

AN EXAMINATION OF HUMAN ANATOMY IN THE DRAMA OF THE EARLY
MODERN PERIOD

by

JAMES TODD HENNESSEY

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

The Shakespeare
Institute
School of Humanities
University of Birmingham
August, 2016

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

An examination of the science of human anatomy and dissection as it occurs in plays of the early modern period. After an introduction that contextualizes the uses and occurrences of dissection in a group of plays in the period, the thesis then moves on to examine the state of human anatomy in England at the time as well as an overview medical training, textbooks and information that may have been available to the public at large. This leads to an examination of a group of plays that refer explicitly to the practice of anatomy, and considers the function of human dissection and anatomy in those plays. In this, the theatrical representation of anatomy is examined with an eye toward investigating the nature of these representations.

Dedication

For my mother, Marion Joyce King (September 6, 1945 – May 17, 2015).

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the staff of the Shakespeare Institute as well as the staff of the Ferris Hodgett Library, Grenfell Campus, Memorial University of Newfoundland for all the invaluable assistance and support. I would also acknowledge and thank my supervisor, Dr. Kathleen McLuskie.

This would simply not have been possible without the support of my wife, Katherine Lockhart and my son, Jacob, who left friends and family to spend two years in Stratford-upon-Avon and spent the last several years helping me through this. I hope they both think it was worth it.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	5
Chapter One: Introduction – Jonson and Anatomy	1
Chapter Two: Anatomy in England.....	33
Chapter Three: Anatomy in Print and Culture	62
Chapter Four: Martial and Territorial Drama.....	127
Chapter Five: Women and Gender.....	164
Chapter Six: Memento Mori.....	223
Chapter Seven: Conclusion.....	242

Chapter One: Introduction – Jonson and Anatomy

In 1598, the Lord Chamberlain's Men presented *Every Man in His Humour* at the Curtain Theatre (Miola 7). This, the quarto version of Jonson's play, is set in Florence with a cast of Italian characters. The inter-mingling of several plot lines that occurs in the play is Jonson's very effective method of creating an interwoven, and vibrant, social scene and it is through this representation of a broad cross-section of a fictional society, that Jonson is free to represent a diverse set of characters, themes and ideas that compete, collude, or simply collide with one another on the stage. In the introduction to a parallel text edition of *Every Man in His Humour*, J. W. Lever notes that in this play, Jonson is interested in using the popular theory of 'humours' to skewer affectation and fad, that Jonson takes 'the word as a vague portmanteau term for mood, eccentricity, or whim' (xiii), and that later plays, like the follow-up *Every Man Out of His Humour*, will be devoted to a more scathing satire.

When the First Folio of Ben Jonson's works was published in 1616 it included a substantially revised version of *Every Man in his Humour*, it is the first play in the folio. While a more complete examination of this play follows later in this chapter, for now it is only to note that among the score of changes that Jonson makes to the play, one of the alterations was to include one, perhaps slight, reference to human dissection, to anatomy. First published in 1598 without this reference, we are left to wonder why Jonson would make this alteration in the years before the play was prepared for publication in the folio. What is also perhaps intriguing is that Jonson would add this reference to a 'humours' play. It certainly suggests that for Jonson and, presumably those interested in the play (both readers and spectators), this was a reference worth including, that it was an interesting enough topic to warrant this

revision. The tension this presents, in the possible juxtaposition of competing medical theories will help frame this thesis. It is perhaps worth taking a longer look at *Every Man in His Humour*, as the overall structure not only helps contextualize this play against others of Jonson (that also represent both the humoral theory and the relatively new science of anatomy) but that also helps contextualize other plays and their theatricalized approach to anatomy on the stage. One of the questions pursued throughout this thesis is dramaturgical – how the inclusion of anatomy and dissection is integral to the plays themselves.

The basic plot of *Every Man in His Humour* involves the concern of a father, Lorenzo Senior, for his wayward son, Lorenzo Junior. Lorenzo Junior has surrounded himself with a group of rakish young men, busy wasting time (and money) in the lower end pubs of London. It is in these locations that Jonson introduces his group of lower class characters, as well as the braggart soldier Bobadill. In an attempt to track the behaviour of his son, Lorenzo Senior tasks his servant, Musco, to disguise himself as a beggar-soldier and follow Lorenzo Junior. Musco, in an attempt to curry favour, betrays the plot to Lorenzo Junior. In the meantime, there is a sub-plot that involves the merchant Thorello who is concerned that his wife, Bianca, is cheating on him, very possibly with Lorenzo Junior's group of cohorts.

Jonson's play rests on the antique – the father-son relationship, the scheming servant, the braggart soldier all point to Jonson's reliance on a classic comic structure. As David Bevington points out 'Jonson seems to be going back to the so-called Old Comedy of Aristophanes for his ideas about dramatic structure...' (117). Clearly this is also a play that makes use of the Galenic system of 'humours', a system that Jonson and other writers (Shakespeare and Chapman, as pointed out by

both Bevington (114) and Miola (13) in their respective introductions) make use of for satiric effect. As Robert Miola puts it, 'Jonson insistently and self-consciously transforms humours physiology into a method of characterization and a structural principle, thus creating a drama not so much of interaction as of display' (13). Jonson puts his society on display, and in *Every Man in his Humour* skewers the fad of affecting 'humours', and the satiric swipe at this kind of affectation takes several forms in the play. Lorenzo Senior will chide his son's 'fantastic humour' (1.2.194)¹, while Lorenzo Junior will encourage Stephano, the 'country gull', to affect a melancholy humour so that he might better fit into the social sphere of London's gallants (1.2.119). As the gull, Stephano is the object of much mockery in the play, as he vainly attempts to ape the style of the city. His naiveté is exposed when he meets Matheo, the 'city gull':

STEPHANO. Ay, truly, sir, I am mightily given to melancholy.

MATHEO. Oh, Lord, sir, it's your only best humour, sir. Your true melancholy breeds your perfect fine wit, sir. I am melancholy myself divers times, sir, and then do I no more but take your pen and paper presently, and write you your half-score or your dozen of sonnets at a sitting. (2.3.79-84)

This vogue for affecting humours is neatly satirized later in the play by the servants, Piso and Cob:

PISO. Thy rheum? Thy humour, man, thou mistakest.

¹ All textual references are to Miola.

COB. Humour? Mack, I think it be so, indeed. What is this humour? It's some rare thing, I warrant.

PISO. Marry, I'll tell thee what it is, as 'tis generally received in these days: it is a monster bred in man by self-love and affectation, and fed by folly.

COB. How? Must it be fed?

PISO. Oh, ay, humour is nothing if it be not fed. Why, didst thou never hear of that? It's a common phrase, 'Feed my humour'.

COB. I'll none on it. Humour, avaunt, I know you not, be gone.

(3.1.144-156)

References to humours abound throughout the play, though they are not always as pointed as the preceding examples might suggest. Rather, the play is peppered with uses of the word, which suggests, at least in certain situations, it is a common turn of phrase, an expression used frequently. Prospero will taunt his friend Lorenzo Junior with 'Nay, what a drowsy humour is this now?' (2.3.24), suggesting that the term had become colloquial (Bevington calls it 'slangy' (115)).

Every Man in his Humour, then, is a play that does not entirely concern itself with its titular feature of the humours. The reliance on a classic structure all but dictates both the plot and sub-plot: the concerned father's attempts to rehabilitate his reckless son, while a husband becomes ever more concerned about the actions of his wife. This is not a play that needs, necessarily, to make use of Galen to further the plot – this classic plot furthers itself. Instead, Jonson paints a rich and vibrant picture of London life, one that is broad-ranging and inclusive in its scope. Early in the play Lorenzo Senior is scolding Stephano for his affectations, and while it is

standard fare, the sort of trope that one would expect in a comedy, it is illustrative of Jonson's larger concern of using a broad canvas:

Cousin, lay by such superficial forms,
And entertain a perfect real substance.
Stand not so much on your gentility,
But moderate your expenses now at first
As you may keep the same proportion still.
Bear a low sail. (1.1.74-79)

Lorenzo Senior is concerned for Stephano's behaviour but even so, cannot prevent the country gull from vainly trying to affect the style of the city. The affectation of humours is integral to the mockery but it is a part of this broader picture that Jonson paints of society. Lorenzo Senior's advice to his son and to his cousin represents a standard paternal trope (Senior's admonition to Musco that he shouldn't disturb Junior if 'he be at study', is the sort of wishful thinking that denotes his wasted concern for his son), and Jonson fills the play with a series of standard scenes, leaning on the classical comic influence and helping to flush out the large tapestry that the author is working within.

So, spiralling out from the plots involving Lorenzo Junior and Stephano, Jonson fills in the play with the complicated disguise plot that sees Musco attempting to double-cross his rightful employer, while Stephano tries in vain to find friends among Lorenzo Junior's contemporaries. Jonson's subplots involve the jealous Thorello who is convinced that his wife is being unfaithful with Lorenzo Junior's circle of friends. The action of the sub-plots takes place, in part, in a tavern where we also

come to meet inn-keepers, servants and the braggart soldier, Bobadill. Imagining he has been slighted by Lorenzo Junior's friend Prospero, Matheo has come to enlist Bobadill to his aid. This leads to the over-blown Bobadill attempting to teach Matheo the finer points of swordplay with two 'bedstaves'. Armed as they are, Bobadill proceeds to give instruction in the staccado and the bastinado, encouraging Matheo to 'twine your body more about you that you may come to a more sweet, comely, gentlemanlike guard' (1.3.200-203). These two 'zanies' will then approach Prospero, where Bobadill will attempt to impress all with his overblown tales and long-winded speeches of vainglorious battle. It is ridiculous, it is fun, and it is all part of the social fabric on display in *Every Man in his Humour*.

Both Bevington (117) and Miola (32) point out that Jonson based his characterization of Bobadill on the *Miles Gloriosus*, the braggart soldier of Plautine comedy. It is one more example of Jonson's use of the classical comic structure and the play fighting of the clowns seems to owe more than a little to the Commedia dell'arte of the Italian theatre. As Miola says, 'in *EMI* he (Jonson) appropriates and transforms classical, medieval, and, to a lesser degree, Italian texts and traditions' (32). An audience's appreciation of these forms would no doubt serve to increase enjoyment and Jonson's plays are shot through with theatrical and meta-theatrical devices, as we shall see. With specific reference to *Every Man in His Humour*, Jonson extends the social world that he has constructed to include the fabricated world of the playhouse itself, through the use of meta-theatrical references and broad, knowing hints to the audience about the world that they are in. The principal example once again involves the two clowns, as their ignorance and failed attempts to be fashionable also includes an attempt at writing.

BOBADILL. What new book have you there? What? 'Go by,
Hieronimo!'

MATHEO. Ay, did you ever see it acted? Is't not well penned?

BOBADILL. Well Penned? I would fain see all the poets of our time pen
such another play as that was. They'll prate and swagger and keep a
stir of art and devices when, by Godso, they are the most shallow,
pitiful fellows that life upon the face of the earth again.

MATHEO. Indeed, here are a number of fine speeches in this book: 'O
eyes, no eyes, but fountains fraught with tears!'; there's a conceit,
'fountains fraught with tears'. 'O life, no life, but lively form of death!'
Is't not excellent? 'O world, no world but mass of public wrongs' – Oh,
God's me! - 'Confused and filled with murder and misdeeds.' Is't not
simply the best that ever you heard? Ha, how do you like it? (1.3.126-
140)

Miola points out that Jonson's reference to *The Spanish Tragedy* ('Go, by
Hieronimo') is part of a theatrical joke – Jonson uses a 'stock phrase to imply
anything disagreeable, inconvenient, or old-fashioned' (107), in the midst of his own
play. The meta-theatrical effect may be compounded, as Bevington points out that
Jonson not only wrote revisions for *The Spanish Tragedy*, but acted the part of
Hieronimo (142). The knowing references to the theatre are a feature that recurs
through the play. Thorello will complain loudly about Prospero that:

He makes my house as common as a mart,

A theatre, a public receptacle

For giddy humour and diseased riot.

And there, as in a tavern or a stews,

He and his wild associates spend their hours

In repetition of lascivious jests,

Swear, leap, and dance, and revel night by night (1.4.53-58)

Jonson's knowing winks to the audience are part of the joke, to be sure, they also point up a simple, and often over-looked fact about theatrical presentation, that it is an illusory world; the examination of plays throughout the thesis will probe this fact. This helps to frame the questions that arise when interrogating the allusions to human anatomy found in the plays examined for this thesis. If these references are in support of the play world, they become theatrically important, which raises further questions about dramatic intent, verisimilitude and thematic function.

David Bevington suggests that 'Jonson's blueprint as dramatist, in *Every Man in His Humour*, is to bring together a collection of if highly idiosyncratic humours characters in one place so that they can foolishly interact and also be critically observed by witty interpreters who point out for us, as audience, what is so amusing about the human foibles on display' (116). That Jonson revises his play and moved it from Italy to London may be taken as a further suggestion that he meant to satirically represent his own time and place on the stage. But it also seems to be more than a simple substitution. As Miola says, 'Jonson is clearly intent... upon initiating in this play a new kind of urban comedy', a comedy that keeps and builds on all the elements used and borrowed for the initial version of the play, including the meta-theatrical awareness of the play world. Jonson presents a broad social world on stage and uses the theory of humours in the service of character and type, in effect

theatricalizing the medical theory for use on the stage. The introduction of anatomy into this play world may be more than a nod to the familiar, it is perhaps also useful to view the general use of anatomy on the stage in a similar way, as a theatrical device, borrowed, and adapted for use on the stage.

Some eighteen years after the first production of *Every Man in his Humour*, Jonson will give the play a place of pride in the Folio publication of his collected works in 1616. This *Every Man* has been revised, as mentioned, and, amongst other changes, the Florentine location has been given over to London and all the character names Anglicized. There are a host of other changes (large and small) but the essential plot remains the same. The quotations found above are all from the Quarto version of the text and the differences between these passages and the Folio are slight; many of the revisions simply seem to have been made for the sake of clarity or dramatic thrust. So, as just one example, in the exchange between Piso and Cob about humours, the Quarto line of Piso's, 'Marry, I'll tell thee what it is, as 'tis generally received in these days: it is a monster bred in man by self-love and affectation, and fed by folly', becomes a more determined and confident line, without the 'as 'tis generally received', (and now spoken by Cash) to 'Marry, I'll tell thee, Cob: it is a gentlemanlike monster, bred in the special gallantry or our time by affectation, and fed by folly' (iii.ii.164-166).

Jonson changed the location, and the names of his characters, and evidently took the time to make a host of minor changes to his play, the result of which is a tighter, leaner, more dramatic story that has been relocated, perhaps to increase its appeal, perhaps, as indicated, as part of a strategy to develop a new form of comedy for the early modern stage. It is difficult to know when Jonson made this revision, but it is conceivable that it was as early as 1606, meaning that the revision of *Every Man*

in his Humour happened approximately eight years after its first presentation and a full decade before taking its place at the front of the Folio. This also suggests that the revised version of the play was performed some time before it was published.

If the host of additions, alterations, and changes that Jonson made to the play are intended to enhance the drama we are able to ponder the significance of one rather curious addition. In the Quarto, Lorenzo Senior's slave Musco disguises himself as a soldier, ostensibly to spy on Lorenzo Junior. Musco, however, has decided that it would be to his greater advantage to double-cross the father and so betrays the plot to the son. Musco soon finds himself in a (comic) predicament as he re-enters Lorenzo Senior's house now disguised as a different soldier (a beggar-soldier named Portensio). To disarm Lorenzo Senior, Musco fools him into thinking that Lorenzo Junior has seen through his disguise and knows he is working for Lorenzo Senior:

LORENZO SENIOR. But how should he know thee to be my man?

MUSCO. Nay, sir, I cannot tell, unless it were by the black art.

Is not your son a scholar, sir?

LORENZO SENIOR. Yes, by I hope his soul is not allied

To such a devilish practice. If it were,

I had just cause to weep my part in him,

And curse the time of his creation.

But where didst thou find them, Portensio?

MUSCO. Nay, sir, rather you should ask where they found me, for I'll be sworn I was going along in the street, thinking nothing, when of a sudden one calls, 'Signor Lorenzo's man!'; another, he cries,

‘Soldier!’; and thus half a dozen of them, till they had got me within doors, where I no sooner came but out flies their rapiers and, all bent against my breast, they swore some two or three hundred oaths, and all to tell me I was but a dead man if I did not confess where you were, and how I was employed, and about what. Which, when they could not get out of me - as God’s my judge, they should have killed me first! – they locked me up into a room in the top of the house, where by great miracle, having a light heart, I slid down by a bottom of packthread into the street and so scaped. (4.1.25-37)

This sequence is nearly identical in the Folio, though in the later version Lorenzo Senior is now Kno’well and Musco is renamed Brainworm. However, nearly identical is not exactly identical; Jonson makes one intriguing addition to the story (emphasis mine):

BRAINWORM. You should rather ask, where they found me, sir, for, I’ll be sworn I was going along in the street, thinking nothing, when, of a sudden, a voice calls, ‘Master Kno’well’s man!’: another cries, ‘Soldier!’: and thus, half a dozen of ‘hem, till they had called me within a house where I no sooner came, but the seemed men, and out flew all their rapiers at my bosom, with some three or fourscore oaths to accompany ‘hem, and all to tell me, I was but a dead man, if I did not confess where you were, and how I was employed, and about what; which, when they could not get out of me – **as I protest, they must ha’ dissected, and made an anatomy of me, first, and so I told ‘hem** – they locked me up into a room i’the top of a high house,

whence by great miracle, having a light heart, I slid down by a bottom
of pack-thread into the street, and so scaped. (4.4.24-39)

Sometime after 1598, perhaps as early as 1606, Jonson changed the mock threat of violence against Musco/Brainworm to include a reference to anatomy – ‘dissected, and made an anatomy of me’. The tone is comedic and Brainworm manages a double-pun; the servant would never betray the master (he would sooner die than betray a confidence) and heightens the threat of the rapiers at his breast (the gang may as well anatomize him with their swords). The comedic tone of the line is reminiscent of Jonson’s use of humours throughout – it is offhand, slight, and has the air of commonplace; Brainworm simply throws out the reference. As with other revisions to the play, this addition does help clarify Brainworm’s character and disposition; his position as classic parasitic slave is solidified in his bombast. Beyond that, this specific reference does little to further the play or the plot, and Jonson’s deliberate decision to include it in a play about humours is, if nothing else, a curious one. It is a joke, and perhaps the satire of affection continues here. As with the ‘Hieronimo’ line, perhaps Jonson is satirizing the use of anatomical references on the stage and suggesting that it, too, has become over worn. If we accept that the play was not only revised, but performed, by 1606, and if we further accept that Jonson is satirising the use of anatomy it may be possible to suggest that audiences had quickly come to accept these references as a theatrical device quite early in the period. Nevertheless, this is a play that rests its comic intent on the system of humours devised by Galen. Some years after the play’s original composition, Jonson chooses to add a reference to the newly evolving science of anatomy, a science that would seem to be in direct conflict with the teaching of Galen and his followers. This apparent dichotomy is dealt with in the following chapter, for now, it is worth

considering Jonson's revision of *Every Man in his Humour* in relation to a study of the importance of anatomy in the period, and the prevalent use of 'anatomies', in one form or another.

These speeches are presented here at length to also illustrate the point that in nearly every other respect, these versions of the play are the same. In both Musco/Brainworm is chased by 'half a dozen', threatened with rapiers and death and nearly escapes all this by sliding out of his prison. The only addition in the later version is the addition of the reference to anatomy and it, in and of itself, adds little to the speech. It is not an act of further violence – Brainworm is hyperbolizing for effect. It is the contention of many modern scholars that the use of anatomy in the period is largely satirical and used principally as a threat. The nature of that threat is seen as extreme, as a form of humiliation after death, with the mutilation of the corpse seen as an act of degradation. It is certainly possible to see a similar use of anatomy in the theatre (and these examples will be discussed) but as Jonson's use of the term so aptly illustrates, the use of anatomy in the theatre can be markedly different and serve an altogether different end, a theatricalized end that fits in with Jonson's dramatic aims and a vision for this new 'urban comedy'.

The intriguing puzzle this presents (the largely unanswerable question as to why Jonson would make this alteration) has ultimately led to this thesis and it would seem that Jonson was not alone in his interest in human anatomy and dissection: some seventy plays that contain a reference to anatomy were examined, forty-five of which are included in this thesis. As the examination of these plays will show, these plays refer to anatomy in a variety of ways, from a usage of the term that means skeletal (and there are abundant references to skeletons in these plays) to the actual

act of human dissection to more poetical, more metaphorical ends. The diversity of meaning is also apparent in the works of Jonson as in other playwrights.

Consider *The Case is Alter'd*, a play that borrows from Plautus and in which Jonson works to present a classic structure and plot. The altercations, misunderstandings, and miscommunications are standard Plautine comedy and the one reference to anatomy occurs in the midst of a great misunderstanding. A groom, Onion, and a cobbler, Juniper, have been snooping in the garden of one Jaques (who all mistake for a beggar), looking for Rachel (who all assume to be the daughter of Jaques; she isn't). Juniper and Onion are attempting (poorly) to seduce Rachel, when Jaques discovers them, and he assumes they have come looking for the cache he has buried in his back yard. Catching Juniper, he proceeds to examine him bodily, looking for clues that this supposed thief has been digging up his yard. Finding no dirt in Juniper's fingernails, Jaques then threatens to 'rip the soles' of his captor's shoes. Leading to this outburst:

JUNIPER: What are you mad? Are you detestable? Would you make
an anatomy of me? Think you I am not true orthography?

JAKES: 'Orthography?' 'Anatomy?' (4.7.65-67)

This is followed by Jaques' rough, physical exam of Juniper. It can be argued that anatomy is used here in a strictly metaphorical sense, that Juniper is protesting the examination of his various parts. Jaques has been, and continues to assess Juniper's body in his attempts to determine if his gold is still safe. And yet, there is also the sense, in the sheer physicality of Jaques' actions, that Jonson conflates the metaphorical and the physical and, once again, perhaps to the point of meta-theatricality, the rough physicality of the clowns (Jaques will probe Juniper's arms

and legs and roughly comb through his hair) sends itself up and reminds us again of the commedia. It seems an action designed to call attention to itself and so seems designed as a deliberate wink to the audience. In this spirit, the closest the play gets to dissection is Jaques' threat to rip up Juniper's shoes, but we are left with the daunting stage picture of Jaques reaching for a knife with which to do so. It is at that moment that Juniper protests the 'anatomy'. The comic outburst is characteristic of Juniper's mishandling of language throughout the play, though here Jonson manages a sublime joke in suggesting that Juniper's honesty is 'true' and that he can be read as honest, as suggested by his comic use of 'orthography'. We are also reminded that 'rip' could connote 'dissect' and that is also part of a joke that relies, for full effect, on the rough stage business, an allusion to 'reading' the book of a body, and a fanciful dissection at which a reader would be present.

The Case is Altered is the earliest of Jonson's plays to make specific reference to anatomy and in this scene Jonson manages a hearty mix of usage and meaning, relying ultimately on the physicality of the business to present a comic dissection. Another layer to the joke may be that Jonson has injected a reference to the practice of anatomy within the Plautine structure of the play itself. We are reminded that the practice of anatomy was not in and of itself new, but new to the audiences of Jonson's theatre and while the playwright may have had an appreciation of the work of classical anatomists it strikes the reader that this is a clever conflation of several images that serve to build an elaborate visual pun. As will be described in more detail, the historical anatomy lesson (and the model broken down by Vesalius) involved a reader, who read aloud from an anatomy text, and an assistant who did the cutting). Does Jonson here borrow, and comically twist, this setup to make this joke? A full appreciation of this joke would have required a rather

complete understanding of anatomy lessons and how audiences may have come by that information is a question that has been pursued by scholars interested in this topic. The next chapter will attempt to provide some arguments in this regard. It would seem, given the nature of the references to anatomy found in these plays, that audiences had access to this information. How they may have come by this information is an intriguing question; a partial theory is presented in the next chapter.

Other plays of Jonson that deal with anatomy will be examined later, but it is intriguing to note that along with an interest in the new science, Jonson will continue to refer to Galen's classical theory throughout his writing career. *Every Man in His Humor* is the early, and very clear, example of Jonson's satirical goals. The follow-up, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, is the second example of the mix of the traditional (as represented by Galen) with the new sciences. In *Every Man Out of His Humour* Jonson even goes so far as to remind his audience of the definition of 'humours'. As Asper tells us in the induction

O, I crave pardon. I had lost my thoughts.

Why, humour (as 'tis, ens) we thus define it

To be a quality of air or water,

And in itself holds these two properties,

Moisture and fluxure. As for demonstration:

Pour water on this floor, 'twill wet and run;

Likewise, the air, forced through a horn or trumpet,

Flows instantly away, and leaves behind

A kind of dew. And hence do we conclude
That what so'er hath fluxure and humidity,
As wanting power to contain itself,
Is humour. So, in every human body
The choler, melancholy, phlegm, and blood,
By reason that they flow continually
In some one part and are not continent,
Receive the name of humours. (85-100)

Having re-affirmed the classical position, Jonson follows immediately with a reference to dissection:

they shall see the time's deformity
Anatomized in every nerve and sinew,
With constant courage and contempt of fear. (118-120)

Here, in the opening of the play, Jonson calls attention both to the older, perhaps even old-fashioned, trope of humours (one that now needs an explanation) and undercuts it with the new science. Jonson uses anatomy to metaphorically extend into the physical, 'every nerve and sinew', and in so doing calls attention to the physical nature of dissection.

Every Man out of his humour, it turns out, is a sinewy play. Consider Cordatus' conclusion that no courtier (exemplified by 'sinewy and altogether unaffected graces' (2.3.338-339) would object to the opening of 'such an empty trunk as this Brisk is? Or think his own worth impeached by beholding his motley inside?'

(2.3.339-340). Likewise, Fastidious, promises to bring Macilente (described as a 'lank and raw-boned anatomy' (4.3.109), skeletal) to the court where he will 'see sweet silent rhetoric and dumb eloquence speaking in her eye, but when she speaks herself, such an anatomy of wit, so sinewized and arterized that 'tis the goodliest model of pleasure that ever was behold' (3.1.91-92). Here again, we encounter the literary anatomy, the intellectual dissection of thought, brought up against the conditions of dissection. J. W. Lever points out that Jonson called *Every Man in His Humour*, 'A Comoedie', while *Every Man Out* was labeled 'A Comical Satyre' (xiii). Miola, in his introduction, details the controversy surrounding *Every Man Out* (235), and the subsequent alterations that were made to the play. Jonson seemed determined, in *Every Man Out*, to push the satire, to skewer the affectations of the age and it is, in the writing, a decidedly darker, more acidic play. It is also more physical, and in pressing the social attack, Jonson sharpened his use of both the language of humours and the language of anatomy. In the Induction, Cordatus will describe, in meta-theatrical fashion, *Every Man Out* as 'Vetus Comoeadia', Old Comedy (see note, 271), marking *Every Man Out's* classical construction as Aristophanic satire. This is another distinctive difference from *Every Man in*; though both plays are classical in structure, *Every Man Out's* satirical edge is much sharper. Jonson uses anatomy and dissection to greater lengths in this play, though it is clear that it is the social milieu that Jonson is aiming for. This is a distinctive difference, one that marks Jonson's use of anatomy as theatrical in nature, and one that will be borne in mind as other plays are examined later.

In 1632, some thirty years after *Every Man in His Humor*, Jonson would write *The Magnetick Lady*, another 'humors' play. Like *The Staple of News*, Jonson structures his play around a series of interludes (Intermeans, as Jonson calls them in

the earlier play) in which two characters, Damplay and Probee, interrogate a 'boy' on the plot and themes set out before them. The play proper deals with the household of Mrs. Loadstone, a widow, and her niece, Placentia. A group of gulls and hangers-on are competing for the hand of Placentia who at one point turns up pregnant by way of the tailor, Mr. Needle. Everything turns out well, though, when it is revealed that Mrs. Polish, a 'Gossip and she-Parasite' had substituted her own daughter, Pleasance, for Placentia when they were infants. The pregnant Pleasance is married off to Needle, while Placentia (now in her true identity) is freed from scandal and marries the scholar Compasse. Mrs. Loadstone will marry one of the play's few sympathetic male characters, the noble Captain Ironside.

That Jonson is still writing 'humors' plays some thirty years on is addressed almost immediately in the Induction. As the Boy tells us:

The author, beginning his studies of this kind with *Every Man in his Humour*, and after, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, and since, continuing in all his plays, especially those of the comic thread whereof *The New Inn* was the last, some recent humours still, or manners of men, that went along with the times, finding himself now near the close, or shutting up of his circle, hath fancied to himself in idea this magnetic mistress. A lady, a brave, bountiful housekeeper and a virtuous widow, who, having a young niece ripe for a man and marriageable, he makes that his centre attractive to draw thither a diversity of guests, all persons of different humours to make up his perimeter. And this he called *Humours Reconciled*. (Induction, 75-85)

Jonson clearly sets out his aim and agenda, tracing the route of his humours plays from his first success to the more controversial follow up and on to this, a play that Jonson acknowledges comes at the end of his career, and one in which he clearly hopes to close the circle – *Humours Reconciled* is the play's subtitle. In *The Magnetick Lady*, Jonson's study of the humors includes among its wide roster of characters a Doctor, Rut, who is called upon for medical advice and who himself has been invited to the extended banquet that forms the backdrop to the action of the play. Early in the second act Rut is called upon to diagnose Placentia, who is complaining of the 'dropsie'. Her pregnancy is becoming harder to conceal and she is, in Mrs. Polish's words, 'Puft, blowne'. The exchange between Rut and Polish is characteristically funny in a Jonsonian way. The down-to-earth, common-sense, wisdom of Polish is attacked by Rut:

POLISH. The Gentlewoman, I do fear, is leavened.

RUT. Leavened? What's that?

POLISH. Puffed, blown, an't please Your Worship.

RUT. What! Dark by darker? What is blown? Puffed? Speak English-

POLISH. Tainted, an't please you, some do call it.

She swells and swells so with it- (2.3.9-12)

Rut is apparently correcting Polish's diagnosis and the doctor's demand for 'English' is quickly followed up by his own diagnosis, a string of Latin all of which describe the various forms of 'dropsy': 'Tympanites', 'Ana-sarca', and 'Ascites'. This leads to a final diagnosis and recommendation:

A wind bomb's in her belly, must be unbraced,

And with a faucet or a peg let out,

And she'll do well. Get her a husband (2.3.20-22)

The final joke might be on Rut here, whose recommended cure for Placentia's distended abdomen ('get her a husband') might be putting the cart before the horse.

That Rut is included among the gadflies that are hanging about Mrs.

Loadstone includes him in the satire, of course, and he is generally the subject of abuse and ridicule throughout. Jonson is in part reflecting the more generalized stage view of medical practitioners that is present in many of the plays examined for this thesis, but he cannot seem to leave it at that. The above quote continues to demonstrate Jonson's at least passing familiarity with medical phrases and, as in earlier plays (and in plays by other playwrights, to be fair), notes the history of medicine in Compass's line 'The doctor is an ass then if he say so,/ And cannot with his conjuring names, Hippocrates,/Galen or Rasis, Avicen. Averroes...' (3.2.32-34). Later in this same act, after Captain Ironside has threatened the party of guests with violence, an overwrought Interest is brought onstage in a chair. As ministered by the Doctor, this gives Jonson the chance to critique his spendthrift usurer with his overly-commercial Doctor. Rut's treatment of Interest is largely focused on the physical, as if Rut literally wants Interest to free up his money. From pinching Interest 'in the nape of the neck' (3.4.7), to boxing his ears Rut intends to 'move those sinews' (3.4.13) of Interest. And while Mrs. Polish will criticize his techniques (I thought his blows/ Would e'en ha' killed him (3.4.15)), the Doctor is convinced he is on the right diagnostic track:

Gi' me your hand, Sir Moth. Let's feel your pulse.

It is a pursiness, a kind of stoppage,

Or tumor o' the Purse, for want of exercise,
That you are troubled with: some ligatures
I'th' neck of your *vesica*, or *marsupium*,
Are so close-knit, that you cannot evaporate,
And therefore you must use relaxatives.
Beside, they say, you are so restive grown,
You cannot but with trouble put your hand
Into your pocket to discharge a reckoning.
And this we sons of physic doe call *chirargra*,
A kind of cramp or hand-gout. You shall purge for't. (3.430-41)

When the apothecary, Item, recommends a purge, Rut concurs: 'I'll first prescribe him,/ To give his purse a purge once, twice a week/ At dice or cards...' (3.4.45-46), a joke that walks the literal/metaphorical line and relies on that tension for its humour. Again, it will be Polish who will offer comment on these physicians, once more suggesting that the stream of Latin is deliberate obfuscation. A charge to which Rut responds:

I had it of a Jew, and a great Rabbi,
Who every morning cast his cup of white wine
With sugar, and by the residence i' the bottom,
Would make report of any chronic malady,
Such as Sir Moth's is, being an oppilation

In that you call the neck o' the money bladder,

Most anatomical, and by dissection. (3.4.65-71)

By now, the joke about expensive doctors is familiar, but Jonson slyly alludes to the commerce of anatomy, of dissection, and the exchange of money that coincides with the exchange of bodies. This may, indeed, be a theme woven into the fabric of the play. Helen Ostovich points out the level of misogyny in the play, and argues that Jonson stifles female agency through the actions of his male characters and in the very construction of the play itself. Ostovich notes, for example, that the 'induction and the choruses between the acts are arguments among men clearly aimed at the privileged male audience' (431); the women are silent. The play's central concern of dealing with the pregnant Placentia strains the dominant patriarchy to be sure, though, as we have already seen in Jonson, there is something of the classical trope of domestic struggle at work. Jonson elevates this situation, in the elevated grotesquery of his characters, but the transactional nature of the play has female anatomy as its locus.

This same mix of elements – the female anatomy, commerce and medicine is also at work in *Volpone*. Certainly, while disguised as the mountebank, Volpone is given freedom to comment widely and wildly on the medical condition of London. Volpone's mountebank is selling a bogus concoction with the 'power to disperse malignant humours'. It is only fitting then that he should invoke the names of Hippocrates and Galen (and, indeed, Paracelsus) to lend credence to his claim. Both the Quarto of 1607 and the Folio of 1616 contain these lines, and we can continue to trace the invocation of Galen's name, even as competing (and contradictory) theories come into practice and find their way, in all the ways discussed, into the

larger, more general culture. Jonson and his contemporaries will frequently gloss famous historical scientists and doctors in their plays, calling attention to the fact that the viewing public had an awareness of the historical figures as well as the emerging theories and practices. Frequently, this is achieved through the example of dissection and the interest in anatomy often remains morbid.

Written and produced in 1606, Jonson dedicated *Volpone* to 'the two famous universities, for their love and acceptance', presumably of the play's performances at Cambridge and Oxford and may suggest that Jonson is relying on the education of his audience to complete his references.

Volpone is something of a lurid play, populated by grotesque characters and situations, its comedy grim and disturbing. Dutton calls it a 'satiric fable' (3), and the overly animalistic quality of the characters cannot be overlooked. There are, of course, the three physically deformed servants (*Volpone* just tells us that they are 'his', we suppose that they are in his service), the eunuch, dwarf and hermaphrodite. *Volpone* lavishes in the entertainment provided by his clowns and while they can sing and dance, there also seems to be a perverse pleasure gained from their physical appearance. Likewise, Corvino demonstrates his own perverse pleasure when he threatens to bind up his wife in a chastity belt.

CORVINO. Then, here's a lock which I will hang upon thee;

[He shows her a chastity belt.]

And, now I think on't, I will keep thee backwards:

Thy lodging shall be backwards; thy walks backwards,

Thy prospect – all be backwards, and no pleasure

That thou shalt know but backwards. Nay, since you force

My honest nature, know it is your own
Being too open makes me use you thus.
Since you will not contain your subtle nostrils
In a sweet room, but they must snuff the air
Of rank and sweaty passengers –
[Knock within.]

One knocks!

Away, and be not seen, pain of thy life;
Not look toward the window; if thou dost –
[Celia starts to leave]
Nay, stay, hear this - let me not prosper, whore,
But I will make thee an anatomy,
Dissect thee mine own self, and read a lecture
Upon thee to the city, and in public. (2.558-72)

This is a complex statement that speaks to the physical desire of Corvino to keep Celia 'backwards' (once again we must accept the implication of anal sex); the repetition of the word 'backward' suggests that this desire is very heightened. There is a hint of perversion here, and the metaphor is extended through Corvino's threat to replace the 'sweet' with 'rank and sweaty passengers', a word unsettlingly close to 'passages'. Already a brutal and cruel threat, Corvino winds it all up by calling his wife a 'whore', threatening to anatomize her himself and read a lecture in 'public'. The last threat, the final savagery, will be to expose his wife to the general population, to the public of the 'city'. In this extended threat, Corvino not only threatens his wife to private deprivation, to cruel, but intimate, sexual abuse, he then offers to expose her most intimate parts to the world. We are free to assume that the

murder of Celia is presumed, but in the heat of his speech Corvino leaves that threat out. In reading the speech it is easy to move from 'dissect' to 'vivisect'.

Corvino's is not the only reference to anatomy, however, and Jonson offers another complicated reference to the practice when Volpone enters disguised as Scoto, a mountebank. The author of two 'humours' plays here offers us a quack 'doctor' selling a useless elixir with the power to 'disperse all malignant humours' (2.2.83). Selling his wares from a temporary stage on the stage, Volpone is joined by his servant, Mosca and his dwarf. Nano even sings an ode to Hippocrates and Galen, a pair of names that recurs through many of these plays. Volpone will follow this up with a brief explanation of the effort required to produce his elixir:

Indeed, very many have assayed, like apes, in imitation of that which is really and essentially in me, to make of this oil; bestowed great cost in furnaces, stills, alembics, continual fires, and preparation of the ingredients (as indeed there goes to it six hundred several simples, besides some quantity of human fat, for the conglutination, which we buy of anatomists) (2.2.128-133).

That anatomists were selling human fat for profit was a common fear, one that was unfounded (Sugg, *Mummies* 105) but that Jonson here exploits for the sake of dramatic creation. As we have seen, Jonson relies on specific, even rarefied scientific knowledge in his plays; here he seems to freely mix the fictional with the factual to press a particular dramatic point.

Ultimately, Jonson is giving us an intriguing line through a complex series of thoughts. On the one hand, Volpone's elixir trumps anything offered by the ancients and he cries down the accomplishments of classical and contemporary scientists

and doctors. Volpone's elixir benefits from the illicit activities of the new medicine for its power and efficacy. That the cure is also a sham is part of the extended stage joke and Jonson would seem to be relying on the mix of knowledge and information available to his audience to build that joke. If, as has been argued, Jonson's audience had access to a variety of methods, treatments, theories for the treatment of illness, as well as a general knowledge of anatomy, the author seems to rely on that compound of information to build his satirical play world. This satirical mix is exemplified by Mosca, early in the play:

And since, to seem the more officious
And flatt'ring of his health, there they have had,
At extreme fees, the College of Physicians
Consulting on him how they might restore him;
Where one would have a cataplasm of spices,
Another a flayed ape clapped to his breast,
A third would ha't a dog, a fourth an oil
With wildcats' skins. At last they all resolved
That, to preserve him by no other means
But some young woman must be straight sought out,
Lusty and full of juice, to sleep by him; (2.6. 25-35)

The fairy tale world of *Volpone* is self-contained, its garish and elevated portrayal of character too outrageous to be taken for anything but a play world. The overtly theatrical nature of the play is also evident, not only in the characterization but in the

self-consciously performative actions (Volpone's turn as the Mountebank, for example). The wide social world that Jonson presents is similar to other plays examined here, and like *The Magnetic Lady*, the action of the play concerns itself with commerce ('gold' is nearly the first word spoken in the play), medicine and anatomy (and through Celia, a very stark and unpleasant negotiation of the female body). The interest in anatomy links this play back to *Every Man in His Humour* and that common thread helps to contextualize a theatrical interest in anatomy on the stage in the early modern period. It is a perplexing question, brought on by the frequency with which references to anatomy occur in these plays, and the wide range of meaning, uses, and applications. The examination of Jonson's work not only illustrates this but helps to bring some focus to predominate themes, themes that will be explored in this thesis.

Perhaps this is the first point to be made, that it seems clear that there was a discernible interest in the topic on the early modern stage. This thesis, then, sets out to examine the relationship between the emerging science of anatomy and the theatre of the early modern period. While anatomy was certainly not a new science, it is in this period that it enjoyed a resurgence and a rapid development in Europe. Starting in the universities of Padua and Bologna, anatomy theatres and schools sprung up all over Europe, becoming not just an important scientific endeavour, but a political one, as universities and governments celebrated the advances made by medical practitioners in the period (which will be discussed in Chapter Two). William Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood is just one example of the ground-breaking work done by these scientists. Interestingly, though, and something that will inform this thesis, the anatomical sciences were slow to take root in England, with

little of the kinds of celebrations found in other parts of Europe. As Cunningham points out:

the main centres for anatomical research and teaching come to be Padua, Bologna and Rome in Italy, Paris and Montpellier in France, and Leiden in the Netherlands. Until the 1650s there was little if any anatomical activity to be discerned in the medical faculties of either Oxford or Cambridge...' (18).

As we will see, there is a similar study to be made of the schools in London and the development of anatomy in England in the seventeenth-century will be the subject of the second chapter.

Despite the late development of the anatomical sciences in England, many contemporary critics have nonetheless described what they see as an over-arching interest in anatomy in the period, in general. This is evidenced not just by the publication of anatomical textbooks, but also a wealth of printed 'anatomies'; Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy* is perhaps the most famous example of such a work. Richard Sugg has produced a comprehensive list of printed anatomies as an appendix to his *Murder After Death*, and this abundance of material has led to a deep examination of what appears to be seen as the importance and function of anatomy in the early modern period. That this over-arching interest in anatomy found its way onto the stage is equally clear. The intersection of anatomy and the theatre is of principle interest here, and the nature of that relationship forms the investigation of the plays that treat anatomy and dissection on the stage. The contemporary analysis of anatomy in the early modern theatre will play an important part in the examination of the plays that follows, but for now it is perhaps enough to note that anatomy was

of interest to playwrights and the evidence for this is the list of extant plays that deal with the subject in some way or another.

The critical response to this question, of the presence and importance of anatomy on the stage, points to an apparently widespread interest in anatomy in the period (and not just in theatre) and has resulted in a broad investigation of this topic. The interpretation of this interest in anatomy (as represented in the current literature) is a question pursued throughout but there seems to be ample evidence that the subject of human anatomy certainly did seem to grab the imagination of many in the early modern period, which has led some modern scholars to conclude that an interest in anatomy was something of a preoccupation during that period. The work of contemporary critics helps bring clarity to one of the main concerns of this thesis, which is the intersection of an interest in anatomy (scientifically and more abstractly) and its representation in the theatre. One important point that is given clarity in this examination is that the function of anatomy in the theatre is markedly different from that in other forms. Rather than being seen as a statement of the obvious, it is helpful to distinguish between what may have been happening in the literature of the period and the application of anatomy in the theatre. This allows for an approach that is different than what is represented in the current literature where the focus is, in the main, on literature and not drama.

So while it is evidently true, as authors like Jonathon Sawday and Richard Sugg point out, that the early modern period was a 'culture of dissection' (Sawday's phrase) and the culture seemed consumed with the idea of anatomy (to paraphrase Sugg), it will be argued that these, and other, critics are often using the example of literature and non-theatrical authors and, despite the apparent strength of these arguments, a different set of optics can be applied to the stage. If nothing else, the

theatre speaks to a broad cross-section of society, and its interest in anatomy is equally broad. This examination of anatomy in theatre will, in part, attempt to demonstrate how that interest grows out of a need for innovation and change in the theatre while satisfying a need for traditional forms. This will be the focus, particularly, of chapter six. To consider one point, we can agree with many modern commentators who point out that, yes, anatomy is violent: it is, as Sawday points out, the act of reducing the human body to its constituent parts in order to better understand the whole. Rather than being surprised at the acts of anatomical violence contained in these plays, it should be considered that the theatre has always used violence, and that anatomy may allow for a new way of expressing violence on the stage. Or, in other words, the modern science of anatomy is a new way for playwrights to express old forms.

The use and development of anatomy in the theatre also shifts throughout the period, ranging from (apparently) detailed representations of the practice (though more on that in chapter three) to more offhand, (again, apparently) indifference towards the subject. Whether this is a move from novelty to a broader acceptance of the practice is difficult to track and, as will be explored, the use of anatomy on the stage continues to take a number of forms throughout the period.

The plays that treat anatomy with altogether less prominence do help, though, to illustrate that rather than accept this supposed preoccupation at face value, anatomy can be treated as a part of the playwright's rubric, an established dramatic resource that is accepted by both writers and their audiences. In certain circumstances, its usage becomes almost shorthand and as the practice slips into the routine of the theatre 'anatomy' becomes one more tool at the playwright's disposal. It is in this context that we sometimes find the term in full use alongside

other, apparently contradictory terms and phrases. As will be discussed in chapter two, with reference to medicine in the period, writers had a host of metaphors, tropes and other expressions open to them and were free to use what was convenient.

The point is, rather than seeing anatomy as diametrically opposed to competing ideas, playwrights had the freedom to put these ideas on the stage, simultaneously. This was not contradiction, or necessarily a deliberate attempt to demonstrate opposition, rather it is important to stress that just as doctors and patients had a variety of treatments to choose from, so writers and audiences had of a set of references that could be drawn on when it was convenient, expedient, or appropriate to do so. As we will see, some modern commentators have made much of this apparent dichotomy, however it is perhaps equally useful to recognize the willingness of writers and audiences to accept what was presented to them at any given time.

This is partly the theme of the next chapter, which also considers the question of how playwrights may have had access to anatomy and its procedures. This, in turn, will help to frame an investigation into the use and purpose of anatomy on the stage.

