts his mastery at the end of the exchange by wringing Grumio by "the ears," the bodily conduit for the "intralingual" mistranslations in which the master and servant have engaged the textual/performative space of the deictic "here."

Above, across, or beyond what the text signifies are the intersemiotic interpretations we can infer to have occurred in a "once and future" time of performance: these involve pointing gestures, in this scene, and also, perhaps, "interrogative" blows that are risky in terms of the mimesis of master/servant relations but comically secure (as Thomas Moisan argues) in the domain of performance and, in particular, in that historical repertoire of performance options that Gina Bloom, Anston Bosman, and William West have persuasively described as "intertheatricality."[22] When Grumio says, incredulously, "Knock you here, sir? Why, sir, what am I, sir, that I should knock you here, sir?," an actor playing Grumio's part could well offer a *simulated* "knock" on Petruccio's chest, as if to say, is *this* the place you mean, sir? Such a gesture would add to the play's running critique of the notion that efficient communication is the major aim of verbal exchanges between those in master and servant roles; such characters' identities ("what am I, sir?") and degrees of power relative to each other are not known in advance but are instead subject to verbal and physical negotiation at every stage of the action.

Read carefully, with a certain kind of queer philological attention that is part of what I mean by "unsafe" reading, *The Shrew* makes an inquiry into "intralingual translation" that suggests the existence of covert and often sexualized language games within the already hybrid terrain of the English language. That terrain had been formed, as George Puttenham stated in his *Arte of English Poesie*, by a series of historical conquests that continued to create divisions in the present. What we "now" speak, Puttenham averred in 1589, "is the Norman English," but before that "it was the Anglesaxon, and before

that the British, which, as some will, is at this day the Walsh, or as others affirme the Cornish: I for my part thinke neither of both."[23] Into this fractured linguistic zone comes Petruccio, whose "archaic dative" seems like a verbal tic that the character may or may not be supposed to perform with something like intentionality over the considerable distance he travels between his first appearance in Padua in 1.2 and his return there, as someone almost ready to buy and rule a townhouse of his own, in the final scene. There, he repeats his use of the dative—and the punning adverb "soundly"—to demonstrate his mastery over Katherina and all the other male and female characters on stage in the concluding banquet scene. "Go fetch them hither," Petruccio commands Katherina, referring to the other wives in the play, Bianca and a Widow whom Hortensio has conveniently married when his bid for Bianca failed. If these females deny his wish, Petruccio adds, "Swinge me them soundly forth unto their husbands" (5.2.109–10). The formulation can be interpreted as "thrash them for me soundly"; but "swinge" has other intralingual translations as well. According to Gordon Williams, it is one of "many copulation-synonyms with [a] primary sense of 'strike.' "[24] It can therefore lead us to consider some of the ways in which the two plots of *The Shrew*—along with its third, unfinished plot about Christopher Sly—invite us to think about homeland insecurity and translation in a sociolinguistic space that I want now to consider as a labile and enigmatically monetized zone between hosts and guests.

Insecurities of Hosts and Guests

The First Folio *Shrew* text begins with a "Begger" cursing a woman who has expelled him from her tavern: "Ile pheeze you infaith," says (or shouts) the Beggar, and the Hostess returns the insult: "A paire of stockes you Rogue."[25] The opening line is usually glossed as "I'll fix you, I'll get even with you"; but the Folio's "pheeze," also spelled "phease," "feeze," "vease," and "feaze," has a bawdy meaning too, like Petruccio's "swinge." According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, "feeze," signifying "twist," derives from the Old Norse "feyka," or fuck. Though the OED examples of this sense are late, the corollary play on "fee" as "coital reward" is attested in several Shakespearean examples.[26] The Beggar's exchange with the Hostess acquires reverberating ironies in the course of the drama; the lines anticipate the violence of Petruccio and Katherina's battle of wits before their marriage puts her under his

control, and they also stake out a territory just outside a house-like structure in which a paying guest who has transgressed the house rules is berated by a host who has lost all semblance of manners.

The exchange reminds us that the category of the "shrew" could be inhabited by men as well as women, though as a term of abuse, "shrew" was becoming increasingly feminized during the sixteenth century. Moreover, as the Induction progresses and we see Sly taken into the house of a male lord intent on amusing himself by "civilizing" the drunken beggar, transforming him into a lord who is married to a boy-wife, we see that the opening exchange with the Hostess sets the stage for the play's intermittent and unsettling reminders that what we think are exchanges between male and female characters are also—simultaneously—exchanges between male actors dressed in clothes signifying different genders. When the Hostess threatens to call in the local "headborough" (constable) to make Sly pay for the glasses he has "burst" (Induction 1.6, 11), Sly promises to "answer him by law" and not to "budge an inch, boy." The insult shifts without a beat from the dramatic fiction that a hostess is female to the boy's body under the Hostess's gown: a body, Sly implies, that has small genital accoutrements.[27]

Christopher Fitter reads Sly's opening lines as "lewd and ludic, disreputably incontinent," an invitation to the audience to experience "holiday license."[28] I would add that Sly's lines also give expression to a frustrated rage against the Hostess as a figure for anyone with the authority to deny hospitality to members of the "large and growing class" of persons who could be legally charged as "vagrants" under a series of acts of Parliament that defined the unemployed as slothful and dangerous to social order. The statutes prescribed punishments of "bloody" whipping, time in the stocks, ear cropping, branding, and, for repeat offenders, execution. Vagrancy is what A. L. Beier has discussed as a "classic crime of status": poor people were arrested for the crime "not because of their actions, but because of their position in society"— a position that signified that they might be thieves in the future or might have committed crimes in the past that went undetected.[29] The category of the vagrant encompassed not only the unemployed but also, as Patricia Fumerton has shown, those who engaged in "multiple, serial, and occasional" forms of work that were deemed illegitimate under the statutes.[30] A statute of 1572, as Beier notes, "included among vagabonds 'common players in interludes and minstrels' who were not patronized by the peerage or the Queen."[31] The traveling company that performs the play Sly watches in the Lord's house would be subject to arrest, therefore—unless they could persuade the Lord to be-

come their patron and master, as the lord chamberlain was for the company in which Shakespeare became a shareholder in 1594—and as King James was when that company opportunely changed its name to the King's Men in 1603. The queen was the patron of a rival company, and her status as the ruler of England is relevant, I will suggest, to *The Shrew*'s reflection on homeland insecurity. From the point of view of conventional Tudor-Stuart doctrine, any country not ruled by a king is in a state of insecurity; and if it is ruled by a queen who has no heir of her body and refuses to name one, things may be seen as dire indeed, at least by some portion of the audience and readership Shakespeare's company aimed to entertain.

The Hostess is, from Sly's point of view, a shrew who threatens him unjustly with legal punishment. The scenario reminds us of a tension in the ideological construction of vagrancy. Those arrested for that crime could be punished by being returned to their birthplace; but once back in that space, they could be charged with vagrancy for being unemployed. If they misbehaved, as Sly obviously has, the ideological crack in the criminalization of vagrancy was easy to miss. When Sly goes from being rejected by a hostess to having a great host who gives him food and drink—and the prospect of sex with a "wife"—the play arguably reflects on the fantasy of masculine rule that began the moment Elizabeth became queen and that continued not just to her death but beyond. Whenever *The Shrew* was first written, it is significant that it leaves open-ended the fantasy that Sly's "translation" to a lord will somehow continue beyond the fifth act, in contrast to what happens to him in *A Shrew*: in that text, he finds himself at the end once again on the cold ground outside of the tavern, where he converses with the "tapster" about the "best dreame / That ever I had in my life," and about the "valuable lesson the dream has given him about how he can tame his own wife."[32] In the Induction of *The Shrew*—though not in the corresponding scene of *A Shrew*—Sly provides a telling account of a "career" that seems to have left him in the same geographical and economic state he was at his birth, in striking contrast to the career of William Shakespeare, born down the road from Sly's village of Burton Heath. Sly names his paternal village and suggests that he has made a circular journey through various jobs to end close to where he began. All of his jobs, including that of "beggar," would have been categorized under the law as vagrancy. A "pedlar" by birth, he became a "card maker" by "education," a "bear-herd" by "transmutation," and he is by "present profession" a "tinker," that is, a "mender" of metal goods who often traveled—as a pedlar did—to sell cheap goods.[33]

Both in his exchange with the Hostess and in his subsequent conversations with the Lord, his servants, and the itinerant actors who are working guests in the Lord's house the night Sly is conscripted as a key element in the spectacle the Lord constructs for his own amusement, the Beggar sheds a searching (if also ludic) light on the zone between guest and host which the Paduan play also explores, most obviously in its depictions of Petruccio's egregious behavior both as a guest at his own wedding in Baptista Minola's house (3.2) and as a cruel and ungenerous host to Katherina in the taming scenes set in his cold and underfurnished country house (4.1, 4.3). Katherina herself draws a fleeting analogy between her situation and Sly's at the beginning of the play when she exclaims to Grumio, "Beggars that come unto my father's door / Upon entreaty have a present alms," whereas Petruccio gives her no food at all (4.3.4–5). The text gives her an odd moment of reflection on the insecurities of the entire system of charitable hospitality, however, when she pauses in her self-pitying comparison to acknowledge that some beggars at her father's door may not have received "present alms" but, "if not, elsewhere they meet with charity" (4.3.4–6). The present tense blandly masks the epistemological shakiness of her statement and opens the door on a pun cluster centered on the word "meet"—as an act of encountering, as a term for conventions of decorum, and as the food that Petruccio and Grumio deny to Katherina with relish, and, allegedly, for her own good.

To approach the play's less visible explorations of the host/guest embedded in the translations subtending the Bianca subplot, I consider Emile Benveniste's historical theorization of the ambiguity carried by the Latin word "hostis." In a section on "hospitality" in volume one of his massive study *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, Benveniste argues that "hostis" originally signified a relation of "reciprocal value" between two persons who were *strangers* in each other's eyes but who were both bound by conventions of behavior, by an economy of mutual compensation—what others have analyzed as the economy of the gift—that could extend its requirements from one generation to another.[34] Benveniste critiques the "global" and "transhistorical" notion that the Latin word "hostis" "means guest but also enemy"—the formulation offered in a note to the English translation of Derrida's fascinating book *Of Hospitality*.[35] Instead, Benveniste argues that a concept and social practice of hospitality as reciprocity between two equals gradually gave way to a more rigid usage of *hostis* as a term signifying an enemy. Benveniste confesses not fully to understand the historical causes of this shift, and his treatment of it is brief. But he makes a valuable intervention in a large field

of inquiry through his suggestion that with the rise of the Roman *civitas*, which he treats as a precursor of the much-debated concept of "nation," fixed geographical boundaries separating insiders from outsiders became more important for practices and ideas of hospitality than they had been in a clan-based society.[36]

Benveniste invites us to think expansively about how England's uneven development as a nation—or what I have elsewhere called an "imperial nation" modeled on Rome's "civitas"—impinges not only on the host/guest relations depicted in *The Shrew* but also on that play's treatments of translation as a means whereby strangers engage in risky modes of communication across different kind of barriers within the so-called nation as well as between what we now call national languages. Those two sets of boundaries are not ideologically symmetrical, and it would not be difficult to argue that in *The Shrew*, as in other Shakespearean play texts, English emerges as an imperial language because it so often incorporates elements of regional languages (Welsh, for instance, as it is misrepresented in *Henry V*) or European languages (especially those that have Latin as a common ancestor) without suggesting that there is any semantic resistance to the incorporation—or any loss to meaning when words from Spanish or French are mistaken by an English speaker such as Christopher (or, as he also says, "Christophero") Sly.[37] We can also, however, view the attitude to "foreign" languages suggested by some of the verbal practices in *The Shrew* as a challenge to one of our own culture's dominant beliefs about the commensurability of national languages. The notion of commensurability is tightly knotted to the idea that translation in its "proper" sense involves a conveyance of linguistic goods from one language to another by a singular translator who has full mastery of two languages.

