ABERRATIONAL BODIES: DRAMATIC AND LITERARY REPRESENTATIONS OF EARLY MODERN HUMORALITY

by

KATHERINE NICOLE WALKER

Bachelor of Arts, 2009
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
AddRan College of Liberal Arts
Texas Christian University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

May, 2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to those who made this thesis possible. Foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Ariane Balizet, for her guidance, insight, and encouragement. Dr. Balizet's challenging questions, her incredible patience, and her remarkable sagacity have led me down new avenues in my research and have shaped how I approach early modern literature in significantly diverse and exciting ways.

I would also like to thank the other two professors on my thesis committee, Dr. Daniel Gil and Dr. Mona Narain, who have provided invaluable guidance throughout the writing process. Dr. Gil has been actively supportive during my final semester at TCU through providing insightful professional and scholarly advice. Dr. Narain has likewise offered excellent guidance, both for this thesis and for my future academic goals.

Texas Christian University's Department of English houses wonderful faculty mentors who have also encouraged me. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Bonnie Blackwell and Dr. Linda Hughes for their instruction and assistance in classes and their sustained interest in my projects. My peers have also played a large role by reading drafts, buying me coffee, and listening to my occasional frustrations. In particular, Molly Knox-Leverenz, Marie Martinez, Nicole Green and James Stewart have been invaluable friends.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their ongoing support of my academic endeavors. My mother, Darlene Wilson, has always encouraged me to "dance on," and her enthusiasm for my research has played a large role in my professional goals. My father, Steve Wilson, and my younger brother Jake have also demonstrated love and support in countless ways. Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Ryan Walker, whose love and understanding have given me the necessary encouragement and fortitude to finish this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Waxen Figures, Changeable Women: Or What the Women Will in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night*……1

Chapter 2: The Covering of the Body: Material Transformations in Male Cross-Dressing and Appropriation of Feminine Apparel in Early Modern Literature……..37

Chapter 3: Monstrous Bodies: Shylock, Caliban, and Racial Humiliation……..69

Epilogue…….....99

Notes……102

Works Cited…….110

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure One: *Of the newe la[n]des and of ye people founde by the messengers of the kynge of porty[n]gale named Emanuel*……97

Figure Two: *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Descriptio[n] of Sundry Strange Things, Seming Monstrous in Our Eyes and Iudgement, Bicause We Are not Priuie to the Reasons of Them*……98

Chapter One

Waxen Figures, Changeable Women: Or What the Women Will in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night*

To you your father should be as a god;
One that compos'd your beauties; yea, and one
To whom you are but as a form in wax,
By him imprinted, and within his power,
To leave the figure, or disfigure it.

MSND: 1.1.47-51[1]

The Duke of Athens delivers this threat to Hermia regarding her unauthorized preference for Lysander. In his admonition, Theseus puts forth the idea that the father both forms and is able to deform the body of his daughter, thus emphasizing the material possibilities of disfiguration and alteration that early modern medical authors articulated in anatomical and medical texts. The bodily possibilities presented here rest on the notion that the body is mutable, open, and continually at risk in suffering dismemberments, contagions, and transformations. Egeus composes Hermia's "beauties" by first providing the necessary seed to generate her body and subsequently by dictating the shape of her physical and moral upbringing. A woman's waxen body is molded and only semi-permanent, as outside influences and masculine predations can both alter the health and shape of her physicality. As architect and artist of her original body's form, Hermia's father has the power and authority to unmake and disfigure the body of his offspring. He may also "leave" the figure by abandoning it to the rough and noxious elements that unbridled passion and communication with the outside world may work upon a young Hermia's body.

Instead of capitalizing on the threats that a woman's waxen body may experience, as Theseus clearly does, Viola in *Twelfth Night* explicitly bemoans a woman's malleable properties: "How easy is it for the proper-false / In women's waxen hearts to set their forms! / Alas, our frailty is the cause, not we! / For such as we are made of, such we be" (2.2.27-30). Viola recognizes a woman's susceptibility to the imprint of a handsome man and the dangers involved when women allow their hearts too much impressionability. Here, Viola does not speak to the pernicious authority of whoever made the materials of a woman's body, "for such as we are made of, such we be," but rather she laments the continuance of waxen qualities in a woman's material and emotional states of being. The unidentified maker is still at fault however, for Viola intimates that a woman's condition and her susceptibility are both products of the ways in which she is formed. Her waxen body is subject to alterations and misdirected passions.

As this discussion on Hermia's and Viola's bodies indicates, the literary trope of the feminine waxen body emblematizes the material permeability of early modern women's bodies. Their lived bodies were, according to anatomical and medical theories, subject to external agents working at will to change and influence their health. Yet men's bodies were also at risk. Even the bland County Paris in *Romeo and Juliet* is not impervious to charges of fluidity and grotesqueness. While the corporeally attuned Nurse, with her frequent references to men's bodies and her own breasts, praises Paris as "a man of wax" (1.3.78), Paris's earlier urging to Capulet to give him Juliet's hand undermines Paris's classical rigidity and speaks to his perhaps inordinate lust and impatience in obtaining the young girl. Underneath this urgency is also a desire for propagation and communal regeneration, as Juliet's mother characteristically reminds her daughter: "Younger than you / Here in Verona, ladies of esteem, / Are made already mothers" (1.3.71-3). Lady Capulet's speech also points to the inevitable fact that despite the aristocratic status of the Capulets and similar "ladies of esteem," class status does not protect one from the

requisite mingling and generation of grotesque bodies in which Juliet, whether with the melancholic Romeo or the immoderately impatient Paris, must participate.

The figurative waxen body is a symbol of early modern corporeality and material experience. By figuring a woman's body as wax, early modern authors could replicate and promulgate gendered hierarchies that relied on both the intellectual and physical inferiority of women. The ways in which Hermia, Helena, Viola, and Olivia either use or counteract the waxen features attributed to her body demonstrate how the waxen woman is a dangerous figure in early modern England, for a woman might deviate from the image and position into which patriarchical society wishes to place her. In this chapter I argue that the prevalent medical and anatomical theories in early modern England had telling implications for this waxen body. Nobody is free from charges of fluidity and porosity, and how the female characters in both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night* either attempt to sublimate or embrace their physical changeability speaks to the idea that early modern anxieties concerning gender, anatomical sex and the act of sex, class status, and race are all constructs that influence a particular character's mode of material subjectivity. These two comedies enact the hold men attempt to have over women's bodies, but these women use their waxen bodies to form their own material and sexual corporeality. That the trope of waxen bodies can adopt so many different forms and functions in both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night* points to how a woman's body represents a dangerous locale of, at best, tenuous masculine control. In both plays, social issues of authority and agency are supplanted by how women use their bodies to voice individuality. However, a woman's waxen qualities are nonetheless set to different purposes in each play. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Hermia's and Helena's waxen bodies are threats to patriarchy, particularly because they both cast their affections and bodies towards one male (whom they choose without another male's permission), and the men throughout the play

(whether the enchanted Lysander and Demetrius, the trickster Puck, or the only mildly concerned Oberon) attempt, but do not succeed, in redirecting and remolding the shape of these women's desires. However, in *Twelfth Night* Viola's mutability—as we see particularly manifested in her cross-dressing—is not at cross-purposes with the final heterosexual order at the end of the play. Instead, Viola's waxen body remains firmly attached to Orsino, and thus Viola's impressionable heart works to reaffirm existing patriarchical couplings. Nonetheless, all waxen, feminine bodies present a prospect which unnerves the men in the plays, just as other aspects of physical fluidity and changeability frighten the men I discuss in the following two chapters of this thesis. As a woman's malleable body and the masculine anxieties that respond to this physical pliability indicate, those who perceive these anxieties react with violence and hatred towards these waxen figures.

That the father can literally disfigure his progeny speaks to the impossibility the early moderns felt existed in attempting to withstand outside influences which encroached upon their bodies. Nonetheless, they reached for physical stability in an effort to guarantee health and physiological normalcy. The result, anxiety-ridden as it is, rests upon the curious onslaught of threats in the form of disfigurement and influx that early modern theories of the body espoused. In the Duke's exhortation, Hermia is reminded of the material realities of her body both in reference to her parentage and to the vulnerability, especially of a woman's body, the early moderns posited concerning the body's relationship to the external world. As Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. describe, in climatological and caloric theories of the body an individual's surrounding environment directly influenced his or her internal stability: "[s]cholars have emphasized the porousness of an early modern body that takes the environment into itself or spills out of its own bounds (or both)."[2] The early moderns were fearful of the body's permeability to these outside influences. To close off the body from these externals was to

protect oneself from frightening alterations. Thus, although no single body was completely free from the environmental elements, attempting to maintain relative solidity was a means for safeguarding against becoming entirely unrecognizable.

Within this medical worldview, Hermia's body is vulnerable in more than one way. Impurities and external factors may enter her semi-permeable body and negatively affect her internal constitution. Not only are her father's image and physical attributes "imprinted" upon her, but the Duke also suggests that the patriarch of a family is in a particularly apt position to dictate the shape of his offspring, both externally and internally. Egeus, in turn, accuses Lysander of altering Hermia's disposition into a hardened, unyielding manifestation of her father's lack of authority: "With cunning hast thou filch'd my daughter's heart, / Turn'd her obedience, which is due to me, / To stubborn harshness" (1.1.36-38). According to the *OED*, during the sixteenth and seventeenth century "harsh" primarily connoted rigidity, roughness, or repugnance.[3] Egeus should be able to dictate the form and appearance of his daughter's sexual inclination and body, but Lysander has already rendered her immovable. Yet Hermia's "form in wax" undergoes several alterations even before the play has begun. Her body, its subjugation under patriarchal authority, alongside the extent of masculine authority over her body and desires (i.e., her choice in a reproductive partner) are all under question precisely because of her body's internal and external changeability.

Both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night* exhibit the impossibility of achieving a purely closed-off body. Although neither play features actual dismemberment, as some of Shakespeare's tragedies do, both comedies encounter and explore the ontological and phenomenological problems with attempting to keep a body healthy and whole. Sexual desire, class status, age, and other, physical attributes are explored and mocked in both plays. More importantly, however, physical qualities demonstrate the unreliability of the body in moments of

duress or excitation because of the humoral fluids coursing within—the melancholic Duke Orsino, the lethargic Duke of Athens, the animal-like Rude Mechanicals, cross-dressing Viola, and jovial Feste all participate in this discourse on what it means to live and experience one's body. Waxen bodies may harden during poignant moments, but inevitably all bodies open up to re-formation, deformation, or complete alteration.

This introduction puts forth preliminary analyses that will be explored in depth throughout the entire thesis. While *A Midsummer* and *Twelfth Night* can provide clues into the status of the waxen body, I also examine other expressions of uncertainty and communicable interaction of early modern bodies in Chapters Two and Three. As a whole, this thesis argues that while the early modern body may be figured metaphorically as composed of material comparable to wax, the body can nonetheless alter, detract from or mix with other bodies, and through environmental influences, become completely unrecognizable. These potentialities of the body were immensely frightening for the early moderns; when Ferdinand in John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* goes mad and his body fills with melancholic humors, he imagines his body and nature entirely altered, albeit in the unseen regions of his interior self. The Doctor describes Ferdinand's descent into a perceived physical alteration that destroys his humanity: "In those that are possessed with't there o'erflows / Such melancholy humor they imagine / Themselves to be transformed into wolves" (5.2.8-10). Here, part of the threat Ferdinand's body and his corresponding animality presents relies on his physical unpredictability and humoral alteration. Yet early modern drama repeatedly stages characters who either play dangerously with the idea of transformation—from human to animal—or who do, like Ferdinand and Bottom, become physically changed, often into monsters. The spectacle and thrill of seeing bodies alter onstage, regardless of the fears these changeable bodies might elicit, nonetheless might have served as a source of satisfaction for the audiences, who willingly lay out ten doits to see a dead

Indian.[4] The horrific bodily transformations enacted and gestured towards onstage would have certainly recalled for a few attentive theatergoers their own need to close off their bodies from the damaging effects of allowing their waxen bodies to alter.

Despite the symbolic resonances of bodily terminology in early modern dramatic works, the potential *realities* of the physical body, particularly the visceral, visible, and permeable aspects of that body, are always present and often dominant. The early moderns lived their bodies through purging humors, balancing the temperature of the body with the caloric qualities of food, and positing the female body as an inversion of a male's anatomy. By examining how bodies are presented onstage, arguably the perfect venue for the presentation of bodies that undergo myriad changes—particularly because the genre displays bodies in front of other material bodies in the audience—we may not only approach a closer understanding of what is at risk for these characters in terms of masculinity/femininity, sexuality, and race, but we also begin to construct a more vivid picture of the early moderns' worldview. How they lived their bodies and performed their genders can help us make sense of the perceived risks involved in wearing the clothes of the opposite gender or consorting with someone from a different race. The phenomenological realities of these experiences and interactions for the characters onstage were influenced by the proliferation of anatomical and medical treatises, which promised to open up the mysterious body to rational explanation and dissection. As Jonathan Sawday illustrates in *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*, the new opportunities for displaying the previously unknown interiority and mechanizations of the early modern body produced both intellectual excitement and further anxiety concerning the body's susceptibility: "The threat or reality of violence runs through all Renaissance anatomizations, dissections, partitions, and divisions [….] But dissection or anatomization is […] an act whereby something can also be constructed, or given a concrete presence."[5] Caught between two

conflicting impulses, both of fear and desire for knowledge, the early moderns had to confront abiding anxieties concerning the permeability of the body and simultaneously adapt and/or reaffirm their phenomenological realities to the new knowledge about bodies. Unfortunately, this was not always an easy process, and many anatomical or medical treatises offered conflicting opinions on, for example, how certain humors influenced both the internal and external constitution of the body.

This thesis rests on a premise articulated by historian Nancy G. Siraisi: access to and proliferation of medical texts and ideas rendered other forms of learning, fictional texts and plays included, participants in the discourse on current ideologies surrounding the early moderns' physical selves: "[B]y the mid-sixteenth century (and indeed long before), a large body of vernacular literature transmitted medical ideas, remedies, and health practices derived from the learned tradition to both practitioners and lay readers."[6] Hence, learned professors of medicine at universities, lay practitioners in various cities or towns, and other interested readers were able to access both ancient medical texts and current, monumental anatomical treatises like Andreas Vesalius's *De Humani Corporis Fabrica*. This textual transmission of medical ideas appears in early modern literature, particularly drama, in multifaceted ways. With the influx of varying opinions on the body and the very real acknowledgement that learned practitioners were dissecting corpses, thus further opening up the body to external threats and disfigurations, it is not surprising that early modern dramatists exposed the contradictions and anxieties of the body onstage: new knowledge and existing ideologies concerning the body meet and clash in many dramatic works, thus illustrating the tenuous position the audience was in when it came to how they experienced their bodies each and every day. What this introduction and the following two chapters present is an exploration of how the early modern stage works to reaffirm, counteract, and/or challenge the perceived threats to the early modern body. These threats come in the form

of quotidian experience—each climate change, aging process, interaction with another individual, and countless other day-to-day activities all involved physical risks to the early modern body.

The Early Modern Body

Conceptions of the early modern body differed widely from our own notions of physical health and disease. While William Harvey's *De Motu Cordis*, first published in 1628, would help usher in a new conception of the body as enclosed and self-regulating, the sixteenth and early seventeenth century retained a view of the body, per Galen, Aristotle, and others, that posited it as open and permeable with the outside world. With his occasional metaphoric flourish, seventeenth-century anatomist Helkiah Crooke highlights the instability of the body and its many threats from the external environment: "The world is a Sea, the accidents and diuers occurrents in it are waues, wherein this small Bark is tossed and beaten vp and downe, and there is betwixt vs and our dissolution, not an inch boord, but a tender skinne, which the slenderest violence euen the cold aire is able to slice through."[7] Here, Crooke imagines the skin as a feeble defense against the torrents of fluids, vapors, and other material in the "sea" of the world which enter the body. As Gail Kern Paster explains, this continuous possibility of porosity garnered anxieties concerning the threats of bodily invasion and external influence: "Solubility, the sine qua non of bodily health, was a function of internal and external economies potentially fraught with peril."[8] This peril, as the Duke of Athens and Crooke both articulate, can come in various forms from the environment—too much heat can melt the figuratively waxen body, while a sea of fluids might invade the body and alter the healthy internal constitution of an individual. Hence, geohumoralism rendered the early modern body continually at risk in potential invasion and influence from the air, sea, the foods ingested, and the other bodies in contact with an individual. Transmission of attributes, diseases, and passions was a common trope for the early moderns—

bodies could adopt characteristics of other bodies, become infected, and even adopt the emotional reactions of those nearby. In regards to this solubility, this perpetual openness with the outside world, physicians and anatomists alike advised attempting a humoral balance.

The four humors—blood, phlegm, yellow bile (also known as choler) and black bile (or melancholy)—circulate, alter, and congeal in the early modern body and thus determine nearly every constituent of health: sex, temperament, development, aging, fertility or virility, and resistance to the changes of the surrounding natural and social environment. Anatomists, physicians, and medical practitioners were eager to provide an authoritative definition of what exactly a humor was and how it originated/operated within the body, for the humors affected both the maintenance of health and afforded explanations and methods for possible cures. Although published several decades after the early modern works discussed in this thesis, Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* echoes similar definitions of the four humors set forth in earlier works from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Burton's is the most comprehensive account of the bodily humors in Renaissance England and thus is representative of earlier thought on the meanings and functions of the four humors:

> A *Humor* is a liquid or fluent part of the Body, comprehended in it, for the preservation of it, and it is either innate and borne with vs, or adventitious and acquisite. The Radicall or innate, is dayly supplied by nourishment, which some call *Cambium*, and make those secondary Humors of *Ros* and *Gluters* to maintaine it: or acquisite, to maintaine those foure first primary Humors, comming and proceeding from the first Concoction in the Liuer.[9]

Burton's explication is notable for several reasons: for one, he articulates the idea that these humors are part of the body from birth, however one acquires more humors and fluids through digestions and imbibitions as an individual develops and ages. Secondly, Burton locates the

origination of the humors in the liver, which was considered the seat of passion, or the organ that creates responsive emotions. As mentioned earlier, the humors are inextricably linked to both emotional and caloric parallels; thus the humors arise, at least according to Burton, in the same area from which affective reactions stem.

Each humor also had its own distinct personality-type correlative: passions may arise from the liver, but other personal attributes are manifested through the relative proportion of a humor within the body. Hence, if one had too much blood, they consequently were more sanguine, or, to put it another way, those of a sanguine temperament were generally more confident, amiable, and content during problematic situations. Notably, anatomists and physicians believed that the blood found in veins and arteries was diluted with other humors. As Siraisi describes the popular conception, blood served as the primary form of nutrition for the body and encompassed the other, lesser humoral liquids of the body: "Blood occupied a special place among the humors. The actual fluid found in the veins was considered to be a sanguineous mass consisting of a mixture of the pure humor blood with the lesser proportion of the other three humors."[10] As we shall see, blood was problematic for the early moderns—menstrual, placental, and other forms of bleeding carried ideological meanings that were usually riddled with anxieties concerning purity and solidity, gender, racial superiority, or potential cannibalism. The other three humoral fluids and complexions also carried associated traits and taboos. The phlegmatic character, with an abundance of phlegm, is irresolute and inactive, while quantities of yellow bile (choler) within the body rendered an individual apt to react in anger to any obstacles or challenges. This trait was not solely an indication of masculinity, as females in early modern drama also become choleric when placed in trying situations. Titania, for example, alludes to a probable outburst if she continues to quarrel with Oberon: "We shall chide downright if I longer stay" (2.1.145). Likewise, Olivia, while attempting to maintain a façade of upper-class passivity

and decorum, becomes more choleric once Sir Toby tries her patience by challenging her lover and now-husband Sebastian: "Ungracious wretch, / Fit for the mountains and the barbarous caves, / Where manners ne'er were preached—out of my sight!" (4.1.43-45). As an afterthought, Olivia asks her husband, Sebastian-as-Cesario, to "Be not offended" (4.1.46). It is unclear, however, if Olivia fears that Cesario will be offended at her uncle's behavior or at her own display of charged emotion. Olivia's outburst seems uncharacteristic and thus unstable given the earlier indications that she is saturated with melancholy due to her brother's recent death.

