

UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE

FACULTY OF ARTS AND PHILOSOPHY

Social roles in Renaissance England as depicted in *The Taming of the Shrew*
and *Kenilworth*

Martina Milarová

Bachelor thesis

2019

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2017/2018

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Martina Milarová**
Osobní číslo: **H16215**
Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro odbornou praxi**
Název tématu: **Společenské role v období anglické renesance ve Zkrocení zlé ženy a Kenilworth**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Studentka bude charakterizovat období renesance v Anglii a definuje tehdejší společenské role. Poté porovná, jak jsou tyto společenské role vyobrazeny v Shakespearově díle Zkrocení zlé ženy. Následně se bude zabývat romantickou literární verzí renesanční společnosti v románu Waltera Scotta Kenilworth. Bude se soustředit hlavně na zhodnocení, nakolik společenské role v dílech odpovídají jejich vnímání v renesanční společnosti a zda je významný rozdíl mezi jejich vyobrazením v díle z tehdejší doby a z doby pozdější.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná**

Jazyk zpracování bakalářské práce: **Angličtina**

Seznam odborné literatury:

- Arata, Stephen. "Scott's pageants: The example of Kenilworth." *Studies in Romanticism* 40, no. 1 (2001): 99-107. PRIMO.
- Bejblík, Alois. *Shakespearův svět*. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1979.
- Bock, Gisela. *Ženy v evropských dějinách: od středověku do současnosti*. Praha: NLN, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007.
- Costa, Maddy. "The Taming of the Shrew: 'This is not a woman being crushed'." Published January 17, 2012.
<https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/jan/17/taming-of-the-shrew-rsc>.
- Craig, Hardin. *The enchanted glass; the Elizabethan mind in literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Dickson, Andrew. "Multiculturalism in Shakespeare's plays." Published March 15, 2016.
<https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/multiculturalism-in-shakespeares-plays>.
- Garin, Eugenio. *Renesanční člověk a jeho svět*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2003.
- Hattaway, Michael, ed. *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000.
- Wright, Louis Booker. *Middle-class culture in Elizabethan England*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2018**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **31. března 2019**



prof. PhDr. Karel Rýdl, CSc.
děkan



Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2018

Prohlášení autora

Prohlašuji: Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury. Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše. Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 9/2012, bude práce zveřejněna v Univerzitní knihovně a prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 14. 06. 2019

Martina Milarová

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my family for support and my friends for helping me stay positive. I would also like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D., M. Litt., for her willing help and valuable comments.

ANNOTATION

This thesis deals with selected social roles in Renaissance England, as depicted in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Kenilworth*. It describes the roles according to historical research and compares the results with their representation in the selected works. The roles of the Queen, Higher and Lower Nobility, servants and women are discussed and the works in question are compared and analysed as well.

KEYWORDS

Shakespeare, Scott, Renaissance England, social roles, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Kenilworth*

TITUL

Společenské role v období anglické renesance ve *Zkrocení zlé ženy* a *Kenilworth*

ANOTACE

Tato práce zkoumá vybrané společenské role v renesanční Anglii a jejich vyobrazení ve *Zkrocení zlé ženy* a *Kenilworthu*. Popisuje role dle historického výzkumu a porovnává jeho výsledky s jejich reprezentací ve vybraných dílech. Diskutované role jsou role královny, vyšší a nižší šlechty, sluhů a žen. Zvolená díla jsou taktéž analyzována a porovnána.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Shakespeare, Scott, renesanční Anglie, společenské role, *Zkrocení zlé ženy*, *Kenilworth*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
1 INFLUENCES ON LITERATURE IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND	8
2 INFLUENCES ON HISTORICAL NOVEL IN THE ROMANTIC ERA	13
3 SOCIAL ROLES IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND	18
4 THE TAMING OF THE SHREW AND KENILWORTH ANALYSES	36
5 CONCLUSION	44
6 RESUMÉ	46
7 BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

INTRODUCTION

The main subject of this thesis is an analysis of social roles in Renaissance England as depicted in the play *The Taming of The Shrew* by William Shakespeare and Walter Scott's novel *Kenilworth*. The Renaissance was an art movement returning to the culture of ancient Greece and Rome, originating in Italy in 14th century and influencing the whole Europe. Shakespeare is the most noted playwright of the Renaissance in England, popular both among the common people and at the court. *The Shrew*, a comedy, focuses on Katherine, considered a shrew, being tamed by her husband Petruchio and on Lucentio's servant Tranio pretending to be his master to help him marry Katherine's sister. The second writer was an important person as well. Scott, living in the Romantic period, was an author of historical novels. *Kenilworth* follows the story of Amy Robsart and the Earl of Leicester. They married secretly and Leicester hid this fact to stay in favour of the Queen Elizabeth I, who he hoped to marry. He strived to not let his rivals win her instead, mainly due to the interference of his servant Varney. The first story was chosen for its creation in the age concerned and the second due to its plot situated in the Renaissance. Chapters one and two briefly describe Shakespeare's and Scott's life and influences on the works in question. Chapter three depicts selected social roles in Renaissance England according to research and compares them with their representation in the chosen literary works. Chapter four compares *The Shrew* with *Kenilworth* in terms of their acceptance by contemporaries and modern readers and the meaning behind the stories. This paper is to compare how realistically were the social roles depicted in the play from the historical period and in the story written in a later epoch, as well as compare the two literary works in question. It is understood that the theme cannot be covered in full length at such a small amount of space, therefore the thesis contains only selected information.

1 INFLUENCES ON LITERATURE IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND

No matter the timeless quality a literary work has, it is always influenced by the age in which it was written and the same applies to literature from Renaissance England. It should be taken into consideration, as Hattaway argues, that what is typically associated with the Renaissance does not necessarily correspond with the English experience. For example, it can be stated that writers were both ‘medieval’ and ‘Renaissance’.¹ That being said, there is a reason why the age is considered to be one of the most productive periods with many even-now-praised writers. Renaissance had a significant effect on the whole society, including literary authors and one of its main influences was the appreciation of classical culture, now known as the humanist movement.

According to Crane, humanism had enormous effect on the English society. For example, it shaped the way subjects thought about themselves and the social and political roles they had.² The fact that roles started to be redefined influenced authors of the period, including Shakespeare, and the evidence of this can be found in many of his plays. For example, *The Shrew* contains discussions about the role and place of women, as well as questions about what makes a person belong in a higher society and how easy is to rise in class, even if only apparently. Thus, humanism had an impact on practically every aspect of life. It affected the educational system as well. As Crane mentions, part of the education was collecting and recycling bits from literary works the students have read.³ This is probably the reason why Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* so strikingly resembles the story of Pyramus and Thisbe. The fact that at least some of his plays were inspired by already known stories is sometimes reproached. However, as Hutton points out, the aim of classical imitation was not reproduction of the original, but changing the imitated models to present use.⁴ This is exactly what Shakespeare was doing – shaping the bits that inspired him to be more palatable for the Renaissance audience and to express themes important for the period. The practice of reusing parts of texts was not, of course, the only important part of the humanist education.

¹ Michael Hattaway, “Introduction,” in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 3. <https://epdf.pub/a-companion-to-english-renaissance-literature-and-culture-blackwell-companions-t.html>.

² Mary Thomas Crane, “Early Tudor Humanism,” in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 14.

³ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴ Sarah Hutton, “Platonism, Stoicism, Scepticism and Classical Imitation,” in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 48.

Rhetoric belongs in the group of the most crucial school subjects when it comes to the development of literature in the period. According to Crane, Shakespeare's literary works are strongly influenced by the methods of rhetoric taught at the grammar school at Stratford.⁵ The study of rhetoric was very significant and it is obviously one of the key aspects of Shakespeare's plays. According to Trousdale, rhetoric is used to affect the emotions.⁶ This is seen in many long powerful speeches delivered by characters in Shakespeare's plays and it is easy to imagine that the audience was strongly emotionally affected by what they saw on the stage. His characters used rhetoric for other purposes as well, such as to win arguments, control others etc. As Trousdale remarks, Othello, for example, was brought into misery by a skillful rhetorician.⁷ It is easy to see the big impact humanist education had on the writers, but their own studies were not the only way in which the education shaped the literature.

The humanist education focused on teaching not just a few, but as many as possible. The fact that not only authors were educated allowed Shakespeare to play with words etc. while most of the audience still understood it. The exact number of individuals who actually had basic education is not known. As Brink acknowledges, there are no data specifying how many people in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries could read.⁸ However, basic knowledge was probably truly considerably widespread, as can be assumed from the popularity of Shakespeare's plays. This is what Brink argues, stating that the Latin word play in Shakespeare's works indicate that the audience was educated enough.⁹ His own education allowed Shakespeare to use languages to his advantage, but it was the enough-educated audience that truly gave him the freedom to do so. Nevertheless, we can never be sure how exactly his plays were constructed, as even printed works do not represent the original version.

It is an universal knowledge that in Renaissance, the printing press started to be used. It is assumed that this led to the codification of language for the sole purpose of printing, but it did not occur immediately. As Edwards informs, Shakespeare's plays were published during his lifetime as well as after his death in print. Some words, lines or even sections vary between

⁵ Crane, "Early Tudor Humanism," 25.

⁶ Marion Trousdale, "Rhetoric," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 623.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 629.

⁸ Jean R. Brink, "Literacy and Education," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 95.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 101.

different editions.¹⁰ It is easily understood why versions published after Shakespeare's death may have been different, but it is not so clear why it is so in case of those issued during his lifetime when he could watch over the process as the author. The fact that he could not discuss anything explains it. As Foucault argues, Renaissance was the age when the idea of authorship originated.¹¹ Nevertheless, the authorship itself was not understood the same way it is defined now. As O'Callaghan explains, in Renaissance, once the original manuscript was sold to a printer, the author had no further rights to it.¹² This, besides the fact that the language itself was not yet codified, means that a modern reader has to think critically about the meaning of printed texts. When it comes to plays, it is even harder as we can never be sure in what way exactly they were supposed to be performed.

As is well known, Shakespeare wrote many theatre plays, therefore it is important to focus not just on literature generally, but on what influenced him in this aspect. Perhaps the most formative was the fact how theatres themselves operated. This is strikingly different from the experience of the modern age. The main difference is, as Michael Hattaway stresses, that plays were never meant to form an illusion that the audience was watching something real. Moreover, the scenes were changed in front of the people, therefore instead of the illusion of the change in the scenery, they admired the mechanical art. This absence of illusion allowed allusion and authors could indirectly refer to court politics of the age etc.¹³ The fact that authors knew illusion is not the goal certainly influenced the writing process. It probably also gave them more freedom, as without having to focus on details supporting the illusion of the reality, they could pay more attention to all the allusions connecting the play with the current state of affairs, and what thoughts they wanted to express. The absence of illusion certainly influenced the way plays were written, but the allusion instead of illusion had another effect.

Plays were a far bigger part of the culture and social life than people of today can imagine. Instead of bringing people in a different world in which they can forget about their ordinary lives, it was more about an allegorical commentary on the society. Hattaway informs that

¹⁰ Adrian S. Edwards, "Early Shakespeare sources: a guide for academic researchers. Part 1: manuscript and early print sources for Shakespeare's works," published April 29, 2016, <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/early-shakespeare-sources-a-guide-for-academic-researchers-part-1>.

¹¹ Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?" In *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-structuralist Criticism*, ed. Josué V. Harari (London: Methuen, 1979), 141.

¹² Michelle O'Callaghan, "Publication: Print and Manuscript," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 87.

¹³ Michael Hattaway, "Playhouses and the Role of Drama," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 136-137.

playhouses were not mere means of entertainment. The players also had a role similar to that of journalists and political commentators.¹⁴ This applied mostly on history plays, as Shakespeare famously used them to support the entitlement of Elizabeth I to the throne by describing Richard III as a villain, but the same amount of effort he put in his history plays in order to ‘serve his nation’ he put in the advocacy of other ideas he considered important: It is obvious he wrote plays in behalf of women and minorities. Even in these, rhetoric was the most important tool used for the purpose of influencing the audience in real life. Certainly the people he met on a daily basis were one of the main reasons why he was trying to change the public opinion and bring more peace among the citizens.