Chapter Two: Anatomy in England

In 1632, the Dutch painter Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669) delivered what was to be one of his first commissions, a work that is now considered to be a major milestone in portrait painting (Martin 7): 'The Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp'. It was Tulp who commissioned the work and who was at the time the preaelector of anatomy for the Amsterdam Guild of Surgeons. Rembrandt's painting commemorates Tulp as surgeon and anatomist, and in its inclusion of other medical figures (who stand gathered around Tulp) also celebrates the medical scene in Amsterdam. William Schupbach in 'The Paradox of Rembrandt's 'Anatomy of Dr. Tulp'', names the figures in the painting as well as the alterations that were made later to the portrait (25). One of the figures holds a sheet that lists the people present; a modern renovation of the painting shows that this list was added later and covers an anatomical drawing, which some have speculated is a drawing from *De humani corporis fabrica* (1543), a monumental work by the Belgian anatomist Andreas Vesalius (Steiner 277). William Heckscher goes so far as to suggest that the commission of this painting is a defining moment for Amsterdam and figures in a medical revolution of sorts: Amsterdam is here declaring that its medical sciences, particularly those of anatomy, stand with the best of the southern European medical halls, especially those of Italy (7). Overall, the portrait attests to the importance of the anatomical sciences in Amsterdam and how advances in those sciences were seen to promote the overall cultural significance of the city in general. Rembrandt's painting would mark a turning point in his career, and it signals the beginning of his arrival in the art world. In commissioning the painting, Dr. Tulp makes a similar announcement with respect to the medical advancements of Amsterdam. As has been pointed out by Schupbach, Heckscher, Steiner and others, the anatomy portrayed in the painting is unusual.

In the portrait, a group of doctors (seven, though it is now generally accepted that the figure on the extreme left was added at a later date) huddle around a corpse, attending Tulp's lecture. A large text sits open near the feet of the executed felon, and one of the observers holds a sheet of paper. Tulp, on the right and facing the group of observers, has opened the left arm of the body and is holding a group of muscles with forceps. Most of this arm appears to have had its skin removed. Tulp's procedure, as painted by Rembrandt, is atypical in that anatomies started with the removal of the viscera. The body of the convict on the table has been identified as Adriaan Andriaensz, (Steiner 277) and based on the fact that dissections in Amsterdam were an annual event, the date of this dissection can be pinpointed. Despite this basis in actual events, this scene is conjectural. These observers gathered around Tulp were not at the real dissection, rather they paid a fee to be included in this portrait (Mitchell 145), in order that they, along with Tulp, would be clearly associated with the cultural celebration.

Likewise, Rembrandt must have chosen (or Tulp chose for him) to depict his anatomy as starting with the forearm of this executed felon. In that, the image of Tulp bears a striking resemblance to a portrait of Vesalius that is found in *De humani corporis fabrica*. While the images differ in their overall composition - Vesalius is alone, the torso of the subject is in the vertical position - Vesalius is shown demonstrating the veins of the forearm, and the focus on the arms in both paintings is striking. Vesalius' major and important work was the benchmark, in many ways, for anatomical texts and practice in the period and here Tulp, through Rembrandt, seems to want his audience to link the two surgeons, practically (like Vesalius, Tulp is here conducting his own anatomy, not leaving it to a demonstrator while he passively reads from an anatomy text) as well as culturally and politically (the

acknowledgement of Vesalius goes beyond the medical realm; the association with Vesalius here carries greater weight than just the scientific significance).

In all, then, Rembrandt's painting serves not only to commemorate Tulp and the Guild of Surgeons in Amsterdam, but also loudly to proclaim the scientific, and cultural, value of the science of anatomy to Amsterdam. William Heckscher, in *Rembrandt's Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp*, reprints an ornate invitation, from 1660, for the public to attend an anatomy lesson (14), suggesting that these events were culturally significant and cause for some celebration. In the early modern period acceptance of the relative importance of the science of anatomy had started in Italy, in part through the work of Vesalius, but also many others, and had swept north. Clearly, by the early part of the seventeenth century, surgeons in Northern Europe were anxious to demonstrate their knowledge and skills and it is something of a high water mark, culturally speaking, to be seen to be contributing to the field. It is somewhat surprising, and in some ways contradictory, that the same level of importance is not given to the science of anatomy in England. England would not see a purpose-built anatomy hall until 1638, six years after Rembrandt's commission, and while English anatomists would, clearly, make important contributions to the field, the science never seems to garner the kind of broad, cultural support that is evident in other major cities and countries. Despite the apparent popularity of the topic, which will be discussed later, the anatomical scene in England seems much more modest than its European counterparts. As Pelling and Webster note:

The sixteenth century is a particularly significant phase in the development of the medical profession in England. At the beginning of the century England lagged far behind Italy in the organization of its

medical profession, in medical education, and in general medical culture. (165)

It would seem, though, that despite the late start, the subject of anatomy would take hold in the minds of readers, viewers, and others in the period. Certainly, scholars and critics have noted the emphasis that placed on dissection and anatomy, and its importance to literature, the theatre, and the culture of England in the early modern period in general. As already noted, Jonathon Sawday describes a 'culture of dissection' in the seventeenth century, though his discussion is focused on the advances of William Harvey and the writing of John Donne, in particular. The link between anatomization to satire has also been noted in the discussion of interiority, or selfhood, that will be addressed later in this thesis. The satire is found in the metaphorical cutting up of a variety of bodies (and, of course, some of these bodies are themselves metaphorical, with the body politic becoming an important target). Neil Rhodes discusses the 'move towards topical, journalistic satire' (4), and Sawday articulates the link between satire and 'dissection and anatomization' (1). That writers of the period would exploit dissection for its satirical value is evident in many works (and in plays, which will be discussed later), though one particularly apt example is a woodcut drawing, 'The Anatomy of Martin Luther', issued by the Jesuit Vitus Jacobaeus in 1567. In the image, Luther is laid out on an anatomy table, while a group of protestant reformers dissect their subject with saws, axes and spears, and at least one of the spectators appears to be eating some part of Luther's body. The Catholic satire of Protestantism is clear, as is the 'anti-mass' that is the consumption of Luther's body. The violation of Luther's body, the implied threat of dissection, even the connection of anatomy to cannibalism are all subjects of satire. And while it may be argued that writers who referenced human dissection and anatomy were doing so

for satirical purposes, or to explore issues of interiority and self-reflexivity, it should also be noted that many references were altogether more mundane, suggesting a broader framework in which it is best to avoid generalities, and to consider that there were other factors at work.

The attitude towards anatomy in the period is difficult to discern, though there does seem to be some general support of the practice - John Banister, in 1578, will talk of the 'fruitfull water that floweth from the fountaines of Anathomie' (3). Likewise, while there are references to anatomy in some religious sermons, the attitude towards the practice seems altogether neutral. Thomas Adams, in 1615, tells us, 'The deedes of the flesh (if euer) are manifest, not onely to God, whom all things lye naked, a dissected Anatomy: t euén to the obseruing of man' (3) and 'That Physitians may not begge him when hee's dead, hee makes himselfe an Anatomie liuing' (67). In three different sermons by Robert Bolton he mentions 'an anatomy consisting of bones and sinewes' (*The Carnall professor* 1634), 'the spiritual Anatomy of Mans deceitfull heart' (*Instructions for a right* 470), and 'the very lively Anatomie and laying open of a good and gracious Soule' (*A three-fold treatise* 2). John Boys will 'come now to the words Anatomie, cutting up every part and particle severally' (*An exposition of the last psalme* 2); Francis Mason will express his concern for the fate of Book of Common Prayer, lamenting that it 'hath beene cut up like an anatomie, every vain of it hath been opened, everie corner searched, every rubricke ransacked...' (*The Authoritie of the Church* sig. A3). There are many like examples, though in this small set it is Mason who associates anatomy with violence or the threat of violence.

What is noteworthy, perhaps because of the frequent references to anatomy, in the other examples is not the level of self-examination or determination of the self

that is being explored by these writers, rather it is the general level of acceptance of the practice. For the most part (and here Donne is an important exception), the fact of dissection is rendered all rather ordinary. Likewise, while it may be tempting to talk of anatomy in revolutionary terms and underscore the value of the new science to the culture at large, there are also reasons to question the level of impact that this new science had on the English culture. To return to *Murder After Death*, Richard Sugg makes the case for a veritable explosion in interest in anatomy in the seventeenth century: 'Around 1575 the wider English public appeared to barely have heard of anatomy; by 1600 it seemed at times unable to talk about little else' (2). A survey of the available plays from the period of roughly 1560 to 1640 has turned up some sixty-five titles that include, in some form or another, reference to human dissection. This may seem a significant number and Sugg also includes in his survey a wide variety of works from broadsheets, sermons and novels, all of which does suggest that anatomy was a topic of interest in the period. Clearly, the level of that interest is hard to gauge, but without doubt it found its way onto the stage and the nature of that interest as well as the nature of transmission to the stage, will be of concern here. Many scholars make a case for the public popularity of anatomy and its subsequent penetration into the culture, and while it has been argued that the public had direct access to the anatomy halls, a case will be made here that the public had indirect access to this information. It will be suggested that a de-emphasis on actual procedures, and a consequent emphasis on other forms of information (even media) helped form the nature of anatomy in its theatrical presentation. This is an important distinction in as much as it can be seen to free theatre practitioners, and their audiences, to pursue other ends and themes in these plays.

In 1540, King Henry VIII granted the newly established guild of Barber-Surgeons the right to the bodies of four executed felons annually for their dissections. The same charter united the two groups, 'the Company of Barbers and the Fellowship or Gild of Surgeons' (Dobson and Walker 9). The unification of the Barbers and Surgeons ended at least a century's worth of rivalry - Dobson and Walker point out that in ordinances of 1410, the distinct roles of the barbers and the surgeons were stated, along with prohibitions restricting each group from plying the other's trade (indicating, among other things, that the barbers were involved in surgical practices until that time) (Dobson and Walker 14). A painting was commissioned to commemorate the granting of the charter to the newly-founded Barber-Surgeon's company, though unlike the Rembrandt, this work, featuring Henry VIII, is more regal in tone, focusing on the ceremony and not the activities of the group. In this painting by Hans Holbein, that now hangs in the Barber-Surgeons Hall in London (though the two groups would again be separated in the 18th Century), it is Thomas Vicary who is shown receiving the charter from Henry VIII. Vicary was sergeant-surgeon to Henry (from 1536 until his death) and made master of the Company in 1541 (he had previously been Master of the Company of Barbers). It has been suggested that it was Vicary who succeeded in convincing the crown to provide the four bodies for the dissections. It is worth noting, and this will be discussed at length later, that Vicary also published the first book on anatomy in England written in English, *The Anatomie of the Body of Man*, in 1548.

The union of the two groups not only saw an end to the rivalry and competition, but was mutually beneficial; the 'Gild of Surgeons' carried prestige in the city, while the 'Company of Barbers' was the largest liveried company in London (Clark 14). The establishment of the joint company now also meant there was an

established training and licensing facility for Barber-Surgeons in the city. As part of this training, the Company conducted dissections, namely of those four people who had been 'condemned, adjudged and put to death for felony' (Dobson and Walker 34). However, while the barber-surgeons would undertake to conduct four dissections a year, a practice that would have begun with the Charter in 1540, a lack of qualified surgeons seems to have prevented regular dissections in the early years. Along with the public anatomies, the ordinances of the Company also provided for 'private' and 'other' anatomies that were to be carried out only in the Common Hall of the company. The ordinances of the barber-surgeons also make provision for a dinner to be held after the demonstrations but also explicitly state that these events were for Liverymen of the company only - 'no other person except of the Assistants shall dine there except the Doctor that readeth and such Doctors as are or shall be Brothers of the Company' (Dobson and Walker 45).

While the dissections were no doubt meant to be an important part of the training of surgeons in London, the Annals paint a curious picture of the place of dissections in the minds of these student surgeons. Sidney Young, in *The Annals of the Barber Surgeons of London*, recounts several cases where members of the company were fined for not attending, or agreed to pay fines in order to be excused from anatomy demonstrations, as well as the conduct of those who did attend. A minute from the records of 1635 has this to say:

...there hath been a general remissness in the greater part of the Surgeons of this Company in their not appearing and making personal attendance in their seats on the scaffoldings of the six lectures times at the public anatomies and the disorderliness of those surgeons that do appear for wanting their outward ornament, comporting themselves

confusedly among the common people whereby the honor and worthiness of this Company on the Surgeons' part hath been much eclipsed... (45)

The Barber-Surgeons would conduct their anatomies in their great hall until 1638, and until the construction of a purpose-built anatomy theatre, the Barber-Surgeons were required to witness human dissection in this make-shift theatre. The annals of the Barber-Surgeons detail a request for raised seating, to accommodate the students, and refer to covering the windows, to prevent curious passers-by from stopping at the windows (Sugg, *Murder* 29). Though attending the anatomy demonstrations was mandatory for all students, it appears as though the guild continued to have difficulty convincing its members to show. The Annals refer frequently to the dismal attendance, the general disregard held by the students, and the attempts (through a system of fines) to encourage better attendance and Dobson and Walker note that 'Surgical freemen of the Company and apprentices were bound to attend the demonstrations' (40) and '....every person of the Commonalty or foreign Brothers professing surgery shall likewise so appear' (45), though while the term 'foreign Brother' appears quite often in the Annals, it is difficult to determine who exactly this group was. Likewise, Young details the division of freemen and apprentices from the liveried members and 'Commonalty' is here used to denote the non-liveried members of the company who, from the period 1603-1670, numbered about two hundred per year.

Some twenty-five years after the Barber-Surgeons were granted the use of four corpses a year for their dissections a similar provision was enacted, by Elizabeth I, for the benefit of the Royal College of Physicians. The College of Physicians was granted a charter in 1518, under the leadership of Thomas Linacre,

an Italian-trained physician who set about attracting Royal physicians into the College (Furdell 4). Having studied at Oxford, Linacre traveled to Italy in 1487 and took a degree in medicine in Padua in 1496. Appointed a royal physician in 1509, Linacre would serve as personal physician to Princess Mary. With the formation of the College, there was now a body responsible for all physicians in London. While this type of College was common throughout Italy, London would be the only English city to boast of such an organization (Pelling and Webster 167).

Despite the connection to similar Italian colleges, and an association with Christ Church Oxford (The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography entry for Linacre notes that the charter of 1518 indicates that the College of Physicians established by Henry VIII had ‘links with both Italy and the new humanist inspired Corpus Christi College, Oxford’), the Physicians would remain a much smaller, and more elite, group of medical professionals than the Barber-Surgeons. However, unlike the Barber-Surgeons, the College of Physicians had none of the prominence or power of the former, and would never achieve recognition as a guild or city organization. Pelling and Webster detail the extent of the handicaps faced by the College, noting the general lack of support from city authorities (because they were not liveried) as well as the pressure on the College to keep up with the needs of a rapidly growing urban population. Instead, the College would remain relatively small, with a variable number of fellows that never rose above 25, but whose credentials were impeccable. The College would only begin to ascend to prominence with the appointment of another Italian-trained physician, John Caius, in 1555, who would work to see dissection become entrenched in the training of physicians.

Like Linacre, Caius was a university student (Cambridge) who left England to study medicine in Padua, from 1539 to 1543. In Padua, Caius attended the classes

of the leading humanist physician Johanne Baptista Montanus as well as Vesalius (according to Keele, Caius lodged with Vesalius). Caius' training in Padua would have engendered, if not cemented, a belief in the importance of dissection to medical training, a view that would inform his actions with the Royal College. Also like Linacre, Caius would devote much of his study to Galen, ultimately publishing several Galenic texts (Furdell 4) (Linacre would also translate Galen from Greek to Latin, and see several works published). Caius was also a Royal physician, tending to Edward VI, Queen Mary and Elizabeth I. Starting in 1546 Caius would teach anatomy for the next twenty years, but at the Barber-Surgeons' Hall, not at the College; in 1547 he would become a fellow of the College of Physicians. It was Caius who successfully obtained permission for the Physicians, in 1564, for dissections to be performed in the College (Queen Elizabeth allowed the use of two corpses - executed felons again - for this purpose); as with the Barber-Surgeons, Fellows were under threat of fine for refusing to deliver anatomical lectures when called to do so. The records of the Royal Physicians state that these lectures were open to 'Fellows, Candidates, and Licentiates...' (O'Malley, *William Harvey* 3). With an endowment from Lord Lumley, Caius would establish the Lumleian lectures in anatomy, though it seems clear from the records of the College that this body had similar difficulties in enforcing attendance (Clark 150). Lumley's endowment, in 1581, of forty pounds a year was, as Keele notes, a rather large endowment and seems designed to place the Lumleian lecturer on par with similar lectures at the universities. While the lectures were to occur twice-weekly, there was to be a dissection 'in the winter months'. In March of 1584, the College committed £100 to the construction of a building to hold the Lumleian lectures and the annals of the College note rules brought in by Caius to enforce the reading of the lectures and

attendance by the physicians. The commitment of the College to both the Lumleain lectures and to the improved lecture space speaks to the relative importance of dissection to the College itself.

Taken together, the Barber-Surgeons and the College of Physicians would seem to represent the two main bodies in London responsible for the training, certification and regulation of medical practitioners in the city. But as Elizabeth Lane Furdell has pointed out (26), the medical scene at the time was in no way restricted to the members and fellows of these two groups. London of the sixteenth century was home to a wide assortment of practitioners, not just mid-wives, but many who practised various folk-remedies, unlicensed doctors (this despite the vigilance of the surgeons and physicians) and even members of the two associations who operated outside of the established ordinances (there are several recorded instances of doctors performing unregulated, private anatomies, for example (Dobson and Walker 39)). Add to this the fact that both universities were also graduating doctors and the medical scene in London is a deeply complicated web of practitioners, services and available remedies. With that point in mind it is worth noting that the history of dissection in the Renaissance begins in Italy, at the universities of Padua and Bologna, in particular. This focus on the Italian schools, and Italian training (Linacre and Caius, after all, received part of their training abroad), can be misleading, however, and Pelling and Webster point out that despite the influence and prestige of the Italian medical schools, the vast majority of medical practitioners in England were, in fact, trained at home. They cite twelve doctors, working in the sixteenth century, who received training in Italy; the vast majority of medical practitioners were trained in England, sometimes in English (190).

Far from anything approaching a hegemony, the medical scene in London in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was a mix of theories, approaches, training, and practice. With respect to dissection and anatomical training, it is also apparent that despite the emphasis placed on this activity neither the Barber-Surgeons nor the College of Physicians seems to have been completely successful in their endeavours to systematize and regulate the practice. As noted, anatomies were not performed regularly and there are several recorded instances of members complaining about the lack of anatomical training or the infrequency with which they occurred. According to Pelling and Webster:

Despite explicit stipulations by visitors and in the statutes from 1549 onwards, anatomies were not performed regularly, although a few students at the time of incepting for their degree, or applying for a licence, claimed to have witnessed anatomy. On the other hand, Thomas Mouffet doubted in 1584 whether a medical student would see one dissection in a decade. (202)

The note to page 202 also indicates that anatomies were not always performed regularly at the universities.

All this perhaps leads to a consideration of one of the main contradictions in considering the influence of anatomy on the plays of the early modern period: how much information was available to writers and audiences. Despite arguments to the contrary, the evidence for the claim that the general public could view anatomies is not as strong as one would like. The annals of the Barber-Surgeons, in particular, are clear on the attempts to encourage attendance among its members, as has been noted. A system of fines was initiated, and reformed, in an attempt to force Company

members to attend these demonstrations. The annals also note the accommodations made to the Common Hall in order to facilitate viewing (the addition of raised seating, for example). But until the opening of the anatomical theatre in 1638 there does not seem to be evidence that a general audience could have been accommodated in the Common Hall. Christian Billing notes that the 'the supply of cadavers was not adequate to provide for public dissection as fashionable entertainment', and that the laws that granted permission for the use of corpses did not allow for public demonstration, consequently, 'not all who wished to watch the anatomy lessons as social distraction could do so' (*Masculinity* 181). So, while the Annals are very specific on the regulations as they apply to its members, there is no provision for the attendance of non-specialists and no mention of fees in a collection of documents that is otherwise very explicit on monetary matters. The situation at the College of Physicians is perhaps clearer. The regulations of that body explicitly state that only members of the College could view the dissections, though Dobson suggests that after the renovations to the anatomy hall, certain foreign dignitaries may have been present. Richard Sugg is one of several critics who points to the quote from Caspar Hofman suggesting that the audience at the Lumleian lectures was comprised in part by the general public:

If only Harvey, you would not hold anatomies in front of jacks-in-office, petty lordlings, money-lenders, barbers and such ignorant rabble, who, standing around open-mouthed, blab that they are seeing miracles...

(*Murder* 29)

The Hofmann quote is from 1636, and Sugg applies it retroactively to the whole period of the Lumleian lectures. Sir George Clark, in *The Royal College of Physicians of London*, details the formation of the Lumleian lectures (held twice a

week with an anatomy 'in the winter months') and points out the difficulties the College had in enforcing attendance.

That situation does not seem to have changed much, even when Harvey ascended to the position of lecturer, and Clark points out that Harvey was frequently away, and rarely delivered all the lectures of a given year. Hofmann, writing well after Harvey had become lecturer, is certainly calling into question the conditions of the lectures. Kenneth Franklin's biography of Harvey, *William Harvey: Englishman, 1578-1657*, goes so far as to suggest that it was Caspar Hofmann who first proposed, in 1622, the theory of the circulation of the blood that Harvey outlines in his famous *De Mortu Cordis* (1628), and that Hofmann confronted Harvey on this matter (the correspondence between Harvey and Hofmann on this subject is reprinted in Whitteridge, *William Harvey and the Circulation of the Blood*). Whatever the relationship between Harvey and Hofmann it is tempting to speculate that Hofmann was not of a mind to be generous to his colleague and perhaps this helped to prompt the scathing quote. Likewise, Sugg notes that the Barber-Surgeons were forced to curtain off the Common Hall to prevent curious onlookers from peering in, and in at least one instance breaking, those windows. It is, however, difficult to interpret this as evidence for anatomies as public spectacle. If anything, it provides evidence for the opposite. If the general public could pay to enter, perhaps we can conclude that there were those who could not, or would not, pay for that privilege; equally this could be read as evidence that the public was not allowed admission. The desire to shield the proceedings equally speaks to the need for discretion, and the breaking of windows only reinforces that need. In short, while tantalizing, in the absence of corroboration, judgement should be reserved, and indeed, the issue remains cloudy. For example, Jan C.C. Rupp in 'Michel Foucault, Body Politics and

the Rise and Expansion of Modern Anatomy' sets out to detail the nature of 'public' (meaning 'open to the general public') in Italy, Holland, France, and England, and while her discussions are detailed and informative the discussion of England begins in the 18th century, with the point that 'unlike in Italy, Holland and France, dissections in England never became public' (32).

If direct access to dissection was not available (or available in a very limited fashion) to the general public of London, perhaps it is worth considering the level of indirect experience that may have been available, as represented by the printing and distribution of anatomical texts.

The first anatomical text to appear in England was a translation of Hieronymus Brunschwig's *Noble Experyence of the Vertuous Handworke of Surgeri*, in 1525 (Furdell 50). There is no doubt that anatomical texts played a substantial part in the education and training of doctors; some critics have pointed out that it was possible, particularly at the universities, to receive a medical degree that was based entirely on textual study, with no practical experience whatsoever. The publication of medical texts, including works on anatomy, would continue throughout the period, but their impact on a general audience is difficult to gauge. Another important publication is Thomas Vicary's *The Anatomie of the Bodie of Man*. Vicary, sergeant-surgeon to the King and master of the Barber-Surgeons, first published his *Anatomie* in 1538. Reprinted in 1577 the *Anatomie* would 'hold the stage for the next 150 years' (Furnivall and Furnivall vi). In the dedication of the first edition, Vicary declares:

Heereaftre foloweth a little treatise of the Anatomie of mans body,
Made by Thomas Vycarie, Citizen and Chirurgion of London, for all
such young Brethren of his Fellowship practising Chirurgie. (11)

Vicary would seem to clearly be aiming his edition at students and specialists; its popularity amongst a lay readership is impossible to measure. Indeed, the nature and constitution of the reading public in early modern England is itself a difficult group to discern. With respect to medical texts, some scholars have suggested that none of these works, and anatomy texts in particular, were ever meant for those without a specific interest in the topic. That group of interested parties could easily be extended from students to teachers, however, and some scholars suggest that despite the message of the dedications, these books would have found their way into the hands of those who would teach, as often if not more so, than in the hands of those who would be taught. Some scholars have argued, strenuously, that the reading public was small to start with, smaller again when it came to the sort of specialized audience that these books would seem to be aimed at. The point remains, though, that even if the number of printed anatomy texts was small, many of them were reprinted, almost continually throughout the period.

The printing of Andreas Vesalius' *De humana corporis fabrica* (generally referred to as *De fabrica*) in 1543 was a milestone event in the printing of anatomical texts. Vesalius' anatomical experiments had exposed flaws in the works of Galen, a classical master on whose authority the vast majority of anatomical knowledge was based in the early modern period. Instruction in anatomy at the time (the early sixteenth century) focused on lessons out of Galen, with little in the way of practical experience or investigation. Vesalius, who insisted on conducting his own dissections, came to realize that Galen had based his writings, in part, on the

dissection of animals, dogs and apes in particular, and not on human anatomy. One of the important consequences of Vesalius' work was this emphasis on direct empirical observation, of the kind expressed in Rembrandt's *Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp*. Andreas Carlino, in *Books of the Body*, traces the evolution of the anatomy lesson through an examination of title pages taken from anatomical texts. Carlino notes that the tradition that Vesalius was challenging saw a hierarchical system of reader, demonstrator and cutter. Sitting on an elevated chair, focused entirely on a text, the reader recited passages from Galen. The demonstrator pointed out (with a rod) the relevant areas (which may or may not align with the reading), while the cutter made the actual incisions. In this arrangement the person conducting the anatomy was the least important participant. Vesalius began the process of reversing this arrangement, hence the importance placed on the title page of his *De fabrica*, which boldly shows the young Vesalius conducting his own dissection. The *De fabrica* is a response to Galen and Vesalius aims to set the anatomical record straight. It is important to note that in the dedication to *De fabrica*, Vesalius recognizes his part in a continuing dialogue, the evolution of science and not the condemnation of previous scholars. It is sometimes assumed that Vesalius had the overthrow of Galen in mind with the *De fabrica*; Roger French's claim that 'Vesalius was going to use his knowledge to demolish Galen' (169) is an extreme example of this attitude, one not supported by the dedication to *De fabrica*. While the tone and intent of any introduction might leave the interpretive door open, Vesalius goes to great lengths to both praise and pay homage to the classical master:

I have no intention whatever of criticizing the false teachings of Galen, who is easily first among the professors of dissection, for I certainly do not wish to start off by gaining a reputation for impiety toward him, the

author of all good things, or by seeming insubordinate to his authority.

(liv)

Vesalius continues, noting that his contemporaries, when faced with contradictions or errors in Galen, are learning to trust their 'not ineffective eyes', are 'making careful notes of the contradictions' and 'sending the notes to their friends in various places with a firm but friendly exhortation to carry out their own investigation as so gain a knowledge of the real anatomy' (liv).

Far from the battle of the new science versus the old, Vesalius paints a picture of evolutionary change, not revolutionary, a dialogue with the old master that sees the science of anatomy as continuing to be developed through the efforts of Vesalius and his contemporaries. With a de-emphasis on a tension that may have existed in these competing approaches and texts, there is room to appreciate that a myriad of beliefs and theories abounded throughout the period and that medical practitioners of all stripes made use of disparate strategies and remedies, depending on the case before them. A consideration, then, for the theatre is that the presence or interest in anatomy is not entirely born out of perceived tension or threat in the medical or social sphere and that the presence of anatomy in these plays is an indication of another agency or other agencies.

In any event, the printing of *De fabrica* was a major event that saw the publication of a large, expensive, folio text out of reach of many book buyers. More in reach of consumers was the much smaller, and cheaper, *Epitome*, printed simultaneously with the larger edition and 'intended as a sort of pathway through these books and an index to the things demonstrated in them' (*De fabrica* lv). The *Epitome* could be purchased with 'paper dolls', figures that could be assembled to

demonstrate the human anatomy, allowing the reader to peel away successive layers of the body in a 'clever process that simulated dissection' (Furdell, *Publishing* 162). Central to the larger text of *De fabrica*, and also allowing the reader access to the interior of the human form are the woodcut drawings, by Stephen Van Calcar. Calcar's drawings are now justifiably famous in their own right, as synonymous as Vesalius' text with *De fabrica*. The original printing of *De fabrica* was not a huge seller, though clearly there was recognition of its financial potential. In 1545 Thomas Geminus published a plagiarized version of *De fabrica* under his own name. Geminus' Latin work, *Compendiosa Totius Anatomie Delineatio* did not make a huge impact, prompting the release, in 1553, of another version, this time featuring a translation of Vesalius' Latin text into English by the school teacher and Eton headmaster, Nicholas Udall (Furdell, *Publishing* 162-166 and O'Malley and Russell 19). Though little is known of Geminus, he is thought to be an engraver, and his copper-plate engravings of Calcar's woodcut drawings is the first such project in England. Geminus' engravings would become ubiquitous and nearly every important work on anatomy would feature these images. Indeed, where Calcar's drawings were an integral part of *De fabrica* (the text and images are tightly linked) Geminus' engravings would see the separation of word and image, with those images now becoming artifacts in their own right, removed from the context of a medical work. Geminus' *Comendiosa*, an amalgamation of a condensed version of the *Fabrica* and the *Epitome* is something of a 'coffee table book' version of Vesalius, and now a good step away from a serious medical work. Certainly, it seems to have had little influence on science or medicine. The text, translated by Udall, known as the author of *Ralph, Roister, Doister*, and who had no medical training, is further evidence, if any is still required, that Geminus sought a wider, consumer base, aiming his book at

the lay reader who may have been attracted to the phenomenal illustrations that, in Geminus' version, provided a window into the body but little practical instruction. Vesalius vehemently opposed this crass plagiarism of his studious work but his opposition could not prevent the reduction of the *Fabrica*, and Calcar's illustrations, to a purely commercial enterprise (O'Malley and Russell, *Introduction to Anatomy* 20).

Thomas Geminus would borrow the Calcar drawings for another medical book - *The Birth of Mankind*. When it first appeared in 1540, *The Birth of Mankind* was a translation of a Latin work, *De Partu Hominis*, though that work was itself a translation of a German book by Eucharius Rosslin, which had been published in 1513. Rosslin was an apothecary and his work is a compendium of Galen, Hippocrates and some medieval Arabic writers. *The Birth of Mankind* would be reprinted in 1545, edited and expanded by the physician Thomas Raynalde, with whom the book is now generally associated (Hobbes xxvii). The title page tells us that it is *The Birth of Mankind: Otherwise Named, The Woman's Book Newly Set Forth, Corrected and Augmented*. While the book offers advice on a variety of topics, from conception, the care and feeding of infants, even such practical matters as the dangers of wearing too much makeup, the *Birth of Mankind* is also an anatomy text, one that goes to great lengths to describe the female form. One of Raynalde's additions to the 1545 edition is a lengthy prologue that, while addressed specifically to the 'women readers', offers an argument and apology for the work as it addresses a multiplicity of audiences. Raynalde wants his book to be of practical utility, and opens his dedication with the reasons why women should value his work:

And farther, have in the first book set forth, and evidently declared, all the inward parts of women (such as were necessary to be known to our

purpose), and that not only in words, but also in lively and express figures, by the which every part before in the book described, may in manner by as exactly and clearly perceived, as though ye were present at the cutting open or anatomy of a dead woman (12).

This virtual anatomy lesson will allow:

the better to understand how everything cometh to pass within your bodies in time of conception, of bearing, and of birth. And farther, by the perfect knowledge of this book, ye shall clearly perceive the reason of many diseases which happen peculiarly to women, and the causes thereof; by which perceivance, again, ye shall have the readier understanding how to withstand and remedy the said infirmities or diseases. For note ye well that, as there is no man, whatsoever he be, that shall become an absolute and perfect physician, unless he have an absolute and perfect knowledge of all the inwards and outwards of man's and woman's body...(12)

Raynalde warns his women readers that visits to the doctor can be shrouded in mystery, a potentially harrowing event made worse through ignorance. A firm understanding of the book will only serve to facilitate communication with the woman's doctor. The opening section of the dedication is practical and straightforward; women only stand to gain in understanding their own bodily processes and systems. For Raynalde, information leads to better care. From here, though, Raynalde attempts to systematically disarm any and all opposition to the publication of this book. That Raynalde is expecting firm opposition is perhaps indicated by the sudden shift in tone. Turning to those who would object to such a

publication, Raynalde adopts a rhetorical stance that is sharply different than the preceding section:

But truly I do suppose that, although I should call down all the nine noble muses out of the famous mount of Helicon; or pray to be assistant the three loving Graces; or great Apollo, god, master, and chief inventor of the nature of all herbs and other medicines; or Aesculapius, chief patron and president in the worthy science of physic; or witty Mercury, with his dulce and sugared eloquency, with sweet Suada, goddess of all persuasion, with all other gods and goddesses whatever they may be in whom ingenious poets do feign to be a majesty, might and power, to incline the hearts of men for to delight and take pleasure in any such thing, which first shall be, by their godhead, allowed and favoured; though (I say) all these should firmly conspire in one together, and bend them utterly to the most of their high puissance, to sacre, hallow, yea, and with their holy poetical spirit to breathe over this book, yet should there be found people of so ingrate, strange, perverse and wayward wits, that would (without all good reason) blame and improve the same, uneath yet seen, and much less read. (15-16)

Raynalde then moves to defend the book from 'lewd' male readers who would use its descriptions of women's 'secrets' and 'privities' to the disgrace or 'shame' of women. Despite all the best intentions, Raynalde recognizes that there will always be those who look, and find, the worst. Clearly, Raynalde's focus has shifted away from his women readers to the men, and he continues to warn them against the misuse of his text. Likewise, he suggests to his male readers, as he has done with the women, that they stand to gain from a more complete understanding of female

anatomy. Addressing a concern that men may in fact come to loathe or abhor women from having read his book, Raynalde suggests that both husbands and doctors will be made more sympathetic, compassionate and understanding, resulting in both better husbands and better doctors.

Raynalde's lengthy (some 18,000 word) dedication serves as an introduction to his anatomical treatise and helps to provide some focus for a complex set of assumptions with respect to the nature and intent of these books. Raynalde was a physician, and this is a medical text that encompasses anatomy, physiology, psychology, and pharmacy. Clearly of use to medical practitioners (and the conclusion of the dedication is directed at midwives who Raynalde imagines will carry his 'little' book around with them), Raynalde is also addressing a non-specialist audience. In fact, the whole intent of the dedication is to make the work's value to the lay reader explicitly clear. *The Birth of Mankind* is intended to benefit those who have no medical training, even expressing its desire to place women at a virtual, imaginative, dissection.

This issue of audience is an important one and Elizabeth Eisenstein, in *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, points out many of the ways in which information was shared and distributed in the early modern period. Eisenstein argues for a shared literary scene in London, one in which books found their way into the hands of buyers, but were then shared among neighbours and friends, and read to those who could not read for themselves. Eisenstein borrows the phrase 'assumed public' (64) in discussing an apparent disconnect between dedication and audience and recognizes that an author's intended, stated, audience may have had little to do with those who may have actually read a given book. This is certainly a helpful point in discussing the more specifically medical works, like Vicary's, and makes

Raynalde's dedications all the more striking. The 'assumed public' for many of the medical texts are other medical practitioners - those whose professions may stand to gain the most from learning from other scholars and scientists. That those books may not have just found their way into those hands is one of the questions Eisenstein poses (and others have pointed out that books directed at students were of equal value to teachers). Raynalde directs his dedication to virtually everyone; his 'assumed public' is the general readership of London, the assumption is that it will be value to anyone who would stop to read it. That Raynalde would assume such a democratic readership is one point; that such a group existed at all is one question that point raises.

Ultimately, Eisenstein argues for a culture of information, a literary scene in which books were commodities, the relationship between buyer and seller an intimate one. Books were read, handed around, discussed, and often re-read to a semi-literate audience of friends, neighbours, and acquaintances. This is the picture of a lively scene, when the sale of books was novel and in that we are helpfully reminded that the social line was indistinct - people bought books, all books, and a sense of class, even propriety, would not take hold until after the shine of the new had worn away. Raynalde may indeed have found his way into the hands and minds of Londoners, but he may have found himself there through as indirect a route as that taken by the anatomy demonstrations.

As interesting a picture as this is, it is only partially helpful when attempting to consider the impact of anatomy on a public audience, part of whom were playwrights. The assumption that an awareness in anatomical techniques was fostered in part by print is helped when one also considers other print formats and

materials. In this, one helpful example is the rather peculiar phenomenon of what have come to be known as 'fugitive sheets'.

A 'fugitive sheet' is precisely that - a broad sheet - on which is the rough image of a man or a woman, usually seated, facing the reader. Overlaid on these images are several 'flaps' that the reader raises to expose the interior, anatomical, structures. In this way, the curious can expose various systems, from the skin through to the spine of each figure. They are reminiscent of 1970s encyclopaedias which employed layers of cellophane images to the same effect - the reader peeled back layers of images to investigate further into the body.

The origin of these so-called fugitive sheets is unknown, though they seem to have first appeared as early as 1538 in Germany. They then spread throughout Europe (examples have been found in France, England, Holland and Italy) and remained in print, in one form or another, until the 18th century. How they came to be known as 'fugitive sheets' is as unclear as their original purpose and while they may have been intended specifically as study-aids for medical students, they quickly became popular among a broad audience. Casey Calkins argues for the benefit of fugitive sheets to art students, though he also claims that they were intended as study aids for medical students. Andrea Carlino provides a detailed overview of these sheets tracing not only early publishers, but also details a print history through to the eighteenth-century (L.H. Wells, 'Anatomical Fugitive Sheets with Superimposed Flaps, 1538-1540', also provides an historical overview). Carlino points out that most fugitive sheets were printed by publishers who did not otherwise print medical texts and that the text of the sheets was too general to be of use to medical students. In fact, Carlino explains that the information on the sheets changed very little, even in the eighteenth-century it tended to repeat the

information found on the original German editions. This may be taken as evidence that the fugitive sheets served a much different audience than medical students: 'The simplicity of the metaphors (the stomach described as a harbor, for instance), the elementary terminology, the emphatic graphic character, suggest that all these prints were in fact intended for a nonspecialist public' (Carlino, *Know Thyself* 54).

As has been noted, Vesalius' *Epitome* served a similar function, in that it allowed medical students to graphically assemble a human frame, superimposing images that allowed for the construction and deconstruction of a body. In 1538, Vesalius also published the *Tabulae anatomicae sex, six folio* sheets of woodcut images with accompanying captions that identified the names of the parts of the body, in Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic (Carlino, *Know Thyself* 62). The level of detail in the diagrams and the descriptions suggests that medical professionals (and students) had much better study aids available to them than the fugitive sheets, which were also published in the vernacular. The Wellcome Institute in London has an example with English text and it certainly seems to reinforce the notion that these items were meant for the consumption of the non-specialist.

Roger French, Elizabeth Furdell, O'Malley and Russell are among those who claim that anatomical fugitive sheets were meant for the popular consumption of a non-specialist audience, speculating (based on the frequency of publication) that there was a market for such material well beyond the medical one. Furdell goes so far as to suggest that with their emphasis on iconography (and consequent de-emphasis on text) fugitive sheets were intended for an illiterate audience who nonetheless had an interest in anatomical material.

Fugitive sheets may indeed have had an instructional purpose, but the images are generally lacking in enough detail to be genuinely useful for medical students or professionals. Likewise, the accompanying text (again, which is in English in one of the specimens retained by the Wellcome Museum in London) is of limited value for the serious student. All evidence suggests that Fugitive sheets were meant for a broad, non-specific, generalist audience who may have had an interest in the proceedings at the anatomy halls. Raynalde, in *The Birth of Mankind*, had the stated goal of making the experience of reading the book analogous with being at an actual dissection. The 'coffee table' variants of Vesalius had the same goal and the purpose of the fugitive sheets, no matter their interest or aid to medical students, was to put the lay reader, imaginatively, at a dissection.

That playwrights in the period had a knowledge and awareness of anatomy is evidently clear. What is not as clear is how those writers, and their audiences, came about that knowledge. It is reasonable to assume that playwrights and audiences did not get their knowledge from a direct observation of dissection, however we can now conclude that there was enough general information available to the non-specialist public to make it possible to form a vague awareness of what was happening in the anatomy halls. If anatomy on the stage can be uncoupled from empirical observation of the practice, perhaps it can then be inferred that the occurrence of anatomy in the theatre is speculative and imaginative and serves a dramatic need beyond the observation of science. While the arguments of current scholars may suggest that playwrights in the early modern period were engaged in the scientific discourse, the aim of which was self-investigation, it can likewise be seen that playwrights sometimes pursued other end, in the representation of anatomy on the stage. An investigation of the plays themselves, and an examination of how anatomy functions

within those plays (and, indeed, the resulting interplay across the works) will help to frame the prominence, importance, and thematic use of human dissection in the drama of the sixteenth- and seventeenth- centuries and arrive at some conclusions about the nature of the subject of anatomy in these plays.

Chapter Three: Anatomy in Print and Culture

The use of anatomy in the drama of the seventeenth century is not only pervasive but wide and varied in its application. The apparently direct references to the practice of human dissection and the activity of the anatomy halls are striking features of some of these plays. In some cases, (particularly *The Insatiate Countess*, as is discussed in some detail later) the references seem so specific they suggest that playwrights and their audiences had direct access to, or knowledge of, the anatomy halls and that that knowledge is put to use in these plays. This would also suggest that the full meaning of these references in the drama can only come with that explicit knowledge; playwrights relied on the fact that audiences were privy to this activity. This chapter will examine that assumption in an examination of a group of plays that do seem to treat directly with the science of anatomy and dissection. The nature of these references varies, as will be discussed, but the overall goal will be to attempt to discern if, in fact, references to the act of dissection in these plays can, or need necessarily, be read as factual. There will be an attempt to place references to anatomy within the overall structure of the plays in question in order to investigate the nature of these references. Which is to say, these plays will be tested to not only probe the factual content but to also attempt to place these plays within a broader, theatrical dialogue that speaks to itself as much as (or moreso) it participates in a medical or scientific dialogue.

It was suggested in the previous chapter that a knowledge of anatomical practice may well have come to audiences by way of the print culture, that readers may have gleaned insight into the practice of anatomy through printed anatomical texts. That this possibility was open to playwrights presents an immediate

opportunity to examine if, and how, some of the plays of this period may be reacting to, or participating in, that print culture. So, for example, Henry Chettle's *The Tragedy of Hoffman* is a play that alludes to anatomical practice in a number of intriguing ways, so much so that it is apparently caught up with the actual procedures of the anatomy halls (and resembles *The Insatiate Countess* in this respect, as we shall see). However, through a careful examination of the text, it is possible to conjecture that this is a play that owes a debt to, and is involved in a dialogue with, the print culture and not to the specifics of the anatomy hall or its activities.

The Tragedy of Hoffman is a revenge tragedy, the story of a son seeking revenge for the death of his father. The elder Hoffman has been hanged for piracy, but the son is outraged at the further offence after death, that his father has been flayed down to the bones and left hanging. Or, as Hoffman tells us:

Beheld the flesh, mangled with many scars,

Pared from the bones of my offended father.

And when he was a bare anatomy,

You saw him chained unto the common gallows (1.1.165-169)

Having stolen his father's skeleton and hung it in a cave, Hoffman is speaking here to Prince Otho, the son of one of the men who condemned the senior Hoffman to death, and suggests that Otho witnessed his father's flaying, that he saw his scarred and mangled flesh removed from his bones. Hoffman presents Otho with his father's bare skeleton and then enacts a similar fate on the Prince. We are told not only that Hoffman is more than capable of performing the surgical act himself but also that the surgeons who flayed his father were nothing more than

a sort of filthy mountebankes,
Expert in nothing but in idle words,
Made a day's work with their incision knives
On my oppressed poor father, silly man;
Thrusting their dastard fingers in his flesh,
That durst not while he lived behold his face.
I have fitted my anatomy
In a faire chain too (1.3.4-11)

Hoffman has set each corpse up, side by side, to be viewed, 'you shall hang by him,/ and hang afore him' (1.3.14-15), he tells Otho's skeleton, 'Come, image of bare death, join side, to side/ With my long injured father's naked bones' (1.3.15-16).

Chettle has orchestrated the intriguing stage picture of two anatomized skeletons, hanging in view of the audience. The anger and disgust expressed by the younger Hoffman is seated not only in the execution of his father, but in the treatment of his father after death. As Richard Sugg suggests, while gibbeting was a common form of execution, it is Chettle's addition of the anatomy that seems to extend the horror for Hoffman (Sugg, *Murder* 26). Hoffman clearly regards the actions of the surgeons to have been a violation and his attitude towards them is equally clear; they are 'filthy mountebankes', with 'dastard fingers'. For Chettle, the flaying is a protracted violation against the father, and reason for the son to want revenge. Hoffman will use the very techniques of the executioners in also reducing Otho to a skeleton. Having demonstrated his own skill as a surgeon, Hoffman proudly displays the skeleton of Otho, and presumably those two skeletons hang on

stage for the remainder of the play, the 'image of bare death' to which he refers. Later, the deranged Lucibella confuses them for starved porters guarding the entrance to Hoffman's cave while Roderique and the Duke of Saxony comment on the apparent freshness of the bones in a speech that further reinforces the stage picture that Chettle has created:

RODERIQUE. these bones are green;
This less anatomy hath not hung long.
The bigger, by the moss and dryness seems
Of more continuance. (5.1.39-42)

Roderique may not be expressing a medical opinion, but his observance of the 'green' bones may have made sense to an audience willing to believe that green meant either unripe or unseasoned. If, indeed, Chettle is using colloquial language to better make a point, it also serves to move the play away from medical accuracy, with the further implication that Chettle's theatrical intention is focused elsewhere, perhaps on the visual iconography he has created. Saxony's reference to a 'bare Anatomy' is another use of a term in a play that repeats a similar image (bare bones, bare skeletons are others) throughout. We are left, nevertheless, to consider the fact that two skeletons hang on stage for the duration and for the most part are meant to indicate Clois Hoffman's hiding spot. This striking visual image, of two anatomized corpses hanging vertically at the rear of the stage is one that Chettle establishes early in the play and strengthens and reinforces throughout. Richard Sugg discusses this aspect of the play at length in *Murder After Death*, going so far as to speculate on the practicalities of presenting a skeleton on the early modern stage (pp.22-23). Chettle does seem to clearly indicate that such a figures are present on the stage; an early stage direction tells us that Hoffman 'strikes ope a curtain where appears a

body' (1.1.6.1), tells Otho to 'behold a father hang'd up by his sonne' (1.1.184), before Hoffman 'hangs up Otho's skeleton' (1.3.15.1). There is little doubt that the physical presence of the anatomized corpses is important to Chettle and, by extension, to the play itself. The early discussion of the anatomical procedures that resulted first in Hoffman's skeleton, and then Otho's, at the younger Hoffman's hands, suggests a certain conflation of the anatomy theatre and the playhouse. In as much as Hoffman has assumed the role of anatomist in the play, the character can be seen to straddle the space between the playhouse and the anatomy theatre. This fluidity gives rise to the suggestion that the procedures of the anatomists was known to the playwrights who were then able to represent this activity on the stage. Indeed, this association of these spaces, the anatomical and the theatrical, has been noted and commented on by several critics.