Too much black bile produced melancholic individuals. Early modern author Timothy Bright devotes several hundred pages to the diagnosis and therapeutic regimen of melancholy, figured as both a humor and a disease, in his work *A Treatise of Melancholy*. He warns his readers: "The perturbations of melancholie are for the most parte, sadde and fearefull, and such as rise of them: as distrust, doubt, diffidence, or dispaire, sometimes furious, and sometimes merry in apparaunce."[11] Michel Foucault demonstrates how melancholy became a symptomatic precursor or cause of madness: "The notion of melancholia was fixed, in the sixteenth century, between a certain definition by symptoms and an explanatory principle concealed in the very term that designated it."[12] The associated threats, here of melancholy in particular and of the profusion of the humors in general, can influence both an individual's health and their internal psyches; the early moderns did not differentiate between psychological and physical health, which means that the quantitative amount of a particular humor in the body influenced both the disposition and the physical stasis of an individual.

The theory of the humors is inextricably linked with Galen's *complexio* theory—the influential concept of corresponding complexions: caloric qualities of heat, cold, moisture, and dryness correlate with many aspects of the body, including the qualities of the humors themselves, particular attributes of specific organs, and types of food that can harm or heal an

individual. A predominate, determinate humor can, to a degree, create audiences' expectations about how a particular character will react to an external or internal anxiety. Thus, Feste immediately identifies Orsino's melancholy, "Now the melancholy god protect thee" (2.4.72), which accords with both Orsino's surfeit of the actual humor (which he desires, like the "food of love," in excess) and his general disposition of being cold and dry. Not only were internal fluidity and temperature analogous to the humors, but seasons and the elements—earth, air, wind, and fire—were also part of this homologous system. As we can see, the layering of meanings and associations between the humors and their environmental and caloric counterparts resulted in many possible physical states of being and enabled early modern medics to prescribe dietary or therapeutic hyper- or hypo-thermatic solutions to disease. Physicians and medical practitioners, once locating a particular excess of humoral fluid within the patient, could prescribe food and environmental conditions of the opposite properties in order to reestablish internal balance within the ailing individual.

Physical differences between men and women during the early modern period, both actual and perceived, reinforced existing gendered hierarchies. The colder bodies of women meant that they retained more fluids and had to purge the excess liquids through menstruation, lactation, and other, charged ideological excretions, such as crying. The emotional component differentiating men from women reasoned that women were more affectively responsive because of their physical and mental constitution. Hence, each fluid exiting the body, whether from a man or a woman, carries stereotypical associations affecting one's masculinity or femininity: a woman who remains stoically dry when faced with tragedy is as unnatural as a profusely saturated, emotional man. The concept of natural and unnatural, in fact, informed many of the gender divisions circulating at the time. Paster, discussing women's psychophysiology, concludes that for the early moderns "women's coldness was both natural and environmental, an

innate feature compounded by the action of the six Galenic nonnaturals (air, diet, rest, and exercise, sleeping and waking, fullness and emptiness, and the passions)."[13] Women's internal temperament and the specific passions arising in their bodies also established the form and function of their sexual organs. Thomas Laqueur's work *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* discusses the early modern belief, inherited from the Greeks, of a physical homology between men and women—women were imperfect men, whose sex organs were equivalent to a man's, albeit in an inverted or misplaced position. Laqueur cites Galen as the primary source for this prevailing anatomical theory: "Galen, who in the second century A.D. developed the most powerful and resilient model of the structural, though not spatial, identity of the male and female reproductive organs, demonstrated at length that women were essentially men in whom a lack of vital heat—of perfection—had resulted in the retention, inside, of structures that in the male are visible without."[14] This one-sex model, Laqueur argues, while occasionally contested, was a prevailing medical theory that explained the anatomical (though not necessarily the epistemological or ontological) differences between men and women.

Other factors were equally influential in establishing one's level of susceptibility and contact with the outside world. As Paster, Floyd-Wilson, and others have observed, class status was another constituent of early modern geohumoralism that rendered a lower class individual more open to and saturated with fluids than someone from the higher classes. As Paster argues, "[t]he language of humoralism, thoroughly suffused by signifiers we assign to ethical discourse, establishes an internal hierarchy of fluids and functions within the body which is fully asssimilable to external hierarchies of class and gender."[15] Thus, if a woman of the upper class was leaky and brimming with excess fluids, a lower class woman was even more internally imbued with immoderate amounts of humors. We can see a clear physical differentiation, for example, between the Rude Mechanicals (especially Bottom) and someone of the upper class,

such as Demetrius or Lysander. When Demetrius satirically lauds the Lion's performance, he alludes to the idea that those of the lower class are more passionate and less rational than the upper class: "The very best at a beast, my lord, that e'er I saw" (5.1.223). The collation of Snug with a beast, both literally onstage and more figuratively in his inherent characteristics, suggests that Demetrius clearly views himself as more of a man than the bestial Lion, onstage and off. Paster also describes the specific physiology of servants: "The properly deferential servant—the servant who *feels* the subjection required of his place—would in theory have a natural, bodily basis for matching his mood to that of his master […] balancing his master's heaviness with his own lightness."[16] When Orsino accepts Viola as his future wife, his admission also speaks to the need for his servant and wife to match her physiological levels to her various statuses: "So much against the mettle of your sex" (5.1.11). His comment is full of wonder and, perhaps, slight disapproval concerning Viola's willingness to adopt the physiologically dangerous status of the obliging servant. On the other hand, Orsino might readily accept Viola because she has already proven that her body's internal processes can align with Orsino's hierarchically higher standing. Class status, then, informs characters' emotional reactions and their permeability. Nonetheless, even with this physical hierarchical structure, white, European bodies are almost always in the early modern worldview physically less impenetrable than the inordinate levels of fluidity and instability of foreign bodies.

Although the specific conditions of Jewish and Native American bodies will be explored in Chapter Three, I wish to briefly explain how and why the English in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries differentiated their physical conditions from other nationalities, races, and types of people—including so-called "monsters," hermaphrodites, and other bodies perceived as deviations from the natural order. Bright definitively separates the English body from foreign ones by enumerating differences in environment, diet, and habitual modes of

exercise: "Our English bodies, through the nature of the region, our kind of diet & nourishment, our custom of life, are greatly diuers from those straunge nations, wherby ariseth great varietie of humours, and excrements in our bodies from theirs, and so the causes of diseases rising vpon breach of diet, the (diet being of an other sort) must needs bee vnlike."[17] Here, Bright differentiates the English body from all others, thus explaining why the English have singular ailments separate from the French or Spanish. However, while Bright espouses a specific English bodily ideal here, the early moderns imagined and reinforced racial difference through the physical stereotypes they placed upon Others' bodies, stereotypes which elided regional location and instead pinpointed skin color and internal processes as dissimilar from, and thus potentially dangerous to, the European body. Hence, a Moor was not only intellectually and morally different from a white, European individual, but he or she also had, according to the early moderns, material signifiers of his or her hierarchically lowered status. Discussing specifically the physiological and anatomical attributes of the early modern black subject, Imtiaz Habib describes the ascription of both damaging and curative properties onto the body of the black subject: "in the terminology of disease, in varying degrees, the black subject is both an abnormal physical condition needing modification and itself a curative for the most virulent malady."[18] In many ways, Chapter Three will build upon Habib's synthesis of historical phenomenology and postcolonial studies in an effort to explicate the supposed physical conditions of Jews and Native Americans during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Notably, Habib's analysis is useful here because all races, besides the ostensibly white Europeans, were conflated in the anatomical, travel, polemic, propagandistic, and literary texts of the early modern era. A Turk, a Moor, a Jew, a Native American, and any other non-European body acquired similar physical maladies or conditions that in turn helped to bolster a sense of racial superiority in the early modern English.

Scholarship on the Early Modern Body

Scholars studying the early modern body in the field of historical phenomenology differentiate themselves from scholars earlier in the century who also noted and explored the historical specificity of Galenic humoralism and the early modern body, but, as Sean McDowell summarizes, "new body scholarship approaches embodiment with significantly different interests, emphases, and goals and thus is providing readers with a greater degree of historical sensitivity about embodiment."[19] McDowell goes on to say that historical phenomenology "departs from the old [scholarship on the body] in finding in this cultural context not rigid and static taxonomies for explaining human personhood, but supple, nuanced explanations for the felt experience of embodiment."[20] Discussing the expanse in scholarship, Roy Porter jokes "[b]ody history has become the historiographical dish of the day."[21] In his essay, Porter notes that his earlier 1992 essay, "History of the Body," primarily called for scholars to examine the early moderns' specific phenomenological theories. This call, Porter concludes, has certainly been answered, primarily because of the growth in interest among scholars in gay and lesbian studies, Foucauldian and post-Foucauldian studies on discourse, and contemporary epidemics such as AIDS, all of which have fueled interest in the historical and transhistorical fragility of the body. Indeed, revisionist historians and literary critics alike have responded to Porter's enthusiasm for body scholarship in ways that reach beyond his original plea and study numerous aspects of the body amid other, sometimes clashing, discourses on early modern spiritual, intellectual, racialized, and gendered selves.

Among the most influential scholars in new body scholarship is Gail Kern Paster, whose books *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciples of Shame in Early Modern England* and *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* both examine the early moderns' lived experiences of their bodies and how anxieties, emotions, and realities of the body are

enacted onstage. In *Humoring the Body* Paster builds upon, and also departs from, Michael C. Schoenfeldt's *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Schoenfeldt's project is to establish "the empowerment that Galenic physiology and ethics bestowed upon the individual."[22] Paster, however, disagrees with Schoenfeldt's laudatory stance on physical equality, noting how this was not always, or even usually, the case: "The implication of such phrasing—that all persons are equal under the laws of Renaissance Galenism—simply ignores the realities of social and gender hierarchy everywhere in the period because it mistakenly presumes an unmarked 'individual' prior to biological—that is to say hierarchical—classification."[23] Paster's work also borrows from other theoretical approaches: by conjoining Mikhail Bakhtin's concepts of the grotesque and classical bodies with what Paster terms "psychophysiology," or the subjective experience of humoralism by an individual (an experience that is necessarily tied to both physical and psychological actualities), Paster establishes a method of inquiry that provides new insights into the historical specificity of the early moderns' lived experiences. More importantly, by privileging the instability of the early modern body and the hierarchical ordering of the humors, organs, and ratios of fluids within an individual, Paster calls to our attention the many implications of the early modern body's communication with the external environment and the internal fracas occurring within. Paster extends this discussion of interior turmoil to concepts of bodily shame and explores the subjective, individual experiences of humoralism. Paster aims "to outline the difference humoralism, or *any other* influential account of human physiology, makes to the subjective experience of being-in-the-body and thus to such matters as the inescapable, though by no means historically uniform experience of bodily shame […]."[24] Paster's notion of early modern shame will inform later readings in this thesis on both the physical threats of male cross-dressing and on racialized others—both groups enact and protest the humoral shame that

others ascribe to their bodies. For example, in Chapter Three I argue that Caliban's stench operates as a material signifier of his inability to rejoin Prospero's reconciled groupings at the end of the play. Moreover, Caliban's odor, as shameful as it is, also reinforces his own subjectivity and allows Caliban to perhaps resist, by utilizing, the collective racial humiliations that Prospero, Stephano, and others attach to his body.

Describing the fraught nature of early moderns' experiences with their bodies also involves recognizing, as mentioned briefly above, the centrality of the passions and the environment in generating the internal constitution of the body. As Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Floyd-Wilson argue in their introduction to *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*, the humoral components of an individual were not the only variables influenced by the outside world. Early modern psychological states of being and changes were also a part of the communicable world of humors and vapors both within and outside of the body: "early modern psychology only partially shares the priority we place on inwardness, alongside very different conceptions of emotions as physical, environmental, and external phenomena."[25] Hence, every emotional reaction of a character onstage involves both interior and exterior influences. Floyd-Wilson further develops this concept, which she terms "geohumoralism," in *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. For Floyd-Wilson, geohumoralism involves the instability of northern, English bodies, even when posed against a potentially more physiologically tumultuous, racialized Other: "The environment—whether that meant the air, temperature, diet, and terrain, or the effects of education, rhetoric, or fashion—necessarily produced and destabilized early modern English selves."[26] The implications of Floyd-Wilson's argument here are numerous. For one, Renaissance scholars need to recognize the formative and communicable aspects of environment and geographic location when considering the humoral reactions of characters. Whether in the Mediterranean locale of Athens

or, as in *Twelfth Night*, the slightly more exotic Illyria, geographical and racial aspects of these cities influence and partly determine the particular humoral makeup of the characters. As Floyd-Wilson illustrates, Othello's country of origin plays a pivotal role in locating his motives and the forms in which his reactions occur.[27] Nonetheless, even in Shakespeare's more overtly anglicized comedies, the environment acts as an agent of change upon the characters. For example, when Demetrius attempts to rid himself of Helena, he warns her "Tempt not too much the hatred of my spirit; / For I am sick when I do look on thee" (2.1.211-212), meaning that his anger upon being followed by an unwanted lover is initiated by the sight of Helena, who instills a feeling of nausea in Demetrius. His reaction to Helena, then, is a manifestation of a two-fold communication: his emotional state of being is induced by the physical presence of another body *and* by the enveloping darkness of the woods, which also, with Helena, "tempts" Demetrius by presenting the possibility of performing rape or other acts of violence upon his admirer. We can see, then, that the earlier example of Hermia's waxen body becoming melted and hardened by outside bodies and environmental influences is similar to Demetrius's emotional reaction to Helena's amorous persistence in that Shakespeare presents both bodies, male and female, as mutable and open to external influences. The characters' physical and psychological conditions involve the influx and expression of passions from both within and without the body. Particularly in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, seemingly civilized characters are transformed into potential rapists by their contact with the pernicious environment. The elements are much more influential than Helena or the other characters can assume.

Floyd-Wilson's analysis of geohumoralism also has provocative implications for the study of race in sixteenth and seventeenth century England and the early moderns' attempt to adapt and translate Italian or Mediterranean concepts of the body to the climatic and humoral conditions in the northern isles. As Floyd-Wilson argues, the English were aware of the

incongruity of relying on ancient texts that specified Mediterranean and southern European states of being in opposition to the environment: "England's northern climate and the English people's northern status colored their perspective on everything from fashion to medicine to politics."[28] As such, the early moderns began to embrace the northern "barbarity" specific to England, Scotland, and Ireland, while at the same time establishing a hierarchical understanding of the English body as racially superior to both other national identities and other races, particularly African. This geohumoralism grounded in race also ushered in other hierarchical orderings: "Achieving 'racial' temperance, in other words, is analogical to securing masculinity or to cultivating nobility."[29] Hence, race in early modern England was a matter of both climatic differences and self-initiated moves toward creating temperance within the body by eating the right foods, performing the correct physical and spiritual actions, and withholding from excessive emotional reactions in times of passion. Floyd-Wilson's argument has significance for how we read both race and the body in Shakespeare's and other early modern dramatists' works because it speaks to the persistent interaction of the body with the environment and the medical understandings of race and interactionism that are present on the early modern stage. In Chapter Three I read the deleterious ways in which the racialized body might affect the white Europeans (both in the play and in the audience) and explore how this fear is transcribed onto the bodies of Shylock and Caliban.

David Hillman and Carla Mazzio also describe the fear of the body's porosity and fluid interaction as articulated in anatomical texts: "early modern anatomies—texts that depend upon the textual and pictorial isolation of parts of the body—are conspicuously fraught with anxiety regarding [the] dialectic of unity and partition."[30] The partitioning of the body, both in literary blazons and in actual dissections taking place during the early modern era, elicits both fear of the vulnerability of the body and avid curiosity and fervor in attempting to understand how the body

functions. Hillman and Mazzio's edited collection *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe* is comprised of essays that each pinpoint one particular aspect of the early modern body—including joints, breasts, the clitoris, and the stomach—and contributes to our understanding of the early modern's fascination with and aversion to the segmented corpse. Segmentation of the body has both epistemic and material consequences for scholars: "We may say, in fact, that in early modern Europe more generally, the multiple traditions of medical and anatomical description, of Petrarchism, of religious and cultural iconography, converged to give individual parts of the body more semiotic complexity than they had ever had before. Nowhere in this period is the status of the part simply a given."[31] We have already seen how Hermia's potential disfiguration involves more than a physical threat, but rather resonates with current anxieties surrounding the permeability of the body and its individual parts, the patriarchal attempt to control these rebellious segments, and also the sexual reproductive capabilities of a woman who is composed of materials that are both mutable and able to create other changeable bodies. In *Twelfth Night*, the semiotic and phenomenological anxieties of the body are perhaps more pointed once Viola dresses as a man. In determining to present herself as Cesario, Viola specifically chooses to pose as a castrati in order to advertise her singing abilities: "I'll serve this duke. / Thou shalt present me as an eunuch to him" (1.2.51-52). The publicized lack of an anatomical member, however, has far more gendered and physical implications than Viola realizes. By predetermining what her relationship to Orsino will be, Viola allows for the fact that her role as servant—as eunuch particularly—will necessarily involve considerations on her body. If, for the early moderns, class status rendered one more permeable and irrationally guided, then Viola willingly debases her body to this physiological and social subordination in order to prevent danger to her person (and maidenhead). Nonetheless, Viola lowers her physical status even more than necessary as a way to nullify any masculine jealousy Orsino might feel.

Interestingly, Viola-as-Cesario's castrated status is either not mentioned to Olivia or, if she is aware of Cesario's lack of a penis, Olivia willingly disregards this aspect of Cesario's body. Moreover, without the symbolic phallus, Viola anticipates the sexual nature of her relationship with Orsino even before she has met him. Later in the play Orsino refers to Viola's lack of phallic agency when he claims "thy small pipe / Is as the maiden's organ, shrill and sound" (1.5.31-32). The pipe, ostensibly Viola's throat, also serves as a dual reference to Viola's anatomy—because she lacks a significant male anatomical part, Viola's "pipe" is hollow and a receptacle for Orsino. Yet here we can see that anatomical segmentation or castration plays more than a Freudian role in determining the motives and agency of characters onstage. Instead, Viola's status as a servant, as a eunuch, and as an object for non-reproductive desire tells us more about the early modern body and the complexities of gender and class than we might originally notice. Just as Demetrius's body and morality might become transformed by the environmental elements, Viola's body undergoes changes through the imposed class status she puts on her body, allowing her to fit more easily in the heterosexual and masculine pairings at the end of the play by invalidating any threat she might have posed as a man. In both plays, the environment and theories on gender and class indicate that the final heterosexual couplings are much more tenuous and darkened by the bodily degradations possible to both sexes' bodies.

Besides bodily segmentation, other scholars have focused on the diseases of the early modern body. Whether transmitted from international waters or developed and exacerbated on national soil, diseases in early modern England carried, as they do today, specific gendered and class-specific connotations. Jonathan Gil Harris's *Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England* juxtaposes the fraught project of establishing and maintaining nationhood with early modern pathological discourse. Both the discourses on disease and the nation's economy "helped to create the other's horizons of textual and conceptual possibility;

changes in one helped produce changes in the other."[32] For Orsino, part of his ideological project during the final moments of *Twelfth Night* is to assimilate Viola's re-gendered body into the proper national and social sphere of Illyria, thus eliminating her outside status—as both a man and as a foreigner: "Cesario, come— / For so you shall be while you are a man, / But when in other habits you be seen, / Orsino's mistress and his fancy's queen" (5.1.378-381). Given Harris's discussion of the pathologization of foreign and feminine bodies, Orsino's lines illustrate to the desire to reintroduce the body he desires into the nationalist and normative locution of social tolerance—as a newly named "master's mistress," promising to, though not onstage dressing in her "maiden weeds" (5.1.250), Orsino calls attention to Viola's previous and current masculine persona as a means for differentiating this state from her future role as naturalized wife to the Duke. Viola will be subjected to Orsino's "fancy" and her nominative role as "queen" only rhetorically paints her physically and socially subordinated role to Orsino. Orsino, by calling attention to Viola's masculine status and eliding concerns over her non-native body, asserts the physical and national appropriateness of his visually inappropriate partner.

