"Introduction to *Kunst Über Alle Künste, Ein Bös Weib Gut Zu Machen (The Taming of the Shrew)*." *Early Modern German Shakespeare: and : Tito Andronico and Kunst über alle Künste, ein bös Weib gut zu machen in Translation*. Shakespeare, William. Erne, Lukas, Florence Hazrat, and Maria Shmygol, eds. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2022. 83–158. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350094741.0010>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 10:47 UTC.

Copyright © Lukas Erne, Florence Hazrat and Maria Shmygol 2022. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

INTRODUCTION TO *KUNST ÜBER ALLE KÜNSTE, EIN BÖS WEIB GUT ZU MACHEN (THE TAMING OF THE SHREW)*

Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* (c. 1592) has aroused lively debate right from the start. Shortly after its first recorded performance in 1608, John Fletcher wrote a sequel, *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed* (c. 1611), featuring the widower Petruccio triumphed over by his new wife Maria. The play continued to have a far-reaching effect throughout the seventeenth century as John Lacy produced another version, called *Sauny the Scot* (1667; printed 1698), which intensifies the violence against the female protagonist. But it was not only at home that Shakespeare's play prompted strong responses. *The Taming of the Shrew* reached the Continent by the middle of the seventeenth century, and a Dutch translation (and partial adaptation), Abraham Sybant's *De Dolle Bruyloft* ('The Mad Wedding'), was published in 1654. A first German version, *Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio mit der bösen Catharine* ('The wonderful wedding of Petruvio with bad Catharine'), is known to have existed by 1658. *Kunst über alle Künste, ein böß Weib gut zu machen* ('An Art beyond all Arts, To Make a Bad Wife Good'), a five-act prose play published in 1672, is the first extant German version of *The Taming of the Shrew*. It often remains close to the English text, while adapting it intelligently and adjusting it to its new cultural and linguistic context. *Kunst* deeply engages with some of the questions Shakespeare's play raises, including issues of gender, by significantly altering key speeches, adding new passages and inventing a female servant, Sybilla. It also

foregrounds social issues by strengthening the prominence of the servants, making them comment on and act as foils for their social betters. The German play is a highly sophisticated early dramatic response to Shakespeare's play. *Kunst* has never been translated into any language, was edited only once, in 1864, by Reinhold Köhler, and has no modern stage history (although it emphatically deserves to have one). The present edition remedies this inaccessibility. Its aims are to provide a detailed examination of the play's engagement with *The Taming of the Shrew* and to assess its role in the reception of Shakespeare abroad.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF *KUNST ÜBER ALLE KÜNSTE* TO THE *TAMING OF THE SHREW*

Kunst über alle Künste is by far the artistically most ambitious and successful of the early modern German Shakespeare adaptations. It is also the only such adaptation that is longer than the original. Whereas *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and *Tito Andronico* are much shorter than *Hamlet* and *Titus Andronicus*, and *Romio und Julieta* is somewhat shorter than *Romeo and Juliet*, *Kunst* is longer than *The Taming of the Shrew* by about 40 per cent.¹ *Kunst* does not preserve the Sly Induction, but it does feature a brief prologue that introduces the theme of wife-taming and frames the play to come as an exemplary how-to lesson for the audience. The rest of the play is divided into five acts ('Handlungen'), largely mapping onto *The Shrew*'s structure, although with some exceptions (see below, pp. 87–93). This part of the introduction is devoted to an exploration of the relationship between *Kunst* and *The Shrew*, and has four sections. The first establishes the basics by explaining how the

¹ *The Shrew* has 2,394 lines (in the Arden 3 edition), whereas *Kunst* has 3,407.

dramatis personae and the plot of the German play correspond to and depart from Shakespeare's. The second explores in greater depth some of the specific ways in which *Kunst* adapts *The Shrew*'s plot, in particular the untangling and clarification of sequences which the adaptor may have considered potentially confusing. The third deals with a central feature of the adaptation, its addition to Shakespeare's play of many soliloquies and asides, and examines what effects this addition has. The fourth section takes a closer look at how the verbal, cultural and dramatic language of *Kunst* relates to that of Shakespeare's play.

Characters and plot: correspondences and differences

Kunst über alle Künste and *The Taming of the Shrew* have an intricate – and intricately related – plot, and *Kunst* renames almost all the characters. Only Katherina has a name that is recognizably the same: Catharina. Many characters in the German play have speaking names, and since their meaning is of some importance, we have usually translated them into English (see the List of Roles and notes). Table 1 provides a short guide to character correspondences between *Kunst* and *The Shrew*.

Apart from Sly and the other characters who appear in the Induction, all the significant characters in *The Shrew* have their equivalent in *Kunst*, with the exception of the Haberdasher, whose small part (in *TS*, 4.3) is conflated with that of the Tailor. *Kunst*, in turn, has two characters (apart from the Prologue) with no equivalent in *The Shrew*: Veit, Theobald's servant, appears in five scenes (1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 5.2) and is assigned thirty-one speeches, so his role is by no means small. Sybilla, Catharina's maid, enters the play quite late, in Act 3, Scene 3, and does not speak until her next appearance in Act 4, Scene 2, but she is an important character late in the play and has twenty-two speeches assigned to her (in 4.2, 4.4 and 5.2), including a soliloquy at the end of Act 4, Scene 4. While Veit is generally a

TABLE 1 Character correspondences between *Kunst über alle Künste* and *The Taming of the Shrew*

<i>Kunst</i>	<i>Shrew</i>
Patient Job / Prologue	
	Christopher Sly etc. / Induction
Catharina	Katherina
Sabina	Bianca
Theobald	Baptista
Alfons	Hortensio
Sebastian	Gremio
Hardman	Petruccio
Wormfire	Grumio
Hilarius	Lucentio
Felix	Tranio
Fabian	Biondello
Veit	
Sybilla	
Blasius	Merchant / Pedant
Adrian	Vincentio
Hardman's Servants	Petruccio's Servants
Matz	Curtis
Fritz the Tailor	Tailor
	Haberdasher
Widow Eulalia	Widow

commentator (many of his speeches are asides), Sybilla's relationship with Wormfire and consequent pregnancy make her an actress in a subplot in which Hardman and Catharina's servants mirror and contrast with their master and mistress.

Even though *Kunst's* other characters have their correspondences in *The Shrew*, their degree of proximity to Shakespeare's parts varies considerably. Many of Alfons' speeches, for instance, are reasonably close to Hortensio's, and their total line number is not vastly different: eighty-four for Alfons and seventy for Hortensio. Structurally, the two characters correspond closely to one another, and each time Hortensio appears on stage in *The Shrew*, Alfons does so in *Kunst* in the parallel scene. At the other end of the spectrum, the part of Wormfire in *Kunst* vastly expands on that of Grumio in *The Shrew*. Apart from a single line in Act 3, Scene 2, Grumio's speaking part is confined to three scenes (1.2, 4.1 and 4.3). Wormfire, by contrast, has a significant presence in nine scenes (1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4 and 5.2), including a scene, Act 2, Scene 2, that consists of a soliloquy from him, and several others in which he has many asides (see below, pp. 105, 110–13). Whereas Grumio has sixty-three speeches, the total for Wormfire is 166, more than any other character in the play except for Hardman. While *Kunst* thus adapts some parts rather lightly, it transforms others fundamentally.

Kunst's plot may be briefly summed up as follows: the opening scene skips the preliminaries of Lucentio's arrival in Padua and immediately dramatizes Catharina's confrontation with her father Theobald and Sabina's suitors, Alfons and Sebastian. This is followed by a brief exchange between Hilarius and his servants about the previously established disguise scheme, and the arrival of Hardman. The next act closely adheres to the structure of *The Shrew*. It introduces Felix, disguised as Hilarius, and Hardman as suitors of Sabina and Catharina, and it dramatizes the first meeting and the engagement of Hardman and Catharina. The play adds a

soliloquy by Wormfire in which he mentions Sybilla, Catharina's maid, and his potential sexual partner. Act 3 includes Sabina's poetry and music lessons, as well as the mad wedding, together with the newly-weds' arrival at Hardman's home, where he puts his taming technique into action. Act 4 weaves together several plot strands. It shows Alfons' interruption of his suit to Sabina after seeing her flirt with Hilarius. It dramatizes the tailor's visit to Hardman's house and the couple's journey back to Theobald. The act also includes the disguise of Blasius as Hilarius' fake father, and his violent meeting with Hilarius' real father, Adrian, who swoons when it occurs to him that the schemers may have killed his son. The last act resolves all conflicts and disguises: Hilarius has married Sabina, and Alfons Eulalia; a mock-trial is set up for the offenders in the disguise scheme; and Wormfire is given permission to marry Sybilla (who is now pregnant). A wager on wifely obedience proves Catharina to be the most tamed of the three wives on stage. The play ends with the servants alone and an allusive song is sung by Fabian about sexual relationships and fidelity.

Anyone familiar with *The Shrew* will recognize in this summary many similarities with Shakespeare's play, while also noting plot elements that are absent. *Kunst*'s plot correspondences to Shakespeare's play are summed up in Table 2 (the symbol indicates that the correspondence is relatively loose, whereas – means that there is no correspondence).

As the table shows, the scenic order of the two plays is largely the same. *The Shrew* has a total of twelve scenes, whereas *Kunst* has sixteen, but the difference is easily accounted for:¹ *Kunst* splits *The Shrew*'s Act 1, Scene 1 into two scenes, and Act 4,

¹ The scene division of both plays is editorial: the Folios and the 1631 quarto divide *The Shrew* into acts (except that the Act 2 break is missing) but not scenes, and so do the early editions of *Kunst*. The usual rationale for scene-breaks in the editorial tradition, which we have applied to *Kunst*, is that a new scene begins when the stage is cleared and the action is not continuous.

TABLE 2 Plot correspondences between *Kunst über alle Künste* and *The Taming of the Shrew*

<i>Kunst</i>	Content	<i>The Shrew</i>
Prologue	Patient Job laments conjugal life with a bad wife, and introduces the play as an example of how to tame a shrew.	Induction
1.1 1–35	Theobald rejects Alfons ’ and Sebastian ’s suit for Sabina until Catharina is married.	1.1.48–66
36–103	They promise to provide tutors for the daughters, and quarrel with Catharina .	1.1.92–104
104–77	They secretly form a pact to find a suitor for Catharina in order to free Sabina for marriage.	1.1.112–44
1.2 1–49	Introduction of the disguise scheme involving Hilarius and Felix .	1.1.185–235
50–67	After initial frustration for being left out, Fabian makes peace with Felix .	1.1.236–42
1.3 1–61	Hardman arrives at Alfons ’ house, declaring his wish to marry a rich woman.	1.2.1–57
62–316	Alfons suggests Catharina and, together with Sebastian , promises Hardman financial reward for his suit. Hilarius is present, disguised as a poetry teacher.	1.2.58–215
316–416	Fabian and Felix enter, and the latter joins in the quest for Sabina .	1.2.217–81
2.1 1–81	Catharina abuses Sabina and is stopped by her father.	2.1.1–38
82–259	The suitors and disguised tutors enter. Hardman introduces himself to Theobald . All are invited inside.	2.1.39–140
260–85	Hardman describes his taming technique in a soliloquy.	2.1.167–79

<i>Kunst</i>	Content	<i>The Shrew</i>
286–486	He and Catharina have an exchange of insults and fake praise.	2.1.180–282
487–574	Catharina rejects Hardman ’s suit, but the latter pretends she has agreed.	2.1.283–328
575–670	Felix and Sebastian vie for Sabina ’s hand, competing for age and wealth. Theobald favours Felix provided his father consents.	2.1.329–414
2.2	Wormfire talks about his flirting with Sybilla .	–
3.1 1–30	Hilarius and Alfons , disguised as tutors, quarrel, then give Sabina her lesson.	3.1.1–25
31–202	Hilarius teaches her dactylic composition, Alfons sings her a song on the metamorphoses of Jupiter.	3.1.26–84
203–33	Veit and Alfons speculate about the relationship between Sabina and Hilarius .	3.1.85–90
3.2 1–85	Catharina complains about the shame of being abandoned on her wedding day. Reports arrive of Hardman ’s and Wormfire ’s outrageous dress.	3.2.1–83
86–147	Hardman and Wormfire arrive, dressed in strange clothes.	3.2.84–126
148–76	Felix , Hilarius and Fabian reflect on Hilarius ’ disguise scheme.	–
176–232	Sebastian reports on the intimidating ceremony inside the house.	3.2.148–82
233–348	When Catharina refuses to leave with Hardman , he carries her out on his shoulders, leaving the perplexed guests behind.	3.2.183–253

<i>Kunst</i>	Content	<i>The Shrew</i>
349–98	Hilarius and Sebastian discuss the latter's love suit, followed by Fabian and Veit discussing their masters' illicit wooing.	–
3.3 1–95	Wormfire arrives at Hardman 's house and gives an account of the exhausting journey.	4.1.1–105
96–186	Hardman abuses the servants and refuses Catharina food and sleep.	4.1.106–67
3.4	The servants comment on Catharina's patient endurance.	4.1.168–76
3.5	In a soliloquy, Hardman explains his taming strategy as a random mixture of rage and affection.	4.1.177–200
4.1 1–20	Sabina expresses her longing for Hilarius .	–
21–85	Hilarius arrives, and they embrace and kiss. They are secretly watched by Felix and Alfons who abjures Sabina .	4.2.1–59
86–105	Fabian enters with the news that he has found someone to impersonate Hilarius ' father.	4.2.60–72
4.2 1–72	Wormfire and Sybilla feast while Catharina enters starving.	4.3.1–35
73–104	The women discuss their impressions of Hardman in private.	–
105–326	Hardman and Alfons arrive, again teasing Catharina with food. The tailor offers his wares, but Hardman rebukes him for bad work.	4.3.36–195
4.3	Felix and Blasius discuss how to perform the role of father convincingly.	4.4

<i>Kunst</i>	Content	<i>The Shrew</i>
4.4 1–9	Adrian worries about his son.	–
10–30	Journeying to her father's house, Hardman tests Catharina 's obedience by insisting he decides what is the time of day.	4.5.1–26
30–98	They meet Adrian .	4.5.27–77
99–150	Adrian meets Fabian , and Blasius and Felix in disguise. The impostors flee.	5.1.15–101
150–75	Adrian swoons, thinking they have murdered his son. Theobald 's servants carry him inside.	–
176–95	Hardman and Catharina promise each other peace, and kiss in public.	5.1.132–41
196–205	Sybilla reflects upon Catharina 's improved future nights and her own impending wedding.	–
5.1 1–17	Theobald and Adrian grieve for the supposed death of the latter's son.	–
18–56	Sabina and Hilarius enter, married, and beg forgiveness from their fathers for deceiving them.	5.1.102–31
57–70	Catharina and Hardman renew their mutual affection and respect.	–
5.2 1–71	Felix , Fabian and Blasius are punished for their disobedience in a mock trial.	–
72–193	Wormfire asks permission to marry Sybilla , who is pregnant.	–
194–216	Catharina and Eulalia have a disagreement.	5.2.16–49

<i>Kunst</i>	Content	<i>The Shrew</i>
217–68	Felix sings an erotic hunting song about the love suits of his betters.	–
269–344	The men have a wager about whose wife is most obedient. Hardman wins, and Catharina provides a brief conclusion on marital love and respect.	5.2.64–195
345–93	Wormfire , Sybilla and Fabian conclude the play; Fabian performs an explicitly sexual song.	–

Scene 1 into three. *Kunst*'s only scene that has no correspondence in *The Shrew* is Act 2, Scene 2, which consists of a soliloquy by Wormfire. What complicates matters slightly is that two act-breaks occur at different moments: *The Shrew* ends Act 3 after the 'mad wedding' scene, but *Kunst*'s third act continues until the end of *The Shrew*'s following scene. The two plays also differ in the final act-break: *The Shrew* ends Act 4 after Petruccio and Katherine, on their return to her father, have met Vincentio, Lucentio's father. *Kunst*'s act-break does not occur until later, after Adrian, Hilarius' father, has met his son's servants. Nonetheless, every scene in *The Shrew* has correspondences in *Kunst*, and the material *Kunst* adopts from *The Shrew* essentially occurs in the same order as in Shakespeare's play.