Christian Billing, for example, has commented on the association of the anatomy hall with the theatre, and argues that in *The Witch of Edmonton*:

... Carter's reference (to a skeleton in the Barber Surgeon's Hall) is not metaphorical abstraction, but an explicit reference to a specific architectural environment.... Also show(s) that Ford had either visited the building or heard about its interior.... (*Masculinity* 184)

Billing argues that Carter's lines were written by John Ford, a former law student who must have had access to the Barber-Surgeon's Halls in order to gain this intimate knowledge of the proceedings. Billing then extends this line of thought to argue that Ford aims this reference at a 'relatively small and elite audience who were congregated around the performer on at least three sides and seated according to wealth or status' (*Masculinity* 184). Billing, then, draws an explicit line between

the anatomy theatre and the playhouse: not only do the two resemble each other, but the 'privileged' audience were made acutely aware of this similarity and made to reflect on it through Carter's lines of dialogue. For Billing the two institutions were analogous in intent and purpose.

In a similar way, we can consider the physical similarities between the anatomy halls and the playhouse. In his article 'Modelling the anatomy theatre and the indoor hall theatre'; Billing uses the fact that Inigo Jones designed both the Phoenix Theatre and the anatomy theatre of the Barber-Surgeons Hall to consider that the two spaces are coterminous. Giving particular consideration to Beeston's Cockpit Theatre, Billing connects the design of early anatomy halls with this performance space, a hall for viewing cockfights and the staging area for John Ford's tragedies. This not only links these spaces in an intriguing way, it provides Billing the opportunity to suggest that it gives the performance spaces a phenomenological advantage in that audiences overlay or derive meaning for the plays from the surroundings – that the theatre is a staging house for a particular act of animal violence and resembles the anatomy theatre would resonate with an audience for, in this example, Ford's major tragedies.

While not looking to break the fascinating set of connections this presents, another consideration may be that the needs of any theatre would be roughly the same, and that Jones' skills in designing spaces that demand both a presentation space and a viewing space would be useful across a range of disparate facilities. Roger French tells us that when Allesandro Benedetti oversaw the first permanent anatomy theatre in Italy he looked to the model of ancient Roman theatres and amphitheatres (83). William Brockbank, in 'Old Anatomical Theatres and What Took Place Within', makes a similar observation, noting that Benedetti 'made use of a

large temporary wooden structure on the lines of a Roman amphitheatre' (374). In the same article, Brockbank describes the anatomy theatre in Padua as 'six concentric galleries' (374), that was 'really a funnel' (375) pointed directly at the corpse. Interestingly, Billing begins his article with an overview of anatomy in England (including some mention of Harvey and Descartes, which we will come to shortly), before moving into his own computerized recreations of anatomy halls. Like Brockbank, Billing, through these images, shows a similar arrangement of circular galleries, with the focus of the room leading to the corpse, prominently displayed in the centre of that room. Billing then draws explicit connections between 'Jones's anatomy theatre and indoor hall playhouse design' (*Modelling np*), and points out the centrality of the 'performers' in these spaces (actors, or lecturers), the socially tiered auditoria, and the 'scripts' used in both spaces. It follows, logically, that both kinds of spaces described in the article are performative. What is less clear is that both spaces are 'theatrical'. There need not be a more explicit conclusion drawn than that the needs, presentationally speaking, of the anatomy hall (with the cadaver prominently displayed for an audience of students) were met by the designs of a theatre. This does not break the connection between the two spaces, but rather allows for an investigation that reconsiders the nature of that connection, including questioning if the inverse of this relationship (anatomy hall to theatre) serves the needs of the theatre.

Other scholars similarly assume that theatrical practitioners, and their audiences, had great and intimate knowledge of what happened in the anatomy halls. Hillary Nunn argues that 'early Stuart playwrights capitalized on the similarities between anatomical and commercial theatres' and that:

the dynamics of ... feigned theatrical destruction of the human body... closely mirror those of the Barber-Surgeons' anatomical dissections, which proved popular theatrical events even among Londoners without any professional connections to the medical realm (2).

Unfortunately, Nunn does not reference her sources for this information, making it difficult to verify for this thesis. Nonetheless, it is important to note that it is Nunn's assertion that playwrights and audiences had first-hand knowledge of anatomical lectures and demonstrations and, her argument goes, playwrights were in a position to portray that activity accurately on the stage. These are intriguing arguments that invite questions about the relationship of writers to the practice of anatomy. And while it does seem to be a matter of some certainty that authors were interested enough in the practice of anatomy to represent it on the stage, we are also free to consider a complimentary set of questions, namely just how accurate were the representations of anatomy on the stage, could that information have come from other sources and, if verisimilitude was not paramount, how are we to read these glosses in the plays? It has been suggested that a certain knowledge of the practice of anatomy could well have come from other sources, namely through print, and it will be further argued that the representation of anatomical practice was not as accurate as it may first appear. Further, if scientific accuracy was not the aim, then a generalized understanding of anatomy is all that these playwrights would have needed. Is it possible to speculate on why these authors felt compelled to include these references?

Richard Sugg recognizes that anatomy in the theatre often represented 'novel reexpressions of violence or threats of violence' (*Murder* 13) (as in the revision to *Every Man in his Humour*). Sugg's vigorous investigation of the subject does

acknowledge the relative lateness with which England came to the anatomical sciences, though he also uses several examples from plays of the period to illustrate his point that writers had more than a passing familiarity with the practices and wrote for audiences who were equally versed in the procedures occurring in the anatomy halls. Sugg's investigation of one play in particular, *The Insatiate Countess*², helps to illustrate the variety of arguments that can be presented and, in the counter arguments, illustrate the intriguing complexity of the subject. In examining the role of anatomical procedures in *The Insatiate Countess*, Sugg quotes Rogero, who threatens Clardiana with 'I would leave thee as bare as an Anatomy at the second viewing' (1.1.166), a line that allows Sugg to draw the conclusion that Marston (and his co-writers) had very explicit knowledge of the anatomy halls. There is even the further suggestion that Marston may have written the scene (and following from Wiggins' argument, will accept that this is Marston's work (XXV)) during (or shortly after) the annual anatomy lesson (*Murder* 18).

Sugg draws attention to the fact that anatomies were conducted around the time of Lent, allowing him to draw further parallels to the kind of religious overtones evident in the Luther drawing (see previous chapter) and suggesting that these events (religious and secular) were approximate in the minds of the public. According to Young's Annals, however, the anatomies took place 'four times a year' (362) and while neither Young or Dobson and Walker specify exact dates (perhaps it is reasonable to assume the anatomies happened in the colder months of the year) they were certainly not exclusive to the season of Lent. Likewise, each anatomy

² All references are to Martin Wiggins' edition. The introduction to which details the authorship question as well as the rationale for reassigning lines to characters other than those found in earlier editions. See also Malchiori's edition for further arguments about authorship. I accept Wiggins' argument that the play is the result of Barksted and Machin revising Marston's draft.

demonstration occurred over three days. This leads Sugg to assert that because of this, 'there must therefore be a very strong possibility that 'at the second viewing' means 'on the second day', implying a body stripped down to its muscles, or even bones' (*Murder* 18). There is some reason to quibble. For very good reasons, mainly having to do with the rapid deterioration of the viscera, anatomies began with the removal of the 'moist' parts of the body. There was little chance that the bones were exposed before the third day. If Sugg is right, and 'second viewing' means 'second lecture', the audience was hearing of the musculature and not the skeleton. All of which is to say that it can be argued that Marston's use of anatomy here, and elsewhere in this play, is metaphorical, illustrative, and not specific. If this is not the precise reference that Sugg suggests, we can begin to speculate that the inclusion of anatomy in *The Insatiate Countess* is for purposes other than a specific gloss.

To begin to examine why Marston would include this reference, it is perhaps useful to examine the play in some detail, to establish context. Certainly, Sugg's description of *The Insatiate Countess* is illuminating and insightful and includes a discussion of Rogero's threat to anatomize Clardiana, from which Sugg draws an explicit link between the action of the play and anatomical lectures (the 'three-day event' that Sugg mentions):

Rogero's startling reinvention of an age-old threat of violence is achieved by association with the now evidently familiar procedures of London's public anatomical demonstrations. ...So exact a glance at the practices of the surgeons and the physicians is rarely found in the period's literature. At the same time, this precision of a reference is achievable via a coded brevity that assumes general knowledge of such matters on the part of a London theater audience, circa 1610.

There is indeed some chance that, when that scene was written, the three-day event had quite recently occurred (*Murder* 18).

There are several interesting points here that will help to frame the arguments presented in this thesis. The 'reinvention of an age-old threat of violence' will come up again later, following the examination of the significance of anatomical practice in this group of plays. Perhaps more importantly for now is the 'coded brevity that assumes a general knowledge'. Though Sugg suggests that Marston's exact glance is a rare one nevertheless it will be argued here that playwrights, and their audiences, could access this information through other, more easily obtainable, ways.

As with the earlier examination of the plays of Jonson, it is useful to come to terms with this play's use of anatomy within the broader fabric of the play itself. In addition to the violence that occurs, the physical, often sexual, imagery found in the play is frequent and explicit. The lust of the countess is countered and replayed throughout the play in many ways, not the least of which are several explicit references to sex and sexual mutilation. The countess will pay the ultimate price for her lasciviousness, and through her actions Marston will examine the actions of men and women in his further examination of sex and marriage. While the Countess finds herself embroiled in several love plots, the subplot of the play will involve Rogero and Clardiana and their new brides, Abigail and Thais. The buffoonery of the two husbands is made apparent on their first entrance, but their wives give us an even clearer look into their dispositions:

ABIGAIL. Then thou'rt a barren woman, and no marvel if thy husband
love thee not. The hour for both to come is six, a dark time fit for

purblind lovers; and with cleanly conveyance by the niggers our maids, they shall be translated into our bedchambers, your Husband into mine, and mine into yours.

THAIS. But you mean they shall come in at the back-doors.

ABIGAIL. Who, our Husbands? Nay, and they come not in at the fore-doors, there will be no pleasure in't. (2.2.57-64)

The 'dark' double entendre is clear (and will recur in other plays that are examined later). While we are not here concerned with the possible attitude towards this activity as expressed by the wives, the reference does serve to indicate that this is a play that will concern itself with the baser nature of humanity in its examination of lust and revenge. The play will move from those very physical concerns to examine the nature of the soul in various ways, which will be examined later, and in its talk of the human heart invites some discussion of the ability, or otherwise, of modern science to discern the soul in human beings.

First though, the wives will attempt to trick their hapless husbands, which will wind up in a double bed-trick. The general confusion and outrage that this causes will eventually lead to the husbands being condemned to be executed. There are several things about this sequence that demand attention, but for the moment consider Clardiana's outburst on the gallows:

But first to our *quondam* wives, that makes us cry our vowels in red capital letters: 'I, O, U' are cuckolds. O may bastard-bearing with the pangs of childbirth be doubled to 'em. May they have ever twins and be three weeks in travail between. May they be so rivelled with painting by that time they are thirty, that it may be held a work of condign merit but

to look upon 'em. May they live to ride in triumph in a dung-cart and be crowned with all the odious ceremonies belonging to 't. May the cucking-stool be their recreation, and a dungeon their dying-chamber (5.2.24-33)

The base, almost chthonic imagery is startling, and Clardiana's list of abuses and embarrassments scatological. The 'cucking stool' is a familiar image from drama and has the implication of embarrassment and public humiliation (it is, in fact, related to the 'ducking stool'). Clardiana's line of thought, then, runs from the pain and visceral condition of child-birth (of twins, no less) to a ride in a cart, crowned with dung to the cucking stool. In this context it is worth noting that since the 13th century a cucking stool was synonymous with a chamber pot (cuck being to defecate). Marston's biological and anatomical concerns with women in the play run from 'back-door' sex to defecation. This particularly base view of sexual relations is also accompanied with images of deformation (Clardiana wishes that he had the 'circumsizing' of the Captain of the Guard so that he could cut short his 'cuckold-maker' (3.2.139-140) and lewd sexual jokes: 'Mizaldus: What, the fall, my Lord? As common a thing as can be: the stiffest man in Italy my fall between a woman's legs' (2.1.165-166).

The play's more general bodily concerns also include very specific references to anatomy and dissection which will be examined in due course. Along with these very physical references, the play also manages several metaphysical ones and raises questions having to do with the mind/body split that we will see in other plays and, at the very least, the play can be seen to be interested in themes of exteriority that are evident in the period, as exemplified in this exchange between Isabella and her Page:

ISABELLA. Here, take this Letter, bear it to the Count.

But boy, first tell me, think'st thou I am in love?

PAGE. Madam, I cannot tell.

ISABELLA. Canst thou not tell? Dost thou not see my face?

Is not the face the Index of the mind?

And canst thou not distinguish Loue by that?

PAGE. No Madam. (2.3.1-7)

And while the Page may have reason to doubt the sincerity of Isabella's feelings, Marston is also playing, and inverting, very familiar love tropes. That the outside is no marker of the inside is a theme that recurs throughout the play. In the first of several references to anatomy in the play, Mizaldus tells Abigail that he does not hold her hand as hard

as you grasp my heart, unwilling wanton.

Were but my breast bare and anatomized,

Thou shouldst behold there how thou tortur'st it;

And as Appelles limned the Queen of Love,

In her right hand grasping a heart in flames,

So may I thee, fairer, but crueller.

ABIGAIL. Well sir, your visor gives you colour for what you say. (2.1.93-98)

The image of the flaming heart is as familiar as the notion that we would see it in the exposed chest, and again Marston's aim seems to be to rebuke a well-worn

trope. From images of the heart, Marston moves on to even less solid material – the soul. As the play works towards its climax, Marston calls the actions of his female protagonists further into question. Late in the play, the Cardinal warns Isabella

O Lady this is but a branch of charity.

An ostentation or a liberal pride.

Let me instruct your soul, for that, I fear,

Within the painted sepulchre of flesh,

Lies in a dead consumption. Good Madame, read. (5.1.91-96)

In the play's interest in anatomy, Marston also subtly alludes to the corporeal nature of death and the impact of the corpse. In one of the play's brief mourning scenes, Count Roberto quickly convinces Isabella to move on from her dead husband; mourners

sail against the wind that wail the dead,

And since his heart hath wrestled with death's pangs

(From whose stern cave none tracts a backward path) (1.1.37-39)

This attitude towards the corpse is repeated throughout a play concerned as it is with physicality and corporeality.

The wooing continues and Isabella is not only able to move past her grief, but also succumbs to the charms of Roberto, though she herself seems aware of the weakness of women, something she expresses in graphic, physical terms:

ISABELLA. Alas, poor creatures, when we are once o' the falling hand

A man may easily come over vs.

It is as hard for us to hide our love,
As to shut sin from the creator's eyes.
I' faith my lord, I had a month's mind unto you,
As tedious as a full- riped maidenhead.
And, Count of Cyprus, think my love as pure
As the first opening of the blooms in May.
You're Virtue's man. Nay, let me not blush to say so.
And see, for your sake thus I leave to sorrow.
Begin this subtle conjuration with me,
And as this taper, due unto the dead,
I here extinguish, so my late dead Lord
I put out euer from my memory,
That his remembrance may not wrong our love. (1.1.84-97)

Isabella's imagery associates a 'ripped maidenhead' and the 'opening of the blooms in May' to suggest a bodily physical sexual encounter. The sexual, and invasive, innuendo is carried further with the suggestion that Isabella will now extinguishes her husband's 'taper', presumably in favour of Roberto's.

Marston will continue his examination of the nature of marriage and sexual commitment in the subplot of feuding neighbours with the antics of the more foolish characters, Mizaldus and Clardiana. A chance encounter on their mutual wedding day leads to an eruption of their feud, including the hot outburst from Mizaldus and brings us to the apparently very specific reference to the science of anatomy:

Shall any broken quacksalver's bastard oppose him to me in my
nuptials? No, but I'll show him better metal then ere the gallimaufry his

father used. Thou scum of his melting pots (that wert christened in a crusoile, vvith Mercury's water, to show thou would'st prove a stinging aspis - for all thou spitt'st is aquafortis, and thy breath is a compound of poison's stillatory): if I get within thee, hadst thou the scaly hide of a crocodile (as thou art partly of his nature) I would leave thee as bare as an Anatomy at the second viewing. (1.1.159-167)

The dialogue between Rogero and Clardiana that precedes is filled with a mix of medical and violent imagery. Those who would interfere in the argument are deemed 'mountebank' and then 'quacksalver', their aid apparently dismissed as cheap, ineffective medicine. This resulting outburst from Rogero follows this theme and mixes in a variety of alchemical, medical, and pharmaceutical allusions before winding its way to the threat of 'Anatomy'. Marston here not only associates anatomy with the kinds of hack medicine he has already condemned but suggests a certain knowledge of the practice – by the 'second viewing' the entrails would be removed, the skeleton not yet visible. Viewed in isolation, it is tempting to suppose that playwrights, and audiences, had specific knowledge of the procedures of the anatomy halls. Marston's reference is incomplete, however, and while the interior of the deceased would be visible, the skeleton would not yet be as fully exposed as Rogero's threat would have us believe. Rather than taking this as an indication of (or concern for) the explicit details of anatomical practice, we can perhaps consider Marston's dramatic interest in presenting a theatricalized version of anatomy on the stage. As the overview of the play suggests, this is a work that has an overall concern with the body and bodily decay and degradation. Rogero's threat of anatomization is one more example of this, the 'second viewing' is more about the process of decay than it is about the science of dissection and rather than reading it

as a specific gloss, we should consider it within the context of the drama as a whole, and in its relation to other plays of the period.

To further expand on the nature of this reference in the play, it should also be noted that this is also not the only reference to anatomy in *The Insatiate Countess*. Late in the play, when Clardiana and Rogero have been sentenced to execution by a frustrated judge and hoping to resolve the 'bed-trick' that has been played on them by their hapless wives, Clardiana seems willing to face his death: 'I'll come off fairly - then beg my pardon, I had rather Chirurgeons hall should beg my dead body/ for an anatomy than thou beg my life. Justice, O Duke, and let us die' (5.2.78-80). The fifth act of *The Insatiate Countess* occurs at a 'scaffold' and Marston almost immediately invokes the name of Aesculapius. The mixing of these images, of death and medicine, will continue throughout the act, leading us to Clardiana's wish to be brought to the surgeon's hall to be anatomized. Here, Marston neatly combines his use of the (apparently) literal with the figurative. Clardiana's plea for death is dramatically heightened at the gallows in his declaration that he 'had rather' the surgeons should fight over his corpse than have his life begged for; the argument suggests Clardiana is choosing the lesser of two options. Once again, Marston seems less interested in the facts of anatomy than in its dramatic impact, particularly in a stage image that we can begin to see has some precedence and dramatic power on the stage, that of a vertical figure, hanging on the stage in an attitude of death.

Faced with her own execution, Isabella will rather dryly suggest to the attending Cardinal that she has consulted her physician and not religion, though the Cardinal remains concerned for her soul. Nevertheless, Isabella urges the Cardinal to consult his own physician in order that he may increase the number of his days,

this as '*she ascends the scaffold*'. As the insatiate Countess goes to her death, Marston repeatedly reinforces this association of the gallows with medicine, and the continuation of this dramatic image, even as he is bringing on Clardiana and his allusion to the anatomy halls.

The long outburst that Clardiana delivers from the scaffold that has already been examined in part concludes with an attack on women:

May they have nine lives like a cat, to endure this and more. May they
be burnt for witches of a sudden. And lastly, may the opinion of
philosophers prove true, that women have no souls. (5.2.33-36)

Clardiana's speech is a wish-list of corporal punishments and embarrassments he would see inflicted on women and yet his final punishment is metaphysical. Curiously, in a play predominantly concerned with physicality we wind up in this less than physical territory, yet this speech from one of the play's comic characters also serves to summarize a theme that has been running throughout, that the physical examination of the body cannot reveal the metaphysical. One of Clardiana's last speeches, one of the last of the play as it happens, also reminds us of the complicated ground that Marston has covered:

Who, my wife chaste? Has your grace your sense? I'll sooner believe a
conjurer may say his prayers with zeal, than her honesty. Had she
been an Hermaphrodite, I would scarce hath given credit to you.

Let him that hath drunk love-drugs trust a woman;

By heaven, I think the air is not more common. (5.2.143-148)

In addition to the slight aimed at the constancy of women (we have just witnessed the death of the Insatiate Countess), Clardiana reminds us of physical

indeterminacy through the image of the hermaphrodite and the mention of ‘love drugs’, which reminds us of the play’s relentless juxtaposition of science and faith (that science cannot reveal the soul, that the destination of the dead is not to an otherworldly home, but a very worldly one, the surgeon’s gallery). It is just this sort of juxtaposing that helps to clarify the point that rather than being concerned with the specifics of dissection, playwrights use allusions to the practice in a number of ways that serve to further their drama. Rather than considering the gloss to anatomy lessons in *The Insatiate Countess* as exact, we begin to see that the treatment of anatomy in the theatre is often wrapped up in other dramatic ends, which brings us back to *The Tragedy of Hoffman*.

If, like Marston, Chettle’s presentation of the practice of anatomy points to something other than the science itself, we are left to consider the particular way in which Chettle, through Hoffman, presents the bones of his father and Otho. In having hung the skeletons up at the rear of the stage, Chettle delivers a stage image that may not be one that he borrowed from the anatomy halls, rather it is possible to suggest that the author seems to have adopted, and adapted, a central image from the printing of anatomical texts, a printed image that would have been familiar to the play’s audience, and returns us to Vesalius’ *De fabrica*, specifically the famous frontispiece that opens the text.

As we have seen, Chettle’s use of this image suggests a link, a performative link, between the theatre and the anatomy halls and Jonathon Sawday, Andreno Carlino, as well as Christian Billing and Hillary Nunn (as already noted), have written extensively on the composition of the anatomy halls as essentially being theatrical in nature. Nunn, for example, joins Christian Billing in arguing that the similarity between the public theatre and the private anatomy hall is ‘significant’ (Nunn, 4).

What might be added to these arguments, though, is the consideration that the demands of a performance space, any performance space, may result in physical similarities and it is helpful to remember French's point about Benedetti (see p. 27). Instead, what seems to be common across some contemporary arguments is the assumption that there was a direct connection between the anatomy halls and the stage; that audiences had an acute, and accurate, knowledge of anatomy that allowed for this connection.

The argument can be adjusted to account for the theatricality of the stage and that theatricality was represented on the printed title pages of anatomy textbooks. Sawday makes particular use of the crowded frontispiece for Vesalius's *de Fabrica* in which a large and boisterous crowd surrounds Vesalius. Framing the action of the scene are two large columns, and from each hangs a figure (one curiously nude). Occupying a striking position in the middle of the frame, and just above the woman who is being dissected is a large skeleton. Skeletons were an important feature of anatomy halls and used as illustrative devices. In the 1543 edition of the *De fabrica* the skeleton is bearing a large baton, in effect making the skeleton its own demonstrator which gives authority to the figure and perhaps is an indication of the importance of the skeletal system to Vesalius' work. Later editions, starting with the re-issue of the *De fabrica* in 1555 alter the baton to a scythe, perhaps complicating the significance of the figure, bearing, as it now does, some reference to the *memento mori* tradition and the ultimate power of death (see Carlino, *Books* 44). The title page is complex and defies easy interpretation, beyond its positioning of anatomy as an empirical science; any interpretation of the central skeleton is slippery but later anatomy texts seem to echo the prominence of the skeleton, through a framing device that replaces the two human figures found on the pillars in Vesalius,

with skeletons. Both Carlino and Sawday reproduce images of anatomical texts printed after Vesalius with title pages that depict two skeletons framing the image. While none are as crowded or as busy as the image from Vesalius, some do depict anatomy halls, the action of which is again framed by two skeletons. William Brockbank also recounts that when the famous anatomy hall in Bologna was reconstructed in the 18th Century, the Cattedra, the anatomist's chair, was rebuilt to display two partly anatomized figures, standing left and right under the chair in poses strikingly reminiscent of these title pages (378).

What Chettle seems to do in his play then, a play replete with both images of, and allusions to, anatomy, is to reflect back at his audience a reference to a specific image of anatomy – a stage version of what is itself a theatricalized visual image that adorns these printed works on anatomy. It does seem reasonable to suggest that a common visual iconography was established with the printing of anatomical texts, particularly in their title pages, and this is the basis for the visual representation that Chettle creates; one visual image (printed) is substituted with another (staged). A conclusion that can be drawn then, is that these authors were not relying on their audiences' awareness of, or participation in, the activities of the anatomy halls. Rather, these authors were relying on information that had been transmitted through the publication of anatomical texts and, in particular, the pictorial representations contained within them.

Richard Sugg and Matthew Landers point to the increased publication of anatomy texts in the early part of the seventeenth-century (Sugg, *Murder* 2 and Landers 14) and that 'explosion' (to use Landers' term) of material can be viewed not only as evidence for a growing public awareness of the practice, but as also having an influence on the print culture itself. Karen Dale suggests that the publication of

printed anatomies reflected the classical interest in the 'microcosm', the largely Aristotelian idea that the construction of the universe is reflected in the interior anatomy of the human body. In other words, the exploration of the interior helps to explicate the structure of the exterior. The 'anatomical mode' (Landers' phrase) of thinking is also represented in the printing of the texts themselves, with the Vesalian model taking precedence. Vesalius' *De fabrica* can be seen in its publication as anatomical in its own right; the methodical and deliberate division of the chapters into ever smaller constituent sub-chapters reflects the analytical process of dissection itself and Vesalius' editorial practice is reflected not only in other medical texts but in a range of printed books that take the title 'anatomy' (in an Appendix to *Murder After Death*, Richard Sugg lists over 100 texts that use the term 'anatomy' in the title, printed between 1576 and 1650). All this is to suggest that the dissective nature of the anatomical texts is taken as an empirical method of exploration that is adopted and used by a host of writers. This helps to define the 'culture of dissection' that Sawday describes, and speaks to an apparent desire to organize and compartmentalize knowledge within the frame of a literary anatomy.

It was also suggested in the previous chapter that a more general knowledge of dissection and anatomy may have been available to the public through indirect means, mainly a print culture that disseminated medical information to a non-medical audience, sometimes pictorially, for example through the publication of such items as 'fugitive sheets'. An inference that can be drawn from this is that the direct references to anatomy and dissection that occur in these plays need not involve specific knowledge of medical practice, but would instead rely on involvement in, or acknowledgement of, the print culture. That print culture is alluded to in several plays, helping to clarify the importance of this avenue as a means of disseminating

information. Evidence that some writers were interested in the function and presence of anatomical texts presents itself in other ways, and in one play in particular, it would seem that the social influence of Vesalius was a cause of as much concern as its medical influence. It is in this context that we will examine several plays that would seem to participate directly in a dialogue about the print culture itself, as it pertains to anatomy and dissection.

George Chapman's *Two Wise Men and all the Rest Fooles* (published 1619), is subtitled '*a comical moral, censuring the follies of this age...*' and its prologue informs us that it is 'custom' to 'allow interludes and discourses upon the Stage' for several reasons, one being for 'the just reprehension of such as with serious and more grave advising cannot or will not be so freely admonished and corrected' (A1v). To correct and admonish, then, is the stated aim of the play and its anonymous author sets about doing just that, satirizing and criticizing nearly every aspect of London culture, though it is worth pointing out that all the characters are Italian who have made their way to England. Indeed, the play first takes satiric aim at travelers. One such traveler, and presumably one of the wise men of the title, is Antonio (known simply as Antony to his English friends), an Italian with no known religion with a reputation for taking advantage, in numerous ways, of his friends and acquaintances. Antonio's lack of religion (he is never referred to as an atheist, only that he has no religion) is of great concern for the other characters and indeed, religion forms something of a theme in the play and one of the issues hotly discussed is the trend of ignoring holidays; or, as the play describes it, the general public of London now find themselves too busy to be able to stop and observe what were once 'Holy-dayes' (C1v). One such debate, between a farmer, a gardener, a tailor and a blacksmith brings with it the implication that industry and commerce have

become more important than religious observance. This extends to other civic practices, including we are told, the habit of some citizens to now visit the Barber on Sunday rather than going to Church. While it is never explicitly stated in the play (the nature of the satire here is such that very little is explicitly stated) there is a curious theme running throughout that science, and in this case medical science, has replaced, or is at least competing with, religion. Vanity is also a target here, certainly, but it is a vanity mixed up with health sciences; patrons of the barbers are availing of unnecessary, cosmetic, procedures and in that the satire of *Two Wise Men* is altogether prescient.

While some of the characters in the play will defend Antonio, the others try and convince each other that they have been duped and set about discrediting this traveler. In so doing, the play is able to cast its satiric gaze far afield, not just commenting on the state of work and religion (though that does seem to constitute the ‘moral’ of the title) but also for the current vogue for all things foreign. It is satirically suggested that Antonio’s exploits abroad will be quickly gathered and published in a book that will no doubt prove popular. Likewise, the play makes an interesting comment on the popularity of other foreign texts. In particular we are told of a book that was brought back to England from Persia, a book that is occupying all the time and energies of its readers, and is of particular interest to a ‘Ladie’ known to several of the men in the play. In mock Latin, the book is titled ‘*de flatibus separandis ac dividendis*’ (E4r). It is difficult to know what to make of the title, but we are told that it was written by ‘a learned Physician doctorate by the magnificent order of the Mountbankes there’. Led by this unnamed ‘Ladie’, the small literary society examining the book is working hard to translate it into English, providing detailed commentary on the text

and hereafter at better leisure she will have the subject of the whole booke Anatomized by her own surgeon, and set forth in due proportion and colors, and give it a convenient roome in her gallerie (E4v).

There seem to be two satirical targets here – the women's reading group, and the publication of an anatomical text. With respect to the group, it would seem that the 'leisure' of the women is called into question, and Mary Ellen Lamb in 'Inventing the Early Modern Women Reader' details some of the anxiety in the period associated with the rise of the consumption of books by women and the leisure time available for reading for pleasure (18). In discussing women and the book trade, Lamb points out that through the sale of books, women could 'could be defined and define themselves not only by what they owned but also by what they read' (17). Sasha Roberts, in 'Engendering the Female Reader: Women's Recreational Reading of Shakespeare in Early Modern England', details the complex interrelationship of male and female readership in the early modern period, pointing out the portrayal of women readers as wanton, or lascivious in their tastes, and established trope of female readers as primarily recreational, and not for academic or intellectual pursuits (37), as was the presumed case for male readers. This tension, between male and female readers, seems to be reflected in the portrayal of female readers in *Two Wise Men*, with an anatomical text serving as the locus for this investigation. Likewise, Heidi Brayman Hackel illustrates some of the concerns surrounding the issue of women readers in the period, noting legal and customary injunctions against women owning books or reading in public (197). Hackel makes the intriguing observation that the prescribed silence of women led to a paucity of notes left in the margins of books (as is more typically found among male readers) (206). Here, however, we are explicitly told that this group is annotating this book as they ready it for publication.

The satire extends from the leisure time of these women and seems to lead to a comment on what might be transgressive behaviour in the translating of a medical text, an object that is also the target of the play's satire.

The evidence of the text seems to indicate that this is a tantalizing allusion to Vesalius's *De fabrica*. While its proper title is, of course, *De humani corporis fabrica*, '*De fabrica*' has been its persistent shorthand title for centuries. Indeed, the characters in *Two Wise Men* refer to *De flatibus* on several occasions. Clearly the rest of the title makes little sense with respect to Vesalius and the author is evidently playing with some degree of nonsense Latin, but in the larger context it does not seem unreasonable to make the connection with 'separating' (*seprandis*) and 'dividing' (*dividenis*) to Vesalius' book on anatomy. Given that Vesalius set the standard for anatomical publication, and that the deliberate structure of *De fabrica* is precisely to 'separate' and 'divide' knowledge, this gloss in *Two Wise Men* easily extends to a comment on the printing of 'anatomies' in general. Likewise, our fictional book's title is also given the tag '*eos emittendis*', still gibberish, but perhaps close enough to 'to be published' to allow us to take it as one more clue that *De fabrica* is indeed the object of satire. All of this is speculative but taken together, the foreign origin, the references to a physician, a surgeon, the use of the word 'Anatomized' all lend credence to a theory that our anonymous author is, indeed, referencing Vesalius. What is also of note is that the book, once translated, will be large and colourful ('set forth in due proportions and colors') suggesting that part of the satire includes the popularity of the oversize medical treatise, ownership of which perhaps points to an ostentatious display (it will be given a 'convenient roome in her gallerie'). Altogether then, there is support for the suggestion that the satire of *Two Wise Men* extends to the book trade, specifically the popularity of certain medical

texts and their permeation into the broader culture. The satire of women readers would seem to bring us back to Raynalde, and a suggestion that reading is good for all, including women. That some of these plays take a much stronger anti-female stance is something that will be examined at the end of this chapter (and in Chapter Five), though with specific reference to *Two Wise Men*, the author seems to comment broadly on the impact of the medical culture, with the play resting its satire on an observation of the print culture.

If this reading of *Two Wise Men* is warranted, it is perhaps also possible to see significant references to other medical texts and treatises in other plays of the period. The direct connection between John Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy* and Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy* is noted by Marion Lomax in her introduction to the play (ix). A further, and perhaps more intriguing, example of Ford's interest in anatomical text may be seen in *Love's Sacrifice*. Ford's reputation as a writer rests on his sensationalism and his major plays all deal with the extremes of emotion and the perils of loving too madly and too deeply. His most famous play, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, contains one of the most memorable stage directions in all of drama: *Enter Giovannia with a heart upon his dagger* (V.vi). Amongst the rhetoric, the heightened emotion and, indeed, the violence, that characterizes the plays, Ford makes just one use of the word 'anatomy', and it is found in *Love's Sacrifice*, though there is a discernible pattern in Ford's works that presents a view of anatomy and dissection that lies across his major tragedies. Coming near the end of this period, Ford's inclusion of these images and themes suggests a compelling attitude towards these issues and a progression in the presentation of these images. The dating of Ford's works is seen as problematic, and Marion Lomax notes that '*The Broken Heart* is difficult to date precisely' (2), though suggests that 'it seems best to settle for 1626-

31 as the likely period of composition' (9). This would put the writing of Ford's tragedy, a work that abounds (as do Ford's other tragedies) in images of the heart and blood, very close to the publication of William Harvey's influential treatise on the circulation of the blood, *Exercitatio Anatomica de Motu Cordis et Sanguinis in Animalibus* (*An Anatomical Exercise on the Motion of the Heart and Blood in Living Beings*).

Printed, in Latin, in 1628, Harvey's theory of circulation was met with a mixed reaction, though by his death the theory was generally accepted (Billing, *Masculinity* 192). Gweneth Whitteridge notes that many of the attacks on Harvey came from Galenists who defended ancient theories without providing any concrete refutation of Harvey's theory (149-153). It would seem that part of the resistance to the theory of circulation came from the fact that, despite experiments that demonstrated that the blood did, indeed, circulate, Harvey could not clearly articulate why this was important to the health of the body and so the theory was seen to have no real practical application (Wright 201). Some of the appeal of the theory lay in its radical nature - it was simply different. Harvey's theory had its detractors among the medical profession, but there were others, like Descartes, who saw in the theory of the circulation of the blood, more evidence of the mechanized nature of the body. Thomas Wright points out that for Descartes, the theory of circulation helped categorize the human body as an engine working at clockwork efficiency (206). Whitteridge notes that even though Descartes had begun to form his own theories on the circulatory system (and had conducted his own experiments) he was enthusiastic about Harvey's discoveries and never failed to credit Harvey for the theory (153). Ford's interest in the subject may have been grounded in all these reasons. Or, for a playwright who continually mixes the traditional with the radical, it may have been

enough that Harvey's theories pitted the older framework (Galen had argued that the liver was the important organ in blood flow, and Aristotle the brain) against the newer science. Given its preoccupation with hearts and blood, it is perhaps not surprising *The Broken Heart* contains a glance at Harvey, and, perhaps, Ford's own knowledge of *De Muto Cordis*.

Shortly after the start of Act Five, Scene 2, Calantha is forced to dance while being informed of the deaths that have recently occurred. This includes the death of Penthea whose self-starvation has attracted comment from those who see her as having succumbed to anorexia (an anachronistic use of the term, but that one that is sometimes used by modern commentators). For Ford, Penthea's starvation has a direct consequence on circulation - the resulting loss of menstruation represents a loss in femininity. After confessing to the murder of Ithocles, Orgilus is strapped to a chair and Calantha departs the stage, soon to die, literally, of a broken heart. Faced with execution, Orgilus asks to be allowed 'to bleed to death':

ARMOSTES. The executioner?

ORGILUS. Myself; no surgeon.

I am well skilled in letting blood. Bind fast

This arm, that so the pipes may from their conduits

Convey a full stream. Here's a skillful instrument.

(Shows his dagger)

Only I am a beggar in this execution,

By lending th'other prick to th'other arm,

When this is bubbling life out.

BASSANES: I am for 'ee.

It most concerns my art, my care, my credit.

Quick, fillet both these arms.

.....

ORGILUS. Reach me a staff in this hand. (5.2.100-100,112)

After the first incision, Bassanes will assist in making a second incision in Orgilus' other arm, commanding him to:

Grasp hard this other stick. I'll be as nimble.

But prithee look not pale. Have at 'ee; stretch out

Thine arm with vigour and unshook virtue. (5.2,127-130)

William Harvey spends the bulk of *De Motu Cordis* establishing and positioning his theory; it is only towards the end that he presents his reader with the idea of circulation and, in chapter eleven, suggests a rather straightforward test:

Now let anyone make an experiment upon the arm of a man, either using such a fillet as is employed in blood-letting, or grasping the limb lightly with his hand... under such circumstances let a ligature be thrown about the extremity, and drawn as tightly as can be borne, it will first be perceived that beyond the ligature, neither in the wrist nor anywhere else, do the arteries pulsate, at the same time that immediately above the ligature the artery begins to rise higher at each diastole, to throb more violently, and to swell in its vicinity with a kind of tide... the artery here, in short, appears as if it were perternaturally full (98).

Printed on the final pages of the book are illustrations showing this experiment - a man's forearm, bound above the elbow, grasps a rod (what could be a staff), showing the distended veins that result. Orgilus, 'well skilled in letting blood', may well have come across his knowledge in any number of ways. Ford's description, however, seems unique in drama, and his use of images and phrases are close enough to Harvey to hazard the speculation that the playwright had read the scientist and nods to a new (even controversial) medical theory in the context of this grisly scene.

J.B. Bamborough, in the introduction to Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (ed. Faulkner, Kiessling, Blair, 1989), notes that Robert Burton, in addition to his academic duties at Christ Church College, was also involved in a variety of dramatic activities. This includes writing part of the lost play *Alba*, as well as starting *Philosophaster*. It's in this context that Bamborough goes on to speculate that Burton and Ben Jonson may well have met while Jonson was visiting Oxford in 1619 (xviii). Burton compliments Jonson in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, and it may be that Jonson references Burton's work in *The Staple of News*.

Much has been written on *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. First published in 1621, it went through five reprints in Burton's lifetime, who revised and expanded the work with each new publication. A work that deals with melancholy as a disease of the mind, *The Anatomy* ranges over a wealth of renaissance thinking and scientific application. The description of the 'partitions' that comprise the book, is a significant indication of the 'anatomy' that Burton presents; it is a detailed, and compartmentalized, examination of the topic. The popularity of the work, and its social significance, may be hinted at, in Jonson's satirical view of 'news' and those who circulate it.

Written in 1626, *The Staple of News* is a sprawling city comedy, with multiple plot lines and characters to occupy those plots. Ostensibly concerned with the relatively recent rise in popularity of newspapers (itself an interesting examination of print culture), the Staple occupies only a part of the attention of the play. We are also introduced to a group of 'jeerers' set upon mocking society or simply to mock themselves should the occasion call for it. Jonson also uses the relatively uncommon meta-theatrical device of introducing a set of characters in the prologue who have actually come to watch the play. All women, these characters continue to comment on the play in a series of interludes, between the acts, that Jonson labels 'intermeans'. Binding these disparate plot threads together is the Pennyboy family – Pennyboy Junior, his uncle Pennyboy Senior and Junior's Father, Pennyboy Canter. Both Junior and Senior believe that Canter has died the week before, but he has in fact faked his death and has come to them in disguise as a street singer (which explains his designation as Canter). Both Junior and Senior are also competing for the attention of Lady Aurelia Clara Pecunia and their schemes to get into her good graces as well as their new-found hunger for 'news' earn them the scorn of their father and brother.

Frustrated with the actions of the Jeerers, Pennyboy Junior and his group, including Pennyboy Canter and Lady Pecunia take refuge in a pub. In their cups, Pennyboy Junior wants Canter to teach them all to become Canters and will propose forming a 'Canters-College'. Pennyboy Canter takes the opportunity to satirize the group starting with the Doctor:

CANTER. The Doctor here; I will proceed with the learned.

When he discourseth of dissection,

Or any point of anatomy, that he tells you,

Of *vena cava*, and of *vena porta*,

The meseraics, and the mesenterium.

What does he else but cant? (4.4.37-42)

Within the context of the play, a play of sub-cultures and cliques, Pennyboy Junior's Canters-College stands in opposition to the 'Jeerers', and will be a group devoted, apparently, to jargon, to specialized language. As defined by Pennyboy Junior, his Canters-College will include nearly all facets of contemporary society, each with its own dialect, its own slang. The satirical attack of the Canters starts with the Doctor and the insinuation here is that medical professionals speak a language all to their own, presumably at the expense of their patients, who cannot decode this speech. This would seem to be another broadside attack on physicians in general but what is interesting is that Jonson, true to form, has borrowed actual, if obscure, medical terminology, and it seems to form the basis of a rather intellectual joke. *The Staple of News* has its share of base, even scatological, references and humour - at the Staple we hear the news of the Brotherhood of the Rosie Crosse and their 'art of drawing farts out of dead bodies' (3.2.98) in Leipzig, and there is talk of scrotums and fistulas. And while the *vena cava* and *vena porta* are, of course, veins, both *meseraic* and *mesenterium* have to do with the lower intestine and the bowels. Jonson is being very precise with his terminology and the suspicion that he deliberately went for the lower extremities is strong indeed, making this a very elaborately base joke that appears to rely on some knowledge of anatomy for its full effect.

But Jonson's references here may be even more subtle, perhaps even pointed, and suggest that the writer was well versed with the print culture. Three of the phrases that Jonson uses, Vena Cava, Vena Porta and Mesenterium, all appear in Richard Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, printed some five years before Jonson's play. Not only do these terms all appear in Burton's book, but these are phrases that rarely occur elsewhere; Mesenterium appears in Thomas Vicary's *The Englishman's Treasure* of 1586 (45) and though it's entirely possible that Jonson was familiar with that work it seems much more likely that he had read the very popular *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Meseraick is also an uncommon term, but does appear in Helkiah Crooke's *Microcosmographia* which was first published in 1615, and reprinted in 1616 and 1618. Crooke's work was controversial and failed attempts were made to first ban it and then publish an amended version (Keynes 74). Objections to the book stemmed from the fact that Crooke was a physician, and not a surgeon, and the publication of a book on surgery was somewhat beneath him. The book also relied on reproductions of illustrations borrowed from Vesalius that focused on the sexual organs; the title page featured a naked pregnant woman; its removal was one of the suggested emendations from the College of Physicians (Stolberg 279). *Microcosmographica* was also in English, the first such work to be printed first in English since the sixteenth century and this as well was a source of controversy. The popularity of Crooke's work and its availability were aided in the publication of an epitome, one that focused largely on the reprinting of the Vesalian drawings, making this another work to disseminate images of anatomy through print (Sugg, *Murder* 4).

While the *De fabrica* is better known to modern readers, there can be no doubting the influence of Crooke's text; C.D. O'Malley asserts that 'the

Microcosmographica was certainly the largest and fullest anatomical work produced in England up to its day and for a considerable time to follow...' (11). Writing in 2012, Matthew Landers declared that 'the importance of Crooke's *Mikrokosmografia* (sic) has yet to be fully recognized, even by medical historians' and that '...Crooke's contribution to seventeenth-century anatomy remains largely unexamined' (17). Given the controversy surrounding it, and its popularity in print, it might follow that Jonson gleaned his knowledge of the intestines from Crooke. It remains that Jonson's references are very obscure, but the effect of the joke does not rely on specific medical knowledge. There is enough of a suggestion, though, that there is a passing nod to those familiar, not with the anatomy halls, but with the printed works on anatomy.