Siraisi also argues that early modern medicine involved an awareness of and interaction with other fields of study in what is known as "medical humanism." This medical humanism provided for the "conviction that medicine intersected with or benefited from other branches of knowledge, but [medical practitioners] offered a range of possibilities when it came to identifying what the most important of those branches might be."[33] For Harris, who emphasizes the other side of this interaction among medicine and other fields of study by focusing on how economics utilized medicinal and humoral discourse, the interchange of ideas led to a conflux of ideological notions of the body, disease, and the nation: "The all-important mercantilist notion of the balance of trade, even as it draws on the new model of Italian double-entry bookkeeping, resonates with humoralism's characteristic vocabulary of equipoise and homeostasis."[34] For the

purposes of my argument, the idea that medicine and disease were significantly involved in other discourses from numerous, sometimes discordant, fields plays a considerable role in how I interpret the texts of the early modern period. *De Morbis Fœmineis, The Womans Counsellour: or, The Feminine Physitian*, a 1657 translation of Alessandro Massario's *Massarius de Morbis Mulier*, for example, combines several discourses and appeals to both men's and women's sensibilities regarding disease and medical treatment in the opening chapter:

> this being a Subiect, which too much modesty, or indeed as it is, simple folly of many of the female Sex hath hindred them from attaining to; and others, to fill their purses, have, and do still endeavour to conceale; But the want thereof being much, and the benefit great to save the health, and sometimes the lives of many poor women, *whom God made* as like himself, as he did the greatest Queen in the world; is the cause of bringing this so much necessary work to every ones capacity.[35]

Obviously, the author's primary intent is to market to women, both midwives and self-diagnosing housewives, by engaging with their sense of urgency and necessity in becoming aware of feminine medical maladies. However, Massario also borrows from economic, political, and class-based hierarchical discourse in establishing the import of his subject. The jump from describing women as foolish and then elevating their status as images of God also involves strong religious and gendered elements that repeatedly arise in early modern medical treatises. As this example illustrates, medicine and disease were closely bound with other types of study or modes of thought. Sometimes, the actual topic under discussion in medical texts is unclear. Often, particular religious or political biases enter into an anatomist's discussion of the body and work to conflate the varying problems associated with gaining an authoritative understanding of how the body operates. Hence, in the final coupling of *Twelfth Night* Orsino renounces his claim to Viola and her body in service and quickly adopts a similar ownership via marriage:

> Your master quits you; and for your service done him,
> So much against the mettle of your sex,
> So far beneath your soft and tender breeding,
> And since you call'd me master for so long,
> Here is my hand: you shall from this time be
> Your master's mistress. (5.1.310-315)

Orsino's proposal of marriage, focusing on Viola's body as it does, "your soft and tender breeding," also contains discourse on Viola's class status, her nubility, and her intellectual vigor in working against "the mettle" of her sex. As in Massario's text, Orsino's lines here indicate an awareness of various modes of thought and study that speak to several different academic, social, and sexual discourses. An idea might rest on the physical properties of a character, but as in Orsino's lines, these ideas quickly depart from one area of focus and combine several, sometimes competing, notions on the body's role and function in various physical and social spheres.

Noting the pervading concatenation of discourses and gender or racial stereotypes associated with disease, other scholars have also explored the enactment of these ideological interchanges on the early modern stage in light of pathological anxieties. In William Kerwin's *Beyond the Body: The Boundaries of Medicine and English Renaissance Drama*, various aspects of midwifery, alchemy, surgery, anti-theatricality, and physician and patient theories and experiences are explored via medical case studies in order to demonstrate how competing and agreeing fields of thought shaped and altered early modern medicine.[36] Likewise, Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson's edited collection *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage* undertakes to explore "the perilous and shifting conjunctions of nature, disease, the patent, the practitioner's art, performance, and the representations of these conjunctions in early modern drama."[37] Each essay in the collection pays attention to the ways in which disease

and discourses about the body interact with theater. As Moss and Peterson explain, "[m]edical discourse helped shape the normative models for individuals belonging to an emerging English nation, thereby aiding in constructing the exotic and monstrous at the same time."[38] Early modern notions of alterity, particularly physical otherness, were both created and reinforced by the language and the performance of disease. Hence, the answer to Shylock's equivocal speech that asks whether Jews and Christians are "subject to the same diseases" (3.1.57) is, in early modern medical ideologies, no. Jews have different, and perhaps more pernicious, diseases.

The amount of scholarly attention paid to the early modern body is quite extensive and cannot be entirely accounted for here. However, I have attempted to provide synopses of some of the significant works in new body scholarship that will prove useful for the rest of my argument because my work builds upon and departs from these authors in important ways. For one, I look to the ways in which historical phenomenology may benefit from the lenses of other critical approaches, such as gender studies and post-colonialism. Many early modern literary scholars have written on specific aspects of the body, thus providing more nuanced, and provocative, analyses of the early modern body. The work done on blood, on the gendered body, on sex, and on anatomical blazons or dismemberments in early modern literature has produced new ways of understanding the early modern body. Nonetheless, there are still topics or particular areas in new body scholarship that have more room for critical consideration, and this thesis takes up several issues left relatively unaddressed by early modern scholars. For one, Jean Howard, Marjorie Garber, and others have thoroughly researched early modern cross-dressing, but have not touched on the physical implications that this act of wearing a woman's clothing might have on a man's body. Hence, Chapter Two explores the potential physical and ideological transformations that may occur for the man who cross-dresses in early modern literature. Likewise, while the works of Floyd-Wilson, Paster, and others have influenced my initial

investigations into early modern race, these analyses do not focus as much on physical attributions of racialized humiliations as I do in Chapter Three.

Classical and Grotesque Bodies

With these unfixed, ambiguous modes of understanding their bodies, constructing an analysis of the early modern body and its relationship in how it is presented, altered, and enlarged in literature requires more than a mere transposition of early modern medical theories onto the bodies of the characters onstage. For example, while we might look to the humoral composition of Orsino, Feste, or Hermia, the accompanying gendered and racialized implications of the humoral theory and other early modern conceptions of the body are far more interesting and complex. Bakhtin's influential *Rabelais and His World* includes a helpful theoretical apparatus for examining the early modern body: the classical and grotesque bodies and the carnivalesque atmosphere in which these bodies operate. Using Bahktin's concept of classical and grotesque bodies, we can approach a closer understanding of how the physical encroachments of contact with other bodies, reproduction, racial identity, and cross-dressing all threaten the body in some degree. For Bakhtin, the classical body is unchangeable, authoritative, masculine, and, of course, closed off from the outside world. In discussing the shift from a medieval conception of grotesque bodies to the idealization of the classical body in the Renaissance, Bakhtin notes

> [T]he body was first of all a strictly completed, finished product. Furthermore, it was isolated, alone, fenced off from all other bodies. All signs of its unfinished character, of its growth and proliferation were eliminated; its protuberances and offshoots were removed, its convexities (signs of new sprouts and buds) smoothed out, its apertures closed. The ever unfinished nature of the body was hidden, kept secret; conception, pregnancy, childbirth, death throes, were almost never shown.[39]

Yet this classical body, ideal as it might be, is never found on the early modern stage unless satirized in comedies, to only be mocked as unattainable. No entirely closed-off character appears—even in *The Winter's Tale* Hermione's statuesque transformation does not elide her previous porosity and abundance in childbirth, lactation, and, albeit false, the stain of potential licentiousness inherent in all early modern female bodies. Instead, all characters on the early modern stage are in some degree grotesque bodies. For Bakhtin, the grotesque body is communal and saturated with fluids, particularly those fluids found in the "lower stratum," where the sex organs and the processes of life and death are also primarily located or articulated. Grotesque bodies constitute the convivial and communal nature of the carnival. Since the carnival is a space in which order is overturned, the collective grotesque body thrives in this environment. Of course, just as there is no entirely classical body onstage, only attempts towards it, there are only grotesque character types, emblematically serving the function of the grotesque and moving towards a collective grotesquerie by means of acting as one agent of the grotesque body, a symbol of what might spread, infect, or influence others. Both the classical and the grotesque body exist in relation to one another, and one cannot speak of a grotesque body without recalling its closed-off counterpart. Nonetheless, on the Renaissance stage classical bodies are only at stasis for a moment, and then Hermione's body is reanimated to rejoin her husband and daughter. Likewise, Bottom may be lower class, hirsute, with bestial appendages, but he is still, nonetheless, hierarchically aware of his body and how it must be presented to the upper classes. This consciousness, then, works to establish Bottom and the other Rude Mechanicals as only semi-grotesque. Their grotesque bodies threaten upper class individuals like the Duke and Hippolyta sitting in the audience, but they still maintain a hierarchical order that belies any complete classification of one or the other group as entirely classical and unchangeable or completely grotesque and expansive. In *Twelfth Night*, Malvolio's desire to marry Olivia is

partly ludicrous because of the physical disparities between class and bodies—Malvolio's melancholy and propensity to quickly imitate the more outlandish fashions of the upper classes illustrate the physical and social barriers that he cannot cross. In this case, Malvolio's body, saturated and rendered excessively singular by the clothing he dons, is too physiologically and absurdly ostentatious to transcend the physical and social limitations that bar him from attaining a more classical body.

To reach beyond this preliminary classification of the classical and grotesque body requires that we look to other theoretical apparatuses, including Paster's articulation of historical phenomenology, in order to arrive at a more nuanced understanding of the early modern body. Paster reorients Bakhtin's analyses and applies them to the subjective, humoral individual. As Paster claims,

> [b]ecause humoralism was the governing paradigm of function within which any individual perceived his or her own body in the early modern period, humoral theory can be used heuristically to connect Bakhtin's totalizing narrative of the contrasting bodily canons with subjective economies and to locate the subject's being-in-the-body within the long-term historical changes with which Bakhtin is most directly concerned.[40]

In many ways, this thesis seeks to achieve what Paster here proposes: a synthesis of the anatomized, theorized body with the individually fraught experiences of characters onstage in order to see exactly how physical stability, cross-dressing, and race play a role in potentially undermining or bolstering a character's agency. Viola's body betrays her status as a woman before Orsino is aware that she is not the eunuch Cesario, Bottom and the Rude Mechanicals' play both amuses and threatens their hierarchically elevated audience (both onstage and off), and Olivia's uncharacteristic outburst at her uncle belies her attempt to remain stoically passive in front of her lover.

Materials

While Shakespeare certainly depicts a wide array of bodily experiences in his characters, other early modern authors also explore the phenomenological and epistemic issues surrounding the nuances of early modern embodiment. Hence, although the primary author I discuss in the following chapters is Shakespeare, I also do not exclude other early modern dramatists and authors. In almost every imaginable mode and state of being, early modern dramatists correspondingly depict a character who ascribes to several bodily stereotypes and yet, more importantly, many of these characters deviate from the "natural" body in provokingly intricate ways. Thus, while we have old men, lactating and pregnant mothers, melancholic lovers, social outcasts of different races, class-bound men and women interacting with their bodies, cross-dressing men and women, and other types of bodies in Shakespeare's work, other dramatists, such as Thomas Middleton, William Rowley, Christopher Marlowe, and John Webster, were also contributing to the discourse of lived bodily experience. Throughout this thesis, I look to other dramatists and authors in order to gather a more polyvocal presentation on how the early moderns interpreted their bodies. As such, I also analyze other fictional works, most notably Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*.

The early modern English both determined outsiders and reaffirmed their own physical superiority through bodily discourse. Yet this extends to early modern masculinity as well. The ways in which all these dramatic and non-dramatic texts work to participate in questions concerning subjective bodily experience indicates that the early moderns used the body as a means for determining relative masculine impermeability, even though this was never a steadied state of being, but rather an ideal towards which men like Pyrocles, Antony, and others reach. If physiologically, cross-dressers and racialized Others were humorally worse off than the stable, "natural" body of English males, then, the reasoning went, judgments on clothing, religion, and

subjectivity were justified. These texts all demonstrate that ideological subjugations were almost always grounded in material signifiers of moral and intellectual inferiority exhibited by these outsiders.

Of course, in order to understand fully the early modern body, I also frequently reference anatomical and medical texts that are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the literary texts examined. Crooke, Bright, Burton, and many other, perhaps lesser known anatomists, physicians, and physiologists play a large role in my discussion due to the extensive, and sometimes contrasting, explications they provide on the workings of the early modern body. Furthermore, I look to travel narratives, particularly those of Samuel Purchas, Pierre Boaistuau, and Thomas Hariot, which establish geographical and material conceptions of Native Americans and other races and worked to authorize assurances of the English's superiority. Finally, this thesis presents many other types of texts and discourses in order to provide multi-textual and conceptual ways of understanding the early modern body. All materials date from the late fifteenth to the mid-seventeenth century in order to account for Shakespeare's and others' intellectual milieu without transposing anachronistic concepts onto early modern notions.

Outline

The following two chapters expand on the initial premises laid out in this introduction. These chapters elucidate a particular aspect of contentious physical state of being in early modern England, namely the continual, conscious need to maintain physical solidity while differentiating bodies of difference from ideal, masculine bodies. Chapter 2, "The Covering of the Body: Material Transformations in Male Cross-Dressing and Appropriation of Feminine Apparel in Early Modern Literature," explores the gendered implications for an adult male who cross-dresses and how this affects his material body. Notions of anatomical and fungible alterations in the body extended to ideas about masculinity and femininity in early modern

England. Further, clothing served as an influentially formative sheath for the body. This covering, while denoting class status, age, and gender, could also give important clues into the internal health of an individual. By deliberately wearing the clothes of a woman, an adult male put his body at risk in potentially changing his internal and external constitution. Yet men could also obtain articles of clothing from a female, whether given freely or obtained surreptitiously, and thus, via women's clothing, could prey upon and potentially infect the female's body. By looking at Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Cymbeline*, and Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's *The Changeling*, we see numerous examples of men wearing women's clothing and using clothing for sexually nefarious means. The implications of this threat of change are numerous—a male could willingly become more feminine or lose his subjective agency through the covering on his body. In turn, this cross-dressing onstage, whether literal or implied, affects the ways in which other characters and the audiences interpret and react to the patriarchal stability that these cross-dressing males attempt to retain. Both the predatory and the self-damnatory aspects of adult males cross-dressing suggest that the physically altering aspects of clothing and the uses of the body's covering were potentially damaging to a male's agency, his masculinity, and, most importantly, his body.

Chapter 3, "Monstrous Bodies: Shylock, Caliban, and Racial Humiliation," builds on this discussion on masculinity and femininity through the lens of race and examines how early modern travel narratives depicted Native Americans and Jews. The derogatory stereotypes attributed to both races, in contrast to the English race, feature numerous physical descriptions that appear on the early modern stage. However, in important ways, these stereotypes are contested and rendered more ambiguous in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Tempest*. Both Shylock and Caliban encounter racial stereotypes grounded in the physical

appearance and internal constitution of their bodies. The ways in which both men counteract the physical qualities of disease, lechery, and moral delinquency provide insight into how these subjected Others use the language and ideas of colonialism (both spiritual and geographical subjugation) to turn the concept of English physical superiority on its head. By looking at how Shylock and Caliban are both forcibly made to recognize their physical inferiority and counteract these deleterious notions gives us significantly new ways in which to approach the concept of race, agency, and exploration on the Shakespearean stage.

Conclusion

Recognizing the material possibilities in early modern texts opens the door to understanding the profound physical anxieties the early moderns experienced. The body is always a waxen figure: it is changeable, susceptible, and lacks complete autonomy from outside influences. As we have seen, Hermia's body is not the only one composed of wax. No one escapes the grotesque realities of early modern medical and anatomical theories. The body is opened up, available for inspection; however, with this inspection comes new opportunities for introspection into why, in a world fraught with diseases, vapors, and countless fluids, one even tries to regain some sense of physical stability. This thesis is about that struggle and argues that various characters' aim for a classical body or for imposing a classical body upon their daughters, lovers, or subjects is a way to ensure that one does not completely give in to the external and internal threats that continually invade the early modern body. In many ways, Hermia's inflexibility in yielding to her father or Viola's cross-dressing shows that Shakespeare's heroines are just as likely as his heroes to manipulate the discourse on a body's waxen qualities. Indeed, despite the fact that Viola's previous stint as a lower-class eunuch, including the possible bodily alterations these social changes recall, allows her to fit easily into the final heterosexual pairings at the end of the play, Oliva's desire for Viola is the initial cause

of Viola's complaint. Oliva, whom Viola accuses of possessing an impressionable heart, thus retains the object of her desire, albeit with an additional member. That no man in either *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or *Twelfth Night* can act as sculptor to a woman's body speaks to the remarkable subjectivity the women in these plays attain via their bodies, and that the cast of the feminine, waxen body may acquire a shape and purpose all its own.

Chapter Two

The Covering of the Body: Male Cross-Dressing and Material Transformations in Early Modern Literature

Making and Unmaking Men: *Elizabeth I* and Sartorial Ambiguities

In the 1998 film *Elizabeth I*, the Queen (played by Cate Blanchett) witnesses her wooer's cross-dressing habits and dismisses his suitability as her future husband. The Queen discovers her foreign, eccentric suitor both conspicuously surrounded by orgiastic revelry and painted in elaborate make-up while dressed as a woman. Immediately Elizabeth recognizes the obstacle to the Duke's proposed marriage, which appears in the film to rest entirely on the fact that the Duke partakes in cross-dressing and immoral self-indulgence. The twentieth century's idealization of masculinity, and the concomitant suggested sexual prowess of men who dress according to societal expectations of what men should wear, renders the Duke's penchant for wearing women's clothing as socially and sexually transgressive. His sartorial habits complicate the typical outward signifiers of manhood, which involve divisions between men's and women's clothing. However, the early moderns may have interpreted the Duke's behavior differently. There were still clear severances between men's and women's apparel in the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras. However, the act of cross-dressing was an unfixed, ambiguous indication of identity—the clothing that one dressed in defined and determined the gender and supposed behavior of the body, potentially altering the anatomical sex and sexual proclivities of the cross-dressing individual. The physical consequences of what was at stake in Renaissance male cross-dressing rendered the act of putting on a woman's attire much more physiologically damaging to the cross-dresser, and the Duke of Anjou's body would have been considered damaged goods in the market for the Queen's hand, for the Duke has already subjected his body to the

feminizations and physical harms of cross-dressing.[41] Interestingly, the Queen herself could cross-dress through wearing men's armor, but only as a performance of her political body, not the virginal feminine body beneath. For Elizabeth, political and social agendas allowed her, as monarch, to transcend the worrisome effects of cross-dressing and the Queen's two bodies could utilize both masculine and feminine personas. However, for a foreign, masculine body such as the Duke's, such cross-dressing would have been much more impermissible.[42]

In this chapter I argue that early modern notions of the body and clothing affect the masculinity—the intellectual, virile, and political agency—of cross-dressing males in deleterious, socially and physically damaging ways. Hence, Pyrocles in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, Antony in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, and Falstaff in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* all subject their masculinity to questionable alterations and feminizations primarily through feminine clothing. All three men in these works cross-dress, yet their act of wearing a woman's clothes involves recognizing the effects this act has upon their bodies. Hence, Pyrocles is warned that his masculine intellect may suffer from his term as Zelmane, Cleopatra acknowledges that future generations will mock Antony's feminizations, and Falstaff is made the laughingstock of any entire community. Yet obtaining the clothing of a woman also involves potentially invading and contaminating her body as well. Consequently, the last portion of this chapter will discuss the infectious and predatory opportunities available to men who surreptitiously acquire a woman's clothes, particularly De Flores in Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's *The Changeling* and Giacomo in *Cymbeline*. De Flores duplicitously gains Beatrice's gloves and thus furthers his ploy to possess Beatrice's body through wearing and utilizing her clothing, while Giacomo symbolically rapes Innogen through her stolen bracelet. In these literary examples, clothing becomes inseparable from the original owner's body and thus when circulated threatens the owner's physical purity. Cross-dressing in early

modern England physically and morally damages all those involved, particularly influencing other, intangible attributes such as the cross-dresser's supposed gender, sexual vigor, and honor. The bodily components of cross-dressing contaminate the body of the wearer and others surrounding him. I argue that once a man donned the attire of a woman, his internal stability was affected to such a degree that his masculinity—demonstrated through his virility and agency—in turn was also rendered unstable and uncertain. Indeed, as early modern anti-theatrical tracts argue, cross-dressing males are dangerous to patriarchal authority and political stability, and the physical dangers in which they willingly put their bodies through dressing as a woman indicate a lack of masculine forethought into the personal and public consequences their cross-dressing has on the wider social sphere.