Adapting the plot of The Taming of the Shrew

While *Kunst* thus generally follows *The Shrew*, it restructures a number of passages and adds dramatic configurations that are absent from Shakespeare's play. In what follows, we wish to identify some of the key features of *Kunst*'s adaptation of *The Shrew*. An important effect of some of *Kunst*'s interventions is

that it untangles *The Shrew*'s plot when it is potentially confusing, or difficult to stage. This applies in particular to the beginning of the play, when Hilarius falls in love and devises the disguise scheme; to the plot involving the fake father of Hilarius; and to the illicit wedding of Hilarius and Sabina. Other important adaptive interventions by *Kunst* are observable in the last act and, in particular, the final scene: the mock trial and the servants' coda are indicative of the adaptation's interest in issues of gender and class.

The Shrew begins with the Induction involving Sly the tinker; this presents the main action of the shrew taming as a play, a 'comonty' (*TS*, Induction 2.133), as Sly puts it – probably a malapropism for 'comedy'. *Kunst* preserves neither the Sly Induction nor its brief return at the end of the first scene (*TS*, 1.1.247–52), perhaps owing to a source that had already omitted them, although it is equally possible that *Kunst* deliberately cut the lengthy Induction as part of its adaptation. *Kunst* substitutes for the Induction an equally metatheatrical device, however, the Prologue of Patient Job, which frames the play as instruction for wife-taming. *The Shrew*'s Induction's concern with social rank, the porousness of social stratification but also its ultimate impenetrability are not, however, removed from *Kunst*, but receive sustained treatment, in particular through the servant figures (see below, pp. 103–4).

The main plot of *Kunst* starts by clarifying Lucentio's falling in love and the invention of the disguise scheme which frames the first appearance of Katherina and Bianca. Lucentio and his servant Tranio arrive in Padua from Verona in order to study (*TS*, 1.1.1–47). They 'stand by' (*TS*, 1.1.47 SD) when a company of people enters and witness their conversation, in particular the complaint of Bianca's suitors, Gremio and Hortensio, about their situation (*TS*, 1.1.48–144). Lucentio also overhears Bianca's reference to her passion for learning which, together with her beauty, makes him fall in love with her. The audience only learns of Lucentio's falling in love when he and

Tranio, left alone on stage, speak about what they have just witnessed (*TS*, 1.1.145–219). Tranio gently mocks his master for the suddenness of his emotions and for his exaggerated praise of Bianca. As it becomes clear that Lucentio wants to marry her, he and Tranio invent the disguise scheme and exchange their clothes. When Biondello enters, he is shocked by the sartorial changes. Lucentio comes up with the explanation that he has killed a man in a quarrel and needs to remain incognito, but does not clarify why Tranio is to become a suitor to Bianca. Biondello briefly expresses discontent for missing out on Tranio's social promotion, but the two servants make up in Lucentio's presence (*TS*, 1.1.220–46).

Kunst omits the frame in *The Shrew*'s Act 1, Scene 1, in which Lucentio eavesdrops and falls in love. Instead, it presents consecutively the dialogue involving the suitors and the sisters on the one hand and the dialogue between servants and master on the other hand. Rather than staging Hilarius' arrival and falling in love in the main play's first scene, *Kunst* has Hilarius and Felix enter in the second, already in disguise (1.2.1–12). Hilarius reminds Felix of the reasons for the disguise, effectively dropping the audience into the middle of the subplot. Fabian appears and is amazed at the altered appearances, but rather than explaining the situation, Hilarius exits and lets Felix make sense of the situation to Fabian. Felix falsely suggests that Hilarius committed a crime and hence his consequent need for disguise, and the two servants discuss the unfairness of the change in Felix's station (1.2.15–67). *Kunst* thus creates a more linear dramatic sequence which eliminates some of *The Shrew*'s intricacies, notably the eavesdropping frame, the spontaneous invention of the disguise scheme by both Tranio and Lucentio, and Lucentio's bombastic use of love language which Tranio teases him about.

A result of the adapted beginning is that the initial character of Hilarius, unlike that of Lucentio, is not quite fleshed out, and the disguise scheme is introduced rather abruptly. In reorganizing the material, *Kunst* also, crucially, chooses to put

Catharina centre-stage. Whereas Bianca is central to Act 1 as the object of Gremio's and Hortensio's suit, and of Lucentio's love-struck gaze, her *Kunst* counterpart, the meek Sabina, is absent from the equivalent scene. *Kunst* delays Sabina's first appearance until Act 2, Scene 1, in which she is depicted in stark contrast to the domineering Catharina. The impression given of Sabina, then, is that she is a vaguely sketched obedient daughter, unlike Bianca who speaks up for herself in Act 1, Scene 1, however briefly (*TS*, 1.1.80–3). Sabina's development in the course of the play, then, is all the more remarkable: she evolves from a mere supporting role into a self-confident young woman with sexual desires and initiative, as shown most notably in Act 4, Scene 1. *Kunst*'s adaption of the beginning of the main play thus has a profound effect not only on dramatic arrangement but also on characterization; it is fundamentally different from its Shakespearean model.

Another of *The Shrew*'s plot lines which *Kunst* simplifies is that of the Merchant from Mantua who plays fake father to Lucentio. In Act 4, Scene 2 of *The Shrew*, Biondello enters to Lucentio, Bianca and Tranio and announces that he has spotted a man arriving in Padua who '[i]n gait and countenance' looks 'like a father' (4.2.66). Once Lucentio and Bianca have departed, the Merchant enters. Tranio then tricks him into dressing like Vincentio by convincing him that there is a ban on Mantuans arriving in Padua and that he needs to assume the identity of his master's father for his own safety (4.2.73–122). *Kunst*, on the other hand, omits the set-up of this third disguise plot. When Fabian enters to Hilarius and Felix towards the end of Act 4, Scene 1, Felix inquires whether he has 'found an honourable father' (4.1.87–8). Fabian reports that he has, that the 'grave gentleman . . . looks as honourable as Saint Valentine, is filled to the brim with imagined wisdom, and when it comes to natural philosophy, thinks he is the biggest pig in the sty' (4.1.91–4). Blasius, as Fabian adds, is 'willing to do anything for gain' (4.1.96–7) and so has agreed to the scheme. For the

far-fetched idea of the ban on Mantuans, *Kunst* thus substitutes the simple idea of pecuniary profit.

The plot line of *The Shrew*'s Merchant is bound up with the secret wedding of Bianca and Lucentio. Shortly after being disguised as Lucentio's father, the Merchant meets Baptista, and the match between Bianca and the Merchant's supposed son is struck. Lucentio (as Cambio) is sent home to notify Bianca of her wedding which is to take place later in the day (4.4.19–71). Biondello then intercepts Lucentio and tells him that Tranio has prepared a secret wedding to take place between him and Bianca (72–106). The plot line of the secret wedding interacts with that of the fake father and his unmasking in Act 5, Scene 1, where the focus switches from one to the other with quick-changing entries and exits. While the confrontation between Vincentio and the Merchant rises in tension, brief sequences pertaining to the secret wedding (5.1.1–6, 36–9) punctuate the unmasking of the Merchant, each plot line increasing the other's pace and urgency until they both join when Lucentio and Bianca enter as a married couple (5.1.97 SD).

As part of the clarification and simplification of *The Shrew*'s complex dramatic structure, *Kunst* does away with the dramatization of the secret wedding. In Act 4, Scene 1, Sabina and Hilarius meet, kiss and promise each other their lasting love. Alfons, who has spied on them, gives up his wooing of Sabina and decides to 'reciprocate the friendliness and desire of a young rich widow' and to 'link [his] life to hers' (4.1.50–2). Sabina and Hilarius part with a kiss, and when we next meet them in Act 5, Scene 1, they enter '*well dressed*' (5.1.17 SD), presumably straight from their secret wedding, and apologize to their fathers for their transgressions. Between these two scenes, we see the fake-father scheme implode: in Act 4, Scene 3, Blasius reassures Felix that he 'will take care of everything and settle the business to my lord's [i.e. Theobald's] liking' (4.3.1–2). But in the following scene, Blasius, Fabian and Felix, in Hilarius' clothes, come face to face with Hilarius' real father, Adrian, who assumes

they 'must have strangled [his] poor son' (4.4.150) and swoons, giving them the chance to escape. By the last scene, they have been arrested and are subjected to a mock trial. *Kunst* thus reduces the complications of *The Shrew*'s plot by focusing on the fake father scheme and eliminating the dramatization of Hilarius and Sabina's secret wedding.

The last scene of the German play weaves together the substantial, entirely original trial scene with a largely faithful adaptation of *The Shrew*'s wager sequence. It separates different sequences in *The Shrew* and skilfully blends them with original material. To appreciate the dramatic make-up of *Kunst*'s conclusion, one needs to see first how differently the two plays reach the final scene.

The Shrew's Act 5, Scene 1 brings together the several disguises: the fake father (the Merchant), the fake suitor (Tranio) and the fake tutor (Lucentio). Initially, the different storylines clash (5.1.15–99). The confrontation between the fake and the real father threatens to spiral out of control, and only abates upon the arrival of Lucentio and Bianca who are now married. Biondello, Tranio and the Merchant flee, realizing they are 'undone' (5.1.101). Vincentio's anger at being duped by his servant persists (5.1.110–11) as he ignores his son's explanations and requests for peace (5.1.114–20), and threatens violence: 'I'll slit the villain's [i.e. Tranio's] nose that would have sent me to the jail' (5.1.121–2). Baptista, too, is outraged at having his paternal authority thwarted by Bianca and Lucentio (5.1.123–4). With threats to 'be revenged' (5.1.126) on the servants and/or disobedient children, the scene uneasily concludes without any reconciliation. *The Shrew*'s last scene starts with a banquet presided over by Lucentio. Peacemaking has thus occurred offstage and between scenes. Huge threats of revenge only a scene earlier have dissolved into 'kindness' (5.2.5) and tolerance towards the servants who are present, though without speaking roles.

Kunst's penultimate scene differs from that of *The Shrew* in that the fathers gladly accept their new children-in-law (5.1.25–

56) and pardon their offspring. Overall, the reactions to the fake father and the secret wedding are more benevolent and forgiving. Rather than showing aggression towards the fake father and Felix who has impersonated his son, Adrian is overcome by emotion and repeatedly swoons (4.4.144–70). When he revives, he and Theobald lament the loss of Hilarius both as son and as possible son-in-law (5.1.16–17). Once their children arrive alive and married, Theobald and Adrian forgive their breach of custom. Whereas *The Shrew* deals with the business of reconciliation behind the scenes, the audience of *Kunst* thus becomes its witness.

As for the transgressions by Felix, Fabian and Blasius, Hilarius, solicitous of their pardon, asks for forbearance, Hardman pleads for the preservation of harmony, and the fathers agree to mere mock-punishment:

HILARIUS . . . I must now also beg forgiveness for
all those who have acted in this, for my sake, as
others than themselves.

ADRIAN They should at least be frightened,
especially that fool who wanted to make me mad.

HARDMAN This day is a day of joy. We should
mingle nothing upsetting or grievous with it.

ADRIAN Then they should undergo an amusing kind
of punishment, and all for their own good.

THEOBALD I add my voice to this, because my house
ought to be a place of pleasure and gladness. So
bring them all in, please.

(5.1.44–56)

While the breach of sumptuary law cannot go unprosecuted, nothing ‘grievous’ (5.1.51) is to interfere with the wedding celebrations. The punishment of the servants therefore takes the form of a communal ritual, so that those who attempted to rise unlawfully are restored to their proper place in society.

While *The Shrew* is keen to establish visual harmony through the banquet and Lucentio’s pacifying words (5.2.1–11), *Kunst*

performs the return to previous power structures through the trial (5.2.1–193), a long sequence that is wholly original to the German play. Sebastian first pronounces a harsh judgement: ‘Master Blasius Nosewhite and Felix are condemned to sweat out the nobility they wrongfully assumed in a hot bath house for three days. Fabian will wait upon them and serve them food, but no drink’ (5.2.23–6). When the offenders beg for mercy, Sebastian revisits the judgement and supposedly condemns them to assistance and participation in the wedding celebrations:

Master Blasius shall join Ceres and Bacchus, and make friends with them for eight days and longer in Sir Theobald’s lodgings in tolerable temperatures . . . Felix will hear an acceptably merciful judgment from his own master, and will behave like a modest guest. Fabian, on the other hand, will be handed over to Wormfire for his excesses, who will put him into the pillory, and run wine through him until he falls to the ground powerless, having done his duty to justice. When he has recovered his modest standing, he shall be made an inspector over the law of the jug. He shall diligently pour the cups overfull.

(5.2.50–65)

The sentence takes the form of an inversion of the scapegoat ritual. Rather than creating social exclusion by assigning unmerited blame, there is social inclusion of the offenders in a prolonged post-wedding Bacchanalian feast.

Just as the trial seems to conclude, Wormfire, in characteristic mock-Latin, states that he ‘must confer another more or less dirty thing to the *Sacro-Sanctae Justitiae*’ (5.2.77–8), and so the trial scene transitions to its second part. As Sybilla is expecting a child, Wormfire asks for permission to marry her, his embarrassment masked by comically convoluted Latinate language (5.2.91–105). The attendants gently tease them, and Hilarius suggests that their punishment for pre-marital sex

should be a prohibition to be 'bedfellows' (5.2.115), but after some comical resistance from the couple, they are allowed to get married. They are to be 'handed over to the priest' (5.2.162–3) and to participate in the wedding celebrations, and, after the birth of their child, 'this whole company shall serve as godparents' (5.2.168–9). In both parts of the trial scene, the threat of punishment and mock humiliation are thus followed by forgiveness, benevolence and joyful social integration.

After this long and funny but linguistically complex additional material, *Kunst* returns to material dramatized in *The Shrew*'s final scene, in particular in the short altercation between Katherina and the Widow (5.2.16–38), and the wager sequence with the demonstration of Katherina's tameness (5.2.64–195). Interpolated within the passage based on *The Shrew* is the recitation by Felix of a poem – 'a little wedding wish' (5.2.218), as he puts it – that retells the story of the three suitors, Hilarius, Alfons and Sebastian, figured as huntsmen of Sabina, who is troped as a deer (5.2.224–55). Apart from adding to the comic conclusion through its recapitulatory effect, the poem also reminds us of Felix's predicament as a servant in his concluding plea to Hilarius for continued patronage and employment.

Kunst aligns itself closely with *The Shrew* for the men's wager on their wives' obedience (*The Shrew*, 5.2.64–195; *Kunst*, 5.2.267–344). It comes as a surprise to the modern reader, however, that, amid this faithful rendition of the English original, *Kunst* chooses to condense Katherina's famous speech on female obedience in marriage (*TS*, 5.2.142–85), the longest speech of the play (it has forty-four lines), into a two-line nugget of sober advice, borrowed from St Paul's Letter to the Ephesians: 'Let me put it briefly. You men, love your wives. And you women, obey your husbands' (5.2.340–1).¹ In *The Shrew*,

¹ 'Husbands, love your wives . . .' (5.25); 'Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands . . .' (Ephesians 5.22).

Katherina's long and rhetorically sophisticated speech, with its massive potential for different interpretations, is the moment towards which the play's conclusion moves. *Kunst*, by contrast, breaks the structure of the final scene into several smaller units: the mock trial of Felix, Fabian and Blasius; the mock trial of Wormfire and Sybilla; the performance of Felix's recapitulatory poem; and the men's wager on their wives' obedience.