Questioning the Dyadic Model of Translation

Theories of translation in the West have been dominated by a concern with dyads since the humanist scholar Leonardo Bruni wrote the first (extant) treatise on translation in the fifteenth century. Bruni construed translation in terms of an affectively charged master/slave dialectic between an original author—presumptively Greek—and his translator, presumptively writing in Latin, although for most humanist scholars and educators, Latin was not their "native" tongue. As Jane Tylus explains in her incisive essay on Bruni in the *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, Bruni envisions the "best translator" as

someone who will "turn his whole mind, heart, and will to his author, and in a sense be transformed by him."[38] This language of self-abnegation, which also appears in many humanist discussions of literary imitation, dramatizes the ways in which humanist discourses of translation overlap with early modern discourses about the religious subject's subjection to God ("convertere" is indeed a Latin term for "translation").[39] Moreover, Bruni's description of the "best translator" also evokes Renaissance discourses about the proper wife, who, under English common law, becomes legally as well as physically "one" with her husband when she enters the institution of matrimony. Bruni conceives of translation as a two-stage process, however, and the second involves a transformation into a master's role along with a conception of translation as a transportation of valuable goods from one place (or language) to another. As Tylus explains, "After losing his identity," Bruni's translator "must regain it, and he can do so only if he is absolute master of his own language" during a process that he sometimes calls "traductio" (to lead across), though in his title, he uses the term "interpretatione" and combines it with the adjective "recta" (correct). The possibility of correctness depends on the idea that Greek and Latin are fully commensurate entities; for Bruni, as Tylus remarks, "there are no untranslatables," because everything that can be said in Greek can be said in Latin.[40] Bruni worries, however, about the extreme "difficulty" of correctly translating figurative language, and much of his treatise is taken up with minute complaints about "incorrect" translations of "varieties of figures," down to their number of syllables. He may well have been the first to use "traductio" to render the idea of translation in its "proper" sense, but the problem of "translatio" as a Latin rendering of "metaphora" haunts his treatise and the formulations of other humanist theorists who advocate "correctness" in translation.

The pedagogical analogue to Bruni's translative couple is the theory of "double translation" articulated in Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster* (1570): let the pupil "take a paper book and, sitting . . . by himself, translate into English his former lesson," Ascham writes. "Then, showing it to his master, let the master take from [the pupil] his Latin book, and, pausing an hour at the least, . . . let the child translate his own English into Latin again in another paper book."[41] In his discussion of this passage in *Scenes of Instruction*, Jeff Dolven justly remarks that Ascham is "vague on exactly what constitutes the final form of the exercise—an idiomatic variation? A copy?" But other humanist writers are more specific. John Brinsley in *Ludus Literarius* (1612) writes that the pupil's product should be "the very same latine of their Authors"; and Brinsley compares the double translation process to retracing the steps of a journey,

"for there is the same waie from Cambridge to London, which was from London to Cambridge." As Dolven astutely comments, Brinsley thus manages to combine the journey of translation with the safety of repetition. The pupil is "like a prodigal son, who has ventured out into the vernacular but is now come home safe to a London, or an ancient Rome, that has been waiting, unchanged and immemorial, for his return."[42]

What happens, I want to ask, in those Shakespearean textual sites where humanist methods and conceptions of translation are ridiculed—as Patricia Parker and others have shown them being in *The Taming of the Shrew*?[43] What happens when the critique of humanist translation occurs not only overtly but covertly, and with repercussions for the still-influential theory of the movement of culture from East to West—the theory of *translatio studii et imperii*? The answer is that *nothing* happens if editors are not alert to the possibility of significant mistranslations of Latin lines occurring in the seemingly known territory of an English play. Such a mistranslation arguably occurs in the first act of the Folio *Shrew* play, but it is erased in all modern editions. It was called out, however, by Thomas Moisan in an article entitled "Interlinear Trysting." He observes that when the character Tranio changes the gender of a word in a Latin line from Terence's *Eunuchus* through the intermediary source of John Lyly's famous Latin grammar, modern editors silently correct Tranio's error. The Folio line is "Redime te captam quam queas minimo"; the line in modern editions is "Redime te captum quam queas minimo," or "Buy yourself out of bondage for as little as you can."[44] By the change of one letter—a *u* for an *a*—the editor adds a notion of Latin and gender correctness but subtracts the Folio text's joke about a male character putting on a female persona. "Captam," the Folio text's feminine form, modifies Lucentio appropriately—that is, queerly—if one grants some significance to his own previous comparison of his love for Bianca to Dido's love for Aeneas. The line appropriated from *Eunuchus* and from Lyly by Lucentio's servant might perform a mistake at Tranio's expense; but given that this servant successfully and lengthily impersonates his master for most of the rest of the play, it seems plausible to grant him the wit to regender his master in Latin after his master has compared himself to a famous female enemy of Rome.

Here we have an example of translation involving multiple hands from multiple places—and not all of the hands are working in concert for the same master. Instead of a source and target or "receptor" text, we have a tissue of translations, mistranslations, imitations—silent emendations of an intralinguistic mistranslation deemed insignificant by educated modern editors. We

also see multilingual puns on proper names of characters who travel to Shakespeare's version of northern Italy from Italian, Latin, and earlier English textual sites. This practice of translation is concerned with but by no means bound by the concept of fidelity so important to biblical translation and to the traditional and often gendered figurations of the translator as a handmaid to an authorial (male) original.

Bélen Bistué has argued that Bruni's influential theorization of translation is a defense against a set of historical practices that provide a much better analogue to the practices in *The Shrew* than do humanist models of translation as the safe transport of linguistic treasure from one presumptively unified (and hence masterable) language to another. Bistué analyzes translation practices common in medieval and Renaissance Europe but largely neglected by historians of translation in Europe and North America. She focuses on *team translation*, which did not always require all parties to be in the same geographical space, and on multilingual editions of texts in various genres produced between the twelfth and the seventeenth centuries across Europe. She is interested in these practices and textual products "because they make visible the fact . . . that translation involves more than one writing subject and more than one interpretive position."[45]

The Bianca subplot of *The Shrew* takes us into a site of comic "team translation" that is also a crossroads, as it were, where multiple acts of translation and communication mingle and sometimes produce conflict; but they also produce some new knowledge, rememberings of things that had been forgotten, and even some intriguing "new/old" social arrangements that occur on the borders of what is conventionally considered licit behavior. A key moment in the courtship of Bianca occurs in the garden of Baptista's house when she and Lucentio "construe" a text by Ovid—and do so in a way that makes Ovid, as an author of multiple poems mentioned or alluded to in the play, a ghostly presence in the main plot as well as the subplot. Ovid is liminal both for translation and for homeland insecurity, for he himself was translated, against his will, from Rome to a place of exile on the Black Sea. The poet who wrote the *Tristia*, a series of laments in which he begs his angry patron to pardon him for his two "crimes," a poem ("carmen," perhaps the *Ars amatoria*) and a behavioral "error" (perhaps, scholars speculate, an indiscreet affair with the emperor's own daughter), is fleetingly mentioned in the scene where Tranio and Lucentio first enter Padua: Tranio advises Lucentio not to be so devoted to Aristotle's "checks" (his moral philosophy, teaching self-discipline) as to make "Ovid be an outcast quite abjured" (1.1.33).[46] The allusion has a double

edge, since Ovid, author of the *Metamorphoses*, was not only a "teacher of love" ("praeceptor amoris") but also a negative model for the punishment a love poet could reap if he transgressed a limit set by a powerful patron and patriarch.

Home Schooling Bianca

The best scene for exploring the multiple translational practices and theories that *The Shrew* both performs and reflects on occurs at the beginning of act 3; the scene contrasts neatly with act 4, scene 1, in which Katherina begins her "education" in Petruccio's country house, and is a fulcrum point—at the center of the play—for the "exchange" between the two sisters in terms of the willfulness associated with the role of the shrew.[47] Moreover, in this scene, Bianca's two major suitors, Lucentio and Hortensio, disguised as tutors with counterfeit foreign names, also begin to change dramatically: both start the scene adoring the fair Bianca, but by the end, Lucentio has been ordered through the text of a Latin translation to "despair not," while Hortensio has been rejected along with his amorous translation of an elementary musical text, the "gamut." Gremio, the rich suitor who has foolishly hired Lucentio to plead the old man's case, is out of the picture, as, for the time being, is Lucentio's servant Tranio, who is masquerading as Lucentio very ably. Hortensio, by the end of the scene, starts to see his mistress as a lustful female very likely to become a "ranging" falcon who will go for any decoy pigeon, a "stale." I will return to that term, which the rejected suitor chooses for his rival.

The behavior of the male tutors in this scene and—less blatantly, but still significantly—their female mistress/pupil seems designed in part as a satiric response to antitheatrical views of the stage as a locus for "bad," that is, immoral, education.

Shakespeare's Paduan sisters both point obliquely, I suggest, to the figure of Queen Elizabeth; the Minola sisters, like Elizabeth and her older sister Mary, exist ambiguously on the contested border between public and private domains, between documents of state and discourses containing gossip about the female rulers' bodies. The house in which Bianca and Katherina receive numerous suitors with various educational agendas looks in some ways more like the chief household of England—the court—than it does like the small, private, bounded, ostensibly safe spaces associated today (fantasmatically) with the idea of the home.

In the main paratext for the home-schooling scene of *The Shrew*, George Gascoigne's *The Supposes*, the home is defined early on as a space less safe for private conversation than is the public street. *The Supposes* begins with a female character instructing a virgin—the double of the Shakespearean character Bianca—to "Come forth" out of the house; "let us looke about," Gascoigne's version of Ariosto's Italian character says, "to be sure least any man heare our talk: for I thinke within the house the tables, the planks, the beds, the portals, yea and the cupboards themselves have eares." In *The Shrew*, Bianca inhabits a textual house filled with echoes of Ariosto, Gascoigne, and Ovid, echoes that thematize the dangers that may arise, for the virginal (English) body and body politic, when words circulate promiscuously across borders. The Gascoignean/Ariostean version of Bianca, a young woman named Polynesta, does in fact sleep with her tutor, belying the purity connoted by Bianca's name and fulfilling the dark expectation of her that is articulated at the end of the home-schooling scene by her music tutor, who is also in the place of the rejected suitor.[48] The house in which the Shakespearean Bianca lives is repeatedly presented as a space open to foreign influence and rife with boundary crossings—between male and female bodies, masters and servants, hosts and guests, suitors and thieves, and, last but not least, humans and birds, both female hawks and male decoy pigeons, or "stales." For the moment, I want to stress that themes of education (of birds or women) are closely tied to reflections on dubiously hospitable spaces in *The Taming of the Shrew*. Such spaces resemble Penelope's home in Ithaca, penetrated by predatory suitors; and they also resemble an English court filled with spies, intrigues, and competitions for "place."