Another reference to print culture, as well as to the medical scene, occurs in *Lingua: or the Combat of the Tongue* (1607) and it is one that helps to build a further point that while authors may not have been relying on specific, medical, knowledge the references to print may have been targeted at specific audiences or, perhaps more aptly, specific readers. *Lingua* is a play written by the Cambridge educated Thomas Tomkis, and not only references the print culture but also presents an intriguing mix of many of the elements seen in the plays that represent anatomy and medical science in general, and does so through the particular lens of a university-trained writer in plays that were arguably intended for student audiences. This may help to explain the obscure references that Tomkis seems to make and distinguish the nature of the material found in these works versus the more general information found in other plays.

Tomkis earned an MA from Cambridge in 1604 and is responsible for two 'university' plays. The other, *Albumazar*, also contains a reference to anatomy, and it

is worth noting that the two plays written by Tomkis are relevant to this discussion on anatomy in drama. There is suggestion that *Lingua* was performed at Cambridge (Turner, jr. 176) and while it is evident that Tomkis uses his knowledge of anatomy and classical sources for poetic ends the author also points out the contrast between legendary and scientific knowledge, a contrast that may have had particular appeal to the university audience and students versed in this material. If we accept that Tomkis' play is aimed at a university audience it would still seem apparent that the play does not rely on specific anatomical knowledge, rather Tomkis is relying on a broad set of knowledge, familiar to his Cambridge audience and as rarified as that knowledge may be, the play does not rely on explicit knowledge of anatomical practice for its effect.

An allegorical battle of the five senses (Auditus, Visus, Olfactus, Gustus and Tactus), presided over by Lingua (or language) the stage directions tell us that 'The Scene is Microcosmus in a Grove', giving the play a classical setting. There are two direct references to anatomy in the play, and each has a different connotation.

Consider this early exchange between Tactus and Olfactus:

TACTUS. no sooner had I parted out of doors,
But up I held my hands before my face:
To shield mine eyes from th'lights percing beames,
When I protest I saw the Sunne as cleere,
Through these my palmes as through a prospective:
No marveile, for when I beheld my fingers:
I sawe my fingers neere transform'd to glasse,
Opening my breast, my Breast was like a windowe,
Through which I plainely did perceive my heart:

In whose two Concaves I discerned my thoughts,
Confus'dly lodged in great multitudes.

OLFACTUS. Ha, ha, ha, ha, why this is excellent,
Momus himself can find no fault with thee
Thou'st make a passing live Anatomie.
And decide the Question much disputed:
Betwixt the Galenists and Aristotle. (Act one, scene seven)

In terms of the drama, Tactus' language is straightforward and the conceit familiar, in that we have a representation of the heart, in which we can discern thought. Olfactus turns this around with his 'passing live Anatomie' (he clearly finds humour in the thought of a vivisection), and seems to recognize that only the hearts of corpses can be so analyzed, and neatly skewers the metaphor. Tomkis even seems to call attention to his combined use of the classical and the modern, the physical and the philosophical in his mention of Galen and Aristotle. The dispute between the Galenists and Aristotle Tomkis refers to may well be of the sort detailed in Stephen Batman's edition of Bartholomaeus (*Batman upon Bartholome*, 1582), in which Batman (or Bateman) describes a disagreement in the nature of the heart's relationship to the liver. Whatever the source, Tomkis is not only aware of a dispute between these two classical figures, but clearly understands the nature of the physical explorations undertaken by each and presumably he is counting on his university-educated audience to have the same understanding. Tomkis may well be relying on the broad education of his university audience, which might include the study of Galen and Aristotle, but not the specifics of the new medical science. A later, more playful, reference in the play to anatomy may help to support this point of view:

ANAMNESTES. Forsooth Oblivio shut the dore upon me I could come no sooner, ha? is he not here? O excellent. Would I were hangd but I lookt for a sound rappe on the pate and that made me before hand to lift up this excuse for a Buckler, I know hee's not at court, for here is his purse without which warrant theres no coming thither, wherefore now Anamnestes sport thy selfe a little, while thou art out of the prison of his company. What shall I do? by my troth anatomize his purse in his absence. (Act three, scene one)

The choice of words is, of course, deliberate - Anamnestes will 'anatomize' a purse, not empty, rob, steal, or any other familiar action that might have been assigned him. Anamnestes will gut the purse, eviscerate it. Tomkis' language suggests that it is possible to use the phrase in a popular context, that the use of the term has been stretched to allow for its use in an off-hand, common way, (this particular metaphor somewhat resembles Jonson's in *The Magnetic Lady*) suggesting that at least in some instances, an over-reading of the term can be avoided.

Tomkis' acknowledgement of classical authors is deepened with a further reference to Galen (and a printed work of Galen's on hygiene) later with Mendacio's 'I mistake, or els Galen in his booke *De sanitate tuenda*, commends gold as a restorative' (2.5). The medical references continue, including Olfactus' mention of Aesculapius. So, while Tomkis (and presumably his audience) share a knowledge of classical works (including medical tracts) and that knowledge informs the play, a specific knowledge of anatomy is unnecessary. So, if early modern dramatists can in this way be seen to have entered into a dialogue surrounding the printing of anatomical texts, and in this way contribute to the print culture, it is also apparent

that the dialogue also extended to the practice of dissection itself. This will provide the focus for the examination of the next group of plays, which deal with ‘anatomy’ on a social or even cultural level.

As noted earlier, the printing of anatomical texts can be regarded as a dissection in itself, in the compartmentalization and organization of knowledge, and it can be argued that this ontology speaks to the very nature of human dissection. Barker notes that this precise exploration of the body, and this drilling down to component parts may have also had less secular aims in that ‘from precise knowledge of the body comes precise knowledge of the soul’ (13), and serves to tie together the physical with the metaphysical in the search for knowledge and for truth. For Karen Dale the dissection of the ‘microcosm’ that is the human body had implications for the macro, or at least the body politic (Dale 85) and the one was concomitant on the other. Roger French notes that Galen adopted Plato’s doctrine that ‘the body is the microcosm of the world, put together by a demiurge’ (38). Several characters in these plays represent both that search for knowledge, the exploration of divine causes, and the effect on the body politic, whether that be the world of the court, or the larger social scene (principally London, though we are occasionally brought into the larger English landscape).

Christian Billing argues that D’Amville, the main protagonist of *The Atheist’s Tragedy*, is the first character in early modern drama to

articulate a desire to ‘anatomise’ a fellow character from which it may be inferred that a realistic staging of ‘anatomie’ (by which I mean a theatrical representation of human dissection that is based on a literal,

rather than a metaphorical, reading of the term) must necessarily follow (*Masculinity 2*).

It may also follow that the same interest in organizing knowledge that informs Landers' 'Anatomical mode' of inquiry may inform the drama, as exemplified through protagonists such as D'Amville who seem intent on dissection.

Published in 1611, with a possible production date of 1607, Cyril Tourneur's *The Atheist's Tragedy* is a revenge play that follows a convoluted and twisted plot before finding its way to a bloody and sensational ending. D'Amville's atheism allows him the convenience of discarding any spiritual influences; his moral compass is set by his own 'nature', and in that case nature leads to violence and death. D'Amville's preoccupation with earthly pursuits is decidedly self-absorbed and allows him to justify nearly any action. This sense of freewill is ultimately not without cost, though, and by the time we reach the conclusion of *The Atheist's Tragedy*, D'Amville's exotic plans for revenge on Charlemont have begun to fray, much like the mind of the play's protagonist.

The fourth act of the play occurs in a graveyard and the corporeal pursuits and themes of the play are brought into stark relief. On the run and caught up in D'Amville's exotic revenge plan, Charlemont takes refuge in a charnel house where, according to the stage direction, '*he takes hold of a death's head; it slips and staggers him*' (4.3.77.1). 'Such is the trust to all mortality' (4.3.79), muses Charlamonte before he hides amongst the skeletons. Within moments, D'Amville enters with Castabella, Charlamonte's fiancé, herself the subject of a rape attempt by D'Amville earlier in the play. As Charlamonte is D'Amville's nephew, Castabella accuses D'Amville of incest, to which he responds that incest is nothing more than a

social custom, 'bondage cast upon/ Our freedoms by our own subjections' (4.3.125-126). D'Amville will even attempt to use the location, with the sight of skeletons all around, to seduce Castabella, though we are given no rationale as to why the sight of the dead should prompt her to want sex. These are the sorts of rationalist arguments that Giovanni will use in John Ford's *Tis Pity She's a Whore*, and like that play, we are here reminded of the illogical ends of these rational, liberal arguments. Tourneur's introduction of an incest theme is starker even than Ford's – the scene he sets, presumably a stage of corpses, skeletons and decomposition is a reminder of the ultimate reality of life and these anatomies point out the futility of all earthly suppositions. D'Amville's 'philosophy', like Giovanni's is rendered rather trite in the midst of the simple, unalterable fact of mortality.

D'Amville and Castabella will 'lie down with either of them a Death's head for a pillow' according to the stage direction, and Tourneur undercuts D'Amville's arguments moments later with the entrance of Snuffe, who immediately 'mistakes the body of a Borachio for Soquette':

Verily thou liest in a fine premeditate readinesse for the purpose.
Come, kiss me, sweet Soquette. [*Kisses the body*] Now purity defend
me from the sin of Sodom! This is a creature of the masculine gender.
(4.3.206-209)

The text gives us no hint as to the state of decomposition of the 'Borachio', but presumably it is still recognizably a body even if the gender is not immediately evident. Snuffe's response, as humorous as it is intended to be, is not based on the fact that he was on the verge of intercourse with a corpse, rather that he was about to commit sodomy. Even that response is tempered – a humorous 'near miss', the

sinfulness of sodomy (or, for that matter, necrophilia or despoliation) does not seem to loom large in Snuffe's mind. The audience is left to consider the possible treatment of a (female) corpse, now an object to be fully, and socially acceptably, subjected to any treatment, open to the capricious whim of any potential examiner, or violator, as the case may be. While the specific treatment of women is the focus of the examination of other plays in this thesis (see Chapter Five, in particular), it must be noted here that Tourneur focuses this argument on the remains of female bodies.

This scene, set in a tomb with the material end of life in front of us not only furthers D'Amville's atheistic arguments, but the scenes of life (and sex) set amongst the dead sends D'Amville even further down the road of rationalist thought, the extreme end of which seems to be that science will conquer death itself. Tourneur uses the language of the new sciences to probe questions of both mortality and immortality, questions that seem to anticipate much later writers. When D'Amville is confronted with the bodies of his two sons (one dead, the other dying) he invokes the name of the great early anatomist – a knowledge of Galen should be enough to save the one son and resurrect the other (K2v). Despite the doctor's protestations that they are beyond saving (the heat of life is utterly extinguished), D'Amville continues to argue that science has a 'power above nature' (K3r). This exchange is rooted in anatomical study – not only has Tourneur alluded to the teaching and understanding of Galen but also suggests that the examination of bodies should have by now revealed their innermost workings and given science a power over death. In the final moments of the play, Tourneur presents us with a unique mix of science, faith and the limits of rational thought. Now being readied for execution, Charlemont is moments from death and D'Amville seizes the moment for his own ends:

D'AMVILLE. A boon, my Lords;

I beg a boon.

FIRST JUDGE. What's that my Lord?

D'AMVILLE. His body when t'is dead

For an anatomy.

SECOND JUDGE. For what my Lord?

D'AMVILLE. Your understanding still come short o'mine.

I would find out by his anatomy;

What thing there is in Nature more exact,

Then in the constitution of myself.

Methinks my parts and my dimensions are

As many, as large, as well composed as his,

And yet in me the resolution wants

To die with that assurance as he does.

The cause of that in his anatomy

I would find out. (5.2.143-152)

D'Amville wants to anatomize his nephew in order that he may understand both his nephew and himself better. D'Amville seems to believe that a dissection of Charlamont, an investigation of the interior of Charlamont will clarify D'Amville's own being, that D'Amville's constitution will be revealed in his nephew's interior. The assumption, of course, is that dissection can reveal that sort of information. This exchange is often quoted; the latter part of the conversation is equally compelling:

D'AMVILLE. I have bethought me of a better way.

Nephew, we must confer. Sir, I am grown

A wondrous student now o' late. My wit
Has reached beyond the scope of Nature; yet
For all my learning, I am still to seek
from whence the peace of conscience should proceed.

CHARLEMONT. The peace of conscience rises in itself.

D'AMVILLE. Whether it be thy art or nature, I
Admire thee, Charlemont. Why,
Thou hast taught a woman to be valiant. I will beg
Thy life. [*To the Judges*] My Lords, I beg my nephew's life.
[*To Charlemont*] I'll make thee my physician. Thou shalt read
Philosophy to me. I will find out
Th'efficient cause of a contented mind.
But if I cannot profit in 't; then t'is
No more, being my physician, but infuse
A little poison in a potion when
Thou giv'st me physic, unawares to me.
So I shall steal into my grave without
The understanding or the fear of death;
And that's the end I aim at, for the thought
Of death is a most fearfull torment, is't not? (5.2.153-174)

D'Amville decides that he can learn more from a living nephew than a dead one. The 'better way' will put his conscience at rest and make him ready for death. This collusion of thought suggests on the one hand that ultimate knowledge can be obtained through science and yet philosophy, thought, cannot be ignored. Tourneur's

hero comes to realize at the end that both are vital. The combination of those two will represent real advancement and, for D'Amville, final peace.

Nevertheless, Charlamont and Castabella choose to face death together and D'Amville mounts the scaffold, axe in hand, ready to execute his nephew and, according to the stage direction 'as he raises up the axe, [D'Amville] strikes out his own brains. [He] staggers off the scaffold' (5.2.239.1). Though it is tempting now to read this as bleakly, blackly, comic, Tourneur does manage something of a theatrical coup in having his atheistic, amoral, protagonist self-destruct in the final moments of the play; a reminder that D'Amville's over-reaching search for knowledge, which here includes the anatomical impulse, is limited by his own delicate mortality. This final scene is, of course, as effective as the scene in the charnel house, indeed, we are returned to a graveyard of sorts. Tourneur finds an efficient end to his play, and it must be noted that the use of dissection in the play serves its dramatic ends, which is to comment on the ends of knowledge, and the price for over-reaching.

Written and first performed in 1612, Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* is a sensational revenge tragedy, complete with poisonings, murders (including those of children), dismemberment, hints of incest, and, for good measure, lycanthropy. Like *The Atheist's Tragedy*, *The Duchess of Malfi* is also a play that will use one specific image of the anatomy halls, an image that is entirely unique to Webster and so helps to further develop an argument that not only were playwrights free to use these images for their own, dramatic, ends but were constructing a dramatic language around anatomy to do precisely that.

With the first entrance of Antonio (soon to be the Duchess' husband, the marriage that will spur on the action of the play) we are introduced immediately to

themes and images of disease and sickness. This is a play that makes frequent mention of physicians and hospitals (indeed, a hospital will figure into one of the play's most sensational scenes). So, for example, Ferdinand will say of his sister, the Duchess, that she has a 'wit were able to undo all the surgeons o' the City' (1.1.111-112); Julia will speak of 'fond Doctors' (2.4.65) and incorrect prescriptions; the Duchess herself will compare unscrupulous hirelings to Doctors who fleece patients of their money. But it will be through the character of Bosola, the play's principal villain, that we get perhaps what are the most intriguing glances at hospitals and doctors in the work. Early in the play, Bosola accosts an old woman who is attempting to make herself look younger, and describes her closet as 'a shop for witchcraft, to find in it the fat of serpents, spawn of snakes, Jew's spittle' (2.1.35-36) before accusing the old woman of being guilty of the 'sin of youth' (2.1.40). Bosola berates the woman in the strongest terms, while also making it clear that much of the blame falls to Physicians for encouraging and promoting a vain attempt to cling to youth and stall the march of time. In graphic terms, Bosola makes it clear that despite the interference of the Physicians we are already the victims of our own mortality:

Though we are eaten up of lice and worms,

And though continually we bear about us

A rotten and dead body, we delight

To hide it in rich tissue: all our fear -

Nay all our terror) - is lest our physician

Should put us in the ground, to be made sweet. (2.1.55-60)

Bosola's awareness that we are all dying allows him to call out the futility of attempting to look younger and he at once blames both the vanity of these women and the same doctors who participate in the futility of the exercise and who eventually bury us. The theme of medicine and doctors continues throughout and a local hospital will also play a significant part in one of the tortures that Ferdinand and Bosola devise for the Duchess. Ferdinand tells Bosola that he is

resolv'd

To remove forth the common hospital

All the mad- folk, and place them near her lodging;

There let them practice together, sing, and dance,

And act their gambols to the full o'th'moon. (4.1.126-130)

Within the context of this play, in which torture plays such an important part and filled as it is with images of death and murder it is also a play that calls upon doctors and physicians and implicates them in the general horror that is played out on stage. Rather than saving the mind of the Duchess this grim masque of singing madmen (an accepted technique of physicians, at least in this play world) is here intended to drive the Duchess out of her mind. Far from healers or saviours, the medical practitioners in *The Duchess of Malfi* seem implicated in a system of destruction and denial; the initial skepticism of Bosola is here reinforced by Ferdinand.

We are also reminded by a Servant that in addition to the references to contemporary medical and scientific thought this is very much a play of humours. That Bosola is melancholy is announced (and, to be fair, quite explicitly obvious)

from the beginning and Antonio will describe the Cardinal as a 'melancholy church-man' (1.1.157-158). The description of Bosola as a 'court-gall' (1.1.23) is just the first of several mentions of gall in the play - when Bosola finally uncovers the secret of the Duchess' marriage to Antonio he tells us 'I'll send/ A letter, that shall make her brothers' galls/ O'erflow their livers' (2.473-75), Antonio speaks of Ferdinand's 'rank gall' (3.2.154), and Ferdinand will say of the Duchess' marriage that it 'drew a stream of gall, quite threw my heart' (4.2.287). Webster's mix of the archaic and the modern is not oppositional, rather we are reminded that writers freely mixed images for dramatic purposes and a further indication that references to dissection are not scientifically accurate.

As Webster mixes scientific thought and theory to his own dramatic ends, he also mixes his uses of anatomy and it glides between the very practical and physical to the more imagistic and metaphorical. The mix of images that Webster uses helps to amplify and explicate the nature of these references, offering further evidence that the use of science need not be read as literal. This is exemplified in the romance, and associated images of romantic anatomy, at the centre of *The Duchess of Malfi*; in addition to the scenes of horror and mutilation, there are a few of love and tenderness. Here, Webster will use images of the heart to signify love and these images in turn lead to more generalized images of the interior, though ultimately these lead to images of insanity and depravity. In the initial wooing scene between the Duchess and Antonio, she will tell him:

Go, go brag

You have left me heartless - mine is in your bosom,

I hope 'twill multiply love there: You do tremble:

Make not your heart so dead a piece of flesh

To fear, more than to love me. (1.1.448-450)

This loving exchange between the Duchess and Antonio will be reflected later in the play, after Antonio's death and during the punishments inflicted on the Duchess:

FERDINAND. Thou art undone:

And thou hast ta'en that massy sheet of lead

That hid thy husbands bones, and folded it

About my heart.

DUCHESS. Mine bleeds for't.

FERDINAND. Thine? thy heart? (3.2.111-114)

The Cardinal will seduce the married Julia with talk of 'a piteous wound i'th'heart' (2.4.37). The metaphorical uses of the heart imagery in these scenes, to describe both love and the loss of love are accompanied by another typical use of such imagery, to suggest interiority or a hidden truth, a truth written on the heart. So Bosola will say to the Duchess about Ferdinand 'O, the secret of my prince,/ Which I will wear on the th' inside of my heart' (3.2.301-302), and Ferdinand, fed up with the Duchess, will declare that he 'will no longer study in the book/ Of another's heart.' (4.1.15-16) When Ferdinand learns the truth of the Duchess' marriage, he also provides one of the most startling uses of a heart image in the play. Entering with the letter that has revealed the truth he tells his brother, the Cardinal, that their sister has 'grown a notorious strumpet' (2.5.4) and then calls for

Rhubarb, O for rhubarb

To purge this choler! here's the cursed day

To prompt my memory, and here it shall stick

Till of her bleeding heart I make a sponge

To wipe it out. (2.5.12-15)

Ferdinand's move from a folk remedy and humours to the image of him using his sister's exposed heart as a sponge to mop up his memory is as visceral an image as one needs to sum up the violence, indeed the madness, that runs throughout the play, and Webster's altogether free association of medical imagery reminds us that the author is using them in service of the drama. The image of the heart as sponge is as nearly as strong an image as John Ford will use when he has Giovanni enter with Annabella's actual heart in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, and a reminder that the dramatic, poetic, impulse takes precedent over the scientific.

These glances inside the body, at hearts specifically, continue throughout the play and ultimately lead to anatomy, in a discussion of Ferdinand's interior.

Ferdinand's collapse is a condition that the Doctor will diagnose as lycanthropy ('lycanthopia' (5.2.6) in the Doctor's words) and he describes the condition:

In those that are possess'd with't there o'erflows

Such melancholy humour, they imagine

Themselves to be transformed into wolves,

Steal forth to churchyards in the dead of night,

And dig dead bodies up: as two nights since

One met the duke, 'bout midnight in a lane

Behind St. Mark's church, with the leg of a man

Upon his shoulder; and he howl'd fearfully;

Said he was a wolf, only the difference

Was, wolf's skin was hairy on the outside,

His on the inside; bade them take their swords,

Rip up his flesh, and try (5.2.8-19)

The images of medicine and medical practice (including Bosola's condemnation of the old woman in which he also demands that such women have the skin flayed from their faces) meet here, in a description of mutilation, grave-robbing and the violence inherent in dissection; like surgeons, the soldiers are bid to rip into Ferdinand's interior, to discover the truth of his disease.

The doctor attempts to break through to Ferdinand by play-acting, pretending to be mad himself, but with limited success, as Ferdinand threatens to 'stamp him into a cullis, flay off his skin, to cover one of the anatomies, this rogue hath set i'th' cold yonder, in Barber-Chirurgeons' hall' (5.2.76-80). In the first instance, Ferdinand is suggesting that the truth of his condition can only be ascertained through cutting, by surgically revealing his interior. What follows is yet another image of a flayed man, reminiscent of the images discussed earlier, combined with the (satirical) view of surgeons. Webster used William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* as the source and inspiration for his play, and drew many of his characters, including Ferdinand from it. Brown, in his introduction to the play goes into some detail on this (xxvii on), and R. W. Dent, in *John Webster's Borrowing* goes into great detail on the multitude of sources (including Painter) that Webster drew on for the creation of the play. With

specific reference to the lycanthropy, both point to Goulart's *Admirable and Memorable Histories* (Dent 247 and Brown 141) as Webster's source of information on that topic. Webster, of course, builds on all these sources and extends into themes and images that are particular to *The Duchess of Malfi*. The reference to anatomy, on the one hand is straightforward enough, but is also, as with the other references, adapted by Webster for the play. Webster moves from the digging up of bodies and ripping up of flesh to the threat of a human stew (the medically prescribed 'cullis') to the flaying of skin. It is a neat, if grotesque arc, that leads from violent imageries of death to one of a skeleton. Webster's description is also, of course, reminiscent of Tourneur and the anatomical texts we have looked at – he asks us to imagine a skeleton hanging in the anatomy halls. While Webster has leaned on other sources to create his Ferdinand, the addition of anatomization is a dramatic device that is not predicated on other printed texts. In reducing Ferdinand to a skeleton, Webster seems to be reinforcing an emerging theatrical trope, one that was borrowed from anatomical texts but is now serving a uniquely theatrical purpose.

The example of Webster, Tourneur, and Chettle have helped to demonstrate that the transmission of a particular set of theatrical images, having to do with the anatomy halls became useful dramatic devices. Webster seems to want to link an association of violent death with skeletons in the barber-surgeon's hall. That knowledge of the Barber-Surgeons' Hall is derived, potentially, from images in anatomical texts and the writers rely on that association to build dramatic images of death and decay. It is perhaps not the fact of anatomy that is important, but the truth of death, as represented by anatomy. That the printed anatomical texts helped provide the context for an awareness of the practice of anatomy has been important

to the discussion of these plays, so far. A further point to consider is that the awareness of the activity of the anatomy halls seemed to have a degree of cultural and social concern; it was a point of conversation. That also would seem to be a theme and topic picked up by the drama, as authors used anatomy and dissection in dramatic dialogue to represent a wider range of social interests if not concerns. Consider, as one example, the social commentary offered by *The Witch of Edmonton*, a play what would seem, in part, to use the new science of anatomy to offer a comparison of the town and the country.

In the entry on John Ford in the Dictionary of Literary Biography, Paul Cantor notes that ‘many critics believe he (Ford) was responsible for (*The Witch of Edmonton*’s) overall construction’ (118) and we might conclude from that that it is Ford who gave the play its rural setting and its host of country characters. That *The Witch of Edmonton* veers toward social commentary is not a new observation but it is worth noting in the present context (Corbin and Sedge 22). This is a play in which the principal characters are led to immorality and, subsequently death, through social pressures. Young Thorney is desperately trying to secure his own future and save his father’s lands. The Witch herself is clearly not guilty of anything in the early part of the play and indeed the term ‘witch’ is nothing more than a slur, a euphemism amongst the village folks for ‘old’. The Witch will turn to witchcraft only after being forced to do so by the townsfolk who fear her. No matter which of the three playwrights was responsible for the witch’s character, we are given a starkly drawn picture of an old woman, cast aside and cast out of society. It is at this point that the witch calls on her familiar, that famous black dog, and sets him loose amongst a population that is, to be fair, half way to hell already. It seems relatively clear from the action of the play that Young Thorney is led to kill Susan by the devil, and yet

there is enough ambiguity to leave the audience suspecting he is responsible for his own actions. And when the witch condemns the women in the town and the court as being the real witches in society, her arguments are strong enough to be convincing. This does indeed lead us to social commentary, but our writers then acquiesce somewhat, and blame the devil for doing it. But perhaps there is more to it than just a last minute hedge on the part of the writers, as one of the intriguing elements of the play is not that it buckles and relinquishes its own argument, but that it mixes old fashioned ideas with the more modern, which is to say that when the principal characters are pressured or tormented by the contemporary world they resort to the old – the modern society gives way to witchcraft, modern views on society and civilization are thrown over for witch-trials and burnings. Young Thorney's trip to the country will make him a bigamist and murderer, while the witch will condemn the urban women as being the real witches. There is in the play a fascinating tension between these two cultures. This distinction between the town and country is brought up almost immediately, in a short exchange between Old Thorney and Old Carter:

OLD THORNEY. I marvel my son comes not: I am sure he will be here
sometime to day.

OLD CARTER. To day or to morrow, when he comes he shall be
welcome to Bread, Beer and Beef, Yeoman's fare; we have no
Kickshaws: full Dishes, whole belly-fulls. Shoud I diet three days at
one of the slender City-suppers, you might send me to Barber-
Surgeons Hall the fourth day, to hang up for an Anatomy. (B4v)

There is something of the everyday in this exchange to be sure, playing as it does on the stereotypical notions of the rustic, full-bodied life of the country versus the refined, more delicate life found in the town. It is also a light reference, casually thrown out, almost a joke. In fact, the casualness of the line suggests just such casualness in the reference, that the practice of anatomy (and the practice of referencing anatomy in plays) has become entirely commonplace. While the joke is on the paucity of meals in the city, there is also the suggestion that the more delicate, or refined, urban life ends at the Barber-Surgeon's Hall. That the playwrights would include that detail in this comparison of town and country life seems to fit into this play's overall worldview. In *The Witch of Edmonton*, life in the town leads to science, inquiry, a search for clinical truth. Life in the country leads to witchcraft, bloody murders and betrayal. It must also be noted that the writers chose to have their bodies hung up (and not laid out), an image now made familiar not only in the printed anatomy texts (as we have seen) but has been tracked through a number of the plays examined in this chapter. *The Witch of Edmonton*, then, relies not only on the distribution of anatomical texts for its dramatic power, but also on a set of images now established through the theatre itself.

The attitude towards medicine and medical practitioners has already been noted in certain plays. Consider the derogatory use of 'mountebank' that has been noted in plays like *Volpone*, for example. As with Jonson, the negative view of doctors and medicine may be an influence, a holdover, from classical comedy. The use of those types will continue to crop up in further examinations. The example of Dekker's *Match Mee in London*, though, presents a unique opportunity to examine a play that not only reflects these kinds of concerns but also an apparently curious use of medical language. Concern over the medical profession is given voice in the play

with the entrance of the King's brother, Don John. Recently taken ill, Don John is frequently in the company of his doctor, who is the subject of much abuse from the ailing John. Ignoring the advice of his Doctor and servant, John visits his brother at court:

JOHN. In this retreat of mine from Court, my bodie
(Which was before a cleane streame) growing foule
By my minds trouble, through your high displeasure
Which went to th'bottom of my heart: I call'd
That sound Card to me, gave him fees and bid him
(By all the fairest props that Art could reare)
To keep my health from falling, which I felt
Tottering and shaken, but my Urinalist
(As if he sate in Barger-Surgions Hall
Reading Anatomy Lectures) left no Artery
Unstretcht upon the Tenters.

KING. So he vext you to the guts.

JOHN. My bowels were his conjuring rooms. (3.2.135-146)

The first part of this exchange is clear enough; John has sent for the doctor and paid the proper fees hoping for a curative. The switch to 'Urinalist' is peculiar though and, according to the OED is the only occurrence of the word. Meaning, no doubt, urologist (though, once again according to the OED, this is an 18th century term), we are left to wonder why it is this person who is 'reading anatomy lectures'. The intent of the exchange seems to be that John received too thorough an examination, as 'no Artery/ Unstretch upon the Tenters' would imply. There is the

further implication of torture, of course, in line with John's frame of mind. Beyond this, there is Dekker's apparent familiarity with the procedures of the anatomy hall in the reference to the 'reader'. Though, given that Dekker has also apparently invented the phrase 'urinalist' we have some reason to question Dekker's precision. In a survey of medical texts available to the public, Paul Slack notes that of the many small reference books that were available one of the more popular was *The Seeing of Urines*, a tract that offered instruction on how to identify disorder through the examination of urine (248). We are left, then, to consider that Dekker has linked a series of concepts involving urine and popular remedies with the science of anatomy and has done so to suit his characters, and this scene in particular. Perhaps we can look to Jonson again, and speculate that this is a joke, a deliberate mixing of inappropriate terms meant to further humiliate the doctor, perhaps the implication is that the Doctor has risen above his station (the Reader has more social status). The overall structure of the scene, though, suggests that Dekker has combined (perhaps invented) terminology and images in order to further the negative characterization of the Doctor, and that the science is in service of the play.

In the opening moments of *The Noble Spanish Soldier* it is revealed that the King of Spain, who has just married Pauline, the daughter of the duke of Florence, was previously engaged to Onaelia, a contract that was never broken, and now the King is wracked with guilt, feeling that he is, in fact, an adulterer. Complicating the issue is the fact that he has had a child by Onaelia, making his illegitimate son a potential heir to the throne. Onaelia has the wedding contract in her possession and the King falsely seduces Onaelia in order to get the contract from her and then burn it. Enter the noble soldier of the play's title, Baltazar, who is pressed into helping the King work against Onaelia and her supporters. Fearing that she is losing the support

of the people, Paulina pretends to be pregnant and works up a poison plot against Onaelia. In the final moments of the play, the King will mistakenly drink from a poisoned chalice meant for Onaelia. The dying King will appoint his illegitimate son, Sebastian, as heir to the throne and sends Paulina back to Florence. One of the interesting characteristics of *The Noble Spanish Soldier* is how it deals in images of flesh, which is described in the play variously as hard, rotten or diseased, all of which will invite discussion of surgeons (and barbers, as it happens).

Shortly after the King confesses the conditions of his previous engagement to a local Cardinal, the Cardinal goes to see Onaelia for himself and attempts to offer her some solace. Not surprisingly, Onaelia is not in a forgiving mood. 'I come to knit the nerves of your lost strength', the Cardinal tells Onaelia, to which she wonders 'What Aesculapius can do this?' (B2v) From this early medical reference Onaelia accuses the Cardinal, in speaking for the King, of having poisoned breath and encourages him to act altogether differently:

You should (my Lord) be like these robes you weare,

(Pure as the Dye) and like that reverend shape;

Nurse thoughts as full of honour, zeale, and purity;

You should be the Court-Diall, and direct

The King with constant motion, be ever beating

(Like to Clocke-Hammers) on his iron heart

To make it sound cleare, and to feele remorse

You should unlocke his soul, wake his dead conscience,

Which like a drowsie Centinell gives leave

For sinnes vast army to beleager him; (B3r)

The reference to the King's 'iron heart' is just one of many such images in the play used, as here, to describe acts of betrayal and those who would commit them. But this is also the first suggestion of mechanization in the play. Beyond the King's cold betrayal, Onaelia here suggests that her former lover needs a mechanical winding up. The Cardinal should work him like a clock, helping the king to keep true time (and thus be true himself). The Cardinal will attempt to counter Onaelia's description and opinion of the King, and tries to assure Onaelia that her former lover has found penitence and 'has turned his joyes into his leprous bosome' (B3v). This notion of diseased, rotting, flesh is diametrically opposed to Onaelia's description of iron, but these two contrasting senses of the flesh will continue to inform the play. Onaelia's servant will talk of 'flye-blowne flesh' (C1r), which is later contrasted with Baltazar's description of himself as a soldier with his flesh frozen into his armor and 'turn'd into iron' (C2v). Similar imagery is used later in the play, when Baltazar has found sympathy for the misused Onaelia. Her uncle, the Duke of Medina, has come to Baltazar in disguise as a French physician and pretends to hatch a poisoning plot against his niece. When Medina 'discovers' himself to Baltazar, he calls the Duke

The perfection of all Spanyards. Mars in little, the best booke of the art
of Warre printed in these Times: as a French Doctor I woo'd have
given you pellets for pills, but as my noblest Lord, rip my heart out in
your service.

MEDINA. Thou art the truest Clocke

That e're to time paid tribute, (honest Souldier)

I lost mine owne shape, and put on a French,
Onely to try thy truth, and the Kings falsehood,
Both which I find: now this great Spanish volume
Is open'd to me, I read him o're and o're,
Oh what blacke Characters are printed in him. (G2r)

The Cardinal will pick up on the 'book' metaphor and encourage Medina not to misread the Soldier, prompting this response from Medina:

No, I will not father;
Now that I have Anatomiz'd his thoughts,
I'll read a lecture on 'em that shall save
Many mens lives, and to the kingdome minister
Most wholesome Surgery (G2r)

Here the clock metaphor leads to a host of associations and extends into the medical. That Baltazar is a clock, suggests, like Onaelia's use of the term, that he is 'true', unalterable. The mechanization of Baltazar's character here suggests his immutability and the extension of the metaphor leads to the suggestion that Baltazar is also a book to be clearly read. As in the suggestion of the clock the implication is also that Baltazar's character is fixed, firmly imprinted. Moreover, the extended reference seems to be to an Anatomy text, that the truth of Baltazar's character is written not only in his (mechanized) body but in a revelatory book on Baltazar's (mechanized) body; Medina will act the 'reader' at Baltazar's anatomy. Medina works from a metaphorical position in the first place (he is anatomizing Baltazar's thoughts) but the implication is clearly physical.

Dekker establishes a clear setup – an anatomy at which Medina is the reader. Not only does this establish the worth of Baltazar's character – and that character is clearly evident from the anatomy, the 'book' of Baltazar's being, but Dekker also clearly wants us to understand that such activity offers a benefit to the whole of the commonwealth. This is one of the few reference to anatomy in these plays that also, by extension, offers an opinion on that activity, and suggests that a knowledge of anatomy is available through the printed texts. Moreover, the extended argument runs from reading to books to anatomy, suggesting that the anatomical texts take precedence over anatomical observation.

Ultimately, then, Dekker's use of anatomy in this scene offers a complex set of images and opinions that touch on the nature of physicality with the suggestion that anatomies have revealed an underlying mechanization, or system in the body. Jonathon Sawday points out that as the century wore on, the anatomical investigation of the body would lead to mechanistic theories of the body's construction (146). This mechanistic image of the body is expressed by Descartes, and has some implications for the 'microcosmic' view of the body that held sway earlier in the period. Certainly, the initial messiness that informed earlier investigations of the interior of the body seems to give way, as the science matures, into a more systematic, clinical, view that sees the body represented, in part, as more mechanistic, more clock-work. That sentiment seems to ring through Dekker, though it seems to reflect the phenomenon of the printing of books as much as it does the emergent practice of dissection. Mechanization also seems to have for Dekker a rather classical implication – that our actions follow our own moral code.

Within the broader context of the play, it is worth noting that Medina's language in this scene is not unique, and the duke will speak in near medical terms

(even when not in disguise) throughout the play. When Medina and his colleagues are first plotting against the King (and plan to test Baltazar's loyalty in the scene just examined), Medina declares

Ile venture it,

And come off well I warrant you, and rip up

His very entrails, cut in two his heart,

And search each corner in't, yet shall not he

Know who it is cuts up th'Anatomy (F2v)

The use of the term here stands in marked contrast to Medina's other use of it and the violence of the activity here is juxtaposed with the clinical, almost stately use of the phrase when applied to Baltazar. Later in the play, though in slightly different terms, Medina will again offer to anatomize the king. 'Open his brest', says Medina of the King,

And with a Sunne-beam search it,

There's no such man; this King of gilded clay,

Within is ugliness, lust, treachery,

And a base soule, tho reard Collossus-high (G4r)

In his anger, Medina resorts to a much less physical, more metaphorical use of the phrase as if over-emotion brings out the poetical, a mood and use of the phrase that stands in contrast to its earlier, near clinical, use. This fluidity of usage also suggests that Dekker is not interested in an accurate representation of anatomy but rather uses the references to suit dramatic intent.

References to medicine and surgery will also accompany some of the images of disease and rot. The Cardinal will chastise his king in these terms:

What have you done? clos'd up a festering wound

Which rots the heart: like a bad Surgeon,

Labouring to plucke out from your eye a moate,

You thrust the eye cleane out (C4v)

As public opinion begins to swirl variously around these public figures, and as each attempts to win the favour of those groups, Onaelia encounters a poet who had initially been in favour of the foreign Queen. Onaelia persuades the poet, described as a 'parcell of mans flesh', to change his opinion (after burning his book of poems dedicated to Paulina) and to use his poetic arts to excise corruption:

Onaelia. I have read of legends of disastrous Dames;

Will none set pen to paper for poore me?

Canst write a bitter Satyre? brainless people

Doe call 'em Libels: dar'st thou write a Libell?

Poet. I dare mix gall and poison with my inke.

Onaelia. Doe it then for me.

Poet. And every line must be

A whip to draw blood.

Onaelia. Better.

Poet. And to dare

The stab from him it touches: he that writes

Such Libels (as you call 'em) must lanch wide
The sores of mens corruptions, and even search
To'th quicke for dead flesh, or for rotten cores:
A Poets Inke can better cure some sores
Then Surgeons Balsum. (C4r)

Dekker reinforces his dramatic image of books and reading and suggests that the Poet's books are just as informative, indeed as necessary, as the anatomical texts and they too reveal a truth. In a delightful twist, Dekker reminds his audience that poetry and science, each an anatomy in its own right, will continue to enlighten (and cure) and can do so through the printed word.

Chapter Four: Martial and Territorial Drama

In their introduction to *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*, Mary Ellen Lamb and Valerie Wayne describe romance drama as a 'hybrid' (3), quoting Barbara Fuchs' characterization of romance drama as that of 'idealization, the marvelous, narrative delay, wandering and obscured identity'. In her introduction to a critical edition of *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, Jill Levenson categorizes that play as a 'Romantic Drama' (28), a 'theatrical form that flourished in the last quarter of the sixteenth century' (28). Levenson briefly traces the history of the romantic drama and its influence on British plays and playwrights before summarizing that romantic dramas are 'plays which are in any way unrealistic' (28). The next group of plays to be examined here can be seen to broadly fit this a definition of 'romantic', and are plays that are, generally, adventure and travel tales, plays that feature exotic plots and locales, and, in the first few cases, feature militaristic and martial plots. That 'travel tales' also fit into this definition (Lamb and Wayne 3) helps as well, as several plays examined here are exotic tales of adventure. But what compels this chapter, apart from an ontological grouping is the sense of 'unreality', the indeterminacy and sometimes disrupted, if not fluid, nature of the plots and the sometimes lurid and often outrageous set pieces of these plays. That those characteristics are linked, dramatically, to anatomy and dissection is a point to be explored.

Based on a novella by Barnaby Riche, the anonymously written *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* details the struggle between two French Dukes, Lodiwick of Burgandy and Mercury of Anjou. In the introduction to a critical edition of the play, Jill Levenson discusses the possible authorship and concludes that

the authorship question for *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* stubbornly refuses to be answered conclusively. Though there is evidence for attributing the comic scenes and parts of the serious portions to Dekker, there is none for assigning the body of the play to any particular dramatist (20).

Levenson also offers her 'personal opinion that *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* reads like a play written in the late 1590s, I propose that its date falls between 1595 and 1600, probably c. 1597 or 1598' (40). Levenson also discusses the play's connection to Barnaby Riche's novella, 'Sappho Duke of Montana' (21). While there doesn't seem to be much current discussion of the play, Tom Cranfill's 1945 essay, 'Barnaby Rich's *Sappho* and *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*' describes the connection between the play and its source in some detail.

In Riche's novella, it is the fallout of the struggle between the two dukes that is of principle concern, but the anonymous playwright wants to politicize and draw out the circumstances of the conflict between Burgundy and Anjou. Departing entirely from its source, the play first gives us a dumbshow, in which we are shown, and then told in a prologue, that Mercury has killed Lodiwick's wife and child, leading inevitably to a bloody rivalry that threatens to erupt into civil war. The French king, on his way to a pilgrimage, is forced to intercede and arranges a forced peace which only serves to buy Mercury enough time to build an army in secret and begin preparations to move against Lodiwick. Anjou is warned of Mercury's plot and is planning his counteroffensive when word comes that the Spanish, led by Hernando de Medyna, have seized the opportunity to invade while the French are busy fighting amongst themselves. In graphic terms, the Spanish invaders detail their easy access:

HERNANDO. It seemes that the Nobilitie of France
Are all a sleepe, that vnresisted, thus
We diue into the entrails of their Land (5.1-3)

This metaphor is intriguing and operates in similar ways in plays that will be examined later, particularly *A Larum for London*, with its similar talk of entrails. As we have seen in *Lust's Dominion*, the centre most part of the structure, the area that is seen to be the most important, is in the entrails. The invading force will penetrate to the core of the 'Land', as symbolically represented by the guts, the very interior of the body. This suggests a surgical invasion, and this opening metaphor will be linked to anatomical processes later in the play.

The plot becomes increasingly complicated and Mercury, Duke of Burgandy falls in with the Spanish against Anjou. Meanwhile, Anjou's son, Frederick, though presumed drowned has in fact been saved by the Duke of Brabant. Frederick falls in love with Brabant's daughter, secretly marries her and is forced to flee for his safety. While this sub-plot is unfolding Hernando and Mercury suddenly introduce their hatred for the Lord of Epernounge. We are told very little about this character, only that both Hernando and Mercury want him dead and that Epernounge is crippled. We are given scant information about the nature of Epernounge's disability, only that he is carried about in a chair. Presumably, he came by his injuries later in life, though there is reference to him having been a soldier and this links Epernounge to other maimed and wounded soldiers found in plays in this chapter. There is even room to presume that Epernounge was wounded in the initial skirmish between Anjou and Burgandy, though his name does not appear in the play until this moment, leading to the bitter outburst by Hernando in which he calls Epernounge a 'Dotard', 'A mere anatomy, a Jack-of-Lent,/ And the pale Image of bloodless ghost' (13. 81-82).

As a deformed soldier, Epernounge bears some similarity to the crippled Stump in *A Larum for London*, and the treatment of wounded soldiers is a feature of both these plays. Epernounge is shriveled in his chair, the lack of motion leading to an atrophy of the limbs, in turn leading to the comparison to a skeleton. For Hernando, the anatomy, the jack-a-lent, and the ghost are one and the same figure. An examination of the 'jack-a-lent' figure, and its relationship to anatomy, follows later in this thesis, but for now it will be noted that this play would seem to follow a dramatic line from foreign invasion to physical deformity, and, in some fashion, traces that line along an anatomical route, specifically with respect to Epernounge's body. Epernounge's physical condition has not affected his mental state though, and he is noted for his sharp with and barbed tongue throughout the play. Epernounge himself makes much the same point when he refers to himself as a 'witherd tree' that yet is full of vigorous sap. Many of these same themes, and indeed similar characters, are also found in the anonymous *A Larum for London*, a play that takes its plot from the siege of Antwerp in 1576.

As with *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, little critical work has been done on *A Larum for London*. A Malone Society Reprint of 1913 was consulted for this thesis, as was William Scott Lancaster's dissertation, *A Larum for London: A Critical Edition of the Performative Text*, 2011.

Published in 1602, *A Larum for London* was performed by the Lord Chamberlain's Men at the Globe, and it has been suggested that it was performed in the late 1590's. Lancaster suggests 1599 (5), while Ann McKenzie summarizes several arguments suggesting that the play was produced at sometime between 1595 and 1600 (284). *A Larum for London* is itself based on an account of a sacking, *The Spoyle of Antwerp*, by George Gascoigne, believed to have been in the city as

an official observer for Elizabeth I (Both the Dictionary of Literary Biography and the Dictionary of National Biography detail Gascoigne's appointment by William Cecil to the posting in Antwerp.) In an interesting early example of foreign correspondence, Gascoigne goes to great pains to stress that his is to be an objective account of the invasion, though given the atrocities committed during the siege, unbiased reporting seems impossible:

I presume to publishe this Pamphlet: protestyng that neither mallice to the one syde, nor parciall affection to the other, shall make my pen to swarue any iote from truth of that which I will set down & saw executed: For if I were disposed to write maliciously agaynst the vanquishers: their former barbarous cruelty, insolences, Rapes, spoyles, Incests, and Sacriledges, committed in sundrie other places, might yeeld mee sufficient matter without the lawful remembrance of this their late stratageme: or if I would vndertake to mooue a generall compassion, by blazyng abroad the miseries and calamities of the vanquished: theyr longe susteyned iniuries and yokes of vtollerable bondage: theyr continual broyles in warre: their doubtful dreads in peace: theyr accusations without cause: and condemnations without prooffe: might enable a dome stone to talke of their troubles, and fetch brinysh teares out of the most craggy rocke: to lament and bewaile the burning houses of so neare neighbours. But as I sayd before, mine onely entent is to set downe a plaine truthe...(ii)

The 'plain truth' is that having managed a surprise victory against the vastly superior Flemish, the Spanish go on to sack Antwerp, racking up a horrible list of crimes and abuses against the city. Gascoigne will report the 'pittiful massacre' of

17,000 'men, women and children' (B7v) and will find it difficult to maintain the journalistic objectivity he has set out for himself: 'me thinkes that a true christian hearte should stand content with victory, and refrayne to prouoke Gods wrath by shedding of innocente blood'.