One reason why the German play can afford to reduce Katherina's long and troubling speech to a succinct piece of advice is that it completes a reinterpretation of the relationship between Petruccio and Katherina which started some time earlier. Although Hardman makes Catharina undergo more or less the same treatment as Petruccio gives Katherina, *Kunst* stresses that the couple's relationship leads to mutual contentment and peace. In a significant departure from Shakespeare's play, Hardman, in his second soliloquy (corresponding to *The Shrew*, 4.1.177–200), says, 'I confess I love her dearly' (3.5.8). In keeping with this are the names Hardman uses for Catharina. Even though Shakespeare's female protagonist insists on her full name – 'They call me Katherine that do talk of me' (2.1.183) – Petruccio reduces her name to 'Kate', consistently during their first encounter and frequently after it too.¹ Hardman, however, uses the shortened 'Trina' during their first encounter but almost invariably calls her 'Catharina' elsewhere in the play, suggesting a more respectful attitude.² Catharina shows similar signs of benevolence towards Hardman in the course of the play. In her conversation with Sybilla, for instance, she says, 'I believe this man has bewitched me, because I have to be gentle to him almost against my will' (4.2.102–3). At the end of Act 5, Scene 1,

¹ After Act 2, Scene 1, Petruccio calls her 'Kate' thirty times and 'Katherine' only twice, in the last scene (*TS*, 5.2.127, 136).

² For the diminutive of the shortened form of Catharina's name which Hardman uses once in the penultimate scene, see 5.1.57 and note. See also 5.2.123, 206 and notes.

immediately after their kiss in public (cf. *TS*, 5.1.139–41), *Kunst* adds a short passage that sums up the stage that their relationship has reached:

HARDMAN Do you see now, my love, that this is
 much better than when we are at odds? So let us
 put away all tricks and stubbornness, and live in
 peace and pleasure after wearing down our horns.
 I will chase away the mad Hardman, and you must
 chase away the bad Catharina. Thus we shall be
 an honourable couple renowned in all the world.

CATHARINA I am content with you if you are content
 with me.

HARDMAN Amen.

(4.4.186–95)

By the time we reach *The Shrew*'s last scene, then, the outcome of Petruccio's taming still hangs in the balance. In *Kunst*, by contrast, the last scene only confirms what the play has previously shown, which is that the couple have made peace.

An effect of *Kunst*'s reorganization of the final scene is the special prominence it gives to the servants. In keeping with this adaptive decision, *Kunst*, after the exit of the higher-ranking characters, adds a coda with the play's four chief servants, Felix, Fabian, Wormfire and Sybilla (5.2.345–93). For much of the final scene, then – the long mock trial, the performance of the poems and the coda – *Kunst* puts the servants centre-stage. While *The Shrew*'s festive conclusion is essentially about the newly-wedded couples – Petruccio and Katherina, Lucentio and Bianca and, to a lesser extent, Hortensio and the Widow – *Kunst*'s conclusion is socially more inclusive and gives considerable space to those servants (Felix and Fabian) who have helped bring about the marriages and to those (Wormfire and Sybilla) who serve as foils to the unions of their social superiors. Whereas *The Shrew* moves towards Katherina's parade of her new obedience as its defining moment, *Kunst*

divides the scene into several smaller units where a significant exchange is limited to gentle mockery of the servants and their robust resistance to it. The weaving together of *The Shrew*'s last scene with *Kunst*'s substantial addition of the trial and the songs by and coda with the servants shows a sophisticated adaptor of Shakespeare's play who deftly interwove new material, while keeping the playful mood of the original.

Soliloquies and asides

To its often close adaptation of *The Shrew*'s text, structure and themes, *Kunst* adds many soliloquies and asides that offer subtle twists to the original in terms of meaning and theatrical pace. The soliloquies often precede or succeed versions of the Shakespearean material, adding anticipatory or retrospective perspectives on what we will soon see or have just witnessed. They elegantly create brief points of rest which allow for (re)consideration of action and motivation and result in dramatic progression at highly variable speeds.

One example of a soliloquy that slows down the progression of the plot is that of Fabian (3.2.164–76) when he compares his own lack of success with the rosy prospects enjoyed by Felix through the disguise scheme. Sandwiched between the passage where Hilarius and Felix discuss the fake father scheme and Sebastian's report of the mad wedding, *Kunst*'s soliloquy slightly halts the rapidly accumulating events of *The Shrew* where the entry of groom and servant, the discussion on the fake father, and Gremio's report of the ceremony follow each other thick and fast. The overhasty betrothal, wedding and impatient leave-taking of Petruccio overwhelm Katherina by presenting her with seemingly inevitable facts, tricking her into acceptance through the speed of theatrical sequencing. There is a logic to the overwhelming thrust of *The Shrew*'s forward-moving plot, and soliloquies would lessen its effect. *Kunst*,

however, puts a premium on varied pace which permits the exploration of motivation and emotional state.

The Shrew's chief soliloquies give us access to Petruccio's reflections just before he meets Katherina (2.1.167–79), and after their shocking homecoming (4.1.177–200). Both instances concern his taming techniques of playing hot and cold with her, and of withdrawing even the most basic of physical comforts, food and sleep. Other than Petruccio, a few characters have short soliloquies at the end of scenes and, in one instance, at the beginning of a scene. Of these, *Kunst* provides versions of similar length by Felix (2.1.663–70; cf. *TS*, 2.1.407–14) and Wormfire (3.3.1–14; cf. *TS*, 4.1.1–10), and a considerably expanded version by Alfons (3.1.224–49; cf. *TS*, 3.1.85–90).¹ The two longest soliloquies in *The Shrew* are thus Petruccio's, which confers a special status on his 'taming of the shrew' and motivations.

Kunst includes largely faithful versions of Petruccio's soliloquies (2.1.225–46 and 3.5.1–30), but it also has six other characters give soliloquies with no equivalent in *The Shrew*, namely Wormfire (3.3.1–14), Catharina (3.2.1–12), Fabian (3.2.164–76), Sabina (4.1.9–18), Adrian (4.4.1–9) and Sybilla (4.4.196–205). These soliloquies have a considerable impact on pace, character and plot. The audience of *The Shrew*, for instance, first meets Vincentio as an unwitting actor in Petruccio's taming test concerning the sun and the moon (*TS*, 4.5.1–25). Hilarius' father Adrian, however, first enters the stage alone, worrying about his son's whereabouts (4.4.1–9). The first impression of him as loving father is confirmed throughout the last part of the play, setting up the mood for a conciliatory ending.

A similar change is discernible in *Kunst*'s addition of Catharina's reflection on her misery and her fear of the mockery

¹ The short speeches by Lucentio and Hortensio when alone left on stage (*TS*, 4.4.103–6 and 4.5.78–80) have no equivalent in *Kunst*.

she will suffer if Hardman does not arrive at the wedding soon (3.2.1–12). Catharina blames her father for rashly giving her away, and confesses to herself that she has found her match in shrewishness. She admits that she would ‘give [Hardman] the kindest words, and force [her]self to be friendly’ if only he returned (3.2.9–10). This concession, lacking in *The Shrew*, anticipates future taming scenes, including the meeting with the tailor (4.2), where Catharina curbs her impulse in order to allow Hardman to end his raging. Through the soliloquy, *Kunst* thus strategically supports the plot and complicates Catharina’s image, showing that she, who flouts traditional gender conventions, is no less bound by social expectations and reputation than those she scorns.

Kunst’s soliloquies provide insights into the workings of the characters’ minds, as well as their feelings. In its astonishing decision to add a soliloquy to Sabina’s part in which she reveals her love for Hilarius, *Kunst* makes her character radically depart from its equivalent in *The Shrew*, showing her as being much more sexually forward. The German play preserves *The Shrew*’s configuration in which the servant disguised as his master hides with the suitor disguised as a tutor in order to witness the flirtatious lesson between a daughter and a poetry teacher (*The Shrew*, 4.2; *Kunst*, 4.1). Into the two sections of hiding and revelation from *The Shrew*, however, *Kunst* inserts a brief speech by Sabina who is waiting for Hilarius. Believing herself to be alone (although Felix and Alfons are in fact on stage), she expresses her love and physical desire:

Happy hour which will bring my soul to my body. O love, never tried by me before, how great is your sweetness! Everything else in the world is stale and miserable in comparison! True joy and pleasure lie in you alone, pervading all my senses, body and soul. Many things can be found to entertain the body, but the soul cannot find pleasure and contentment but through

another soul, united in sweet love. But where is the comfort that I long for so much? Does his mind not feel the same yearning desire as mine?

(4.1.9–18)

Sabina remains teasingly vague about what it means to ‘entertain the body’ (4.1.14). The violence of her feelings and their expression, though, as well as her keenness to kiss and touch, even on her own initiative – ‘*She kisses him*’ (4.1.84 SD) – point towards her awareness, if not necessarily knowledge, of sexual pleasure. Her remarkable frankness in word and deed differs significantly from the arch voice of Bianca. The equivalent scene of *The Shrew* has the latter exchange merely a handful of quick-witted lines with Lucentio before he, rather than she, confesses his love for her (*TS*, 4.2.10). And no stage direction in *The Shrew* alerts us to a kiss between the two.

The German adaptation’s non-judgemental attitude and its greater interest in female desire and sexuality become evident not only in its depiction of higher-ranked characters like Sabina, but also in its remarkable addition of the female servant Sybilla, a character who seems to be an invention by the author of *Kunst*, although the idea of inserting a female servant into the play may have been prompted by Slobbetje in Abraham Sybant’s Dutch adaptation of *The Shrew* of 1654, *De Dolle Bruyloft* (see below, pp. 125–7). As Catharina’s maid, Sybilla provides a female equivalent to Wormfire, Hardman’s servant, filling a comic vacuum in *The Shrew*. She is first mentioned by Wormfire, after Theobald has agreed to Catharina’s marriage to Hardman. In his soliloquy, Wormfire muses on his flirting with Sybilla, and expresses confidence that she will eventually come around to having sex with him: ‘I have set up my cause well. She is ready on certain conditions. If my lord says yes, and her lady yes, the whore will be mine. I thought my tool would have it my way, but not this time. Such an honourable tree will not fall with one stroke’ (2.2.5–9). In her first speaking scene,

Act 4, Scene 2, in which she and Wormfire feast on leftover food at Hardman's house, it becomes clear that the couple has now had sex (she is pregnant) and are hoping to get married before the baby is born. They face the situation with jocular acceptance rather than anxiety, and are more interested in the food than in the precariousness of their circumstances (4.2.1–25). As she puts it, their extra-marital sex in fact 'conforms to *courtoisie*' (4.2.14) as practised by socially more distinguished people. This down-to-earth relationship between the two servants thus explores sexual mores, calling into question loftier but ultimately no less appetite-driven models of courtship. Her relationship with Wormfire is robust and frank but never condemned and, eventually, even blessed by marriage.

Later in Act 4, Scene 2, *Kunst* continues the theme of female sexual experience when Sybilla and Catharina discuss the wedding night (4.2.73–104). Sybilla frankly asks her mistress how the bedding was, and equally frankly receives a negative answer: 'He has left me all too pure so far' (4.2.86). The passage is not a soliloquy, but, like a soliloquy, it gives the spectators access to Catharina that is unrestricted by public norms of behaviour or expression, and so shares with them a private moment in which she is genuinely vulnerable. As there is no equivalent confidante in *The Shrew*, all we experience of Katherina is her starvation and lack of sleep; there is little emotional reflection. Catharina, by contrast, exposes her vulnerability and wonders about her changing relationship with and attitude towards Hardman who, she claims, 'has bewitched [her]' (4.2.103).

Sybilla returns to the theme of female sexual pleasure in her own soliloquy (4.4.196–205) which caps the busy final scene of Act 4. Having witnessed the public kiss between Hardman and Catharina, and their promise to be respectful towards one another, a breach of which would be followed by a ban from their shared bed (4.4.179–95), Sybilla humorously reflects on how their improved understanding must reflect a happier sexual

life: 'Well, I take it she is content with him now. She has had better nights than the first' (4.4.196–7). Through the soliloquies, therefore, *Kunst* acknowledges female desire and sexuality with a degree of frankness that is absent from *The Shrew*. In sum, *Kunst* treats the female characters' desires and appetites with equanimity, allowing them to elaborate *for themselves* what they wish for, untrammelled by male observations *about* them.

Kunst's added soliloquies thus help to enhance characterization and function as a tool to control and vary the dramatic pace of the play, slowing it down in order to open up spaces in which characters articulate their emotional states, such as Fabian's social frustration, Catharina's fear of mockery, Wormfire's and Sabina's sexual desire and Vincentio's fatherly care. Whereas *The Shrew* employs soliloquizing chiefly to allow Petruccio to reflect on and rationalize his 'taming of the shrew', *Kunst* opens it up to many other characters, resulting in an introspective heteroglossia that is absent from Shakespeare's play.

The soliloquy as a dramatic device is closely related to the aside, in that both are only heard by (or even addressed to) the audience, and, indeed, *Kunst* adds not only many soliloquies to *The Shrew* but also many asides. The aside is a well-established convention on the early modern stage, although stage directions that render them explicit are rare in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions of Shakespeare's plays, and *The Shrew*'s early modern editions contain no instance of it.¹ The early editions of *Kunst*, however, mark twenty-four speeches as asides ('beyseits' in German),² almost all of them with material that has no

¹ For the prominence of the aside on the early modern English stage, see Dessen and Thomson, 15–16. Note that many of *The Shrew*'s modern editors mark several speeches as asides, although Barbara Hodgdon, in the Arden 3 series, does so only once (5.1.37 SD), arguing that, on the whole, 'whether a line is or is not spoken "aside" is best left for performers to work out' (341).

² This excludes the rare occasions where two characters speak aside to one another, unheard by others (so-called 'split asides').

equivalent in *The Shrew*. It is likely that asides are more pervasive still in the play but have been recorded unsystematically in the early editions. In Act 2, Scene 1, for instance, as Hardman and Sebastian speak to Theobald about their suit to his respective daughters (2.1.82–145), Wormfire makes ten interjectory comments during their conversation, none of which in any way registers with or is responded to by the other characters, and this despite the fact that many of the comments are so provocative that, if heard, they would elicit a rebuke or some other response. Yet the early duodecimos mark only four of Wormfire's ten speeches as asides. There is nothing about the nature of Wormfire's comments that would allow us to determine why those four should be spoken as asides and not the other six. Similar patterns can be observed elsewhere in the play (see, for instance, 1.1.17–32, 2.1.196–200). Given that these and similar comments – chiefly spoken by servants, as we shall see – play an important role in the play, we have usually marked them as asides (signalling the editorial intervention by square brackets), even though the early editions do not. It would be possible, of course, to perform many of these asides in such a way as to elicit a non-verbal response by other characters, but we nonetheless consider them to be asides insofar as they fail to register in the other characters' dialogue.¹

Of the sixty-one (original or editorial) asides in the play, by far the greatest number, thirty-eight, are spoken by Wormfire, and of those that are not, the majority are assigned to two other servants: Veit and Fabian. Indeed, it is noticeable that *Kunst* frequently inserts asides by servants into faithfully translated passages from *The Shrew*, and it does so as part of a conscious strategy to make the servants reflect on the actions and motivations of the higher-ranked characters. For instance, in

¹ Our understanding of what is usefully considered an aside is here shaped by Morgan, *Turn-Taking*, 105–15.

the following passage, Sebastian tells Hilarius, disguised as Johannes, how to prepare for his teaching of Sabina:

SEBASTIAN [*to Hilarius*] The next thing I want is
that you buy for her the best books about love that
you can find. These have great power to enflame
the fire of love in the hearts of maidens.

WORMFIRE (*aside*) But not for you.

SEBASTIAN And they should be bound in the
daintiest and prettiest manner. The paper that you
use must be well perfumed, for she whom my
soul loves is worth more than all exquisite spices.
And may I remind you, Johannes, to be as diligent
in her service as you can. Your reward from me
will exceed even Sir Theobald's generosity.

WORMFIRE [*aside*] He looks to me as if he would
receive his salary from her without your
knowledge or will.

SEBASTIAN But what matters will you treat with her?
(1.3.158–72)

If we compare the passage to *The Shrew*, we notice that it corresponds to a single speech by Gremio, addressed to Lucentio disguised as Cambio, into which *Kunst* has inserted the two acerbic asides by Wormfire:

GREMIO O, very well; I have perused the note.¹
Hark you, sir, I'll have them very fairly bound
(All books of love, see that at any hand)
And see you read no other lectures to her:
You understand me. Over and beside
Signor Baptista's liberality,
I'll mend it with a largess. Take your paper too,
And let me have them very well perfumed,

¹ Ard³ *TS* annotates, 'bill, account – presumably, for Lucentio's purchase of books'.