In the home schooling scene of 3.1 the rival suitors disguise themselves as a tutor of music and Latin, respectively, while tensely exchanging the roles of actor and spectator. As Lucentio woos Bianca under and through Ovid's rendition of Penelope's words in the *Heroides*, Hortensio looks on suspiciously and impatiently, having been ordered by Bianca to take his "instrument" and "play you the whiles; his [Lucentio's] lecture will be done ere you have tun'd" (3.1.22–23). As Laurie Maguire has remarked, this stringed instrument (a kind of lute) works like many other images of instruments in early modern English texts as an elaborate comic synecdoche "for sexual organs or sexual activity."[49] Bawdy puns proliferate in this scene as Hortensio and Lucentio spar verbally for Bianca's favor while she herself asserts her mastery over them in a ringing denial of schoolboy status that works resonantly and ironically to call attention to her boy's body—and backside—beneath her woman's apparel: "I

am no breeching scholar in the schools," she proclaims (3.1.18). The participle—the only use of it in Shakespeare's textual corpus—is usually glossed as a reference to the common (though disputed) practice of boy-beating by pedagogical masters with a rod named "my ladie birchely" in a famous passage by Richard Mulcaster in *Positions* (1581).[50] But Shakespeare's use of "breech" and its homophone "breach" elsewhere, most famously in *Henry V*, to signify a hole in the fortifications or the enemy line ("Once more unto the breach!," 3.2.1), lurks in the air of this scene, especially when the Latin teacher orders the music teacher to "spit in the hole" (of his instrument) to make the peg stick.[51] Entrance to Bianca's body, whether viewed as belonging to the boy actor or to the privileged young Italian lady the actor is figuring, is a major goal in the verbal game the male characters are playing in this scene—and Bianca is an apparently sophisticated participant in this game, although she preserves appearances at the scene's end by insisting that she prefers "old fashions" to "odd inventions."

Throughout the scene, the Latin tutor carrying a book of Ovidian verse about abandoned women is abusing the trust not only of Bianca's father but also of the elderly suitor Gremio, who has hired Lucentio to carry his (Gremio's) suit forward. As a translator both of Gremio's desires and of Ovid's original Latin words, Lucentio performs freely, with an eye firmly on his own self-interest. He invites us to think about translation as a web with ontological, social, and linguistic strands carrying his desires from one book—Ovid's—to another, the "white" bride he figures as a copyrighted book in act 4, scene 4; here, as Lorna Hutson has astutely argued, Bianca's quality of whiteness is "soiled" through the "clandestine" marriage Lucentio's servant Biondello arranges by giving "counterfeit assurances" to various senex figures (including Bianca's father and even the "old priest" hired to perform the hugger-mugger ceremony). But the book metaphor arguably soils Lucentio as well, mocking his belief that he is somehow the sole author or "imprinter" (his black ink on Bianca's white pages) of the chaste marital property he thinks he has transported from Ovid's Ithaca (already secondhand from Homer's) to Shakespeare's Padua. Biondello tells Lucentio that the Bianca-book is his "cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum" (a Latin copyright formula signifying "with exclusive printing rights") (4.4.89–90).[52] But Lucentio/Cambio's interchanges with Bianca and Hortensio in 3.1 ask us think about translation not as a means of transferring goods such as a book or "household stuff" from one male owner to another but rather as a mode of *queering* notions both of ownership and agency. By queering I mean that such notions are not so much

"subverted" as rendered strange, odd enough to belong in the socio/textual territory that Bianca enters as a rule-bending translator who likes "old fashions" such as that of the clandestine marriage.

It is perhaps not surprising that 3.1's exploration of translation as multiple "supposes," in that word's Latin sense of placing under and also in its English sense of hypothesizing falsely, has tended to be cut in modern performances. The scene requires slow reading to be grasped as a reflection on translation. Drawn from the Italian tradition known as *commedia erudita* and specifically, as I have mentioned, from Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto's *I Suppositi*,[53] the scene of Bianca's supposed education is often drastically altered, as, for instance, in Franco Zeffirelli's 1967 film starring Liz Taylor and Richard Burton. In this film, Bianca's education in a garden by apparently "courtly" tutors is cut, spliced, and ideologically subordinated to the Burton-Petruccio character's perspective—and plot—as he, like an early version of Henry V, pursues a rustic-looking Katherina up stairs and through doors, so that Bianca's lesson becomes a grossly comic (and hardly comprehensible) backdrop for the luscious erotic chase going on "above." Zeffirelli's reading of Shakespeare, however, simply adds a new twist to a quite traditional and Anglophilic understanding of the play. Indeed, Zeffirelli's English-language film corresponds strikingly with Brian Morris's view of the play as outlined in his 1981 introduction to the Arden II edition. Morris argues that "the deepest sources of *The Shrew* lie in the folk-tales and ballads Shakespeare would have known from boyhood. Woven into the strong simplicity of these stories of shrewish wives and drunken tinkers is the fashionable complexity of Italian comedy, which has its roots in the Latin *commedia erudita*" (87).

Morris's way of contrasting the play's strong native roots with its learned and apparently effete foreign ones suppresses the fact that Petruccio's name and character originate in the same *commedia erudita* tradition from which Bianca's suitors come. In Gascoigne's *The Supposes*, "Petrucio" is a servant, or rather, one of a pair of low-born men who serve a "gentleman stranger" referred to only as "The Sienese." In Shakespeare's 1623 text, Petruccio has become a version of his erstwhile master; now he himself is ostensibly a "gentleman stranger" who relishes beating his servants. His roots in a translation from the Italian may acquire a new purchase on our interest if we think about him—and his educational project of wife taming—in relation to the play's theme of dubious genealogical "roots" (starting with Christopher Sly's claim to be descended from "Richard Conqueror")[54] and its multiple games of "supposing"

that involve changes of name as well as of social rank. Bianca's tutors have significant name changes, to which I turn now.

Translation as/and Promiscuous Naming

Lucentio takes the name Cambio, meaning "I change" or "exchange." He is a walking allusion, as it were, to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.[55] Under his Lucentio moniker, this character, like Petruccio, has a previous (and parallel) life in Ariosto's and Gascoigne's *Supposes*. In the Gascoignean/Ariostean textual arena, Lucentio not only uses deceit to gain entrance to the father's house but also, as I noted earlier, penetrates Bianca's virginal body before any marriage ceremony occurs. The two tutors in the Bianca plot are characterological versions—the effect of letters on the page and speaking bodies on the stage—of what we might fairly call multilingual puns.[56] Cambio/Lucentio competes for Bianca's favor with Hortensio disguised as "Licio" (also spelled "Litio" and "Lisio" in the First and Second Folio texts that are the bases for modern editors' renderings of this name). Petruccio introduces Hortensio, disguised as a master of music and mathematics, to Baptista, who presumably knows his fellow Paduan Hortensio well, and who is the owner of the house where the action is occurring. The introduction turns Hortensio from Petruccio's initial host, and apparently his friend and social equal, into a servant verbally effeminized by being treated as a kind of gift between men:

> I do present you with a man of mine
> Cunning in music and the mathematics
> To instruct her fully in those sciences
> Whereof I know she is not ignorant.
> Accept of him, or else you do me wrong.
> His name is Licio, born in Mantua. (2.1.55–60)

Whoever or whatever Licio is, he hails from Virgil's birthplace and enters textual existence as a Shakespearean character in the context of Petruccio's scheme to gain entrance to Baptista's house and elder daughter. Petruccio aggressively turns his host Hortensio not only into a servant but also into a kind of emblem for Petruccio's own ambitions. Initially recognized by Hortensio as someone or something "blown" by a "happy gale" to Padua from "old

Verona" (1.2.44–45), Petruccio could have been recognized by Elizabethans with some schooling as a *servant* from another textual home who is now appearing in the (perhaps false) guise of a man of independent means: "Crowns in my purse I have, and goods at home," this son of a recently dead father proclaims to Hortensio; but if he has all those goods, why is he so eager to "thrust" himself into the comic "maze" of marriage plots aimed at "wiving" and (thus) "thriving" (1.2.50–52)? The comic glaze over the words and names in this play suggests that we take all of the male characters' genealogical claims with some skepticism.

Hortensio, whose role as Petruccio's friend is later taken over by Tranio, is a problematic character textually; Hodgdon suggests that his peculiar role may represent "a stage of revision we cannot recover."[57] His appearance as a double and erotic rival to Lucentio suggests that Hortensio exists, in both his original name and in his set of differently spelled aliases, as a supplemental and liminal figure; in the Folio texts of *The Shrew*, Hortensio is part of the "courtship of Bianca" plot, but he, unlike Lucentio, has no analogue in the plot's main textual source: Gascoigne's 1566 translation of Ariosto's play about mistaken substitutions, which is itself an imitation—or what might also be classified in Dryden's phrase as "translation with latitude"—of Terence's *Eunuchus*. Although Hortensio the music master and rival to Lucentio is absent from those source texts, his alias is present in *The Supposes* in the form of a servant—a character named Litio or Lytio who knocks on a sleeping man's door in a way that comically resembles Grumio's knocking—after repeated instruction—on Hortensio's door in the Folio's *Shrew* play. So Hortensio is a character who both is and is not "translated," we might say, from an Italian set of texts into an English set including both Gascoigne's play and the 1623 Folio version of *Shrew*. What is then in his nickname, we might ask? Something about the lability of master-servant relations in the world Shakespeare constructs to mirror aspects of England in apparently Renaissance Italian settings that are themselves full of ancient literary echoes. Hortensio, in any case, the man with a house in Padua who is alleged to come from Mantua, is an interesting if not altogether trustworthy guide into the intertextual and multilingual territory limned—in a fragmentary way—by the puns I hypothesize as lurking in his alias.

Licio's name has been endowed with semantic baggage in its intertextual travels by only one scholar I have found: Richard Hosley. Writing for the *Huntington Library Quarterly* in 1964, three years before publishing an edition of *Shrew* for Pelican, Hosley persuasively argues that Hortensio's alias should be

read within the New Comedy tradition of meaning-bearing names:[58] after all, Hortensio's main rival is nicknamed Cambio, which, as we have seen, carries an Italian verb and noun into the English play text while signaling as well a complex set of allusions to Ovid. Hosley argues that the names of other servant-characters in *The Shrew* also carry foreign meanings, for instance "Grumio," the name of Petruccio's servant, signifying "clodhopper," or, I would add, the English word "groom"; Grumio gains in comic richness by having his name separated by only one vowel from the rich senex figure, Gremio. Hosley does not, however, consider the possibility of a signifying name carrying more than one possible meaning, and that is where he and I part company. To put his argument about Hortensio's alias in a nutshell, Hosley thinks that Hortensio's alias comes from an old Italian word for garlic found in the verse version of Ariosto's *I Suppositi*; the Italian word is "lizio," and the name in the English playwright's text should therefore be spelled that way in a modernized text of Shakespeare's play; "Litio"—as a variant spelling for "Lizio" in Ariosto's text—should be used henceforth in "normalized old-spelling texts."[59] Although modern editors have evidently not found Hosley's semantic argument persuasive—and his notion of a "normalized" old-spelling text strikes me as a contradiction in terms—most modern editors do standardize the nickname as "Litio." I propose an alternative to Hosley's interpretation of the nickname that interrogates that standardizing practice.