The Duke's behavior in the film is clearly meant to connote the inadequacy of the Duke's masculinity via his clothing and behavior, which, however problematic, serves as a prime example of the fraught associations clothing has with gender, both in the 16th-17th centuries and now. Nonetheless, sixteenth-century audiences would have seen the Duke's cross-dressing as a physical, neither strictly sexual nor affective, barrier to his marriage to the Queen. Indeed, as the works I discuss in this chapter suggest, early modern audiences would have worried over the many bodily and emotive alterations possible for a male who wore the clothing of a woman.

The changeability of sex through clothing gave material accoutrements further weight on the scale of masculine or feminine identification. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century anatomical treatises claimed that by wearing male clothing and acting as a man, a woman could turn into one—with heat her vagina, or her inverted penis, could drop from the body. Helkiah Crooke articulates this Galenic theory of a woman's inner anatomy, which the early moderns inherited from the ancients, in *Microcosmographia*: "For the ancients haue thought that a woman might become a man, but not on the contrary side a man become a woman."[43] Although men were

thought to be less mutable in their reproductive organs, gender was nonetheless a factor of environmental and humoral influences, which could alter an individual who becomes either more physically female or male. The material realities perceived by the early moderns through clothing had many more consequences than a simple judgment on sexuality. Instead, the body is also at risk in wearing clothes of the opposite gender; while for men cross-dressing could not affect anatomical sex, it could materially threaten other forms of masculinity—including virility, agency, and intellectual acuity. Phillip Stubbes's anti-theatrical tract *The Anatomie of Abuses* describes the transformation from human to beast that occurs in cross-dressers' bodies: "Our Apparell was giuen vs as a signe distinctiue to discern betwixt sex and sex, & therfore one to weare the Apparel of another sex, is to participate with the same, and to adulterate the veritie of his owne kinde. [Cross-dressers become] [m]onsters of bothe kindes, half women, half men."[44] Despite the fact that one's sex ostensibly determined one's apparel, clothing had the potential to affect the material body of a male in ways that threatened the masculine solidity of the body and undermine his authority and subjectivity. As I discuss in the Introduction, masculinity was, for the early moderns, partially established by a male's relative ability to close his body off from the world and prevent internal alterations from occurring. A male's body played a large role in determining his agency and masculinity, and to be able to control that body meant that the male had full mastery of his sexual potency and intellectual acumen. Hence, a body's solidity was essential to masculine identity, and cross-dressing posed many dangers to the masculinity of the cross-dressing individual.

Putting on Masculine Attire: Constructing and Performing Gender in Early Modern England

The early moderns interpreted gender, anatomy, and clothing as materially potent in the sense that these categories or signifiers of identity were either changeable or could, in

themselves, change the body. Will Fisher describes the early modern perception of dress and behavior as "more fundamental" in determining the gender of a body than our current understanding of them are today.[45] This scale of fundamentality relies considerably on the Galenic humoral theory, on early modern anatomical and ideological conjectures concerning anatomical sex, and on the functions and forms of dress in determining gender, social class, and bodily susceptibility.

As opposed to focusing on the materialist changes and, in William Prynne's term, "degenerate" alterations of the boy actor's body, this chapter examines how clothing and early modern theories of the body affected masculinity.[46] Through these analyses, I argue that the masculinity of all the cross-dressers in the play is rendered unstable precisely because the material foundations of this masculinity are threatened through the clothing upon men's bodies. Here, early modern masculinity is understood as a gendered and physical condition that characters strive to maintain through material solidity and impermeability. Just as women were leaky and unstable, early modern men ensured their masculinity through the constitution of their bodies, which were drier and hotter and thus able to withstand the humoral and caloric changes to which women were more susceptible.

Many scholars have discussed the ideological and physical threats to which boy actors were subject via performing and dressing as women. However, in historical phenomenology, few scholars focus on the accoutrements that cover the body. Moreover, gender studies analyzing the early modern era typically focus on the agency and position of women. This chapter combines historical phenomenology and gender studies through the lens of (trans)formative apparel as a means for understanding more completely what was at risk for a male who cross-dressed. In early modern literature and onstage, male characters who, throughout the course of the plot, don a woman's clothing for either theatrical or comical purposes—or in order to gain access to a

female's body—engage the threats and anxieties surrounding cross-dressing in ways that Moll Cutpurse or a young boy actor playing Juliet do not. What does it mean for a "man" (neither a "stripling" nor a "youth," but rather a male beyond the period of adolescence) to don feminine clothes in order to achieve a certain objective? Further, an important component of cross-dressing has been largely ignored; namely, that this act involved the acquisition and appropriation of material clothing, which in turn affected the body's internal and external composition. The economic, material, and climatological "realities" of men dressing as women offer a fruitful area of consideration, particularly in light of how the exterior transformations of the body could influence internal, and even invisible, elements of the wearer. While the literary and historical precedents of cross-dressing men are relatively sparse in exempla, the few instances of males who do cross-dress, and those who threaten to "put on" a woman in terms of dressing himself in the woman's body, are striking instances because they present an ambiguous body of interpretation for early modern audiences—age, intentions, and the specific manner of clothing worn all complicate any essentialist determinations on what genders or identities these males acquire once they transform their outward appearances. Although men are neither automatically feminized when cross-dressing, nor are they always punished for their violations of the gendered norms for clothing, this chapter contends nonetheless that we may approach a closer understanding of what the early moderns believed happened to the bodies and subjectivities of cross-dressing men. Polonius may offer good advice to his son "the apparel oft proclaims the man" (1.3.72), but his qualitative "oft" speaks to the uncertainty that is always present in relying on clothing to determine one's social station and bodily health. Apparel might "oft" signal certain characteristics of the wearer's body, but not always. The possibilities offered to the cross-dressing man, in fact, sometimes outweigh the physiological and anatomical threats of wearing women's clothes, though the possible bodily effects are an undercurrent in the

language describing the appareled transformation. Yet by recognizing the ambivalences of early modern male cross-dressing and the figurative act of putting on a woman, we can approach a closer understanding of how the early moderns experienced their clothed bodies and the anxieties involved in attempting to maintain gendered boundaries through clothing and their material bodies.

The cross-dressing on the early modern stage and in other Renaissance literature is an ongoing critical topic. Jean Howard's intriguing question, "How many people crossdressed [sic] in Renaissance England?" has fueled an analytical preoccupation with the ambivalences and complexities of androgyny, boy actors dressed as female protagonists, prostitutes donning masculine attire as a form of patriarchal subversion, hermaphroditic characters or historical figures, and same-sex desire in early modern England, just to name a few topical foci in Renaissance studies concerning cross-dressing and cross-gender behavior.[47] Since the 1980s, scholarship on early modern cross-dressing has inundated the field and examined Howard's question from a variety of angles.[48] Besides Howard's work, scholars such as Marjorie Garber, Stephen Orgel, Phyllis Rackin, and many others have addressed early modern cross-dressing and the associated identity forming processes involved in wearing clothes of the opposite gender. One result of these inquires into cross-dressing and its concomitant acts of material transformations has been a reevaluation of the early modern conception of identity, particularly in connection with masculinity and femininity, or what we might refer to as "gender." Tied into this is Stephen Greenblatt's famous observation that Renaissance identity was inherently able to be molded, formed, and altered: "[…] in the sixteenth century there appears to be an increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process."[49] Although Greenblatt does not focus on clothing, we can extrapolate from his analyses the idea that clothing was both a socially and physically formative object in constituting one's identity,

gender, and sex. As Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass argue in their book *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, "[w]e need to understand the animatedness of clothes, their ability to 'pick up' subjects, to mold and shape them both physically and socially, to constitute subjects through their power as material memories."[50] Orgel likewise argues that the difference between sexes on the early modern stage is "a matter of costumes and mannerisms," not one of gendered or biological differences.[51] With this understanding, cross-dressing acquires a new dimension of complexity—not only were clothes a constitutive and physically determinate part of the body, but they were also an extension of the individual's body in a very real way. For example, Shylock complains that Antonio spits on his "Jewish gabardine," not his person (*The Merchant of Venice* 1.3.108). The treatment Shylock's race-specific cloak receives is indicative of the many layers of constitutive identification based on clothing alone. In this moment, Shylock's cloak suffers the bodily humiliations of Antonio's spite: Shylock is not merely complaining that his cloak gets spit upon, but Shylock's cloak and Shylock's body are one and the same. Shylock reiterates the shame of Antonio's spit upon his body just a few lines later: "You, that did void your rheum upon my beard" (1.3.114). Here, the distinction between Shylock's gabardine and his beard is unclear because of their proximity in Shylock's speech and because of the prosthetic nature of both hirsute and cloth additions to the body. Fisher demonstrates the culturally and physically artificial aspects of bearded masculinity in early modern England: "early modern masculinity was in crucial ways prosthetic."[52] Hence, for Antonio to spit upon Shylock's cloak and beard is to challenge Shylock's masculinity by defiling extensions of his body—both are objects which are "put on" in order to portray masculinity. Just as Shylock's race was perceived as a distinct and indissoluble category of identity, his gabardine acquires the same physical degradation. In the process, his supposed race becomes a physical

extension of Shylock's body. If, then, one's own clothes were such an integral part of the body, how much more could wearing the clothes of the opposite sex affect one's body and gender?

The distinction between sex as a biological condition and gender as a socially constructed set of norms, which are attached to either the male or the female depending on how society desires each gender to behave, partially characterizes our conceptions of sex and gender today, though Butler and many other feminist critics have challenged this sex/gender schema. For Butler, sex and gender are both constructs, and in *Gender Trouble* she poignantly asks "[c]an we refer to a 'given' sex or a 'given' gender without first inquiring into how sex and/or gender is given, through what means?"[53] Just as there was no strict binarism between gender and sex in early modern England, this chapter contends that clothing was a material apparatus and a formative part of the wearer's body that worked to reaffirm both sex and gender for the early moderns. There were no "givens" for either sex or gender because both categories of identity were fluid and mutable.

Inherently tied into the idea that gender and sex are both constructs determined by social factors instead of innate characteristics is Butler's articulation of the performativity of gender: "One is not simply a body, but, in some very key sense, one does one's body and, indeed, one does one's body differently from one's contemporaries and from one's embodied predecessors and successors as well."[54] The artificiality of gender, then, acquires a heightened sense on the early modern stage and through men, whether in reality or in literature, who dressed as women. Cleopatra is not simply a masculine woman, but rather performs her subjectivity through either masculine or feminine attributes as she sees fit, and Hamlet is not merely an irresolute intellectual, but through clothing, language, behavior, and other forms of linguistic, cultural, or material embodiment he "puts on" his gender daily. His black mourning clothes are an extension of the gender that Hamlet performs before the court of Denmark, before Ophelia, and most

importantly, before himself. The performance of gender is remarkably interesting in light of early modern dramatic and literary texts, wherein the actor performs the role of the character, and the character adopts various other roles, of one or both genders, in achieving his or her aims. In one of the most complex examples, a boy actor plays the female character Rosalind in *As You Like It*. Yet Rosalind disguises herself as Ganymede, who subsequently pretends to be Rosalind. As Rosalind/Ganymede demands in the epilogue: "What a case am I in then, that am neither a good epilogue nor cannot insinuate with you in the behalf of a good play!" (Epilogue. 6-8). The wordplay on "case," which could mean "plight," "costume," or a "vagina," reproduces the gendered uncertainties surrounding Rosalind and boy actors in general. The boy actors have no case to speak of, but they perform another gender, and thus adopt a case (vagina) through an external case (costume).

"Sodomitic" Pairings: Early Modern Discourses on the Physical and Moral Dangers of Cross-Dressing

Thomas Laqueur's summation on the ambivalences surrounding categorical definitions/distinctions of the sex/gender schema, known as the one-sex model, is representative of how the early moderns conceived of their genders and their bodies.[55]

In this system, biological dissimilitude between men and women matters less than what gender one presents. In the one-sex model, the heat and the behavior of a body allowed it to oscillate, instead of resolutely remain, between ends of the male/female spectrum. In Antony Fletcher's words, the "physical body was seen as vulnerable to the pressures of a blurred gender system."[56] As Laqueur reiterates later in *Making Sex*, "biological sex, which we generally take to serve as the basis of gender, was just as much in the domain of culture and meaning as was gender."[57] Conceived of this way, a male could always become more feminine through clothing and behavior. The consequences for women, however, had much more drastic physical effects. Not

only could she become more masculine, but clothing and physical labor could in turn cause her inverted penis to drop down from the body. Ambroise Paré includes several examples of this ejection of the penis from the female body in his work *On Monsters and Marvels*; the case of Marie Pacheca, whose "male member came out of her," is one of several transformative subjects that Paré cites.[58] As Paré clarifies for his medical readership, heat is the one variable that may, engendered by masculine behavior and clothing, initiate the transformation from female to male: "women don't have so much heat, nor the ability to push out what by the coldness of their temperament is held as if bound to the interior."[59] Although males were less likely to change, in this volatile and ever-changing ideology of the human body and gender, the early moderns were at the very least anxious about retaining and preserving their norms of masculinity.

Sex and gender were thus irrevocably conflated: an individual was a man because he had a penis, grew a beard, and wore a doublet. If a woman grew a beard, or wore masculine apparel, she was transgressing her gendered and sexed norms, *and* subjecting her body to the potential threat of becoming a man by having her inverted penis eject itself from the body. In this conflux of sex, gender, and the body, clothing played an important role in delimiting and defining the sex and gender that the body possessed—behavior and clothing determined the internal and external balance of the gendered body.

Not only were male cross-dressers potentially stunting or harming their physical solidity and integrity, but the elicited attraction that other males might conceive for the cross-dresser was problematic for moralists. Philip Stubbes's anti-theatrical tract *The Anatomie of Abuses* voices the concern that plays engender sodomitic pairings: "these goodly pageants being done, euery mate sorts to his mate, euery one bringes another homeward of their way verye fréendly, and in their secret conclaues (couertly) they play y^{e} *Sodomits,* or worse."[60] William Prynne, perhaps the

most famous anti-theatrical polemist, seconds this in his massive work *Histrio-Mastix, The Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragaedie, Divided into Two Parts*:

> [T]his putting on of womans array (especially to act a lascivious, amorous, whorish, Love-sicke Play upon the Stage, must needs be sinfull, yea abominable; *because it not onely excites many adulterous filthy lusts, both in the Actors and Spectators; and drawes them on both to contemplative and actuall lewdnesse […]* but likewise *instigates them to selfe-pollution*, (*a sinne for which* Onan *was destroyed:*) *and to that unnaturall Sodomiticall sinne of uncleanesse.*[61]

Not only, Prynne argues, is cross-dressing morally wrong because it is expressively prohibited by Biblical law, but the act of dressing in a woman's clothes stimulates misdirected same-sex desires and leads to acts of sodomy. While it would be wrong to claim that what we today call homosexuality is an act of carnival in the Bakhtinian sense, for the early moderns cross-dressing and what the moralists believed naturally followed from this cross-dressing, sodomy, were considered to represent a challenge to social and religious order. This challenge then, is grotesque in that it inverts the accepted order for gender presentation (i.e. wearing the correct clothing) and legitimated pairings (i.e. heterosexual marriages). The idea of the grotesque will inform later readings in this chapter in connection with cross-dressing and masculinity because of the transversal nature of wearing the opposite gender's clothing and eliciting desires that were considered unorthodox and an inversion of the heterogeneity of sexual preference promoted by religious and civic authorities.

The anti-theatrical polemic against young boy actors playing the roles of women is couched in surprisingly physical and almost voyeuristic terms. For example, Dr. John Rainoldes, in his charged pamphlet titled *Th' Overthrow of Stage-Playes*, provides a quote from the Bishop of Paris, who argues that the texture and touch of a woman's garment will vividly remind the

male wearer of a woman's body: "A womans garment beeing put on a man doeth vehemently touch and moue him with the remembrance and imagination of a woman; and the imagination of a thing desirable doth stirr up the desire."[62] Rainoldes expresses distrust against feminine clothing not only for the power it has to transfer femininity onto its wearer, but also because the touch of the cloth recalls the mould (and perhaps the genitals) of a woman. Prynne offers a more physically damaging analysis of the cross-dressed stage players:

> May we not daily see our Players metamorphosed into women on the Stage, not only by putting on the female robes, but likewise the effeminate gestures, speeches, pace, behaviour, attire, delicacy, passions, manners, arts and wiles of the female sex, yea, of the most petulant, unchaste, insinuating Strumpets, that either Italy or the world affords? What wantonnesse, what effeminacy parallell to that which our men-women actors, in all their feminine, (yea, sometime in their masculine parts) expresse upon the Theater?[63]

By feminine and masculine "parts," Prynne means the roles that the actors perform. However, these lines are also permeated with physically transformative language throughout: "metamorphosed," "passions," and particularly "parts," a word used frequently during the Renaissance to mean "penis" or "genitals."[64] Earlier in *Histrio-Mastix*, Prynne juxtaposes clothing with the body to illustrate the feminizations of the cross-dressing actor: "[O]ur Men-women Actors are most effeminate, both in apparell, body, words, and workes."[65] Prynne essentially levels the distinctions among clothing, the body, and behavior; all three work to feminize the male actor's body. In this light, the anti-theatrical polemists were fearful, though unclear, of the potential transformations that performing the opposite gender had on the male body. These alterations on the body are never specified, rather, Prynne and others hold an indistinct notion of what might happen to the male's body while dressing and acting like a

woman. Anatomical treatises, however, give us a closer understanding of what these transformations might involve.