For she is sweeter than perfume itself
To whom they go to. What will you read to her?
(*TS*, 1.2.142–51)

In *The Shrew*, the ‘books of love’ have already been purchased, whereas they have not yet in *Kunst*, but the German adaptation nonetheless preserves all the important elements of Gremio’s speech: the plan to have the books bound and to use them in the teaching to further the wooing, the additional reward, the perfumed paper and the final question. The faithfulness in the adaptation of Gremio’s speech contrasts with the innovation of Wormfire’s comments. Clearly, they are both asides, although only the first is marked as such in the early editions: Wormfire’s second comment anticipates Hilarius’ wooing of Sabina for himself, which is precisely what remains hidden from Sebastian. *Kunst* thus adds a layer to the passage by having Wormfire comment on the ongoing action, increasing the complicity between the audience and the servant character (who understands Hilarius’ plan), while exposing and undercutting the foolish project of Sebastian.

The same mechanism can be observed on a larger scale in the previously mentioned passage in Act 2, Scene 1, in which Hardman and Sebastian introduce themselves to Theobald as suitors to his respective daughters (2.1.84–143). The passage follows the equivalent dramatic sequence in *The Shrew* (2.1.39–86), and almost every speech by Petruccio, Gremio and Baptista has its corresponding speech in *Kunst*. What is radically different in the German adaptation, however, are the asides by Wormfire. In *The Shrew*, Grumio is simply absent from the scene; in *Kunst*, Wormfire provides a sarcastic running commentary, inserts daring jokes and exposes to the audience much of what the other characters try to keep hidden from one another, thereby deflating their motives and unmasking their ambitions.¹

¹ One could also point to other passages in which Wormfire (e.g. 1.3.235–7; 2.1.222–23; 3.2.117, 124–5; 4.4.59–60) or, less frequently, Veit (e.g. 2.1.569–70) or Fabian (e.g. 3.2.229) have asides that have been added by *Kunst* in passages that otherwise closely follow *The Shrew*.

The perspicacity and irreverence with which Wormfire frequently comments on and subverts the self-interested projects of the higher-ranked characters arguably make him the protagonist of the German play. This may seem surprising, given the Shakespearean source, but it is less so if we place *Kunst* in the context of the seventeenth-century theatre companies that travelled across Germany. In many of their plays, Pickelherring was typically the protagonist, and the actor playing him was often the company leader (see Katritzky, 'Pickelherring' and 'A plague'). Indeed, he was so prominent that his name became a generic word designating a fool.¹ Pickelherring, like Wormfire, is a servant figure who owes his importance to the place he occupies in the plays as witty, irreverent commentator and trenchant interrogator. Like Wormfire, the German stock character has a special relationship with the audience, often speaks aside and has a propensity for bawdy innuendos. Nor is *Kunst* the only early modern German Shakespeare play in which a version of the Pickelherring figure comes to occupy an important role. In *Romio und Julieta*, Pickelherring is a character himself, an amalgamation of the Nurse, Peter and another Capulet servant in Shakespeare's play (Erne and Seidler, 76–7). In *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, he is called Phantasmo, a name that seems to be unique to this play but whose functions are clearly related to Pickelherring's (Erne and Seidler, 9–10). Wormfire, then, offers a late instance of a character whose adaptation to the German stage is shaped by the conventions of the Pickelherring figure. In *Kunst*, he complements several other servant figures, notably Felix, Fabian and Veit, and reinforces the play's more general interest in servants and their relationship to their social superiors.

¹ For the clown figure in early German professional theatre more generally, see Asper, *Hanswurst*, 124–230.

Verbal, cultural and dramatic language

Apart from the addition of soliloquies and asides, another important feature of *Kunst*'s adaptation of *The Shrew* is its revision of the dramatic writing that makes up Shakespeare's play. Unlike *The Shrew*, which combines verse and prose, *Kunst* is written almost entirely in prose, although it contains two short verse passages during the poetry lesson in Act 3, Scene 1, a song that is performed during the music lesson in the same scene, and two poems that are recited in the last scene.¹ If we compare *Kunst* and *The Shrew* closely, we notice that the German adaptation sometimes follows Shakespeare's play speech by speech and almost word for word. The following excerpt, taken from the passage in which Hardman/Petruccio feigns dissatisfaction with the work of the tailor ('Fritz' in *Kunst*), serves to illustrate the occasional verbal proximity between the two plays. *The Shrew* reads as follows:

KATHERINA

I never saw a better-fashioned gown,
More quaint, more pleasing, nor more
commendable.

Belike you mean to make a puppet of me.

PETRUCCIO

Why true, he means to make a puppet of thee.

TAILOR She says your worship means to make a
puppet of her.

PETRUCCIO

O monstrous arrogance. Thou liest, thou thread,
thou thimble,
Thou yard, three quarters, half-yard, quarter, nail,
Thou flea, thou nit, thou winter-cricket, thou!
Braved in mine own house with a skein of thread?

¹ See 3.1.46–50, 3.1.67–70, 3.1.143–78, 5.2.224–60 and 5.2.352–79.

Away, thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant,
Or I shall so bemete thee with thy yard
As thou shalt think on prating whilst thou liv'st.
I tell thee, I, that thou has marred her gown.
(TS, 4.3.103–16)

Here is the equivalent passage in *Kunst*:

CATHARINA I say he has worked well. You want
to make a rogue of him, and a fool of me.

HARDMAN You speak right. It's the rogue who wants
to make a fool of you.

FRITZ She says, my lord, it is you who wants to
make a fool of her.

HARDMAN O, great presumption by the shadow of a
man in my own house! You lie, you lie, you thread,
you Tom Thumb, you needle tip, you flaky-headed
clod of earth, you! I'll soon measure your mangy
back with your mete-yard and make you remember
it all your life. You've wasted everything that's
been given into your hands.

(4.2.202–14)

The four speeches occur in the same order, and each has its easily recognizable equivalent. Catharina's speech condenses and simplifies the first sentence in Katherina's, but the second sentence remains close, except that it adds the idea that Hardman mocks not only her but also the tailor. Hardman's first speech closely follows Petruccio's and relies on the same feigned misunderstanding. Fritz then, like the *Shrew*'s tailor, corrects Hardman/Petruccio by explaining the misunderstanding. Hardman's following outrage, or mock outrage, draws on many of the same elements as Petruccio's. The initial exclamation is followed by an accusation of lying, followed by a series of apostrophes that belittle the tailor through references related to his profession. The (feigned) resentment at being contradicted

in his own house also recurs, though in a slightly different position. *Kunst* omits Petruccio's order for the tailor to go away, but the two speeches conclude in the same way with the threat of beating the tailor with a yard rule and the charge that he has spoiled the work, although Petruccio's accusation that he has spoiled the 'gown' is more specific than Hardman's that he has 'wasted everything'. All in all, then, the relationship between the two passages in *Kunst* and *The Shrew* is close. To the extent that it is a translation, the translation is rather loose, but to the extent that it is an adaptation, the adaptation closely follows the original.

While occasional proximity is one feature of the relationship of *Kunst*'s language to *The Shrew*'s, the German play also contains distinct characteristics that depart from or go beyond Shakespeare's play. One such feature is its fondness for proverbs, some of which are inevitably lost in translation, although we use the commentary to draw the reader's attention to their presence in the original and to their literal meaning. In the opening scene, for instance, Catharina taunts Sebastian by telling him, 'Dann jhr ja nicht könnet einen Hund auß dem Ofen locken', of which a more-or-less literal translation might be that Sebastian 'could not tease a dog out from under the oven'. Given that Sebastian is unable even to make a dog move, he will be utterly unable, Catharina implies, to evoke desire in a young woman. Our translation, 'you couldn't tease a dog out from under the oven' (1.1.38–9), preserves the insult to Sebastian and the canine reference, but in the absence of a precise equivalent in English, it inevitably loses something of the colourfully proverbial original.

On other occasions, the German play uses expressions that have at least a proverbial appearance, although they cannot be found in the most comprehensive reference work of German proverbs, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander's five-volume *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexicon* (1866–80), and may be idiosyncratic coinages by the German author. So in Act 1,

Scene 3, as the suitors are fighting over Sabina, Wormfire comments that 'where carrion is stinking, there the ravens will gather' (1.3.359–60), a characteristically irreverent comment that tropes Sabina as rotting flesh over which the suitor-ravens fight. The German text contains many such vivid expressions, often rooted in references to the animal world, in particular but by no means only spoken by Wormfire. In line with this feature of *Kunst*'s language is its proliferation and amplification of sexual allusions, often channelled through outspoken servants (notably Wormfire, Sybilla and Veit) but also through characters of higher rank, like Catharina. All these linguistic features contribute to making *Kunst* an earthier and more exuberant play than *The Shrew*.

While using many distinctly German expressions and proverbs, the author of *Kunst* also goes beyond this linguistic adaptation by fitting geographic and cultural references to the German context. For instance, Hardman is from Worms (1.3.249), not Verona, and he claims to be planning a trip to Frankfurt, not Venice, to purchase 'gorgeous robes and jewels' for the wedding (2.1.539–40). Wormfire affirms (perhaps fancifully) that he and Hardman served in the military at 'Bautzen' (1.3.310) in east Saxony, associated with various events during the Thirty Years' War, including a siege in 1620 and the town's destruction by fire during occupation by the Catholic imperial army in 1633. His interjection 'Leipzig surrenders' (2.1.128) likely alludes to another event in the Thirty Years' War, the Battle of Breitenfeld (1642), during which Leipzig surrendered to the Swedish forces. Elsewhere the same character refers to 'a market in Hanover' (2.1.112–13), in northern Germany, and to 'Bacherach wine' (3.2.250) from the wine-growing region of Bacherach in the Rhine-Palatinate. Geographic references thus range from west to east and from north to south, though what may well be the most regionally-specific reference, 'Bacherach', is compatible with the opinion of several German scholars that certain linguistic

peculiarities point to western central Germany as the homeland of the play's anonymous author (see below, p. 143).

A specific instance of cultural translation may be observed in Act 3, Scene 1. In its endeavour to make the English play recognizable to German culture, the translator replaces the Ovidian Latin lesson with a tutorial on dactylic composition in German while keeping the romantically suggestive content and context of *The Shrew*. The line-by-line translation of Latin (to 'conster' is Bianca's word for it – *TS*, 3.1.30, 40) was a staple activity of humanist education and would have playfully activated school-time memories of many male readers or audience members (see Maurer). The Latin passage is from Ovid's *Heroides*, and the part on which Lucentio has Bianca focus is from Penelope's letter to Ulysses, recounting her difficult situation as wife left behind in their kingdom, beset with unwanted suitors. Shakespeare toys with the obvious inference that Bianca's suitors are just as unwelcome as Penelope's, and are, for the moment at least, rebutted by her translation. Elite references to classical literature are thus embedded in *The Shrew*'s scene in specific cultural practices that have implications for plot and characterization.

Kunst's adaptor realizes the particularity of the passage and adapts it to German literary culture of the seventeenth century in which use of the dactyl was rare.¹ The complex layers of intertextuality between Ovid and Shakespeare are sidestepped for a more straightforward situation-based adaptation that focuses on the flirtation between student and tutor. The German stresses the potentially sexual relationship between teacher and pupil by having Hilarius explain the dactyl in terms that suggest

¹ Martin Opitz (1597–1639), the leading theoretician of German literature of the seventeenth century, did not advocate use of the dactyl, but his contemporary and successor August Buchner (1591–1661) did. The author of *Kunst* may well have been aware of Buchner's posthumously published *Anleitung zur deutschen Poeterey*, sigs F10r–G6r ('Instructions for German Poetry', Wittenberg, 1665; VD17 39:121087A).

the male sexual organs (one long syllable and two short ones, for which the standard notation was —○○), and its composition in terms suggesting sexual intercourse: ‘Although it may appear to you a little sour the first time, afterwards it will seem so sweet that your appetite will not be stilled’ (3.1.49–51). The passage thus combines wit and daring at the same time as *Kunst* adapts it to its own cultural context.

Though *Kunst* thus eliminates *The Shrew*’s Latin lesson, it includes many Latin words and phrases elsewhere. It does so far more than Shakespeare’s play, making the presence of Latin snippets another characteristic feature of *Kunst*’s language that distinguishes it from *The Shrew*’s.¹ This presence might be thought to pull the language of *Kunst* over towards sophistication and sober learning, but given the barely veiled mocking or suggestive undertone of many of the Latin words and phrases, it does not. Although its appreciation presupposes some learning, the Latin with which the play is peppered usually serves a comic or satiric purpose, such as the exposure of pretentiousness or the conveyance of mock formality. In Act 1, Scene 2, for instance, Fabian mocks Felix’s newfound noble status through bragging in French and Latin: ‘How now, my brand-new lord, *avec permission*, may I interrogate you and receive report through my *quaestiones*?’ (1.2.40–2). In Act 2, Scene 1, as Hardman is getting ready to meet Catharina for the first time, he sends Wormfire away on the grounds that he ‘need[s] to think’, an idea his servant mocks by using Latin: ‘I can well believe you: there will be brave *lectiones*, you will receive the *contra*’ (2.1.248–51). Sebastian’s pompous and self-righteous quotation from Ovid’s *Fasti*, ‘*Magna fuit capitis quondam reverentia cani*’ (‘in the past there used to be great reverence for the white head’), is immediately countered by

¹ For Latin in *The Shrew* outside the Latin lesson, see Grumio’s ‘*Inprimis*’ and ‘*Ergo*’ (4.1.59, 4.3.129), the Tailor’s ‘*Inprimis*’ (4.3.133) and a phrase by Tranio (1.1.161) and by Biondello (4.4.91–2).

Veit's acerbic comment, 'Even if you gather all the maxims from Cicero and Seneca, you will not convince a pretty maid that you are more suitable for her than a fresh young gentleman' (2.1.613–17). In the tailor passage, Fritz reads out Wormfire's written instructions to defend himself against Hardman's accusations of professional incompetence (4.2.236–97), and the comedy of the passage partly relies on the note's combination of pompous diction, convoluted syntax and repeated use of Latin (and French). Latin is pervasive when, during the second part of the trial scene, Wormfire confesses that Sybilla is pregnant and requests permission to marry her (5.2.73–192). Struggling to come clean about Sybilla's pre-marital pregnancy, he hides his embarrassment in confusing syntax and Latin, with the result that his onstage (see 5.2.81) as well as his offstage audience find it hard to understand him.

In other passages, characters use Latin to give bawdy allusions a veneer of respectability, or mock respectability. Disappointed that his first close encounter with Sybilla has not led to full sexual intercourse, Wormfire rationalizes his disappointment by stating that 'one stays *in atrio* [i.e. in the entrance hall] the first time' and only later gets to 'drift into the Netherlands' (2.2.21–4). When Sybilla, in her soliloquy, concludes that Catharina, since her wedding, 'has had better nights than the first' (4.4.197), she attributes the change to the '*instrumentum pacis*', the instrument of peace, that is, the male member. In the music lesson, Alfons presents to Sabina his method of gamut teaching by using several Latin words that contain sexual innuendos: 'Here is the *scala* which I have devised in a perfect new manner. Women usually conceive better of *b flat major* than *b flat minor*, so I will first instruct you in the *ascendendo*, and then in the *descendendo* which teaches itself' (3.1.112–16). The German text reads 'dur' for '*flat major*', that is, Latin for 'hard', and '*scala*', '*ascendendo*' and '*descendendo*' allude to the erection and detumescence of the male sexual organ. Examples could be multiplied, but the point

has been made: Latin, in *Kunst*, is not the language of learning but comedy. It serves to expose pretension, to deflate ambition or to give bawdy puns an air of (mock) respectability. It usually suggests pseudo-learning. That said, there is nothing pseudo-learned about the play's implied audience or readership which should be educated enough to appreciate the comic function of these Latin passages. *Kunst* might share this feature with a play like *Love's Labour's Lost*, but does not share it with *The Shrew*. The place of Latin in the play, in other words, is another feature through which the German play distinctly emancipates itself from the language of *The Shrew*.