There is a web of potential puns on the name in question, and "Litio," of the three possible spellings in the First and Second Folio versions of *The Shrew*, does the least to make that web visible for the modern reader. Hortensio's nickname appears as "Litio" (three times) and as "Lisio" (four times) in the First Folio; in the Second Folio, it also appears as "Licio." No one of these spellings is more correct than another—none, that is, can be preferred on the grounds that it faithfully represents a singular author's intention. But the historical fact that variant spellings are common in an age before lexical standardization should not prevent us from seeking historical understanding in "minute particulars," as William Blake called them. My candidate for Hortensio's nickname is "Licio"—and Barbara Hodgdon, I am delighted to say, has voted for this option in her Arden III edition—on the grounds that it opens more semantic windows for modern readers than do the other spellings.[60] "Licio" has both a phonic and a graphic kinship with the Italian verb "licere," "to allow or to license"; and that semantic dimension of his nickname links Hortensio to characters in other early modern English plays who have versions of this name (Licio, for instance, in John Lyly's *Midas* of 1592, and, as mentioned

above, a servant named Lytio or Litio in Gascoigne's *Supposes*). The intertextual network creates links among an indeterminate number of characters who share Hortensio's qualities of ambition, unrootedness, and desires that may be deemed illicit by someone with authority over them. The interlingual pun on "licere" brings Ovid the exiled (because transgressive) lover together with many characters who were defined as vagrants in early modern England; the pun blurs the boundary between elite and popular cultures, as does the possibility that the pun works intralingually as well as interlingually. One feature of the "forward" suitor bearing the name Licio is that he is "lecherous." This is an English word that has Old English, French, Italian, and Provençal roots connoting, among other things, licking, living in debauchery, and greediness. In "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?," Derrida writes that "if I love the word, it is only in the body of its idiomatic singularity, that is, where a passion for translation comes to lick it as a flame or an amorous tongue might."[61] He adds that he does not know how, or in how many languages, "you can translate this word lécher [in French in Venuti's English translation] when you wish to say that one language licks another, like a flame or a caress." I do not know either, but Shakespearean English, which welcomes Latin and Romance languages into its body, would surely be one. *The Shrew*, that is, may be said to play an interactive and indeed erotically inclined host to the guest of the Latin and Italian complex centering on the verb "licere." This is one of those words Derrida uses to illustrate his contention that *each* word "carries in its body an ongoing process of translation," but some words, such as "lécher" and "relevant"—which Derrida takes from Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*—do so more visibly than others.[62] Such words have networks of use in which the word *"floats* between several languages . . . and that merits an analysis that is at once linguistic and sociological, political and especially historical, wherever the phenomena of hegemony thus come to inscribe their signature on the body of a kind of idiom that is European . . . in character" but that may be "spreading universally" in a world in which certain languages have global economic reach.[63]

From "licere" comes the English word "licit"; moreover, an Italian cousin appears as "lice" (the third person present singular verb form—banish from your mind the image of multiple bugs conjured up by the English noun) in a famous line from Tasso's pastoral drama the *Aminta*, which was translated into English by Abraham Fraunce in 1592. The line is "s'ei piace, e lice" (if it pleases, it's licit), and it is a line I propose not as a certain *source* for the "Licio" of the *Shrew* text but rather as a thread in a web of meanings that emerges out of the

interaction among material texts—in this case, printed ones from the sixteenth century—and a modern reader situated in complex institutional and linguistic ways. The web I am both finding and spinning around the name Licio might include English, Latin, French, and Italian words in the "licit" family.

Unlike the proper names defined by grammarians as different from common nouns because the former supposedly point to a single individual, the ostensibly proper name Licio operates promiscuously, pointing to multiple possible referents in precisely the way that the servant named Lytio in Gascoigne's play *The Supposes* suggests is possible when he says, in response to a question from his master about why there seem to be two men in that fathermaster's role: "I cannot tell you what I shoulde say sir, the worlde is large and long, there maye be moe Philganos and moe Erostratos than one, yea and moe Ferrars, moe Sicilias, and moe Cathaneas: peradventure, this is not that Ferrar which you sent your sonne unto [another Suppose]."[64] Hortensio's alias's textual ancestor or double suggests here that the network in which his name exists is known—and still partly knowable—quite differently to differently educated persons; the network can never be fully grasped—phenomenologically or epistemologically—because we cannot say for sure who makes what intertextual or interlingual connection when. This is true both despite and because of the work generations of editors and scholars have done as they open and close the variable texts of the 1623 *Shrew* play by standardizing spellings and annotating—or not annotating—formulations that may seem "forward," "preposterous," and in need of censorship to some readers.

The puns lurking in Hortensio's assumed name, and in the multiple sources for it, suggest that the network of associations the Licio name calls up, or might call up for different readers and auditors, serves to broach versions of a significant question for upwardly mobile writers, readers, and spectators in Elizabethan England: what are servants *allowed to do and be* as they cross borders—geographical, linguistic, temporal, sexual—and risk punishment, but also court advancement and pleasure by doing so? Or to what extent are lecherous desires licit, and how can one know without attempting to break some rules?

This is the kind of question that another of Hortensio's close textual cousins poses in act 1, scene 2 of John Lyly's *Midas*. Here, two servants named Petulus and Licio debate which of them is the "better man"; Petulus serves a man, and Licio serves that man's daughter; therefore, says Petulus, "the Masculin gender is more worthy than the feminine, therefore Licio backare." To this Licio (or rather "Li," in the text's speech heading) replies, "That is when

those two genders are at jarre, but when they belong both to one thing, then—"
"What then," says Petulus—"Then," retorts Licio, "they agree like the fiddle
and the stick." The dialogue continues, with Licio chastising Petulus for be-
ing too saucy a "boy" and then introducing a violent image of censorship:
"Lock up your lips or I will lop them off."

This scene is directly echoed in act 2, scene 1 of *The Shrew* and also has
resonant parallels in the home-schooling scene of 3.1, to which we shall
shortly return. In line 73 of 2.1, Gremio pretentiously uses a "foreign" expres-
sion to show off his (pseudo) knowledge;[65] Gremio exclaims, "Baccare! You
are marvellous forward," and his words invite the actor to make a gesture of
bodily censorship that consists of pushing Petruccio back. Petruccio replies
with comically false deference and very likely, modern editors surmise, with a
bawdy pun in his line's final participle, "O pardon me, Signor Gremio, I
would fain be doing" (line 74).[66] This exchange between male characters, like
that in Lyly's play, arguably offers a translingual joke on *baccare* as a word
playing on the English word "back" as well as on the very fact of a comic merg-
ing of English and Latin letters or sounds in a form that conjures up the
same-sex antics—including sadistic punishments—of the Elizabethan school-
room. If we read Shakespeare's lines as part of a larger textual field including
Lyly's dialogue between two clever servant boys, one of whom, named *Licio*,
is elsewhere in Lyly's play called a "page," it seems likely that *baccare* comes
from the sociolinguistically dense (and to us somewhat foreign) world of
bi- or trilingual schoolboy humor, a world where what would later be called high
and low cultures promiscuously and even preposterously mix. This is precisely
the world in which Hortensio and Lucentio, alias Licio and Cambio, com-
pete for masterly prerogative over their ostensibly female—and temporarily
shared—pupil, Bianca.

Cambio begins 3.1 by assuming a tone of mastery over his rival; the first
line is an insulting alliterative command, "Fiddler, forbear. You grow too for-
ward, sir." The line recalls Gremio telling Petruccio to back off (as I read
"baccare") in 2.1, and reminds us that Hortensio/Leechio (as I shall hence-
forth take the liberty of spelling his name) is very much Petruccio's "man"
even though Hortensio, like Lucentio, will eventually be a "loser" in the game
of wife commanding when Petruccio is a winner, at least temporarily. As a
winner of the play's concluding wager, which harks back to the Induction
Lord's boasting of successful bets on his hunting dogs, Petruccio fulfills fan-
tasies that are also ascribed to the play's other suitors: "you are the man / Must
stead us all," as Tranio says in 1.2 (255–56). But none of the aspiring husband/

masters in the play gains a secure position as master of a household. Petruc-
cio's win in the play's famous final scene may depend on Katherina's agreeing
to play a theatrical game with him, as, according to one interpretation of her
character, she learns to do in the scene on the road (4.5) where she goes from
being Petruccio's "puppet" to being his fellow actor deceiving a senex figure.
While critics, directors, and actors continue to disagree about how to read her
infamous final speech declaring wifely obedience, we should not forget that
she and Petruccio, in their still unconsummated marital union, both stand to
gain economically from winning his wager. Petruccio's win, however, which
seems to indicate his mastery of Katherina's will, is revealed as temporary in
the larger textual arena in which I have been suggesting that we set this play
text, for as we have seen, John Fletcher published a "sequel" in 1610 to one or
both of the earlier *Shrew* plays, *The Tamer Tamed*, in which Petruccio comes
on stage as a male character banished from the bed of his (new) wife and hu-
miliatingly demoted from the role of master in his own household. Fletcher's
audience, like Shakespeare's, included readers who knew that what goes around
comes around in comedy: Petruccio was/is a servant in Ariosto's and Gas-
coigne's text about "supposing," and his rise to mastery can be read as a
narrative no more secure, in the end, than Christopher Sly's, famously left
unfinished in the 1623 *Shrew* text.

Changing Places

Act 3, scene 1 of the Shakespearean *Shrew* text limns and foreshadows some
of the dangers lurking for such characters as Sly and Petruccio. The male char-
acters here play roles that stress the ambiguity and lability of the master/
servant dyad. Lucentio and Hortensio, and their theatrically renamed "dou-
bles," are servants paid to instruct rich men's daughters, and one, the music
master, has already been beaten and humiliated by Katherina. As pedagogues,
Leechio and Cambio presumably possess a measure of mastery over their "in-
struments" of instruction: a lute and a book of Ovidian verse. Bianca, however,
their Petrarchan mistress and (they hope) their docile pupil, appears to know
at least as much if not more music and Latin as her tutors. A three-way battle
of wits ensues, one that looks back at a primal battle of Western culture, that
initiated by the theft of a Greek wife, Helen, by Paris, a son of the Trojan
king Priam. The figure of the male tutor in this scene, like the figures of
the actor and of the translator that the scene also invites us to think about,

illustrates a series of quick changes from master's to servant's position and back again; like Sly the pedlar become a tinker become a lord, the tutors change places but do not necessarily grow rich in their movement.

Bianca herself moves in this scene from the high position of desired potential wife (and perhaps also of a "patroness," as line 5 suggests) to being at least obliquely the butt of bawdy humor "between men" who play with the audience's awareness that the body beneath the virginal and apparently queenly Bianca's costume belongs to a boy. The boy's body arises, as I suggested earlier, despite and because of Bianca's proclamation that she is "no breeching scholar." The home-schooling scene suggests how thin and possibly illusory is the line that exists between what Moisan calls shrew "training" and shrew "taming." The sisters are shown by the play's metaphors of falcons to be two birds of a feather, although Bianca will imagine herself as a "bird" in a less aristocratic sport than hawking when she speaks to Petruccio in the play's final scene: as he seems to be coming after her for "a better jest or two," she asks, "Am I your bird? I mean to shift my bush" (5.2.48). Shifting the metaphor to a sport where the bird is the prey rather than the servant-hunter of the master, Bianca makes a bawdy joke about her "bush" and then challenges everyone on stage to pursue her with their bows. But she proves to be a difficult target to hit, in part because she joins with her sister, and with the barely characterized Widow who marries Hortensio, as a version of Ovid's Penelope when all three are together on stage or page during the final scene.

Ovid's Penelope, taking time off from her weaving and unweaving activities to write a letter of complaint to her absent husband, presents a darkly comic counter to the image of the obedient and socially privileged wife Katherina limns in her famous speech.[67] Whereas Penelope's husband is off having enjoyable adulterous affairs while his wife is unsafe at home, Katherina portrays a wife who lies "warm at home, safe and secure," while her husband has

> commit[ted] his body
> To painful labour both by sea and land,
> To watch the night in storms. (5.2.154–56)

In neither case are husband and wife together in the same space, securing the future through biosocial reproduction. With this aporia in mind, we may also notice that Bianca and the Widow have no chance to speak after Katherina's last words. Critics, directors, readers, and actors have had wildly different

opinions about how Katherina's words should be interpreted, and that, perhaps, is what the play is set up to achieve: a debate, a desire for the story to continue, as indeed it did with John Fletcher's sequel. But the play is also set up to ask some readers and spectators to think about the audience members who are silent at the end: Bianca and the Widow, who are also figured in and by Penelope.