The mixtures of races and cultures present in London, where Shakespeare was living, had a great impact on his work. As Twyning mentions, London became a metropolis in the sixteenth century, due to a huge migration of people from country to the city and other factors.¹⁵ Therefore, Shakespeare could meet many members of different minorities by simply going through the city, which would not have been possible before. This fact certainly affected his writing in several ways. For one thing, as Dickson remarks, London transformed in a city of immigrants and the problematic interactions between ethnic minorities and majorities could have influenced the way Shakespeare depicted immigrants, outsiders and exiles. On one hand, he was sympathetic with their situation in his plays and asking the audience to find understanding, on the other hand, his worlds still exposed the complexities of multiculturalism.¹⁶ Due to this ability of compassion, he probably felt the same way when it came to any other oppressed group, including women. Moreover, Shakespeare presumably saw a lot of ships coming in and out of ports, as the age of Renaissance is famous for a lot of overseas expeditions and new discoveries. Dickson argues that this might have been the reason why travel is often the driver of actions in his plays and a lot of them take place in a different country than England.¹⁷ *The Shrew*, for example, is situated in Italy. His personal relationships with women could have also affected his depiction of them, but perhaps even bigger effect may have had Elizabeth I as the Queen.

¹⁴ Ibid., 139.

¹⁵ John A. Twyning, “The Literature of the Metropolis,” in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 119.

¹⁶ Andrew Dickson, “Multiculturalism in Shakespeare's plays,” published March 15, 2016, <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/multiculturalism-in-shakespeares-plays>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

The sovereign almost always had huge impact on literature. The proof of this is easy to see especially when we compare literature written during the reign of Elizabeth I and the reign of James I. As Perry informs, Elizabethan writers used elaborate allegorical fictions to explore political topics, which was abandoned during the reign of James I and replaced by a plainer style, as he was not in favour of it.¹⁸ It could be said that Elizabeth I influenced literature more than any other sovereign before or after her. The reason was the mere reality of who she was. Literature was shaped by her gender, taste and even age. As Perry argues, many amatory fictions were written in her prime and later, with her aging, appeared stories of unrequited love.¹⁹ Perhaps the fact that for most of Shakespeare's life, the Queen was the ruler of the country, led to the discussions of where is the place of women in general. It could be assumed that this was one of the reasons why Shakespeare often wrote in a way which could be taken as pro-feminist and as Piesse mentions, "He also writes about the need for a strong sense of self to resist the constructions of identity imposed by others, especially in the case of women."²⁰ All those aspects confirm how closely connected were all the details of an ordinary life with literary works and how the atmosphere of the period influenced the literature in ways which are not obvious at first. Whether it is even possible to write a believable story set in the period after it had ended and what impact had influences of Romanticism on such task will be discussed in the next chapter.

¹⁸ Curtis Perry, "Court and Coterie Culture," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 115.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 113-114.

²⁰ A. J. Piesse, "Identity," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 640.

2 INFLUENCES ON HISTORICAL NOVEL IN THE ROMANTIC ERA

As Amazon informs, the novel *Kenilworth* was written by Sir Walter Scott in 1821. It was published in the Romantic era, since, as Lindenberger explains, Romanticism was in 1798–1824 when it comes to England.²¹ As *Kenilworth* depicts a fragment of the Renaissance age, it is obviously a historical novel. Therefore, knowing what was the influence of Romanticism on the genre is crucial for the subsequent analysis. To determine this, a brief introduction to Romanticism itself is needed.

Some aspects regarding the formation of Romanticism could be attributed to all of them, despite Lovejoy stressing that no criterion was common for all Romanticisms.²² For example, as Schneider mentions, Romanticism was a reaction to rapid changes in life, leading to the feeling of nostalgia.²³ As is generally known, Industrial Revolution started in the 18th century, with a tremendous progress and development of sciences. Naturally, when everything around is changing, people are more inclined to look at the past and therefore it seems understandable why Scott wrote about Renaissance and other ages of history. Another general aspect of Romanticism could be, as De Paz mentions, that feelings started to be more important than rules, as rules impede creativity.²⁴ This description of Romanticism suggests possible reason why Shakespeare, living in the Renaissance age and famously ignoring dramatic unities, started to be appreciated anew.

Shakespeare can be considered the single most admired author of the English Romanticism. As Arac informs, his value was dramatically changed in the later eighteenth century. Around 1830, he was admired in many countries and became crucial for Romantic writers.²⁵ It seems that one of the causes was The French Revolution. Simpson assumes that Shakespeare's

²¹ Herbert Lindenberger, "Literature and the other arts," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 366. <https://epdf.pub/the-cambridge-history-of-literary-criticism-vol-5-romanticism-v-5.html>.

²² Arthur O. Lovejoy, "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms," *PMLA* 39, no. 2 (Jun 1924): 232.

²³ Helmut J. Schneider, "Nature," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 92.

²⁴ Alfredo de Paz, "Innovation and modernity," trans. Albert Sbragia, in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 31–32.

²⁵ Jonathan Arac, "The impact of Shakespeare," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 272.

greatness started to be discussed due to nationalist feelings.²⁶ These feelings increased in the 18th century and the Revolution was one of the reasons, as further explained below. That being said, Shakespeare started to be more recognized for other causes as well. As Arac states, the perception of Shakespeare's plays as deeper than simple entertainment begins in the Romantic period.²⁷ There are examples of people coming to a greater appreciation of the way he presented his characters. For instance, Arac informs that Wilhelm Meister analysed Hamlet as a real person and psychologically interpreted his character development.²⁸ This is not surprising, since the humanities were developing. As Arac adds, this character criticism spread due to innovations in psychology.²⁹ Romantic writers started to think about mental processes more carefully, and Shakespeare depicted his characters astonishingly in this respect. This is crucial, as Scott probably inspired by him when writing his own characters and their development. Notably, Shakespeare's style of writing may not be the only way he affected Scott. As Simpson argues, during the Romantic age, some believed that works of art always contain aspects characteristic for the age and place they were formed in.³⁰ This would make the study of history needless after reading literary texts. However, as Perkins urges, literature does not always reflect the world in which it was created.³¹ Modern readers understand that literature does not mirror the world completely. As Perkins adds, this was often ignored by the Romantics. They often thought that literature lets people gain an insight into the mentality of any age better than historical documents.³² Therefore, Scott could have assumed that the society operated in a certain way, although its depiction in texts could differ from the reality. On the other hand, as Perkins states, due to great effort of scholars, historical information was manifold.³³ Therefore Scott also had access to many historical materials, which could have helped him determine the reality. In *Kenilworth*, he described many sources he studied.³⁴ Nevertheless, even if he did not actually consider Shakespeare's plays equally important, it can be assumed he took them into account, because Shakespeare's influence was

²⁶ David Simpson, "Transcendental philosophy," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 82.

²⁷ Arac, "The impact of Shakespeare," 281.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 283.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Simpson, "Transcendental philosophy," 85.

³¹ David Perkins, "Literary history and historicism," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 347.

³² *Ibid.*, 347-350.

³³ *Ibid.*, 344.

³⁴ Walter Scott, *Kenilworth* (Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1831), 511-520.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc2.ark:/13960/t5cc17972&view=1up&seq=7>.

inevitable, as was discussed. It can be concluded that Shakespeare was the most important author for the Romantics and he greatly influenced the genre of novels, but although people admired him for aspects of his plays that novels had in common, it did not alleviate all the problems the genre had during its creation.

The start of novels was considerably difficult. As Shaffer states, the Romantics did not consider genre distinctions to be crucial.³⁵ Despite this, some of them were purely antagonistic to the idea. As Brown mentions, people continued debating about the mere creation of prose fictions, since it was thought to tempt people to primitive passions.³⁶ For this reason, novels were often considered bad and condemned. In fact, Brown argues that the later 18th century was less about the development of the theory of the novel than about whether novels should even exist.³⁷ This is the main reason why Scott was not merely a writer of novels, but why he was so crucial in the establishment of the genre. As Brown informs, he was one of the first authors specializing in the writing of novels. This allowed the novel theory to start to form.³⁸ Overall, it is clear that novels generally had a harsh start, however, in case of historical novels, the events and the state of society could have helped in their acceptance.

The world was changing rapidly during the Romantic period and before it, so people could easily feel afraid. Moreover, political events strengthened the feeling of estrangement from the former way of life as well. As Schneider states, the French Revolution represented break with the status quo, and the unpredictable future frightened everyone.³⁹ It seems logical that this atmosphere made people look to the past. Moreover, the Revolution also led people to appreciate the past of their nation in order to protect themselves from its influence. As Perkins comments, medieval literature and early modern literature started to be praised as the national literature, one of the reasons being that it was a tradition abandoned by the French.⁴⁰ It seems understandable why the Renaissance, the age of Shakespeare, was one of the most appreciated epochs for the English. The Romantics valued it even more than other periods. As Arata informs, there was even a cult of Merrie England, which developed also due to Scott's

³⁵ E.S. Shaffer, "Religion and literature," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 144.

³⁶ Marshall Brown, "Theory of the novel," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 255.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 253.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 251.

³⁹ Schneider, "Nature," 93.

⁴⁰ Perkins, "Literary history and historicism," 360.

writing.⁴¹ From the name itself it is obvious that people considered it better than it had been. Oxford Reference describes the term as an important attitude for Victorians, nostalgic thought that life before was better, people were closer to each other, more virtuous and happier.⁴² It is therefore possible that *Kenilworth* depicts the age or the Queen excessively idealistically for the benefit of the people who needed it. However, it is important to know that public opinion shaped literary works more than before in general.

According to Brown, middle class increasingly started to read novels.⁴³ This is easy to understand since more people than before were literate, but that was not the only reason. As Wellbery explains, reading begun to be privatized in the 18th century because the medium of print became more connected with the society.⁴⁴ This was a crucial turn in the history of reading as a whole. After it became private, the opinion of a reader started to matter more than before, as he was choosing what exactly he would read. This is the reason why, according to Brown, people begun to care about writers and readers and not just literary works themselves and discussed interpretations of texts.⁴⁵ Therefore, although the printing press was created many years before, only now it significantly affected literature, making reading a new experience and creating public opinion, which writers had to acknowledge. This is also why psychology started to be widely used, for analyses of characters.

Black states that the Romantics were the ones who inaugurated psychology, which was perhaps the most influential of human sciences.⁴⁶ The emphasis of inner feelings influenced literature and novels in particular. As Brown mentions, the focus of novels is not the adventure, but emotions of the characters.⁴⁷ It is easy to see even in *Kenilworth* how much this is true, for the inner feelings and thoughts are described in detail, while the plot of the whole novel could be summarized in a few sentences. Psychology is complex, of course, and it seems hard to represent the mind of anyone, let alone somebody living in a different age. In case of Elizabeth, depicted by Scott, the issue was even bigger. As is well known, Scotland

⁴¹ Stephen Arata, "Scott's Pageants: The Example of 'Kenilworth'," *Studies in Romanticism* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 101.

⁴² "Merrie England," Oxford Reference, accessed June 16, 2019, <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100151694>.

⁴³ Brown, "Theory of the novel," 256.

⁴⁴ David Wellbery, "The transformation of rhetoric," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 187-188.

⁴⁵ Marshall Brown, "Introduction," 1-2.

⁴⁶ Joel Black, "Scientific models," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*, ed. Marshall Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 129.

⁴⁷ Brown, "Theory of the novel," 261.

was united with England in 1707. This is remarkable, because Scott was from Scotland and when writing *Kenilworth*, his country was united with England only briefly. The history of difficult relationships between Scotland and England is infamous, and it could have affected the way Elizabeth was described. In fact, although Scott was determined not to be influenced by his origins, he states this apprehension in *Kenilworth* himself.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, due to Scott's vast research, it could be assumed that he depicted psychological processes of Renaissance people as accurately as possible. The next chapter describes how the social roles operated in order to compare how successful he was, even in comparison with Shakespeare.

⁴⁸ Walter Scott, *Kenilworth* (Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1831), 5.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc2.ark:/13960/t5cc17972&view=1up&seq=7>.

3 SOCIAL ROLES IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND

It should be noted that in any age, not all individuals belonging to a group act similarly. Therefore this thesis takes into consideration only what was considered the norm. Social roles to be discussed are the Queen, Higher and Lower Nobility, servants and women. The Queen Elizabeth and Higher Nobility only appear in *Kenilworth*, however, her presence had an impact on the whole age and she was greatly influenced by people closest to her, thus these two groups were chosen as well. Another important aspect to consider in this chapter is the fact that, as Brockman mentions, term 'class' is not the most appropriate word for the early modern period.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the term is used for the purpose of simplicity. It is true that *The Shrew* takes place not in England, but in Italy, where class distinctions could have been different, however, Shakespeare is known to place his plays elsewhere but keeping social life the way he knew it, so this was not taken into consideration. The most important person was the Queen, so the analysis starts with her.