In terms of stage action, by contrast, *Kunst* stays closer to *The Shrew* and usually follows the English play in the passages they share. For instance, both Katherina and Catharina, in Act 2, Scene 1, strike Bianca/Sabina (*TS*, 2.1.22 SD / 2.1.10 SD), and while Petruccio '*pulls [Grumio] back and forth by the ears*' (1.3.15 SD), Hardman similarly '*wrings [Wormfire] by the ears*' (*TS*, 1.2.17 SD). At other moments, however, the German play is more specific in what it records in stage directions. In particular, several characters who simply enter in *The Shrew* do so in *Kunst* in ways that are specified. So when Fabian enters and discovers that Hilarius and Felix have swapped clothes, he '*Looks at both in dismay*' (1.2.12 SD; cf. *TS*, 1.1.219 SD). Alfons, when Hardman and Wormfire have arrived at his house, enters '*hastily*' (1.3.22 SD; cf. *TS*, 1.2.19 SD). Felix, upon discovering his master's father, is '*all aghast*', and Adrian, seeing Felix in his son's clothes, looks '*shocked*' (4.4.143–4; cf. *TS*, 5.1.57–8). Such additional information can often be derived from the dialogue text, as when Hardman arrives before his wedding '*strangely dressed*' (3.2.85 SD; cf. *TS*, 3.2.83 SD) or when Sebastian, after the same wedding, enters '*laughing*' (3.2.176 SD; cf. *TS*, 3.2.147 SD), but these directions may well have been added for the benefit of readers who are thus allowed to apprehend the information at the same time as spectators would, rather than belatedly, through the dialogue.

Of particular interest are passages in which *Kunst* clarifies stage business that may – but does not have to – be implicit in *The Shrew*. During the forced engagement in Act 2, Scene 1, for instance, stage directions in *Kunst* clearly indicate that Hardman first ‘*extends his hand to [Catharina]*’ and then ‘*takes her hand and presses it into his*’ (2.1.543 SD, 546 SD). Petruccio encourages Katherina – ‘Give me thy hand’ (TS, 2.1.318) – but what stage action follows these words is not made clear. Something similar may be observed when the couple departs after their wedding in Act 3, Scene 2. In *The Shrew*, since Katherina is unwilling to leave, Petruccio claims to defend her against the dangerous advances of her friends and family: ‘Grumio, / Draw forth thy weapon, we are beset with thieves; / Rescue they mistress, it thou be a man’; turning to Katherina, he pretends to reassure her: ‘Fear not, sweet wench, they shall not touch thee, Kate; / I’ll buckler thee against a million’, at which point an unspecific ‘*Exeunt*’ stage direction indicates that the couple leaves the stage (3.2.236–40), without clarifying how they do so. *Kunst*, by contrast, chooses to pinpoint the action: ‘*He carries her out in his arms*’ (3.2.328 SD). A similar instance is the conflict between the two tutors at the beginning of Act 3. In *The Shrew*, Lucentio calls Hortensio a ‘Preposterous ass’ (3.1.9) and provokes him by belittling the importance of music. Hortensio threateningly responds that he ‘will not bear these braves’ at which point Bianca interrupts them: ‘Why gentlemen, you do me double wrong / To strive for that which resteth in my choice’ (TS, 3.1.15–17). Is Hortensio’s threat followed by aggressive action, or does the conflict remain purely verbal? In *Kunst*, Hilarius responds to Alfons’ threat and ‘*starts to beat him*’, prompting Sabina’s intervention: ‘Hold, my lord. It’s strange that you should quarrel about what lies in my choice alone’ (3.1.19–20). In these cases, the German play spells out stage action that is left unclear in *The Shrew*, but is not incompatible with it.

In the passage dramatizing Hardman’s arrival at his house, *Kunst*’s stage directions indicate a whole series of actions

which *The Shrew* does not render explicit. In *The Shrew*, Petruccio objects to all his servants do and showers them with abuse, but the early editions add no stage directions concerning his physical treatment of them. As Barbara Hodgdon has pointed out, ‘Most modern editions, following Rowe, introduce SDs at 134 (“*Strikes him*”), 141 (“*Strikes Servant*”) and 154 (“*He throws the food and dishes at them*”), and ‘performances often incorporate such stage business’. Yet, as she adds, ‘the scene has also been played without some or all of the traditional physical action’ (Ard³, 248); her edition therefore refrains from adding stage directions to this passage. The early editions of *Kunst*, unlike *The Shrew*’s, are perfectly explicit in directing Hardman’s treatment of his servants. Shortly after their entrance, he first ‘*strikes them*’ (3.3.104 SD), and a short time later, ‘*He strikes the [Second] Servant*’ (3.3.127 SD) who tries to take off his boots. Another servant who has brought a bowl of water is beaten with the bowl itself (3.3.133 SD, 136 SD). Later in the scene, Hardman ‘*beats*’ a servant whom he accuses of spilling the broth, and shortly before the end of the sequence he also ‘*strikes*’ Wormfire (3.3.146 SD, 176 SD). Whereas the absence of stage directions in *The Shrew* leaves open the possibility that the abuse in the scene is purely verbal, *Kunst* has determined that it is also, and repeatedly, physical.

While the stage directions in *Kunst* are often similar to or at least compatible with *The Shrew*, there are passages where the German play adds stage business that has no equivalent in Shakespeare’s play. In the scene just discussed, Petruccio, amidst the abuse he hurls at his servants, turns to Katherina and bids her ‘welcome’ (4.1.128) to his house. Hardman also does so – ‘Be welcome, dearest darling’ (3.3.119) – but follows up on his words with a kiss: ‘*He kisses her, while she stands still*’ (3.3.119 SD). Similarly, after their wedding, and shortly before carrying her out in his arms, Hardman turns to Catharina and ‘*kisses her*’ before telling her, ‘You are my all, my nothing, my life and death depend on you’ (3.2.315–16). No kiss accompanies Petruccio’s

equivalent words, and they are addressed, significantly, not to Katherina, but to the other men: 'She is my goods, my chattels . . . my anything' (*TS*, 3.2.231–3). Another case in point is the conflict between the two sisters in Act 2, Scene 1. In *Kunst*, Catharina not only beats Sabina once, as Katherina does Bianca, but Catharina then '*binds her hands*' (2.1.24 SD), after which she '*beats her*' (2.1.28 SD) again, suggesting a degree of (partly playful?) violence absent from the sisters' conflict in *The Shrew*. Beating and kissing are actions that are characteristic of comedy and, in particular, farce, and it seems significant that they figure prominently in *Kunst*. They contribute to stage action which the play scripts with greater frequency and precision than Shakespeare's play, a difference that can inform alternative and additional ways of understanding the dynamics among characters.

To conclude, the linguistic, dramatic and structural changes of *Kunst über alle Künste* reveal an incisive reconsideration of *The Taming of the Shrew*. At a time when we have become all too familiar with Shakespeare's play and the issues it raises, its seventeenth-century German adaptation offers untapped insights into the potential of the English comedy to signify anew when meeting a different cultural and yet still early modern context. *Kunst* allows us to witness complexities of intercultural exchange, in particular in its creative exploration of gender and social issues, adopting, adapting, omitting from, adding to and embracing the Shakespeare play it so aptly reconfigures.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW IN GERMAN IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The early history of *The Taming of the Shrew* is bound up with a similar play, *The Taming of a Shrew*, performed in c. 1592 and published in 1594 (Hodgdon, 12–14). Theories concerning the

relationship between the two plays include: one, that *A Shrew* is an early draft by Shakespeare; two, that it is an anonymous source play that Shakespeare adopted and elaborated; three, that it is an adaptation of Shakespeare's play; and, four, that it is a memorial reconstruction that derives from and tries to record (a version of) Shakespeare's play (Hodgdon, 20).¹ Unlike *The Shrew*, *A Shrew* returns to Sly at the end of the play (as he awakens from his supposed dream) and thus treats as a frame what editions of *The Shrew* call an Induction. While *The Shrew*'s Katherina plot is close to *A Shrew* (in which the character is called 'Kate'), the Bianca plot is not. *Kunst über alle Künste* clearly follows *The Shrew*, and we have found no evidence to suggest that its author may have been aware of *A Shrew*.²

The Taming of the Shrew is assumed to have been written in or around 1591 (Taylor and Loughnane, 499–503). It first reached print in the First Folio of 1623, followed by a quarto reprint in 1631. It is unknown how the text found its way abroad. Its first appearance on the Continent is recorded in the Netherlands: a Dutch version of *The Shrew*, *De Dolle Bruyloft* ('The Mad Wedding'), was performed in 1654 at the Amsterdam Theatre and published the same year (Wiggins, 3.159; Hoenselaars and van Dijkhuizen, 55; Nassau-Sarolea, 44).³ The translator-adaptor, Abraham Sybant (c. 1620–60), was associated with several Anglo-Dutch companies of itinerant

¹ For a close analysis of the relationship between *The Shrew* and *A Shrew*, see Miller, 12–31, 127–43.

² It has been argued that the Sly material in *The Shrew* and *A Shrew* received separate adaptations in two mid-seventeenth-century Dutch farces, the anonymous *Pots van Kees Krollen, hertogh van Pierlepom* ('Farce of Kees Krollen, Duke of Neverland', Leiden, 1649) and Melchior Fockens' *Klucht van droncken Hansje* ('Farce of Hans the Drunkard', Amsterdam, 1657) (Helmers). See also Gstach, 428–30.

³ The play received four performances in 1654 (9, 12, 16 and 19 November) and a total of three more in 1655 (4 February) and 1656 (24 February, 7 August) (Wiggins, 3.158).

players, which may have given him access to texts from England (Hoenselaars and van Dijkhuizen, 55). Neither *De Dolle Bruyloft* nor *Kunst* refer to Shakespeare or an English original, but, while the title page of *Kunst* mentions no author and the play's anonymous author acknowledges in a note the text's status as a translation-adaptation (see below, pp. 140–1), it is Sybant's name that is mentioned on the title-page of *De Dolle Bruyloft* and in three short celebratory verses preceding the play proper. The Dutch play is composed in rhyming hexameter couplets throughout. Unlike *Kunst*, Sybant generally retains the English names though he gives the servants Dutch names. Among these, he invents a female servant called Slobbetje for whom there is no precedent in the English. She has a brief speaking role at the beginning of Act 4, taking over a handful of lines from one of Petruccio's servants. The brevity of her role means that Slobbetje does not qualify as the source on which *Kunst*'s Sybilla is based, although it is possible that the presence of a named female servant in *De Dolle Bruyloft* gave the author of *Kunst* the idea for the character.¹

Like *Kunst*, *De Dolle Bruyloft* slightly rearranges *The Shrew*'s act division and condenses parts of *The Shrew*'s first scene, notably Lucentio's falling in love with Bianca. Unlike *Kunst*, however, the Dutch play omits the Widow and the wager in the last scene, nor does it include the Induction, or any other prologue. This has been taken to suggest that the English copy Sybant was working from – perhaps a copy of the 1631 quarto – may have been damaged at its two extremities (Nassau-Sarolea, 55), as easily happened to unbound quarto playbooks. Ton Hoenselaars and Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen have argued,

¹ Another possible hint of the acquaintance of *Kunst*'s author with *De Dolle Bruyloft* is the description in the List of Roles of Matz Trumper's function as 'well-established oven-raker and firekeeper'. Sybant amplifies Curtis' name to Curtus Stookebrant, literally 'the one that stokes the fire', a detail the author of *Kunst* may have remembered.

however, that the text of *De Dolle Bruyloft* suggests a conscious and deliberate reworking of the entirety of Shakespeare's play (56–7). What is clear, in any case, is that the author of *Kunst* did not work from *De Dolle Bruyloft* but from a text, no doubt a German text (see below, pp. 141–2), that was closer to Shakespeare's, although it is possible that he was familiar with the Dutch version or a German derivation from it.¹

Although *Kunst* is the earliest text of a version of *The Shrew* in German, there are records of earlier performances that are likely to be related to Shakespeare's play. We owe the earliest such record to Johann Christoph Gottsched, the leading German literary scholar of the mid-eighteenth century. Gottsched compiled an overview of German drama from 1450 to his time, *Nöthiger Vorrath zur Geschichte der deutschen Dramatischen Dichtkunst* (Leipzig, 1757), in which he mentions four plays that were performed 'auf dem Zittauischen Schauplatze', that is, in the theatre in the Saxon town of Zittau, from 5 to 7 March 1658. The fourth play is 'Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio, mit der bösen Catharine' – 'The Wonderful Wedding of Petruvio with the Bad Catharine' (210).² 'Petruvio' might be assumed to be the result of a simple copying error, but the name's reappearance in a later record (see below, p. 129) suggests that it is a conscious adaptation of the name in Shakespeare's play. Gottsched derives his information about the performances from

¹ For *De Dolle Bruyloft*, see also Helmers, 125–8.

² The titles Gottsched gives for the other three plays are 'Androfilo oder göttliche Wunderliebe', 'Sylvia, oder wunderthätige Liebe' and 'Der klägliche Zwang'. The first two were written by Sigmund von Birken and jointly published in 1656, *Androfilo oder die Wunderliebe* and *Sylvia oder die Wunderthätige Schönheit* (Lüneburg, 1656, VD17 23:284204W). The second is not known to survive, but it is likely to have been a translation of Lope de Vega's *La fuerza lastimosa* (Köhler, xii), produced by Georg Greflinger, who announces a forthcoming play of his called 'Der beklägliche Zwang' (sig. *2v) in a preface to his translation of Pierre Corneille's *Le Cid* (*Die Sinnreiche Tragi-Comoedia genannt Cid*, Hamburg, 1650, VD17 1:627142D). See also Gärtner, 135.

a now lost programme by Christian Keimann (1607–62), headmaster of the Zittau grammar school from 1638, suggesting that the performance was a school production (see Köhler, x).¹ Keimann is known to have produced plays from 1638, usually based on biblical material (Pescheck, 348). These included plays he translated and adapted, such as *Samuel* by Johann Förster (1646, originally published in Latin in 1604, VD17 39:139726E) and *Susanna* by Nicodemus Frischlin (1648, also originally published in Latin, VD17 7:710222Q) as well as plays he wrote himself, notably *Junger Tobias* (Freiberg, 1641, VD17 3:308439H) and *Der neugebohrne Jesus, den Hirten und Weisen offenbahret* (Görlitz, 1646, VD17 23:236006T).² Keimann was crowned poet laureate, ‘Poeta Laureatus Caesareus’, in 1651 (Flood, 973–8; see above, pp. 65–6). It is known that ‘englische Komödien’ had been publicly performed at the Zittau town hall by the ‘kurfürstlich sächsische Comödianten’ (‘Elector of Saxony’s Comedians’) from 14 to 25 July 1650 (Pescheck, 348). Perhaps this offered an opportunity for Keimann to see plays of English origin or even to secure texts of some of them.³

Keimann’s 1658 programme is lost, but a later programme made for a production in 1678 probably gives us information about the play that was performed under Keimann. The programme is for a school production in Görlitz, some twenty miles from Zittau, overseen by the headmaster Christian Funcke (1626–95).⁴ Its title page mentions two plays that were to be performed ‘auff öffentlicher Schau-Bühne zu einer nützlichen und erbaulichen Schul-Übung’ (‘on a public stage as a useful

¹ Gstach’s mention of further Zittau performances of the play in 1661 (523) relies on a misunderstanding of a confusing footnote in Köhler (x–xi). See also Junkers, 249.

² The last of these plays has received a modern reprint (Markus).

³ For Keimann, see also Kühlmann, 340–1.