Penelope in No-Man's-Land

Counterpointing other major scenes of education in the play—Katherina's rough behavioral modification training in Petruccio's country house, the later scene of education in humility and /or acting on the road back to Padua, and, arguably, the final scene where Katherina steps into the role of wife-teacher and actor—act 3, scene 1 raises without answering questions about both male and female fantasies of dominion in a space that is fundamentally insecure: a garden within a house within an Italian city that comes to be compared not only to ancient Ithaca but also to ancient Troy, a homeland recalled in Latin words—foreign words—in an English text that also contains not one but two (competing) translations of the original words. The foreign words become the pretext for a courtship resulting in an illicit (but swiftly, fantastically licensed) marriage that proceeds without paternal consent and that leads, ultimately, to the new wife disobeying the new husband and publicly humiliating him in a competition between men in the play's final scene.

Ironically, the foreign words are from a letter by a wife chiding her (long absent and sexually unfaithful) husband, and they serve as the shaky ground, as it were, on which two well-educated English speakers supposedly speaking in Italian engage in a battle of wits. In a further ironic turn, the words that Cambio and Bianca mistranslate concern the fall of a primal patriarchal structure of Western culture—the "lofty palace" of Priam—and the flow of a river—the Simois—through a landscape that now (at the moment in history when the words are imagined as being spoken) belongs to no one, neither the defeated Trojans nor the Greeks, who have (mostly) departed for and even arrived at their homes. It is elegantly apt, therefore, that the fragment of an Ovidian letter included in a Shakespearean play about ongoing battles between persons of different genders and social ranks should be two of the only four lines of Ovid's poem that are presented as an interpolation, literally, a quotation of an unnamed speaker within the web-like fabric of Penelope's epistle

to her absent husband. Moreover, the unnamed man is a complex figure for both a faithful and an unfaithful husband—and, I would argue, for the inability of any single author fully to possess a textual property through *translatio imperiiet studii*. Shakespeare's young lovers spar with each other by means of a text not only quoted from a Greek warrior in Penelope's letter as written by Ovid, but in the particular lines cited (and recited), Ovid is himself translating—and altering—a famous textual sequence spoken by Aeneas at Dido's request in book 2 of Virgil's epic—before Aeneas has become Dido's husband (in her view, at least), and before he has abandoned her for Rome. The speaker whom Lucentio takes as his (renewed) starting point for courtship thus stands in for, speaks in the places both of Ulysses and Aeneas, historical enemies cast by Ovid as occupying the same place, as narrators of an ancient story for an audience including a powerful female (Dido, also called "Elissa," and Penelope); such female figures have their own (somewhat dissonant) stories to tell, which makes the cited textual ground indeed a space of multiple and competing translations.

Ovid ventriloquizes or steals Penelope's words throughout the first poem of the *Heroides*, but in the two lines Shakespeare's male tutor chooses to read from the book of Ovidian verse gullibly given to him by Gremio, we hear (see) a "male" voice describing in a mini-ekphrasis an ephemeral picture—traced in wine on a table—of a Trojan "place" that no longer exists in its original form although it exists in the unnamed speaker's memory. It is reconstituted, but also drastically altered. By not naming the speaker, Ovid makes the lines into a "commonplace," part of a multilingual cultural inheritance over which battles between men—and between men and women—continued to occur in Ovid's time and again in Shakespeare's. Ovid's *Heroides*, in which he ascribes to ancient women like Penelope and Dido laments very similar to the kind he penned in his own *Tristia* bemoaning his unjust exile, were commonly studied by English boys in grammar schools (fifth form!) and were also licensed, even recommended, reading (as several other of Ovid's texts distinctly were not) for privileged girls being educated at home, that is, in "private" spaces suited for their social function as wives in training. A female's education, according to Richard Mulcaster, must be "within limit" because her "end" is marriage, "obedience to her head," whereas "our" training—that is, men's—is "without restraint for either matter or maner, bycause our employment is so generall in all things" (*Positions*, 176). Mulcaster's neatly gendered ideological division is troubled, however, when he has to admit that some girls are destined for "government" and hence cannot be fully contained

within the private sphere of the house or, by implication, the straitened role of the obedient wife. By making a pair of lines from *Heroides* 1.1 the "ground" for a seriocomic replaying of a battle about who will wear the breeches (as it were) in the marriages being generated in the play, Shakespeare intervenes slyly in a cultural debate about the role of women in "government" in both private and public spheres. Although Erasmus considered Ovid's first *Heroides* poem well suited for girls' "private" education—and indeed as "most chaste," Shakespeare's play reopens the question about what kind of educational model Ovid is, even or perhaps especially when he writes of Penelope shrewishly chiding her absent spouse.[68]

Ovid's poem is obsessed with the uncertainties of culturally transmitted knowledge, including a wife's knowledge of her husband's sexual behavior and, by implication, his of hers. Penelope describes her repeated efforts to gain knowledge of Odysseus's whereabouts since he left Troy years ago, but the "word brought back from Pylos," for instance, "was nothing sure" ("incerta est fama remissa Pylo").[69] A brief respite from uncertainty occurs when an anonymous person who was once at Troy shows Penelope and her guests what happened; what Ovid gives us is the verbal traces of that scene, not the winedrawings but the accompanying words beginning with a "shifter," a deictic "here" (hac) that Shakespeare's text shifts once more in what some modern editors note (but do not theorize) as a textual "corruption": Ovid's "hac" becomes "hic" in the English "copy" of the lines. The difference is so slight that the English translation does not register it either in a modern bilingual edition of Ovid such as the Loeb or in modern editions of *Shrew*, which give three "hics." Does this matter? I will argue that it does in the play's larger reflection on processes, and purposes, of translation.

Lucentio/Cambio reads the Ovidian lines in response to Bianca's question "Where left we last?" indicating that the tutoring and courtship activity have begun in a previous time unavailable to the audience and presumably also to Hortensio/Leechio's prying eyes and ears. "Here, Madam," says Cambio, and proceeds to read Ovid's deictic "here" as paradoxically pointing to a place *not* here, not in any "present" except that of the (re)reading or enacting of the words on the page: "hic ibat Simois; hic est Sigeia tellus; / hic steterat Priami regia celsa senis" (*The Shrew* 3.1.27–28). The Latin text, in all editions of Ovid, gives the opening word of each of the three parallel clauses differently: "*Hac* ibat Simois, *haec* est Sigeia tellus; / *hic* steterat Priami regia celsa senis" (my emphasis). The (Shakespearean) English, as I have remarked, simply does not register the change (and neither does the modern English of the Loeb

translation). Perhaps illustrating a queerly retroactive influence showing the "target" language's power over the "source" language, the Latin "in" the Shakespearean text removes the slight but significant difference of specifying words too: as translated in the Loeb, and in the notes of modern editions of the Shakespearean play, the lines read: "Here [hic] flowed the river Simois; here [hic] is the Sigeian land; here [hic] stood the lofty palace of old Priam." In Latin texts of Ovid's poem, "hac" (an adverb) is what Shakespeare renders as the first "here"; it goes with Simois and means "in this way";[70] in the second instance, "haec" is the Latin original, the feminine singular version of "hic," and agrees with "tellus," the feminine noun for earth (and also for the goddess of that name); in the third and last instance, the Latin original is "hic," the form appearing in all three parallel "places" in Shakespeare's version of Ovid's Latin. "Hic" is a *common* word for "here," contrasted in some dictionaries to the "less common" "hac"; "hic," which can also signify "this" functioning as a pronoun, triumphs over the other less common forms. A Latin scholar would know that Ovid's "hic" is functioning as an indeclinable adverb, not as a pronoun, because if it were the latter part of speech, it would need to be in a feminine form to modify the feminine noun "regia" correctly. In the Shakespearean version of the Ovidian lines, however, rules of gender agreement are loose (as we saw when the feminine "captam" modified the "male" character Lucentio); so at the end of Lucentio's reading of Ovid's lines, we cannot be certain whether he is imagining Priam's palace as the paradoxical deictic "here" of a textual description of a past place now destroyed; or as "this" place, here (there), in Baptista's house, which Lucentio/Cambio is presently translating into a new version of Priam's house, with Lucentio/Cambio playing the role of a Greek bearing gifts, a role like that of Ovid's Ulysses, whom Penelope justly suspects has been unfaithful in the long years of his voyage from there to here.

We have a choice of seeing such details of translational grammar as boring or interestingly boring; if we choose the latter path, we have to ask how and why to ascribe significance to the apparent textual "mistake" in the *Shrew*-text's copying of the original Latin "hac" and "haec." We cannot proceed on the basis of any simple notion of authorial or printerly intentionality, although hovering on the edges of the picture is Emerson's wry observation that "it is remarkable that we find it so hard to impute our own best sense to a dead author."[71] Bracketing intentionality, I want to suggest that the small changes in "hac" and "haec"—flattening them all to "hic"—may serve for a reader concerned with the "letter" of translation to signify a *lack* of such concern on the

part of the set of textual effects we read as a "character" named Cambio/Lucentio, a character posing as a Latin *teacher* but repeatedly and extravagantly exposing his "true" status as an English-speaking lover manipulating words for his own purposes in a Paduan garden inside an Ovid-loving English lord's house. For most spectators, whether Elizabethan or modern, Lucentio's "hics" serve as comic hiccups in a speech that is funny precisely because it is incomprehensible; but for the studious reader of the text, there is another dimension of comedy lurking in the way the "hics" get rid of pesky problems of gender and agreement and, by doing so, underscore Lucentio's shaky mastery of Latin syntax. He is amusingly *careless* of the original, even as he makes jokes that might have been fleetingly amusing to his first readers as their pedagogical egos were flattered by translations whose general meaning is already known: Lucentio is wily like a flowing river; his identity ("hic est") involves his status as son of one Vincentio of Pisa (whom, as we have also learned, never stays in one place but flows like a river); the Sigean land or earth is no foundation for this man's identity but merely a pretext for his ability to disguise himself to get his interlocutor's love; that which "stood" here ("hic steterat") is the virile Lucentio come a wooing, and "Priam" is no longer a king but a servant ("my man Tranio," who bears his master's "port"—a complex joke on doubling, since "port" signifies "bearing" as Tranio, in Lucentio's clothes, signifies Lucentio). The pun on "port" and "bearing" does not for long remain a doublet; it quickly opens to another signification: port as the kind of place where a merchant puts in to rest—and exchange goods—before sailing to another such place. The English word "port" is thus a clever "suppose" or stand-in for "regia"—the Latin name for a noble house, a king's palace; and in this slyly signaled mistranslation, we are reminded, as Moisan writes, that Lucentio's very choice of what Ovidian lines to read for his continued "lesson" has a political valence, albeit a debatable one. Does his choice of *these* Ovidian lines have the effect, as Moisan argues, of "silencing and suppressing a radically different and far unhappier perspective on the domestic arrangement [that] Katherina's exposition dutifully idealizes" in the play's final scene, when she describes the husband laboring in his sea-voyaging work while the wife lies "warm at home, secure and safe" (5.2.149–51)? Or does Lucentio/Cambio's choice of text look ahead to his own *inability* to master a "disobedient" wife in the play's final scene? How different is that Bianca from the one shown in 3.1 asserting her refusal to be mastered by her tutors? "I am no breeching scholar in the schools," she proclaims, using a resonant participle, as I noted above. She goes on in this passage to echo her older sister in a significant way: "I'll

not be tied to hours nor 'pointed times, / But learn my lessons as I please myself" (3.1.15–18). The lines recall Katherina's scornful words to her father back in her "shrew" phase: "What, shall I be appointed hours?" (1.1.102).