Elizabeth's womanhood, together with the history of her family, formed her life the most. As Findlay notes, due to her royal lineage, some aspects of the life of women did not apply to her.⁵⁰ In comparison to ordinary women, she had various benefits. For example, Crane informs that humanist education was provided to her and she used it in her speeches and life.⁵¹ This can be seen throughout the whole novel *Kenilworth*. Her knowledge of history, for example, is demonstrated with her clever remark likening Amy to Helen of Troy, showing her ability to see the parallel between those two situations.⁵² Nevertheless, her sex was not forgettable for anyone and people acted according to it, men actively courted her. As Crane mentions, Earl of Leicester and Earl of Sussex are associated with her the most.⁵³ As will be discussed below, the favour of Elizabeth was crucial for any courtier. Those she truly paid her attention to had more benefits, though also more unstable position. *Kenilworth* describes continuous rivalry between Sussex and Leicester and speculations about who will ultimately win, leading to agitation when Sussex fell ill.⁵⁴ Despite the uncertainty Elizabeth kept them

⁴⁹ Sonya L. Brockman, "Tranio Transformed: Social Anxieties and Social Metamorphosis in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Journal of Early Modern Studies* 4, no. 4 (2015): 215.

⁵⁰ Alison Findlay, "Women and Drama," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 501.

⁵¹ Crane, "Early Tudor Humanism," 25.

⁵² Scott, *Kenilworth*, 221.

⁵³ Crane, "Early Tudor Humanism," 25.

⁵⁴ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 178.

in, Leicester is depicted as the one with more chances to even become her husband for the majority of the novel. *Kenilworth* illustrates this several times. For example, she continues courting him in return despite rumours of the possibility of their marriage.⁵⁵ It seems that should she want the rumours to end, she would not do so. *Kenilworth* even shows her declining the offer of marriage, telling herself she has to be married only to England, yet thinking about the possibility.⁵⁶ This state of her mind is commented in the novel by Leicester himself. In one scene, he says that she is often close to talk lovingly, yet always stops herself because she does not want to lose her position.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the chance is still there, as she actively considers this possibility. It is ruined only at the end of the novel, where Elizabeth even admits that the kingdom lost a king due to his actions.⁵⁸ In reality, Leicester truly had a reason to hope for fulfilling his ambition of becoming the king. The National Archives provides one of the many sources documenting her affection towards him, his last letter to her before his death, which she kept in a casket by her bed until her dying day.⁵⁹ They, obviously, never married. One of the reasons is well known and logical – she, as is said, did not want her country to be at mercy of anybody else. Most importantly, she wanted to prove that even a woman can be a good ruler. As Hammer stresses, some people criticised a female ruler and argued that women are predisposed to fleshly weakness. For this reason, Elizabeth strived to have a good reputation and her court to be virtuous.⁶⁰ This may be the reason why she made fundamental changes to the way the court operated in comparison to her father's. As Perry notes, in order to minimise hostility among courtiers, she managed factions, which was not common for Henry VIII.⁶¹ This is commented in *Kenilworth*, which explains such an organization. It states that it was means of balancing interests and she used it her entire reign to make no one certain in his position, for the sake of the kingdom.⁶² This was wise, as her courtiers sometimes quarrelled, but this tactic made her more capable of managing the situation. One example of this is the scene where she grants knighthood to Richard Varney, the servant of Leicester, but consequently knights another man chosen by Sussex in order to

⁵⁵ Ibid. 279.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 413-414.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 245.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 488.

⁵⁹ "Earl of Leicester to Elizabeth," The National Archives, accessed June 16, 2019, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/elizabeth-monarchy/earl-of-leicester-to-elizabeth/>.

⁶⁰ Paul E. J. Hammer, "Sex and the Virgin Queen: Aristocratic Concupiscence and the Court of Elizabeth I," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 82–83.

⁶¹ Curtis Perry, "Court and Coterie Culture," 112.

⁶² Scott, *Kenilworth*, 178-179.

make her favourites equal again.⁶³ Her being a woman was beneficial in this aspect. As Perry notes, the ability to keep her favourites at the same level may have been due to her status as an unmarried queen. Only women could do her chamber service, therefore none of her favourites could rise in position through this means and she could administer who and when had access to her.⁶⁴ *Kenilworth* describes that she also ate alone, making herself even less accessible.⁶⁵ This made her capable of having her court under control, as well as choosing who she makes her favourite. Another aspect mentioned in the novel which seems plausible is the way she was viewed by others. In *Kenilworth*, there are few scenes when her character is described either as partly reminiscent of her father, or a mixture of a woman and man. For example, when she gets angry due to Leicester's misbehaving, it is suggested that the spirit of her father is visible in her.⁶⁶ In another part of the book, Leicester states that she is not like any woman because she has the heart of one, but the head of a man which makes her act more sensible.⁶⁷ In other words, most of her good qualities are said to be present in her despite her womanhood and her temper to be after her father. The spirit of her father is present in her a lot in *Kenilworth*, which shows several instances in which she goes from calm to angry and back. This seems to be a true depiction, as this behaviour was present in reality as well. For example, as Hammer notes, when one of her chamberers secretly married, Elizabeth was furious, but the woman soon returned to her service, probably also because Elizabeth felt guilty that she harmed her hand during the fit of anger.⁶⁸ In *Kenilworth*, people are aware of this changing attitude. For example, Leicester, after being reprimanded for contradicting Elizabeth's orders, did nothing to object and therefore she soon started to feel sorry for him and calmed her anger.⁶⁹ It should be taken into consideration that she had her reasons to act so intensely when somebody broke the rules. In *Kenilworth*, the reason for her anger is obvious – she, the Queen, was deceived and courted like a paramour. In the real life, the status of a female ruler was to blame. As Hammer stresses, penalizing those who endangered the decorum of her court meant proving that negative stereotypes of queens did not apply to her. Since her mother died due to accusations of adultery and incest, any disruption of the decorum greatly affected Elizabeth.⁷⁰ Her reactions in this regard were well known to her

⁶³ Ibid., 390-391.

⁶⁴ Perry, "Court and Coterie Culture," 112.

⁶⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 237.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 208.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 245.

⁶⁸ Paul E. J. Hammer, "Sex and the Virgin Queen," 80-81.

⁶⁹ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 209.

⁷⁰ Hammer, "Sex and the Virgin Queen," 83.

court and it explains why Leicester in the novel was so afraid of her reaction were she to find out the truth about his marriage, not only due to the loss of her favour, but possible consequences. In fact, something similar happened in real life as well, although it concerned Leicester's secret marriage with someone else than Amy. As Findlay notes, Elizabeth was furious when she found out about the unallowed marriage.⁷¹ Overall, *Kenilworth* rightly depicts her entire character as complicated, with many things for her courtiers to be careful about. It also illustrates that she hated when somebody was not paying attention to her, thus making everyone surprised when she tolerated Leicester to be absent in mind after being harsh to him.⁷² In reality, she truly was less harsh to Leicester than the others. As McIlvenna informs, when Raleigh secretly married, Elizabeth imprisoned both him and his wife.⁷³ This is in contrast with how she reacted when Leicester did the same. As Borman states, when Elizabeth learned about Leicester's marriage with her cousin, she banished her, but Leicester was forgiven eventually.⁷⁴ Similarly, *Kenilworth* suggests that people had to look the right way around her. After riding with her, one character said that it is necessary to change clothes before attending her again, similarly to players changing costumes.⁷⁵ This is suggested several times, and she even admits that she forgives Tresilian his bad dress only because she understands his feelings. In that scene, the fact that she later sent away Sussex for similarly soiled boots is commented.⁷⁶ This is not surprising, since, as explained in the paragraph about servants, clothes truly were extremely important. Elizabeth is also depicted as a capable, just ruler, reacting strictly only when wronged. The National Archives support this claim, stating that she was charismatic, authoritative and precisely what her country needed during the time.⁷⁷ Her capability of ruling justly is shown through the whole novel, but her incapability to do so when she is furious as well. In *Kenilworth*, after she learns about Leicester's marriage, she acts without restraint and calms down only after being reminded that she would look cheated if responding like this, and that she has to be above this weakness if she does not want people to believe she could act this way.⁷⁸ It is truly hard to imagine anybody would

⁷¹ Findlay, "Women and Drama," 503.

⁷² Scott, *Kenilworth*, 447.

⁷³ Una McIlvenna, "Why Sir Walter Raleigh Was Beheaded," published October 29, 2018, https://www-history-com.cdn.ampproject.org/v/s/www.history.com/.amp/news/sir-walter-raleigh-execution-reasons?amp_js_v=0.1&usqp=mq331AQCKAE%3D.

⁷⁴ Tracy Borman, "Robert Dudley: Queen Elizabeth I's great love," published January 8, 2016, <https://www.historyextra.com/period/elizabethan/robert-dudley-queen-elizabeth-is-great-love/>.

⁷⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 368.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 386.

⁷⁷ "Elizabeth's first speech," The National Archives, accessed June 16, 2019, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/elizabeth-monarchy/elizabeths-first-speech/>.

⁷⁸ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 484-486.

have known if she had been acting this way, but this comment illustrates that people in Romanticism praised her, not willing to believe anything wrong about her. The same sentiment is seen in a scene in which Varney comments that her reign is unprecedented, based on love of the people, and thus her position cannot be threatened by anything.⁷⁹ This idealised outlook was already discussed in the second chapter. It is obvious that her courtiers had to be careful not to fall out of favour and they had to actively court her in order to get close to her. Overall, the Higher Nobility had more problematic position than before.

The situation of the peerage was dramatically changed with the Tudor dynasty. A considerable number of nobility died during the infamous War of the Roses preceding the Tudor reign, which meant that there were far less members of this social group than before. Moreover, rank and titles were no longer the most important aspect at the court, as discussed in the next paragraph. It is therefore clear that instead of being close to the monarch just because one's birth, people had to focus on other means to gain her favour. As Crane mentions, humanist education, together with rhetorical training, became a means of rising to preferment at the court.⁸⁰ In *Kenilworth*, there is strong emphasis on rhetoric as well, since it was the reason why Raleigh gained Elizabeth's favour and Leicester and others often used it for avoiding problems or for persuasion. While one of the obvious reasons for trying to be close to her was the prospect of marrying her, having her favour was greatly beneficial on its own. As Perry mentions, those who were favoured were courted by others and gained rewards from Elizabeth which they redistributed among their supporters. This demonstrated their prestige and strengthen their position. A good courtier always had a considerable number of dependants.⁸¹ In *Kenilworth*, this aspect of a courtier's life is present constantly, as both Leicester and Sussex have several men on their side, supporting them. For example, when Sussex is ill, his house is filled with his followers.⁸² As Leicester and Sussex were Elizabeth's greatest favourites, they also had an office which simplified access to her. As Perry notes, they were both Masters of the Horse of the Queen, which meant that they accompanied her during excursions.⁸³ This is depicted in *Kenilworth* several times, when both of them engage in her trips. It can be seen, for example, in a scene on a barge when the theatre is discussed.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, her favour towards them and a beneficial position did not mean not having to

⁷⁹ Ibid., 436.

⁸⁰ Crane, "Early Tudor Humanism," 21.

⁸¹ Perry, "Court and Coterie Culture," 106.

⁸² Scott, *Kenilworth*, 180.

⁸³ Perry, "Court and Coterie Culture," 106.

⁸⁴ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 223-236.

strive for her affection. They could still be replaced by a new favourite, which is illustrated in *Kenilworth* when Raleigh became another man Elizabeth noticed more than the others, making Leicester nervous as he was well aware he now had another dangerous rival despite the distance in their ranks. In notes to *Kenilworth*, Scott gives an example of Raleigh's ability to operate at the court. When imprisoned, he fought with the lieutenant to get to the window to see Elizabeth from the distance. Since he was his friend, it is likely that this was arranged in order to flatter her.⁸⁵ This illustrates that the whole existence at the court was full of pretending. As is even stated in *Kenilworth*, courtiers had to hide their feelings and decode those of others.⁸⁶ The novel depicts several scenes in which Leicester truly had to pretend. In one, it is even stated that he had to appear happy as was expected, no matter how he felt.⁸⁷ This corresponds with the depiction of Elizabeth's wanting to be talked to appropriately and noticed, according to her discussed temper. The truth is, no one was ever safe from losing his status. As Leicester explains, even he is not secure in his position and admitting marriage at the wrong time would ruin him.⁸⁸ At the end of the novel, he truly experiences the position of a disgraced courtier. His enemies celebrate, most of his friends do not talk to him and many people are antagonistic to please Elizabeth.⁸⁹ The already mentioned example of Raleigh, temporarily imprisoned, supports the claim that even her favourites were not saved from punishments. Relationships were crucial in this aspect. Due to her affections, the real Leicester was never severely punished, but connections with other courtiers were important as well. As Krischer mentions, peer trials, although they were not usual, often ended well due to the solidarity of other peers.⁹⁰ This is suggested in *Kenilworth* as well. After a scene when Leicester decides to admit being married, he starts to write to his allies in order to not be easily killed as those who had not been supported by others.⁹¹ Varney reminds him that he is powerful only because of his relationship with Elizabeth. This claim is supported by the fact that when she learns the truth, the idea of him maybe being capable of returning back to her favour one day makes his position easier.⁹² The right behaviour and relationships were not the only important things a courtier had to maintain. A courtier had to look the right way, as is

⁸⁵ Ibid., 514.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 77.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 446.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 88-89.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 490-491.