Coverings, Sheaths, and Layers: Anatomical and Medical Tracts on Clothing and the Body

Thomas Johnson's 1634 translation and collation of Paré's extensive philosophical and didactic works, including his medical and surgical treatises, mentions variants of the word "cloth" in connection with medical healing and health over one hundred times.[66] Typically Paré uses the word "cloth" regarding the application of linen bandages to cover and bind everything from rabies, fractures, gout, cramps, all the way up to venereal diseases like gonorrhea. In several chapters, Paré includes entire discussions on the different types and uses of bandages. Curiously, and for us today, horrifically, Paré advises surgeons to recycle bandages from articles of used clothing: "that Linnen is to bee made choice of for this use, and judged the best, not which is new and never formerly used, but that which hath alreadie beene worne and served for other uses, that so the Bandages made thereof may be the more soft and pliable."[67] Of course, Paré advises that these bandages be clean, usually dipped in healing ointments or antiseptics. Nonetheless, the idea of reused bandages entails that many families were encouraged to use, for example, Uncle John's old doublet or Aunt Mary's placket to bind and contain little Robert's cut knee. In this exchange, the idea of formative clothing adopts a rather perplexing potential. Clothing, because of the properties the early moderns attributed to it, could be the means for transmitting specific bodily attributes or fluids to other bodies. In this exchange, any appropriation of clothing or cross-dressing involves a character or individual willing to put his or her body at risk in this exchange between bodies and apparel. Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass have done extensive research on the circulation and pawning of clothing during the Renaissance. Yet, they have also shown how articles of clothing "were closer […] to a second skin"[68] Recall that Paster illustrates the environmentally communicative aspect of early modern

humoral theory, in which the body was susceptible to inhaling vapors and infections humors from other bodies and the outside world: "psychophysiology […] permitted minute environmental, cultural, or physical changes to have transforming effects on the humoral subject."[69] Hence, the use of used bandages, formerly constitutive of another's body, in close contact with the open wounds or orifices of the diseased body potentially had transmittable effects from one body to another. Clothing up one's body to withhold the outside influences of other bodies, but using the clothing and the materials that have been rubbed against the body of another, represents a seeming contradiction, which is nonetheless representative of early modern medical thought, which was fraught with ambiguities and uncertainties surrounding the health of the individual, his or her contact with outside elements, *and* the act of wrapping one's body tightly for curative purposes—even if the clothes do not originally belong to the wrapped individual, Thus, the early moderns had to, at times, exchange a lesser evil, that of sharing the "second skin" of clothing with others, for the greater evil of letting a wound or broken joint putrefy. In this light, Iago's offer to bind up Cassio's leg, abetting the flow of blood that Iago himself caused to flow, may be even more sinister than it is performance of supposed good will:

> Cassio: My leg is cut in two.
>
> Iago: Marry, heaven forbid!
>
> Light, gentlemen. I'll bind it with my shirt. (*Othello* 5.1.73-75)

Iago's own clothing, formative of his melancholic and vindictive personality, could seep into and affect Cassio's own body. With clothing passed from body to body, the internal composition of an individual's body is destabilized through the contact of clothing and bandages upon another's skin. Portia, when devising her ploy to act as Doctor Bellario, specifies to her messenger to receive the Doctor's garments—a necessary addition to her professional persona—but this exchange also involves the transmission of masculine agency and attributes through the male

clothes Portia puts on and in part explains Nerissa's rhetoric in response: "Why, shall we turn to men?" (3.4.79). To "turn" into Doctor Bellario, Portia requires his clothing, but Nerissa's hesitation in Portia's plan indicates a fear of the contamination possible in trading, acquiring, and sharing clothes among different bodies, especially among different genders.[70]

Crooke does not focus on linen bandages, but rather he typically employs the use of clothing to provide an analogy between parts of the body and the membranous sheathings that cover various organs. Nonetheless, Crooke also follows the idea that clothing may modify the internal makeup of the body. When discussing the difference between the livers of humans and animals, Crooke cites the clothing of people as the main determinant in differentiating the two types of liver: "But in bruite beasts it is diuided into foure, fiue, or six Lobes or Finnes, which are continuated or coupled together, onely by the mediation of Veynes, within which lobes their stomackes are couered as it were with the fingers of a hand, because they haue no cloathes to keepe it warme, as men haue."[71] In this comparison, humans do not have as many lobes in their livers because their binding clothes heat and determine the physical constitution of the organ.

Besides the communal sharing of clothing and bandages and the inwardly transformative powers of apparel, warm clothing was then, as now, determinate of an individual's provision against the severe temperaments of weather. While enumerating the humoral constitution of men who work in certain professions, Paré provides a general standard by which health can be achieved: "That calling of life which is performed with moderate labour, clothing and dyet, seemes very fit and convenient to preserve the naturall temper of the body."[72] Hence, not only was clothing physically determinative, but it also was required in abundance for humoral health. This connects back to social class and the body—those who could afford warmer and more protective clothing had the physical advantage in protecting their bodies. Robert Burton describes this visual of poor health as an immediate vilification: "for we see men commonly

respected to their means, and vilified if they be in bad clothes."[73] This also means that nakedness was not only a marker of prelapsarian bliss, primitivism, or erotic display, but also a potential hazard to the body. Hence, of the many meanings of clothing, as an indication of social class and physical health, clothing was important in establishing a visual signal of the potential harm another body could offer—by identifying an individual's health through his or her clothing or lack thereof, an individual could predetermine their interactions with the person accordingly.

Becoming a Woman in Literature and Onstage

Sidney's *Arcadia* features one of the more determined male cross-dressers in Renaissance literature: Pyrocles, who adopts the attire and name of Zelmane to hide his identity and pose as a woman, remains dressed as a female for three of the five books in Sidney's work. Zelmane's prominence in a story in which masculine chivalry and honor are continually espoused is notable for several reasons. For one, the dissembling motive behind Pyrocles's cross-dressing is based on sexual conquest—he dresses as a woman in order to have closer access to the beautiful Philoclea, the youngest daughter of King Basilius. This deception allows him to eventually win his desired object, but only after originating the cataclysmic downfall of the King and his wife Gynecia, who both become lustfully captivated by the feminine appearance and behavior of Zelmane. The gendered ambiguities in the narrative abound, and the interchange of feminine and masculine pronouns, coupled with homoerotic and homosocial bonds created throughout the tale, complicate the supposed gender Pyrocles/Zelmane performs. S/he acts masculine whenever it is convenient and necessary to do so, but otherwise her lovesickness and her frequent idolizations of beauty render Pyrocles more femininely verbal and less resolute in action. Yet despite the feminine outpouring of verbiage and the restraint from performing acts of heroism during battle (because she is imprisoned twice during the narrative Zelmane is unable to perform her masculine desires of fighting, instead she must remain indoors, i.e., her cross-dressing has forced

her to remain in the domestic domain of females), the most prominent marker of Pyrocles's transformation from a man to a woman is marked by his change of clothing, which is able to mask his masculinity so well that it fuels both male and female desire for his/her body. Even his childhood friend Musidorus fails to recognize Pyrocles in drag and the nearly emblazoned Zelmane is given full attention by the narrator:

> Upon her body she ware a doublet of sky-colour satin, covered with plates of gold and, as it were, nailed with precious stones that in it she might seem armed. The nether part of her garment was so full of stuff and cut after such a fashion, that though the length of it reached to the ankles, yet in her going one might sometimes discern the small of her leg, which with the foot was dressed in a short pair of crimson velvet buskins, in some places open, as the ancient manner was, to show the fairness of the skin.[74]

Notably, Zelmane has chosen to wear clothing that entices and suggests further nakedness, with a pun on "stuff" implying a penis, to both hint at and deceive concerning which gender s/he is. The partially revealed skin intimates that a woman is beneath the clothing, yet modesty would require that a woman remain hidden and contained within her clothing. As an Amazon, Zelmane exhibits more masculine attributes than Pamela or Philoclea, but her description as "fair" and the lightsome colors she displays upon her body all suggest that the wearer is a little too fastidious in her/his appearance. It also indicates that Pyrocles is sliding into a more feminine position, not only shown by her clothing, the color of her skin and her acknowledgement that she has taken "a woman's hue," but also by Musidorus's initial reprimand on his friend's cross-dressing:

> And see how extremely every way you can endanger your mind: for to take this womanish habit, without you frame your behaviour accordingly, is wholly vain; your behaviour can never come kindly from you but as the mind is proportioned unto it: so

> whatsoever peevish imperfections are in that sex, to soften your heart to receive them – the very first down-step to all wickedness.[75]

Musidorus's reasoning focuses on believability and inward transformations; Pyrocles cannot fool anyone in his cross-dressing disguise unless he behave like a woman, and behaving like a woman, including dressing as one, will alter the mind and heart, soften the body, and cause Pyrocles to become more open to other forms of wickedness. Musidorus believes that once in women's clothing, the male must then form his mind and body to the clothing in order to achieve credibility. Not only will others believe that Pyrocles as Zelmane is a woman, but his own body and mind will begin to credit the deception to such an extent, according to Musidorus, that Pyrocles's morals and inner constitution will be permanently compromised. Indeed, the ways in which Pyrocles's internal composition alters his agency and masculinity, in turn, affects how we read Pyrocles's inaction throughout the tale. The fact that Musidorus chooses rather to wear the clothing of someone from a lower class instead of feminine garb differentiates the two men, who are otherwise almost indistinguishable. Hence, the material threats Pyrocles is willing to undergo suggest that, in some sense, Pyrocles possesses even more bravery and resolve to obtain his desired object than his counterpart Musidorus does. Despite Pyrocles's cross-dressing and the dangers this cross-dressing presents to his body, as Zelmane he is able to make "a womanish habit to be the armour of her boldness" and disregards his own health in exchange for the sexual satisfaction he hopes to enjoy.[76] Nonetheless, Zelmane's status as an Amazon—an early modern figure for gender ambiguities—mitigates Pyrocles's complete feminization. Instead, s/he is able to retain some masculine attributes, such as bravery and choler, in the guise of Zelmane.

The hue of Pyrocles's skin and the internal stability of his heart and resolution are at risk because of Pyrocles's cross-dressing. Likewise, Antony in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* is also physically endangered by his bouts of wearing women's clothing, but the dynamics of his

cross-dressing are changed because it is encouraged and perhaps sexually enjoyed by Cleopatra. The histrionic Egyptian Queen reminisces on her and Antony's former exchange of apparel: "I drunk him to his bed, / Then put my tires and mantles on him whilst / I wore his sword Philippan" (2.5.21-23). Here, Cleopatra admits that she altered the state of Antony's mind before she put accoutrements of her clothing on his body. Yet, by early modern medical texts, Antony has already put his internal health at risk by indulging in excesses of drink. Remonstrance against drinking abounds in Renaissance medical texts, here again Paré serves as a useful guide to early modern notions of drunkenness, gluttony, and excessive indolence: "For thus wine, although it be by faculty and nature, hot and dry, yet taken too immoderately, it accumulates phlegmaticke humors, and causes cold diseases. Therefore drunkennesse, gluttony […] causing much phlegme in us, may beget a Quotidian feaver."[77] Antony, then, is already at fault for subjecting his body to the unhealthy accumulation of fluids, in which case his drunken cross-dressing is an effect of his already destabilized body. Notably, Paré argues that the drunk becomes colder in internal constitution, much like the internal frigidity of a woman's body. The fact that Cleopatra initiates this exchange of apparel is another marker of Antony's effeminacy, and her ability to wield his "sword Philippan" puts the rest of his body at risk for over-saturation and could lead, according to Paré, to various diseases such as fever, plague, gout, and even leprosy. Unlike Pyrocles's affected mind and heart, Antony's lower stratum (his belly, his lethargic limbs, and his penis) is transformed. Bakhtin reminds us that Shakespeare frequently illustrated the carnivalesque in his drama: "Shakespeare's drama has many outward carnivalesque aspects: images of the material bodily lower stratum, of ambivalent obscenities, and of popular banquet scenes."[78] Antony's cross-dressing encompasses all three of these carnivalesque aspects, albeit in a different order: his decadent banqueting with Cleopatra in turn affects his lower stratum and renders his body, through cross-dressing, an obscenity to the Romans who censure him. Take, for example,

Pompey's scoff that Antony will not return to fight because he "in Egypt sits at dinner, and will make / No wars without doors" (2.1.12-13). Like Pyrocles, Antony's relationship with Cleopatra and rumors of his profligacy locate him within doors, in the domestic realm. In this context, the rumor of Antony's cross-dressing serves as an outward indicator of his new position as the moistened, drunk, and grotesque corporeality who, under direction of his female lover, wears her clothing. More damaging, however, is the fact that Antony's cross-dressing is not his active choice: in an odd twist of logic, Antony is more feminized because he is not active in opting to dress in women's clothes. As opposed to Pyrcoles, Antony's lack of agency further emphasizes his physical and political deterioration into a passive, drunken partner to the masculine Cleopatra.

Yet Antony's supposed cross-dressing, which is never actually shown onstage, has far more damaging political ramifications because it conveys and puts forth as an imitable model feminized weakness and inaction. Antony's feminized transformation, moreover, is already established before the play begins; Philo describes Antony as "transformed / Into a strumpet's fool" (1.1.12-13) and Octavius Caesar sneers at reports of Antony's effeminacy: "not more manlike / Than Cleopatra, nor the queen of Ptolemy / More womanly than he" (1.4.5-7). Here, Caesar describes the couple's genders as equal on the scale of masculinity and femininity; both are unnaturally located on the spectrum. By equating Antony's femininity with Cleopatra's masculinity, Caesar essentially depersonalizes them to the point that the two are indistinguishable, a point made particularly sardonic by Enobarbus when he "mistakes" Cleopatra for Antony:

Enobarbus: Hush, here comes Antony.

Charmian: Not he, the Queen.

The gender confusions are exacerbated by Antony's role in his relationship to Cleopatra, which blurs the lines between masculine and feminine in sexual vehemence and imperative command. The contrast between Antony's political responsibilities and his current subjection to Cleopatra's charms calls attention to the fact that Antony is a public man attempting, but failing, to live a private life. Because of his political role, Antony's body is not the only one in danger of feminization, rather, his men "make their looks by his" (1.5.54-55). If this is the case, then his followers may mimic Antony's cross-dressing and Epicureanism. Certainly Enobarbus follows Antony in his dissipation through the disproportionate consumption of wine and his inability to show emotional tact at the death of Fulvia, using sartorial references to refer to "putting on" another woman: "When it / pleaseth their deities to take the wife of a man from him, it / shows to man the tailors of the earth; comforting therein that / when old robes are worn out there are members to make new" (1.2.147-150). Like De Flores in *The Changeling*, Enobarbus imagines women as garments to be worn, but Enobarbus's lines also point back to Antony's own body, which because women's clothing has influenced its caloric composition, is also become "worn out" and stretched with the intake of fluids. These fluids then, accumulated and exacerbated via cross-dressing, upset the image of the masculine ideal that his men are to follow. Instead, as Enobarbus illustrates, his men reproduce their leader's feminine decadence. Antony's defeat can thus be read on another level besides that of political failure, it is also a bodily conquest that inundates the martial tact and power of his camp: "he has given example for our flight / Most grossly by his own" (3.10.27-28). The word "grossly" recalls Antony's own bodily transformations and physicalizes his lack of masculine tenacity.

While Pyrocles and Antony are both physically at risk for their cross-dressing, Falstaff in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is already humorally feminized through his obesity and porosity, which is continually emphasized throughout the play: "Flemish drunkard" (2.1.21), "gross

watery pumpkin" (3.3.33), "Old, cold, withered, and of intolerable entrails" (5.5.144). Falstaff's cross-dressing in the play is not by choice; he must don the apparel of an old woman, described as a "witch" (4.2.72), in order to escape the jealous Ford. Before Falstaff's clothed transformation, he ironically claims that he cannot act like other effeminate young courtiers, who "come like women in men's apparel and smell like Bucklersbury in simple time" (3.3.60-61). Falstaff contrasts his aged body with those of younger wooers; he implies that the men who "come like women" are more effeminate because they court a woman using poetic love language, as Slender wishes he could do by having his "book of songs / and sonnets" (1.1.165-166), and try to mask their smell through perfume (Bucklersbury was a pungent street in London where herbs and perfumes were sold). Falstaff's pejorative sneer against men who use perfume is redolent of his own aging body, which because it is already feminized through its saturated exorbitance, is more grotesque than the young perfumed men because of his corporeality and his vicious lasciviousness. That Falstaff is so sensible of his body, aged and saturated as it is, renders his refusal to attempt to mask his body's odors and his corpulence in general all the more voracious in its consumptive need to spread and come in to contact with other bodies. This bodily contrast between the young wooers and Falstaff is also framed to render ironic and ridiculous Falstaff's later cross-dressing.

Mistress Page and Mistress Ford devise the cross-dressing for Falstaff as a second punishment for his sexual advances to the both of them. Interestingly, all three of the retributions the wives invent involve clothing: first Falstaff is put into a dirty laundry basket, then he is made to dress as an old woman, and finally he dons the costume of Herne, a ghost of local lore with horns on his head. All three punishments also feminize Falstaff. He is crammed into a laundry basket with other "foul clothes" (3.5.92) and thrown into a river, suffering a trial analogous to the "dunkings," which were publically sanctioned shaming rituals for women who gossiped or

nagged their husbands.[79] Then Falstaff is literally dressed as a woman, through fittingly the persona he adopts is an aged, obese woman—his exact feminine counterpart it would seem—and beaten by a jealous husband. Finally, Falstaff is made to wear horns like a cuckold, and the symbolic suggestions of masculine castration and impotence resound upon his twice-beaten, thrice-transformed body. Falstaff descends, therefore, from an initially paunchy, corporeal male to a feminized woman/cuckold. The various performances of gender that Falstaff is *forced* to undergo, which all materialize through clothing, alter, for the worse, his humoral constitution. The old woman's clothing, in particular, illustrates Falstaff's further loss of masculinity.

On concocting Falstaff's second escape from the jealous Ford, the wives remember that the "fat woman of Brentford" (4.2.61) has conveniently left a gown at the Ford's house. Luckily, "she's as big as he / is; and there's here thrummed hat, and her muffler too" (4.2.63-64). A thrummed hat was made from coarse wool, hence it was unadorned, typically fluffy, and was especially a marker of the lower class. In 1571, in order to aid the wool trade and milliners in particular, Parliament enacted a law requiring all those who were not of the nobility (such as Sir John Falstaff, a knight, is) to wear a woolen cap on Sundays.[80] Hence, the cap on Falstaff's head denotes not only femininity because it is a woman's cap, but also an abasement in social class. As Paster illustrates, social hierarchy, as well as gendered hierarchy, was a determinant in the constitution of the humors: "[…] humoral thinking and humoral textualization tended to reproduce—and thus to biologize—prevailing narratives of social difference."[81] This one article of clothing, because it both belongs to a woman and one of a lower social class, adds to Falstaff's distended body and threatens his internal health. Because those in the lower classes were thought humorally affective and thus less guided by reason, Falstaff's internal functioning and emotive responses are at risk. Interestingly, just like Shakespeare's cross-dressing women, Mistresses Ford and Page do not give Falstaff their own clothes—they prevent Falstaff from gaining access

to their bodies via clothing while also maintaining the purity of their accoutrements through withholding them from their sexual predator. Instead, they provide Falstaff with clothes from an unwanted, unattractive woman, perhaps transmitting some of the Aunt of Brentford's physical attributes, through her clothing, onto Falstaff's body.

The men, particularly Ford, do not recognize the disguised Falstaff once he is dressed as a woman. However, Sir Hugh Evans is disturbed by the Aunt of Brentford's uncomely beard: "By Jeshu, I think the 'oman is a witch indeed. I like not / when a 'oman has a great peard. I spy a great peard under his / muffler" (4.3.167-169). Despite Evans's accent, the humorousness of the lines rely on the audiences' understanding that Falstaff is underneath the Aunt of Brentford's clothing and his beard, however masked by the muffler, is still visible from underneath his facial covering. While the persistent presence of Falstaff's beard may be a hirsute indicator of his masculinity, the early moderns believed that female witches also had beards.[82] Instead of asserting his masculinity, Falstaff's clothing and his facial hair actually promote his femininity *and* demonization. As the communal scapegoat, Falstaff-as-woman redirects the citizens of Windsor's sexual, mercantile, and social anxieties onto his own grotesque, demonized body. One moral we might extract from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is that excessive, predatory sexual appetite and extensive corporeality easily lead to further influxes of threatening, misbalancing humors by feminizing, demonizing, and socially degrading the male. These degradations are most thoroughly achieved through the constitutive clothing Falstaff is made to wear. Falstaff does not entirely transform into a woman, but his cross-dressing and bodily humiliations render him more feminine than masculine, and his subsequent chastisement is a result of his overly lascivious nature and his ridiculous cross-dressed body.

All three of these male, cross-dressing protagonists—Pyrocles, Antony, and Falstaff—are ostensibly high-ranking, important men in their communities or political spheres. Yet these men

willingly disregard the potential physical damage and social mockery that may arise from their cross-dressing and instead use clothing as a means for obtaining or pleasuring a woman. Although Falstaff dons the Woman of Brentford's clothing in order to flee from jealous husbands, he nonetheless willingly adopts this cross-dressing disguise rather than confront the dangerously suspecting Ford. Falstaff exhibits no hesitation before he wraps himself up in numerous folds of a woman's clothes, and just like Pyrocles and Antony, he chooses to cross-dress in order to gain something—in this case freedom from the potential harm Ford may inflict. Unlike other early modern cross-dressing characters—particularly women like Rosalind or Viola—the men who wear the opposite gender's clothing willingly disregard the physical correlatives to their gender. Female characters who cross-dress, on the other hand, retain a sense of their original modesty and femininity.[83] However, for Pyrocles, Antony, and Falstaff, considerations of their masculinity fall to the wayside once a potential sexual object is in sight.