The scene in which Bianca echoes not only Katherina but also Ovid's Penelope quoting an unnamed man situates us in a cyclical time of ongoing contests for mastery among rivals who may switch genders—on the page—in the process of translation among languages. Let us look once more at Ovid's lines, this time as "construed" by Bianca immediately after a bawdy exchange between her and Lucentio/Cambio at Hortensio/Leechio's expense. Eager to get his chance at teaching Bianca "the order of my fingering" (l.60), this suitor has interrupted the Latin lesson to announce that his "instrument's in tune" (35). Demanding audible proof of the claim, Bianca exclaims, "O fie! The treble jars." Her line plays metatheatrically on the audience's awareness of the sliding tones of her own voice, a boy's rising to figure a girl's. Lucentio/Cambio responds with the joke quoted earlier ("Spit in the hole, man, and tune again"), reminding us of the many holes at play in this scene, including that of the woman's mouth and ears; even hearing such words from her suitors endangers Bianca's premarital chastity; so does her act of speaking as if she were an English version of a woman already married, a mother, and abandoned by Ulysses. Bianca, however, quickly sets about retuning the "instrument" of Ovid's lines for her own purposes, with a "treble" better than the music teacher's; later, she will tell him directly that his lesson of a "gamut," or scale, which he presents to her as a letter translating the scale's letters into alphabetic ones glossed with statements about his desire for her love, is unnecessary—"I am past my gamut long ago" (67)—and, moreover, unpleasing to her. She prefers the Latin master's suit, but only in the form in which she translates it, which differs as much from Lucentio's translation as it does from a faithful English version of Ovid's original.

Nonetheless, as Heather James has suggested, Bianca's version of Ovid's Penelope pays more attention than Lucentio's does to the syntactic "integrity" of the Latin, and this is significant for the play's reflection on translation as a mode of discourse somehow in between "old fashions" and "odd inventions."[72] Bianca begins her translation exercise by using subjects and verbs to make her statements, whereas Lucentio used only "neighbor" word pairs—which speaks ill of his ability really to grasp the rules of Latin syntax as different from English, which relies so much more heavily on word order. Moreover, when Bianca uses a single word—*regia*—to express her desires, she uses it to display her (present) power as a female ruler to tell a suitor to "presume not." Her ver-

sion of "regia" counters Lucentio's interpretation of the word as signaling *his* power to command a servant (Tranio) "bearing my port." She takes his claim to rule, as it were, and translates it into her own, which anticipates what she wittily does both in her final translated statement and, later in the scene, in the ironic rationale she gives for preferring Lucentio's suit (as revised by herself) to Hortensio's.

Here is her version of Penelope's web, a weaving of Ovid's words with her own in counterpoint with the already mixed text previously offered by Lucentio/Cambio: "'*Hic ibat Simois*,' I know you not, '*hic est Sigeia tellus*,' I trust you not; '*hic steterat Priami*,' take heed he hear us not, '*regia*,' presume not, '*celsa senis*,' despair not." Her English clauses are far from the literal meaning of the Latin, but they are nonetheless figuratively *attached* to the original in a way that Lucentio's are not. An always flowing river like Lucentio cannot be known; the "ground" of ancient Troy, read as a trope for this wooing man, cannot be trusted. Bianca's message is close in spirit to Penelope's at other points in Ovid's poem, for Penelope, as we have seen, is deeply concerned about her inability to know her husband's history in the years since the fall of Troy. In the face of such doubt, Bianca focuses on present danger, in the form of an "internal" audience member, Hortensio ("take heed he hear you not")—that is, on a blocking figure who is inside the space of the tryst rather than outside it, as are the two figures, Tranio and Gremio, whom Lucentio associates with "Priami" in his version of Ovid's lines. Finally, in her last two promiscuously mixed statements, "regia, presume not" and "celsa senis, despair not," Bianca performatively enacts the role of a queen who both distances herself from her lover and bids him stay near in hope of future favors. "Celsa senis" conjoins two Latin adjectives—lofty (or erect) and (of) old—in a way that gives them new semantic life when they are, in turn, conjoined with the gracious imperative, "despair not." Words are indeed paired in new ways in both Lucentio's and Bianca's constructions of Ovid, and the two different statements Bianca and Lucentio/Cambio make with the help of Ovid's Penelope—and the anonymous Greek warrior whom she is quoting—create a language game in which Bianca bends but does not wholly break the rules either of the Latin lesson or of the patrilineal order it ostensibly supports. She asserts her prerogative as a female ruler ("'regia,' presume not") but agrees to a clandestine marriage that leaves the audience in doubt as to her degree of likeness to the historical Queen Elizabeth, the ancient figure of Penelope—Homer's patient, chaste wife, Ovid's doubting shrew—or her own sister Katherina.

The degree of likeness or unlikeness depends not on substantive similarities but rather on timing, verbal actions, and hermeneutic perceptions. In the eyes of Hortensio/Leechio, whose nickname connotes both lechery and license, as we have seen, while also (additionally) suggesting "lis, litis," the Latin nominative and genitive forms for a legal controversy or a suit, Bianca starts to look like a poorly trained hawk, one that rebels against her master by failing to seek her true prey and going instead for a "stale"—a decoy pigeon (3.1.84). Editors suggest, indeed, that that word applies to Lucentio as he is seen, at the end of the home-schooling scene, by his disappointed male rival; but Katherina, or the boy playing her, applies the same word to herself in her very first words in the play, words in which she is imagining herself as she is likely seen by others: "I pray you, sir, is it your will / To make a stale of me amongst these mates?" (1.1.157–58). As Karen Newman observes, Katherina plays here "on the meaning of stale as laughing stock and prostitute, on 'stalemate,' and on mate as husband."[3] Continuing Newman's feminist work of opening the compressed "puncept"[4] of "stale," I would like to note that according to the OED, the meaning of "stale" as "decoy pigeon" has a French genealogy (from "estalon"), whereas another set of meanings, from the Old English (Teutonic) intertwines "stale" with "steal" (the two "cannot be completely separated," write the OED editors). Moreover, the two lines of signification, Teutonic and Romance, as it were, cross and recross historically to produce meanings that associate "decoy" with "thief's accomplice," and specifically with that much-used male or female body for sale as a "prostitute." This meaning in turn mixes with those shades of stale that apply to food, drink, and erotic experiences that are "worn out," stale in the sense of not fresh, not new. "Stale," like "lechery," is clearly part of that transnational kinship group that, as we have seen, interests Derrida in "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" When Katherina protests vehemently her father's treating her as a "stale," she both displays a certain linguistic agency and presses upon readers and spectators the (not new) idea that the "stale" is a phenomenon with multiple parts, signifying in different times and places. Created in part by the reader's or spectator's act of "constering," the "stale" is a queer and labile sign. It resembles translation as I have attempted to trace it here, across and within the shifting, contested borders of an English language: a no-man's-land that no forces of homeland security can secure or make English only.

CHAPTER 7

On Contingency in Translation

JACQUES LEZRA

Here's how the story goes.

Calixto, a young man of good standing in the city, is trying to find a way to make contact with a protected, beautiful young woman he has glimpsed accidentally and then spoken to, while chasing his hawk into an enclosed garden. One of his servants arranges for a notorious go-between to offer her services; when this go-between knocks on the master's door, another servant announces to Calixto that the first servant, Sempronio, is at the door with an "old bawd hee hath brought along with him." We are of course in the landscape of Fernando de Rojas's 1499 work *La Celestina*, or as James Mabbe's translation has it, the world of *The Spanish Bawd*.[1] Calixto worries aloud that this serviceable go-between will feel insulted at being called a bawd, *puta vieja* in Rojas's Castilian. His servant, Pármeno, answers him:

¿Por qué, señor, te matas? ¿Por qué, señor, te congoxas? ¿E tú piensas que es vituperio en las orejas desta el nombre que la llamé? No lo creas; que assí se glorifica en le oyr, como tú, quando dizen: ¡diestro cauallero es Calisto! E demás desto, es nombrada e por tal título conocida. Si entre cient mugeres va e alguno dize: ¡puta vieja!, sin ningún empacho luego buelue la cabeça e responde con alegre cara. . . . Si passa por los perros, aquello suena su ladrido; si está cerca las aues, otra cosa no cantan; si cerca los ganados, balando lo pregonan; si cerca las bestias, rebuznando dizen: ¡puta vieja! Las ranas de los charcos otra cosa no suelen mentar. Si va entre los herreros, aquello

Publications Universitaires de Saint-Etienne, 2004), 233–44; Berriot, *La Belle Rebelle*. See also Zamaron, *Louise Labé*.

29. For a summary of this event, see Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 42–43.

30. For this suggestion, see Rigolot, *Oeuvres complètes*, 72n1. Rabelais may also be a source for Folie's remark that the world needs risk takers as well as "Monsieur le sage," "the wise man [who] will have all the time in the world to go and plant cabbages" (104). Though this is a proverbial phrase, one recalls the sensible cabbage planter, down to earth even in a fantastic situation, who greets the astonished author when he has been swallowed up into Pantagruel's mouth (*Pantagruel*, chap. 31).

31. On the likelihood that Greene died in a stranger's house, begging his estranged wife for money, see Crupi, *Robert Greene*, 27–28.

32. Donald Frame, "Pleasures and Problems of Translation," in Biguenet and Schulte, *Craft of Translation*, citing an unnamed first user of the term, 85.

6. TRANSLATION AND HOMELAND INSECURITY IN SHAKESPEARE'S *THE TAMING OF THE SHREW*

1. I take the adjective "malleable" from Barbara Hodgdon's superb introduction to her edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* for the Arden III series (London: Methuen Drama, Bloomsbury, 2010), 35. All quotations are from this edition unless otherwise indicated. I follow Hodgdon's spellings of the main characters' names, which are variably rendered in early texts and paratexts, except when I quote modern critics who have chosen a different spelling. For Hodgdon's rationales for her decisions about "Petruccio" and "Katherina," see *Shrew*, 135–36. I have consulted a number of other modern editions and have benefited particularly from the notes and contextual materials provided by Frances E. Dolan, who uses a text established by David Bevington in her edition of *The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts* (London: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996).

2. Quintilian, *De Instituio Oratorio* 8.6.vi, 3–7, in the Loeb Classical Library bilingual edition, trans. H. E. Butler, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1922), 3:303.

3. "Meta" in Greek has been translated as "beside," "with," "among," "adjacent," "beyond," and "after," the latter preposition alluding to the influential placement of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* after the *Physics* in the canonical arrangement of his works at least as old as *Andronicus of Rhodes* (fl. 60 BCE). "Beyond," in the sense of "higher," "more general," "in a position to reflect on," has become a dominant modern meaning and underpins the transformation of the Greek prefix into a multilingual adjective and even a proper name: *Meta: Journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal* is the bilingual title of a journal published in Montreal. In the case of Aristotelian "metaphysics," as in the cases of many translations, spatial or temporal secondariness does not necessarily determine value: Aristotle called the subjects of metaphysics "first philosophy," whereas he called the study of nature "second philosophy" (*Metaphysics* 1037a15). Douglas Robinson, interestingly but en-

igmatically, translates "meta" as "change"; see his book *The Translator's Turn* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 138.

4. I refer to the First Folio text because the Arden, like other modern editions, does not retain the speech prefix "begger [sic]." See *The Taming of the Shrew*, in *Mr William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*, a facsimile edition prepared by Helge Kökeritz (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1954), 208.

5. Julia Reinhard Lupton, *Thinking with Shakespeare: Essays on Politics and Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 62.