⁹⁰ André Krischer, "Noble Honour and the Force of Law: Trial by Peers, Aristocracy and Criminal Law in England from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century" in *What Makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. Jörn Leonhard, Christian Wieland (Oakville: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 68-69. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=azPeXrxrDW4C&pg>.

⁹¹ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 434-435.

⁹² Ibid., 491.

commented in *Kenilworth* when Tresilian is reminded that to go to the court, he has to buy expensive clothes.⁹³ This was obviously true in reality, since the right clothes were always essential. Moreover, as was mentioned, courtiers had to constantly praise and entertain Elizabeth. As Perry states, this was the reason why courtiers composed literary works or hired others to do so.⁹⁴ For the same purpose, celebrations at Kenilworth, both in the novel and reality, were so magnificent. As English Heritage mentions, Elizabeth spent nineteen days at Kenilworth in 1575 and her stay was filled with glorious spectacles.⁹⁵ To summarise, the members of the Higher Nobility closest to the Queen had far more complicated life than their predecessors, as they could rise or fall any day. The men in the lower rank had similar issues, but if they did not have ambitions for court favouritism, their lifestyle was less complicated in a way.

As was indicated, the position of the Lower Nobility was changing during the age. In order to discuss this group, it has to be specified first, however, this task is troublesome. As Gromelski argues, scholars have been trying to define gentry, but it has been inconclusive, because it cannot be done in terms of wealth and influence.⁹⁶ Moreover, as Coss stresses, the term ‘gentry’ is now used to name the members of the lower landed society, because ‘nobility’ started to be applied only to the peerage. However, in the 16th and 17th centuries, those two groups were described as nobilitas major and minor.⁹⁷ It is also clear that determining the specific rank of characters would be of no avail. As Coss adds, the same persons could be called gentlemen or yeomen. Moreover, the line dividing the gentry and Higher Nobility started to be visible only with the existence of stable peerage.⁹⁸ Since this shows that differences would be too minor to take into consideration, all ranks of the Lower Nobility are to be considered one group for the purpose of this thesis and the term ‘gentry’ as its synonym. As was mentioned, even with this distinction, the Lower Nobility was not particularly different from the Higher Nobility, with the exclusion of courtiers. As Gromelski mentions, although gentry lacked the influence of nobles, they were considered gentlemen and were

⁹³ Ibid., 166.

⁹⁴ Perry, “Court and Coterie Culture,” 113.

⁹⁵ “History and Stories,” English Heritage, accessed June 16, 2019, <https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/kenilworth-castle/history-and-stories/>.

⁹⁶ Tomasz W. Gromelski, 2010, “The greater and lesser nobility in early modern Europe: Poland-Lituania and England and Wales in the sixteenth century,” EUI Working Papers, Max Weber Programme, 1.

⁹⁷ P. R. Coss, “The Formation of the English Gentry,” *Past & Present* no. 147 (May, 1995): 39.

www.jstor.org/stable/651039.

⁹⁸ Coss, “The Formation of the English Gentry,” 42.

above ordinary people, the dividing line with the nobility not being clear.⁹⁹ Consequently, the life at the court and favouritism of the Queen seems to be the only difference between those groups. Moreover, the example of Raleigh shows that this class could have been in the inner circle of Elizabeth as well. It is believable that gentry maybe was not used to the way the court operated. This is illustrated in *Kenilworth*, when a character states that Tresilian does not know how to act at the court and could endanger himself.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, Amy, coming from a gentry family, was only learning the right behaviour at the court. In one scene, she even comments that she likes truth more than courtly lies, but she will have to get used to them.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, this problem with adaptation was not a rule, since Raleigh knew how to react well. It is even mentioned that he understood how to speak with Elizabeth more than some of the courtiers.¹⁰² This is further supported by Scott in the part with historical notes. He states that he knew better than other courtiers how to court her and pay her the right compliments.¹⁰³ In any case, since a title was not crucial for being close to Elizabeth, it was easy to almost ignore the distinction between ranks altogether. This fact obviously changed the way the Lower Nobility perceived the Higher Nobility, which should be more respected but it seems that this idea started to vanish. As Quilligan informs, Sir Philip Sidney once got into a fight with the Earl of Oxford, and although he indicated his own lesser position, he did so in a way that made the Earl look less honourable and not deserving his deference.¹⁰⁴ *Kenilworth* both shows the knowledge of the middle ground Lesser nobles existed in and that they were not afraid to confront those above them. In one scene, Amy warns Tresilian to not slander her husband, because he is higher in rank than Tresilian and he has no right to do so.¹⁰⁵ Gentry was also probably more likely to talk less formally with ordinary people, yet they were quick to remind their status. *Kenilworth* shows Tresilian denying answer to Lambourne on the basis of his rank, despite talking to him normally before.¹⁰⁶ The same idea of differences in rank, however, did not prevent him from partly ignoring Leicester's status. He was willing to discuss the situation only with Elizabeth, stating that Leicester is still just a

⁹⁹ Gromelski, "The greater and lesser nobility," 1-4.

¹⁰⁰ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 425.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 80-81.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 198.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 514.

¹⁰⁴ Maureen Quilligan, "Sidney and His Queen," in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 171–172, <https://books.google.cz/books?id=msF3SYd4-ZoC&pg>.

¹⁰⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 53.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 110.

subject, although a noble.¹⁰⁷ He also did not hesitate to draw his sword if his or Amy's honour was in question, no matter the rank of the opponent. Towards the end of the novel, he decides to fight with Leicester for honour, despite the distance between them.¹⁰⁸ It seems that only direct servanthood towards a noble made gentry truly acknowledge the difference between them. In *Kenilworth*, Varney, a servant of Leicester, continues to serve him after becoming a knight, not considering it dishonourable simply because Leicester is still higher and if he becomes the king, even nobles will serve him.¹⁰⁹ Since nobles served Elizabeth herself, it seems plausible gentry did not consider this kind of inferiority irreverent. In other cases, they even had a reason to not truly feel lower in rank. As Gromelski stresses, the 16th century saw great social changes and aristocracy was in a crisis, both due to the actions of the Tudors and the fact they did not understand finances and spent too much. The gentry, on the other hand, were quick to adapt to the capitalistic market.¹¹⁰ This corresponds with *The Shrew* where Baptista, for example, has his position due to his being a merchant. However, despite not considering themselves below the courtiers, members of the gentry wanted to distinguish from others slightly below them and were thinking about where exactly they are among the others of their class. As Coss informs, they cared about their status on this level, although it is not clear whether they were connected locally.¹¹¹ *The Shrew* suggest this possibility, because people present seems to know each other. For example, Petruchio is a friend of Hortensio.¹¹² Similarly, Baptista does not know Lucentio's father personally, yet he knows the name.¹¹³ Interestingly, the man hired to play Lucentio's father had heard about him as well. When stating he knows about him, the first and only thing he mentions is the wealth he has.¹¹⁴ This illustrates one crucial means of showing prestige. As Coss adds, wealth was the main determinant of the differences among the gentry.¹¹⁵ It is easy to understand that without any particular sign of distinction, wealth was almost the only thing which could do the task. It is the reason why Petruchio wants a rich bride and Baptista the richest son-in-law. Petruchio even states that wealth is the only thing he wants from his wife.¹¹⁶ This shows that when it comes to weddings, money was even more important. As Kahn explains, the richer the groom,

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 162.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 469-470.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 395-396.

¹¹⁰ Gromelski, "The greater and lesser nobility," 5.

¹¹¹ Coss, "The Formation of the English Gentry," 49.

¹¹² William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew* (USA: Penguin Books Inc., 1967), 36-37.

¹¹³ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 50.

¹¹⁴ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 88.

¹¹⁵ Coss, "The Formation of the English Gentry," 49.

¹¹⁶ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 39.

the bigger the prestige for the household.¹¹⁷ In this context, it is even more understandable why the secret marriage of Amy in *Kenilworth* was so devastating for her close ones. Baptista, the whole time choosing the richest groom, was similarly shocked. In case of *The Shrew*, the secret marriage was possible only due to the servant Tranio, switching place with his master. Both Lower and Higher Nobility had a complicated relationships with their servants, particularly due to the condition of the servanthood during the Renaissance.

The position of servants was changing in the Renaissance. Similarly to Lesser nobles being more capable of rising in power and status, social mobility applied to servants as well. For example, as Brink stresses, all graduates from the university were seen as gentlemen.¹¹⁸ This applies to Tranio in *The Shrew*. According to Brockman, Tranio had gentlemanly education, because he was capable of comparing Aristotle's philosophy and Ovid's poetry.¹¹⁹ This was not the only example of his knowledge. His ability to recitate a part of latin works supports this claim.¹²⁰ His education is the main reason why he managed to pretend to be his master so successfully, using the right rhetoric and manners. This shows that education was one of the most crucial aspects of mobility, since it is the main thing which differentiates Tranio from Sly. Sly, unlike Tranio, seemingly got higher in class but was incapable of acting according to it, his inability to even properly talk with his supposed wife despite being prompted several times illustrating lack of knowledge and rhetorical training necessary for being convincing in the role of a lord.¹²¹ Nevertheless, there were not only means to rise in class, many things supporting the idea happened as well. As Hattaway notes, unwanted fine clothes from the nobles were used by the players.¹²² Although they used it for playing the nobles, it is easy to assume people felt that if only clothes are enough for the change, rising in class is manageable. The idea that only learnable behaviour and clothes distinguish one class from the others was known by everyone, which consequently made people greatly focused on clothes. As Brockman informs, the Tudors were anxious that the order of society could be disrupted and therefore issued several legislations stating what different classes should wear in order to maintain visible distinctions between them. During the reign of Elizabeth, the mobility of

¹¹⁷ Coppélia Kahn, "'The Taming of the Shrew': Shakespeare's Mirror of Marriage," *Modern Language Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring, 1975): 91.

¹¹⁸ Jean R. Brink, "Literacy and Education," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 102.

¹¹⁹ Sonya L. Brockman, "Tranio Transformed: Social Anxieties and Social Metamorphosis in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Journal of Early Modern Studies* 4, no. 4 (2015): 214.

¹²⁰ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 32.

¹²¹ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 25.

¹²² Hattaway, "Playhouses and the Role of Drama," 142.

middle class increased, leading to more laws than before.¹²³ The fact that clothes were far more crucial than nowadays is seen in both literary works many times. It was the reason why Lucentio and Tranio could switch places in *The Shrew* solely by changing their outfits.¹²⁴ In *Kenilworth*, even a woman hides her rank through this means. Amy is dressed poorly during her escape to Kenilworth to disguise herself, making the Queen think she is an actress.¹²⁵ Therefore, the face was far from being the most important factor, as is seen in *Kenilworth* as well. A character describing Amy to Tresilian focuses solely on her fine clothes while talking about her beauty, not even remembering her features.¹²⁶ This is not shocking because even now people take notice of the way somebody is dressed if they do not know the person. However, the fact that this aspect was far more important during the Renaissance is illustrated, for example, by the fact that in *Kenilworth*, Elizabeth did not identify Tresilian when he was badly dressed, although she had already met him.¹²⁷ Interestingly, when it comes to the confusion of a Lesser noble and a peasant, Shakespeare and Scott take a different approach. While in *The Shrew*, a considerable part of the play focuses on a servant being capable of playing the role of his master, in *Kenilworth*, Lambourne argues that only ordinary people would not distinguish a gentleman from someone below in rank, as it is hard to learn the proper behaviour if someone was not born into the gentry.¹²⁸ This, however, does not change that clothes frequently covered the identity in the novel as well, as was already discussed. Nevertheless, the sole fact that clothes were the main distinguishing factor would not probably be frightening enough if not for the way servanthood operated, supporting feasibility of raising in class. In truth, it was occurring often and nobody really expected that servants would stay servants until their deaths. As Brockman states, the temporary aspect of service was well known, making servants, capable of becoming masters themselves afterwards, refuse to have their identity shaped by their position.¹²⁹ With this prospect, the behaviour of both Tranio and Varney throughout the literary works, their audacity and self-confidence, is even more understandable. However, there was yet another aspect making the relationship between servants and masters more complicated—the way the servanthood itself manifested. As Brockman mentions, the position of servants was considered as something between an employee and a part of the family, this sole fact making them operate in two

¹²³ Brockman, "Tranio Transformed," 217.

¹²⁴ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 34.

¹²⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 415.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* 30-31.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* 381-382.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 37.