"All You Need is Glove": Sartorial Predations

We have so far seen that the sexual predations involved in putting on a woman's clothing in order to gain access to her body are typically benign, though somewhat reprehensible, both because of the deception to others, males and females alike, and for the potential emasculating effects this cross-dressing can have on the wearer's body. However, of a more rapacious nature is when a man desires to dress himself in a woman's body by figuring her vagina as a garment to be worn. The duplicitous Gallipot voices this idea directly when he stakes his own claim on Moll's body in *The Roaring Girl*: "Then pray, sir, wear not her, for she's a garment / So fitting for my body I'm loath / Another should put it on" (3.2.257-259). If dressing and acting as a woman has physical consequences for the male, then the woman suffers additional threats once a man appropriates an integral part of her attire. Perhaps the most pernicious example of this is De Flores's confiscation of Beatrice's glove in Middleton and Rowley's play *The Changeling*.

Beatrice, professing a deep-seated hatred for her father's gentleman-servant De Flores, exasperatingly wonders "Not this serpent gone yet?" (1.1.232), referring to De Flores's persisting presence during her conversation with Alsemero. Directly after this line, Beatrice drops her glove. Although Vermandero and the others believe that Beatrice has accidentally relinquished her glove, the symbolic functions of the glove indicate that she purposely drops the glove in order for Alsemero to retrieve it and perhaps retain it as a love token. The fact that the sexually voracious De Flores picks it up instead prefigures his later theft of Beatrice's body from Alsemero. The glove, then, serves as a prefatory cuckolding, especially given De Flores's ruminations on the sexual prospects offered by the glove: "I know she had rather wear my pelt tanned / In a pair of dancing pumps than I should thrust my fingers / Into her sockets here" (1.1.241-243). De Flores first imagines his skin as a covering for Beatrice's body, stretched out and protecting her from the external elements of weather. Yet he quickly moves from imagining his body as a cloak upon her body to his own uses of her as apparel. To "thrust" his fingers into her glove, besides the obvious sexual meaning, carries another aspect once we consider Beatrice's angry direction to De Flores concerning her gloves: "Take 'em and draw thine own skin off with 'em" (1.1.239). De Flores suffers from an unidentified skin disease that causes his skin to flake off and shed and his exfoliative skin thus becomes ingrained in the glove itself.[84] Just as the sexual union of two bodies involves a joining of flesh, De Flores's flesh lodges itself in Beatrice's glove, which is an extension of her body and her virginity. The ravishment of the glove, then, is a symbolic ravishment of her body, for De Flores enters without permission and leaves within the glove parts of his body. This conjoining is also later echoed when De Flores charges Beatrice to remember that her consent to the murder of Alonzo has made her equal to, and part of, her former enemy: "You're the deed's creature; by that name / You lost your first condition, and I challenge you, / As peace and innocency has turned you out / And made you one

with me" (3.4.137-140). De Flores's use of Beatrice's glove and his use of coercion in demanding her virginity are all the more invasive because of his shedding skin and his need to put his body where it does not belong. With Beatrice becoming "one" with him, De Flores sheds both his skin and seed, and the glove is only a precursor of the later comingling that will render both De Flores's and Beatrice's bodies grotesque by the very excesses they come to practice—in sexual vivacity, greed, and in blood through the murder of both Alonzo and Diaphanta. Yet Beatrice's gloves are the initiatory catalyst to these excesses. As an extension of Beatrice's actual body, De Flores "puts on" her before he is even touched by her own hands. Wearing Beatrice's body in this way, De Flores is able to articulate his desire and join his hand with hers in a contorted farce of the palms joining in marriage. Instead, through the glove De Flores takes away Alsemero's marriage bed.

In Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, Giacomo's sexual predation hinges on the possession of Innogen's bracelet, which she received as a love token from Posthumus. Once Giacomo emerges from his trunk into Innogen's room, and while gazing on Innogen's sleeping body, Giacomo directly lifts a bracelet from her arm:

> As slippery as the Gordian knot was hard!
> 'Tis mine; and this will witness outwardly,
> As strongly as the conscience does within,
> To the madding of her lord. On her left breast
> A mole cinque-spotted, like the crimson drops
> I' the bottom of a cowslip: here's a voucher,
> Stronger than ever law could make: this secret
> Will force him think I have pick'd the lock and ta'en
> The treasure of her honour. (2.3.34-42).

Giacomo's transgression contains an allusion to the Gordian knot, which Alexander the Great reputedly sundered with his sword. In this comparison between the famous Gordian knot and the bracelet, Giacomo speaks to the idea that a sword, an accoutrement of a man, may break both an impossible knot and a woman's chastity. Allusions to famous rapists earlier in Giacomo's monologue, and the sliding of Innogen's bracelet directly off her arm, or unsheathing a covering on her body, represent moments wherein Giacomo symbolically and literally gains access to Innogen. The bracelet trailing off of Innogen's body is indeed more invasive than his eager gaze, for Giacomo must reach out to touch Innogen's arm, perhaps encircling his own hand around her arm as he extracts the piece of jewelry. He proceeds in his speech to enumerate her physical attributes, focusing on her breast and a "mole cinque-spotted." Perhaps the five spots form a circle, reflecting the ring of the bracelet already taken from Innogen's body.

When Giacomo reveals the bracelet to Posthumus, he argues that the bracelet must breathe: "Be pale: I beg but leave to air this jewel; see! / And now 'tis up again: it must be married / To that your diamond; I'll keep them" (2.4.95-98). Not only does Giacomo steal the bracelet from Innogen, but he then subjects the bracelet, now an extension of Innogen's wronged body, to the air and the contaminative elements that might rust or harm the jewelry. Here, Giacomo's crime is perhaps even more inimical than De Flores's appropriation of Beatrice's glove, for Giacomo directly takes the article of adornment from Innogen and subsequently displays this supposed conquest for other men and other elements to look and speculate upon. As with De Flores, Giacomo takes an object of clothing or adornment from a woman and is able to gain further access to her body; Giacomo's proximity to Innogen when taking the bracelet leads him to look under her breast and see the mole. In both *The Changeling* and *Cymbeline*, the men who take articles of a woman's clothing either completely or nearly bring ruin to a woman by staining her body and reputation. Their own bodies are already symbolically damaged—through

either a leper-like skin disease or through inordinate sexual saturation—hence, these men are able to use clothes and their bodies to threaten women. Again we see that these men disregard their own bodies in favor of gaining access to and harming that of a woman's. The transformative and predatory possibilities of clothing engage a whole set of exciting chances for these men to not only disguise themselves and get closer to women, but to enter an entirely different social sphere. Giacomo sees the inside of Innogen's room, while De Flores is able to have sex with a socially superior woman. The symbolic rapes that occur are first initiated by access to a woman's private domain and to the most intimate coverings upon her body.

Addressing the Undressing: Conclusion

All the men I discuss in this chapter either relinquish the clothing they have stolen or finally put back on their masculine attire. Nonetheless, their brief forays into cross-dressing or possessing a woman's clothing render them incomplete and altered because they have lost some form of masculine agency and social standing. Pyrocles is able to regain his masculine standing, but his former identity as Zelmane haunts him throughout the conclusion of *Arcadia*: when Basilius awakens from his stupor, it takes "many garboils […] through his fancy before he could be persuaded Zelmane was other than a woman."[85] Indeed, Zelmane might be "other" than a woman, but Pyrocles is no longer entirely a man either, for the memory of his cross-dressing and the figurative impressions it leaves upon his body never fade. For Antony, the lasting image of him in drunkenness and women's clothing worries his lover. In her fears that her story will be mocked by future comedians and playwrights, Cleopatra describes the characterization of both her and Antony: "the quick comedians / Extemporally will stage us, and present / Our Alexandrian revels; Antony / Shall be brought drunken forth" (5.2.212-15). Indeed, Cleopatra pinpoints the lasting reputation of Antony as a drunk, hinting that their previous Alexandrian revels, which supposedly involved Antony's cross-dressing, will carry over into posterity.

Antony's reputation will not rest on his valorous deeds, nor on his personal vivacity. Instead, Cleopatra fears that these Alexandrian revels will blot out Antony's other attributes, while her own femininity will be mocked once she is played by "some squeaking Cleopatra boy," who, while cross-dressed, will defame her reputation. For Falstaff, dressing as a woman, becomes dejected and loses his masculine agency, for he allows himself in the final scene to be used at will: "Well, I am your theme: you have the start of me; I / am dejected; I am not able to answer the Welsh / flannel; ignorance itself is a plummet o'er me: use / me as you will" (5.5.151-3). Falstaff's passivity in this scene indicates that his former supposed sexual prowess and masculine agency have been depleted through his cross-dressing humiliations. Notably, Falstaff also mentions Welsh flannel in these lines, referring to Evans and to the cheap woolen cloth that the Welsh supposedly wore. By referring to a cheap cloth material, Falstaff points back to his former stint as a lower-class woman dressed in coarser and cheaper material than Falstaff is presumably used to. Yet, women's bodies may also be humiliated if men steal objects from their bodies. For both Beatrice and Innogen, the loss of a part of their clothing opens their bodies up to the predation of men. However, the result of the threats to their bodies ends differently for the women, for while Innogen remains innocent, Beatrice partakes in her own ruin. Beatrice willingly gives De Flores access to her body, but Innogen uses cross-dressing as a means for her own escape from the predations of other men like Cloten. Indeed, one woman is able to successfully disguise her own body even after it has been threatened by the removal of her attire. Another allows her glove to serve as a precipitate signifier of her eventual sexual concession.

Ultimately, men who cross-dress and who take women's clothing in early modern literature and onstage can harm their bodies or potentially infect the bodies of women. Clothing has transformative and symbolic powers beyond merely connoting particular sexual proclivities, as the film *Elizabeth I* suggests. Instead, the early moderns instilled more powers and more

socially constructed codes of meaning into the clothing that one wore. Indeed, the physical correlatives to cross-dressing or using clothing to harm someone's body indicate that the material dangers of clothing was much more poignant and could harm one's masculinity or chastity in telling ways.

Chapter Three

Monstrous Bodies: Shylock, Caliban, and Racial Humiliation

Transatlantic Theories, Bodily Conflations: The Lost Tribe Theory in Early Modern England

> "[S]o the *Jewes* did *Indianize,* or the *Indians* doe *Judaize,* for surely they are alike in many, very many remarkable particulars, and if they bee Iewes, they must not for that be neglected."[86]

In 1650, Thomas Thorowgood, expounding upon Menasseh ben Israel's theory that the South American Indians were Jewish, published his *Iewes in America, or, Probabilities that the Americans Are of that Race*. Thorowgood juxtaposes the South American Indians' relish for human flesh with Jewish customs, building on the medieval tradition which held that Jews assiduously practiced cannibalism by consuming Christians: "the Man-devouring that is in America; for what an inference may this seem to bee; there bee Carybes, Caniballs, and Maneaters among them, therefore they be Jewish?"[87] To answer his own question, Thorowgood quotes Leviticus 26:29, "Yee shall eate the flesh of your Sonnes and of your Daughters."[88] The intrinsic fear of Jewish and Native American cannibalism was prevalent in early modern England, and new interactions with North American Indians raised anxiety concerning the early moderns' physical superiority and the link between the imagined anthropophagite in Jewish blood rituals and the threat of cannibalism practiced among Native Americans. As I will argue, these two groups—already subjected to conjectures on their intellectual and physical inferiority to the English—were further condensed into the homogenous group of "Native American/Jew." Thorowgood's work is only one example of how the early moderns—on the stage, in sermons, and in political or travel accounts—vilified both groups as dangerous or effeminate bodies that threatened the salubrity of the English nation and individual English bodies. More importantly,

the fact that these two distinct racial groups were forcibly assigned a common heritage speaks to the ways in which racialized discourse in early modern England conflated disparate identities in order to contrast a physically inferior group to a specifically English notion of bodily superiority. If a common enemy could be defined, whether through a shared appetite for human flesh or through other physical indications of inferiority, then the fear of many different groups encroaching upon the English body could be lessened or eradicated.

In early modern racial ideologies, such disparate characters as Shakespeare's Shylock and Caliban could share certain physical and behavioral characteristics based on their bodily humiliations.[89] Attributions of menstruation, monstrosity and bestiality, blackness, cannibalism, and odor physically subjugate both Shylock and Caliban in ways that suggest that their shared characteristics speak to early modern fears concerning the supposed fluidity and expansion of Jewish and Native bodies. This chapter is not suggesting that Shakespeare believed the Native Americans were in fact remnants of an isolated Jewish race. Rather, this essay examines the physical and psychological connections between Shylock and Caliban in light of early modern material and moral prejudices in order to explore how and why subsequent authors could conceive of Jews and Native Americans as physically linked by their related feminized, monstrous, and unrestrained bodies. In *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Tempest*, the outsider to the white, heterosexual community is cast as morally degenerate and uninfluenced by Christian ethics—wanting, respectively, either a pound of flesh or to propagate his seed by rape. Yet, this role of villain, a role both Shylock and Caliban adopt differently, also carries particular material signifiers of each character's offensive alterity. Together, the ways in which the physical markers of Shylock and Caliban's racialized humiliations operate in the plays provide us with a closer understanding of certain ethical counterparts to the material signifiers of their Otherness. Shylock's final, painful conversion and Caliban's lack of acceptance into the Christian

community both enact the idea that the body and the supposed physical signs upon that body become actual barriers to communal and moral integration or assimilation into the white European communities of both plays. Hence, Shylock's and Caliban's physical similarities and the discussions on their external attributes do not only serve as important instances of early modern racialized discourse and understanding; rather, these material aspects of the characters also point to the ways in which the dominant groups in these plays can use the body and existing prejudices about Others to ensure that the homogeneity of those morally and emotionally reconciled remains unadulterated by the bodies and problems of the Other.

For the purposes of this essay, I examine how Shakespeare and his contemporaries defined a Jewish individual, which includes marked physical differences, ambivalence towards the religious similarities and differences with the Christian religion (particularly Protestant Christianity), inherent personality traits (greed, envy, lasciviousness), and loosely held confederation with other Jews.[90] Early modern authors also frequently employed the term "Savage" to refer to a variety of indigenous populations, including Native Americans.[91] Miranda explicitly uses the expression when addressing Caliban: "When thou didst not, savage, / Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like / A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes / With words that made them known" (1.2.358-361). I have opted to use "Native" when discussing unspecific appellations ascribed to various indigenous or native populations.[92] Hence, I refer to Caliban as Native whenever he represents an entire population or each time other characters identify Caliban as a generalized signifier of "Native" physical stereotypes.[93]

In both *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Tempest*, attributions of physical inferiority take up the discourse on a body's saturation; these plays portray both Jewish and Native bodies as physically dangerous because of internal and external fluidity. For the early moderns, a fluid body was one that could alter, affect other bodies, and was volatile and unpredictable. As such,

Shylock and Caliban are both charged with owning fluid bodies in ways that belie the other characters' fears of how Shylock and Caliban might harm or influence other bodies. The ways in which the Europeans in the play conflate the Jewish and the Native body, and, more importantly, how Shylock and Caliban also adopt this discourse, works to produce tension in this unstable binary between the English body and the Native/Jewish one. Shakespeare explores the prejudicial devices that the Europeans use in order to colonize the body of the Other visually, spiritually, and intellectually—the white Europeans onstage describe Shylock and Caliban as beastly, sensual, and physically inferior as a means for ideologically and materially isolating these Othered characters from the masculinist norms of white English/European identity. A body's saturation or moistness, in particular, was a frightening characteristic in that it signified moral and physical imbalance, while also indicating an alignment with femininity due to medical theories on the proportionate humors within males and females. Hence, the supposed fluidity of Jewish and Native bodies, a fluidity partially composed of a certain humoral moistness, works to physiologically and ideologically segregate these characters from the Christians in both plays.

Authors and artists represented these bodies in order to distance the European/English Self from the frightening Other. Shylock and Caliban's bodies thus become locales on which the white Europeans in Shakespeare's plays and in his audiences could recreate/perform and reaffirm existing prejudices and subdue growing anxieties over the physical threats that these foreign bodies presented. In this odd conflation of two races into one, Shylock and Caliban's physical humiliations within the plays also share similarities that rest on the fluidity of the body: Graziano asks for the currish Jew to change or transform his nature (4.1.287), alluding to Shylock's symbolic connection to canines, while Prospero calls Caliban a "poisonous slave" (1.2.322), invoking Caliban's association with nocuous humors and contamination. In both cases, attributions of bestial affiliations or toxicity would have invariably recalled for early modern

audiences the fluid, dangerous aspect of Othered bodies. Thus the Native body was classed under the same label as the Jew in terms of physicality, whereby the stage and other literature could restructure already existing hierarchies of physical wholeness descending from the English body of solidity to the Native/Jewish body of plurality and fluidity. Shylock's and Caliban's physical humiliations and subjections provide us with a new way in which to explore early modern discourses surrounding race, identity, and the physical bodies of Others. Both the Jew and Native American are exploited and implicated by visual and textual precedents of Jewish or Native monstrosity and physicality, which in turn adds new dimensions to the ways in which we read Shylock's religion, Caliban's grotesquerie, and both of their positions in early modern theories of the body. Their positions are similar because their fluidity in bleeding and stinking, their connection to animals, and the threats they present all stem from the need, exhibited by the white Europeans in the plays, to subdue the frightening body of the Jew and Native.

Theorizing Taxonomic Generalizations: Shylock and Caliban's Conflated Race

Caliban is not a Jew, nor is Shylock a Native American, an African, or any other race, in early modern terms, but Jewish. However, Caliban's and Shylock's similar physical humiliations mark them as materially different from the other marginal races or groups in Shakespearean literature because they share a bond that rests on growing English fears of physical monstrousness and consumption. Despite the fact that Othello, Aaron the Moor, and Cleopatra all represent physical and ideological threats to English bodies through acts of seduction and murder, Shylock and Caliban share a materiality that rests on these and other aspects of fluidity. These aspects of fluidity in turn put to their associations with monstrosity and femininity; their somatic connaturality carries distinct religious and social precepts based on English notions of physical superiority to the avariciousness of the Jew or the sordidness of the Native American

that in particular ways are materially different from the racializations of Othello, Aaron the Moor, and Cleopatra.