6. Hodgdon, introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, 120.

7. For an excellent orientation to the different ways in which critics have understood this speech, see Lupton, *Thinking with Shakespeare*, 62, and Dolan, introduction to *Taming of the Shrew*, 32–33, and ibid., "The Household," 218–19; Hodgdon provides a rich account of both the critical and the performance history of interpreting Katherina's "speech of submission" in her introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, especially 120–31.

8. See James M. Marino, *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).

9. Quoted from the official government website, http://www.dhs.gov/about-dhs. See the part of the mission statement devoted to "secur[ing] our borders."

10. For valuable discussions of the vexed relation between the 1623 play and the 1594 text printed under the title *A Pleasant Conceited History of the Taming of A Shrew*, see Hodgdon, introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, 7–38; Marino, *Owning William Shakespeare*, 48–74; and Leah Marcus, *Unediting Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 101–31; this chapter revises and expands her "The Shakespearean Editor as Shrew Tamer," *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992): 177–200. Hodgdon, Marcus, and Marino offer bracingly skeptical views of the relation of these two plays and of critical efforts to "secure" the 1623 text—widely seen as the better play on aesthetic grounds—for an "early" William Shakespeare; critics have resorted to the stratagem of imagining a Shakespeare-authored "ur text" to counter the idea that the anonymous *A Shrew* might have been written by Shakespeare (along with others in his company) and then served as a "source" for *The Shrew*. At different moments in their history as theatrical and print "properties," each play has been interpreted as a translation of the other. The relation between the two plays is *indeterminate*, in my view, and thus has been felt to be threatening to Shakespeare's authority as a national figure and as a singular "owner" of texts printed under his name. For critiques of the modern construction of authorship as it applies to early modern playwrights, see Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), and *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare's Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, forthcoming). See also Paul Werstine, "Close Contrivers: Nameless Collaborators in Early Modern London Plays," in *Elizabethan Theater*, ed. A. L. Magnusson and C. D. McGee (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002): 15:2–20. Hodgdon adopts a new editorial approach to the two plays by including a facsimile of the sole surviving copy of the 1594 text in her edition. *A Shrew* was "reprinted in 1596 and re-entered in the Stationers' Register"—the licensing record of the London guild of booksellers,

printers, and other book workers—in 1607, along with texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labors' Lost*. Hodgdon thinks it likely that "the play available on London's bookstalls from 1594 to 1623 was *A Shrew* (11), though some version of *The Shrew* was probably also being performed by Shakespeare's company.

11. David Simpson, *Situatedness, or, Why We Keep Saying Where We're Coming From* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002), 20.

12. John T. Hamilton, *Security: Politics, Humanity, and the Philology of Care* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013). Hamilton also contributed the entry on *securitas* for the *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, 936–38.

13. Walter Benjamin, "Edward Fuchs: Collector and Historian," in *One-Way Street and Other Writings*, trans E. Jephcott and K. Shorter (1979), as cited by Tejaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 110–11.

14. Cited and translated from Hamilton, *Security*, 256, from Plessner's "Die Aufgabe der Philosophischen Anthropologie" (1937). Hamilton also discusses Plessner in the entry on "securitas" in the *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, 937.

15. Simpson too asks why some words receive scare quotes; see *Situatedness*, 31; for Locke's valuing of the nonreferential preposition, see Margaret Ferguson, "Syntax, Poetic," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry*, 4th ed., ed. Roland Greene (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012), 1402.

16. On this problem, see Francis E. Dolan, *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 26. See also Kevin Sharpe's discussion of a skeptical critical stance toward evidence, which "has as its first meaning 'clearness,' 'obviousness,' and derives from the Latin *videre . . .* which means to see, to perceive," in *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England*, 26, as cited in and discussed by Dolan, *True Relations*, 18.

17. Quoted from the reprint of Jakobson's article in *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., ed. Lawrence Venuti (New York: Routledge, 2004), 139. Note that Jakobson performs "intralingual" translation by giving us three alternative formulations in English for each of his three types of translation.

18. Jacques Derrida, *L'oreille de l'autre*, 1982, trans. Peggy Kamuf in a book that expands on the original under the title *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation*, ed. Christie McDonald (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988), 100; Jacques Derrida, *Apories*, trans. Thomas Dutoit (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993), 10. See also Derrida, "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?," trans. Lawrence Venuti in Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader*, 423–46, esp. 430, on Jakobson's inter/intra linguistic distinction.

19. See for example Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, translator's preface to Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), ix–lxxxvii; and Barbara Johnson, "Taking Fidelity Philosophically," in *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph Graham (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985), 142–48.

20. For valuable analyses of this scene of a servant's "misprision" of his master, see Amanda Bailey, *Flaunting: Style and the Subversive Male Body in Early Modern England*

(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 55–57; and Thomas Moisan, "'Knock Me Here Soundly': Comic Misprision and Class Consciousness in Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 276–90.

21. Bailey, *Flaunting*, 55.

22. See Gina Bloom, Anston Bosman, and William West, "Ophelia's Intertheatricality, or, How Performance Is History," *Theatre Journal* 65 (2013): 165–82.

23. George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, book 3.4, facsimile of the 1589 ed., intro. by Baxter Hathaway (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1970), 156. See also Paula Blank, *Broken English: Dialects and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings* (London: Routledge, 1996); and Lynne Magnusson, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

24. Gordon Williams, *A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language* (London: Athlone Press, 1997), 298.

25. Cited from the facsimile edition prepared by Helge Kökeritz, *The Taming of the Shrew* (see note 4).

26. See Williams, *A Glossary*, 122. Editors of modern editions aimed at student/teacher consumers do not include such philological speculation about Sly's first verb; therefore, an archaic or dialectal but nonetheless native meaning becomes foreign to modern Anglophone readers through forces of time and editorial decorum. All editorial practices are also inflected by economic issues having to do with the play's continuing status as a "movable" property or a "comoditie," as one of the actors in *A Shrew* describes the genre which, along with the "Tragicall," is available for purchase by the Lord. Here and elsewhere, I cite *A Shrew* from the facsimile copy in appendix 3 of Hodgdon's edition of *The Taming of The Shrew*; the "comoditie" appears on page 347 of her edition.

27. Compare Sly's homosocial insult to the one Petruccio's servant Curtis gives to Grumio in 4.1: "Away, you three-inch fool, I am no beast"; though the slur may pertain to Grumio's height, as Hodgdon notes, Grumio interprets it as an insult to his penis. For the ways in which earlier editors attempted to "avoid indecency" in their glosses on the exchange, see Hodgdon's note to 4.1. 23–25, p. 241.

28. Christopher Fitter, *Radical Shakespeare: Politics and Stagecraft in the Early Career* (New York: Routledge 2012), 131.

29. A. L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560–1640* (London: Methuen, 1985), xxii.

30. Patricia Fumerton, *Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 26. See also Linda Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001); and Paul Slack, "Vagrants and Vagrancy in England, 1598–1664," *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 27 (1974): 360–79.

31. Beier, *Masterless Men*, 96.

32. See Hodgdon, *The Taming of the Shrew*, appendix 3, 394.

33. Sly's description of his career (Induction 2.16–19) parodies the idea that a person born poor can improve his fortunes through "education" or "transmutation," the latter term signifying the kind of transformation or translation offered—fantasmatically—by

and in the theater. Sly's "transmutation" involved his leaving the marginally legitimate work of "card-maker" (if that is indeed a job in the wool industry as opposed to a rogue's job of setting up card games for money) for the job of a very low-status member of the London entertainment business.

34. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 1, *Économie, parenté, société* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1969), 92. My translations. For a brilliant analysis of the economy of the gift, see Scott Cutler Shershow, *The Work and the Gift* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

35. Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans. Rachel Bowlby (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 157n2.

36. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 95.

37. "Paucas pallabris, let the world slide. Sessa!" says Sly to the Hostess, having just announced that his family came to England with "Richard Conqueror" (Induction 1.4.5); his corruption of the Spanish "pocas palabras" (few words) and his pompous use of a term probably derived from the French "cessez" (stop) but since then appropriated for aristocratic English sports such as hunting and fencing, where it assumes an altogether different meaning as a "cry of encouragement," add to the drama's comic effects without causing too much mental labor for contemporary readers or audience members. My glosses borrow from Hodgdon's on this passage, 140n5.

38. The quotation is from Tylus's translation of the Italian version of Bruni's text, *Sulla perfetta traduzzione [De interpretatione recta]*, ed. Paoli Viti (Naples: Liguori, 2004). For an English translation, see Bruni, "On Correct Interpretation," trans. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson in *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1987).

39. See Tylus, "No Untranslatables!," in *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, 1153. For a wide-ranging discussion of cognates for "translate" in early modern English texts, see Patricia Parker, *Shakespeare from the Margins* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 116–20 and passim. Thomas Cooper's definition from his *Thesaurus Linguae* of 1565 is "a translation, or bringing from one to an other. . . . The taking of goods from the right owners, and giuing them to others. . . . The . . . remouing of the faulte from one to an other. The transferring or the translating of one worde." Cited from the digitized version of Cooper's *Thesaurus* by the Archimedes Project (http://archimedes.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/cgi-bin/archim/dict/hw?step=list;id=d002;max=100). Cooper's list of words beginning with the prefixes "tra" (as in "traduco," "To translate out of one tongue into another") and "trans" (as in "transfiguro," "To . . . turne one shape into another") includes "Tranio, A seruaunts name in Plautus." In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Tranio is Lucentio's servant who dons his clothes and seems to turn into him so perfectly that Baptista asks Tranio to rehearse the part of bridegroom with Bianca after Petruccio rudely leaves the wedding feast with Katherina. Shakespeare uses the noun "translation" only once.

40. Bruni, "On Correct Interpretation," 228.

41. Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster*, ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967), 14–15. Cited and discussed in Jeff Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 43–44.

42. See Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction*, 44; for further discussion of "double translation," see Parker, *Shakespeare from the Margins*, chap. 4; on parodies of humanist education in Shakespeare, see ibid., 130.

43. See Patricia Parker, "Construing Gender: Mastering Bianca in *The Taming of the Shrew*," in *The Impact of Feminism in English Renaissance Studies*, ed. Dympna Callaghan (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 193–201. See also Lynn Enterline's brilliant analysis, "The Cruelties of Character in *The Taming of the Shrew*," in *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), chap. 4; and Katherine A. Sirluck, "Patriarchy, Pedagogy, and the Divided Self in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 60, no. 4 (Summer 1991): 419–34. Some critics have argued that Shakespeare takes humanist pedagogy "straight" in the representation of Petruccio's "education" of Katherina. See Dennis S. Brooks, " 'To Show Scorn Her Own Image': The Varieties of Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 48, no. 1 (1994): 7–32.

44. Thomas Moisan, "Interlinear Trysting and 'Household Stuff': The Latin Lesson and the Domestication of Learning in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Studies* 23 (1995): 100–19. See also Patricia B. Phillippy's analysis of Turberville's translation of the *Heroides* in " 'Loytering in Love': Ovid's *Heroides*, Hospitality, and Humanist Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Criticism* 40, no. 1 (Winter 1998): 27–53; Moisan remarks that the *Heroides* are recommended reading for both "callow youth[s]" and for female students, in contrast to the *Amores* and *Ars amatoriae*, which many humanist scholars regarded as likely to corrupt the minds of young girls. Erasmus indeed singles out *Heroides* I as "most chaste" in his colloquy, *A Mery Dialogue, Declaringe the Propertyes of Shrowde Shrewes, and Honest Wyves*, which has been cited as either a source or an analogue for *The Shrew*; George Turberville, "To the Reader," in *The heroycall epistles of . . . Publius Ouidius Naso, in English verse* (London: Henrie Denham, 1567), n.p. or signature; I quote from the STC copy of the second edition, 18939, British Library, and am indebted to Phillippy for leading me to this text. I am also indebted here and throughout this chapter to Moisan's argument for a generally "parasitic" relation between the educational and the domestic spheres in the Shakespearean *Shrew*.