⁴ The programme is extant at the Oberlausitzische Bibliothek der Wissenschaften in Görlitz (call number Mil. II/131.60). It has been digitized and can be accessed at <http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id1667619160>.

and edifying school exercise'). The first is Christoph Kormart's *Polyeuctus*, a translation of Pierre Corneille's *Polyeucte*, published in Leipzig in 1669 (VD17 23:239720M). *Polyeuct* was to be performed, the programme continues, 'nebst der Wunderbahren Heyrath PETRUVIO mit der bösen KATHARINEN' ('alongside the Wonderful Wedding of Petruvio with the Bad Catharine') (sig. A1r). The fact that the title is the same as that of the Zittau production of 1658 and includes the surprising spelling 'Petruvio' offers strong evidence that the two plays were identical.

The 1678 programme contains no information about the contents of the plays, but, as well as giving the dates of the performances (20 and 21 October), it includes a list of roles with the names of the actors (sig. A2v).¹ The character names in the list suggest considerable proximity to Shakespeare's play: 'Baptista Minola', 'Catharina, Baptistae älteste Tochter' ('Catharina, Baptista's oldest daughter'), 'Bianka, Baptistae jüngste Tochter' ('Bianka, Baptista's youngest daughter'), 'Lucentio, ein junger Edelmann von Pisa' ('Lucentio, a young gentleman of Pisa'), 'Petruvio, Edelmann von Verona, der Catharinen Liebhaber' ('Petruvio, gentleman of Verona, suitor to Catharina'), 'Hortensio, ein Junger Edelmann in Padua' ('Hortensio, a young gentleman in Padua'), 'Vincentio, Lucentii Vater' ('Vincentio, Lucentio's father'), 'Vermummeter Vincentio' ('disguised Vincentio'), 'Grumio, alter Bürger zu Padua' ('Grumio, old citizen of Padua'), 'Die Wittib' ('the widow'), 'Curtas, Petruvii Diener' ('Curtas, Petruvio's servant'), 'Tranio, Lucentii Diener' ('Tranio, Lucentio's servant'), 'Bondello, Lucentii ander Diener' ('Bondello, Lucentio's other servant'), 'Grumio, Petruvii Diener' ('Grumio, Petruvio's servant'), 'Martinus, Baptistae Kammer-Diener'

¹ The address to the reader, which concludes the programme (sigs A3r–A4v), contains no information about the *Shrew* production. It is signed by 'Joh. He[il]nrich Oder, von Torau auß Nieder-Laußnitz' and dated 19 October 1678 (sig. A4v).

(‘Martinus, Baptista’s valet’), and ‘Der Schneider’ (‘the tailor’).¹ We note the occasional departure in spelling, not only ‘Petruvio’ for ‘Petruccio’ (or ‘Petruchio’), but also ‘Grumio’ for ‘Gremio’ (no doubt an error given the recurrence of ‘Grumio’ later in the list), ‘Curtas’ for ‘Curtis’ and ‘Bondello’ for ‘Biondello’. On the whole, however, the names are close to Shakespeare’s. The list excludes the smallest parts, such as attendants and some of the servants. It also excludes the haberdasher, as does *Kunst*, perhaps an unsurprising omission given that his role is easily omitted or conflated with the tailor’s. On the other hand, it adds ‘Martinus, Baptistae Kammer-Diener’ (‘Martinus, Baptista’s valet’), probably the name given to Baptista’s servant who, in Shakespeare’s play, speaks three lines to Bianca to interrupt the music lesson (see below, p. 131). The list further shows that the Sly material was omitted and replaced by a ‘Vorredner’ (‘Prologue’), again as in *Kunst*. Unlike *Kunst*, the play also had an epilogue, or even two, by a ‘Schluss-Redner’ (‘Epilogue’) and an ‘Allgemeiner Schluss-Redner’ (‘General Epilogue’).

The list of roles in the Grömitz programme of 1678 shows in fact a number of parallels to the list of roles (called ‘Personaaden’, sig. A2v) in Sybant’s *De Dolle Bruyloft*. The spelling of ‘Catharina’ and ‘Bianka’ is identical and slightly differs from the spelling in *The Shrew*. The descriptions in the programme of Lucentio as ‘ein junger Edelmann von Pisa’ (‘a young gentleman of Pisa’), of Hortensio as ‘ein junger Edelmann in Padua’ (‘a young gentleman in Padua’), of Petruvio as an ‘Edelmann von Verona’ (‘a gentleman of Verona’) and of Gremio as an ‘alter Bürger zu Padua’ (‘old citizen of Padua’) largely correspond to those of the same characters in Sybant, where Lucentio is an ‘Edelman van Piza’

¹ Nicholas Rowe’s 1709 edition of Shakespeare’s plays is the first English edition of *The Shrew* that contains a list of roles.

(‘gentleman of Pisa’), Hortensio an ‘Edelman te Padua’ (‘gentleman in Padua’), Petrutio (note the spelling) an ‘Edelman van Verona’ (‘a gentleman of Verona’) and Gremio a ‘Burger tot Padua’ (‘citizen of Padua’). Moreover, Lucentio’s fake father is ‘Vermummeter Vincentio’ in the programme and ‘gemomde Vincentio’ in Sybant, both meaning ‘disguised Vincentio’. Most compellingly, not only the programme but also Sybant give a name to Baptista’s unnamed servant in Act 3, Scene 1 of *The Shrew*, which is virtually the same: ‘Martinus, Baptistae Kammer-Diener’ in the programme and ‘Martijn, Dienaar van Babtista’ in Sybant.¹ The evidence need not suggest that the play performed in Görlitz in 1678 (and, by extension, also the play performed in Zittau in 1658) are wholly derived from *De Dolle Bruyloft*. Indeed, the widow is absent from Sybant’s play and list of roles, whereas she is mentioned in the 1678 programme, a clear indication that whoever produced the Zittau/Görlitz play knew *The Shrew* and not just *De Dolle Bruyloft*. Nor does the programme mention some of the other named characters in Sybant’s play, notably ‘Claas Slikom’, ‘Keen Partinentie’, ‘Pieter Zuykerzop’ and ‘Slobbetje’ (Petrutio’s servants). What can be said at the very least, though, is that some of the designations in the list of roles in the 1678 programme go back to the list of roles in Sybant’s play. The

¹ Martijn is not named in Sybant’s play beyond the list of roles. The characters appear in the list of roles in the order of their appearance, and the location in which ‘Martijn’ occurs in the list makes it clear that the name must designate Baptista’s servant who, in Shakespeare, interrupts the music lesson to tell Bianca, ‘Mistress, your father prays you leave your books / And help to dress your sister’s chamber up; / You know tomorrow is the wedding day’ (*TS*, 3.1.80–2). In Sybant, an unnamed ‘Dienaar’ appears at the same moment and speaks the equivalent of the first two of the three lines in *The Shrew* (*Dolle*, sig. B8v). The point is worth making since the existence of a named servant of Baptista’s in Sybant and the 1678 programme might otherwise wrongly suggest that Theobald’s servant Veit, one of *Kunst*’s fairly prominent additions to *The Shrew*, originated in Sybant’s play or in the version performed in Zittau in 1658.

other conclusion that can be drawn is that, judging by the programme of 1678, the Zittau performance of 1658 was of a German version of *The Shrew* that stayed reasonably close to Shakespeare's play.¹ That *Kunst* derived from it, however, as Bolte ('Schulkomödie', 128) believed, is not made clear by the extant evidence.

On 3 March 1663, the Saxon court of Dresden saw the performance of a 'Komödie', called 'Amphitrione', and several 'Possenspiele' (farces), including 'die erste tolle Hochzeit, die andere tolle Hochzeit' ('the first mad wedding, the other mad wedding') (Fürstenau, 215–16). This raises several questions: is one farce here referred to or two? The title of Sybant's version of *The Shrew* is *De Dolle Bruyloft*, that is, 'The Mad Wedding', so was the Dresden performance (or were the Dresden performances) related to the Dutch play? What is implied by the generic designation 'Possenspiele' (as opposed to 'Komödie')? The difference may be partly one of length, a 'Komödie' being the main performance at an entertainment, with a 'Possenspiel' serving as an afterpiece, as was sometimes the case. If so, is it possible that *De Dolle Bruyloft* was adapted to serve as two 'Possenspiele' (perhaps for performance on subsequent days), the first leading up to Petruccio and Katharina's wedding, the second focusing on Lucentio and Bianca's? The evidence is too inconclusive to allow for clear-cut answers.

What increases the likelihood that the 1663 record is of a two-part play is a performance of 'der erste und zweite Theil "von der bösen Katharina"' ('the first and second parts of "Bad Katharine"') (Fürstenau, 251–2) among several other comedies at the Saxon court of Dresden in May 1678. Another play

¹ Bolte ('Schulkomödie', 125–8) did not notice the connections between Sybant's play and the 1678 programme and therefore argued that the Zittau 'Wonderful Wedding' of 1658 and *De Dolle Bruyloft* derived from Shakespeare's play independently.

performed in early 1678 was ‘die Komödie “von Amphitryone”’ (Fürstenau, 251), which may suggest that this and the two-part play may have belonged to the same repertory both in 1663 and in 1678. The later performances were by a company led by Johannes Velten, and, indeed, a repertory list of Velten’s company of 1679 includes ‘Die böse Catharina’ (‘Wicked Catharina’), although the list makes no mention of its being a two-part play (Gstach, 651).

Other records that can confidently be associated with a German version of Shakespeare’s *Shrew* date from 1667. A company led by Johann Ernst Hoffmann and Peter Schwartz, the ‘Churpfälzische Compagnie Comoedianten’ (‘Elector Palatine Company of Comedians’), performed at the court of Charles Louis, Elector Palatine (1617–80), in the spring of that year. A list of their repertory has survived, listing fifteen plays, including ‘Die tolle Hochzeit von der böß Katharina’ (‘The Mad Wedding of Wicked Katharina’) (Gstach, 646). They were back at the Mannheim court in December of the same year, when they are known to have performed several plays from their repertory, including ‘Die tolle Hochzeit von der böß Katharina’ on 20 December (Gstach, 647).¹ It is notable that the title of the play performed in 1667 by the Elector Palatine’s Company of Comedians includes an element of the title of the 1663 ‘Possenspiele’, namely ‘tolle Hochzeit’, but also anticipates the title of the play in the 1679 list of Velten’s company, ‘Die böse Catharina’. Another record of a performance prior to the publication of *Kunst* in 1672 dates from 6 July 1668, when the prolific German poet Sigmund von Birken, who lived in Nuremberg, noted in his diary that he had seen a performance of the ‘Comoedie von der bösen aber frommgemachten Br[aut]’ (‘Comedy of the Bad Bride who was Made Pious’), quite possibly another reference to a German

¹ For Hoffmann and Schwartz’s company connections, see Rudin, “‘Zwei Mal’”.

version of Shakespeare's play (Kröll, 1.381; Gstach, 523). The performance record is patchy and the relationship of the different titles ultimately inconclusive, but what seems clear is that in the years prior to the writing of *Kunst*, a German version of *The Shrew* could be witnessed in various theatres.

Kunst über alle Künste appeared in 1672, probably in Frankfurt (see below, pp. 147–9). Whether it was ever performed and if so, where, is not known. It would have required at least fifteen actors, a reasonably large cast (see the Appendix). Little can be inferred from the stage directions about any implied performance space, as most characters are simply said to enter and exit. When Hilarius' real father, Adrian, meets the fake father, Blasius, the latter appears at a 'window' (4.4.101 SD), like the Merchant in *The Shrew* (5.1.14 SD), but Blasius later simply runs out, not down, to the main stage (see 4.4.132 SD and note), which may imply that no second level 'above' is involved. There is one stage direction, however, that might suggest that *Kunst's* author imagined performance in a fairly specific theatrical space. Early in Act 4, Scene 1, Sabina enters and 'sits down at a table on the inner stage' (4.1.8 SD, 'setzet sich bey einen Tisch in der inneren Scene'). At the equivalent moment in *The Shrew* (4.2.5 SD), Bianca simply enters, and no inner stage is mentioned or implied. Inner stages are referred to in a number of contemporary German plays (see the note to 4.1.8 SD), and it has been suggested that their usage may 'derive from the practice of English companies touring in Germany' (Brandt and Hogendoorn, 34). *Kunst's* anonymous author relates in an address to the reader that he had seen the play from which he adapted his *Kunst* (see below, p. 141) in the theatre, so it is possible that Sabina's appearance on the inner stage corresponds to what he had seen performed.

The documentary record of the seventeenth-century German reception of *The Taming of the Shrew* starts in the town of Zittau, and ends there, too, with Christian Weise's play *Die böse Catharina* ('Bad Catharina'). Weise (1642–1708) was

headmaster of the Zittau grammar school from 1678 to 1708, as Keimann had been from 1638 to 1662. Formerly a pupil of Keimann's in this same school, Weise had probably witnessed and may even have acted in the 1658 'wunderbare Heurath', and so may have returned to the material later in his life. Weise's output was vast: apart from poetry and satirical novels, he wrote some sixty plays for performance by his pupils of which about two-thirds have come down to us (Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'Early Modern', 136–8). *Die böse Catharina* was not printed but survived thanks to two manuscripts which are now at the Christian-Weise-Library in Zittau (call numbers 4° Mscr. 47 (B) (1) and 4° Mscr. 50a (B); see Keller et al., 648–50). The play is dated between 1689 and 1702 by Ludwig Fulda (lxxiv), its first modern editor (Fulda, 103–272).¹ Fulda (lxxii) speculates that the unnamed comedy performed in Zittau on 28 October 1693 in honour of the Elector of Saxony, John George IV, may have been Weise's *Böse Catharina*, but there is no evidence to confirm this. The play follows the basic outline of Shakespeare's play but significantly departs from it by adding subsidiary plot strands and characters. It has none of the dramatic intensity and verbal wit of *Kunst*. Weise replaced most of Shakespeare's names with German equivalents, except for Baptista, Bianca and Catharina. It is noteworthy that the Petruccio character is called Harmen, which closely resembles *Kunst*'s Hardman, suggesting that Weise was familiar with *Kunst über alle Künste*.

The first faithful translation of Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, by Johann Joachim Eschenburg, appeared in 1775, and its title testifies to *Kunst*'s legacy more than a century after its publication. *Die Kunst eine Widerbellerin zu zähmen* ('The Art of Taming a Back-Barking Woman') adopts the first key word of the title of the seventeenth-century adaptation by

¹ For a more recent but unannotated reprint, see Roloff and Kura. As Fulda shows (lxxi), Köhler's suggested date, 1705 (xiii), relies on a misunderstanding.

conceptualizing the taming as an *art* (Eschenburg, 147).¹ The Schlegel-Eschenburg translation (1810–12, 18 vols) essentially reprinted Eschenburg's text but changed the title to *Zähmung eines bösen Weibes* (1811, vol. 14, p. 1). While the new title eliminated the word 'Kunst', it introduced part of the subtitle of the seventeenth-century adaptation: *ein böß Weib gut zu machen* ('to Make a Bad Wife Good'). The title in the famous Schlegel-Tieck translation (vol. 6, 1831), *Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung*, still current today, finally eliminated any echo of the title of *Kunst* and no doubt accelerated the play's descent into the oblivion from which the present edition aims to raise it up.²

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

The early editions and their contexts: publication, paratext and authorship

Kunst über alle Künste was published in duodecimo format in 1672. The title page of the first edition (see p. 150) reads:

Kunst über alle / Künste / Ein böß Weib gut zu machen.
/ Vormahls / Von einem Italiänischen / *Cavalier*
practiciret: / Jetzo aber / Von einem Teutschen Edel- /
man glücklich nachgeahnet / und / In einem sehr
lustigen Possen- / vollem Freuden-Spiele / fürgestellt.
/ Samt / Angehencktem singenden / Possen-Spiele /
Worinn / Die unnötige Eyfersucht ei- / nes Mannes
artig betro- / gen wird. / Rapperschweyl / Bey Henning
Lieblern 1672.

¹ Eschenburg mentions *Kunst* in the appendix to his translation and quotes from it extensively (397–409).

² For a list of translations of *The Shrew*, see Blinn and Schmidt, 219–22.