Both *The Merchant* and *The Tempest*, along with works such as Thorowgood's, intellectually and visually colonize Othered subjects, laying open the beliefs, customs and bodies of Natives and Jews for viewing by the early modern public. Although we might not label these works as "orientalist" in Edward Said's sense, Richmond Barbour's term "proto-orientalist" is useful and more accurate in describing early modern texts.[94] This term clarifies the epochal location of early modern literature in relation to the later overt British imperialism in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. In his illustration on the critiques of performativity directed towards "the East," Barbour claims that "antitheatrical and masculinist discourses converged […] to build a fundamental proto-orientalist critique: eastern shows of opulence and power, however strange, exciting, or fearsome, were deceptive, effeminate, and debasing."[95] Barbour's argument concerning the theatricality of the East also applies to the proto-orientalist "studies" or tracts that describe the Native American body as well as those that describe the Jew. In addition to the Turks, Moors, and other ethnic or national groups, the early moderns also labeled Native American and Jewish men as effeminate males who supposedly relished all forms of performance or spectacle. Thus Barbour's term, in describing what Shakespeare's texts enact in terms of colonizing desires and the de-humanizing stereotypes attributed to Shylock and Caliban, enables us to explore how Shakespeare's plays (or the European characters in the these plays) construct proto-orientalist conceptions surrounding the Native and Jewish body. When Portia demonstrates Shylock's illegality in pursuing a pound of Antonio's flesh, she prevents Shylock from leaving by referencing the law: "The law hath yet another hold on you" (4.1.342). Here, the Venetian law stands in for a whole barrage of legal, social, and physical "holds" the Venetians have over Shylock. The Jewish body loses its agency via these proto-orientalist holds. However,

Barbour cautions against merely replicating and orientalist discourse in discussing these works, for early modern interactions with and ideas of Jews and Native Americans are far too varied and interconnected for one statement to cover the broad range of relationships and understandings among the early modern English and the racialized groups they encountered. Hence, it is far from my aim to present a simple condensation of early modern racialized understanding.[96] Nonetheless, by looking to how proto-orientalist discourse places physical and ideological humiliations onto the bodies of Shylock and Caliban, we can reach a closer understanding of how physical descriptions were an integral aspect of proto-orientalist colonizing of both peoples and nations.[97]

As Paster has shown, not only were the early moderns anxious and conscious of their bodies and the humors that circulated throughout these bodies, they were also anxious to define what other bodies consisted of—i.e., a Spaniard's body was innately different in physiological constitution from the English body, or a woman's body was inherently colder and moister than a man's body. Of course, in this classifying system of phenomenology, bodies of Others, particularly non-Europeans, received the severest marks of physical deformities—monstrosity, corporeality, and fluidity. Bodily constructions of the Other, then, create further ambivalences in proto-orientalist discourse, and subsequently shape later orientalist texts, themes, and prejudices. Remarkably, few scholars have examined how English prejudices concerning the physicality of Others influenced the proto-orientalist rhetoric of the early modern era. Approaching the topic of Native and Jewish bodily conflations by combining phenomenological and post-colonial theory allows us to understand how constructions of the physical bodies of Others—including their smells, fluids, porousness, and monstrosity—served as both a self-referent for the English ideal body and influenced early modern proto-orientalist aims, together with figurative subjugation of Others' subjectivities and bodies. Just as Said argues that collection of information was a

practice that fueled the Orientalist field of study, constructing paradigms of thought concerning the Native and the Jewish body were forms of colonizing the unknown territory of Otherness, which these bodies represented.[98]

These two critical paradigms, post-colonialism and historical/material phenomenology, can illuminate the ways in which Shylock's menstruation, Caliban's smell, or even Jessica's imagination in reproduction work to reiterate—and critique—the Europeans' colonizing impulses. By pictorially and cognitively colonizing the body of the Native, England gained justification for moving into the New World and taking control. And, by colonizing the body (and the religion) of the Jew, the early moderns acquired the ability to reaffirm the primacy of their own religion and morals. Finally, by conflating both bodies into one "monstrous" physicality, the English identified who needed to be converted and/or vilified. The early modern stage combines and questions these anxieties towards the subjected body of the Other, where the tableau of Otherness and subjectivity brings these issues to the forefront. In both *The Merchant* and *The Tempest*, the stark confrontation of the Self and the Other plays upon these issues and works to complicate our understanding of Shylock and Caliban. Nonetheless, by looking to how both characters are colonized, I argue that we can in turn understand how modes of action and inaction rely to a great degree on their bodies.

The Native American in Early Modern England

Trinculo's sardonic quip on the English love of spectacle over charity, "When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, / they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian" (2.2.31-2), has served as evidence for various scholars that Shakespeare's play *The Tempest* at least tangentially concerns the position of the Native American in both colonized lands and in England itself. Alden T. Vaughan, for example, argues that this line and Stephano's suspicious expletive, "What's the matter? Have we devils here? Do / you put tricks upon's with savages and men of

Ind, ha?" (2.2.56-7), at minimum indicates that the English had a level of familiarity with Native Americans.[99] Although *The Tempest* is arguably the first early modern play (at least that we have extant) to feature a Native character, a few references to Native Americans, or Native figures, appear in other early 17th century dramatic works. John Fletcher and Nathaniel Field's *Four Plays, or Moral Representations, in One* (1613) directly presents Native characters onstage. These figures notably appear only once and remain props of spectacle surrounding the god Plutus: "*Enter* Plutus, *with a troop of* Indians, *singing and dancing wildly about him, and bowing to him*" (*The Triumph of Time* iii. sd. i).[100] Fletcher and Field's inclusion of Native Americans accompanying Plutus, the Roman god of wealth, invokes the idea that the New World was a land of riches available to those who ventured to take it. Despite the atypicality of these Native characters, they nonetheless operate as denuded figures of fetishization; they are slaves to a pagan god of wealth and, as exotic emblems of a foreign land and hidden riches, dance around the god.

The Comedy of Errors is the only Shakespearean play to mention the word America; Antipholus of Syracuse, in response to Dromio of Syracuse's jests, incredulously asks, "Where America, the Indies?" (3.2.131). The topicality of Native Americans and the New World was prevalent in early modern psyches even before a large number of English citizens were actually living in America. Nonetheless, the relative dearth of New World figures on the early modern stage is curious, given the greater number of Jewish characters and the salient interest other authors, such as Hakluyt, Purchas, Raleigh, Spenser, and Montaigne, took in the New World body. Spenser, though his reference to the New World Indians is brief, assumes that the early moderns are aware of the garb and skin color of the Native Americans:

> His garment neither was of silke nor say,
>
> But paynted plumes in goodly order dight,

Like as the sunburnt Indians do aray

Their tawny bodies in their proudest plight. (3.12.8.1-4)[101]

Spenser, depicting the figure of Fancy, presupposes that the early modern reader has some visual notion of what bodies he describes. Like Trinculo's observation on the English desire to view the Native American body, Spenser's lines indicate that the early moderns could envisage a Native American, viewed either through images, texts, or actual bodies.[102]

Images and descriptions of Native Americans circulated in many travel texts and depicted the indigenous populations as agile, exotic, and effeminate. Representations of Native Americans from both North and South America became popular media for imagining the threats and desires of the New World. For example, in a 1520 tract titled *Of the Newe La[n]des and of Ye People Founde by the Messengers of the Kynge of Porty[n]gale named Emanuel*, the figures on the title page are about to commence a cannibalistic feast (see Figure One). The woman on the right nurses one child and attends to another, demonstrating her potential domesticity, but, more importantly, her ample fertility. The man in the image holds an erect stick or weapon between his legs, exemplifying the threat the early moderns felt concerning the sexual immorality of the Native Americans. Moreover, the engraver feminizes both bodies through exposing the upper torso and legs of the male and accenting the sagging breasts of male and female. The male, in his ostensible role as the provider and cook of the cannibalistic meal, is also rendered grotesque by his proximity to the bleeding head and leg he is about to devour. Moreover, the chosen limbs of consumption, a head and a leg, are notable for their symbolic functions. As consumers of a human head, the Native Americans in this image threaten to undermine the intellectual faculties of the European, for in America rational superiority may not gain one physical safety. By eating a leg, as a symbol of the breadth and expanse of territory available to a European, the Native Americans emblematically vitiate where the European can travel by taking away the means of

mobility. Nonetheless, pictorial and theatrical representations of Native bodies were far more common for the English than the possibility of actually seeing a Native American or South Indian. Yet, despite the rarity of seeing a Native in person, in *The Tempest* Stephano immediately recognizes Caliban's inferiority and connection to the feminized or cannibalistic Native: "If I can recover him and keep him tame and get to Naples / with him, he's a present for any emperor that ever trod on neat's / leather" (2.2.65-67). Stephano quickly decides to capitalize on Caliban's body, and the immediate visual signifier of Caliban's native, and hence inferior, status operates in a similar fashion to the visual feminizations and exoticism of the image, for both the spectators of the image and Stephano are able to quickly colonize the image and subjectivity of the Native in sight.

Amid the dissemination of images and descriptions of the Native American body, Menasseh ben Israel's work *The Hope of Israel*, published in 1650, was the first English tract to argue that the indigenous populations, in both North and South America, were remnants of the ten lost tribes of Israel. The ten lost tribes of Israel, around the eighth century BCE after the Babylonian exile, were dispersed by Assyrian armies and lost to history. Based off of *The Hope of Israel*, then, Thorowgood argues that

> for surely [the Native Americans and Jews] are alike in many, very many remarkable particulars, and if they bee Iewes, they must not for that be neglected, *Thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverbe, and a by-word to all nations, &c. Deut* 20.37. and so they are every where to this day: what more reproachfull obloquy is there among men, then this, *Thou are a Jew?*[103]

Indeed, Thorowgood's concession that the worst insult for anyone is to call another a Jew essentially results in degrading the humanity and agency of the Native Americans by labeling them as Jews. Although these works on the Lost Tribes were written in the 1650s, Richard W.

Cogley notes that these theories certainly predated the publication of ben Israel's and Thorowgood's treatises: "Published endorsements of the Israelite-origins view had been circulating in western Europe at least since 1567."[104] Thus, despite the fact that the influence of this theory has not been specifically located in England during the late 16th century, the pan-European influence of this theory concerning the Native Americans or even the elusive Red Jews at the very least suggests that there were those in early modern England, before the publication of Thorowgood's and ben Israel's tracts in the 1650s, who knew of and perhaps believed in the idea that inhabitants of America were vestiges of an ancient Jewish tribe.[105]

The Jew in Early Modern England

Jews, on the other hand, were a more pervasive presence, both actually and textually, for the early modern English. The expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 ostensibly meant that Shakespeare's audience three hundred years later still had little access to conversing with or simply viewing a Jew. However, as many scholars have shown, Jewish bodies were not only more visible and in contact with the early moderns through trade and commerce, but there were also Jews living in London during the 16th and 17th centuries: "The borders of England were permeable, and these Jews were only a small part of the vast stream of thousands of immigrants who entered England in the course of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries."[106] Yet, even if one never saw a Jew in person, certain physical stereotypes carried over from the medieval period into early modern notions. Jews were believed to have hooked noses, red and curly hair, swarthy complexions, a distinct smell (known as *foetor judaicus*), and other conspicuous outward attributes. Further, Jews were thought to react differently in terms of disease and even cyclical responses, the most famous being the idea that Jewish men menstruated. In characterizing early modern understandings of Jewry, David Katz aptly summarizes, "The Catholic was an Englishman who had chosen membership of the wrong club.

This was not the case with the Jews, defined racially and physically by their peculiar smell and by circumcision."[107] With few or no actual Jews to counteract these stereotypes of deformity and monstrosity, the stage was a venue for both perpetrating and complicating early modern anti-Semitism. Consequently, early modern authors created Jews of varying moral and physical purity, both cultivating and/or questioning the stereotypical Jew.[108]

Among the legends concerning Jewish tribes, their history, and the contemporary status of Jewish individuals, both in England and abroad, other myths surrounding Jews continued to influence early modern perceptions. Hence, the belief that malicious Jews regularly utilized poison in order to plague their Christian neighbors was a theory that persisted throughout the early modern era. Barabas exhibits a remarkable aptitude at poisoning food in *The Jew of Malta*: "So, now I am revenged upon 'em all. / The scent thereof was death; I poisoned it" (4.4.45-6). Indeed, the fear of Jews poisoning Christian wells and food was greeted with credulity all across Europe. The image of a Jewish man poisoning a well, with the concomitant devil urinating in it, was a popular trope in early modern England (see Figure Two). This image, from Pierre Boaistuau's *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature, Containing a Descriptio[n] of Sundry Strange Things, Seming Monstrous…Gathered out of Diuers Authors*, was translated by Edward Fenton and published in England in 1569. The Jewish male in the image stands with his chest thrust forward, with one hand upon his hip and the other holding the bag of poison over the well. Physically, the Jew has an elongated (but not necessarily hooked) nose, his beard and hair amply spill over onto his collar, and his narrowed eyes intimate resolute purpose or malevolent design. Ruth Samson Luborsky, examining the image of the Jew in Boaistuau's, Stephen Bateman's, and Holinshed's works, astutely notes "[i]n both Boaistuau and Bateman (but not in Holinshed) the image of the Jew keeps company with pictures of monsters, marvels, and repellent events."[109] Indeed, images like the one in Boaistuau illustrate the fear of poisoning, which extends in the

plays beyond the actual poison that Jews like Barabas possess. Instead, poisoning could arise from the fluidity of the feminized Jewish body as well, and a Jew could potentially poison a Christian in more ways than one—even proximity to a Jew could negatively affect a Christian and contaminate the purity of the English body. Jonathan Gil Harris discusses this early modern extension of the myth of poisoning to the physical bodies of Jews: "For Elizabethans, the belief that Jews poisoned wells readily translated itself into a more general association of Jews, and specifically their bodies, with poison."[110] Related to noxious poison and internal instability was the idea that Jews shared animal-like attributes. Shylock's position as a "wolf" (4.1.72) links him with Boaistuau's image in that Shylock seeks to devour or destroy the "lamb" (4.1.73), both of God and of Christ's people, through murder. However, Shakespeare turns the stereotype of poisonous Jews on its head when he has Shylock ask "If you poison us do we not die?" (3.1.55). In this moment, Shylock articulates the possibility that Christians have the same ability to use poison, and perhaps poison other bodies simply through physical proximity, as Jews. Likewise, Prospero charges Caliban with possessing baneful humors, terming him a "poisonous slave" (1.2.322), thus indicating that the body of any Other, whether a Jew or a Native, is supposedly noxious and harmful to the purity of the colonizers in the plays. For Shylock, the attempt to evade a rooted stereotype concerning his malapert proclivities to use poison fails, for during the trial scene his antagonists continually reference his own body. Graziano recalls the Pythagorean theory of the transmigration of souls in calling Shylock inhumane: "Thy currish spirit / Governed a wolf who, hanged for human slaughter, / Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet, / And, whilst thou lay'st in they unhallowed dam, / infused itself in thee" (4.1.132-136). Here, the wolfish spirit leaves an animal body and enters into others at will. Graziano charges Shylock with a transmutable soul that continues to infect his sense of mercy. Shylock's body is both animalistic and toxic, and Graziano's speculation on Shylock's cruelty combines these

stereotypes in ways that suggest that Shylock's inner poison threatens the Christians by spreading and acting as predator upon Antonio's body.

Of course, many critics have examined Shylock's own position in terms of mercantilism, religion, language, physicality, fatherhood, and other positionalities.[111] Part of the methodological problem arises from the question "What is a Jew?" and the early moderns were certainly anxious about this problematic question in defining their own bodies and in determining the appearance and threats of Othered bodies. Shylock's famous speech that asks, "Hath not a Jew eyes?" (3.1.50), exemplifies the potential leveling of physical and moral distinctions that could, and did, take place. Converted Jews were still demonized and in England invariably associated with the infamous Roderigo Lopez, Queen Elizabeth's Jewish physician who was hanged in 1594 for supposedly being complicit in a Spanish plot to assassinate her Majesty. Despite the varying opinions critics have on this issue, the fact that *The Merchant* appeared onstage only a few years after Lopez's execution indicates that Elizabethans would have recalled the religious/racial identity of Lopez and the events surrounding his death when watching *any* play that features a Jewish male who desires to ruin a Christian. Whatever the precise relationship between Lopez and Shylock, all the stereotypes and political/religious concerns surrounding Jewish and Native bodies would have influenced the early modern audiences' perceptions of both Shylock and Caliban by antedating any sympathetic or humane sentiments either character might express; the preconceived notions of Native and Jewish physical characteristics would have qualified an early modern audiences' perception of the subjectivity and humanity of both characters.

Monstrosity, Fluidity, and Abnormality: The Bodies of Shylock and Caliban

With both Native American and Jewish bodies onstage and in other literature, the question of how these foreign bodies' fluidity might affect the English was central. The early

modern body communicated with external "foul and pestilent congregation of vapours" (*Hamlet* 2.2.293). Environmental influences could enter and leave the body, threatening its internal stability. As Paster notes, "the representation of emotional experience—often in the form of self-report by characters in the throes of strong feeling—presupposes a demonstrable psychophysiological reciprocity between the experiencing subject and his or her relation to the world."[112] This relation with the world involved emotions and physical health. A body's ability to close off from the outside world, to remain internally stable and solid, was a marker of health and masculinity. Women, on the other hand, were emotionally and physically leaky: "*Women's passions*, then, is just another term for temperamental inconstancy."[113] Thus, for a body to be fluid and open to the outside world was to be feminized, deadly, and far too sexually licentious. As Katz explicates, Jews were charged with possessing moist bodies, just as women were, and were believed to menstruate: "The notion of Jewish male menstruation was […] somewhat of a commonplace in medieval and early modern Europe, and would certainly be added to the list of Jewish physical peculiarities."[114] This curious belief held by many early modern white Europeans speaks to yet another attempt by the English to subjugate the body of the Jew in order to define their own solidity (and thus reassert their own masculinity and prowess) and place the body of the Jew under the heading of Other. Thus, Shylock's moving speech on the physical and moral commonalities between Jews and Christians, in light of Katz's argument, is subtly a joke on the male Jewish propensity to bleed once "pricked" (3.1.54). Caliban, less directly, also has an odd relationship to blood and "cramps" or "side-stitches"(1.2.328, 329). In a play with an overt reference to "an unstanched / wench" (1.1.42-3), Caliban's relationship to blood is not direct, nor have I found any reference to early moderns conjectures that Native American men menstruated. Nonetheless, Caliban's connection with monstrosity and his propensity to quickly drink Stephano's "celestial liquor" (2.2.109) soon establish Caliban as full of humors and fluids

as well. Caliban might not be overtly associated with myths on Jewish male menstruation, but his fluidity certainly renders him susceptible to charges of feminized moistness.

In telling ways, a body's fluidity could also blur the line between human and animal. A monstrous body, for the early moderns, was characterized by plurality (i.e. an excess of limbs), openness with the outside elements, and affinity with other beasts. These allegations of monstrosity, then, carry a wide array of ideological associations about the body of the monster, and both Shylock and Caliban are connected with the monstrous by identifications with beastliness, sexuality, and fluidity. For example, Shylock is continually called a dog: "You call me misbeliever, cut-throat, dog, / And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine" (1.3.107-8); similarly Caliban is defined as a monster: "A freckled whelp, hag-born—not honoured with / A human shape" (1.2.285-6). As the child of a witch and the devil, and mistaken for a fish (2.2.24), Caliban's monstrosity extends beyond his connection with animals and includes his parentage and his potential contamination of others. Likewise, by calling Shylock a dog and linking him with open sexuality, the Venetian Christians verbally and physically separate Shylock's body from their own.[115] The connection with animals, with sexuality (and sensual parentage), or with feminizing fluids marks these Other bodies as monstrous and sub-human.

Theories on Jewish and Native American Skin Color

Another physical stereotype attributed to both Jews and Native Americans involved their supposed black skin color. Although this was a common way of conflating the two groups, the exact classification of "race" remained for the early moderns one of ambivalence. For example, Arthur Bury wonders "[w]hat black *Indian* of the *East* or *West*, what wilde *African* or *American*, will change that *Divel Worship* which their *fathers* have practiced without any such *guilt*."[116] That Native Americans were black in color, propagated more so because of their associations with the devil and with demons, was a popular myth that circulated throughout England during

the early modern era. In this light, Prospero's admission that "This thing of darkness I / acknowledge mine" (5.1.278-279) might refer to more than Caliban's moral or social tenebrosity, suggesting that we are meant to visualize a chiaroscuro pageant during this last scene in which the darkness of Caliban operates on both a symbolic and physical level and further highlights his inability to discover the "grace" he sues for. Certainly, this is how later generations interpreted Caliban's skin color; Ania Loomba notes that "in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Caliban's blackness was taken for granted, both by his champions and by those who read him as a monster."[117] Whether or not Caliban is meant to appear physically as black, the continual references to his monstrosity and demonism recall those early modern tracts that compared the Native Americans to the black devil.