The Spoyle of Antwerp is a shocking account of the sack, and the 'A Larum' Gascoigne means to sound is a warning to England against the Spanish who are represented as cruel, almost barbaric, in their continued violence after the siege. The cruelty of the Spaniards is only amplified, though, in the hands of the anonymous author of *A Larum for London* and this same story becomes a vicious indictment of both the leaders of Antwerp as well as the Spaniards who come to overthrow the city. While Gascoigne takes the time to recount that the invaders are a group of Spanish soldiers in revolt, the author of *A Larum* indicts the Spanish leadership and presents the sack as a premeditated, vicious attack (Lancaster notes the 'Hispanophobic' nature of the work (12)).

Through the course of the play, and in this it is similar to *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, the author takes us from outside the city walls to deep within the interior of the ravaged city. This change in scope is neatly echoed in the plot as we move from a wide, almost panoramic view of the cityscape, as we learn of the plans to invade, and then the action narrows in on the city leaders, the soldiers and the victims of the atrocities. It is in this move that the play become most personal, finally narrowing in on the most intimate affront of all – the threat of anatomization. This move to the deeply personal is established from the beginning with the anthropomorphizing of Antwerp itself; the cruel invaders will feminize Antwerp as they are assaulting the city – the invasion becomes physical, a rape and an intrusion,

expressed in extremely visceral terms. That feminine personification is echoed by the citizens themselves, as they come to lament the torture of Antwerp.

As the play opens we are first introduced to Sancto Danila, conspiring with other Spanish officers just prior to the assault and in a distinct departure from Gascoigne's original account they justify their actions as having resulted from the sheer vanity and complacency of the people of Antwerp. Here Danila and his officers set the tone and the language for what is to come. According to these Spanish soldiers the leaders of Antwerp

are remiss and negligent,

Their bodies used to soft effeminate silks,

And their fine minds set all on dalliance,

Which makes them fat for slaughter, fit for spoil. (128-129)

This 'effeminacy' of the townspeople is soon projected on to the city of Antwerp itself, with the same implication, that Antwerp has both asked for and deserves what it gets:

DANILA. What patient eye can look upon those turrets,

And see the beauty of that flower of Europe,

And in it be ravished with the sight of her?

Oh she is amorous as the wanton air

And must be courted. From her nostrils comes

A breath as sweet as the Arabian spice.

Her garments are embroidered with pure gold,

And every part so rich and sumptuous

As India's not to be compared to her.
She must be courted. Marry, herself invites
And beckons us unto her sportful bed. (130)

In these terms, the city is sexy, alluring, the price for which is that the invaders will 'pierce her sides' (136) and make 'Antwerp bleed' (134). That the invaders will make 'her' sides bleed is a direct example of the feminization of the Antwerp; that the Spanish are masculine is best represented in the description of the cannons deployed around the city, the force of which breaks open the walls to the invaders. The feminization of the city is a characterization that will be picked up by the invaded as well. The Flemish leaders, now patently aware that their own complacency is partly to blame will refer to their city as 'she' and 'her' while referring to the war that has 'furrowed through entrails and arteries' (163). The leaders themselves have come to convince themselves that they may, indeed, have brought this fate on themselves, and characterize Antwerp as an idle girl who has sat by while 'her' neighbor cities (now metonymically referred to as people) have been assaulted and ravaged by the Spanish. To this point the leaders of Antwerp (characterized as lazy, fat, and vain by the Spanish), faced with the reality of invasion, have only been able to respond to the crisis in attempting to bribe or pay out their attackers. It is only when it is far too late, do they come to realize the threat to their own lives and fortunes and lament the destruction of the woman that is Antwerp. In the midst of all this we are introduced to a one-legged Flemish soldier, 'Stump', who, despite having been ridiculed and mocked by the Flemish citizens, attempts to lead the only true resistance to the invasion. Stump does bear some similarity to Epernouve, and as wounded soldiers these characters can be seen to represent something of a statement on the nature of martial action the very real, bodily, cost of war. Unlike

Epernouve, Stump is more mobile, though we are reminded throughout that he has a wooden leg. The mutilation, the deformation, of Stump's body is a continual reminder of the consequences of war, and the corporeality of the body. The wooden leg signifies the loss of flesh, and the early references seem designed to point this out – Stump talks of his 'rotten' stump, and, while rescuing a woman, complains that in any other circumstance she would have turned her nose up 'for feare my smell shold have infected her' (167). Patricia Cahill notes that amputations often resulted in gangrene, and it seems clear from the context that Stump's flesh is rotting away, and the very dissolving of his limbs is a horrific reminder of mortality, and a shameful one – strangers in the street are likely to turn away from this wounded soldier. Both Sawday (3) and Gail Kern Paster (9) talk about shame with respect to anatomy as well as the permeability of the body. Here, Stump seems to be dissolving before us, and the failure of his own body to retain itself makes Stump the object of scorn and ridicule. Katherine Park talks about the treatment of dead bodies in Northern Europe, and the 'liminal period', the 'gradually fading life' (115) of the recently deceased, and Stump's slow decline into death seems to echo this. Stumps seems to be the walking dead, and other characters are aware and revile him for it. He also wears a prosthesis, and this technological addition further marks his social isolation. Cahill calls Stump a 'wound-man', with the obvious connections to St. Sebastian, pierced repeatedly through the body, and reprints images of male figures pierced with knives and swords, in addition to the traditional arrows that pierced the saint. No doubt this association reminds the audience of Stump's sacrifice, his heroism in battle. The reminder that Stump is both a wounded soldier and an outcast may have also registered with contemporary audiences. Though, like Epernouve, the treatment of these bodies seems to carry a further signification. Epernouve is shriveled in his

chair, Stump moves about on a wooden leg, a leg attached to, and protruding from, rotten and decaying flesh, giving the appearance of a rather bony appendage. It certainly makes for an intriguing stage picture, a flayed appendage serving as a continual visual reminder of mortality and the slow decay of death.

Stump reluctantly picks up the mantle of hero and serves as the focal point of the action from the time of his entrance. The character is not a narrator as much as a witness to the increasingly horrific action and is present through many of the play's more outrageous incidents, as the play shifts from the larger scope of the invasion to the more intimate, and personal, episodes that make up the mid to later action of the play. One such incident occurs when two Spanish soldiers chase the wife of one of the city officials onto the stage with threats of

FIRST SOLDIER. Search her

SECOND SOLDIER. Zounds, turn her inside outward.

FIRST SOLDIER. Ransack her, every part of her. (167)

Presumably, to 'ransack' is to search her for possessions or gold, but when the first soldier suggests they 'cast lots who shall have her' (168) and the soldiers begin to strip the woman, the earlier words take on an altogether darker connotation and the threat to 'turn her inside outward' becoming menacingly physical. In some respects, this assault is the physicalization of the threat that Danila makes early in the play when he promises to 'strip her (Antwerp) of her pouches' (127). Indeed, the passage noted above, in which Danila commits to the idea of Antwerp as a woman deserving of a violation, is a metaphor that is now fully realized in the person of this hapless female victim; the 'sack' of Antwerp is here mirrored in the 'ransack' these soldiers are about to make. Once again, the play has moved from the general to the

specific, with the physicalization of the metaphor, that Antwerp is a woman to be invaded. This feminizing of Antwerp, is not an uncommon metaphor and bears a striking similarity to other contemporary tracts. In the anonymous *The Famous and renowned History of Morindos a King of Spaine*, we hear of a witch whose ‘magick charmes shall unbowell the earth, rip up her bosome, ransack her rich treasures for thy use’ (no pag.). John King’s *Lectures upon Jonas* describes how mariners on a listing ship will ‘ransacke all the corners of the ship, unbowell her in most celles’ (78). In a lecture on the *Bitter Waters of Babylon*, James Forsyth will describe a sack of Jerusalem: ‘Antiochus... did ransacke the Citie, spoile the temple of her ornaments...’ (4). In another sermon, John Reading tells us that ‘darke and hidden are the deepe veines of the earth, yet Art hath found a way into her bowels, to ransack her treasures’ (138).

Stump will intervene in this attack and later he will draw an association between this near rape and the destruction of Antwerp:

Yet is not Antwerp quite bereft of life
So long as we two breathe to stand for her,
Nor shall her ransack pass, without some right
Of just revenge (196).

Gascoigne will only use the term ‘ransack’ with reference to the looters going through the homes in Antwerp, our anonymous author draws an association between the city and its denizens, specifically the female city and the female victims of assault. In both cases the attacks are invasive and destructive.

The author continues to treat the city metaphorically, expressing the assault on the city in physical terms that are echoed in the brutal incidents that make up the

action of the play. At the height of the occupation, with the city now firmly in his grasp, Danila turns his attention to the female residents of the city and sets out to bed the daughter of a wealthy citizen and, when the old man will not reveal his daughter's whereabouts, threatens to torture the father for the information. Under duress, the old man confesses that his daughter is secluded in a nunnery, but not even that detail will sway Danila who orders his men to 'drag the Damsell hence.' Dutifully, his men do, bringing the young woman into his chamber while Danila is busying torturing someone else. His greeting to her is ominous and signals that a mingling of the extended metaphor that has characterized the play:

Welcome, fair sweet; mine arms shall be your throne,
Where, seated once, mock Death, and laugh to scorn
The boisterous threats of blood-besprinkled war,
Who, while he shows wild friscoes in the streets,
And with his gambols overthrows huge buildings,
Mingle their tottered ruins with the limbs
And clotted blood of many thousand souls,
Shall as an antic in your sight appear,
Yielding no more occasion to be feared
Than painted shapes of lions on a wall. (193-194)

The daughter pleads that her chastity be preserved, arguing for the protection of her own body and her father's dignity:

If you touch me with a lascivious hand,
As from his eyes descends a flood of tears,
So will you draw a river from his heart

Of his life's blood: both ways you shall obscure

The honor of your name: if virgin I,

Or aged he, misdone by tyranny. (194)

In the first example the male figure of war (perhaps the author means to invoke an image of Mars) has completed his violation of the female city, with a material loss of human life. The clotted blood of the dead citizens lying in the streets is particularly evocative, suggesting as it does that the veins of the city itself, its lanes, alleys and streets are as drained of life as the citizens who have fallen to the invaders. As we move to the interior, to the episode with Danila, the daughter makes a personal plea that speaks to the anatomy of her father – the blood that runs in his veins. Not to be dissuaded, Danila is about to claim his prize, only to be interrupted by the incursion of Stump and his resistance fighters. Danila, determined that no one else will enjoy his spoils, shoots the daughter before callously ordering his men to stab the father. The use of the gun would seem to be a deliberate echo the description of the cannons in the opening moments of the play, and serves to link the violent eruption into the feminized Antwerp and the similar fate of the daughter. This episode occurs shortly before the murdering of two children, which marks something of a turning point in the play; shortly the focus of the play will switch to the insurgents. Curiously, one of the last scenes involving the Spanish focuses on Alva who is attempting to extort the English politicians and soldiers, who have failed to come up with an adequate sum of money to ensure their safety:

ALVA. And is not plate

Good boot for soldiers? Have you that,

And dare you yet plead needy poverty?

Go fetch it to me; or presently I'll send

A crew of such sharp carvers to your gate
As shall anatomize your beating hearts
To fill their conquering hands with wished spoils. (204)

This is virtually the last word from the Spanish invaders, and this threat of anatomy represents the final move from the general threat of invasion to the final, extremely personal, act of violence. The plot now gives over almost entirely to Stump and the liberating forces he brings. The arc of the Spanish in the play ends at this point of violence, the threat against the anatomized heart of this one last victim. In a play filled with violent image and action it is interesting indeed that the ultimate threat delivered is the one of anatomy.

To this point in the play, we have been treated to all manner of bloody images, scenes, and dialogue. The nature of the violence in the play has escalated throughout, becoming darker at every turn, and it is not surprising that Alva essentially threatens to rip out the hearts of the English. But that threat alone is not sufficient; Alva is here calling for the surgeons to act out his bloody deed. The final threat is of being anatomized, the spoils are surgically removed organs. The move from the more general to the specific is again reminiscent of *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, and both plays seem to suggest, in their overall structure, that the act of dissection is carried out against the body politic, the subjects of the anatomy are the subjects themselves, the inhabitants of the interior of the body; the blood of the city is the blood that runs in its citizens' veins. There also seems to be something intrinsically dramaturgical in this motion. These militant plays deal in the abstract with thousands of soldiers, positioned, orchestrated, maneuvered, by leaders and generals in scenes and speeches for the benefit of the audience (*The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* opens with a dumb show and prologue, *A Larum for London* has

Time set the stage). These large scale operations then scale down to the actors on the stage, and then focuses on their very physical presence, and sometimes through physical deformity to remind us of our own bodies. As the city walls are breached in these plays and the human occupants are pierced and stabbed with swords and knives, the intimate invasion that is dissection is one more reminder of mortality and figures in the dramatic action of these plays.

While plays with foreign settings sometimes depict the larger scale of war and invasion, others, set in foreign courts and with foreign characters venture further into romance territory, pushing the ‘unreality’ of the situation and plots.

While attributed on the title page to Christopher Marlowe, *Lust's Dominion or the Lascivious Queen* is now generally held to be a collaborative effort, though some argument is made for it being (mainly) the work of John Marston. Claire Jowitt argues that the play ‘is thought to have involved collaboration by John Marston (who was paid for a play or part of a play called *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy* by Philip Henslowe in the autumn of 1599 for the Fortune or Rose) and Thomas Dekker, William Haughton, and John Day...’ (412). Charles Cathcart presents a similar argument (360). Printed in 1661, it is thought to have been performed as early as 1600 (Cathcart suggests 1600 (360), Jowitt 1599 (412)), putting it in line with *Every Man in his Humour*. A tragedy, *Lust's Dominion* follows Eleazar, a moor and Prince of Barbary, who is involved in an affair with The Queen, referred to in the play as the Mother of Spain. King Philip, her husband is lying sick (presumably dying) while this affair with Eleazar continues.

The opening of the play is rich with sexual innuendo and suggestion that not only serves to categorize the nature of the illicit relationship, but also the character of

Eleazar, whose sexual desires and proclivities associate him with as extreme a character as Sancto Danila. In the first scene the queen is actively trying to seduce Eleazar, while he attempts to deflect her advances

QUEEN. Why is my loves aspect so grim and horrid?

Look smoothly on me:

Chyme out your softest strains of harmony,

And on delicious Musicks silken wings

Send ravishing delight to my loves ears,

That he may be enamored of your tunes.

Come let's kiss.

Eleazar: Away, Away

Queen: No, no, saies I; and twice away

saies stay:

Come, come, I'll have a kiss, but if you strive

for one denial you shall forfeit five.

Eleazar: Nay prithee good Queen leave me,

I am now sick, heavie, and dull as lead.

Queen: I'll make thee lighter by taking

something from thee. (1.1)

The Queen takes her kiss, but certainly the suggestion of the line is altogether sexual. The level of this sexuality will come back into the dialogue shortly, but first there is more such persuading until the Queen makes the following offer:

I prithee smile on me, if but a while,
Then frown on me, I'll die: I prithee smile:
Smile on me, and these two wanton boies,
These pretty lads that do attend on me,
Shall call thee Jove, shall wait upon thy cup
And fill thee Nectar: their enticing eies
Shal serve as chrystal, wherein thou maist see
To dresse thyself, if thou wilt smile on me.
Smile on me, and with coronets of pearle,
And bells of gold, circling their pretty arms
In a round Ivorie fount these two shal swim,
And dive to make thee sport:
Bestow one smile, one little smile,
And in a net of twisted silk and gold
In all my naked arms, thy self shall lie. (1.1)

The introduction of the 'wanton boies' is striking, and talk of them recurs throughout the play. As Nabil Matal suggests, moors were frequently presented as homosexual on the stage, something that the connection to Jove would suggest. Following from Matal's work, Claire Jowett points out that in *The Turke*, a play generally held to be greatly influenced by *Lust's Dominion*, the character of Bordello, a 'humorous traveler' (English, not a turk or moor) is a 'catamite', further evidence that homosexual characters were present on the stage (436). Celia Daileader in 'Back Door Sex: Renaissance Gynosodomy, Aretino and the Exotic', argues that foreigners were often presented on the English stage as being sexually deviant (304). Much of the talk of the boys throughout the play is voyeuristic in nature; they

are deemed guilty of witnessing the congress between Eleazar and the Queen. Whatever their role in the bedroom, the 'boys' are involved on some level. The dialogue continues (and it is worth pointing out that we are still in the opening scene), Eleazar calls the Queen a 'strumpet', and has this to say about the affair:

QUEEN. Too true, woe is me;

I am a strumpet , but made by thee.

ELEAZAR. By me; no, no; by these young

bauds; fetch thee a glasse

And thou shalt see the bals of both thine eies

burning in fire of lust; by me? there's here

Within this hollow cistern of thy breast

A spring of hot blood: have not I to cool it

Made an extraction to the quintessence

Even of my soul: melted all my spirits,

Ravish'd my youth, deflour'd my lovely cheeks,

And dried this, this to anatomy

Only to feed your lust, (these boies have ears) (1.1)

The 'young bauds' are referred to as 'smooth boies' a little later, suggesting again that they are sexually subservient to Eleazar. The reference to anatomy is interesting and occurs while the Queen and Eleazar are negotiating their sexual relationship. Clearly, the Queen desires sexual congress as these allusions make clear. Her offer to make Eleazar 'lighter', is followed by Eleazar's complaint that his 'this' has been reduced to an 'anatomy'. Surely, his body has been drained, but it's difficult to avoid thinking that Eleazar is referring directly to his manhood. If that

reading is correct, it makes it the only anatomical reference to male sexual organs that has been found. It is worth considering that again the reference to anatomy is negative, or at least a means of complaint. While not explicitly stated, Eleazar's resistance to the Queen arises out of his fear of her, or at least his concern that she will dessicate his manhood. This is an unusual sentiment among this group of plays, all of which associate anatomy with the feminine, but none does so as explicitly sexually, as in *Lust's Dominion*.

The affair between the Queen and Eleazar will ultimately lead to war breaking out in *Lust's Dominion*. And when that happens, we find similar bodily metaphors as those in *A Larum for London*; Spain is treated anthropomorphically, as a body to be abused, dissected, and torn apart. So, when the King of Portugal arrives he makes the following comment on the ongoing conflict: 'Poor Spain, how is the body of thy peace/ Mangled and torn by an ambitious Moor!'

Earlier in the play, the young prince Philip will accuse his mother not only of the affair with Eleazar but of throwing the state into chaos:

Tell Philip's ghost, that Philip tells his Queen,
That Philip's Queen is a Moor's Concubine:
Did the King live I'de tell him how you two,
Rip't up the entrails of his treasury:
With masques and antick Revellings. (1.3)

In crying out against his mother's actions, Philip associates the illicit affair with a violent attack on the economy. As the battles continue and the play moves into its later stages we find, again in ways not dissimilar to *A Larum*, that the focus moves to the personal, the individual, and the emphasis switches away from the body of Spain

to the bodies of the combatants. So, for example, Eleazar, with claims to the throne declares that 'although my flesh be tawny, in my veines,/ Runs blood as red, and royal as the best/ And proud'st in Spain'. This motif is countered throughout the play by the use of increasingly bloody imagery as Eleazar is thrown deeper into the struggle for the Spanish throne. Of the prince, Philip, he says 'I call him tyrant here's a sword and arme,/ A heart, a head, and so pish, 'tis but death.' Locked in a physical struggle with Philip, Eleazar talks of 'sinewy' arms, 'brainless heads' and 'bleeding bodies' (4.3). For his own part, Philip threatens to 'tear his heart out'. Philip will draw on a similar conceit later when he implores his soldiers to 'give me but halfe your hearts, you have all mine'. *A Larum for London* and *Lust's Dominion* are alike in that they each only contain a single reference to anatomy. In *A Larum*, it comes at the end of the conflict, the brutal assault on Antwerp. In *Lust's Dominion*, it occurs at the beginning, before the conflict erupts. In each case, anatomy not only represents a threat (to loss of fortune or loss of manhood), but also characterizes the violence that occurs in both plays.

A survey of plays written and performed in the period indicates that the metaphorical use of anatomy, or dissection, is not only prevalent but serves a variety of ends, and takes a variety of forms. That the use of anatomy in these plays defies easy categorization is exemplified in two late plays, where the use of these images would seem to echo earlier usage. Take, for example, a rather late play, William D'Avenant's *The Cruel Brother*, performed in 1627. *The Cruel Brother* follows a predictable path when the Duke of Sienna begins to covet the wife of Count Lucio. Sending Lucio out of the country on a pretext the Duke attempts to seduce his friend's wife and when that is revealed the inevitable revenge plot unfolds. Late in the play, Lucio and his 'creature' Foreste appear at the Duke's bedside, presumably

to enact their revenge. The Duke is startled awake by their presence and all but begs them to kill him for his misdeeds. When the Count cannot bring himself to commit the murder, it prompts this response from the Duke:

Lucio, stay, Foreste say awhile.

Leave me not thus anatomiz'd with breath

He riseth from the bed

Dissect me really with your good swords.

Behold my Breast, take out my heart: and if

You finde your figures there, then use my Fame

With Mercy. (K2v)

The action of D'Avenant's revenge tragedy is fairly predictable and here in this scene, the Duke responds in action and language in ways that we would expect, even if it now includes an offhand reference to both anatomy and dissection. The call for the intruders to examine the Duke's heart is, in the context of this study, a familiar trope, seen in several scripts. But here, D'Avenant casually throws in the command to dissect, not 'rip' or 'open' or any of the countless other phrases that have been used in like situations. By this time, we can fully expect that the play-going audience had become fully attuned to 'dissect' and this is D'Avenant's phrase. So, in many ways, the attention that anatomy receives in these plays begins to feel dated, or at least commonplace though there are certainly still unusual occurrences that warrant attention. We are also able to see that some of the playwrights begin to examine the function and role of physicians (and by extension, if not directly, the anatomists) in the larger society.

The conspiracy at the heart of Henry Killigrew's play of the same name (1635) involves overthrowing a King, though we are given little reason as to why this proposed coup is necessary. The King himself does admit to being a tyrant, but we have little to go on, save the determination of the conspirators themselves. There is also a revenge plot woven throughout the action though here again, Killigrew does not provide much rationale for the action. In the early part of the play, during a meeting of these conspirators, we are told of a shipwreck and the arrival of a 'stranger'. That stranger turns out to be one Pallantus, who has been so long away from the court and is now so deformed that he goes unrecognized. Pallantus joins the ranks of deformed soldiers that includes, in this survey, *A Larum for London's Stump* and Epernounge in *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*. Pallantus fends off, and kills, two mercenaries who have been sent to kill him and we learn that he has his own reasons for wanting revenge – his father has been killed, his sister the victim of a rape. Pallantus infiltrates the group of conspirators while he plots against Timeon; Pallantus has a letter that details how Timeon had been plotting against him. Late in the play, after the conspirators have replaced the King and Pallatus has revealed his true identity, Timeon is confronted by his sister, who now knows the truth about her brother's plot against Pallatus. She confronts Timeon with the letter:

looke on this unworthy man.

Shee gives him the Letter.

Heere you are discected, and see if I ought to mourne for any part
being lost, or rejoyce for any that safe in the whole Anotomy. (N1r)

As in *The Fatal Contract*, Killigrew has here updated an older trope to reflect the new science, the pen is now mightier than the scalpel, but the damage done is just as lasting, just as painful and, more to the point, this is a set of imagery that the

audience is well aware of, suggesting that the usage is familiar to the playgoing audience.

This is not a play that dwells for long on medical or surgical practice or imagery. Rather the thrust of the play is the ongoing conspiracy between those who support the old regime and those who support the usurpers, though again, we are never given clear indication as to why the conspirators feel it necessary to unseat the current King. There are vague references to past wrongdoings and the ills of the past or, as one character puts it, 'the infections of the former age'. This image of disease is picked up and played out by Timeon, who has sided with the new king, and swears his allegiance:

I shall goe to worke like a resolute,
But skillful Surgeon, that dares feele and search
A wound, and if hee finde dead flesh dares cut
It off, or more corruption will not spare
A limbe. (F1r)

The earlier, literary, anatomy is here contrasted with the apparent necessity of surgical practice, as well as the dangers inherent in it. Again, this is not a new metaphor by any means, but does provide further evidence that contemporary medical practice has been absorbed into contemporary playwrighting. While Killigrew's play has none of the tone of the earlier military plays examined here, the all together more brief use of anatomy and anatomical references may suggest that by the end of the period the metaphors and tropes had not only been largely worked through, but have come to be accepted and used, as in other plays, in a short-hand

fashion that speaks to the familiarity of the device, both for writers and their audiences.

The co-writers of *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, John Day, William Rowley and George Wilkins will find a compelling use for their metaphorical anatomy in a play that retells the well-known exploits of the Sherley brothers, Anthony, Thomas and Robert. Commissioned by Thomas Sherley, the play recounts the exploits and adventures of the brothers as their father, Anthony, was on a 'diplomatic' mission throughout the mid-east. While in Persia, Anthony Sherley is introduced to the Sophy (the Shah Abbas) and a cultural encounter ensues. Both men will demonstrate their own military prowess through two staged battles - the first shows the Persian customs the second the British (or the 'Christian', which is sometimes the word used to highlight the differences between the two cultures). While Anthony applauds the military might of the Persians, the Sophy notices several distinct differences, the main being that the British take hostages, whereas the Persians raise the heads of the vanquished on pikes. Despite the differences in approach demonstrated by the two, both Sherley and the Sophy arrive at a mutual admiration and respect for each other. When, after watching the staging of the English battle, the Sophy asks 'what's the difference twixt vs and you?', Sherley, the diplomat responds with:

None but the greatest (mighty Persian)
All that makes vp this earthly Edifice,
By which we are cald men, is all alike.
Each may be the others Anotomie,
Our Nerues, our Arteries, our pipes of life,
The motiues of our senses all doe mooue

As of one Axeltree, our shapes alike,
One worke-man made vs all, and all offend
That maker, all tast of interdicted sinne,
Onely Art in a peculiar change
Each country shapes as she best can please them,
But that's not all, our inward offices
Are most at iar, would they were not, (great Prince)
Your fauour here if I out-strippe my boundes,
We liue and die, suffer calamities,
Are vnderlings to sicknesse, fire, famine, sword,
We all are punisht, by the same hand and rod,
Our sinnes are all alike, why not, our God. (B1r)

While the play's collaborators (Day, Rowley, and Wilkins) present a play filled with spectacular episodes and thrilling set pieces, the play also, as a result of its particular commission, serves as political propaganda. Anthony Sherley was on a diplomatic mission to unite the eastern and western worlds and the play presents that message to a local audience familiar with the structure of these 'adventure' plays. The writers, though, chose to present this message in the language of dissection. While the play does ultimately side with the British, the argument is that anatomy cuts across cultural, and religious, boundaries. Other plays have certainly used war, aggression, and anatomy for their own purposes, but this is apparently the first instance of a character expressing the belief that science has demonstrated that we are all the same on the inside. In the plays examined, this might be the strongest case for an investigation of 'interiority' that contemporary critics point out in an

examination of anatomy in the theatre. Here, though, rather than a self-reflexive, or self-absorbed act, this play speaks for a broader (if culturally biased) viewpoint.

If the writers of *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* present something of a measured view of the East, the opposite is largely true of *The Raging Turk* (Nabil Matar explains the stereotypical presentation of the east on stage in the early modern period. It is worth noting that Matar argues, persuasively, that this view of Turks, Muslims, and Ottomans was largely confined to the stage). There are three plays that are generally attributed to Thomas Goffe and were published together in 1656 under the general title of 'Three Excellent Tragedies'. Of those, *The Raging Turk* is thought to be his first play, probably performed at Christ Church, Oxford (For more on the dating, performance, and publication of *The Raging Turk* see Susan O'Malley 4). Goffe's play presents the more familiar picture of 'Turks' on the early modern stage - bloodthirsty, irrational, and dangerous. *The Raging Turk* tells the story of Bajazet II, who is trying to find a successor and the blood bath that the ensuing power gap will lead to. Concerned as the play is with bloodlines and heredity it is no surprise that this will emerge as something of a theme, a theme that will be expressed in particularly physical and violent images. Bajazet's twin brother, Zemes, will ponder the vagaries of fate that saw Bajazet born first:

every servile groom
Congratulates the coronation
of Bajazet: harke how they roare it out.
A cold disturbance like a gelid frost
settles my blood within me, and I hate
his cheerefull triumphs, more then mine own fate.
'Tis true, indeed, I prov'd not the first fruites,

an elder offspring of my Fathers breed,
yet was it so that Bajazet and I
both tumbled in one wombe...(C1v-C2r)

Almost immediately, Isaak, one of the 'Bassas', will enter fuming at a disgrace done to his daughter:

Divorc'd my Daughter? Fond and insolent man
Ile crush thee into nothing: if I can
endure the noise of my disgrace, I know
how to return it, I am a flame of fire,
a chafing heat distempers all my blood.
Achmetes, thou must cool it, when thy limbs
are emptied of that moisture the sucke in,
and thy stain'd blood enchanted from thy veins,
(C2r)

As the plot thickens and conspirators and co-conspirators plot amongst themselves, a tense meeting of the principals occurs mid-way through the play. This too concerns Achmetes, as Bajazet anxiously awaits his return. As the court drinks healths to one another, Bajazet, in an aside, speaks of his mistrust of Achmetes. There is a curious repetition in the dialogue here and one is left to wonder if it might be a consequence of a first time writer borrowing his own images (or perhaps even a mistake by the printers, though O'Malley is not alone in criticizing the 'unworkable' structure of Goffe's play), or perhaps it is Goffe's intention to truly impress on the viewer the powerful image of blood and bloodiness that runs through the play. Nevertheless, Bajazet in his aside mirrors the earlier speech of Isaak's:

There must be treason in it. How my blood
boils in my brest with anger! I have not the wine
could work such strong effect: my soul is vext.
A chafing heat distempers all my blood,
Achmetes thou must cool it: when they limbs
are emptied of that moisture they suck in,
and they stain'd bloud unchannel'd from thy veins,
then shall I be secure...(E1v)

Prompted by Bajazet, Achmetes will now be allowed to deliver a stirring and harrowing account of his encounter with Zemes, a passionate speech that details 'limbs bath'd all in bloud,/ and purple streams gush't from our wounded breasts'(E2r). Interestingly, Goffe now switches to increasingly frequent images of hearts. Zemes will speak to the Bishop of Rome of 'the open passage of my heart'(G3r). Bajazet will later confess that his 'cares are too great to be compriz'd within the narrow compasse of my brest' and he will 'powre into thy heart/ part of my secrets' (H4v). Bajazet will talk of his own 'bloody heart' and 'spotted heart' and, when locked in a duel with one of his sons:

Hold, hold thy venom'd tongue, if there be hid
more of this kind un-uttred, Ile rip up
thy full fraught bosome; and to save mine eare,
mine eyes shall overview what I'le not hear. (K2v)

The extension of the heart metaphors that have run throughout the play seems to be that Bajazet will be able to read the truth in his son's heart, a truth that Selymus is unable to speak. The bloodthirstiness expressed here and throughout a

play that will see some sixteen people dead before its end is finally resolved when Bajazet's grandson, Solymon, assumes control. In the final pages of the play, Goffe switches from personal feuds and vendettas to a more impersonal, political tone. In addressing his new court, Solymon will make the only reference to anatomy in a play filled with violence, murder and, as has been pointed out, an almost physical move in the dialogue from blood and veins to exposed and bloody hearts. But here, Solymon makes it clear that the Turks now need to repair their damaged empire:

Fly hence hereditary hate, discords dead,
let not succeeding enmities and hatred live,
let none presume to cover private sores
with publicke ruines, nor let black discord
make an Anatomy of our too leane
Empire, let it wax fat again... (O1v)

Goffe makes a compelling switch from the passionate and individual calls for bloodshed that have filled the play to this dispassionate, near geopolitical, awareness that the state must be brought back to health with the further avoidance of destructive violence. It is within this rational argument that the play makes its only reference to the science of anatomy.

John Fletcher also offers a view of an exotic locale in *Four Plays or Moral Representations in one*. First published in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, there is evidence that the play was first performed after 1609, perhaps as late as 1613. The play is notable for its unusual structure and turns into something very like a masque at the end. E. K. Chambers suggests that the play may have been performed by one of the boy's companies of the period, the Children of the Queen's

Revels. Part of the play's unusual structure is its induction in which the newlywed King Emanuel of Portugal (the locale is identified as Lisbon) and Isabella of Spain are arriving to watch a play, held to honour the pair and commemorate their wedding. What follows are the four 'moral presentations' of the play's title, presented as 'Triumphs'. The first centres on Martius, a Roman who has recently led a successful invasion of Athens, where, he has captured Sophocles and his devoted wife, Dorigen. The nobility and devotion of the couple serves to humble and enlighten the conquering Romans who fail in their attempts to subjugate and humiliate the Athenians. In the first scene, Martius is attempting to break Sophocles to his will, demanding that the Athenian ruler bow before the Roman. Sophocles demonstrates his willful single-mindedness in his first exchange with Martius:

MARTIUS. What meanes proud Sophocles?

SOPHOCLES. To go even with Martius,
and not to follow him like his Officer:
I never waited yet on any man.

MARTIUS. Why poor Athenian Duke, thou art my slave,
my blows have conquered thee.

SOPHOCLES. Thy slave? proud Martius,
Cato thy country-man (whose constancie
of all thy Romans I did honour most)
rip'd himself twice to avoid slavery,
making himself his own Anatomie.
But looke thee Martius, not a veine runs here
from head to foote, but Sophocles would unseame, and

like a spring garden shoote his scornfull blood
into their eyes durst come to tread on him... (26)

This is the only reference to anatomy in the play and happens in the context of an invasion of Athens. This is interesting, in that several of the plays reference Aristotle in their mentioning of anatomy and because here it is clear that we are dealing with dissection. Cato opened himself is the implication of the line, not that he was reduced to a skeleton. We have here yet another living anatomy (Cato anatomized himself) and Sophocles follows the example of violence in threatening to tear his own veins. Fletcher acknowledges the fleshly, corporal, nature of anatomies in both these lines, and the violent reality of anatomy is the metaphor that Sophocles uses in demonstrating his determination.

In her discussion of *A Larum for London*, Patricia Cahill points out that while the anonymous author was no doubt drawing on an historical event for didactic reasons, to warn against a Spanish attack of England (174), it would be a great mistake to consider *A Larum* as simply didactic in nature. To do so, warns Cahill would be to 'ignore its status as theatrical performance' (175). There is little doubt that warfare and martial plays were popular on the English stage. But, again as Cahill points out, an interest in these plays went beyond national zeal or 'war fever' (10). To attribute an interest in martial plays to one cause (a possible war with Spain) 'homogenizes Elizabethan playgoers who presumably attended the theatre for a multitude of different reasons' and 'assumes that the playhouse was no more than an inert space where patriotic fervor might be given voice' (Cahill 10).

The anonymous *Dick of Devonshire* reads as openly patriotic, referencing as it the Spanish Armada and Elizabeth directly, along with the British Navy. The action

of the play even occurs in a Spanish port that is about to be invaded by the English. The play opens on an apparently simple domestic note as we meet Don Pedro and his two sons, Henrico and Manuell. Manuell is to accompany his father on a trip to France, Henrico will stay behind and promises to safeguard his fiancé, Eleonora. With his father and brother gone, Henrico takes Eleonora to his home where he promptly bars the gates to anyone except his servant, Buzzano. It is then that we hear about the invasion and an account of the British navy, cannons, and fortifications. Much to the surprise of the Spanish, the English forces successfully conquer the town's fort, and, feeling no threat from the Spanish, several of the English, among them Dick Pike, have taken to wandering the hills, enjoying the Spanish countryside. Two narratives then take hold. In one, Dick, after a skirmish with some Spanish, finds himself wounded and in jail, lamenting the treatment he is receiving at the hands of the Spanish. Meanwhile, Henrico, who is locked away with his fiancé Eleonora, for no apparent reason suddenly rapes her, arguing that since they are as good as married there is no cause to wait. Upset and distraught, Eleonora writes to Don Pedro and on hearing the news both he and Manuell rush home. Arriving before his father, Manuell confronts his brother who, again without apparent provocation, accuses his brother of murdering their father. Soon, all the principle characters are assembled before a court in Sherris. Dick Pike is to face sentencing as a prisoner of war, Bustamente, the fort's commander, to face charges of treason for having lost the battle, and the Gusman brothers to face the charges of rape and murder.

Indeed, this is not a play that shirks from dark images and it maintains a tone of violence throughout; we are reminded of the inquisition, the otherwise loyal and brave Bustamente is immediately sentenced to death, and Manuell is ordered to be

racked in order to determine his guilt or innocence (faced with the prospect of torture, Manuell immediately confesses to a crime of patricide he did not commit). Alone in jail, and bandaged as a reminder of the indignity, Dick Pike goes on at length about the cowardice of the Spanish soldiers who wound men at the moment of their surrender. Then, of course, there is the rapist, Henrico, who uses almost the same language of assault and warfare that the invading British use when talking of the fort as he forces his fiancé to 'yield' in the same way that the fort is forced to yield.

The invasion of Eleonora is made strikingly similar to the invasion of the Spanish town, though we are made acutely aware that the foreign invaders are much more honourable than the Spanish counterparts. Early in the play, Henrico seems every bit the loving suitor, speaking to Eleonora in soft, romantic language. As soon as they are alone, however, he turns into a brooding schemer, a liar, and, of course, a rapist. At the top of the fifth act, the local deputy mayor (the 'Teniente') is trying to persuade Henrico to marry Eleonora, as he had promised to do, and bring some resolution to the affair. The Teniente is not the first to suggest this, but having taken her by force, Henrico now has no apparent desire to go through with the wedding. In fact, his actions seem to have put him off women altogether and he suggests that all women are unfaithful to some degree. Henrico's cynical description of his ideal woman would only live for him, something he now obviously believes impossible. Included in his description is this demand:

I would not have her tall, because I love not
to dance about a May pole; nor too low
(litle Clock goe seldome true;) nor, sir, too fatt,
(slug shipps can keepe no pace) no, nor too leane,

to read Anatomy lectures ore her Carcas;
nor would I have my wife exceeding faire,
for then she's liquorish meate; (74)

The only reference to anatomy in the play comes from the suddenly misogynistic Henrico who envisions a woman laid out like a carcass. While Henrico will ultimately be brought back to his senses and Eleonora will decide against having him executed, in this lone scene, Henrico's bitterness reaches his peak and in his deranged state caustically uses the image of an anatomy lecture to drive home his point. While not the threat that we have seen used in many other plays, the cruelty of the image carries its own weight, especially when used against the already severely abused Eleonora, who was treated so tenderly in the earlier part of the play.

Dick of Devonshire refers to Sir Francis Drake ('the very name of Drake was a Bugbeare to fright (Spanish) Children' (11) on several occasions, making a connection for the audience to real historical events and a cause for military alarm. And yet, following on from Cahill, the play's jingoistic moments seem a backdrop to the exciting, and harrowing, adventures of its characters.

Likewise, Barbara Mowat discusses the criticism levied against dramatic romance, the 'ridiculous plays' (237) of the sort discussed here, 'absurd' (238) narratives that feature wild adventures and foreign tales. Mowat deals mainly with the late plays of Shakespeare, but notes that similar criticism was leveled against romances throughout the period. The popularity of these plays is also noteworthy, and clearly audiences had a taste for such tales. The scope, scale, and 'unreality' of plot are some elements that link the plays in this section.

That the function of anatomy in these plays is sometimes linked to performance and a metatheatricality is also sometimes evident in this group of plays, as grounded as they apparently are in realism, journalism and topical events. Massinger's *The Maid of Honour* is a deeply political play that relies on a set of courtly intrigues for its dramatic power. As the play opens, Ferdinand, Duke of Urbino, has launched an assault against Aurelia, the Duchess of Sienna, because she has rejected his offer of marriage. The action of this tightly written 'tragae-comaedy' follows the intrigue of the court, though it is the love-plots that are the focus of the play, and so it does avoid the kinds of 'martial' language found in other plays in this chapter. The play's courting scenes, often seem intentionally comic, and the conceits and metaphors put us in a different tonal territory; the foppish Sylli will answer Camilio's question 'You are no Barber?' with

Fie no, not I, but my good parts have drawne
More loving hearts out of faire Ladies bellies,
Then the whole trade haue done teeth.

Sylli, the main comic foil of the play, makes reference to barbers (and surgery) and finds a joke in mixing the love metaphor with the very product of his desires. Sylli is no Eleazar (or Danila), rather the lascivious, even hedonistic, warriors of those plays is here transformed into a clown. The one reference to anatomy in *The Maid of Honour* comes as Ferdinand is leading his assault on Sienna. Anxiously waiting for reinforcement from Sicily and fearing the end of their supply lines, Ferdinand's soldiers have begun to fear starvation:

DRUSO. There is not

Three days provision for every soldiour,

At an ounce of bread a day left in the Citty.

LIVIO. To dye the beggars death with hunger, made

Anatomies while we live, cannot but cracke

Our heart-strings with vexation (2.3)

Ferdinand, fearing the worst, tells his men he would 'teare out my bowels, rather' (2.3) then face defeat. No sooner has he said this, though, then a soldier turns up to describe an impending battle between two knights of Malta. The soldier offers to take these men to higher ground where they can watch the battle 'where/ As in a Theater you may see their fates/ In purple gore presented' (2.4). Here Massinger has given us the only mention of anatomy in the play and even though he means it in the context of starvation, the soldier has expressed his fear of becoming a 'living skeleton'. Ferdinand responds with the offer to eviscerate himself which is followed by an offer to watch more bloodshed, in a 'Theater'. We are left to wonder how this 'purple gore' affect would be achieved in the Soldier's theatre, but *The Maid of Honour* is a remarkably bloodless play, though we can see here that a series of wrenching images serves to combine warfare, theatricality and dissection.

This blend of anatomy and theatricality brings us back to this notion of the 'unreal', that in the scenes of battle and bloodshed, while perhaps playing to some collective fear of invasion or simply jingoistic pride, also transport the audience beyond that, as the particular metatheatricality of these works may demonstrate. As Stump trots up and down on his wooden leg, carries off women in distress, and all while rails against allies and foes alike, he demonstrates a particular energy that

seems to carry him beyond the confines of the stage. The wooden leg at the end of a rotten stump of a leg is a macabre, bleakly humorous reminder of the end of life, but it is also not that far removed from Bobadill and his wooden bedstave. While both characters have vastly different functions in their plays, both are soldiers (of a sort) and both can be seen to function in a metatheatrical way as their plays call attention to themselves.

Chapter Five: Women and Gender

Perhaps for many readers, a familiar example of anatomy in theatre can be found in *King Lear*, with Lear's famous direction to 'Then let them anatomize Regan; see what breeds about her heart. Is there any cause in nature makes this hardness?' (3.6.70-72). By this point in the play, Lear has divided his kingdom, wandered the heath, met 'Mad Tom' and has endured the storm. Many readers will also be aware that the text of *King Lear* is quite different in its printed versions, and some of those differences are pertinent here, as they do affect this moment in particular. In the Quarto version of the play, first printed in 1608, this line comes during the mock trial scene in which Lear and Edgar arraign and prosecute Lear's daughters for their crimes against their King and father. As the Fool and Kent look on in sadness, Lear and Edgar act out their mad trial scene, in which stools stand in for the daughters and it is in this context that Shakespeare, in a clever conflation of the real and surreal, has Lear call for a physical examination of his daughter that he hopes will reveal the truth of her character. The synecdoche that Shakespeare presents leads an audience to assume that the dissection of Regan reveals the 'hardness' of her heart to be both a metaphor and an object for inspection. That Regan is hard-hearted is suggested as both a physical manifestation (echoing Edgar's lines) and a metaphorical, poetical, allusion to her character.

The Folio version of the play omits most of the trial but retains Lear's directive to anatomize Regan. Absent from the Folio is the extended verbal investigation, itself an anatomy, of the daughters and instead it leaps almost directly to the medical investigation. While the Quarto allows the audience to connect the investigation of the trial with the physical exam, and thus is much fuller in the presentation of the

metaphor, the Folio version omits that in an apparent attempt to lead the audience directly to the anatomical metaphor where Regan is made explicitly 'hard-hearted'. There is a thematic shift between the two versions of the plays and one that allows us to understand that variable nature of the treatment of anatomy in these plays.

Roger Warren argues, in 'The Folio Omission of the Mock Trial Motives and Consequences' that the alterations in the trial scene are dramaturgical (47) and, consequently, the play is streamlined and refined (and these dramaturgical changes seem similar to Jonson's revision of *Every Man in His Humour*). The result for the trial scene, argues Warren, is an emphasis on the madness of Lear and Edgar and a de-emphasis on the procedural elements of the trial. What remains consistent is the reference to Regan and, in that, the truncation of the trial scene in the Folio *King Lear* would also seem to emphasize the anatomy (the reference in the revised version occurs very quickly); likewise, there is an argument for familiarity in that Shakespeare is able to move quickly to that point because audiences have accepted the trope. If we continue to accept that Shakespeare (or an agent) revised the play, and this scene in particular, for purposes of the drama we are left to suppose, as we did with Jonson, that the reference to anatomy is dramaturgically important. That Lear calls for an anatomy in the Folio serves to highlight Lear's madness, but only in as much as he demands an illogical act. It is not a reflection on the practice, but is used here for dramatic purposes. As with Jonson and *Every Man*, we are reminded that authors combined a variety of methods to construct a scene and the example of *King Lear* helps to illustrate, as we move into this chapter, the occasional difficulty in separating the nature of the references to the practice of anatomy that we find in these plays, and examining the usage of anatomy through the period will occupy some of this chapter.