¹²⁹ Brockman, "Tranio Transformed," 215-16.

different roles.¹³⁰ It could hardly be different when servants spend many years in one family. This is mentioned both in *Kenilworth* and *The Shrew* as well. Leicester acknowledges that Varney has been serving him since childhood.¹³¹ This was not unusual. As Palliser explains, households often had children from other families as servants.¹³² *The Shrew* gives another example of this. Vincentio comments that Tranio was a part of their household since the age of three.¹³³ This explains why there was often such an intimacy and even a kind of friendship between the master and the servant. Tranio plays his role for the gain of Lucentio, as Lucentio states at the end.¹³⁴ He was not the only servant in the discussed works to do something for the love of their masters. In *Kenilworth*, Varney was scheming to get Leicester on the throne not only for his own gain, but also for the benefit of Leicester.¹³⁵ The relationship did not even have to be lasting for years for the servants to be loyal to their masters, as is shown in *Kenilworth*. Janet knew Amy only briefly, yet she was willing to risk poisoning herself for her safety.¹³⁶ The affections of the master towards the servant were seen both in *Kenilworth* and *The Shrew* as well. In the former, Amy is capable of reprimanding Janet for her behaviour if she is too audacious, yet she declares that she is her only friend.¹³⁷ Her husband had even more serious relationship with Varney, possibly because they had known each other for a long time. In one scene, Leicester begs Varney to stay, relies on his advice and basically promises to do anything he says if he stays.¹³⁸ The friendship between a master and a servant therefore proves to be capable of making the master act according to what the servant wants. In other words, due to their relationship, Varney manages to make Leicester do his bidding, because he trusts him as a friend. Similarly, Lucentio would probably never risk switching places with Tranio if not for trust. Both Varney and Tranio used compelling language to influence their masters and reach their goals throughout the plots, but without the fondness toward them and belief they want the best for them, their masters would not have been so easy to manipulate. It seems that the issue of over-friendliness between masters and servants was a reality and people advised against it. As Gouge comments (1634; quoted in Brockman 2015), servants

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 216.

¹³¹ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 442.

¹³² D.M. Palliser, *The Age of Elizabeth: England Under the Later Tudors 1547-1603* (New York: Longman Inc., 1992), 72.

¹³³ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 108.

¹³⁴ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 109.

¹³⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 442.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 296-297.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 304-308.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 449.

could use the friendship for their own ambitions.¹³⁹ This is certainly true for Varney, who helps his master for the good of both of them, wanting a profit from it as well. It is less obvious in *The Shrew*, nevertheless, it could be assumed that Tranio enjoys his pretended status, making the situation beneficial for himself. As Brockman comments, this voluntary reliance on Tranio questions both Lucentio's capability as a master and the pureness of Tranio's motives.¹⁴⁰ At the end of the play, the possible pitfall of the situation is clearly shown. Tranio became so used to acting as a master that he even starts to send Lucentio's father to prison.¹⁴¹ It could be argued that he continued pretending in order to save the plan for Lucentio, but nobody could ever know for sure. Although Tranio is put back into his place at the end, it is obvious he did not forget this. He continues to be audacious in a way, which is seen in his dialogue with Petruchio, when he mocks him.¹⁴² As Brockman notes, this shows that he is well aware of the social hierarchy and that he can tease him because Petruchio is below Lucentio, whom he serves.¹⁴³ Therefore, it could be nothing else than truly being aware of his position as a servant. However, should he were truly tamed, he would probably not talk like this so early after being reprimanded, despite the authority to do so. From all things mentioned above, it is clear that the issue of servanthood was complicated, but it seems that the biggest threat was becoming too close with the servant. However, this was not the case, as the other extreme was harmful as well. As Brockman states, although the master should have been authoritative, he had to be paternal as well. If this was not the case, the imperfect master had to rely on force instead of willing subordination.¹⁴⁴ Petruchio illustrates this perfectly, even more so in the stark comparison with the communication of Lucentio and Tranio before their exchange. They talk with each other respectfully, in a civilized manner.¹⁴⁵ This is not to be found in any interaction of Petruchio with his servants. He is cruel to them and they mock him and do not listen to him, which is seen from the very start, in the scene where Grumio obviously deliberately does not understand his command.¹⁴⁶ Petruchio also frequently beats his servants and it is clear that it is of no avail. Basically the only effect it has is the fact that the servants comment on it and think him mad. The dynamic between masters and servants certainly seems complicated, as well as being a good enough master. Nevertheless,

¹³⁹ Brockman, "Tranio Transformed," 224.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 108.

¹⁴² Ibid., 113.

¹⁴³ Brockman, "Tranio Transformed," 226.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 216.

¹⁴⁵ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 27-28.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 36-37.

subordination by force was certainly not a good method. The pressing question of how exactly to rule over another person was a theme discussed with regards to women as well.

The issue of womanhood had always been complicated and Renaissance made the life of women better only partly. For example, humanism influenced the whole society, yet it seems that this did not particularly apply to women. As Detmer mentions, although humanists considered women equal to men in a spiritual way and people lower in rank were below them, they still had to submit to their husbands.¹⁴⁷ The true equality in marriage was not formed with the humanism, and its education did not affect women greatly as well. As Crane informs, only men continued to attend schools, so only daughters of families which could afford private tutors came to know the new learning.¹⁴⁸ In *The Shrew*, this idea makes up a considerable part of the plot. Baptista was looking for private tutors for his daughters and only due to that Lucentio and others could get close to Bianca by pretending to be ones.¹⁴⁹ Although Baptista does not really take Katherine's feelings into consideration, the fact that he cared about the education of both her and Bianca shows that he was progressive in a way, for he had to be both wealthy enough and willing to provide it to them. Baptista himself states that he is liberal when it comes to the upbringing.¹⁵⁰ It can be assumed that this state of education did not encourage women to learn. In *Kenilworth*, this is mentioned regarding Amy, who was naturally averse to studying and therefore learned basically nothing.¹⁵¹ Consequently, it is clear that women did not particularly thrive due to the humanist movement. The fact that a woman was the Queen also did not directly influence their position. Nevertheless, as Suzuki argues, Elizabeth was seen as a model for women trying to assert against men.¹⁵² Therefore, although her position did not help in an obvious way, it was motivating. Generally, the position of women was hard, because many bad traits were associated with them, as was discussed regarding Elizabeth. As Knowles notes, people thought women to be unstable and passionate.¹⁵³ The idea is described both in *The Shrew* and *Kenilworth*. In the former, a lord in the induction comments on the ability of women to cry

¹⁴⁷ Emily Detmer, "Civilizing Subordination: Domestic Violence and The Taming of the Shrew," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (Autumn, 1997): 278.

¹⁴⁸ Crane, "Early Tudor Humanism," 24.

¹⁴⁹ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 48-49.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁵¹ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 286-287.

¹⁵² Mihoko Suzuki, "Gender, Class, and the Social Order in Late Elizabethan Drama," *Theatre Journal* 44, no. 1 (March 1992): 44.

¹⁵³ James Knowles, "'Tied / To Rules of Flattery?': Court Drama and the Masque," in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 537.

whenever they want to.¹⁵⁴ Not unlike today, it could have been seen as a means of manipulating men to do their bidding. In *Kenilworth*, Amy comes to a conclusion that Leicester will be angry at her, but she will cry and that will soften his behaviour.¹⁵⁵ It is true that women could have used crying and other means to get what they wanted or be pardoned, but in a world in which their husbands were the masters of everything, this may have sometimes been the only way to influence their own life. However, despite the ongoing inferiority to their husbands, their role did change for better during the Renaissance. As Howard mentions, many texts defended women or otherwise participated in the discussion about their role in marriage etc.¹⁵⁶ The question of how exactly make them submit to their husbands was the most crucial in the debate. As Howard adds, a woman was capable of substituting for her husband in many daily activities.¹⁵⁷ This started to be stressed more and was the reason for changing the subordination. As Fletcher notes, people called for respecting women and stop with their beating.¹⁵⁸ The idea of taming is crucial for the whole play, therefore further discussed in the next chapter. Obviously, not all women listened to their husbands despite the pressure to do so. *The Shrew*, of course, presents Katherine as unwilling to be obedient for the most of its plot. Amy in the *Kenilworth* is not sometimes following the orders of her husband as well, particularly when she escapes to Kenilworth. Even more significantly, Leicester comments that she will not obey him if that order stains her honour, although Varney immediately stresses that she should.¹⁵⁹ Later in the novel, Amy confirms this attitude. She states that when it comes to her honour, she truly would not listen to him¹⁶⁰. Nevertheless, the idea that wife should obey anything her husband wishes continued to be present. It was the reason why it was crucial for Petruchio to tame Katherine and why the sun/moon argument was so significant, for she fully agreed with him out loud in the end.¹⁶¹ Leicester acts more kindly towards Amy than Petruchio towards Katherine, but he decides even about where she can and cannot be, forbids her to visit her father and scares her in a kind way whenever she starts to talk about something he does not want to discuss. Neither Petruchio nor Leicester use violence to tame their wives, but consider their superiority to

¹⁵⁴ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 20.

¹⁵⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 338.

¹⁵⁶ Jean E. Howard, "Was There a Renaissance Feminism?" in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), 645.

¹⁵⁷ Howard, "Was There a Renaissance Feminism?," 646.

¹⁵⁸ Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 198-201.

¹⁵⁹ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 281-282.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 431.

¹⁶¹ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 101-103.

them rightful. In the sun/moon argument, Petruchio states that Katherine should agree with him simply because it is him who says something is true.¹⁶² He strives to get to a point when she blindly follows his orders, as it is a necessary state their marriage has to reach. As Kahn comments, several instances in *The Shrew* shows the role of wives as degrading, without any embarrassment for taking it like that. The play is a farce of reality, in which husbands suppressed the will of wives on the basis of social norms and custom.¹⁶³ This leads to a conclusion that the whole idea of 'shrewishness' was not objective at all. Kahn supports this claim by stating that should Petruchio be a woman, he would be considered a shrew as well, since the whole issue is that behaviour desirable for men cannot be present in women.¹⁶⁴ Even some of the characters are aware of this. In one scene, Petruchio's servant states that Petruchio is more of a shrew than Katherine.¹⁶⁵ His actions may be shocking for people around, but since he is a man, his audacity is accepted if not appraised. While everyone is bewildered by his behaviour at the wedding, for example, there is no punishment for him. On the other hand, for Katherine to be named a shrew, she had to do nothing more than talk. For the same reasons, her sister Bianca was considered an ideal woman. As Kahn notes, submissive women were desirable, while rebellious were considered shrews. Katherine commented her situation, unable to do anything to change it and she constantly talked in defence.¹⁶⁶ When it comes to discussions about marriage, this is even more pressing. When Petruchio declares she loves him and wants to marry him, nobody listens to her disagreement.¹⁶⁷ This is probably because everyone wanted her to stop being a problem. In this atmosphere, her reactions are more than understandable. The comparison of Katherine's and Bianca's story is interesting as well. As Kahn explains, Bianca seems to have a romantic storyline, but she is still a piece of property, her father agreeing on her marrying whoever has more money.¹⁶⁸ The fact that money was the main thing to discuss when it came to marriage is depicted in *The Shrew* several times. The most striking example is the scene in which Baptista comments that love is important only after debating money.¹⁶⁹ On the other hand, this debate was normal and the fact that he even talked about love is notable. It is obvious that marriage was the most important thing for women to do in their lives, apart from giving birth to children. That is why Baptista decided

¹⁶² Ibid., 101.

¹⁶³ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 94-96.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 93.

¹⁶⁵ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 79.

¹⁶⁶ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 92.

¹⁶⁷ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 58-59.

¹⁶⁸ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 91.

¹⁶⁹ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 51.

to marry off Katherine before Bianca, to ensure husbands for both of them. As was seen in the case of Leicester, for example, secret marriages also took place. *The Shrew* comments on this, when right before Lucentio secretly marries Bianca, Biondello, page of Lucentio, comments that he knew someone who was married after going in the garden for a herb.¹⁷⁰ It is quite probable that similar examples happened in real life, surely making the parents upset. Due to the fact that women officially had no say in who they want to marry, even though their husband would control their entire life, the idea of secret marriages is understandable. Nobody would object to the behaviour of husbands to their wives, which is probably why Katherine is hopeless during the taming.¹⁷¹ It is no wonder, since when society takes something as a norm, many people do not even come to question it. As Detmer stresses, the community considered even the beating as a natural way of controlling the wife and intervened only when it started to be life-threatening.¹⁷² *Kenilworth* shows another example that the superiority of a husband was considered normal, even under harsh conditions. In one scene, Tresilian cannot believe Amy would not visit her ill father because somebody ordered her so and then asks, whether the man ordering it was entitled to do so as her husband.¹⁷³ Interestingly, Amy in *Kenilworth* is both obedient and rebellious. At the beginning, she listens to orders of her husband despite not wanting to, anytime she tries to discuss her condition and he stops her, she obediently mutes herself. It is only when it comes to her honour, as was already mentioned, or when her situation is dire that she breaks the rules. In one scene, she comments that she is disobedient because she has to in order to save her life, yet she means to listen to Leicester's will in anything else, believing in his protection.¹⁷⁴ She truly keeps this decision. Despite all the things happening, her letter, still full of love, ensures she would listen to anything but being with Varney, whom she fears.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, Amy starts to even think about being rebellious only after becoming uncertain that Leicester still loves her.¹⁷⁶ Interestingly, despite silent and obedient women were considered an ideal, both the *Kenilworth* and *The Shrew* suggests that in fact, men wanted a wife to be rebellious in a way. Elizabeth in *Kenilworth* states that according to her, men want women to be capable of competing with them.¹⁷⁷ Although this could be only an assumption since she is not a man,

¹⁷⁰ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 100.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 89-90.