The English translation reads:

An Art beyond All Arts, to Make a Bad Wife Good,
formerly composed by an Italian knight, but now
happily imitated by a German gentleman and presented
in a very amusing comedy full of merriment. With an
appended singing-jig, in which the unnecessary
jealousy of a husband is prettily deceived.
Rapperschweyl, at Henning Liebler's, 1672.¹

The printed title page, with which some extant copies start, appears in fact on sig. A2r, and it was originally preceded by an engraved title page, which was pasted onto the otherwise blank sig. A1r, of which some copies are extant (see below, pp. 156–7). At the top of the copper engraving, the following title appears: '*Kunst über alle Kunst, Ein bosweib [sic] / guth Zu machen*'. Below it, the background shows a house on a cliff and windy clouds. In the foreground there is a woman to the left with snake hair and bare breasts, who is being tickled in the mouth with a fox tail by a man who stands to the right with his back to the viewer. He has thrown the noose in his left hand around her neck, and holds a club in his right hand. With his left foot, the man stands in a circle on a checkerboard floor made of a Latin inscription in capital letters: '*In verbis et herbis et lapidibus magna consistit virtus*' – 'there is great power in words, herbs and stones'.

The engraving shown in Fig. 6 depicts a scene of the taming of a fury-like female by a well-dressed male; its relationship to the play is clear. The relevance of the Latin inscription, however, is not immediately obvious. It derives – as does the second half of the play's title, '*ein böß Weib gut zu machen*' ('to Make a Bad Wife Good') – from a Shrovetide play by Hans Sachs, printed

¹ The final 'n' in 'Lieblern' is a dative flexion.

6 Copper engraving, *Kunst über alle Künste* ('Rapperschweyl', 1672, 2nd edn), sig. A1r (Austrian National Library, shelfmark: 23387-A).

in the third volume of his works, *Das dritte Buch. Sehr Herrliche Schöne Tragedi, Comedi vnd schimpff-Spil, Geistlich vnd Weltlich* (Nuremberg, 1588, VD16 S 151; ‘The Third Book: Very Delightful, Beautiful Tragedies, Comedies and Farces, Religious and Secular’): *Das böß Weib mit den Worten, Würtzen, vnd Stein gut zu machen* (sigs ³H6r–I2v; ‘To Make a Bad Wife Good with Words, Herbs and Stones’). In Sachs’s play, a man complains to his neighbour about his bad wife, who remembers the advice King Solomon gave to someone who had the same complaint, namely to use the wholesome effect of words, herbs and precious stones to cure her. The man tries all three, to no effect, before throwing stones at her until she drops to her knees and swears to improve.

At the end of the duodecimo volume appears a twelve-line poem called ‘Erklärung dess Kupffer-Tittels’ (sig. K12r), ‘Explanation of the Copper-Title’.

To rule a woman you must use your *status ratio*
Act like a man who plays a flute and let the notes
 you blow
Be sometimes harsh and rough and coarse, then soft
 and sweet-refined,
You must see everything, and yet with open eyes be
 blind.
Your ears too must be firmly closed and yet hear
 every sound.
Then, *hocus pocus*, change your tactics when the
 time comes round.
Mix bad words with the good ones if you want your
 bride to dance;
With Hercules’ Club and Reynard’s tail you’ll stand
 a better chance.
Outside you’d take me for a fool, within I’m shrewd
 and smart;
My noose is ready; club and tail are poised to play
 their part

In catching this bad cat at last. You bet they'll serve
my turn;

If you seek wit and daring, this is the place to learn.¹

The German poem is in octameters, whereas the English translation, produced for us by Anthony Mortimer, is in fourteeners. The translation is not literal, but it conveys the sense and manner of the original. It provides a kind of Epilogue to the play from the position of the male tamer figure and, like the Prologue, comments on its ability to teach readers the ability to apply its insights.

The play's anonymous author ('a German gentleman' according to the title page) seems to have assumed that the play was of Italian origins ('by an Italian knight'), probably for the simple reason that the setting and the names in Shakespeare's play are Italian.² This is suggested by an address to the reader, printed after the end of the play, in which the anonymous author's voice is clearly audible:

Favourable reader, I can say of this comedy that it is
someone else's, but also my own. It is someone else's,
not only because it was often performed in the theatre
by comedians, but also because it is an invention whose

¹ The original reads:

Jst auch wohl in einem ding *Status ratio* von nöthen
So ist es im Weiber-Zwang: Man muß wunderlich die Flöthen
anzusetzen und zu blasen wissen, bald starck, bald gelind,
grob und rein: bald muß man sehen, bald mit ofnen Augen blind
Gleichsam seyn: Das Ohr muß nicht hören, und doch alles hören:
Man muß, *hocus pocus* gleich, alles nach der Zeit umkehren
Gute Wort mit bösen mischen, Herkuls Keul' und Reinckens Sch[w]antz,
so man gantz *polit* gebrauchet, führen offt die Braut zum Tanz.
Aussen Narr, von innen klug, steh' ich jetzt im Zirck umkreiset
Meine Schlinck' ist zugericht, Keul' und Schwäntzchen sich auch weiset,
meine böse Katz zu fangen. Was gilts, es gelinget mir,
Wer Witz und auch Kühnheit heget, folge nach und lerne hier.

² Given the reference to a 'gentleman', we assume that *Kunst* was written by a man, but the author's anonymity means that it is impossible to be certain.

old names and ways of speaking indicate to those who have already seen and heard it that it is of Italian origin. I can call it mine because, in view of its pleasant manner, I have recomposed it, altering and writing what I liked, with quick inventions that easily came to me. The jig is known to anyone who knows actors, and is attached as a coda, according to current fashion. Enjoy yourself with it, as I enjoyed myself in watching it, and fare well until things get better.¹

(For the appended jig, see below, p. 144.) This address answers some questions, but raises others. The play which formed the basis of the anonymous author's adaptation had been frequently performed, in German, and had been witnessed in performance by the author. But where the play was performed and by whom remain obscure. The process of adaptation seems to have involved both copying and original composition, but the details of this process are not clarified. It may well be that the version the author witnessed in performance was essentially a German translation of Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, but just how close the translation was to the original and how often the author

¹ The original reads:

Gunstgeneigter Leser.

Von diesem Freudenspiele kan ich sagen, daß es eines andern, und doch auch mein seye. Eines andern ist es, weil es nicht allein schon offft von *Comoedianten* auff dem Schauplatz fûrgestellt worden, sondern auch die Erfindung, alte Nahmen, und Redens-Arten, deme, so es zuvor angesehen und gehöret, zeigen, daß es von Italiänischem Ursprunge: Mein kan ich es nennen, dieweil ich solchs, wegen seiner artigen Manier, gefasset, und auß meinem Kopffe, wie es mir gefallen, geändert, und hingeschrieben, nach dem es die geschwinden Einfälle, ohne Kopff brechen gegeben. Das Possen-Spiel kennet ein jeder, so *Comoedianten* kennet. Und ist an statt des Schwantzes, nach jetziger Manier, angehencket. Belustige dich hiermit, wie ich in derer anschauen gethan, und lebe wohl, biß es besser wird.

(sigs I12v–K1r)

The word 'Schauplatz' could refer to any theatre. There is no reason to believe, pace Gstach (522), that there is any reference to the theatre in Zittau.

of *Kunst* simply followed it are unclear. Nor do we know anything about the process of textual transmission: did the author of *Kunst* have access to a manuscript, perhaps thanks to the actors who performed the play, as has been assumed by Ellinger (267)? Or did the author work from a (now lost) printed text, as conjectured by Bolte ('Schulkomödie', 124–7)? Or might another form of transmission, such as shorthand, have been involved?

Little is known about the anonymous author, but we do know that he can be credited with two other playbooks. One of them contains another address to the reader which also comments on *Kunst*:

To this and the preceding jig, esteemed reader, the same applies as to *Kunst über alle Künste, ein böß Weib gut zu machen*: I saw them performed by actors in the theatre, preserved them because of their pleasantness, and have written them down for your useful amusement, as they please me according to my judgement. I see no point in racking my brain over new inventions, and thereby losing time that is better spent on something else, and so here only *inventis addo* [add inventions]. Whoever else has seen or heard them will notice the difference between the old and the new, and will profitably recognize that, with such grotesquery, I show the world and its vanity (whose change and improvement I, and all of us, heartily desire).¹

¹ 'Mit diesem und vorigen Possenspiele, Geehrter Leser, gehet es, wie mit der Kunst über alle Künste, ein böß Weib gut zu machen: Ich habe sie von *Comoedianten*, auf dem Schauplatz fürgestellt, gesehen, wegen ihrer Artigkeit behalten, und schreibe sie, zu deiner nützlichen Belustigung, hin, wie sie mir, nach Gutküncken beyfallen. Ich mag meinen Kopff hierin nicht wegen neuer Erfindungen zerbrechen, und hierüber Zeit verlieren, welche ich besser in andern anwenden, und hier nur *inventis addo*: Wer diese sonst gesehen, oder gehöret, wird den Unterscheid, unter dem alten und neuen, finden, und dass ich in solchen Fratzen auch die Welt und ihre Eitelkeit zeige (welcher Ender- und Besserung ich, mit unser aller, hertzlich wünsche) erspriesslich erkennen' (*Alamodisch*, sigs 2B8v–2B9r).

The anonymous author thus on at least two occasions adapted dramatic texts of plays or jigs he had seen in the theatre, but the precise nature of the adaptive process remains obscure. A lot depends on what the author means when writing that he ‘preserved’ (in German, ‘behalten’) the playtexts. It may imply that he got his hands on manuscripts which provided the texts he adapted, but in the absence of further evidence, it is impossible to be certain.

The author of *Kunst* addresses his readers in each of his playbooks, but he consistently refrains from revealing his identity. In one of them, he makes a point of commenting on his deliberate anonymity: ‘The reader has no need to know my name, for it does not matter whether a kitten be called Mignon, Weinzchen, Heinz, Murner, Novazemblisch or Australisch, provided it catches mice.’¹ While his name thus remains unknown, it can be gathered from linguistic features in his plays that he was probably from Hesse or an adjacent part of Germany (see Köhler, xxv–xxvi; Bolte, ‘Görlitzer Schulkomödie’, 128; Ellinger, 267). His writings also reveal considerable learning, and show that he was steeped in German literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century (Ellinger, 267; Scheitler, 1056–7).

In keeping with the author’s deliberate anonymity is the fake imprint at the bottom of the title page: ‘Rapperschweyl, at Henning Liebler’s, 1672’. No information about a printer or bookseller called Henning Liebler has come down to us, and no printing press is known to have existed in the Swiss town of Rapperswil (to which ‘Rapperschweyl’ seems to refer), nor is there a plausible connection to the Alsacian town Rappoltsweiler. As we shall see below, the place of publication was probably Frankfurt.

¹ ‘Meinen Namen hat der Leser nicht nöthig zu wissen: dann ein Kätzchen Mignon, Weinzchen, Heinz, Murner, Novazemblisch oder Australisch mag genennet werden: wann es nur wol mauset’ (afterword to *Irrthum*, sig. L9r).

A version of the same fake imprint was used for the anonymous author's other dramatic publications. In the year after *Kunst*, *Der Pedantische Irrthum des überwitzigen doch sehr betrogenen Schulfuchses* (*The Pedantic Error of the would-be clever but much deceived Schoolfox*) was published in duodecimo: a satirical play in three acts about bad, pedantic schoolmasters (see Ellinger, 268–74). The imprint reads, 'Rappersweil, Bey Henning Lieblern, Im Jahr 1673' (VD17 23:252481T). This was followed two years later by *Alamodisch Technologisches Interim* (*Fashionable Technological Interim*), also in duodecimo, a satirical three-act play about clerical abuse and hypocrisy (see Ellinger, 274–8), with an analogous imprint: 'Rappersweil, Bey Henning Lieblern. Im Jahr 1675' (VD17 23:235914D). Many of the characters in *Irrthum* reappear in *Alamodisch*, and a minor character in *Alamodisch* is 'Blasius Nasenweis . . . Rector paganus' (sig. A4r), who also appears in *Kunst* as the character who corresponds to the Merchant, that is, Lucentio's fake father, in *The Taming of the Shrew*. Stylistically, the three plays are closely related, characterized by the same rough, often bawdy and typically proverbial or proverbial-sounding language, although the plots of *Irrthum* and *Alamodisch*, unlike that of *Kunst*, recede for much of the time behind dialogues whose relevance to the plot is tangential.

Each of the three plays is followed by a jig, reflecting the performance practice of (or in the tradition of) the itinerant English players (Ellinger, 278). The play appended to *Kunst* (sigs K1r–11r) is called *Singendes Possenspiel Die doppelt betrogene Eyfersucht vorstellend* (*Singing Jig Presenting Doubly Deceived Jealousy*). Fearing to be made a cuckold, Pickelherring, before leaving on a journey, tells his wife to say 'no' to all wooers. She turns away the first two accordingly, but the third, the 'Kavalier', cleverly asks her whether she would turn down his presents, to which she responds 'no' and gives herself up to him. Different printed versions of this jig survive in German, Dutch and Swedish (Wiggins, *Jig of a Miller*),

vol. 4, pp. 6–7). The jig appended to *Irrthum* (sigs L11r–N11r) is *Die seltsame Metamorphosis der Sutorischen in eine Magistrale Person* (*The Strange Metamorphosis of a Shoemaker into a Teacher*). Its central character is good-for-nothing Jan Pint who escapes from his shoemaker's apprenticeship, marries a prostitute and, despite his ineptness, is offered a position as a teacher by a headmaster who is interested in seducing his wife (in which he succeeds). The jig appended to *Alamodisch* (sigs 2B7r–2E4v), finally, is *Der viesierliche Exorcist* (*The Peculiar Exorcist*). It deals with an adulterous relationship that is witnessed by a friar who, upon the cuckolded husband's return, pretends the lover is a devil using a would-be exorcism to allow him to escape. Versions of this material are well known (Ellinger, 284–6), including one from the fifteenth-century comic poem *The Friars of Berwick*.¹

Apart from the three closely-related playbooks of 1672, 1673 and 1675, only one other publication is known to have a similar imprint, and it contains what we believe is a false lead concerning the author's identity. *Donum nundinale oder Meß-Gaabe; allerhand merkwürdige Lähren, Fragen u. scharfsinnige Beantwortungen* (*Donum Nundiale, or Fair Stuff: All Kinds of Strange Instructions, Questions and Shrewd Replies*) appeared in 1673, also in duodecimo, and was, according to the imprint, 'Gedruckt zu', that is, printed at, 'Rapperschweyl, bey Henning Lieblem [sic]' (VD17 1:642505G). 'Lieblem' is clearly a misprint for 'Lieblern', and 'Rapperschweyl' is identical in spelling with the place name in the imprint of *Kunst*. *Donum nundinale* is not a play but a collection of anecdotes about ancient and more recent historical figures in which Socrates and Xanthippe – who feature prominently in the Prologue to *Kunst* – make several appearances (e.g., sigs A10r–v, B9r). The straightforward prose of *Donum nundinale* differs stylistically

¹ For the three jigs, see Bolte, *Singspiele*, 110–37.

from the rougher style of the plays, but we do not think that the differences are such that they preclude common authorship. Also, linguistic features and geographical references in *Donum nundinale* point to the author's origins in or near Hesse, as is the case with *Kunst* and the other two anonymous plays (Bolte, 'Schulkomödie', 129). This along with the fake imprint suggest that the author of *Donum nundinale* may well be the author of *Kunst*.