What is also true about this scene is that Lear orders an anatomical examination of his daughter. We have already seen that some playwrights use the subject of anatomy in their plays to examine the relationship between men and women. We have also seen that anatomy is sometimes used as a threat, either a threat of outright physical violence or the more psychological one of public ridicule and scorn. While the father/daughter relationship is, of course, paramount in Lear, we can use this as a springboard to examine plays use anatomy to investigate male/female relations, with a particular interest in a group of plays that would seem to focus an attack against women.

What are we to make, in the first instance, of Lear's directive to anatomize Regan to survey her character? Observing what seems to be something of an overwhelming interest in anatomy in the early modern period led Richard Sugg to suggest that 'around 1575 the wider English public appeared to barely have heard of anatomy; by 1600 it seemed at times unable to talk about little else'. (*Murder* 2). For Sugg, 'anatomy...was a clearly pervasive social phenomenon' (*Murder* 4). In *The Body Emblazoned*, Jonathon Sawday will describe what he terms a 'culture of dissection' (viii). For Sugg, Sawday, and others, dissection and anatomy become one of the touchstones for change and intellectual revolution in the early modern period. In establishing the central argument for *The Body Emblazoned*, and defining this 'culture of dissection', Sawday says that

it is a central thesis of what follows that we cannot properly understand the familiar (or less familiar) cultural legacy of the Renaissance, without attending to the birth of a science which was to transform entirely people's understanding not only of themselves and their sense of identity or 'selfhood', but of the relationship of their minds to their

bodies, and even their feeling of location in human society and the natural world (viii-ix).

Scholars and critics seem to have associated an interest in dissection with an emerging sense of self-discovery, self-identification, or inwardness. This is a line of thinking that would seem to follow from the work of Stephen Greenblatt, most notably in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, in which Greenblatt tells us that 'in the sixteenth century there appears to be an increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process' (2). In attempting to develop this thesis, Greenblatt admits to the difficulties inherent in trying to understand a period or culture that is not our own, and suggests a way forward:

Among artists the will to be the culture's voice – to create the abstract and brief chronicles of the time – is a commonplace, but the same will may extend beyond art. Or rather, for the early sixteenth century, art does not pretend to autonomy; the written word is self-consciously embedded in specific communities, life situations, structures of power. We do not have direct access to these figures or their shared culture, but the operative condition of all human understanding – of the speech of our contemporaries as well as the writings of the dead – is that we have indirect access or at least that we experience our constructions as the lived equivalent of such access (7).

Greenblatt accepts his own notion that artists of the sixteenth century clearly and deliberately speak for the larger community, a community that extends beyond personal realms into the larger, public one. This allows Greenblatt, and critics that follow, to not only see the work of an artist against a larger backdrop but to allow a

sort of cross-pollination, that what may or may not be said of a given artist can be said of other artists, in other contexts. The immediate result for *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* is that Greenblatt can move from Wyatt, to More, to Marlow and then to Shakespeare in a web of influences and cross-cultural influences. In a desire to place the relationship of theatre and anatomy in context for this thesis, it has been argued that writers may well have relied on the transmission of printed texts for information, if not inspiration. Greenblatt's argument is apt, then, though in recognizing the strength of the approach it does come with some cautions. So, for example, while Greenblatt suggests a link between acts of corporal punishment and the theatre with

this idea of the 'notable spectacle,' the 'theater of God's judgements,' extended quite naturally to the drama itself, and indeed, to all of literature which thus takes its rightful place as part of a vast, interlocking system of repetitions, embracing homilies and hangings, royal progresses and rote learning (201)

it also offers the opportunity to question the theatre's role, and to suggest that, while perhaps participating in the 'system of repetitions', the theatre could operate quite differently. So, for example, when discussing *Tamburlaine*, Greenblatt argues that Marlowe's refusal to participate in the system is evidence of the system itself, however (and while recognizing the merits of the argument) this does not preclude the argument that Marlowe's approach, as theatre, was different, and allows for separate questions. Ultimately, Greenblatt's argument that Marlowe's heroes struggle to invent themselves (212) seems somewhat solipsistic and it is Greenblatt's own theory that is advanced, not Marlowe's.

Nevertheless, Greenblatt's interest in 'self-fashioning' seems central to much of the current discussion about anatomy, with a connection drawn between a metaphorical inwardness and the very literal probing of the interior that occurs in dissection. Margaret Owens makes this argument in *Stages of Dismemberment*, when she tells us: 'according to Jaques Lacan, an almost crushing sense of our own fragmented condition is the price we pay for entry into subjectivity, into language (the Symbolic) and into human society' (12). 'A fascination with corporeal disintegration', Owens goes on to tell us, 'may very well constitute one of the few foundational and cross-cultural features of humanity. Fears about body integrity, after all, are metonymic for a fear of death, an undeniable universal' (12). Owens' suggestion that the urge to take the body apart is a 'cross-cultural' one allows for this lens to be freely used, though the assumption that a fear of 'body integrity' is the same as a 'fear of death' is not clearly established. The influence of Greenblatt also appears to be present in Jonathan Sawday's work, especially as he works outward from the writing of John Donne, in order to make broader assumptions about the culture at large.

Sawday's *The Body Emblazoned* investigates the role and nature of anatomy in the early modern period and is a seminal work on the topic. As already noted, Sawday identifies what he calls a 'culture of dissection' in the early modern period, and emphasizes the satirical impulse found in the anatomical impulse. For Sawday, 'dissection might denote not the delicate separation of constituent structures, but a more violent 'reduction' into parts...' (2). It is this violent impulse that seems to attract Sawday and it is, for him, the feature that links anatomy with satire: 'In the literary sphere, dissection and anatomization have come to be associated with satire, and hence with a violent and often destructive impulse, no matter how artfully concealed'

(1). Part of Sawday's argument is that the violent and destructive impulse that is the hallmark of both anatomy and satire is a subjective examination of the self. An objective, 'scientific', method will come later in the seventeenth-century. Sawday equates anatomists (who literally took bodies apart) with authors (who metaphorically and satirically 'anatomized' the world) and explorers (early cartographers can be seen to have partitioned the world out of a similar anatomical impulse) and suggests that behind it all is a subjective drive to disintegration, as expressed through 'brutal dismemberment'. For Sawday, these are acts of division, whether it's separating the body or the world into its constituent parts, and the divisive nature of these acts is violent and Sawday finds the dichotomies expressed by this conflict to be emblematic of the period: '...partition stretched into all forms of social and intellectual life: logic, rhetoric, painting, architecture, philosophy, medicine, as well as poetry, politics, the family and the state were all potential subjects for division' (3).

Sawday points to the connection between early-modern cartographers and anatomists, as does Valerie Traub in 'The Nature of Norms in Early Modern England: Anatomy, Cartography, King Lear'. Traub notes that play's 'dependence on a cartographic consciousness' (43), and that the mapping of both the land and the body contributed to a new kind of social discourse: 'Shakespeare's play, I argue, participates in cultural logics that developed out of the material and conceptual interaction of anatomical illustrations of the human body and representations of human figures on maps' (45). Both Traub and Sawday point out the dissective nature of cartography and link it to the anatomical impulse to uncover larger truths about the nature of the land and of the human condition; the partitioning that happens as a result (and has been noted with reference to anatomical texts) allows for an ordering

of knowledge. Sawday emphasizes the violent opposition characterized by these partitions, and sees a struggle in the resulting binaries and he (along with many commentators that follow) attempts to illustrate these struggles. This results, among many other things, in an attempt to portray antagonism between the early modern anatomical pioneers and their classical forerunners. This is particularly true when it comes to the pioneering work of Andreas Vesalius, and his monumental *De humani corporis fabrica* (published in 1543), a figure who is often portrayed as not only standing in direct opposition to the system of humours generally associated with Galen but actively seeking to destroy it. For Sawday, Vesalius had ‘an urge to overturn Galenic authority...’ (26), but, as was discussed earlier, it is perhaps more accurate to view Vesalius’ work as extending from Galen (something that Vesalius’ own introduction to the *De fabrica* makes clear).

Arguments that support the similarities in space sometimes also lead to an assertion of similar meaning, or reception. The interest in self-examination, inwardness, and interiority that scholars take to be apparent in the sciences seems, to them, to logically extend into the theatre. Nancy Gutierrez, in the opening pages of *‘Shall She Famish Then?’: Female Food Refusal in Early Modern England*, a work that deals with the representation of what we might now call anorexia nervosa in certain plays of the early modern period, declares that she

joins such scholars as Gail Kern Paster, Jonathon Sawday, and Michael Schoenfeldt, who locate early modern ideas of selfhood in the age’s understanding of the body and bodily functions, that is, the recognition that behaviour and feelings are a result of the internal workings of the body (3).

For David Hillman 'the idea of personhood, and personality, was never far from the question of the internal composition... of the body' (82). This approach to, and consideration of, anatomy in the period also extends into the theatre and suggests, to some degree, an interest in interiority on the stage.

Working from the example of the anatomy halls and other textual sources, scholars have used the example of violence in early modern drama as an argument in support of the expression of self in the early modern period. The corporeality of the body, with the evident desire to dismember and destroy that body, is evidence for some of the nature and extent of 'self-fashioning' in the period. For Francis Barker,

The glorious cruelties of the Jacobean theatre thus articulate a mode of corporeality which is structural to its world. Although the involvement of the body in punishment is only an essential and typical section across the way in which discourse invests it with a fundamental (and therefore, in this world, superficial) meaning, it none the less represents a generalized condition under which the body, living or dead, is not that effaced residue which it is to become, beneath or behind the proper realm of discourse, but a materiality that is fully and unashamedly involved in the processes of domination and resistance which are the inner substance of social life. The stage of representation and that other scaffold of corporal punishment are, as Marvell saw, effectively continuous with each other. On both, the spectacularly visible body is fully in place within signification, coterminous with the plane of representation itself. (23)

Barker's starting point for *The Tremulous Private Body* is Samuel Pepys and his diary, and for Barker the appearance of a diarist speaks directly to the invention of selfhood that he finds so intriguing in the period. A similar argument for the 'private' body is made by Anthony Synnott who argues that 'the Renaissance therefore witnessed the beginning of the end of the ascetic idea of the body as enemy, and the strengthening of the idea of the body as beautiful, good, personal, and private' (19). Synnott, like Barker, wants us to believe that in order for the body to be beautiful, good and personal it must also be private. It should be noted that Pepys wrote his famous diary after the restoration of the monarchy, and Barker does not seem to consider that the social, and private, circumstances of 1660 London may have been markedly different than the preceding period. That Pepys would find the time, find the need, to undertake a private, self-reflexive act, is evidence, for Barker, of a growing obsession to explore interiority, and Barker reads that obsession into the lives of those in the earlier period, apparently on the assumption that Pepys' self-reflexive action must logically extend from the nascent or emerging trends in the earlier part of the seventeenth-century. For Barker 'the disappearance of the body from public view' (13), as evidenced by the creation of the diary, occurs alongside the increasing displays of violence against the body and both lead to a revelation of the soul; the illusory, shadowy façade of the exterior is mitigated through discourse with the interior, the 'modern soul' (12) as Barker describes it and this is achieved, in part, through the violent destruction of that exterior.

The nature of the assumption about the relationship of interior/exterior in the theatre is neatly expressed by Katherine Eisaman Maus:

The point of such distinctions (interior vs. exterior) is normally to privilege whatever is classified as interior. For Hamlet, the internal

experience of his own grief 'passes show' in two senses. It is beyond scrutiny, concealed where other people cannot perceive it. And it surpasses the visible - its validity is unimpeachable. The exterior, by contrast, is partial, misleading, falsifiable, unsubstantial (4).

Maus has been discussing Hamlet who has 'that within which passes show'; the argument is that Hamlet, a dramatic character, is seen by critics as being more 'real' on the inside than the outside. 'Persons and things inwardly are, all these writers assume; persons and things outwardly only seem' (5), Maus tells us; after all Hamlet has clearly articulated this dichotomy. Maus attempts to clarify her argument with respect to the theatre, a medium that, for her, is particularly suited to the interplay of illusion and truth: 'theater involves, too, a deliberate, agreed-upon estrangement of fictional surface from "truth"' (31). For Maus, that truth is clearly under the surface, in the interior; exterior denotes falsehood. While Maus is arguing for this condition in the theatre she is also reluctant to accept the conditions of performance, suggesting that limitations in staging also contribute to this apparent dichotomy, that the 'conditions of the performance' (31) are limiting:

The dramatic techniques favored by English Renaissance dramatists further aggravate the relationship between spectacle and truth.... a writer for the theater must take into account the limits upon what can be presented onstage...

Maus sums up her survey of the theatre with

...the English Renaissance stage seems deliberately to foster theatergoer's capacity to use partial and limited presentations as a basis for conjecture about what is undisplayed or undisplayable... I

would argue...that in a culture in which truth is imagined to be inward and invisible, and in which playwrights seem perversely to insist upon parading the shortcomings of their art, a theatrical representation becomes subject to profound and fascinating crises of authenticity (32).

Maus's assumptions about the metaphorical function of the theatre (the 'undisplayed or undisplayable'), while interesting, may be misleading, particularly as it applies to the idea that spectacle somehow occludes or hides 'truth'. The nature of that 'truth' is difficult to discern, but presumably writers of the period are prevented from allowing their characters to express themselves because 'truth' is privately held and, consequently, cannot be shown on the stage. The very limitations of the early modern theatre then, forced audiences to fill in those imaginary blanks for themselves. In arguing that Hamlet has 'that within which passes show', Maus argues that the characters who graced the early modern stage were possessed of a private, inner truth that was crudely demonstrated, given the limitations of the means of presentation. Maus never successfully argues that these 'limitations' were very limiting at all. A perhaps more intriguing question, and which is not immediately evident in Maus' work, is how those very limitations were responsible for these plays in the first place. This does bring us to a very interesting question, though, having to do with the inner life of these characters. That no fictional character has an inner life is an obvious point, more apropos, however, is a consideration of when characters expose their inner feelings and to whom. While characters may actively hide their intentions from other characters, they are often frank with the audience. 'Well, then, /Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land' (1.2.15-16), is a plan first revealed to the audience. Similarly, and in the context of the soliloquies that Margaret Owens is investigating, Hamlet has nothing within 'which passes show' as far as the audience

is concerned; Hamlet is only honest with us. This helps to shape the investigation of anatomy in the theatre; If characters are not hiding an inner truth because, generally speaking, characters reveal themselves to the audience, this would imply that authors use anatomy in the theatre for something more than the inner exploration of character or of truth. This again, helps to frame anatomy on the stage in a distinctly theatrical light. If the audience is privy to information and knowledge that is withheld from other characters, what are we to make of the anatomical impulse to uncover truth? After all, Lear may need to anatomize Regan, but the audience doesn't; we understand Regan's motivations in ways that Lear never can, because we have had access to her actions and personality.

We can also, in this context, make the further observation that many of these plays are concerned with the violent investigation of female bodies. And while it can be stated that the anatomical impulse describes an investigation of bodies, and of self, that are then generally reflected back on society, it can also be seen that many of these plays, including *King Lear* are also focused on an investigation of an external, often female, self. The complexity of this argument, and the questions it raises, are brought to bear in the works of John Ford, who at once seems to question the nature of anatomical investigation in these plays and, because the plays operate as part of a discourse with the drama of the time, also act to reaffirm it.

John Ford's reputation rests on a handful of plays, several of which have been noted for their reflection of earlier works. Ford's deliberate echoing of earlier works (notably Shakespeare) has been the subject of much commentary and the inversion of plots and characters also helps to throw a useful lens on the use of anatomy in these plays. Ford's interest in anatomy seems oblique, as a writer he seems far more interested in what results from placing his characters in extreme situations.

Those extreme situations often result in extreme acts of violence, and it is the dissective, anatomical, aspects of these displays that would seem to frame a commentary on the presence of anatomy in drama.

A previous discussion *Love's Sacrifice* noted a connection to print, though it is worth noting in this context, that like many of Ford's major works, *Love's Sacrifice* also deals with the theme of forbidden love, and an investigation of truth, honour and loyalty, particularly among men and women. In *Love's Sacrifice*, we find Fernando in love with the Duke's wife, Bianca. Fernando knows his passion is illicit and dangerous and yet, in typical Ford fashion, Fernando is unable to contain his passion or the drive to confess it to his love. In a line that echoes Giovannia in *'Tis Pity*, Fernando declares that he must 'speake or burst' (2.1.128) and 'that passion, and the vowes I owe to you,/ Have chang'd me to a leane Anatomy' (2.1.130-131). That love can desiccate is a familiar theme in Ford and, likewise, the starvation or deprivation brought on by unrequited love provides much of the emotional impact of another of Ford's major tragedies, *The Broken Heart*. Ford's use of anatomy here furthers the emotional life of his protagonist and the sheer fervency of the characters is expressed through the senses and not the intellect. Ford's protagonists are so emotional that they often don't seem content to wait for death to expose their internal systems. Fiormanda, the Duke's sister, and suffering her own unrequited love for Fernando, is also ready to 'burst' with rage late in the play. There is seemingly no room for an intellectual, clinical, or medical examination of the heart in Ford, rather all threats to expose are emotional in the extreme. Propelled by his 'bleeding heart', Fernando will swear an oath to Bianca:

If when I am dead you rip

This coffin of my heart, there you shall read

With constant eyes, what now my tongue defines,
Bianca's name carv'd out in bloody lines (2.3.98-101).

King Lear, as distraught and emotional as he is by the third act, calls for Regan's anatomy in the context of an imagined courtroom – the King will have some sense of order. Ford elevates his characters and scenes to a fever pitch, where order seems an impossible achievement. Bianca will respond in kind to Fernando, after she offers to 'write/ This love within the tables of my heart'. In a set of images that will play out throughout Ford's work, the writer here combines the poetical, the metaphorical, the lyrical with the bloody and the physical. Ford's characters seem to understand that knowledge might be gained through dissection (indeed, vivisection and venesection), as has been discussed, but it is a bloody, violent and destructive act, as much as it is passionate and emotional. So concerned is Ford to make his characters' emotional state principle over their physical state, he does not allow his lovers to consummate their relationship. Bianca is therefore physically chaste, but this is small consolation to the spurned Duke. When confronted by his sister with knowledge of the affair, he responds in violent terms:

DUKE. I vow,
And vow again, by all princely blood,
Hadst thou a double soul, or were the lives
Of fathers, mothers, children, or the hearts
Of all our tribes in thine, I would unrip
That womb of bloody mischief with these nails,
Where such a cursed plot as this was hatched (4.1.66-72).

Bianca may well question the morals and laws of a society that bar her from her emotional desire ('what's a vow? A vow?'), but this is the sort of intellectual musing that leads Ford's characters to excruciating suffering and physical harm. Believing herself to be innocent (if only technically so), Bianca pleads her case with her distraught husband:

BIANCA. 'Twas my Lord:

Yet but a vision; for did such a guilt

Hang on mine honour, 'twere no blame in you

If you did stab me to the heart.

DUKE. The heart?

Nay, strumpet, to the soul; and tear it off

From life, to damn it in immortal death (4.2.56-61).

It is typical, and part of the power of his writing, that Ford jumps from the physical to the metaphysical, but it is so extreme, so overwrought, that the playwright seems to deliberately call the associations into question, to suggest that such associations are impossible. Ford pushes these established tropes to their breaking point and, in the homage to the earlier plays, deliberately questions the established romantic truths.

This is certainly evident in Ford's most famous play, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. When Annabella cleverly undercuts Soranzo's attempt to woo her at 3.2, 'Did you but see my heart, then you would swear-/ That you were dead', she not only demonstrates her own lively wit and inventiveness but highlights a theme that Ford has been pursuing throughout his play. From the start, Ford has set up and then undercut this familiar romantic conceit. Soranzo may be all too cavalier in his attempt

at seduction here, but he is no more and no less portraying himself as the renaissance lover and using the familiar trope of heart as seat of the emotions, as well as the familiar blazon that it could, indeed, show physical evidence of a romantic (even philosophical) truth. But Soranzo does not know that he is not the first to woo Annabella, and that this conceit has already been used in winning her. In this scene with Soranzo, Annabella also neatly reverses the same image that has won her earlier in the play, when her own brother offers himself to her:

And here's my breast, strike home.

Rip up my bosom, there thou shalt behold

A heart, in which is writ the truth I speak (I.ii.204-206).

Moving between romance and practicality, Annabella acknowledges the gap between the literal and the metaphorical, but this does her little good when, on her wedding night with Soranzo, he learns he has not married a maid. Demanding to know the name of her lover he threatens to 'rip up thy heart,/And find it there.' Annabella's taunt that he 'do, do' is not only a touching moment on the part of the writer (that this victim of abuse would stand up to her attacker in such fashion is emotionally charged) but also ironic - Annabella seems to be the only one in the play who makes the distinction between the figurative and the literal. Though, as here, that will be little comfort when Giovanni comes to exact his final revenge. By the time, then, that Giovanni enters with his sister's heart on his dagger, the audience has been well prepared for such an image. We have watched this university-educated (at no less an institution than the University of Bologna), attractive young man advance from lover to murderer and in the final moments of the play, Ford continues to present his audience with the disconnect between romantic truth and intellectual fact. Wielding his gruesome dagger, Giovanni declares

'Tis a heart,

A heart my lords, in which is mine entombed.

Look well upon't; d'ee know it? (5.6.26-28)

Giovanni's question is, of course, a metonymic failure - the guests at the party cannot identify the person from the part. Ford's heart concludes the play and is the final in a string of images that underscores this essential dichotomy as well as a principal tenet of dissection, that knowledge comes at the very real price of destruction. And while Ford never mentions anatomy in this play, this image has also been established in the preceding scene, where Ford can also be seen to alluding to anatomical practice. When Giovanni enters his sister's chamber he has come to kill her. But that murder, extending as it does into the final scene, carries an even bloodier intent. The stage directions call for the couple to kiss, as Giovanni stabs his sister ('Brother, unkind, unkind' (5.5.92) is the famous reaction). Christian Billing, in considering the final shocking moments of the play, points out that the dialogue of this scene suggests that Giovanni begins his evisceration while Annabella is still alive (*Masculinity* 208), and as they metaphorically exchange hearts (Annabella promises to forgive her brother 'with my heart' (5.5.78) before he stabs her, he rallies himself with 'stand up my heart' (5.5.105) after he has committed the deed) it is clear that this act of dissection is, for all practical purposes, an act of vivisection. Ford's seemingly relentless drive to push these acts to their extremes calls the acts themselves into question – Ford isn't interested in anatomy as much as he is interested in the results of pushing his characters to physical extremes. In this Ford participates in a dialogue with other playwrights, and in acknowledging the presence of anatomy in the theatre, also moves the argument. Ford's extremes help form an ontology and in the cross-current of the plays, it becomes apparent that the function

of anatomy is not contained to a scientific investigation or simply the inclusion of a popular element.

In her introduction to an edition of Aston Cockayne's *The Obstinate Lady*, Catherine Shaw notes that Cockayne may have used both Burton and John Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy* as sources for his play (xxxv). The Cambridge-educated Cockayne would, like John Ford, come to belong to the Inns of Court (probably the Inner Temple), and though there is no record that any of his plays were ever performed, his connection to, and knowledge of, the theatre is attested to in the prefatory and commendatory verses that he wrote for Brome and Massinger. A comedy, *The Obstinate Lady* is much lighter in tone than *The Lover's Melancholy* and is a play filled with mistaken identity, disguise and unrequited love. The basic plot of the story revolves around a young Lord, Carionil, who is in love with Lucora, the obstinate lady of the play's title. A feud between the families means that Carionil is forbidden to woo Lucora, though even with free access it would apparently do him little good, as Lucora has forsworn all wooers. In a desperate bid to get close to Lucora, Carionil disguises himself as a moor (he is described in the text as a 'counterfeit Negro'), Tucapelo. Meanwhile, and despite protestations to the contrary, Carionil's trusted friend, Falorus has also fallen in love with Lucora.

Late in the play, a distraught Falorus confesses his love for Lucora to Carionil, and offers to let his friend kill him:

FALORUS. Leave complements Carionil, and make

A passage for my soul, that it may leave

So vile a habitation as this body:

And (when I'm dead) rip out my heart and in't
Survey my fault (I2v)

Carionil is not, despite the confession of love, anxious to kill his friend:

Can I be happy and Falorus dead!
No, I should live a desolater life
Then ere the strictest Anchorite that done,
And wear my body to an Anatome,
For real sorrow at such a dire mishap (I2r)

It is the nature of Cockayne's comedy that several characters confess their love for another and there is either the offer or a threat of death. Carionil himself will offer to stab himself over Lucora earlier in the play, but that is a fairly bloodless event and, though histrionic, has none of the imagery found in this scene. Cockayne starts here, like Ford, with familiar rhetoric in having Falorus offer to expose his heart, an object that will reveal the truth of his 'fault' through evisceration. In an interesting moment of juxtaposition, Carionil counters the offer of death with an offer of living death, or severe deprivation. While Falorus' offer of dissection is ignored, Carionil seems to pick up and alter the suggestion – he will wear down his body to an anatomical, skeletal, state but no one has to die. The 'real sorrow' for Cockayne seems to be that his characters will live with their faults and not have them exposed, or purged, after death. *The Obstinate Lady* is perhaps an underdeveloped play, the work of an inexperienced writer. Nevertheless, it does seem to lean on both Burton (a work Cockayne undoubtedly knew) and Ford. This is to suggest that a particularly theatrical trope exists and can be seen in operation in several of these plays. Both Cockayne and Ford may rely on the written text for inspiration, but the images have

crystallized on the stage (or close to it – if never performed, *The Obstinate Lady* was clearly written to be performed).

John Stephen's uses the classical setting of *Cynthia's Revenge* to satirize a range of topics and types, from false religion to politicians. As Mainelle Cole points out, in the introduction to *A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of Cynthia's Revenge*, Stephens uses the play to criticize women and politicians (23). Late in play, a conspirator, Pheudippe, who is plotting against Menander's life boldly declares that if his plans should fail:

Il'e sure prevent the heads-man, hang my selfe
With expedition, hire a mounte-bankek,
Some noted empr'icke, to anatomize
My polititian corpse, dissect my scull.
Boyle tongue and heart together in my blood
Effuse them into broth made of my braines,
In which, my unctuous kidney-lease dissolv'd
With the more lusherious marrow, may compose
A poultice, which will speedily contrive
The downe-fall of erected favorites,
Enflame desire-then disanull the ends
Which that affection gapes for: I resolve
Thus to bequeath my members, to the sect
Of those, who narrow inquisition make
After each mysticke virtue, physicall;
If our attempts prove not effectuall. (J4r)

Under Cinthia's spell, many of the characters have been driven to emotional extreme, but Stephens takes the opportunity to draw an association between politics, anatomy and mountebanks. The mixing of the 'poultice' is the job of the mountebank, and Stephen's association of the anatomy hall and the charlatan is clearly negative. This is also one of the few plays that makes a direct connection between hanging and the anatomy halls. While many plays will deal with executions in one way or another, and, of course, there is frequent mention of the barber-surgeons and the anatomy hall, there is seldom this direct a connection between the two. *The Atheist's Tragedy* springs to mind but in that play it is D'Amville who wishes to do the anatomizing, and in that respect *Cinthia's Revenge* is unique though it must also be noted that Stephen's blend of macabre tortures and alchemical potions suggests that the use of anatomy in this context is once again used for theatrical affect and not to suggest a knowledge or appreciation of dissection. Pheudippe foils the axe-man, and Stephens suggests a link between the hanged and the anatomy halls, but it is surely for theatricalized effect.

Stephens also offers a scathing critique of women throughout the play. On his wedding night, Pheudippe will summarize the character of women:

Most women love to talke,
To scatter tales, and yet sweare silence too,
To breed sedition, to deceive all those
Who in simplicity are confident,
Of honest meaning: o they doe insult
With a tyrannicke bold-nesse ouer one
Who through bewitch'd opinion, doth impart
The substance of included secresie.

O they will dare the soule of such a man,
Make him so subiect to their base command,
As if they had his heart-strings in their hand. (II. li.47-57)

Cinthia's Revenge is set in Sparta, where the goddess Cinthia is complaining about the fallen state of her cult. She subsequently drives all the men into madness, providing the bulk of the action of the play. Early in the play, the King of Sparta decides to marry Favorina, an act which spawns a series of plots and counterplots as most of the men suddenly find themselves jealous of each other (all under the spell of Cinthia, of course). One of the subplots of the play involves Amilcar, who has convinced Favorina that Menander has been killed and that she should run away with him for her own safety. Working with the eunach, Graccus, Amilcar sets about wooing Favorina. So twisted has his mind become under the influence of Cinthia, that he swears he will win her or, failing that, rape her. Favorina, having become aware of Amilcar's designs (Graccus will ultimately betray Amilcar) declares:

Faith you have done a deed of charity,
Tooke me by rescue, from death past the chin,
To rip my pregnant wombe, and flea my skin,
But know (Amilcar) I am so resolv'd
Upon the spot-lesse love of chastity,
As I with proper violence will rend
My wombe in peeces, teare my tempting face
And go beyond a woman's forritude,
Rather than (like a strumpet) prostitute. (P1v)

While this is a self-described revenge play, there is little by way of violent imagery in it. This outburst of Favorina's is an obvious exception, and the level of violence is startling in the context of yet another image of a ripped womb (it is unclear from the text whether Favorina is pregnant by Menander or reacting to the possibility of becoming pregnant by Amilcar) and a flayed (here female) body. By way of comparison, Menander, driven mad himself and now faced with the loss of his young bride declares:

But o my friend, I am not as I seeme,
Merry indeed, but only seeming so;
Un-rip my bosom, and with lines of blood
Deeply ingrav'd upon my trembling heart,
You may discern attractive Epitaphs. (N2v)

This much more traditional imagery is more representative of the language of the play in general and stands in contrast not only to Favorina's speech, but also Amilcar's who will threaten his former conspirator, the eunuch Graccus:

(False wretch) I must forget humanity,
And fall acquainted with some forest Wolfe;
Hee, and such bloody tutors shall instruct the shameless Art of savage
cruelty,
To kill thee, and become exorbitant;
I will anatomize thy limbs alive;
Will mince small gobbets of thy quaking flesh
And feed my Haukes... (Q2r)

Amilcar continues on, threatening to learn from a 'Turke' how to inflict some plague on Graccus that will extend the torture. This is the first reference to anatomy in the play and is clearly meant as a threat, with the horrifying implication of vivisection. When Amilcar's plot is ultimately foiled there is a general call for him to receive his own violent punishment. Favorina herself calls for his dismemberment ('cut off his members; bind and broile the slave'), as well as a call to 'flea him, and make a trophy of his skin' (S4r).

Other plays will weave images of anatomy and medicine more generally into the fabric of plays that reflect the ongoing negotiations between men and women. The domestic tone of the plays is laced through with surgical and anatomical references, and help to shape a picture of a particularly theatrical set of associations; the gender roles assigned to characters are contained, defined, sometimes in medical terminology. James Shirley's *The Constant Maid*, is centred on a young gentleman, Hartwell, who has fallen on hard times and is unable to secure a fortune in order to marry his love, Frances, daughter to the widow Bellamy. Aiding him in his pursuit of Frances is his friend, Playfair. Playfair is in love with the daughter of the local usurer, Hornet, whose miserliness is expressed in physical terms:

He looks like some cast money-bag, that had given up
The stuffing, and for want of use growne moldy:
He dares not keep much fire in's kitchen, lest
Warming his hands, which rather look like gloves,
So tann'd and thin, he let them scorch, and gather
Into a heap, I do not think he ever
Put off his clothes, he would run mad to see

His owne anatomy, that such a wretch
Should have so vast a wealth. (A2v)

So Hartwell tells us of the usurer in familiar comic terms, though here we also get morbid humour in the suggestion that Hornet would run in fear of his own emaciated body. Hornet will feature in the comic subplot of the play – Playfair is in love with his neice, who pretends to go mad so that Playfair can pass off his cousin as a doctor, in order to gain access. Hornet has accepted the services of this ‘doctor’ but immediately complains about the expense of medical care, a complaint he will air several times throughout the play. And while the cousin is simply aping, his comic turn as the doctor is revealing and we are shown a professional who is working through theories (exaggerated here, of course, for effect), as he attempts to effect a cure. The light tone of Shirley’s mockery is characteristic of the play in general, a play in which we are treated, by and large, to a society dealing with the everyday, complaining, cajoling and, in general, trying to steer their way through the usual trials of life. Part of the suburban mosaic that Shirley generates involves stereotypes and generalities that seem to extend from, and are contextualized by, the earlier reference to anatomy. In Shirley’s world, not only does Hornet complain about physicians bleeding him dry, but here Barbers exist to ‘firk up’ women’s hair and we hear jokes about the dangers of bad barbers and cut throats. What is interesting is the ordinariness, the casual acceptance of the surgeons, medicine and anatomy that now form part of the fabric of the play world society that Shirley presents.

Similar themes are pursued in another Fletcher play, *Love’s Pilgrimage*, though Fletcher weaves these elements throughout the play, to offer a more sustained, and thorough, examination of women, medicine and culture. The play’s performance history is complicated by the fact that at some point after its initial

performance and before it appeared in print, it appears that the first act was re-written to include a section of Jonson's *The New Inn* (Baldwin 707). In its printed form, *Love's Pilgrimage* is a lively comedy of mistaken identities and improbable plot complications. In the (revised) first act we are at an Inn where a young nobleman, Philipo, is losing a bid to rent accommodations for the night as the Inn's only room has been already rented by another, rather mysterious, young man. Rather than see Philipo's generosity at the Inn go unrewarded, the hosts plot to sneak Philipo into the room's second bed once the young man has fallen asleep, betting on the fact that he will be none the wiser. This being a comedy, the young man is promptly startled awake and then reveals that 'he' is in fact a she, searching out her brother after her fiancé has callously left her. As it happens the young girl, Theodosia, has already found her brother, as it is none other than her roommate, Philipo. The siblings, hearing that Theodosia's jilting lover, Markantonio, is in Barcelona, soon set out to find him. The plot is further complicated when the Inn becomes refuge to a group who has been held up and robbed on the road. Among their number is a young boy, who is also soon revealed to be a young girl, Leocadia, who is also on the run from Markantonio. In the course of conversation, Leocadia reveals her secret to Theodosia, not realizing that she is in fact a rival for Markantonio.

It is within this confused and comic context that the plot of the play unravels. In addition to these three there are upset fathers and city officials and soon Markantonio himself makes an appearance, wounded in a scuffle in the townsquare. Carried on in a chair to meet the City's governor the two soldiers carrying Markantonio are left to ponder on the state of current affairs and the state of the nation. Part of the concern is the passing of the previous generation, though as the second soldier points out:

SECOND SOLDIER. Old Ignatio lives still.

FIRST SOLDIER. Yes, I know him: he will do prettily well at a mans liver:

But where is there a man now living in the Town
That hath a steady hand, and understands Anotomy
Well? if it come to a particular matter of the lungs,
Or the spleen, why? alas Ignatio is to seek; are
There any such men left as I have known, that
Would say they would hit you in this place? is there
Ever a good hertist, or a member percer, or a
Small-gut man left in the Town, answer
Me that.

SECOND SOLDIER. Masse, I think there be not.

FIRST SOLDIER. No, I warrant thee (4.2)

Presumably, Old Ignatio is the town's doctor and that accounts for the sudden shift in the conversation from lamenting the poor quality of the young men in the town to the state of medicine in Barcelona. In some respects, this exchange serves as the crux of the play and it is curious that in a play that rests entirely on the disguise of its two female protagonists, so much of the play from this point forward will rely on a general mistrust of surgeons. Much of this is also driven by the women, women whose disguises have only failed in each other's presence; Thedosia having apparently intuited that Leocadia was a woman earlier in the play. Now in Barcelona, Leocadia plots to harangue her jilting lover and uses his wounded state to do so. For his part, Markantonio is only lightly wounded though he too immediately announces

his mistrust of surgeons. Leocadia promptly convinces Markantonio that he is grievously wounded and in an exchange that ultimately leads to his admitting to having wronged both Leocadia and Theodosia, the word 'Surgeon' is used four times. This is for comic effect, surely, and it is logical that the sudden preoccupation with surgeons comes only after the brawl in which Markantonio is wounded, and yet none of this happens until after the two soldiers decry the state of surgeons in Barcelona, and it is dialogue initiated by a woman in disguise, using Markantonio's concern for his injury to reveal the truth. Markantonio had earlier even tried to use the sight of his wounds to impress yet another potential conquest, wounds that now go undressed as Leocadia probes for truth.

Love's Pilgrimage, then, moves from a lament on the lack of male anatomists and then relies on its female protagonists to conduct a (metaphorical) dissection. It is a clever inversion that presents an imbalance in the town and affords the women power as a result of the failure of the men to assume control – including medically. A much more direct attack on women can certainly be found in the plays of the period; some rely, as in *Love's Pilgrimage*, in a peculiar conflation of women and medicine, sometimes expressed in anatomical terms. Consider the particularly strong language of *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*:

ORLANDO. Say thou art not a Whore, and that's more then fifteene women (amongst fiue hundred) dare sweare without lying: this shalt thou say, no let mee say't for thee; thy Husband's a Knaue, this Lord's an honest Man; thou art no Puncke, this Lady's a right Lady. Pacheco is a Thiefe as his Master is, but old Orlando is a true a man as thy Father is: I ha seene you flie hie, sir, & I ha seene you flie low, sit, and to keepe you from the Gallowes, sir, a blue Coat haue I worne, and a

Thiefe did I turne, mine owne men are the Pedlers, my twenty pound
did 'flie hie, sir, your wiues Gowne did flie low, sir: whither flie you
now, sir? you ha scap'd the Gallowes, to the Deuill you flie next, sir.
Am I right, my Liege?

DUKE. Your Father has the true Phisicion plaid.

MATHEO. And I am now his Patient. (K2r)

This follow an earlier exchange in the play:

MATHEO. It's my humor, Sir, 'tis a foolish Bag-pipe that I make my
selfe merry with: why should I eate hempe-seed at the Hangmans
thirteene-pence halfe-penny Ordinary, and haue this whore laugh at
me as I swing, as I totter?

DUKE. Is she a Whore?

MATHEO. A sixe-penny Mutton Pasty, for any to cut vp.

ORLANDO. Ah, Toad, Toad, Toad.

MATHEO. A Barbers Citterne for euery Seruingman to play vpon, that
Lord, your Sonne, knowes it.

HIPPOLITO. I, sir, am I her Bawd then?

MATHEO. No, sir, but she's your Whore then, (k1v)

In both exchanges we find a women being insultingly called a whore, and that
derision is followed by a curious medical reference. Orlando is declared a 'physician'
entirely for diagnosing Bellafront a whore – and passing that lesson on to her
husband. For his own part, Matteo would have his wife become the object of several

forms of public consumption; prostitution becomes just one act amongst several. The 'pasty' reference is particularly crass though also found in other whore plays and in satires, with its gluttonous overtones and the particularly devalued state of Bellafront's body this implies.

Taking it as understood that the cittern found at any barber's shop was there to be casually played by the servants waiting for their masters, then the image here of the 'Barber's Cittern' is particularly stark and insidious, and another complex association of medical science and whoredom in the play. The image of this woman being callously used, by the servants no less, while the general public receives some form of health care appears to be a particularly dramatic one, with little evident precedent or counterpart. Dekker establishes a metaphor that builds on a connection between surgery and women that arises out of a theatrical tradition but is apparently outside the literary one.

Dekker uses a similar, if dramatically heightened set of images *Match Mee in London*, which features a complicated plot in and around the court of Spain. With a lecherous king as the main protagonist it is not surprising that sex is the motivating factor as the King tries to seduce a local maid, Tormiella. When Tormiella marries a shoemaker, Cordolonte, the play verges on becoming a revenge tragedy but all is resolved happily in the end. In the meantime, though, and like other plays where sex is driving the plot, several bawdy subplots unravel in the background. The chief instigator is Bilbo the comic servant to Malevento, Tormiella's father. When the play opens, Malvento is feverishly searching for his daughter, out past her curfew. Bilbo's responses all seem calculated to cause further anxiety in Malevento, as in this exchange:

BILBO. A Barber stood with her on Saturday night very late, when he
had shav'd all his Customers, and as I think, came to trimme her.

Malvento. A Barber! To trim her! Sawst thou the Muskcod?

Bilbo. A chequer'd aprone Gentleman I assure you: he smelt horrible
strong of Camphire, Bay Leaves and Rose water: and he stood fidling
with Tormiella.

Malvento. Ha?

Bilbo. Fidling at least halfe an hour, on a Citterne with a mans broken
head at it, so that I thinke 'twas a Barber Surgion... (B2r)

Bilbo plays on Malvento's over-concern for his daughter by also suggesting that a visit to the Barber is on the one-hand frivolous, as indicated by the derogatory (and feminizing) attack on the profession. There is also reason to suspect that Bilbo's language is meant as a series of sexual puns, which also play on Malevento's suspicions of his daughter. That the Barber will 'trim' her, seems to connote that she is being made ready for dalliance, if not just socializing. That 'trim' might be read this way, is suggested by a late ballad, *The Cony Barber*, which in bawdy turns describes a woman barber 'trimming' her female lover (the ballad describes the interaction of the women in overtly sexual terms, and tells us the women 'wrangled, they jangled, they strangely entangled'). Not only does the mention of the Barber catch Malevento's attention, but Bilbo extrapolates the situation to involve a Surgeon. Here again, Dekker uses the image of the cittern, in this case to raise paternal concern for a daughter. The image of the cittern cittern and the barber, who 'fiddles' with the young woman and once again, also seems to raise questions about not only the

profession of the Barber-Surgeon, but perhaps also the freedom of young women to indulge in such activities.

Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster, or Love Lies A-Bleeding* presents its set of relationships in familiar ways but also along uniquely gendered lines. Suzanne Gosse says that 'Philaster is a play concerned with sex, gender and deviance, pushing against physical and psychological norms and boundaries. But gender is also a political issue in this play' (41). With tensions in the play revolving around Arethusa's place in the hierarchy as a female heir, and with particularly weak men, questions of gender and propriety abound. Early in the play, Dion describes the popular Philaster:

DION. But here comes one, more worthy those large praises, then the large speaker of them. Let me be swallowed quick, if I can find, in all the anatomy of yon man's virtues one sinew sound enough to promise for him he shall be constable. By this Sun: he'll never make King, unless it be of trifles, in my poor judgement. (1.1.169-174)

Dion's characterization of Philaster continues, as does the anatomical metaphor:

DION. Every man in this age has not a soul of crystal to read their actions through. Men's faces as so far asunder, that they hold no intelligence. Do but view yon stranger well, and you shall see a fever through all his bravery and feel him shake like a true tenant. If he give not back his Crowne again upon the report of an elder-gun, I have no augury. (1.1.260-267)

Absent the physical interrogation of anatomy, there is no window to the soul. This extends the anatomy metaphor from earlier in the play and makes it clear that

the exterior is no true signifier of the interior. With its double revenge plot, scenes of violent jealousy and deception (including a love-sick gentlewoman in disguise and several other acts of disguise), we are introduced early to the theme of appearance that will run throughout the play. The assumption that the play will toy with, of course, is that people are not what they seem. Here Beaumont and Fletcher, perhaps not surprisingly given the play's classical setting, use an ancient conceit, that appearance mirrors reality. That truism will be sorely tested in Philaster's jealousy of the innocent page, Bellario, who of course turns out to be Leon's daughter, in disguise. This theme will play itself out in more bodily ways, and the play's language becomes increasingly violent when directed at the women of the play. So when the King comes to accuse Megra of deceit he condemns her exterior show:

KING. Now Lady of honour, where's your honour now?

No man can fit your palate but the prince?

Thou most ill-shrouded rottenness, thou piece

Made by a painter and a pothecary,

Thou troubled sea of lust, thou wilderness

Inhabited by wild thoughts, thou swollen cloud

Of infection, thou ripe mine of all diseases,

Thou all sin, all hell and last all devils! (2.4.130-137)

Philaster will express himself in a similar way, as he comes to distrust his Page, Bellario:

Oh my heart!

This is a salve worse than the main disease.

Tell me thy thoughts, for I will know the least

That dwells within thee or will rip thy heart
To know it. I will see thy thoughts as plain
As I do now thy face. (3.1.224-229)

Philaster's stabbing of Bellario, while on the run, is perhaps a signal of his eroded mental state, but may also be a very physical manifestation of a restless desire to probe the interior, to reveal truth, to manifest the 'augury' that Dion suggests is missing. This desire, though, begins to be turned on itself; the idea of knowing the interior through the exterior calls all knowledge of others into question. The struggle to sort deception from reality is not only a difficult task in the play, but seems to wear away at the faculties. This is evident in the characterization of Philaster, who's behavior becomes more erratic throughout and, most especially in the presentation of Bellario. Philaster's relationship with Bellario, including Philaster's stabbing of Bellario, is complex and possible to be read as romantically charged. Certainly, Philaster seems jealous of his young page, and suspects he's had sex with the (virginal, as it turns out) Arethusa. When it is discovered that Bellario is Dion's daughter, Euphrasia, the peculiar gender politics of *Philaster* are not, as one might expect, resolved by this revelation; after Bellario/Euphrasia confesses her love for Philaster, she is invited by Arethusa to live with them, 'Come live with me/ Live free as I do' (5.5.193-194). The exact nature of this relationship is cloudy – Bellario will now live as a woman, but committed to never marrying, living in a household with the man she loves and the woman he loves. The play's intriguing investigation of gender defies typical resolution; the play's relentless interrogation of interiority and gender is centred on a woman's body.

The gender politics of *Philaster* are amplified in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Love's Cure*, a play that extends this connection between science/anatomy and the

female form. It would seem that deep and complex societal concerns are examined, probed, and turned around in a play that deals with the investigation of anatomy, including an examination of genitalia, gender and the interior organs, including the reproductive system.