¹⁷² Detmer, "Civilizing Subordination," 275-276.

¹⁷³ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 53.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 308-309.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 478.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 453.

The Shrew supports this idea. When Petruchio hears that Katherine struck Hortensio with the lute after he forced her fingers on it, he exclaims that now she intrigues him more.¹⁷⁸ It needs to be noted that while it seems that only a few women were rebellious, it was not the case. As Howard mentions, although literature mostly depicts women as silent and obedient, there is evidence that despite the lack of official authority, they often had surprising power and influence in the community.¹⁷⁹ Nevertheless, it is clear why Scott and Shakespeare chose to understand the obedient woman as a desirable norm. Scott needed Amy to be gentle for the purpose of the story and Shakespeare meant to use it to contrast this with Katherine's behaviour. What other goals they could have in mind is discussed in the next chapter.

¹⁷⁸ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 52-53.

¹⁷⁹ Howard, "Was There a Renaissance Feminism?," 649.

4 THE TAMING OF THE SHREW AND KENILWORTH ANALYSES

Perhaps the most important aspect of any literary work is how it is understood throughout time and what aims the author had in mind while producing it. While the influences under which the literary work was formed are crucial, its effect on the readers is perhaps equally important. In case of *The Shrew*, reviews and analyses are plentiful and can even help to see the bigger picture.

One of the most important things to consider when it comes to *The Shrew* is, according to Stanton, that Shakespeare often deliberately used tactics to allow different readings of the same play. In case of *The Shrew*, the gender is the main aspect allowing various interpretations.¹⁸⁰ It is clear that the text can be seen as misogynistic, due to the depiction of taming and Katherine's final speech where she talks as an obedient wife. However, there are other ways to understand it and as Stanton argues, the crucial fact is that Shakespeare let the readers/members of audience decide which of the many possible interpretations they want to see.¹⁸¹ Moreover, although the play seems to revolve around the question of women, it is not the only important theme. As Brockman notes, the focus on gender norms distracts from the theme of social mobility, the example of Tranio showing servanthood as nothing but a social performance.¹⁸² His ability to play the role of a master is stressed greatly, as he quickly adapts to the situation. Lucentio even compliments his word choice and Gremio states that Tranio could out-talk all of them.¹⁸³ It is easy to conclude that when the theatre-goers saw this kind of mobility on stage, they could start noticing its possibility in real life more. Similarly, the play could make them think about the genre roles. It can be only discussed how much Shakespeare actually wanted to use his plays for bringing awareness to various themes, but his ability to compose nuanced work would make this aim easy to achieve. In case of *The Shrew*, at least one allusion can be considered deliberate: making one thing the focus of the play to distract from another important theme. As Suzuki informs, changing the focus of a play from gender to class system and the other way around was a common practice, because

¹⁸⁰ Kay Stanton, "Intersections of Politics, Culture, Class, and Gender in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *The Merchant of Venice*," *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* 12, no. 27 (June 2015): 42-43.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 51.

¹⁸² Sonya L. Brockman, "Tranio Transformed: Social Anxieties and Social Metamorphosis in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Journal of Early Modern Studies* 4, no. 4 (2015): 220.

¹⁸³ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 45.

gender and class relations anxieties were considered analogous.¹⁸⁴ From this it is obvious that class mobility and gender relations were equally pressing themes in the age and were somewhat interchangeable in stage interpretations. That being said, the majority of analyses still focuses on the gender issue and since the mobility of servants was already discussed in the previous chapter, it is the main focus here as well.

As was mentioned, there are various ways to understand the play and its implications. According to Kahn, the age of Shakespeare was based on order through hierarchy. In *The Shrew*, he indicates that the division of power according to sex may be a mere illusion, if a woman must be submitted to a man for harmony to be preserved.¹⁸⁵ If this was the case, the idea was quite audacious, because this way of thinking could have been considered dangerous. The fact that Renaissance people took the subordination of wives as crucial obviously shaped the social life in many ways, it determined how people understood the world around them. According to Detmer, there is a historical evidence of anxiety when it came to rebellious women and shrews were commonly disciplined. The shrew taming was taken as a norm, therefore the contemporary audience was not likely to sympathize with Katherine at all.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, it was in his time that the whole idea of dominating women started to be reconsidered. As Detmer stresses, a movement urging men to use other means to control their wives than beating was taking place. Although the importance of taming was never questioned, it was discussed which means were permissible. In this perspective, Petruchio's taming was considered an improvement. Moreover, the absence of beating was a proof of Petruchio's gentleman status and the fact he worked on his own made him more manly than characters of previous plays about shrews, who cooperated with friends.¹⁸⁷ Katherine even utters the idea herself, probably to make it more impactful. In the scene when she strikes Petruchio, she adds that he would be no gentleman if he used violence on her.¹⁸⁸ At the same time, the play stresses the importance for Petruchio to tame Katherine, according to the needs of the age. In one scene, he basically takes it personally, because it insults him that others consider him incapable of doing it alone.¹⁸⁹ The fact that they do not believe it is suggested from the start till the end where Katherine's speech confirms his success to them. The disbelief is illustrated in a scene where Gremio calls Petruchio Hercules for taking up this

¹⁸⁴ Suzuki, "Gender, Class, and the Social Order in Late Elizabethan Drama," 42.

¹⁸⁵ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 88.

¹⁸⁶ Detmer, "Civilizing Subordination," 290.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 280-289.

¹⁸⁸ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 55.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 43-44.

task.¹⁹⁰ Due to this, Petruchio naturally puts emphasis on the issue. He even states that he was born for taming her.¹⁹¹ His superiority to other men is also illustrated by the fact that Hortensio studied his methods, yet was unable to successfully use them on his wife. It is easy to assume that the audience was likely to be greatly influenced by the message that only weak, low men use violence on their wives for the inability to tame them otherwise and reaching the goal without it is a sign of manliness. This also explains why Petruchio was so praised by other men at the end of the play.¹⁹² Another thing to be noted is that Katherine seems happy at the end. According to Kahn, this makes the dream of male dominance complete without real life consequences. On the other hand, the play is filled with farce, which also mocks the fantasy and suggests that Petruchio's manliness is infantile.¹⁹³ This statement further supports the idea that there are various ways to understand the play, since it is impossible to see his actions as silly and more manly at the same time. The whole question of Katherine's shrewishness is disputable as well. As Kahn comments, characters in the play take her shrewishness as granted, but the atmosphere could have made people question what in fact is shrewishness, more so because shrews in previous plays were always already married and considered tyrans for acting as husband generally did.¹⁹⁴ Even when Katherine did marry, it was not willingly, since she was forced into it by men (Petruchio and her father). This is illustrated by Petruchio stating that he will marry her even if she does not want to.¹⁹⁵ Unable to decide anything about her own life, she continued protesting in words, which consequently marked her as a shrew. Talking about her situation was the only means of coping with it, as she confirms by stating that she has to be free at least in words to endure it.¹⁹⁶ This is truly the only thing she can do. As Kahn argues, the play shows that male dominance make women less human and the sun/moon argument (p. 101–103) even demonstrates that it is a nonsense in itself, for it means that a man is right even if what he says is nonsense.¹⁹⁷ This scene in particular is, together with Katherine's final speech, one of the most discussed scenes in the play, once again with various interpretations.

¹⁹⁰ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 46.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 57.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 118.

¹⁹³ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 88-89.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 90.

¹⁹⁵ Shakespeare, *The Shrew*, 57.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹⁹⁷ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 96.

The most obvious understanding of the sun/moon argument and what follows it is that Katherine was broken at last, but there are other ways to see it. As Kahn explains, one interpretation is that both Katherine and Petruchio merely have to play their roles in the society. In the argument about sun and moon Petruchio understands that she is not sincere in her accepting his truth and mocks him as well, but takes it as a compromise, content with her obedience even if she thinks something else.¹⁹⁸ Another explanation, accepted mainly by modern theater workers, further this even more. As Costa informs, the director Lucy Bailey thinks that *The Shrew* is a type of love story, because only when Petruchio is not superior to Kate the play is not odd.¹⁹⁹ This refers to the first chapter, where it was stated that nobody knows how the plays were supposed to be performed. Moreover, Costa adds that a player of Katherine thinks that Petruchio finally gave her freedom of speech, because nobody listened to her the whole play and then everybody pays full attention to her final speech.²⁰⁰ One does not need to accept the idea of love story to see this last argument as valid. Even if it is not about love, it is disputable who won the taming. As Kahn stresses, the end of the play should be a triumph for Petruchio, however, Katherine's speech takes the spotlight from him. He was the most prominent character until now, but this speech is both the longest Katherine speaks and the longest in the whole play.²⁰¹ The fact that *The Shrew* can be seen as a love story, misogynist play, a play challenging the social structure and many other things comes to show Shakespeare's genius, as well as the uniqueness of his style of writing. There is no wonder that later authors appreciated him greatly, including Scott.

It is easy to see that Scott considered Shakespeare a great author and therefore was probably inspired by him. For one thing, the idea of Shakespeare's greatness pervaded the whole Romantic age, as was already explained in the second chapter, but there are other proofs Scott acknowledged him. In *Kenilworth*, for example, Shakespeare is an established author, his plays are frequently discussed. In one scene, a character comments he always remembers his words when wanting to think about something else.²⁰² Moreover, although the older generation did not really spend time with his plays, it is even considered normal to know his work by heart. This is illustrated in the scene when Elizabeth cannot remember part of his

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 96.

¹⁹⁹ Maddy Costa, "The Taming of the Shrew: 'This is not a woman being crushed'," published January 17, 2012, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/jan/17/taming-of-the-shrew-rsc>.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Kahn, "Mirror of Marriage," 98.

²⁰² Scott, *Kenilworth*, 219.

work but considers it normal that someone will.²⁰³ This would not have been possible in reality. As Jani stresses, Shakespeare was just a small boy in the year *Kenilworth* takes place.²⁰⁴ It seems that Scott made him an adult not only for admiring him, but also to be able to discuss the theatre of the age. In one scene, he lets the older generation criticize the theatre, because the bear-baiting, more manly entertainment, is neglected due to it.²⁰⁵ *Kenilworth* also makes characters discuss whether the theater is even beneficial. The scene gives two ideas, one is that plays keeps people from thinking about state affairs, the other that the plays make allusions to those affairs and it is dangerous to allow them.²⁰⁶ *Kenilworth*'s Elizabeth does not agree with this, appreciating the value of plays, the same way real Elizabeth famously did. Those examples also shows Scott's appreciation of Shakespeare, otherwise he would not discuss him so much. The appreciation was probable even stronger because Shakespeare's drama, as was mentioned, was closer to the genre of novel than it may seem. As Goethe explains (1989, quoted in Brown 2008), novels are about sentiments and events and with a passive hero, while drama revolves around characters and deeds and the hero is active. However, for example Hamlet, as a drama, is more about sentiments and therefore is partly similar to a novel.²⁰⁷ In *The Shrew*, the sentiments are more important than the events, so this statement applies on it as well. At the same time, of course, there is a lot of differences between the genres. As Arac mentions, one crucial difference between drama and novel is the fact that the plot of a novel must evolve slowly, the development of characters must come gradually as well.²⁰⁸ This makes sense, because a play, no matter how many days it encompasses, must be reasonably short for the performance to be manageable. In *The Shrew*, characters change their attitudes and actions, but time available for this development is limited, therefore it cannot go too deep. In *Kenilworth*, it is easier to become truly invested in characters, because characters develop in the course of many pages, according to how novel should be constructed. It seems necessary for *Kenilworth* to be constructed the right way, since when it comes to novels in general, *Kenilworth* is one of the most important in history.

²⁰³ Ibid., 235.

²⁰⁴ Darsha Jani, "Sir Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*: An Exquisite Amalgamation of History and Imagination," *Research Matrix-International Multidisciplinary Journal For Applied Research* 1, no. 4 (November 2013): 14.