45. Bélen Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-version Texts in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 1.

46. Few modern editors gloss this line as an allusion to Ovid's *Tristia*, the series of elegies in which he lamented his exile and begged the emperor to allow him to return from banishment on the Black Sea; but Heather James remarks the allusion and ties it to Touchstone's invocation of "the most capricious poet honest Ovid . . . among the Goths," with a bilingual pun on goats ("capri" in Latin) (*As You Like It* 3.3.5–6). See James, "Shakespeare's Learned Heroines in Ovid's Schoolroom," in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, ed. Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004), 66–85; quotation from 81.

47. For the idea of the scene as a "fulcrum," see Margaret Maurer, "Constering Bianca: *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 14 (2001): 186–206.

48. For a discussion of this "foreign" sexual counterplot, both derived from Ariosto and Terence's *Eunuch*, see Keir Elam, "The Fertile Eunuch: *Twelfth Night*, Early Modern Intercourse, and the Fruits of Castration," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 1–36; and Patricia Parker, "Mastering Bianca," 208n17.

49. See Laurie Maguire, "Cultural Control in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Renaissance Drama* 26 (1995): 89.

50. In a striking exception to the general rule of humanist anti-beating discourses, Mulcaster argues that the rod "may no more be spared in schools than the sworde may in *Princes* hand." Moreover, he adds, "For the private, whatsoever parents say, my ladie birchely will be a guest at home, or else parents shall not have their wills" (270.7). See also *Positions*, 155, where Mulcaster worries about those parents who are "ticklish" about schoolmasters beating children and suggests that such parents constitute a threat to the monarchy. Mulcaster's views contrast with those of Erasmus, who famously inveighed against the more brutal practices of his contemporary and precursor schoolmasters in his *De pueris instituendis*; for a discussion of this contrast, see Richard Halpern, *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation*, 25–28. For the feminization of the "birch," see Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 239n59; see also Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997), 99. Mulcaster's editor, William Barker, argues that "Lady Birch" is the common expression for a form of punishment given by males to males; presumably punishment by a (symbolic) female to the male buttocks would intensify the humiliation (446, note to 270.7). Wall also directs our attention to Thomas Tusser, who suggests that the wife had hands-on interaction in managing servants. He warns the maid that the mistress may "uncover [her] bare" if she fails to rise early: "Maides, up I beseech yee / Least Mistress doe breech yee" (*Five Hundreth Points of Good Husbandry* (1573, rpt. *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984, 162], cited in Wall, 260, n. 55.). Thanks to Fran Dolan for help in my research on the "Lady Birch." In this much discussed "feminization of the birch," Mulcaster metaphorically sends the schoolmaster into the private sphere as a guest the hosts may not welcome.

51. 3.1.39; see Hodgdon's note on this line, *Shrew*, 22. For a similar association of ideas, see *Henry VI, Part 2*, 3.1.288: "a breach that craves a quick expedient stop!"; see also Dolan's discussion of disputes between spouses and between masters and servants in chapter 3 of *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), "Fighting for the Breeches, Sharing the Rod: Spouses, Servants, and the Struggle for Equality." On "breaching" as a semantic cluster in Shakespeare's plays, see Parker, *Shakespeare from the Margins*, 140–42, 152–53 and passim.

52. See Dolan's notes to this passage in her edition of *Shrew*; she reads "counterfeit assurance" as "pretended betrothal agreement"; see also Lorna Hutson's illuminating discussion of both Lucentio's and Petruccio's innovative versions of the "clandestine marriage"—arguably, "not in itself very subversive of social norms," since English communities "had, for hundreds of years, found that the ambiguous position in law of the secret con-

tract enabled both the control and accommodation of matches made against the wishes of kin"; *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1997), 218–19. Hutson draws a useful contrast between Lucentio's and Petruccio's marriages, with the former's moving "in the traditional direction from clandestinity into community control," while the latter's, "far more subversively, goes the opposite way," with the "disguise" of "openness" (219). I would argue that insofar as both marriages are textually represented as belonging to the brides as well as to the bridegrooms, both show a type of "contract" that cannot be wholly secured by husbandly or fatherly agency.

53. Ariosto's verse version from 1509 was so popular that he rewrote it in a longer prose version; for a discussion of both, see Ludovico Ariosto, *Supposes*, trans. George Gascoigne, ed. with an introduction by Donald Beeker, annotations by John Butler (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1999).

54. The theme of the dubious patriarchal "line" is pursued also in 3.1 when Bianca expresses her scholarly doubt that "Aeacides / Was Ajax, call'd so from his grandfather" (49–51). She debates the meaning of a line that follows hard on the heels of the two lines actually quoted in Latin in the Shakespearean text; Ovid's poem locates "Aecides" in relation to "Ulysses," but does not specify whether the former warrior is Ajax or Achilles. Bianca's "mistrust" of Cambio's certainty about male lineage is justified, as Patricia Parker has persuasively argued, because in the *Iliad*, Ajax famously loses an argument with Ulysses about his (Ajax's) "right" to inherit the armor of Achilles, a right that depends crucially on his claim to the name Aecides. The name, like the patrimonial "line," is subject to debate, and Bianca's doubt "translates" the old debate on the Homeric battlefield into a new textual venue with open margins. She prefers the reading given by another English translator of Ovid's *Heroides*, George Turberville, to the reading maintained by Lucentio/Cambio. Turberville renders Aeicides as "Achylles" in his 1567 translation of *Heroides*, as Parker notes; for a fuller discussion, see her "Mastering Bianca in *The Taming of the Shrew*," esp. 204 and 209nn18–20.

55. As Vanda Zajko remarks, Tranio persuades Lucentio to substitute Ovid (of the *Amores*) for Aristotle when he first arrives in Padua; see "Petruchio is 'Kated': *The Taming of the Shrew* and Ovid," in Martindale and Taylor, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, 37.

56. For a discussion of the pun in relation to ongoing critical debates about tropes and about translation, see Margaret Ferguson, "Fatal Cleopatras: Puns in Shakespeare's Poetry," in *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry*, ed. Jonathan Post (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 77–94.

57. Barbara Hodgdon, "Plot Inconsistencies and the 'Hortensio Problem,'" 316.

58. See Richard Hosley, "Sources and analogues of *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (1964): 289–308.

59. Ibid., 305.

60. See Hodgdon's note on the nicknames in her discussion of "Hortensio" in the "List of Roles," 136–37 in *Shrew*.

61. Jacques Derrida, "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?," 424.

62. Ibid., my emphasis.

63. Ibid., 429, my emphasis.

64. Cited from Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957), 141.

65. See Moisan, "Interlinear Trysting," 110, on Gremio's use of "baccare" as a "stock piece" of "faux Latinity" aimed at asserting "the dignity of his age and wealth against the importunate advances of Petruchio, who has jumped the courtship queue in his haste to claim Katherina." See also Parker, *Shakespeare from the Margins*, 25.

66. For the sexual pun in "doing," see Hodgdon's note on 2.1.74.

67. For an important discussion of the play's transformation of the wife from a productive member of a household into a luxury item like the "kates" (dessert cakes) to which Petruccio compares the female he insistently calls "Kate," see Natasha Korda, *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 52–75.

68. On Ovid as an educational model, see Phillippy, "'Loytering in Love'"; Heather James, "Ovid in Renaissance English Literature," in *A Blackwell Companion to Ovid*, ed. Peter E. Knox (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 423–41; James, "Shakespeare's Learned Heroines"; Vanda Zajko, "Petruchio Is 'Kated': The Taming of the Shrew and Ovid," in Martindale and Taylor, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, 33–47.

69. Ovid, *Heroides and Amores*, 2nd ed., trans. Grant Showerman (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), I.64, pp. 14–15.

70. At first glance, or if one is in a hurry to get to one's "real" task, as Lucentio/Cambio evidently is, one might read "hac" as the feminine ablative singular of "hic," the pronoun, and just decide that the generic masculine form will do (hic). In performance, the lines can be very funny, like hiccups.

71. From Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks*, vol. V, 1835–1838, ed. Merton M. Sealts (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1965), 226. See also Hugh Kenner, *The Counterfeiters. An Historical Comedy* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1968), for a witty entrée to analyzing modes of rhetorical condescension one often finds in criticism of dead writers.

72. James, "Shakespeare's Learned Heroines," 70.

73. Karen Newman, *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 40.

74. This is Gregory Ulmer's apt term—see his "The Puncept in Grammatology," in *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*, ed. Jonathan Culler (London: Basil Blackwell, 1988): 164–90.

7. ON CONTINGENCY IN TRANSLATION

I am delighted to acknowledge the insightful questions and comments I received during earlier presentations of this chapter, which helped me to focus and shift the argument. Except where indicated, the translations are my own.

1. Fernando de Rojas, *The Spanish bawd, represented in Celestina: or, The tragicke-comedy of Calisto and Melibea*, trans. James Mabbe (London: Printed by I[ohn] B[eale], 1631), 14.

2. Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina: Comedia o tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. Peter E. Russell (Madrid: Castalia, 2001), 256–57; a useful companion edition is *Tragi/Comedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. Fernando Caltalapiedra Erostarbe (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2000). The translations are mine except where indicated.

3. This is Mabbe's translation of the passage:

"Sir why doe you vexe your selfe? why grieue you? Doe you thinke, that in the eares of this woman, the name, by which I now call her doth any way sound reproachfully? Beleeue it not. Assure your selfe, she glories as much in this name, as oft as shee heares it, as you do, when you heare some voyce, Calisto to be a gallant Gentleman. Besides, by this is she commonly called, and by this Title is shee of all men generally knowne. If she passe along the streetes among a hundred women, and some one perhaps blurts out, See, where's the old Bawd; without any impatiency, or any the least distemper, shee presently turnes her selfe about, nods the head, and answers them with a smiling countenance, and cheerefull looke. At your solemne banquets, your great feasts, your weddings, your gossippings, your merry meetings, your funeralls, and all other assemblies whatsoeuer, where there is any resort of people, thither doth shee repaire, and there they make pastime with her. And if shee passe by where there be any dogs, they straightway barke out this name; If shee come amongst birds, they haue no other note but this; If she sight vpon a flocke of sheepe, their bleatings proclaime no lesse; If she meet with beasts, they bellow forth the same: The frogges that lie in ditches, croake no other tune; Come shee amongst your Smithes, your Carpenters, your Armourers, your Ferriers, your Brasiers, your Ioyners: why, their hammers beate all vpon this word. In a word, all sorts of tooles and instruments returne no other Eccho in the ayre; your Shoomakers sing this song; your Combe-makers joyne with them, your Gardeners, your Plough-men, your Reapers, your Vine-keepers passe away the painefulnesse of their labours, in making her the subject of their discourse; your Table-players, and all other Gamesters neuer lose, but they peale foorth her prayses: To be short, be she wheresoeuer she be, all things whatsoeuer are in this world, repeate no other name but this: O what a deuourer of rosted egges was her husband? What would you more? Not one stone that strikes against another, but presently noyseth out, Old whore" (14–15).

Stephen Gilman, *The Art of "La Celestina"* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1956), argued that in these lines Rojas is borrowing from Petrarch's preface to *De Remediis utriusque Fortunae* II. Alan D. Deyermond acknowledges the Petrarchan influence in his *The Petrarchan Sources of "La Celestina"* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1975),