In *Love's Cure* the two main protagonists spend most of their time 'cross-gendered', a condition which leads to a variety of sexual jokes, innuendos, suggestions of interiority, sexual violence, and a demand, ultimately, for 'custom'. What is or is not customary (and this is tied to issues of appearance) is a predominant theme in the play, and one that is examined through a probing, anatomical, look at the play's protagonists. When we first meet the play's 'hero', Lucio, he has spent most of his life disguised as a woman, to protect him from political enemies. Meanwhile, his sister Clara has spent most of her life dressing, and behaving, like a man. The plot of the play is concerned largely with returning brother and sister to more 'customary' behavior. The play's unusual approach to its subject matter suggests that it is this preoccupation with traditional roles that is being examined; this is a play that helps mediate the complex association not only of anatomy and the theatre, but gender and gender roles as examined in this group of plays.

Our introduction to Lucio sees him already being ridiculed for his feminine behavior, and his nature is questioned immediately by Bobadilla. 'Go fetch my work: this ruffe was not well starch'd' (8) are Lucio's first words in the play, making his feminine concerns immediately evident. This prompts Bobadilla to refer to Lucio as a Hermaphrodite and to launch into a tirade against Lucio's generally feminine behavior. The rest of the exchange brings out several of the predominant themes of the play:

BOBADILLA. May you have ten womens tongues that way I am sure:
why my yong Mr. or Mistris, Madam, Don or what you wil, what the
devill have you to do with Pullen, or Partrich? or to sit pricking on a
clowt all day? you have a better needle, I know, and might make
better work, if you had grace to use it.

LUCIO. Why, how dare you speak this before me, sirha?

BOBADILLA. Nay rather, why dare not you do what I speak? ---though
my Lady your mother, for fear of Vitelli and his faction, hath brought
you up like her daughter, and h'as kept you this 20 year, which is ever
since you were born, a close prisoner within dores, yet since you are
a man, and are as wel provided as other men are, methinks you
should have the same motions of the flesh, as other Cavaliers of us
are inclin'd unto. (8-9)

Much of the tone and subject of the play are introduced in this exchange. In addition to 'hermaphrodite', the sexual innuendo and bawdiness is characteristic of the play in general. Lucio's feminine interests are countered in Bobadilla's concern for more manly pursuits – mostly sexual. We then meet Clara, and while the tone shifts substantially, there are more of the kinds of innuendo (Lucio's 'needle', Clara's 'sword') and issues of transgender that we have already encountered. Having spent most of her life on the run and in disguise, her guardian, Alvarez, here attempts to persuade Clara to return to her 'normal' role:

ALVAREZ. My Love Clara

(For Lucio is a name thou must forget

With Lucios bold behaviour) though thy breeding

I'the camp may plead something in the excuse
Of thy rough manners, custome having chang'd,
Though not thy Sex, the softnesse of thy nature,
And fortune (then a cruell stepdame to thee)
Impos'd upon thy tender sweetnesse, burthens
Of hunder, cold, wounds, want, such as would crack
The sinewes of a man, not borne a Souldier:
Yet now she smiles, and like a naturall mother
Looks gently on thee, Clara , entertaine
Her proffer'd bounties with a willing bosome;
Thou shalt no more have need to use thy sword;
Thy beauty (which even Belgia hath not alter'd)
Shall be a stronger guard, to keep my Clara ,
Then that has bin, (though never us'd but nobly)
And know thus much.

CLARA. Sir, I know only that
It stands not with my duty to gaine-say you,
In any thing: I must, and will put on
What fashion you think best: though I could wish
I were what I appeare. (11)

Clara is not so willing to give up her masculine role, declaring that she wishes she 'were what I appeare'. This notion that Clara is not just cross-gendered but trans-gendered raises questions in the play of appearance versus reality, is startling in its context, and confirms that this play is built around transgression – Clara, at least initially, wants to physically be a male. Much of the imagery of the play is built

around the loss of manhood (usually through violent means); Clara wishes to put it on, to add it to her body.

Throughout the play, Bobadilla will continue to act as arbiter of gender, continuing to rail against the transgressions of brother and sister, mostly in crude, overly-sexualized images. Bobadilla will make a 'man or a mouse' of Lucio and more than once threatens to cut off his manhood in violent frustration:

BOBADILLA. Oh craven-chicken of a Cock o'th'game: well, what remedy? did thy father see this, O' my conscience, he would cut of thy Masculine gender, crop thine eares, beat out thine eyes, and set thee in one of the Peare-trees for a scar-crow: As I am Vitelli , I am satisfied, but as I am Bobadilla Spindola Zanco , Steward of the house, and thy fathers servant, I could finde in my heart to lop of the hinder part of thy face, or to beat all thy teeth into thy mouth: Oh thou whay-blooded milk-sop, Ile waite upon thee no longer, thou shalt ev'n waite upon me: come your wayes fir, I shall take a little paines with ye else. (21)

Bobadilla's anger and threats of violence are extreme, but his attitude is not simply preserved for Lucio; this tirade against Clara is filled with more violently sexual imagery:

BOBADILLA. I have like charge of you Maddam, I am as well to mollifie you, as to qualifie him: what have you to doe with Armors, and Pistols, and Javelins, and swords, and such tooles? remember Mistresse; nature hath given you a sheath onely, to signifie women are to put up mens weapons, not to draw them.... Custome hath turn'd nature topsie-turvy in you. (22)

That women are meant only to sheath men's sword is not just a commonplace here – indeed the particular violence of that image speaks to many of the images of gender, including the lack of gender, that pervade the play. These images are picked up and expanded on by the clowns of the piece: the cobbler Pachieco and his servant Lazarillo. Their first exchange, though comedic, is complicated and serves to highlight several of the prominent themes of the play. We once again find our clowns talking about starvation and a lack of food. So starved is Lazarillo that he declares:

They tell me in Civill here, I looke like an Eele, with a mans head: and
your neighbour the Smith here hard by, would have borrowed me
th'other day, to have fish'd with me, because he had lost his angle-rod.
(15)

Lazarillo has a man's head but is otherwise an eel and apparently genderless below the waist – starvation has robbed him of gender, a state which also seems to coincide with the loss of his neighbour's 'angle rod', the bawdy connotation of which implies that a sexless Lazarillo is good for nothing. That this reading of the exchange is at least partially accurate is given credence in the very next exchange. Picking up on the theme of lack of gender, we get the intriguing story of the 'maid of flanders'.

PACHIECO. As long as he can without feeding: did'st thou read of the
miraculous maid in Flanders ?

LAZARILLO. No, nor of any maid else; for the miracle of virginitie now a
daies ceases, ere the virgin can read virginitie?

PACHIECO. She that liv'd three yeere without any other sustenance
then the smell of a Rose.

LAZARILLO. I heard of her Signior ; but they say her guts shrunk all into Lute-strings, and her neather-parts cling'd together like a Serpents Taile, so that though she continued a woman still above the girdle, beneath yet she was monster.

PACHIECO. So are most women, beleeve it. (16)

Would that Pachieco and Lazarillo had read their Raynalde, as tied up in this exchange is a complex set of ideas about gender, specifically a fear of female anatomy. Clearly, living on nothing more than the smell of a rose has led the maid into a state that can be described from our modern view-point as anorexic – the picture of the maid we are given is startling in its proximity to contemporary images of young (primarily) women suffering from this condition. Starved to a stage of unnatural thinness, the maid has shriveled, in all respects, and has lost any hint of femininity. The crass description we are given is nonetheless physiological and we are invited to undertake an imaginative examination of the Maid. The description is too crude to be taken as fact (or even science) and in describing the maid in such terms we are reminded of Raynalde's admonition and may wonder if we have crossed a boundary into prurient curiosity of a now-deformed anatomical part. The play invites a comparison of the material, scientific, nature of anatomy and dissection with its imaginative uses in the theatre. Raynalde would perhaps also object to the assertion that most women are monsters below the waist and the play, momentarily at least, reminds us of the generalized fear of sex and sexuality that is commented on in a variety of ways in the plays being examined. We are also reminded of the main theme of the play and the collision of presumed gender identity and the reality of the lives of the characters.

The overarching concern of the play will remain how to deal with these two transgressives, and the resultant lack of stability brought to a society that cannot possibly deal with the reversal. As Eugenia, the sibling's mother, will herself say to Alvaraz, who has raised Clara:

EUGENIA. Ile returne

The joy I have in her, with one as great

To you my Alvarez : you, in a man

Have given to me a daughter: in a woman,

I give to you a Sonne: this was the pledge

You left here with me, whom I have brought up

Different from what he was, as you did Clara ,

And with the like successe; as she appeares

Alter'd by custome, more then woman, he

Transform'd by his soft life, is lesse then man. (15)

Here is the theme of 'custom' again, and it pervades the play – more than biology, it seems, the raising of the children has altered them beyond recognition. Late in the play, as Clara and Lucio are struggling with their own gender identities, their sworn enemy, Vitelli is at once threatening Lucio's life and offering to marry Clara. In part, Clara tells Vitelli:

CLARA. Custome, that wrought so cunningly on nature

In me, that I forgot my sex, and knew not

Whether my body femall were, or male,

You did unweave, and had the power to charme

A new creation in me, made me feare

To think on those deeds I did perpetrate,
How little power though you allow to me
That cannot with my sighes, my teares, my prayers
Move you from your own losse, if you shoule gaine.

That murderer is, of course, Lucio, who in attempting to rediscover his manliness has discovered a blood-lust:

LUCIO. Mistresse, you know I doe not weare a vaine.
I would not rip for you, to doe you service:
Life's but a word, a shadow, a melting dreame,
Compar'd to essentiall, and eternall honour.
Why, would you have me value it beyond
Your brother: if I first cast down my sword
May all my body here, be made one wound,
And yet my soule not finde heaven thorough it. (5.3 p. 55)

In the final moments of the play, Lucio struggles with the idea that being a man means wanting to kill. Lucio also wants to locate the essence of manhood, which seems to lie in the vicinity of his soul. This metaphorical exploration of the interior is the play's alone and not a question of anatomy or dissection. *Love's Cure* explores questions of gender (Clara, in her confusion, recognizes that there are other options besides simply male or female), and uses anatomy as part of the discussion but the material, empirical, discoveries cannot take precedent over the thematic, dramatic, issues of the play.

Indeed, given the examination of the plays in this chapter, that may serve as an overall observation; the science of anatomy as represented in these plays is in

service of the dramatic action of the plays. And while the references to anatomy in some of the plays approach verisimilitude it would appear, on closer scrutiny, that the appearance of reality is all these plays strive for, and not realism; the plays do not require it, and the playwrights have drawn freely from a number of sources to create their playworlds and have freely adapted medical techniques to suit the needs of the play. The range of references and meaning also point us toward the creation of a set of theatrical tropes that occur throughout the plays. This is evident in the plays examined in this section and helps us to avoid an over-interpretation of these references.

Consider, for example, the light interplay between the male and female characters of John Fletcher's *Wit Without Money*. In this comedy we first hear of a young gallant, Valentine, who has squandered away his estate living a carefree life. Valentine's companions in the play, Fountain, Bellamore and Hairbrain, are busy wooing a local widow, one Lady Hartwell. For his own part, Valentine expresses a rather dim view of women. 'He will not look with any handsomeness upon a Woman', his Uncle explains, '...yet he will converse and flatter 'em, make 'em, or fair, or foul, rugged, or smooth, as his impression serves, for he affirms, they are only lumps, and undigested pieces, lickt over to a form by our affections...' (B1v) Valentine's younger brother, Francisco, finds himself in love with Lady Hartwell's younger sister, Isabella, but as he has no means to support her sister, Lady Hartwell attempts to move them off to the country.

The plot complications are easy enough to trace and the relationship between Valentine and Lady Hartwell will develop as we might expect, but not before Valentine has several opportunities to criticize widows specifically ('they that enjoy

'em, lie but with dead men's monuments' (C2v)) and women and relationships more generally:

What do we get by women, but our senses, which is the rankest part
about us, satisfied, and when that's done, what are we? Crest-fallen
Cowards. What benefit can children be, but charges and disobedience?
What's the love they render at one and twenty years?... and come to
years once, there drops a son by th' sword in his Mistresses quarrel, a
great joy to his parents: A daughter ripe too, grows high and lusty in her
blood, must have a heating, runs away with a supple ham'd
Servingman: his twenty nobles spent, takes to a trade, and learns to
spin mens hair off... (C3r)

Valentine's depressing view of marriage and family would seem to stem from his own personal disappointments, though it is worth noting that he does seem to find a way to blame the women for all his (projected) troubles. The son might die, but it will be because of a 'mistress'. The daughter too, will come to no good, though in the conflation of trades Fletcher suggests two bad ends for her, either married to a barber or to a pimp, both of whom are responsible for the loss of hair. Fletcher seems to suggest that the social position of both the barber and the pimp are coterminous.

Fletcher identifies anatomy (represented first by barbers) with the trading of flesh, and continues this metaphor further in the play. Valentine and Lady Hartwell will argue with each other for most of the play, and their heated disagreements can only, in the grand comic tradition, lead to their falling in love. Nevertheless, they each do their best to condemn the other, as they do in Act Three, Scene One, where

Valentine takes the opportunity to roundly condemn not only the affectations of the widow, but also her circle of friends:

VALENTINE. ...what though you have a Coach lined through with velvet and four fair Flanders mares, why should the streets be troubled continually with you, till Carmen curse you? can there be ought in this but pride of shew Lady, and pride of bum-beating, till the learned lawyers with their fat bags, are thrust against the bulks till all their causes crack? why should this Lady, and t'other Lady, and the third sweet Lady, and Madam at Mile-end, be daily visited, and your poorer neighbours, with course napses neglected, fashions conferr'd about, pouncings, and paintings, and young mens bodies read on like Anatomies. (E2v)

The widow responds in kind, arguing that women are victims of the lies and gossip spread about them by men, that no matter what they do will suffer in the court of public opinion, their every action misread and misinterpreted. In turning the argument around, Lady Hartwell astutely argues that 'should we examine you thus, wer't not possible to take you without Prospectives?' Lady Hartwell's retort seems to turn Valentine's use of the word 'anatomies' back on itself, though without resorting to Valentine's obviousness. Valentine has spent much of the play to this point condemning women for all sorts of reasons, and some of those are very clearly spelled out here. It is interesting that he would conclude his tirade not just with the accusation of lust or even some level of covert admiration. Instead, the final argument made is that women read men's bodies 'like Anatomies'. It would be one thing, surely, for Valentine to simply suggest a wayward eye, but for Valentine the full extent of the crime is that the women are behaving like anatomists. This is not to

suggest that anatomy in and of itself is suspect, but rather it is the association of women with anatomy (an association that will be examined in further detail later) that is called into question. Lady Hartwell will retort, and cleverly at that, but for her the accusation stops at 'examination'; she does not accuse men (or Valentine in particular) of anything stronger than observation. For Valentine, however, women are intrusive to the point of dissection.

A more intriguing, and curious, attack on women is found in several plays, including *Bartholmew Fair*, *The Court Beggar* and *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*, three plays that make a unique association between women and anatomy. In asserting that women were either watching anatomies or desiring to do so, these three plays not only highlight one treatment of women in the drama but also serve to contribute to the murky historical record if, as the plays seem to suggest, a non-medical female audience was in attendance during dissections. Despite the implication of the plots, it will be argued that we should resist the inference that women were necessarily present at anatomy lectures. Again, it may be more helpful to consider these incidents within their own dramatic context, separate from the historical reality.

Ben Jonson paints a broad picture of London life in *Bartholmew Fair* and the happenings of its citizens and the desire to get to the fair. What the fair represents to some of the citizens is neatly summed up in this exchange between Win and John Littlewit in Act Three:

JOHN. Do you hear, Win, Win?

WIN. What say you, John?

JOHN. While they are paying the reckoning, Win, I'll tell you a thing

Win: we shall never see any sights i'the Fair, Win, except you long still, Win. Good Win, sweet Win, long to see some hobby-horses, and some drums, and rattles, and dogs, and fine devices, Win: The bull with the five legs, Win, and the great hog. Now you ha' begun with pig, you may long for anything, Win, and so for my Motion, Win.

WIN. But we sha' not eat o'the bull, and the hog, John, how shall I long then?

LITTLEWIT O yes, Win! You may long to see as well as to taste, Win: How did the 'pothecary's wife, Win, that longed to see the anatomy, Win? Or the Lady, Win, that desired to spit i'the great Lawyers mouth, after an eloquent pleading? I assure you they longed, Win, good Win: go in, and long. (3.6.1-12)

This is a fascinating exchange for several reasons. Firstly, we have a bittersweet recognition of failed desire and this interesting contemplation of longing. Some things are clearly beyond the reach of our Win and Littlewit as they are beyond the reach of many others. But what are we to make of the "pothecary's wife", who 'longed to see the Anatomy?' How are we meant to read this? Of course the questions are rhetorical, and of course we are to understand that none of these things are possible. Nevertheless, it is difficult to ignore the reference to women viewing anatomies. The apothecary's wife longs to see an anatomy, a longing that will go unfulfilled. Jonson hints at this curiosity amongst the population of London generally and its women specifically.

There is also the question of the joke at the heart of this exchange, and in that Jonson has neatly inverted the kind of eroticism we have already noted. Surely there is a pun here, and Littlewit is rather broadly suggesting that Win wants to see just how 'long' the body is (if we can assume for the moment that 'anatomy' here means dissection and not skeleton). Win's desire to see the nude (and deceased) body not only inverts the male desire to view and dissect the female, but also questions it outright. Jonson's satire seems to be playing on a prurient interest in anatomy (the sort of thing that Raynalde warns against) though ultimately derives its power from a skeptical view of women as expressed through the science of anatomy. Jonson raises the issue of the presence of women at anatomy lessons; that topic is furthered by Brome.

Like *Bartholmew Fair*, Richard Brome's *The Court Beggar* offers another satire of contemporary London life. Here, Brome principally skewers the fashion of get-rich-quick schemes that are affecting the British economy, a fashion represented in the play by the 'projectors' who present ludicrous schemes to the aging Sir Andrew Mendicant, who has sold all his estates and holdings in the country in order to speculate in London. Sir Andrew is anxious to marry his only daughter, Charissa, to someone who can properly support her and has settled on the rakish Ferdinand as husband of choice. Charissa is in love with Frederick, though he has no estate and Sir Andrew forbids the union. Ferdinand is perhaps no better a choice, however, as he has been driven into madness through his love of the widow, Lady Strangelove, a woman who is described several times as a 'humorous Lady', and whose scorn and ridicule are, apparently, enough to drive men mad. Certainly, she has no lack of suitors, and this band of would be lovers are also on the tip of Brome's satirical skewer.

Brome's satire of the medical profession starts early, with the projectors' schemes, one of which is that Sir Andrew corner the market on the manufacture of peruke wigs and for which they will need only the best supply of human hair, 'no diseased or infectious stuff, of dead or living/ No verminous or sluttish locks' (1.1.80-81). Sir Andrew's servant wittily responds that this supply cannot, then, come from 'gallows, nor hospitals; from whence/They have had great supplies' (1.1.82-83). The implication here is that those bodies, the same bodies used in medical studies and experiments, are of the worst quality, and offers a critique of the corpses that are the basis of medical experiment and education. To cure Ferdinand of his lunacy, a doctor is brought in and, as in *The Antipodes*, Brome is further able to satirize contemporary life as well as contemporary medical practice. Invited into the home of Lady Strangelove, where the disturbed Ferdinand is convalescing, the doctor soon attempts to rape the widow. Captured by the company of men who keep the widow company they threaten something akin to vivisection:

COURT-WIT. That's too high strained. What think you Madam, if to rectify his judgement, we picked all the errors of his brain; First, opening the pericranium, then take out the cerebrum, wash it in *albo vino*, till it be thoroughly cleansed (4.2.730)

It is quickly determined that while they cannot be responsible for the death of the doctor, they can be responsible for his mutilation and Lady Strangelove brings in a 'gelder' to permanently mar the doctor's manhood. The wits and Lady Strangelove position the doctor for the procedure, a procedure that seems to suit both the clinical and non-clinical nature of the operation:

SWAIN-WIT. What must he be stripped now? Or will letting down his breeches be enough?

DOCTOR. You dare not use this violence upon me
More rude then rage of prentices.

CIT-WIT. Doctor it is decreed.

DOCTOR. You cannot answer it.

COURT-WIT. Better by Law then you can the intent
Of Ripe upon the Lady.

(SOW-GELDER, who has been unpacking his professional equipment, gets it ready for use: he whets his knife, lays out linen, places a basin by table.)

DOCTOR. That was not to have been my act, nor was it done.

SWAIN-WIT. When this is done we'll talk w'ye. [*To COURT-WIT and CIT-WIT*] Come lay him cross this Table. Hold each of you a leg of him [*To DOCTOR*] and hold you your peace, Dodipoll. And for his arms let me alone. [*SWAIN-WIT, COURT-WIT and CIT-WIT position themselves accordingly.*] Do you work, gelder. (4.2.750-756)

While this scene could easily describe the gelding of the animals that are more familiar to the gelder, we also have the parody of a surgical procedure, in which the doctor is at the mercy of the medical practitioners. That Brome is suggesting the parody of medicine is made all the clearer before the incident unfolds, when the men suggest that Lady Strangelove should not be present:

COURT-WIT. But will you see the execution Madam?

LADY STRANGELOVE. Why not as well as other women have
Seen the dissections of anotamies,
And executed men ripped up and quartered?
This spectacle will be comical to those. (4.2.741-742)

Presumably, the spectacle will be comical because all the viewers are familiar with the real procedure. Brome's allusion to women watching anatomies is much more direct than Jonson's and the reference presents an intriguing puzzle. The records indicate that only medical students were permitted to attend such lectures (for which they were required to pay a fee); the statutes of the Barber-Surgeons are quite clear on this fact. And yet, Brome is here suggesting that not only were non-medical students present, but some of those lay observers were women. In *Books of the Body*, Andrea Carlino suggests that societies have been able to work an uneasy compromise between the wishes of the state and the practice of its citizens in the passing of laws that, on the one hand, are seen to be restrictive and prohibitive, and yet are routinely ignored by the populace. This is not lawlessness, or anarchy, but rather a convenient and necessary device that allows the state some freedom in the application of its judiciary system. To repeat, there is no evidence that confirms or denies the presence of outside observers at medical anatomies (the often quoted example of Samuel Pepys is, we must remember, from a later period) and yet the suggestion that this was happening recurs in the drama (at the very least there is more than a passing suggestion that the non-medical audience had a working knowledge of these procedures). The transmission of that information may have happened in a public context, but the thought that women were allowed to view these procedures (perhaps themselves hidden from male view) is tantalizing.

Brome's is not the only explicit reference, something similar is found in Dekker's *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*.

Following on the events of the *First Part*, Dekker's *The Second Part of the Honest Whore* thrusts us immediately into the life of Milan, and traces the story of two couples dealing with jealousy and incrimination and where Bellafront, the heroine of the first part, will find her husband falling quickly back on his old ways. Bellafront refuses to surrender her honour and is ultimately saved through the machinations of her father, Orlando. The play, concerned as it is with a searing inquiry into the life and culture of a thinly veiled London, is filled not only with images of sickness and disease, but also investigation, surgery and, ultimately, anatomy. The phrases 'surgeon', physician and Barber occur frequently throughout the play, concerned as it is with dissecting the culture. This is clear from the opening moments of the play, where the first meeting of friends on the stage is capped with the image of disease:

LODOVICO. Good day, Gallants.

OMNES. Good morrow, sweet Lodouico.

LODOVICO. How doest thou Carolo.

CAROLO. Faith, as Physicians doe in a Plague, see the World sicke,
and am well my selfe. (A2r)

Many of the characters in the play will have little choice but to 'see the world sicke', though it will be mainly Orlando, in disguise, who will see through the machinations of the characters. Late in the play, when the plots and subplots have been resolved the Duke will to Orlando as a physician, furthering this association and suggesting that medical inquiry and the search for truth are deeply connected.

Images of surgery and dissection occur throughout a play that is preoccupied with violence, particularly that which is brought on by vengeance and misguided jealousy. That the violence is sometimes mixed with a misogynistic view of sex is made clear in a scene involving Infelice and Dorathea Target, a woman being brought to be punished on the wheel. Crass, abrupt, and headstrong, 'Doll' flies in the face of both the public and her punishers. Asked by Infelice if she will cry, being punished, Target's answer is a swift: 'Say yee? weepe? yes forsooth, as you did when you lost your/ Maidenhead: doe you not heare how I weep?'(K4r)

Violence is here equated with sex and the loss of virginity. Sexual violence against women is expressed throughout, particularly in the intense jealousy of Matteo and Hippoloto's extreme lust, emotions that are focused on the figures of desire in the play – the women. A curious reference reflects the attitude towards women in the play:

DUKE. 'Tis well: this day in Iudgement shall be spent,

Vice (like a wound launc'd) mends by punishment.

INFELICE. Let me be gone, my Lord, or stand vnseene;

'Tis rare when a Iudge strikes, and that none dye,

And 'tis vnfit then, women should be by.

FIRST MASTER. Wee'll place you, Lady, in some priuat roome.

INFELICE. Pray doe so.

Exit.

ORLANDO. Thus nice Dames sweare, it is vnfit their eyes

Sould view men caru'd vp for Anatomies,

Yet they'll see all, so they may stand vnseene,

Many women sure will sinne behind a Skreene. (K1r)

The misogynistic tone of the play is first expressed in a series of violent images, but here the condemnation seems moral, an attack on the hypocrisy of women in an image that seems entirely the creation of the playwright. Dekker here extends an image that is suggested by Jonson in *Bartholmew Fair* and expanded by Brome in *The Court Beggar* to make this explicit reference to hiding. Again, while Young points out in the *Annals* that there were women in the guild of Barber-Surgeons and presumably present at anatomical lessons, there is no evidence that they were segregated from the male students. Based on the evidence, it can safely be concluded that no women stood behind screens to watch anatomy lessons. Dekker's suggestion that women are, in fact, secretly watching anatomy lessons is a more direct attack on the morality of women than we have seen in either Jonson or Brome, and his characters accuse them of being hypocrites for denouncing an action in public and then secretly taking part in that same activity.

The particular image constructed in these three plays, that of women at anatomies, would seem to be entirely a dramatic one. If it can be concluded that women (who were not in the Guild) were not attending anatomies, and so could not be doing so in secret, then these plays would seem to offer something more than just a specific representation of women (or of anatomy). What seems to tie all the plays in this chapter is something of an attack, to greater and lesser degrees to be sure, on women. This ranges from an attack on character, to position in society, to gender roles more generally. This would certainly have something to do with the issues of 'selfhood' and interiority that some critics are exploring, but it certainly also seems to have something to do with a dramatic examination of the roles of men and women. This

examination also seems to coincide, in these plays, with a persistent connection between women and anatomy. In some ways, a denouncing of women along with a suggestion that the practice of anatomy was illicit seem tied up together. In the absence of fact (no member of the general public was watching) this image is a piece of dramatic fiction, created by writers to serve their plays. That it might have a cultural connection seems possible only through the drama, that the conflict between men and women is now being expressed in medical terms, in a connection between women and anatomy, suggests only that it is an extension of that dramatic conflict. In the double criticism of women and anatomy, perhaps we are getting a glimpse into at least one larger cultural concern having to do with any activity that exposes or reveals the feminine. In the plays that appear to deal with this issue, the level of derision leveled against the female characters can become quite extreme. In *The Second Part of the Honest Whore* we not have the continual characterization of women as whores, but that sentiment is frequently accompanied with some sort of medical reference.

The themes that these plays pursue, and the connection between women and anatomy, also highlights a particular sort of violence towards women – these are women cut up to be exposed and revealed. The desire to physically expose the insides of women not only brings the discussion back to issues ‘interiority’ but the simple fact of the violence itself. Margaret Owens, again in *Stages of Dismemberment*, finds the ‘intense fascination with the dismembered body’ (12) to be a significant and over-arching component of early modern drama and her ontological approach finds her attempting to make connections with the drama of the earlier period. In examining the religious drama of the medieval period, Owens

attempts to find connections with the nature of violence on the early modern stage and to find meaning in the representation of that violence:

Violence was contained by a governing ideological framework that endowed suffering with meaning and purpose. Presumably the pre-Reformation audience believed that it gained some spiritual benefit by participating vicariously in Christ's Passion as it was enacted on the stage. With the Reformation and the emergence of the secular drama of the Elizabethan playhouses, violent spectacle was released from the signifying system that had previously invested suffering and the human body with easily identifiable meanings (19).

In discussing the early modern period, Margaret Owens also points out that various forms of violence are 'differently encoded', which might suggest that audiences could discern between representations or demonstrations of violence in the culture. However, her argument for encoding suggests levels of interpretation and meaning that perhaps overstate the case:

Taking a typological view of biblical history, the audience at a cycle play would have understood the acts of violence prior to the Passion - the killing of Abel, the threatened sacrifice of Isaac, the massacre of the innocents - as types foreshadowing the Crucifixion. Similarly, acts of violence subsequent to the Passion - violent martyrdom in saint plays or the self-mortification of Everyman - would have been seen as imitations of Christ's sufferings (18).

With the loss of religious signification, Owens argues, violence on the early modern stage 'may have seemed more threatening, and the body more at risk because the attendant meanings and values were no longer as tightly controlled'

(19). Owens doesn't directly compare the extreme nature of the violence on display in the medieval period with that of the early modern or consider that wholesale violence is a characteristic of the theatre of both periods. That leaves aside one pertinent question, having to do with a taste for, and expectation of, violence on the stage generally. Instead, Owens sees the transmission of violence from the medieval to early modern period as yet one more dichotomy in the loss of, or reduction in, 'attendant meanings'. The suggestion of this dichotomy, of a stress between these periods also leads to a failure to consider that the theatre can be thought to operate, broadly, in a model that depends on the relationship of the past and the present (in this case, between the medieval and the early modern).

In other words, the theatre relies on the transmission of a tradition, a tradition that suggests an expectation and a broad framework within which the practitioners operate. This is tempered by any current innovation that questions, alters, or interrupts that tradition, the end result of which is the continuation and development of the form. This is one way in which we might consider the treatment of anatomy in the plays throughout the period. One important feature of anatomy in the theatre is the evolution of its treatment over time. As we have seen, that evolution is not strictly linear, rather playwrights throughout the period will continue to treat anatomy in a variety of ways, while it is also possible to see its usage become fairly commonplace, suggesting not that anatomy comes to simply be accepted in the theatre, but rather that playwrights and their audiences become more comfortable with the theatricalization of anatomy, its tropes and metaphors become more stock, representing a theatrical shorthand available to the early modern theatre.

While the nature and extent of violence on the medieval stage is outside the scope of this thesis, this does seem to be an interesting application of Greenblatt's

methods, as Owens is arguing here that the nature of the violence on the seventeenth-century stage is an extension of, even a result of, the nature of the violence on the medieval stage. This point will be examined in the next chapter, in particular, and a suggestion will be made that indeed the seventeenth-century theatre relied on the legacy of the earlier theatre, as is represented by certain traditions, that it is perhaps possible to see, in the treatment of anatomy in another group of plays, that the practices of the earlier theatre had been adapted to fit the circumstances of the newer theatre, with the further suggestion that no other explanation may be necessary. This is a point that Owens does not consider and the search for the meaning of violence onstage leads to the conclusion that 'the fascination with violent spectacle evident in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama also bespeaks a desire to reclaim the body, to restore to it some of the centrality it held in the earlier religious drama' (20). The emphasis on centrality aligns Owens with Barker and neither seems to acknowledge that an interest in violent spectacle on stage could be its own end, and that there is more to consider in the function of anatomy on stage than a subjective search for identity.

Chapter Six: Memento Mori

Come hither Mall, is none here but we two?
When didst thou see the starveling Schoole-maister?
The Rat, that shrimp, that spindleshanck, that Wren, that
Sheep-biter, that leane chittiface, that famine, that leane
Envy, that all bones, that bare Anatomy, that lack a Lent,
that ghost, that shadow, that Moone in the waine. (E1v)

So says the character Brabo to Mary in *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife From a Bad*. Mary, a chaste and innocent woman, finds herself the object of unwanted attention, and the suspicion of many of the men in the play. Here, Brabo is suspicious of Sir Aminadab, the subject of this verbal attack. Brabo's role in the play is unclear, he is perhaps a hired guard (C.R. Baskervill notes that *How a Man* is derived from Cinthio and that the role of Brabo is typical of the Courtesan's guard or companion, suggesting that Brabo is a bravo). In an attempt to impress Mary, Sir Amanadab has approached her disguised as a soldier, perhaps contributing to Brabo's contempt. The invective laid against Sir Amanadab is physical and bodily, and if Sir Amanadab is not thin, certainly Brabo here reduces him to near-nothingness. That leanness would be associated with skeletal is perhaps not surprising, and that is the context of 'Anatomy' here, but the further association of the 'Jack a Lent' is curious.

The Jack-a-Lent (or Jack O'Lent) was a puppet, an effigy stuffed with straw that children threw stones at, during carnival activities. In some cases, the figure was burned at the end of Lent. Frederick Jonassen, in 'The Meaning of Falstaff's Allusion to the Jack-a-Lent in 'The Merry Wives of Windsor'' quotes Thomas Couch:

The beginning of Lent was once marked by a custom which is now defunct. A figure, made up of straw and cast-off-clothes, was drawn or carried through the streets amid much noise and merriment; after which it was either burnt, shot at, or thrown down a chimney. This image was called 'Jack o' Lent' and was, as I have heard, intended to represent Judas Iscariot. (53-54)

Jonassen also notes that the Jack-a-Lent was 'a puppet at which children threw stones during Lent' (46) and the term Jack-a-Lent meant a person or object of insignificance, a cypher. These are sacrificial figures, meant to be destroyed, and Brabo makes this clear in associating Jack-a-Lents with skeletons, ghosts and shadows. Jonassen goes on to say that this figure could 'suggest a death figure' (50). Several of the plays examined in this section will also, like *How a Good Man*, will make a similar connection between anatomies, jack-a-lents and other fairground figures, that may suggest a connection between anatomy and the older memento mori tradition, suggesting another avenue for the introduction of anatomy into the plays of the period.

In *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Tragedy*, Michael Neill traces the influences of certain medieval cultural practices on early modern tragedy. Suggesting that the devastation of the Black Death, that began in 1347 (15) contributed to such activities as the Totentanz and the *memento mori* figures, Neill then traces that influence into the drama of the early modern period. This fascination, perhaps preoccupation, with death begins to also explain, suggests Neill, the figural representation of death in print in the period. So, the particularly lively, energized, corpses that fill the pages of anatomical texts owe something the heritage of the *memento mori* figures. Neill notes the intriguing move from fleshly corpses in the

earlier period to skeletons in the sixteenth century. It is difficult to suggest that this move from flesh to bone is the result of anatomical study, but it certainly brings to mind, once again, the busy title page of *De fabrica*. We have already noted the presence of the skeleton in that scene, and are reminded again that the lecturer's rod held by the skeleton is replaced in later printings by a scythe – the figure presiding over the lecture morphs into the grim reaper (Sawday refers to it as a 'skeletal *memento mori*' (115))

The influence of the *memento mori* may help to explain the abundance of skeletons in these plays and suggests that it is an interest in death, generally speaking, that informs these plays, as expressed through the new language of dissection and anatomy. Neill not only draws attention to Vesalius (p. 114), but will make the same sort of comparison to the physical structures of the anatomy hall and the playhouse (117) that has already been discussed, and though Neill suggests that the anatomical impulse that is found in both spaces is concerned with discovery, a discovery of the interior, we are left to consider that the theatre's interest in anatomy is a reflection of a popular, and often lively, interest in death and dying. While Neill's interest is in tragedy, we can see similar functions at work in comedy, and can open out the discussion to other carnival, fairground, and popular tales that bring a discussion of mortality to the stage, through the filter of anatomy.

How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad is sometimes attributed to Thomas Heywood, and bears some resemblance to his other works, *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* for example, and may count as one of Heywood's 'city-comedies', which allows the references to the Jack-a-Lent in *How a Man May Choose a* fairground, festival, atmosphere in the context of the civic setting of London. A light comedy, *How a Good Man* is mainly domestic in tone and is a story of wrongful

jealousy, mistaken identity and the usual comic plot complications that follow from such things. When we first meet Mistress Mary she is accompanied by Mistress Splay (who is as risqué in her speech as her name would imply) and Brabo whose tirade, quoted above, suggests that Aminidab is a figure of ridicule, a position compounded by his being called both a 'bare Anatomy' and a 'Jack a Lent'. An important part of the insult here is that to be both an anatomy and a Jack-a-lent is to be reduced to nothingness, to not only be lean, but to be a ghost, a shadow.

In an interesting, and potentially amusing, twist, Brabo continues to threaten Aminidab, vowing to 'hang him up,/ Like a dried sausage...', calling him 'That stock-fish, that poor John, that gut of men' (E1v). A stock-fish is, of course, dried codfish, which was traditionally prepared by splitting it open along the spine and laying it out to be dried. The fish was also traditionally beaten to draw out moisture and aid the drying process. 'Stock-fish', in this context, is often used as an insult, with frequent violent overtones. The threat to be beaten like a stock-fish is similar to the stoning of the Jack-a-Lent. Similarly, the splitting, the laying open as it were, of the stock-fish, is as destructively reductive an image as that of the Jack-a-Lent and a skeleton. There is also, of course, the natural, and festive, competition between fish-mongers and butchers at lent, a time when meat was given up for fish. That that competition was real is detailed in Billington, who also notes that the appearance of the Lord of Misrule was followed by a Jack-a-Lent (100). The image of a split Aminidab seems potentially tied to the image of Aminidab as skeleton or Jack a Lent, and it is tempting to want to tie all these verbal images to the name of Mary's companion, maybe even her bawd, 'Splay'. Taken altogether, the conjunction of Jack-a-Lent and 'anatomy' extends from the skeletal imagery to the fairground. Here, 'anatomy' is ridicule,

satire, and entertainment. The violence leveled against Aminidab might be cruel; it is also meant to be entertaining.

Nevertheless, this 'pleasant' comedy soon takes a very dark turn, and Young Arthur plots to murder his wife to clear his way to Mistress Mary. Several plot complications later, and Mistress Arthur is lain to rest having been apparently poisoned by her husband. It turns out that the poison was only a sedative, though that might give us a particular glimpse into 16th century surgical procedures as we are told that the potion given to Mistress Arthur was

a compound powder was of poppy and mandrakes,
Of purpose to cast one into a sleep,
To ease the deadly pain of him, whose leg
Should be saw'd off... (L1v)

While a comedy, the play flirts around the edges of darkness and destruction and in its use of anatomy once again serves to remind its readers and audience of the *memento mori* tradition, in the abrupt shift from sleep to corporal destruction and the reminder of mortality that is important to the *momento mori*. If this play is indeed Heywood's, the writer seems to be drawing all these associations together with an image his audience would have been familiar with – a fairground figure, a puppet stuffed with straw, a victim of ritualistic abuse and punishment, the Jack-a-Lent. Modern audiences, however, may be most familiar with the phrase from Shakespeare's use of it in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, when Mistress Page refers to Falstaff's page Robin as a 'Jack-a-Lent'. Falstaff will use the term himself later in the play, and for a more complete examination of this subject see Frederick B. Jonassen's 'The Meaning of Falstaff's Allusion to the Jack-a-Lent in 'The Merry

Wives of Windsor”. What is unusual in Heywood, though, is the association of ‘Jack-a-Lent’ with anatomy. Heywood’s direct connection of these images is also found in the Anonymous *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* (examined in the section on military plays) when Hernando says of Epernounge:

Am I reuilde and bafled to my face,
And by a Dotard? one but for his tongue,
In whom there is no difference twixt himselfe,
A meere Anothomie, a lack of lent,
And the pale Image of a bloudlesse ghoast? (F3r)

A very similar, if not quite as direct, association is to be found again in Heywood, this time in *The Four Prentices of London*. On the pilgrimage that has separated him from his four sons (the apprentices of the title) the old Earl is captured and being robbed by a villain and a clown. They drag him onstage, ‘rifling him’, as the Clown demands ‘Give us the gold my Captaine you, you old Anatomy’. Desperate for relief the Earle is willing to part with all he has, despite this the Clown threatens his life:

Nay you old lack a lent, sixe weekes and vpwards: though you be our
Captaines father, you cannot stay there, and for surety that you shall
not go back, and tell him what we haue done to you, wee'le kill you,
and fling you into some Cole-pit. (D1v)

In the space of two lines the Clown first calls the Captain an ‘Old Anatomy’ and follows that directly with ‘you old jack a lent’, drawing a line under the association of those two images. That Jack-a-Lents were puppets meant to be abused in various ways suggests a form of public humiliation and the association

with anatomy may suggest that dissection also carried a stigma, or a threat of public disgrace. But rather than take references to anatomy in these plays as an indication of anxiety or concern having to do explicitly with the new science of dissection, it is perhaps equally helpful to view them as a new turn of an old phrase. 'Anatomy', used here to signify skeletal, carries the same connotation as 'jack a lent' – impoverished, gaunt, poor, or insignificant. In other contexts, the reduction to the skeleton, the anatomical process, carries a similar connotation, which is to say the act of anatomization is sometimes used to denote a similar sense of derision or, sometimes, threat. The use of the phrase in these plays helps us to understand, though, that in addition to considering these references as a contemporary preoccupation with self-identity or an anxiety having to do with issues of interiority, writers may have been retreading, recycling even, earlier tropes and metaphors and renewing their appeal through reference to a new, and popular, topic. The association of these puppet figures with anatomization would seem to tie together an older tradition, like the *memento mori* figures, that extends from medieval fairgrounds and attractions with the newer practice of dissection and the new drama of the day.

If the association between anatomy and the Jack-a-Lent seems forced, it is worth noting that while Jonassen uses Heywood as a strong example of this association of meanings it would seem that the direct association of anatomy with the Jack-a-Lent figure occurs mainly, if not exclusively, in drama. While the term is not uncommon, its use is largely restricted to a comment on poverty or deprivation. So, for example Adam Foulweather would write, in 1591's *wonderfull, strange and miraculous astrologicall prognostication* 'yet through extreame colde poore men shall die at rich mennes doors: shall be exiled, good woorkes truste over the sea with Jacke a Lent and Hospitalitie banist as a signe of popish religion...' (C2v-C3r). In

1622 Jack Daw, in his Prognositation, would express a similar sentiment: ‘Good works thrust out of doores with Jack-a-Lent, and Hospitality whipt out of the Country as a relicke of the old Religion...’ (C1v). Other references to the Jack-a-Lent in literature of the period run along similar lines, where the figure is used a metaphor for lack, for poverty, and for deprivation. There are similar occurrences in drama, both Brome (in *The Antipodes*, F4v) and Jonson (in *Bartholmew Fair*, 5.2) will use the phrase strictly in this context. However, where there is an association between the puppet figure and anatomy it does seem to occur exclusively in drama and the most explicit use of this connection is Heywood’s.

One more late play helps to further illustrate that the use of anatomy in drama is rooted in tradition, or at least owes itself to something other than just the new science or a developing sense of self-identity and self-discovery. James Shirley’s *The Maid’s Revenge*, would seem to owe its interest in anatomy to fairy stories and myth. This might be the same spring that Heywood and others have been drawing on, and further illustrates the point that early modern dramatists were adopting the new, scientific, discoveries to fit older agendas.

In *The Maid’s Revenge* Count Gasper de Vilarezo has two daughters, Catalina and Berinthia, and one son, Sebastiano. Sebastiano’s closest friend is Antonio who has a sister, Castabella. The plot will revolve around the fact that Antonio is in love with Berinthia, and Sebastiano with Castabella. Unfortunately for Antonio the count will not allow Berinthia, as the younger daughter, to marry before Catalina, the older sister. Antonio, with Sebastiano’s aid, pretends to be in love with Catalina in order to be close to Berinthia. When Catalina discovers the truth, that she has been tricked and lied to, it sets off the revenge tragedy of the title and by play’s

end, all are dead. In plotting against those who have wronged her, Catalina sends her waiting-woman, Ansilva, to the doctor for poison.

The lone scene with Sharkino, 'the famous doctor' (35) and his servant Scarabeo is something akin to a representation of a medical clinic. In addition to the poison for Ansilva, Sharkino will also fetch a love potion for the play's comic figure, the Count 'de Monte Nigro'. Sharkino will also diagnose a young maid's urine in order to determine if she has lost her virginity in the night. In a curious tale, the girl tells the doctor that when she woke in the morning she found a 'paire of breeches on my bed' (38), and suspects that she was deflowered the previous evening. This maid has no identity, indeed no other function in the play, then to appear briefly before the doctor with this tale. There is no explanation as to why she would not remember the event (or indeed, why the owner of the breeches would leave without them), but the doctor assures the girl that she has indeed lost her maidenhead and should find the man as 'he that hath stolne your maidenhead shall bring it againe' (39). Perhaps in the context of the play, Shirley wants us to understand that marriage is the only way to restore honour, a course of action that will not be followed by the play's protagonists.