²⁰⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 232.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 233-234.

²⁰⁷ Arac, "The impact of Shakespeare," 286.

²⁰⁸ Brown, "Theory of the novel," 263.

As Arata informs, *Kenilworth*, was the first novel to be published in the triple-decker format, which makes it the most influential work of fiction of the nineteenth century.²⁰⁹ Even more crucial was the novel in terms of historical novels. As Jani mentions, Scott laid the foundation of this specific genre.²¹⁰ It should be noted that to analyse historical novels, it is important to understand that they are a work of fiction and not history. Scott was well aware of that and never had an intention to describe historical events as they actually happened. As Jani explains, Scott's greatest skill was mixing historical facts with his own imagination. Instead of wanting the authenticity of events, he took history as a basis on which to lay his romantic speculations.²¹¹ Many critics understand that rather than history itself, capturing the feeling of the age as a whole was the most crucial goal for Scott. Brown states that he preferred when events seemed plausible, but the romance of uncertainty completed them.²¹² Truly, in *Kenilworth*, there is a lot of emphasis on imagining how certain real people could have acted under various circumstances etc., forming believable reactions although they cannot be proven. Due to the imagining, the characters come alive as well as the essence of the age, and despite possibly wrong assumptions, this is perhaps the most important aspect of the novel. The fact that history in literature does not have to be according to the true history is common both for Scott and Shakespeare, who famously changed some aspects in his historical plays without considering it wrong. Similarly, Scott altered several facts in *Kenilworth* as well.

There are various historical inaccuracies in the novel. As Jani informs, *Kenilworth* is probably set in 1575 (due to the real date of the royal party held there), but Amy died in 1560 and she had not married secretly. Her death was probably an accident, but it was suspicious and became one of the reasons Elizabeth did not marry Leicester. The Queen granted him the castle at *Kenilworth* only in 1563, the title of Earl a year later, therefore he was neither the Earl nor an owner of *Kenilworth* during Amy's life. Elizabeth truly was angry after finding out Leicester had secretly married, but it was not with Amy. Tressilian is likely made up, Foster, vulgar in the novel, was a gentleman etc.²¹³ However, it would be a mistake to think that because Scott changed the history for the purpose of his story, there was never a sufficient historical research as the basis. As Jani mentions, Scott inspected historical sources, ballads,

²⁰⁹ Arata, "Scott's Pageants," 99.

²¹⁰ Jani, "Sir Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*," 13.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Brown, "Theory of the novel," 270.

²¹³ Jani, "Sir Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*," 13-14.

chronicles and mainly plays.²¹⁴ One example of this is the legend of Wayland Smith, an invisible smith residing in a rock, which Scott used and transformed by his imagination into a human only thought to be supernatural. His imagined history is described in *Kenilworth* and skillfully used for the story. For example, it allows him to cure Sussex, so that he can continue rivalling with Leicester.²¹⁵ Scott studied several sources of rumours about Leicester and Amy as well. He admits that it was the elegy Cumnor Hall which inspired him the most and that he could have painted Leicester badly, yet he stresses that his contemporaries already considered Amy's death suspicious, for several reasons.²¹⁶ In *Kenilworth*, Leicester is painted as loving husband, only swayed by his ambitions and Varney reminding him that the kingdom would be in the hands of his enemies if he retreated. If the implication of Scott's research, described after the novel itself, is trustworthy, the real Leicester frequently used Dr. Julio to poison his rivals. This claim is supported by the fact that he died when his wife gave him a potion he had claimed to be a medicine. Scott explains that his character was changed for the novel, as should all the rumours be true, he was too evil for the story.²¹⁷ Dr. Julio was present in the novel as well, however, Leicester did not know that he uses poison against his rivals. This was just one of the many changes. However, due to Scott's research illustrated by those examples, it can be assumed that the essence of the age is well captured despite it.

The depiction of the people and age seems to be as authentic as it could possibly have been in this format. Records of Elizabeth's temper were not rare, therefore it is easy to assume Scott depicted her the right way due to the study of materials, as he did with many other examples of behaviours and events. The spirit of the age was therefore rather accurate, thus fulfilling the main aim of the novel. However, truth is that the novel is not well known nowadays and, as was the case with *The Shrew*, the way readers see it have changed during the course of time. Capturing the essence of the age being the main aim might be the reason why. As Jani informs, the novel was highly successful both with readers and critics when first published.²¹⁸ This is in contrast with the later reviews of the novel. As Arata judges, the reason people loved the novel when it first came out and later it changed was the fact that in the twentieth century, 'novel' was understood in terms of "the novel of domestic realism". The plot with Amy Robsart and her husband was therefore considered the main aspect, which was never the

²¹⁴ Ibid., 14.

²¹⁵ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 184.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 5-8.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 513-520.

²¹⁸ Jani, "Sir Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*," 14.

case. This plot was obviously not considered interesting or the focus of the novel from the very beginning. The main thing everybody appreciated were the spectacles for the Queen, making up considerable part of the ending.²¹⁹ This actually makes sense, because domestic dramas were probably occurring all the time and were nothing particularly new for the readers. What they really wanted, even more so in the Romantic age, was the ability to feel like the history was becoming alive before their eyes. And this, it seems, Scott managed brilliantly. It is true that for the modern reader, his style too often breaks the illusion. For example, there are comments about the behaviours and actions of characters. In one scene, Scott states that a character talked in a confusing manner and he now retells it so that readers might understand it.²²⁰ He also jumps in time sometimes in order to explain the plot. This is seen when Amy screams and then Scott wrote that it is necessary to go back a little to a scene with her to clarify why.²²¹ Interestingly, *Kenilworth* slightly resembles a play sometimes, which supports the idea of those genres being similar. Characters frequently talk to themselves out loud, as on the stage, which is illustrated, for example, by Tresilian talking alone about Amy.²²² Moreover, many references of how a place looked in his age are another disruption. For example, Scott describes Cumnor Hall and informs that the ruins may still be there.²²³ However, as Arata stresses, Scott never wanted the present to not exist within the story.²²⁴ Moreover, this type of information may break the illusion of the past being relived, but it allowed readers to connect the past with the present. Instead of the feeling of something happening somewhere, it was set in the real world, people could realise what places they daily passed by had actually existed in the past and how they changed, thus making the story more real in a way. Romanticism was focused on the connection with the past, so it could be said that the aim was fulfilled through this means as well, the great historical novelist properly linking his age with the age of Shakespeare.

²¹⁹ Arata, "Scott's Pageants," 99-100.

²²⁰ Scott, *Kenilworth*, 69.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 50.

²²² *Ibid.*, 51.

²²³ *Ibid.*, 38.

²²⁴ Arata, "Scott's Pageants," 102.

5 CONCLUSION

To conclude, the Renaissance and particularly humanism had great effect on the society and literature. It was a norm to reuse parts of older texts in the new ones, after altering them for a new purpose. People also started to look differently on their social roles, which allowed plays to focus on this question. Since basic education was more widespread, it enabled Shakespeare to use both clever rhetoric and play with words, which is significant for him. The way theaters operated, plays focused on allusion to real issues instead of illusion of reality, therefore it can be assumed that Shakespeare used the plays to influence the audience. Similarly, the fact that London was a city of immigrants made him situate many of his plays in a different country, such as *The Shrew* in Italy, and he also showed compassion with oppressed groups of people, often writing in a pro-feminist manner. Romantic nostalgia and the fact that English Romantics considered the Renaissance to be the best period of their kingdom could have influenced the way it is represented in *Kenilworth*. The Romantics also started to put emphasis on psychology of characters, for which Shakespeare was praised and became the most influential author for them. It was mostly taken as a truth that literature depicts the age of its origin better than anything else, however, Scott studied historical sources as well, therefore it is not clear whether this factor influenced his work or not. Nevertheless, Shakespeare's plays surely had an impact on it, since he was crucial for all the Romantics. In the Romantic age, middle class also started to read more and the reading experience became private, which gave importance to the opinions of the readers. In terms of the social roles in the selected works, the Queen could have been depicted differently than she was, due to the idea that everything in the Renaissance had been better, but also the fact that Scott was from Scotland, which would have had an opposite effect on her character. Nevertheless, her great temper, fits of anger followed by remorse and furious reactions to secret marriages corresponds with her character described in historical sources, as well as her love for Leicester. The Higher Nobility had a problematic position due to historical events and Tudor actions, making it necessary to please the Queen in order to stay in her favour, which led to many literary works during the age. The title no longer secured a position, therefore they could have been easily replaced by a man of lesser rank. Being in favour of Elizabeth meant receiving rewards from her, which they consequently divided between their dependants. This in turn strengthened their position and increased their prestige. The Lower Nobility started to be more successful in terms of finances than the peers, since they were quick to adapt to increasingly capitalistic market. This is illustrated in *The Shrew*, where gentry consists of

merchants. The members of this class distinguished themselves from the others in terms of their wealth and a good marriage was crucial, which is shown in *The Shrew*. *Kenilworth* stresses the importance of good marriage as well, but its main focus is on the fact that gentry started to feel equal to the Higher Nobility, due to the almost invisible differences between them. Servants were not in service their entire life, were taken as a part of the family, and masters were warned both against too close relationships and friendships with them and against subordinating them by force. The class mobility increased during the age, which made people focus on the clothes more than before. The women could not choose their husbands, they were considered shrews even for talking too much, and a movement to subordinate them without violence was taking place. It seems that this group is the only one with a representation that significantly does not reflect the reality, since there were more women capable of wielding power than the literature describing their ideal and norm as silent and obedient suggests. The consequent analyses of the works showed that *Kenilworth* was praised at first and later readers did not enjoy it as much, because they considered the plot to be the most important part, which was not the case. *Kenilworth* was filled with both historical facts from the research, a little alternated for the story, and various deliberate inaccuracies, because the history was meant to be only a basis for the romantic story. *The Shrew* can be interpreted in various ways, which was Shakespeare's aim. It can be seen as a misogynist play, a love story, a story about being broken to obedience, becoming able to speak and be heard, merely playing social roles and many other things. The focus on the theme of women who did not want to be obedient makes the illustration of possible social mobility less visible and it is notable that those two issues created analogical fears and plays often focused on one of them while dealing with the other. Neither work is supposed to be a strict representation of the reality, since *Kenilworth* focuses on the atmosphere of the age and romantic story and *The Shrew* deliberately uses farce to show the results of taming without bad consequences and the society where men are always right as devoid of logic. Perhaps the most crucial is the reminder that literary works have to be read critically, illustrated by many interpretations of *The Shrew* and possible influence of nostalgia on the representation of Renaissance England in *Kenilworth*.

6 RESUMÉ

Práce se zabývá problematikou vybraných společenských rolí v renesanční Anglii a jejich zobrazení v dílech *Zkrocení zlé ženy* a *Kenilworth*. Zkoumá, nakolik historické role odpovídají ztvárnění ve zvolené literatuře, zda je v románu ovlivnil jeho vznik v romantickém období, jaké vlivy působily na autory a také porovnává díla mezi sebou. K závěrům se dospělo za pomoci průzkumu sekundární literatury a analýzy literatury primární. Práce je rozdělena na pět kapitol – úvod, vlivy na literaturu v renesanční Anglii, vlivy na historický román v období romantismu, společenské role v renesanční Anglii, analýzy *Zkrocení zlé ženy* a *Kenilworthu*.

Z průzkumu k první kapitole vyplývá, že renesance a hlavně humanismus velkou měrou ovlivnily společnost i literaturu, která tak v sobě nese specifické prvky, jako je například používání částí starších textů v nových dílech nebo důraz na rétoriku. Stejně tak se v nich začala odrážet skutečnost, že lidé začali přemýšlet o svém místě ve společnosti a více jich mělo základní vzdělání, což Shakespeareovi umožnilo hrát si při tvorbě her pro masu s jazykem.

Druhá kapitola informuje, že pozdější romantismus se k renesanci vracel z důvodu nostalgie a vzniklého národnostního cítění a vnímal toto období v mnohem lepším světle, než jaké skutečně bylo, což mohlo ovlivnit jeho ztvárnění. Velký důraz začal být kladen na psychologii postav, Shakespeare byl za její ztvárnění obdivován, jeho díla začala být analyzována a velkou měrou ovlivnila autory. Čtení se touto dobou navíc stalo soukromou záležitostí a začalo záležet na názoru čtenářů. Vznik historických románů byl problematický, jelikož se dlouho vedly debaty, zda by vůbec měly existovat.