Unlike the three plays, *Donum nundinale* contains a pseudonymous authorship attribution on the title page – 'Von dem Freygebigen' – followed by the Greek letters mu, beta and chi.¹ It is unclear what the Greek letters designate. 'Von dem Freygebigen', which might be translated as 'by the generous one' or 'by the munificent one', has been interpreted as a reference to the Count Ulrich von Kinsky, a member of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft (the Fruitbearing Society; Latin, *societas fructifera*), a German literary society, founded in Weimar in 1617, whose chief purpose it was to promote German as a literary and scholarly language (see Ball). Members adopted pseudonyms, among them Ulrich von Kinsky, who went under the name 'der Freigebige'. He had joined the Society in 1658 and died in 1687, so he was alive and active in the first half of the 1670s when *Kunst* and the other 'Rapperschweyl' publications appeared. Based on the coincidence of the title-page reference to the 'Freygebigen' and von Kinsky's pseudonym, VD 17, the standard short-title catalogue of seventeenth-century printed titles published in Germany, attributes *Donum nundinale* to von Kinsky. Yet there are good reasons to be sceptical about the attribution. Von Kinsky belonged to a distinguished Bohemian family that had been elevated to the rank of nobility in the early seventeenth

¹ Bolte ('Schulkomödie', 129) reads the small initials on the duodecimo title page as 'M. B. K.', but after analysis with a magnifying glass, we think they are more likely to be the Greek letters mu, beta and chi.

century. He occupied important positions in the Electorate of Saxony, and is known to have been the commander of the Königsstein Fortress near Dresden (*Akademie*). He was a member of the Saxony-Weimar branch of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft.¹ Nothing connects him to Hesse or other western parts of Germany, and what is known about the dialectal features of the works with the fake ‘Rapperschweyl’ imprints is difficult to reconcile with the assumption that he wrote them. The ascription to the ‘Freigebiges’ on the title page of *Donum nundinale* is thus probably a false lead put in place by someone who was determined to preserve his anonymity.² The author of *Donum nundinale* may well have written *Kunst* and the other anonymous plays, but it seems unlikely that the author is Ulrich von Kinsky. In the absence of further discoveries, it thus remains impossible to identify the author of the German adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Taming of the Shrew*.³

The place of publication of *Kunst* has repeatedly been assumed to be Hamburg (Weller, 22–3; Hayn, 134, 138), and VD17 conjecturally agrees with this assumption (VD17 32:677848D). Thanks to a bibliographic accident, however, it can be shown that the place of publication was probably Frankfurt. Three copies (of which one is now lost; see below, pp. 157–8) of the second edition of *Kunst* feature a copper engraving which has no relationship to the play. It contains a

¹ The Weimar archives of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, extant in three volumes at the Thüringische Hauptstaatsarchiv Weimar (Kunst und Wissenschaft: Hofwesen 11817.1 and 2, and 11818), contains no document by or addressed to von Kinsky. We are grateful to Andreas Herz for this information.

² There is one other German society of the seventeenth century whose members took on similar pseudonyms, the Deutschgesinnte Genossenschaft. The member directory published in volume 12 of the works of Philipp von Zesen suggests that this society had no member who used the pseudonym ‘der Freigebiges’ (van Ingen).

³ It should be noted that none of the playbooks with the ‘Rappersweil’ imprint is listed in any of the Frankfurt or Leipzig book fair catalogues; *Donum nundinale*, however, is mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogue of autumn 1672, as published by ‘Henning Lieblein’ (sig. B4v).

view across a gate onto an alley of poplars with a coach drawn by horses. Above the gate are a naked woman and a skeleton holding a wreath that surrounds the following text: 'Die wieder kommende ANGELICA' ('the returning Angelica'; see Bolte, '*Kunst*', 446). This is the title of a short anonymous novel, conjecturally dated c. 1680 on VD17 (23:665989F) but in fact mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues in 1671 (*Catalogus* Spring 1671, sig. C3v; *Catalogus* Autumn 1671, sig. B3v). Two copies of *Die wieder kommende Angelica*, a slight duodecimo, are known to survive, and both contain the copper engraving.¹ As has been pointed out, 'The simple and probable explanation is that the *Angelica* novel and the *Kunst über alle Künste* were printed about the same time at the same print shop . . . Some careless workman confused the two copper plates' (Jantz). The catalogues contain the following information about the publication of *Die wieder kommende Angelica*: 'Frankf[urt] bey Joh. Hoffmann' (*Catalogus* Spring 1671, sig. C3v) and 'Franckfurt bey Jac. Gottfr. Seylern' (*Catalogus* Autumn 1671, sig. B3v). Based on the evidence in the Leipzig book fair catalogues, it thus seems likely that *Kunst* (and thus probably also the other 'Rapperschweyl' publications) appeared in Frankfurt. This place of publication squares well with dialectal features in the anonymous publications (see above, p. 143). It may be added that Frankfurt is one of the rare place names mentioned in *Kunst*: in Act 2, Scene 1, Hardman intends to 'travel to Frankfurt now, and buy the most gorgeous robes and jewels' (1.2.469–70) for Catharina. All things considered, then, Frankfurt is a plausible place of publication for *Kunst über alle Künste*.

What complicates matters is that of the two publishers mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues, only one, Jakob

¹ Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, call number QuN 943 (2), and Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, call number Scrin A/1613, the third item in a Sammelband.

Gottfried Seyler, can be associated with Frankfurt. Johann Hoffmann, a known publisher whose activities have been thoroughly researched and documented (see Deneke; and Benzing, 1173), was in fact based in Nuremberg. In the *Catalogus* of spring 1671, three lines below Hoffmann's mention as the publisher of *Angelica*, appears a title that is correctly said to have been published in 'Nürnb[erg] bey Johann. Hoffmann' (sig. C3v). What is likely to have happened, then, is that the information regarding Hoffmann's publication of *Angelica* is erroneous and resulted from eye-skip. The manuscript from which the spring book fair catalogue was printed probably mentioned Seyler as *Angelica*'s publisher, as the autumn catalogue did, but the compositor's eye accidentally turned to Hoffmann's name slightly further down in the list when setting the type.

Independently of what happened in the printing of the spring 1671 Leipzig book fair catalogue, there is no reason to doubt the information in the autumn catalogue according to which Jakob Gottfried Seyler was the publisher of *Angelica*. By extension, given the *Angelica* engraving, he is also likely to have been involved in the publication of *Kunst*. Seyler was active in Frankfurt as a publisher from 1667 until 1683 and is known to have published at least 129 titles there during that period (Benzing, 1268). Although he seems to have moved some of his business to Kassel in the course of the 1670s, he kept a bookshop in Frankfurt at least until 1678 (Paisey, 172). In the absence of information about the play's author, he is the one and only person we can associate with some confidence with the origins of *Kunst*.

The order of publication of the two editions of 1672

There are two early duodecimo editions of *Kunst*, both dated '1672'. The title pages of the two editions are identical in text and font, and the layout is very similar. The easiest way of telling the title page of the first (see Fig. 7) from that of the

7 Title page of *Kunst über alle Künste* ('Rapperschweyl', 1672, 1st edn), sig. A2r (Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Weimar, shelfmark: O 9: 246).

second (see Fig. 8) edition is that at the end of line nine, the slash ('/') that follows the word 'nachgeahnet' is followed by a blank space in the first edition, whereas it is not in the second where the bottom of the slash almost touches the lower part of the final 't'. Both editions have some misnumbered pages,

8 Title page of *Kunst über alle Künste* ('Rapperschweyl', 1672, 2nd edn), sig. A2r (Austrian National Library, shelf mark: 23387-A).

especially towards the end, and the last page number in what we will show below is the first edition ('D1' short for the first duodecimo edition; VD17 32:677848D) is '138' (instead of '238'), whereas the last page number in the second edition ('D2'; VD17 23:236440V and VD17 23:252479X) is '337' (instead of '237').

It is unclear from the title pages which is the earlier of the two editions, so bibliographic analysis is needed to establish the order. Typographic arrangement turns out to be an important source of information, since it points to one edition trying to replicate as far as possible the line breaks and page breaks of the other. On sig. A4r, for instance, the compositor of D2 falls slightly behind in line 3 (D1 ends with ‘An-’, for which D2 lacks space). In the next few lines, we see the compositor of D2 trying to catch up, or at least not fall behind further. In line 4, the last word is printed as a two-letter word (the second letter seems illegible), although the equivalent word in D1 is ‘daß’. There are various contractions in D2 (and none in D1), ‘eyterbissigē’ (line 6), ‘dē’ (line 9) and ‘gestochē’ (line 10). When it becomes apparent to D2’s compositor that his line breaks will be before D1’s despite the contractions, he seems to have stopped using contractions and resigned himself to using an extra line of type at the end of the page (D1 has twenty lines of text, not counting the catchword and the signature, whereas D2 has twenty-one). As he is approaching the end of the page, D2’s compositor has actually not fallen behind quite enough (i.e., not quite a whole line), which means he decides to waste space, as shown by the large spaces before and after ‘Hosen’ in the penultimate line. At the end of the last line, D2 has ‘an Beseeli-’. D1, however, only has ‘an’, with ‘Beseeli-’ following on the next line as the catchword. D2 fails to have a catchword on a separate line and, even more surprisingly, also omits the signature present in D1, ‘A jv’. The following page then starts identically, ‘Beseelungsstatt’, D2 thus repeating not the catchword but the last word on the last line of text on the preceding page. All these oddities in D2 are clearly attempts to keep the printing process as simple as possible by making it a line-by-line or, when that fails, at least a page-by-page reprint of D1.

Something similar may be observed on sig. A4v. From the first line, we see D2’s compositor use a contraction, ‘vō’, to have the same line break as D1. The same happens in the next

line, with D2's 'welchē'. D2's compositor nonetheless falls behind in line 6, which ends with 'lassen/' in D1, but with 'las-' in D2. But the difference remains small for much of the page, and a series of contractions close to the bottom of the page ('vō', 'Jungē', 'uñ' (for 'und') and 'Däck') allows D2's compositor to catch up with D1's line breaks. D1, by contrast, uses no contractions, nor any extra-large spacing, suggesting that its compositor, unlike that of D2, is not trying to work to line and page breaks imposed by an earlier edition.

Similar evidence could be adduced from later in the book, but the important point has been made: recurrent space-wasting and space-saving devices in D2 and the absence of such devices in D1 show that D2 was set up from D1. D1 is thus the first of the two editions dated 1672; D2 the second.

D1 collates A-K12. Leaf A1 is blank, with the engraving pasted onto sig. A1r. The title page is on sig. A2r. After a blank verso follows the List of Roles ('Personen dieses Freuden-Spiels', sigs A3r–v) (see Fig. 9). The text of *Kunst* (sigs A4r–I12v; for a sample page, see Fig. 10) is directly followed by the address to the reader ('Gunstgeneigter Leser', sigs I12v–K1r) which is in turn directly followed by the jig, whose title appears at the bottom of sig. K1r, followed by a List of Roles ('Personen dieses Possen-Spiels') and a short argument in verse ('Einhalt'), both on sig. K1v. The text of the jig (sigs K2r–K11v) is followed by the 'Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels' (sig. K12r). The last page is blank (sig. K12v). Several pages are mis-signed: sigs B7r 'Bvj', H5r 'Hijj', K2r 'Kijj', K3r 'Kij' and K4r 'Kv'. Sig. H4r is unsigned. Page numbers start on sig. A3r ('5'), and, with the exception of '218' lacking on sig. K1v, follow consecutively until '230' (sig. K7v). The page number then jumps to '331' (sig. K8r), then follows consecutively until '337' (sig. K11r) and ends with '138' (sig. K11v). There are no page numbers on leaf K12.

The make-up of D2 corresponds to that of D1, with a few exceptions. The text of the jig is made to fit on sigs K2r to K11r, with the 'Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels' printed on sig. K12r.

9 List of roles, *Kunst über alle Künste* ('Rapperschweyl', 1672, 1st edn), sig. A3r (Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Weimar, shelfmark: O 9: 246).

Sig. B7r is mis-signed 'Bvj' and sig. H5r 'Hijj'. Sigs A4r, E4r and H4r are unsigned, and, after K1r, the last sheet is entirely unsigned. Page numbers are at first identical with those in D1, except that 164 is misnumbered '184'. As in D1, '218' is lacking on sig. K1v, and the numbering jumps from '331'

10 Sample page of *Kunst über alle Künste* ('Rapperschweyl', 1672, 1st edn), sig. F4r (Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Weimar, shelfmark: O 9: 246).

(sig. K8r) to '337' (sig. K11r). Since the text of the jig ends on sig. K11r, not on sig. K11v as in D1, the final page number is '337'. The page with the 'Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels' has no page number, as in D1.

Extant copies of the early editions

There are five extant copies each of the two 1672 duodecimo editions of *Kunst über alle Künste*:

First edition (D1):

- Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek Weimar (call number O 9: 246). Lacks the copper engraving. The bottom-right corner of the title page is missing, with some loss of text.¹
- Austrian National Library, Vienna (call number 4679-A ALT MAG). Lacks the copper engraving. Bound up with another play, Laurentius Postel, *Traur-Freudenspiel von Almadero und Liarta* (Hamburg, 1652), which precedes it. Postel's play does not appear in VD 17.
- Russian State Library, Moscow (call number MK IV-нем. 8°). This copy was previously in the Saxon State Library in Dresden (call number Lit. Angl.A.661), from which it disappeared after the Second World War.
- Staatsbibliothek Bamberg (call number: 14 N 2#2). With the copper engraving.
- Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University (call number Zg17 G88 672r). Lacks the copper engraving. The second of three titles in a

¹ It is from this copy that our German text (see above, p. xvii) has been prepared.

Sammelband, preceded by anon., *Malus Mulier; Das ist Neue Böser Weiber Legenden* (n. pl., 1671, VD17 1:668937W) and followed by Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, *Rathstübel Plutonis oder Kunst Reich zu werden* (Samarien: 1672, VD17 12:653071C).¹

Second edition (D2):

- Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (call number QuN 847 (1)). With the copper engraving. Bound up with *Der Pedantische Irrthum* (1673; see above, p. 144) and *Der seltzame Springinsfeld* by Hans Jakob Christoph von Grimmelshausen (1670, VD17 23:233338F).
- Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (call number Lo 4098.1). With the *Angelica* engraving (see pp. 147–8) in initial position, and the *Kunst* engraving inserted between sigs I12v and K1r. An early ownership note reads, ‘F[erdinand] A[lbrecht] H[erzog] z[u] B[raunschweig] u[nd] L[üneburg] . . . 1682’.
- Privately owned. Previously on loan at the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle (call number AB 40 19/h, 19) but returned to its owner in 2010.
- Austrian National Library, Vienna (call number 23387–A). With the copper engraving and, before it, the *Angelica* engraving (see pp. 147–8).
- Landesbibliothek Coburg (call number Rara / Cas A 2532). With the copper engraving.²

¹ We are grateful to Sara Powell from the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Dr Stefan Knoch from the Staatsbibliothek Bamberg and Kerstin Schellbach from the Saxon State and University Library in Dresden for information about these copies.

² We are grateful to Gerd Schramm from the Landesbibliothek Coburg and Bettina Lampel from the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle, for information about these copies.

A copy of the second edition previously known to exist at the Landesbibliothek Kassel (call number Fab. Roman. Duodez 114) almost certainly burnt in a fire in 1941.¹ It included both the *Angelica* and the *Kunst* engraving (Bolte, 'Schulkomödie', 129).

Editorial history

The modern editorial history of *Kunst* is very brief and confined to the edition published by Reinhold Köhler in 1864. Köhler's text is mostly a faithful reprint, although spelling and punctuation are somewhat modernized. Köhler followed the original division into acts and added no scene division, or any stage directions. The major exception to his otherwise conservative editorial policy is that he omitted from his text what he considered a few 'particularly dirty passages' ('besonders schmutzige Stellen', xxxviii). The first is from Wormfire's soliloquy at the end of Act 2 ('One . . . better', 2.2.19–23), and the other three are from the final scene (5.2.110–40, 146–54, 345–93). Köhler also bowdlerizes a couple of other passages (see 2.2.7–8, 17–18 and notes) by changing 'die Hure' ('the whore') to 'sie' ('she'). He prints some of the corresponding Shakespeare passages at the bottom of the page and provides a scholarly introduction (v–xliii) and commentary (213–60). Cohn did not include an edition of *Kunst* in *Shakespeare in Germany*, but he devoted a number of pages to it in the introduction (cxxiv–cxxxi) and printed three short passages, with English translation (cxxvii–cxxix). Prior to the present publication, no translation of the play had been undertaken.

¹ We are grateful to Heike Homeyer from the Universitätsbibliothek Kassel-Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel for this information. Attention was drawn to the Kassel copy by Bolte, 'Kunst', 446.