This is an episode that occupies no more than a page in Shirley's play, but it happens just at the end of the scene with the doctor and one supposes it completes the portrait of the physician that has been begun with his entrance a few pages earlier. When Sharkino asks his servant, Scarabeo to 'scrue your selfe halfe out at one of the crevices, and give me notice what patient approaches me' (34), we may fully expect that the portrayal of the doctor will resemble any number of the mountebanks and charlatans that we have already encountered. Shirley will set the scene with the stage direction: 'Enter Signior Sharkino in his study furnished with

glasses, viols, pictures of wax characters, wands, conjuring habit, Powders paintings...' (34). This is apparently confirmed when Ansilva attempts to discretely ask for poison to kill a 'rat' (35), setting off a string of overly colourful descriptions of the doctor's poisons. And yet, this doctor sees a string of would-be patients during the scene, all of whom seem convinced of the doctor's authority and skill. No sooner has Ansilva left with her 'rat' poison than the hapless Count de Mounte Nigro comes looking for his love potion, referring to Sharkino as 'the famous doctor'. Again, the patter of Sharkino and Scarabeo, full of elaborate claims and conceits, seems designed to fool rather than demonstrate real ability. Sharkino warns the Count away from some trinkets on a table with 'they are dangerous, this is the devils girdle'. His love potion

...a powder whose ingredients were fetch'd
From Arabia the happy, a sublimation of the Phoenix
Ashes, when she was last burned her selfe, it beares the
Colour of sinamon... (36)

Just as their transaction is complete the three serving men who have been teasing the Count appear, but the doctor ushers him to safety:

Please you my Lord obscure your selfe behind these hangings then, till
they be gone, Ile dispatch 'em the sooner; of if your honour thinke fit, tis
but clouding your person with a simple cloake of mine, and you may at
pleasure passe without discovery, my Anotomy shall be waiting on you.
(37)

The 'Anotomy' here is the servant Scarabeo, of course, and we suspect he has wasted away in the service of the doctor. His appearance is certainly called into

question with Ansilva's entrance, at which point she refers to Scarabeo as 'Raw Head and Bloody Bones' (34), a boogey-man figure as relayed through various folk tales. The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that the first use of the 'Raw Head' phrase is from approximately 1580, and tells us that the term describes a 'bug-bear to terrify children'. While both the 'Raw Head' and 'Bloody Bones' were thought to indicate a murdered man, haunting the scene of a crime, it is an interesting enough coincidence that, in Shirley, there is an association between Scarabeo the 'Anotomy', and Scarabeo the 'Raw Head and Bloody Bones'. Shirley may not be using an altogether familiar image here; its use in drama seems limited - Brome uses it in *The Northern Lass* ('Here's one might serve for a whole history. The Life and Death of Raw-Head and Bloody Bones' (3.2)), and Dekker in *Satiro-mastix* ('So, that raw-head and bloudy-bones Sir Adam, has fee'd another brat' (H3v)). Shirley's use of the image seems deliberate; it is a curious device in the context of the doctor's study. The 'Raw Head' of the tales had nothing to do, of course, with medicine of any kind, but the suggestion of the open wounds, the 'rawness' of Scarabeo's state, is somehow fitting in the context. And then, of course, Sharkino will refer to him as his 'Anotomy', a phrase that throughout these dramas has been used to indicate starvation if not just a state of leanness. Here, though, Shirley seems to want to juxtapose the earlier image of Scarabeo, both 'raw' and 'bloody', with 'anatomy', all in the doctor's study. Perhaps further complicating our image of the character is his name. Scarabeo, presumably 'scarab', implies he is a beetle or bug, a suggestion that does not quite fit with his description as the boogey-man. 'Scarabeo' is not a common character name, though it does demand at least partial consideration with a line found in Burton's *Melancholy*: 'an posit plures similes creare deos, an ex scarabeo deum etc. & quo demum ruetis sacrificuli'. Unlike Heywood's connection of

anatomy with the scarecrow figure of the jack-a-lent, Shirley connects anatomy with wounds and blood, with the opened body, in his association with the 'Raw Head and Bloody Bones'.

While the reference to anatomy in Shirley's play is rather off-hand, we are still left with quite an intriguing look at the life of a doctor and his profession. Our doctor is clearly popular, well known, and successful, if the string of clients that we see in this scene are any indication. And yet he is accompanied by a monster, of sorts, making Scarabeo something of an alchemical familiar. The doctor's language and dress put him in the company of any number of mountebanks and charlatans that we have seen represented throughout. Far from a success, *Sharkino* should be a resounding failure. Shirley does show us a doctor at work, prescribing remedies, offering council and protecting his patients – all in a vaguely mysterious, almost mystical environment. One can suppose that this is precisely the juxtaposition that Shirley wanted to portray, that the doctor here represents the mystery of medicine and, one supposes, anatomy, and for Shirley anatomy is at least somewhat tied up with fairy-stories, with tales of the boogey-man. Shirley's play comments on medical practice and combines a use of anatomy with an image out of folk-tales and if, in so doing, the play expresses some anxiety about the process, or can be taken as satire, here again, we can conclude that rather than expressing contemporary sentiments, the playwright repurposes an older tradition (or at least the familiar) in the retelling of those tales.

Providing an interesting comparison to the plays examined so far in this chapter is the anonymous *The Two Noble Ladies*, a potboiler of exotic plots, characters, and sensational episodes. While it is difficult to determine an exact date of either performance or publication, there is some evidence that this is mid-century

piece (perhaps performed in 16203) and one that mixes its exotic locale with a madcap, fantastical subplot. The only reference to anatomy occurs late in the play and in the context of the subplot, which relies on a very physical conceit.

The Two Noble Ladies takes place in Egypt, Syria, and Bablyon, and the play even allows for a late entrance of a Roman squadron and a final triumph of Christianity. The plot centers on two cousins, Lysander and Justina. Lost since birth and raised as an Egyptian, Lysander is in love with the Sultan's daughter, Miranda. Meanwhile, Justina, as the supposed heir to Antioch is on the run from the Egyptians and fearing for her life. Justina, in the company and protection of Doron, flees to Babylon. To further complicate matters the Egyptian Sultan declares his love for his daughter, Miranda, and soon lays a plot for Lysander, his chief rival. Miranda will disguise herself as a man, Amidar, and flee her father's court and soon all the principal characters find themselves embroiled in a plot of mistaken identity, duels, and death plots. Not surprisingly, given the play's exotic locale, *The Two Noble Ladies* takes full advantage of ethnic stereotypes and a dispute between Egypt, Babylon and Antioch to deliver exciting episodes and sensational dialogue. Justina is threatened at least twice with rape, as well as torture and drowning. When Miranda flees the Egyptian court her father threatens her eunuchs in a blood-curdling fashion:

Away with them, and first cut out their tongues the harsh relaters of this hated tale. Next plucke their drouzie eies out that durst sleep while she

³ There is a Malone Society reprint of the *The Two Noble Ladies*, but scant critical work has been done on the play. Some useful information, including speculative dates, has been gleaned from Miller's thesis of 1968.

was waking. then hew them in peeces and set up their dismembered limbs on poles in ev'ry quarter of the camp. Away. (18)

The sultan saves some of his wrath for his traitorous daughter, and expresses himself in remarkably emotional terms, perhaps here assuming the role of spurned lover, not just a betrayed father:

and be't proclaim'd that who ere finds Miranda disguise, and mangle her enticing face, seare up her tempting breasts, teare wide her mouth, and slit her nose, that thus defac'd, my hate neither by love nor pittie may abate. (24)

Ultimately, and predictably, all is resolved – Lysander is revealed as the heir to Antioch and wins Miranda (a political union that is initially opposed by the rival fathers), Justina is saved from harm and reunited with her cousin and peace wins out. But this can happen only with the intervention of the Romans, who not only enforce peace but also a religion – Christianity will also win the day. While exciting, and not without its vivid set pieces, for our purposes the intriguing component of *The Two Noble Ladies* is its subplot and minor characters. Against the backdrop of the battles and political intrigue we have a minor cast of characters consisting of Barebones, Bloud, and Sinew all competing for the love of Caro. Add into this mix the conjurer Cyprian and his summoned demon and a particularly fleshy subplot will emerge; the subplot of *The Two Noble Ladies* is based entirely around an extended pun on anatomy and dissection.

We first meet Barebones on the run in Antioch. He comes by his name honestly – a 'poore scholar' (41) who can scarce afford to eat, he has been reduced to a veritable skeleton. Soon taken prisoner by the Syrians he is at once delighted

with their generosity and eats heartily in the enemy camp. Sinew, a soldier, soon enters and confesses to Barebones his love of Caro, whose name 'signifies flesh: now flesh you know is frayle; sometimes it battens, and sometimes it bates; and we cannot help it'. To which Sinew replies, 'And sometimes it stinckes, and sometimes its fly blowne; now maggots eat you' (42). This is a particularly vivid exchange that demonstrates that all the characters understand the meaning of 'Caro', and which helps to solidify the particular dissective quality of the triangle that soon develops:

O Barebones; The little God of Love has coudgell'd the great god of warre out of me; in which conflict I was wounded to the hart with the love of Mrs. Caro: a pretty peece of flesh she is, and unless poore Sinew be infolded in that flesh, I shall remayne in a most miserable case . (25)

Sinew's main rival is a courtier, Bloud, and he has come to enlist the help of Barebones and the conjurer, Cyprian:

Alas man, there is one Bloud a servant to the Lord Colactus, a proud boasting courtier hee is, who though he came but out of an ould smokie thatch'd house yet braggs of his pedegree and progenitors five generations before Jupiter. This muskie fellow has gotten into her affection, and foists me out of her favour. Now if you could get one of your Masters goblins to make Mrs. Caro sticke to Sinew in spite of hot Bloud: then should Sinew cling close to Barebones till both of us be dead and rotten. (25-26)

Barebones swears his allegiance and continues the pun, assuring Sinew that he 'will not shrincke willingly'. Enlisting the help of the conjurer, Cyprian, Barebones

and Sinew soon have a personal demon, Cantharides, at their disposal, and here as well, the play continues with its relentless punning on the bodily theme:

Cantharides! Ha ha ha. the fittest name for a pimp that can bee.

Cantharides is a bawdy flie, of which the apothecaries make a provocative medicine, that stirs up lust beyond all performance. This fly was pandar to the God Priapus, and therefore is very skillful at catering to the flesh market

Cantharides is indeed the name of a brightly coloured beetle (sometime referred to as 'Spanish Fly') which was used in animal husbandry and, when the bodies are ground to a powder, causes priapism in men. Numerous texts from the period refer to it in these terms as well as to it being a dangerous poison. In this group of plays, Fletcher's *Philaster* makes reference to this, with Leon's 'Sure this Lady has a good turne against her wil, before she was common talke, now none dares say Cantharides can stirre her' (41), providing at least some other evidence that use of the phrase is common.

As good as his word, Cantharides will soon cause Caro to fall in love with Sinew, but will quickly double-cross him and all the other potential suitors. Soon, Barebones, Bloud and Sinew are all competing for their rightful place with Caro. The play's extended joke on anatomy is broad and inclusive. So, Bloud will say to Caro, 'we cannot be divorced without death to both: for flesh and blood can not beare it' (38). There is Sinew's 'welcome sweet Caro, Sinew shall give both sense and motion to all thy delight' (40). And, of course, Barebones gets his turn as well, when he too realizes his affection:

O delicate Caro! O dull pated Barebones! What an asse was I to help another to such a dainty morsel, and let my selfe fast that have as good a stomach as hee. has not Barebones as much need of flesh, as any Sinew in the world? (40)

Scenes of confusion abound as the three men are each 'infected' by Cantharides and pursue Caro. For her part, Caro beds each suitor and then discards them, leading to the only direct reference to anatomy in the play when she has dropped the 'thin-gutted' Barebones for Bloud: 'faith, Barebones will get on thee such infant anatomies, that the Surgeons will buy them up to save them selves the labour of making Sceletons' (58). This is a rather horrific joke, one that plays on thinness (these will be skinny babies), with the larger implication being not only that surgeons must make skeletons, but that their source material can come from many sources (those same babies again).

Perhaps proving the adage that too much aphrodisiac is a dangerous thing, Cantharides bites each of them once again, driving them all crazy and leaves them 'to their fates' (61). This is a visceral play, as evidenced at first by the actions at court and then through the secondary characters and the sub-plot rests on a working knowledge of the body, and its anatomy, to deliver its humour. A level of misogyny is expressed throughout, however, and the specific images of violence against women that occur earlier in the play still find their way into the presentation of a women whose control over men is ultimately destructive and this negative force is associated with dissection.

The pictorial representation of skeletons on the stage has already been noted and here we have a group of plays that seem to revel in the presentation of deathly

or near-deathly figures: bones, blood, sinews, all cavorting around the stage. Micheal Neill argues that these figures have an association with an earlier tradition, borne out of the plague. Sawday also notes the liveliness of anatomical illustrations, like the ones found in *De Fabrica*, figures that seem animated, alive in some ways, and that interact with their environments. These illustrations sometimes place their figures (sometimes skeletal, sometimes carrying their own skins) in pastoral environments. In many cases, they seem to be only aware of their surroundings but their conditions, and seem engaged in a dialogue about dissection and death. If, as it was argued previously, playwrights adopted these printed images for theatrical purposes, there is also a degree of originality and invention in these stage pictures and figures. Albert Howard Carter, in a critical edition of *The Maid's Revenge* details the extensive sources of the play, noting that Sharkino and Scarabeo are the playwright's own invention, influenced, perhaps, by Jonson (xxxiv). This is a further suggestion that playwrights are adapting and adopting a range of influences, including an earlier theatrical tradition, for use on their stages.

But to what end? Sawday argues persuasively that anatomical texts, including their illustrations, were an important tool in early modern culture as a way and means of negotiating death and the natural process of decay. When Hamlet leaps into Ophelia's grave, it is impossible to ignore that he can only accept his own identity, 'I am Hamlet the Dane', after accepting the simple fact of his own mortality. It is a profound moment, and brings us back to issues of selfhood, interiority, and identity that have been discussed. And perhaps this group of plays, in their delight with decay, death, beatings and other forms of corporal punishment are also reminders of the unalterable fact that all life comes to an end. The macabre, carnivalesque humour on display here may be another way that playwrights deal with this issue on

the stage, reinventing and adapting that tradition for their contemporary audiences, now acquainted with a new vocabulary of death brought in by the anatomists.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

The introduction to this thesis began with an examination of a play that included what might appear to be an altogether slight reference to dissection. The addition of that single line, though, sparked the further examination of a range of plays that also include references to human anatomy and dissection that, as we have seen, vary in application, intent, and dramatic purpose. To be sure, this particular examination could be applied to any number of references to a host of activities, events, or topical allusions that are found in these plays. It was the particular adaptation of a scientific, medical practice to the stage that was intriguing, however, especially in an age, as we have seen, that seemed otherwise interested in questions of selfhood, identity and personal agency. That the science of dissection seemed apropos of those larger, cultural, concerns, warrants discussion with respect to its application to the stage. And yet, as we have also seen, that process of adaptation resulted in some variety of end results, and perhaps that process of adaptation was itself mediated and affected by the development of the theatre in this period. If *Every Man in His Humour* can be seen to represent the various threads that were pursued in this thesis, perhaps another can serve as a useful summation.

Like *Every Man in his Humour*, Robert Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies* contains just one reference to anatomy, though taken as a whole, this is a work that serves to contextualize the various points of discussion raised here. A fictionalized account of two historically real murder plots, *Two Lamentable Tragedies* presents a London that would be very familiar to its audience; one of the two tragedies happens on streets and in neighbourhoods that would be known to Londoners. Like Jonson, Yarrington presents a fictionalized version of the city to itself, and perhaps there is

some similarity to *The Witch of Edmonton* in that the action is based on historical, and known, events.

Yarrington, though, doesn't just present London, and this is an important point. The construction of the play is curious and presents us with two interwoven plots. In one, Merry and his sister Rachel, attempt to get away with two bloody murders, while in the other an unscrupulous uncle hires thugs to murder his recently orphaned nephew. The 'Merry' story occurs in London, the 'Orphan' story is in Italy, near Padua, and the play intercuts the two plots together, so that scenes alternate throughout. On the page, there is sometimes an indication that the scene has shifted, but often it simply seems as though the two plays were indiscriminately woven together. Indeed, there is little to connect the two, in terms of plot and character, except for the inclusion of several allegorical characters, whose presence serves both as an induction and running narrative on the events of the play.

While there hasn't been much critical work done on *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, Anne Patenaude points out the obvious connection to the morality play in Yarrington's use of these allegorical figures (95). The first to be introduced is Homicide, who immediately laments the general lack of immorality among the townsfolk. This leads to a dialogue with Avarice and the two determine to lead one of the local characters astray. Truth will enter, and attempt to defend the character of the townsfolk, but she (and it is a she) is horribly outnumbered and can never make ground with the assortment of allegorical characters who continue to comment on the action of both plays. The addition of these allegorical characters and the moralizing that sometimes happens, suggests an older framework, that *Two Lamentable Tragedies* is borrowing from the medieval tradition as represented by the morality play. *Two Lamentable Tragedies* appears to have been written in the

years before 1600 and so (and also perhaps like *Every Man in His Humour*) can perhaps be seen to straddle these two periods, or at least anticipate the plays of the 17th century that dominate this thesis.

We are also told several times throughout the play that the Merry action happens during Bartholmew Fair, giving the play, quite literally, a festival setting; the character Truth promises a 'bloodie feastivall' (sig. A2v) early on, and Beechum tells us later that it is 'Bartholmew eve' (B2v). That the play gives the impression of a morality play is helped along by the general lack of depth in the characterization, coupled with a stilted dialogue that only serves to underscore the slight morality on offer throughout. An early exchange between Avarice and Homicide illustrates the point:

HOMICIDE. Mistrust me not I am thy faithful friend

AVARICE. Many say so, that prove false in the end.

HOMICIDE. But turn about and thou wilt know my face.

AVARICE. It may be so, and know thy want of grace. (A2v)

The level of verse here is indicative of the play in general, lending it an unsophisticated and immature tone that suits both the allegorical nature of the piece, the moralizing that happens throughout, and the fairground atmosphere. Indeed, Yarrington's use of these figures, and the constant moralizing that happens throughout, seems tactical, a deliberate choice by the playwright to excuse and blanket the level of violence and spectacle that occupies so much of the play. Patenaude notes that the sources for the play include a variety of folk tales, ballads and children's stories (24), for both the Merry and the Orphan plots, and this serves to contribute to the play's overall feeling of fantasy and freedom. The overall

structure of the play points also suggests that Yarrington may not have been committed to the level of moralizing that his figures present. The feminized Truth is often at the mercy of Avarice and Homicide, who seem to win every argument they forward. Yarrington gives us a female Truth, and weakens her (and her position) throughout and to the very end. When Truth tries to banish her allegorical foes ('Hence Stigmaticks! you shall not harbor heare (xxviii, 19-20)), they present a straightforward argument:

AVARICE. Mauger the worst, I will have many harts,
That shall affect my secret whisperings;
The chinck of gold is such a pleasing crie,
That all men wish to heare such harmony.
And I will place sterne murther by my side,
That we may do more harmes than haughty pride.

HOMICIDE. Truth, now farewell, hereafter thou shalt see,
Ile vex thee more with many tragedies. (xxviii, 27-34)

Truth, for her part, concedes, lamenting the state of men's hearts, and her final plea to the audience seems doomed to failure. Yarrington's pessimistic end seems contrary to expectation, and while it might be a deliberate statement on his part, also seems to suggest that the moralizing may indeed serve the other function, as cover for the extreme sensationalism on display.

Particularly where it concerns the Merry story, *Two Lamentable Tragedies* is sensational. Of particular note are Yarrington's discursive stage directions, which have no discernible equal in their bloody detail:

*S.D. Then being in the upper Rome Merry strickes him in the head
fifteene times. (B3r)*

And also:

*S.D. When the boy goeth into the shoppe Merrie striketh six blows on
his head and with the seauenth leaves the hammer sticking in his head,
the boy groaning must be heard by a maide who must crye to her
maister. (C4r)*

These explicit directions verge on a macabre humour, with 'fifteen times' and 'six blows' and the effect, however it may have been realized, of a hammer protruding from a skull. Partenaude (37) and Hanabusa (xii) discuss Yarrington's use of stage directions, which sometime conform to usual dramatic practice and sometimes, as above, don't. Both concur that the printed edition of *Two Lamentable Tragedies* was not a final playhouse copy, which raises the question of performance. There certainly seems to be enough evidence in the text that Yarrington was aware of the conditions of performance and these discursive stage directions may be take as directorial, as an indication of how Yarrington wanted these events to be staged.

The object of these murders has been Merry's neighbour, Beech, and his serving boy William. There is, perhaps not surprisingly, little to motivate the crimes outside an over-developed sense of greed - Merry is jealous of Beech's success and sets about taking that away from him. Merry's sister, Rachel, comes to discover what her brother has done and the two of them try desperately to hide the murder of Beech by dismembering his body (which is meant to happen onstage) and hiding the pieces. This plot unravels, though, when two boatmen find Beech's torso and then, in another delicious bit of staging, several characters reassemble the body parts

onstage to try and determine the identity of the murder victim. A search of the neighbourhood leads to the uncovering of the murderer and Merry and Rachel, who is convicted as an accomplice to the crime, are hanged onstage.

The Merry story is incredible for all these reasons and stands in surprising contrast to the Orphan story which, while terrible in its own outcome, contains none of the bloody detail of its counterpart. In the second story (and it's important to note that neither of these stories is in any way a 'sub-plot' of the other, they are two unconnected stories, cut together), an uncle sets about to hire two mercenaries to murder his nephew in order to steal an inheritance. Despite the bloody detail of the stage directions and the presence of the dismembered limbs there is no reference to anatomy in the Merry section. Instead, the single reference to anatomy that occurs in the play, happens in the Orphan story, and it serves to connect both of these tales. Because *The Two Lamentable Tragedies* presents both of these stories in an episodic fashion, with the action switching back and forth between the locales of each, the stories are afforded a proximity that allows for the action to build between each section.

Late in the Merry and Rachel sequence, Merry has entered with a bag, 'to bear hence Beeches body in the night' (E2r) Knowing that the body will be too heavy to move easily, Merry has planned to

cut him peece-meale, first his head and legs
Will be one burden, then the mangled rest,
Will be another, which I will transport,
Beyond the water in a Ferryboate,

And throw it into Paris-garden ditch.

Fetch me the chopping knife...

Rachel protests:

Oh can you finde in hart to cut and carve,

His stone colde flesh, and rob the greedy grave,

Of his dissevered blood besprinckled lims?

MERRY. I mary can I fetch the chopping knife. (E2r)

At which point the stage direction tell us that '*Merry begins to cut the body, and bindes the armes behind his backe with Beeches garters...*'

We then switch back to the Orphan story, where our murderers are arguing about the crime they have been hired to commit. While one murderer is feeling the pangs of conscience, the other (identified as the first murderer) clearly is not:

Grace me no graces, I respect no grace,

But with a grace, to give a gracelesse stab,

To chop folkes legges and armes off by the stumpes,

To see what shift theile make to scramble home:

Pick out mens eyes, and tell them thats the sport,

Of hood-man-blinde, without all sportiveness,

If with a grace I can performe such pranckes,

My hart will give mine agents many thanks. (E3r)

When the young nephew, Pertillo, begins to realize what fate has in store, he pleads for release, though he finds no sympathy from this same murderer:

Leave of these bootlesse protestations,
And use no rush enticing argumentes,
For if you do, ile lop you lim by lim,
And torture you for childish eloquence. (E4v)

The first murderer then runs Pertillo through with his sword, which prompts the second murderer to attack him, leading to a sword fight. The Duke enters to find Pertillo and a murder dead, with the second murderer fatally wounded and asks him to 'speake then thou sad Anatomy of death,/ Who were the agents of your wofulnesse?' (xiv 208-209).

The Two Lamentable Tragedies is a sensational play that relies on a sensational historical event for its most gruesome sequences. What is intriguing, what seems to emerge in the combination of these two stories, which are entirely independent, is that that they are on the one hand connected in their use of language - the act of dismemberment (which happens in front of the audience) is followed by several conversations about dismemberment (as if to remind the audience of the horror they have just seen), which leads to a mention of anatomy, which here denotes an unfortunate loss of life. Death hangs over both plays and it is represented by anatomy.

As mentioned, *Two Lamentable Tragedies* opens with a peculiar epilogue in which the allegorical Homicide introduces the themes that will run throughout the play:

And will not soile their well addicted harts:
With rape, extortion, murther, or the death,
Of friend or foe, to gaine an empery.

I cannot glut my blood delighted eye;
With mangled bodies which do gaspe and grone,
Readie to passe to faire Elizium (A2r)

This grim prediction is, of course, borne out in the course of both tragedies, and this is not a play that shies away from the gruesome and the macabre. *Two Lamentable Tragedies* reads like a pulp fiction account of a nasty murder case that winds inevitably to the downfall of the protagonists. While the fate of the murderers in the Orphan plot is not shown onstage, the other plot ends with the execution of Merry and Rachel, who both walk to their deaths on the gallows. The stage direction tells Merry to 'Goe up the lather' (xxvii.22.1), and after a short monologue he 'Turns of[f] the Lather' (xxvii.59.1); Rachel follows shortly after. *The Two Lamentable Tragedies* ends as *Hoffman* begins, with two hanged bodies on the stage.

Marissa Greenburg, in 'Signs of the Crimes: Topography, Murder, and Early Modern Domestic Tragedy' uses the phrase 'spatial indeterminacy' (17) in describing the effect of moving from the clearly identified locale of the Merry story to the vague geography of the Orphan story. While Greenburg is analysing the play as domestic tragedy, part of her argument is that the integration of these two plots is apparently deliberate on the part of the writer. Despite the play's appearance on the printed page, that it is a clumsy amalgam of two disparate stories, it reads as a clever slide from one to the other; the astonishing level of violence (and it is quite rightly categorized by Greenburg as literal in its depiction) of the Merry story stands in stark contrast to the poetic, metaphorical language of the Orphan story, so that each serves, and heightens, the other. And perhaps one extrapolation is that the reference to anatomy in the play functions in a similar way and is one of the

mediating devices that Yarrington uses in the play. The spatial indeterminacy of the Orphan story, is matched in some respects, by the spatial determinacy of the Merry story; it happens on familiar London streets. Greenburg calls the representation of London a 'theatrical fantasy' (23) and we are reminded that this London (like Jonson's London) is a simulation. The topography of London is overlain with a fictional representation of the city. We are also reminded of Sugg's very useful idea of the 'novel reexpression of violence' that is represented in these plays and in the representation of anatomy in general.

There is no way to determine, of course, why Jonson would add a reference to anatomy in the revised version of *Every Man in His Humour*, all we can do now is note that the change was made. One effect of this change, as can be seen across so many of these plays, is an increase in the threat of violence. That effect can be subtle, as in *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, where the use of anatomy, through the juxtaposition of characters and scenes, seems almost to haunt the play; the threat of dissection lies across it, in the intercutting of the scenes and characters. Jonson's use of the term in *Every Man in his Humour* may seem slight, insignificant, and yet the deliberate change in the text suggests it is more than that; it is of dramaturgical importance, it is a reference that is woven into the play and so helps connect the themes and characters of that play. Lear's call to anatomize Regan is similar. Lear's need to peer inside his daughter, to display the nature of her heart is the wounded and broken cry of a father, desperate to come to terms with a betrayal. So many of these plays seem to enlist the science of dissection in a like way, to express distrust, even fear, of women by husbands, fathers, and patriarchs. There is some novelty in this 'reexpression of violence', a sense that playwrights are adapting an old form, and is not only evident in Jonson's reworking of classical forms and characters, but

also in the fairground and carnival setting of other plays that have been examined, in order to re-present these forms in new, and innovative ways. Hoffman, D'Amville, and a myriad of revengers, dissect and anatomize to achieve their ends, lovers and jilted lovers sometimes want to tear into each other to probe the depths of longing, or the lack of it. The language of anatomy serves as one more poetic device for authors to describe these arcs and stories.

In considering, and reconsidering, why anatomy was important to so many of these authors and their plays, the influence of other printed texts seemed to become clear. Not only do playwrights appear to have been influenced by other works of fiction, but also by the pages of anatomical texts and the pictures that they contain. In considering all of this, a clear image began to surface and repeat itself - Stump, thumping up and down on his wooden leg, defying his enemies to do more damage to his failing, amputated, body. The restless need for so many of these characters to delve into the flesh of others is a repeated device, often couched in the new language of dissection, and the cutting, flaying, and probing that occurs (or threatens to occur) is an expression of violence that operates, routinely, in many of these works. Often, these images of anatomy and dissection would seem to resolve themselves in images of death, an image that we have seen repeated throughout many of these plays, an image borrowed from anatomical texts and repeated on the stage, of skeletons hanging above the action, silent witnesses, who nevertheless seem to leer, taunt and, ultimately, invite death to visit the Stumps, the Regans, the Annabellas, doomed to be dissected, often physically, sometimes, poetically, but always facing knives, daggers and fingers that bore into the centre of pliable, corporeal, flesh.

To suggest that anatomy in these plays represent death is, of course, too reductionist, too simplistic a generalization of a group of plays, many of which deal profoundly with their themes and ideas. Jonathon Sawday defines his idea of a 'culture of dissection' as a 'network of practices, social structures, and rituals surrounding this production of fragmented bodies' (2) and it must be acknowledged that the anatomical inquiry of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-inner centuries represents a cultural desire to interrogate, map, and define bodies of knowledge, including the human body. There does, though, seem to be something inescapably theatrical in the use of anatomy on the stage. *Two Lamentable Tragedies* takes place in a stylized London, a theatricalized version of the city and so, by extension, we can view the use of anatomy in this and other plays to be a dramatic extension of the act of anatomy. Anatomy in these plays, as in *The Insatiate Countess*, is slightly disconnected from reality, altered and adapted to suit the play. And that anatomy fits into a larger dramatic discourse is perhaps evident in a theatrical approach and a repetition of images that has been seen across these plays. That some of these plays juxtapose their use of anatomy with fairground or carnival activities, and bring in Jack-a-Lents and Bloody Bones, may also signify a debt to other traditions and forms and while it perhaps cannot be said that all these plays are fairy tales, there is no denying that they are meant to entertain, and that anatomy and the science of dissection has been enlisted in that aim as well.

Works Cited

Adams, Thomas. *Englands sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels Divided into two sermons*. Early English Books Online. 7 July 2016. Web.

Anonymous. *A Critical Edition of the Anonymous Elizabethan Play The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*. Ed. Jill L. Levenson. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1980. Print.

---. *Dick of Devonshire*. Oxford: The Malone Society, 1955. Literature Online. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *The famous & renowned history of Morindos a king of Spaine who maryed with Miracula a Spanish witch*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *A Larum for London*. London, 1602. Malone Society Reprints, 1913. Print.

---. *A Larum for London: A Critical Edition of the Performative Text*. Ed. William Scott Lancaster. Diss. Texas A&M University-Commerce, 2011. PDF File.

---. *The Two Noble Ladies*. Malone Society Reprint. London: Oxford UP, 1930. Print.

---. *The Two Noble Ladies: An Edition of an Anonymous Elizabethan Play*. Ed. Gary L. Miller. MA Thesis Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, 1968. PDF File.

Baldwin, Maxwell. 'The Date of *Love's Pilgrimage* and its Relation to *The New Inn*'. *Studies in Philology*. 28 (1931), p. 702-708. PDF File.

Bamborough, J.B. Introduction. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. By Robert Burton. Ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Banister, John. *The historie of man sucked from the sappe of the most approved anathomistes*. Early English Books Online. 7 July 2016. Web.

Barker, Francis. *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection*. London: Methuen, 1984. Print.

Barksted, William and Lewis Machin, from a draft by John Marston. *The Insatiate Countess*. Ed. Martin Wiggins. *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies*. New York: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Baskerville, C.R. 'Source and Analogues of How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad'. *PMLA*. 24.4 (1909): 711-730. PDF File.

Batman, Stephen. *Batman Upon Bartholome*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. *Love's Cure, or the Martial Maid*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *Philaster, or, Love lies a-Bleeding*. Ed. Suzanne Gossett. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2009. Print.

Billing, Christian. *Masculinity, Corporality, and the English Stage 1580-1635*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2008. Print.

---. 'Modelling the anatomy theatre and the indoor hall theatre: dissection on the stages of early modern London'. *Early Modern Literary Studies Special Issue*. 13 (April, 2004): 3.1-17. Web. 8 July 2016.

Billington, Sandra. 'Butchers and Fishmongers: Their Historical Contribution to London's Festivity'. *Folklore*, Vol. 101, no. 1 (1990): 97-103. PDF File.

Bolton, Robert. *Instructions for a right comforting afflicted consciences with special antidotes against some greivous temptations*. Early English Books Online. 7 July 2016. Web.

Boys, John. *An exposition of the last psalme delivered in a sermon preached at Paules crosse the fifth of November 1613*. Early English Books Online. 7 July 2016. Web.

Brayman Hackel, Heidi. *Reading Material in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: UP, 2005. Print.

Brockbank, William. 'Old Anatomical Theatres and What Took Place Therein'. *Medical History*. 12:4 (Oct., 1968): 371-384. PDF File.

Brome, Richard. *The Court Beggar*. Modern Text ed. Marion O'Conner. Richard Brome Online. Web. 8 July 2016.

---. *The Northern Lass*. Modern Text ed. J. Sanders. Richard Brome Online. Web. 8 July 2016.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Cahill, Patricia. *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma and the Early Modern Stage*. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Calkins, Casey M., James P. Franciosi and Gary L. Kolesari. 'Human Anatomical Science and Illustration.' *Clinical Anatomy* 12 (1999): 120-129. PDF File.

- Cantor, Paul A. 'John Ford.' *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Vol. 58. Detroit: Gale, 1987. 91-106. Dictionary of Literary Biography Vol. 58. *Dictionary of Literary Biography Main Series*. Web. 9 July 2016.
- Carlino, Andrea. *Books of the Body: Anatomical Ritual and Renaissance Learning*. Trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi. London: U of Chicago P, 1999. Print.
- . 'Know Thyself': anatomical figures in early modern Europe.' *res* 27. Spring 1995. Anthropology and Aesthetics. p.52-70. PDF File.
- Cathcart, Charles. 'Lust's Dominion; or, The Lascivious Queen: Authorship, Date, and Revision'. *Review of English Studies*. 52.207 (August 2001): 360-375. PDF File.
- Chapman, George. *Two Wise Men and All the Rest Fooles. Early English Books Online*. Web. 7 July 2016.
- Chettle, Henry. *The Tragedy of Hoffman. Five Revenge Tragedies*. Ed. Emma Smith. London: Penguin Classics, 2012. Print.
- Clark, Sir George, F.B.A. *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964. Print.
- Cranfill, T.M. 'Barnaby Rich's 'Sappho' and The Weakest Goeth to the Wall'. *Studies in English*, 25 (1945/1946): 142-171. PDF File.
- Cokayne, Aston. *The Obstinate Lady*. Ed. Catherine Shaw. New York: Garland Publications, 1986. Print.
- Cunningham, Andrew. *The Anatomist Anatomis'd: An Experimental Discipline in Enlightenment Europe*. London: Ashgate, 1988. Print.

Daileader, Celia R. 'Back Door Sex: Renaissance Gynosodomy, Aretino, and the Exotic. *ELH*. 69.2 (Summer, 2002): 303-334. PDF File.

Dale, Karen. *Anatomising Embodiment and Organisation Theory*. Place: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

D'Avenant, William. *The Cruel Brother*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Daw, Jack. *Vox graculi, or Jacke Dawes prognostication*. Early English Books Online. Web. 8 July 2016.

Day, John, William Rowley and George Wilkins. *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*. Early English Books Online. Web. 12 July 2016.

Dekker, Thomas. *Match Me in London*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Volume III. London: Cambridge University Press, 1966. Print.

---. *Satiro-mastix*. Early English Books Online. Web. 8 July 2016.

---. *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Dent, R.W. *John Webster's Borrowing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960. Print.

Dobson, Jessie and R. Milnes Walker. *Barbers and Barber-Surgeons of London*. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1979. Print.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and cultural transformations in early-modern Europe*. 2 vol. New York: Cambridge UP, 1979. Print.

Fletcher, John. *Four Plays or Moral Representations in One*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *Love's Pilgrimage*. Literature Online. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 1994. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *Wit Without Money*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Ford, John. *Love's Sacrifice*. Ed. A.T. Moore. Manchester UP, 2002. Print.

---. *The Broken Heart*. Ed. Marion Lomax. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore and Other Plays*. New York: OUP, 1995. Print.

---. *The Lover's Melancholy*. Ed. Marion Lomax. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore and Other Plays*. New York: OUP, 1995. Print.

---. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Ed. Marion Lomax. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore and Other Plays*. New York: OUP, 1995. Print.

Forsyth, James. *The bitter waters of Babylon*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Foulweather, Adam. *A Wonderful, strange and miraculous, astrological prognostication for this yeer of our Lord God 1591*. Early English Books Online. Web. 8 July 2016.

Franklin, Kenneth J. *William Harvey: Englishman, 1578-1657*. London: Macgibbon and Lee, 1961. Print.

French, Roger. *Dissection and Vivisection in the European Renaissance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999. Print.

Furdell, Elizabeth Lane. *The Royal Doctors: 1485-1714*. New York: University of Rochester Press, 2001. Print.

---. *Publishing and Medicine in Early Modern England*. New York: University of Rochester Press, 2002. Print.

Furnivall, Fredk. J, and Percy Furnivall. *The Anatomie of The Bodie of Man by Thomas Vicary. The Edition of 1548 as re-issued by the Surgeons of St. Bartholomew's in 1577. With a life of Vicary, notes on surgeons in England, Bartholomew's Hospital, and London, in Tudor times, an Appendix of documents, and illustrations*. London: OUP, 1930. Print.

Gascoigne, George. *The spoyle of Antwerp*. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 7 July 2016.

Goffe, Thomas. *The Raging Turk*. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 12 July 2016.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.

Gutierrez, Nancy A. *'Shall She Famish Then?': Female Food Refusal in Early Modern England*. London: Ashgate Publishing, 2003. Print.

Harvey, William. *On the Motion of the Heart and Blood in Animals*. Trans. Alex Bowie. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962. Print.

Heckscher, William S. *Rembrandt's Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp: An Iconographical Study*. NYUP, 1958. Print.

Heywood, Thomas. *The foure Prentises of London*. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife From a Bad*. Early English Books Online. Web. 10 July 2016.

Hillman, David. *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism, and the Interior of the Body*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.

Jonson, Ben. *Bartholmew Fair*. Ed. John Creaser. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 4 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

---. *Every Man in His Humour*. Ed. Robert S. Miola. New York: Manchester UP, 2000. Print.

---. *Every Man in His Humour. A Parallel-Text Edition of the 1601 Quarto and the 1616 Folio*. Ed. J. W. Lever. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971. Print.

---. *Every Man in His Humour, Quarto Version*. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

---. *Every Man Out of His Humour*. Ed. Randell Martin. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

---. *The Case is Altered*. Ed. Robert Miola. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

---. *The Magnetic Lady*. Ed. Helen Ostovich. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 6 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

---. *The Staple of News*. Ed. Joseph Loewenstein. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Vol. 6 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

---. *Volpone*. Ed. Richard Dutton. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. Vol. 3 of *The Cambridge Edition of Ben Jonson*. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, gen. ed. Print.

Jowitt, Claire. 'Political Allegory in Late Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Turk Plays: *Lust's Dominion* and *The Turke*. *Comparative Drama*. 36.3/4 (Fall 2002/Winter 2003): 411-443. PDF File.

Keynes, Geoffrey. *The Life of William Harvey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966. Print.

King, John. *Lectures upon Ionas deliuered at Yorke in the yeare of our Lorde 1594*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Lamb, Mary Ellen. 'Inventing the Early Modern Women Reader through the World of Goods: Lyly's Gentlewoman Reader and Katherine Stubbs'. *Reading Women: Literacy, Authorship, and Culture in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Ed. Heidi Brayman Hackel and Catherine E. Kelly. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008. Print.

Lamb, Mary Ellen and Valerie Wayne. *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Lancaster, William Scott. *A Larum For London: A Critical Edition of the Performative Text*. Diss. Texas A&M University, 2011. PDF File.

- Landers, Matthew. 'Early Modern Dissection as a Model of Organization'. *Anatomy and the organization of knowledge, 1500-1850*. Ed. Matthew Landers and Brian Muñoz. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012. Print.
- Levenson, Jill L. *A Critical Edition of the Anonymous Elizabethan Play The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*. New York: Garland Publications, 1980. Print.
- Marston, John and Others. *The Insatiate Countess*. Ed. Giorgio Melchiori. Dover: Manchester UP, 1984. Print.
- Martin, John Rupert. 'Portrait of Doctors by Rembrandt and Rubens'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 130.1 (Mar., 1986): 7-20. PDF File.
- Massinger, Philip. *The Maid of Honour*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.
- Mason, Francis. *The authority of the Church in making canons and constitutions concerning things indifferent*. Early English Books Online. 7 July 2016. Web.
- Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. Columbia UP, 1999. Print.
- Maus, Katherine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1995. Print.
- Mckenzie, Ann L. 'A study in dramatic contrasts. The siege of Antwerp in 'A Larum for London' and 'El saco de Amberes''. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. 59.4 (October 1982): 283-300. PDF File.
- Mitchell, Dolores. 'The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Tulp: A Sinner Among the Righteous'. *Artibus et Historiae*. 15.30 (1994): 145-156. PDF File.

- Mowat, Barbara. 'Afterward: Shakespeare and Romance'. *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance and Shakespeare*. Ed. Mary Ellen Lamb and Valerie Wayne. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Neill, Michael. *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Nunn, Hillary M. *Staging Anatomies: Dissection and Spectacle in early Stuart Tragedy*. London: Ashgate, 2005. Print.
- O'Malley, C.D. 'The Fielding H. Garrison Lecture: Helkiah Crooke, M.D., F.R.C.P., 1576-1648'. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*. 42.1 (January, 1968): 1-18. PDF File.
- O'Malley, C.D. and K.F. Russell. A facsimile reproduction. *Introduction to Anatomy* by David Edwardes. London: OUP, 1961. Print.
- O'Malley, C.D., F.N.L. Poynter, and K.F. Russell. *William Harvey Lectures on the Whole of Anatomy: An Annotated Translation of Prelectiones Anatomiae Universalis*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961. Print.
- O'Malley, Susan Gushee. *A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of Thomas Goffe's 'The Courageous Turk'*. Diss. Tulane University, 1973. PDF File.
- . 'Thomas Goffe'. *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Vol. 58. Detroit: Gale Research, 1987, pp. 115-122. Web.
- Owens, Margaret E. *Stages of Dismemberment: The Fragmented Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005. Print.

Ostovich, Helen. 'The Appropriation of Pleasure in *The Magnetic Lady*'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 34.2 (Spring 1994): 425-442. PDF File.

Park, Katherine. 'The Life of the Corpse: Division and Dissection in Late Medieval Europe.' *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*. 50:1 (January 1995): 111-132. PDF File.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humouring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. University of Chicago Press, 2004. Print.

Pelling, Margaret and Charles Webster. 'Medical Practitioners'. *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*. Ed. Charles Webster. London: CUP, 1979. Print.

Raynalde, Thomas. *The Birth of Mankind: Otherwise Named, The Woman's Book Newly Set Forth, Corrected, and Augmented. Whose Contents Ye May Read in the Table of the Book, and Most Plainly in the Prologue*. Ed. Elaine Hobby. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. Print.

Roberts, Sasha. 'Engendering the Female Reader: Women's Recreational Reading of Shakespeare in Early Modern England'. *Reading Women: Literacy, Authorship, and Culture in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Ed. Heidi Brayman Hackel and Catherine E. Kelly. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Rowley, Samuel. *The Noble Spanish Soldier*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

Rupp, Jan C.C. 'Michel Foucault, Body Politics and the Rise and Expansion of Modern Anatomy'. *Journal of Historical Sociology*. 5.1 (March 1992): 31-60. PDF File.

Schupbach, William. 'The Paradox of Rembrandt's 'Anatomy of Dr. Tulp''. *Medical History, Supplement No. 2*. London: Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1982. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear: A Parallel Text Edition*. Ed. Rene Weis. New York: Longman, 1993. Print.

Shirley, James. *The Constant Maid*. Early English Books Online. Web. 7 July 2016.

---. *James Shirley's The Maid's Revenge: A Critical Edition*. Ed. Albert Howard Carter. New York: Garland, 1980. Print.

Steiner, Gary. 'The cultural significance of Rembrandt's 'Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp''. *History of European Ideas*. 36 (2010): 273-279. PDF File.

Stephens, John. *A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of Cinthia's Revenge*. Ed. Mainelle Cole. Diss. Texas Tech University. 1977. PDF File.

Stolberg, Michael. 'A Woman Down to Her Bones'. *Isis* 94 (2003): 274-299. PDF File.

Sugg, Richard. *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*. London: Routledge, 2011. Ebook collection (EBSCOhost). Web. 19 Dec. 2013.

---. *Murder After Death: Literature and Anatomy in Early Modern England*. London: Cornell University Press, 2007. Print.

Synnott, Anthony. *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Tomkis, Thomas. *Lingua: or the Combat of the Tongue, and the Five Senses For Superiority*. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 7 July 2016.

Tourneur, Cyril. *The Atheist's Tragedy*. Ed. Katherine Eisaman Maus. *Four Revenge Tragedies*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Traub, Valerie. 'The Nature of Norms in Early Modern England: Anatomy, Cartography, King Lear'. *South Central Review*. 26.1&2 (Winter/Spring 2009): 42-81. PDF File.

Turner, jr., Robert K. 'Standing Type in Tomkis's *Albumazar*'. *Library*. 13.3: pp. 175-185. PDF File.

Vesalius, Andreas. *On the Fabric of the Human Body: A Translation of De Humani Corporis Fabrica Libri Septum. Book 1: The Bones and Cartilages*. Trans. William Frank Richardson. San Francisco: Norman Publishing, 1998. Print.

Vicary, Thomas. *The Englishemens treasure*. London, 1586. *Early English Books Online*. Web. November 2012.

Warren, Roger. 'The Folio Omission of the Mock Trial: Motives and Consequences'. *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of King Lear*. Ed. Gary Taylor and Michael Warren. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983. Print.

Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi*. Ed. John Russell Brown. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1964. Print.

Wells, L.H. 'Anatomical Fugitive Sheets with Superimposed Flaps, 1538-1540'. *Medical History*, 12.4 (October 1968): 403-407. PDF File.

Whitteridge, Gweneth. *William Harvey and the Circulation of the Blood*. New York: American Elsevier, 1971. Print.

Wright, Thomas. *William Harvey: A Life in Circulation*. New York: Oxford UP, 2013. Print.

Young, Sidney. *The Annals of the Barber Surgeons of London*. Reprint of the 1890 ed. published by Blades, East and Blades, London. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1978. Print.