Třetí kapitola uvádí role popsané akademiky podle průzkumu historických materiálů a porovnává, nakolik jejich ztvárnění v dílech odpovídá historické realitě. Vybrané role jsou královna, vyšší šlechta, nižší šlechta, sluhové a ženy. Královna je v románu *Kenilworth* popsána jako temperamentní, často má záchvaty vzteku nad porušováním pravidel, zejména co se týče nepovolených manželství, následované výčitkami. To vše, včetně náklonnosti k Leicesterovi a mírnění rivality mezi ním a Essexem, odpovídá historickým faktům. Další rolí je vyšší šlechta, která měla složitější pozici než kdysi, jelikož tituly nadále nezajišťovaly přístup ke královně a proto se museli o její oblibu aktivně snažit. Z toho důvodu vznikala

početná literární díla, typická pro toto období. Šlechtici se jí často snažili zalichotit v naději, že se stanou králem, o což usiloval hlavně Leicester, ale být v její oblibě bylo obecně prospěšné, jelikož šlechtici od ní dostávali všemožné odměny, které následně rozdělovali mezi své přívržence, což navyšovalo jejich prestiž a přinášelo jim podporu proti nepřátelům i pro případ, že by si královnu znepřátelili. I tyto hlavní aspekty z reálného života jsou v *Kenilworthu* správně ztvárněné. Jakožto další probíraná skupina je představena nižší šlechta, která je z důvodu její nejednoznačné definice a příliš malých rozdílů mezi jednotlivými jejími vrstvami pro účely této práce definována jako skupina obsahující všechny jedince, kteří jsou na žebříčku výše než obyčejní lidé, a níže než nejvyšší šlechtici. Nižší šlechtici začali být finančně úspěšnější než vyšší, jelikož vyšší nedokázali tak úspěšně zacházet s financemi a stejně tak přizpůsobit se nové formě ekonomiky, jako zástupci šlechty nižší. Mezi sebou se tato skupina odlišovala podle bohatství, což je ve *Zkrocení zlé ženy* ilustrováno tím, že pokud někdo někoho zná jen podle jména, bohatství je první věc, kterou zmíní. Nižší šlechtici také kladli důraz na dobré manželství, přičemž bohatství budoucího partnera byla hlavní věc, kterou rodiče při jejich domlouvání zvažovali. Správný výběr partnera byl podstatný pro prestiž celé domácnosti, jelikož čím bohatší byl, tím lépe to působilo na okolí. To je také důvod, proč tajné svatby rodiče a blízké zúčastněných tak zasáhly, jak je ztvárněno v obou dílech. Další podstatný aspekt nižší šlechty byl, že přestávala brát vyšší šlechtu jako jim nadřazenou. Toto je doložené z historie, kdy se Philip Sidney pustil do sporu s hrabětem z Oxfordu. Vzhledem k tomu, že i lidé z nižší vrstvy šlechty se mohli dostat do Alžbětiny přízně, opravdu neměli důvod cítit se jakkoliv podřazení oproti vyšším šlechticům, pokud jim přímo nesloužili. Tato problematika je v dílech taktéž ztvárněna věrohodně. Jako předposlední probíraná skupina byli zvoleni sloužící. Lidé zpravidla sloužili jen určitou část svého života, což bylo známé a způsobovalo neochotu se své pozici plně přizpůsobit. Navíc bývali bráni jako součást rodiny, což komplikovalo vztahy. Jejich páni byli varováni jak před přílišným přátelstvím k nim, tak před používáním síly k zajištění jejich poslušnosti, a vzhledem ke vzrůstající sociální mobilitě byl velký důraz kladen na oblečení, které často bylo jedinou možností, jak od sebe vrstvy obyvatelstva odlišit. Otázku, zda opravdový původ je nebo není pod šaty vidět, odpovídají obě díla jinak, kdy *Kenilworth* soudí, že pouze obyčejný člověk rozdíl nepozná, a *Zkrocení zlé ženy* je na skutečnosti, že nejde o nic jiného než naučitelné chování, založené. V obou dílech je ale oblečení hlavním prostředkem skrytí skutečného původu člověka. Navíc, sociální mobilita touto dobou vzrůstala, a gentlemanem se muž mohl stát i prostým vystudováním vysoké školy. Toto vše, včetně kladení velkého důrazu na ošacení, je v dílech popsáno dle reality. Poslední probíraná

skupina jsou ženy. Průzkum osvětluje, že si nemohly samy zvolit manžela, i pouhé přílišné mluvení je označovalo za nežádoucí, a v průběhu renesance probíhalo hnutí za jejich kontrolování jinými způsoby než silou a násilím, jelikož takové metody byly neefektivní. Ačkoliv hnutí také volalo po upuštění od bití manželek proto, že humanismus připouštěl jejich duševní rovnost s manželi a v mnoha denních činnostech mohly manžela nahradit, jelikož stály výše než jim podřízení muži, nutnost jejich poslušnosti a krocení nikdy nebyla popírána. Popis této skupiny jako jediný nějak výrazněji neodpovídá skutečnosti, protože ačkoliv dobová literatura se neustále zaobírá ideální ženou jakožto tichou a poslušnou, ve skutečnosti se jich již nezanedbatelné množství dokázalo prosadit.

Čtvrtá kapitola nabízí analýzu děl. Z výzkumu vyplývá, že *Zkrocení zlé ženy* může být vnímáno několika způsoby, což Shakespeare záměrně běžně způsoboval. Hra může být podle postoje čtenáře brána jako misogynní, příběh o lásce, příběh o zlomení ženy nebo naopak o umožnění, aby ji ostatní začali poslouchat. To, že se *Zkrocení* zaměřuje na otázku postavení žen také zakrývá druhé podstatné téma, sociální mobilitu, což odpovídá skutečnosti, že obojí vytvářelo stejné obavy a často ve hrách bývalo zaměňované jedno za druhé. Co se týče *Kenilworthu*, romantismus mohl ovlivnit ztvárnění atmosféry a postav v něm, jelikož ve viktoriánské Anglii byla doba renesance pokládána za nejlepší období dějin, kdy vztahy byly pevnější, lidé poctivější a více se starali jeden o druhého. Ze stejného důvodu mohla být královna Alžběta I. popsána v lepším světle, než jaká opravdu byla, jelikož patřila mezi hlavní osobnosti tohoto období. Zároveň mohla být místy naopak zabarvena negativněji, jelikož Scott pocházel ze Skotska, které mělo s Anglií vždy napjaté vztahy. Tohoto ovlivnění, jak sám píše, se ale pokoušel vyvarovat. Analýza děl dále ukazuje, že *Kenilworth* obsahuje jak fakta, tak četné záměrné historické nepřesnosti, protože čistě reálné zobrazení nebyl úmysl. V době prvního vydání byli čtenáři nadšení, zatímco pozdější čtenáři toto nadšení nesdíleli. Jako důvod je uvedeno, že zápleтка je příliš nudná, avšak v době romantismu na ní čtenářům také nesešlo a oblíbili si hlavně znázornění renesanční atmosféry. Román často narušuje iluzi minulosti komentováním současného stavu, ale zapomenout během příběhu na přítomnost nikdy nebyl záměr. Osamělé promluvy postav připomínají monology na jevišti, což více zdůrazňuje propojení her s románem. Ani jedno z děl zcela neodpovídá realitě, *Kenilworth* pro záměrné nepřesnosti a *Zkrocení* přehnaným jednáním poukazuje na skutečnost, že pokud muž má mít pravdu za všech okolností bez ohledu na to, zda jeho jednání nepopírá logiku, společnost je nastavená špatně.

V páté kapitole jsou krátce shrnuty zjištěné závěry. Nejpodstatnější je nahlédnutí do problematiky různých interpretací Shakesperových her, což spolu s příkladem, že atmosféra romantismu mohla období zbarvit znovu připomíná, že nad literárními díly je třeba kriticky se zamýšlet. Práce také nabourává domněnku, že žen neodpovídajících ideálu tichosti a poslušnosti bylo málo, jak se dá soudit dle literárních děl z tohoto období. Tato problematika, která se zde z důvodu omezeného prostoru nemohla probírat do hloubky, otevírá možnosti dalšího zkoumání.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arata, Stephen. "Scott's Pageants: The Example of 'Kenilworth'." *Studies in Romanticism* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 99–107. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25601489?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.
2. Borman, Tracy. "Robert Dudley: Queen Elizabeth I's great love." Published January 8, 2016. <https://www.historyextra.com/period/elizabethan/robert-dudley-queen-elizabeth-is-great-love/>.
3. Brockman, Sonya L. "Tranio Transformed: Social Anxieties and Social Metamorphosis in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Journal of Early Modern Studies* 4, no. 4 (2015): 213–230. <http://www.fupress.net/index.php/bsfm-jems/article/view/15808/14813>.
4. Brown, Marshall. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 5, Romanticism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. <https://epdf.pub/the-cambridge-history-of-literary-criticism-vol-5-romanticism-v-5.html>.
5. Coss, P. R. "The Formation of the English Gentry." *Past & Present* no. 147 (May, 1995): 38–64. www.jstor.org/stable/651039.
6. Costa, Maddy. "The Taming of the Shrew: 'This is not a woman being crushed'." Published January 17, 2012. <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/jan/17/taming-of-the-shrew-rsc>.
7. Detmer, Emily. "Civilizing Subordination: Domestic Violence and *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (Autumn, 1997): 273–294. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2871017>.
8. Dickson, Andrew. "Multiculturalism in Shakespeare's plays." Published March 15, 2016. <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/multiculturalism-in-shakespeares-plays>.
9. Edwards, Adrian S. "Early Shakespeare sources: a guide for academic researchers. Part 1: manuscript and early print sources for Shakespeare's works." Published April 29, 2016. <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/early-shakespeare-sources-a-guide-for-academic-researchers-part-1>.

10. English Heritage. "History and Stories." Accessed June 16, 2019. <https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/kenilworth-castle/history-and-stories/>.
11. Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.
12. Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" In *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-structuralist Criticism*, edited by Josué V. Harari, 141–160. London: Methuen, 1979.
13. Gromelski, Tomasz W. 2010. "The greater and lesser nobility in early modern Europe: Poland-Lituania and England and Wales in the sixteenth century." EUI Working Papers. Max Weber Programme.
14. Hammer, Paul E. J. "Sex and the Virgin Queen: Aristocratic Concupiscence and the Court of Elizabeth I." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 77–97. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2671290>.
15. Hattaway, Michael, ed. *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000. <https://epdf.pub/a-companion-to-english-renaissance-literature-and-culture-blackwell-companions-t.html>.
16. Jani, Darsha. "Sir Walter Scott's Kenilworth: An Exquisite Amalgamation of History and Imagination." *Research Matrix-International Multidisciplinary Journal For Applied Research* 1, no. 4 (November 2013): 13–16.
17. Kahn, Coppélia. "'The Taming of the Shrew': Shakespeare's Mirror of Marriage." *Modern Language Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring, 1975): 88–102. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3194204>.
18. Krischer, André. "Noble Honour and the Force of Law: Trial by Peers, Aristocracy and Criminal Law in England from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century" in *What Makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jörn Leonhard, Christian Wieland, 67–89. Oakville: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. <https://books.google.cz/books?id=azPeXrxrDW4C&pg>.
19. Lovejoy, Arthur O. "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms." *PMLA* 39, no. 2 (Jun 1924): 229–253. https://www.jstor.org/stable/457184?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.
20. McIlvenna, Una. "Why Sir Walter Raleigh Was Beheaded." Published October 29, 2018. <https://www-history->

com.cdn.ampproject.org/v/s/www.history.com/.amp/news/sir-walter-raleigh-execution-reasons?amp_js_v=0.1&usqp=mq331AQCKAE%3D.

21. Oxford Reference. "Merrie England." Accessed June 16, 2019. <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100151694>.
22. Palliser, D.M. *The Age of Elizabeth: England Under the Later Tudors 1547–1603*. New York: Longman Inc., 1992.
23. Scott, Walter. *Kenilworth*. Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1831. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc2.ark:/13960/t5cc17972&view=1up&seq=7>.
24. Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. USA: Penguin Books Inc., 1967.
25. Stanton, Kay. "Intersections of Politics, Culture, Class, and Gender in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *The Merchant of Venice*." *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* 12, no. 27 (June 2015): 41–54. <https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/mstap/12/27/article-p41.xml>.
26. Suzuki, Mihoko. "Gender, Class, and the Social Order in Late Elizabethan Drama." *Theatre Journal* 44, no. 1 (March 1992): 31–45. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3208514>.
27. The National Archives. "Earl of Leicester to Elizabeth." Accessed June 16, 2019. <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/elizabeth-monarchy/earl-of-leicester-to-elizabeth/>.
28. The National Archives. "Elizabeth's first speech." Accessed June 16, 2019. <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/elizabeth-monarchy/elizabeths-first-speech/>.
29. Quilligan, Maureen. "Sidney and His Queen," in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, edited by Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier, 171–196. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988). <https://books.google.cz/books?id=msF3SYd4-ZoC&pg>.