The blackness of Jews was a persistent, but equivocal, stereotype that carried over into the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In 1655, Paul Isaiah published a translation of Sebastian Münster's work *The Messias of the Christians and the Jewes Held Forth in a Discourse between a Christian, and a Iew Obstinately Adhering to His Strange Opinions*, in which a Christian immediately identifies a Jewish man merely by the color of his face:

> *Iew.* And God save you; how know you me to be a *Iew*, that you speake so in Hebrew with me? art thou a *Iew* and one of our people?
>
> *Christian.* I am not a *Iew*, neither of thy people, neither am I acquainted with you; but from the form of your face, I knew you to be a *Iew*: For you *Iewes* have a peculiar colour of face, different from the form and figure of other men; which thing hath often fill'd me with admiration, for you are black and uncomely, and not white as other men.[118]

Nonetheless, the "peculiar color" of Jews was by no means widespread. In *The Merchant*, the Prince of Morocco, not Shylock, is the most notable dark-skinned character, and the Prince willingly calls attention to his outward appearance during his attempt to woo Portia. He

emphasizes the inner worth of his valor and blood: "Mislike me not for my complexion, / The shadowed livery of the burnished sun" (2.1.1-2). Nonetheless, Shylock too fixates on the outward physical differences between himself and the Christians. His claim "Well, thou shalt see, thy eyes shall be thy judge, / The difference of old Shylock and Bassanio" (2.5.1-2) focuses on the visual differences between Christian and Jew. While Shylock's complexion is never referred to as "dark" or "swarthy," his insistence here that one may view a marked difference suggests that Shakespeare is aware of the stereotype of black Jews and at least plays off of this concept by having Shylock himself refer to the outward differences between his body and the other Europeans in the play. Along with the Prince of Morocco, Jessica's complexion is referenced much more overtly than Shylock's. Indeed, to align her more with the Christians they continually use the descriptive "fair" to describe her appearance. Solanio even plays upon this idea by claiming "Shylock, for his own part, knew the bird was / fledge, and then it is the complexion of them all to leave the / dam" (3.1.25-7). Is Solanio suggesting that Jessica's complexion, or her fairness, propagates her disavowal of her religion and her father? The word complexion carries a wide range of ideological and physical associations. According to the *OED*, complexion could refer to the level of balance of humors within the body, a particular humor, temperament of personality, or skin color.[119] Roxann Wheeler discusses the medical and cultural trajectory of the term from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century, noting that complexion, and humoral theory in general "was often called on to explain psychological, social, and physiological characteristics as well as to formulate stereotypes."[120] Thus, for Salanio to credit Jessica's flight to her complexion supplies a physical reason for why she left her father—their complexions were not of commensurate qualities, both within and without.

Shylock and Caliban's blackness, unlike their fluidity, monstrosity, or animality, serves as the most generalized stereotype placed upon their bodies. Whether or not Shylock and Caliban

are actually black or any other color does not matter nearly so much as the fact that the Christians in the play forcibly assign allegations of blackness upon the Native and Jewish body as a means for physically and morally separating these bodies from their own. Caliban is a "thing of darkness" in more ways than one, but his darkness immediately excludes him from the festivities in celebrating Ferdinand and Miranda's marriage. Caliban's darkness exiles him from the final reconciliations that occur in *The Tempest*. Shylock is black because he is Jewish, and he is Jewish because he is black—his body is physically demarcated from daughter's in a move to differentiate his visible villainy from Jessica's fair-skinned assimilability. In *The Merchant*, Shylock is racially segregated from his daughter, and the Christians use Shylock's supposed race to justify their appropriation of his daughter.

Fathers and Daughters: Reproduction, Offspring, and Rape

There are other physical or regenerative qualities that separate Jessica from Shylock. According to M. Lindsay Kaplan, medieval constructions of Jewish identity followed the neo-Aristotelian model of reproduction, wherein the male provides the seed that shapes the matter (or blood) in the woman's womb. The male's seed, according to Albertus Magnus and his student Thomas Aquinas, "tends towards the generation of a male offspring […] conception of a female offspring is something of an accident in the order of nature."[121] From this, Kaplan draws the conclusions that "Jewish daughters, like all daughters and unlike sons in a neo-Aristotelian system, are less like their fathers" and that miscegenation with a converted Jewish woman would nonetheless produce "offspring [who] will take their form from the Christian father and will not receive any shaping from their mother or from her former religion."[122] I want to suggest that Kaplan's succinct analyses of the neo-Aristotelian construction of reproduction, particularly in relation to the production of male or female offspring, also applies to other races and nationalities. Perhaps this model in part explains why the Nurse calls Aaron the Moor's child

"thy stamp, thy seal" (4.2.69) in *Titus Andronicus*, for the child, as a male, bears the imprint of Aaron, "the figure and the picture" (4.2.107) of his father's image. Aaron's seed has performed the act of shaping Tamora's blood into a male infant, and Aaron takes excessive pride at his regenerative abilities.

In light of this reproductive model, Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda is thus rendered even more threatening—the Native will produce other male Natives, not merely a mixture of a Native and European body. Caliban articulates this idea when he boasts: "O ho, O ho! Would't had been done! / Though didst prevent me; I had peopled else / this isle with Calibans" (1.2.352-4). Notably, Caliban would not have "peopled" the unidentified island with children possessing half of Miranda's attributes and half of his; rather the brood would consist only of Caliban's physical copies, so long as they too were male. By claiming that the island would be populated with "Calibans" and not "Calibanias," Caliban emulates the misogyny of neo-Aristotelian models of reproduction. If Caliban is highly adept at mimicking the Europeans in their language, he also appropriates their notions of gender roles in creating offspring that possess the "spirit" of their father's seed. Caliban's body then—as monstrous, odorous, and fluid as it is—still retains the ability to propagate other Native bodies that may, in turn, threaten the maidenheads of other Europeans. Likewise, Shylock's anger at the loss of his daughter, "My own flesh and blood to rebel!" (3.1.30), can be read on a deeper level than mere shock at losing a daughter and wealth—the dispossession of Jessica and of the right to marry her to a Jewish man, in the neo-Aristotelian reproductive model, means that Shylock's ability to become the patriarch of a Jewish family, with Jewish grandchildren, is null. Instead, Shylock's daughter is now a Christian and will produce only Christian children who avoid inheriting any Jewishness via their mother. Likewise, Jessica loses the appellation of "daughter," she is rather Shylock's "flesh and blood," a descriptive that emphasizes both her physical role in reproduction and Shylock's attempt to

somatically separate and guard his daughter from the other "flesh" of the Christians. In both *The Merchant* and *The Tempest* the subaltern woman is physically denied agency—Jessica cannot verbally contest her position, and Miranda could not articulate her true sexual desires were they to counteract her father's wishes.

The prospect of ravishing Miranda involves another dimension of masculine colonization of a female's body when we consider that Caliban represents an inversion of the fantasy of subjecting and copulating with the colonized maiden. In *Eastward Ho!* Captain Seagull envisages the New World female inhabitants as willing to share their bodies among the English settlers: "Come, boys, Virginia longs till we share the rest of her maidenhead" (3.3.14).[123] The idea that the inhabitants of Virginia long to "share the rest of her maidenhead" recalls the femininity attributed to the Native Americans and exemplifies the early modern notion that Native Americans, while feared for their cannibalism, are nonetheless silent when it comes to the ravishment of Indian women. However, Caliban's attempted appropriation of Miranda's body represents a direct contradiction of what the Sea Captain Seagull in *Eastward Ho!* envisions—the fear that the Native can rape the bodies of the colonizers' women is not present in Jonson, Chapman and Marston's play; instead, the colonizer has all the right of physical conquest and rape. Caliban's desire to rape Miranda differs because the body of the colonizing female, though without much agency in terms of allocation of rule, nonetheless is able to speak back: "Abhorrèd slave, / Which any print of goodness wilt not take, / Being capable of all ill!" (1.2.354-356). Although many editors believe that this speech is out of character for Miranda and assign it to Prospero, Miranda's earlier vehemence and political acumen concerning Prospero's usurpation indicates that Miranda has more agency than some readers assume. Notably, Miranda's lines suggest that Caliban's body is unable to acquire the imprint of any positive quality—his body is too deformed to allow, in the neo-Aristotelian model of reproduction, for replication of

goodness. Miranda, although limited in what she can say, is able to voice her disdain for the Native body and her admiration for the correct sexual partner—a white Christian. Nonetheless, in transposing the roles of ravisher and ravished, Shakespeare builds upon the developing fears the early moderns possessed concerning control of the Native Americans' bodies, while also critiquing the ludicrous height in which the Europeans articulate this fear. Because Prospero has been Miranda's sole educator, she emulates his disdain for the Native body to such a degree that Caliban must necessarily use humoral and physical discourse to refute his sub-human status. Caliban curses Prospero, first wishing for "All the infections that the sun sucks up / From bogs, fens, flats, on Prosper fall and make him / By inch-meal a disease!" (2.2.1-3). Caliban curses Prospero's body, because both Prospero and Miranda subject Caliban's own body to physical humiliations and torture. For all the mortal inhabitants of the isle, language focusing on materiality is used as a weapon and a curse. In depicting Prospero, Miranda, and Caliban as all highly aware of their bodily needs and material powers, Shakespeare illustrates the untenable nature of fixing on and using the body to obtain agency. Moreover, by articulating the potential inversion of the Sea Captain's fantasy, Shakespeare in turn explores the many layers of disgust associated with imagining a Native male ravishing a European's body. This disgust operates on more than simply a moral level—the physical grotesquerie of Caliban renders him a highly unsuitable suitor for Miranda. Nonetheless, the prospect of a Jewish male copulating with a European never arises in *The Merchant*. Rather, both Caliban and Shylock are more threatening in terms of consuming, not ravishing, the Europeans.

Foot for Thought: Native American and Jewish Cannibalism

One has to wonder if Caliban's disgusting, but intimate, offer to become Stephano's "foot-licker" (4.1.218) became a verbal and physical approximation of cannibalism on the early modern stage. Caliban's forked tongue, simultaneously promising servility and approaching

consumption of a limb of Stephano, might have onstage actually jutted out from between his fish-like lips and tasted Stephano's soiled, but still edible, boot or bare foot. When the audience sees the Native approach a European with mouth and tongue, the ravenous desires of Caliban and his identification with the New World become more frighteningly real. Thus, while Skura concisely notes that Caliban feeds off of roots, berries, and fish, Caliban's offer to become a taster of Stephano's foot clearly links him with the Native American cannibals.[124] Furthermore, although Skura claims that Caliban's name, while sounding like "Cannibal," is still too distinct to merit this close-sounding parallel as proof of Caliban's diet, the suggestive element in Caliban's name and his offered foot-licking all work to visually and aurally remind the audience of Caliban's savage-like affinities. Likewise, Shylock's persistent desire for Antonio's flesh is both an attempt to obtain means for bartering for subjectivity, and also a play upon the fear of cannibalism believed to be practiced by Jews in early modern England. When Salerio demands to know why Shylock wants Antonio's flesh, Shylock responds in language that resonates with the act of consumption and satiation: "If it will feed nothing else it will / feed my revenge" (3.1.45-46). Although Shylock asserts that he will not use the flesh of Antonio for food, the language of swallowing or consuming litters Shylock's speeches. In a more overt reference, as Shylock prepares to dine with Bassanio and Antonio, he unabashedly pronounces "But yet I'll go in hate, to feed upon / The prodigal Christian" (2.51415). Cannibalism, in both plays, represents a threat that cannot be immediately dismissed or disregarded. Instead, intimations of Caliban's and Shylock's desire to eat their oppressors periodically appear and thus counteract the levity of the Europeans in their treatment of the Jew or the Native.

Sniffing out the Other: The *Foetor Judaicus* and Caliban's Stench

Just as Jews bled into the world, thus contaminating it, and possessed black, fluid bodies, they also purportedly released noxious odors into the world and offended the nostrils of the

Europeans. In 1569 Pierre Boaistuau claimed, "as well to al the *Iewes,* as Lepres, thorough out all the prouince of *Europe,* being founde culpable therof, that their posterities smell therof til this day."[125] This idea was still prevalent enough in 1646 for Thomas Browne to feel the need to deconstruct this view by commenting on the Jewish comingling with other nations: "[I]t will be hard to establish this quality (the *foetor judaicus*) upon the Iews, unlesse we also transferre the same, unto those whose generations are mixed, whose genealogies are Jewish, and naturally derived from them."[126] Nonetheless, this passage points to the fear of the great masses of Jews in all nations, including England. In attempting to allay the misconception that the Jews emanate a particular smell, Browne simultaneously posits that the Jews are already mixing with the English nation. Given the fear of miscegenation, this tract undermines the concept of English purity. As Shapiro notes, "[t]he erosion of recognizable difference paradoxically generated ever more strenuous efforts to distinguish Christian from Jew."[127] In these attempts at differentiating English from Jewish, the early moderns built upon anatomical and climatologic theories that clearly separate the pure English body from the odoriferous emanations of the Jew. Despite protests from learned individuals, Browne and others still felt the need to reiterate the falsity of the *foetor judaicus*, which suggests that this myth was a persistent belief that many early moderns credited. In a sense, then, both Shylock's blood and the myth of *foetor judaicus* are further representations of the physical deformity of his body. Shylock urges Antonio and Bassanio to "Forget the shames that you have stained me with" (1.3.134), perhaps indicating a desire to erase not only the degrading epithets and the vicious greed attributed to him, but also the shameful fluids and smells that supposedly exit his body. Shylock wants to close his body from the allegation of odor and counteract early modern beliefs concerning Jewish bodies in order to validate his own subjectivity and individuality. Shylock's denial of fluidity, his attempt

at sealing up his body's gaps, enacts resistance to the Venetian Christians' frequently voiced prejudices.

Caliban, distinctly marked by his emanating stench, does not attempt to lessen his odor—he perhaps sublimates his smell into a counterattack on his colonization. If Prospero denies Caliban freedom, as opposed to the eventual emancipation promised to Ariel and the other spirits, then Caliban, seeking to deny his oppressor complete control over his body, never refutes his smell. In fact, when Stephano and Trinculo complain that they smell of horse piss, Caliban fails to respond, prompting Stephano to demand "Do you hear, monster?" (4.1.200). Caliban's smell is also part of his dismissal by the Europeans—at the end, despite Caliban's desire to "seek for grace" (5.1.299), and essentially become assimilated into Prospero's system of morals, he is not received. The body of the colonized, by smelling and exuding vapors or liquids, is still too Othered for the colonists to accept. Shylock's silence on his forced conversion and the silence of Prospero on Caliban's promise to reform are both indicative of the unresolved boundaries between the colonized's and the colonizer's bodies that cannot be transcended via religion or acceptance. Caliban refuses to deny his smell, and Shylock, though attempting to diminish the physiological differences between his and the Europeans' bodies, still retains a marked distinction from the Christians; as Kaplan notes, the last mention of Shylock in the play is to "the rich Jew" (5.1.291), not to the "rich convert."[128] Silence, from both those religiously colonizing and those spiritually colonized, results in a tenuous denial of cultural assimilation that rests on both physical and spiritual differences. The body is always a site for contestation, and the very qualities of the body represent another form of the Europeans refusal to give some ground—in these cases religiously and physically—because the Jewish or Native body is persistently, despite its offensive menstrual liquids and smells, property of the colonizer. Hence, Shylock *cannot* speak against his religious colonization and must submit to his newly converted status. Likewise,

Caliban is immediately sent away at the close of the play—he does not belong among the new, elite alliances formed between Milan and Naples. The Europeans in the play deny both the Jewish and the Native body agency through silencing their attempts to avoid the "staining" shames of physical humiliation. Thus, perceived physical differences, particularly damaging or noxious ones, exclude Shylock and Caliban from any sort of moral or social assimilation in the plays. In an important way, both are dismissed as unsuitable because their bodies, as odiferous, leaky, and monstrous as they are, remain too disparate from the colonizing Europeans to allow for the possibility of integration or complete reconciliation.

This dismissal of both Shylock and Caliban does not eliminate their roles as continual reminders of the Othered body. Yet Shylock and Caliban differ in that one represents an ever-present threat to the solubility of the European body within the geographical region of Europe and potentially England. For Bassanio, Antonio, and the other Venetian men, just because Shylock is subdued does not mean that the continuing threat of Jewish bodies stops encroaching upon their economic and social interactions. On the other hand, Caliban serves as a stand-in for the removed, Native body that is distanced from the English stage, and from Prospero's vision of social harmony, because he is left behind, or left to remain on a desolate island away from the Europeans. Nonetheless, the Native body also threatens to cross boundaries and "contaminate" the Europeans, namely through the appropriation of a white, European woman. Indeed, for the women in both plays their bodies are discursively and physically claimed by both Jew/Native American and European. However, the women, once claimed, have less agency in voicing their own identities: Miranda and Jessica must belong to either a racialized group or the Europeans, but they cannot carve out their own place within this physically determinative and racialized hierarchy.

Conclusion

Native American and Jewish bodies, for the early moderns, were sites of problematic uncertainties, including whether these characters belong, if at all, in the social tableau of the plays. Indeed, Shakespeare indicates that Jewish and Native bodies are too stained to be able to regain any form of agentive voice or social standing among the Christian groups in the plays. Both Jew and Native embodied early modern fears concerning monstrosity, the devil and religion, and the outside elements that could potentially contaminate a colonizer's own physical soundness. Shylock and Caliban are closely connected in that the prejudices attached to their bodies are collectively degrading and exemplify early modern racialized condensations of identity. Their treatment differs markedly from that received by Miranda or Jessica because the colonized female's body can ultimately be assimilated, while the male's body, because of its smell, its unnatural fluidity, its color and its supposed desire for human flesh, cannot. This connection between the Native and the Jew was picked up by later writers like ben Israel and Thorowgood and further employed as a proto-orientalist prejudice that fueled missionary efforts, racism, and colonization. Shylock's attempt to close up his body, and Caliban's willingness to let his body seep odors and semen, prevent these Othered characters from speaking the exact same language as the Europeans—because the Native and the Jew have fundamentally different bodies, on which the Europeans may make claims and assumptions concerning monstrosity, these Othered bodies can never occupy the same level of humanity as the white European.

Figure One: Anonymous. *Of the newe la[n]des and of ye people founde by the messengers of the kynge of porty[n]gale named Emanuel Of the. x. dyuers nacyons crystened. Of pope Iohn and his landes, and of the costely keyes and wonders molodyes that in that lande is.* London: 1520. Title Page. From the British Library.

Figure Two. Boaistuau, Pierre. *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Descriptio[n] of Sundry Strange Things, Seming Monstrous in Our Eyes and Iudgement, Bicause We Are not Priuie to the Reasons of Them. Gathered out of Diuers Learned Authors as well Greeke as Latine, Sacred as Prophane.* London: 1569.

Epilogue

Before Ferdinand descends into his bestial madness, he reveals that the Duchess of Malfi has only seen waxen figures, not the actual dead bodies of her loved ones: "These presentations are but framed in wax / By the curious master in that quality, / Vincentio Lauriola, and she takes them / For true substantial bodies" (4.1.114-117). Yet, despite the harrowing images these waxen figures display, early modern literature and the medical ideologies of the period reveal that the "true substantial bodies" are just as worrisome, for these actual bodies contain countless possibilities for transformation, infection, and contamination. We have seen how Hermia and Viola are both prone to the effects of imprinting and disfigurement in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night*. Indeed, these two comedies illustrate the many potential alterations to which an early modern body, particularly a feminine body, is subject. These plays also highlight the tenuous and futile nature of attempting to prevent one's body from becoming too changeable. When men aim to regulate and direct the physical and sexual qualities of women in both plays, they find that the waxen woman may also use her physical qualities to direct and focus her desire in a particular direction. Hence, despite the continuing threat that Egeus may "disfigure" his daughter, Hermia persists in molding and tempering her own desires. Viola, on the other hand, uses the qualities of her changeable body to reintroduce her gendered body into the masculinist, heterosexual social sphere of Illyria.

While in these plays the masculine authority of father, duke, or lover is threatened by the qualities of the feminine body, in Chapter Two I turned to the ways in which clothing might alter the inner constitution of a male and render his less tangible qualities, such as political and social agency, also at risk. Pyrocles, Antony, and Falstaff each suffer some form of masculine degradation based on the transformative possibilities inherent in the feminine apparel they don.

Clothing is not only an extension of the body for the early moderns, but it also has its own power to mold and alter the wearer's physical state of being. Hence, once women's articles of clothing are forcibly appropriated by men, their bodies are put into similar, compromising situations: Beatrice is led to having sexing with De Flores, while Innogen's disgrace requires that she brave her body to the elements *and* put her own femininity at risk in wearing the clothes of a man. Here, the discourse on clothing, medicine, and masculinity intersect to comment on the dangers and potential pleasures involved in using women's clothes for gain or sexual satiation.

In the hierarchization of mutable bodies, foreign or racialized bodies are even more dangerous to early modern English masculinist norms than female or feminized male bodies are. Hence, Shylock and Caliban's supposed shared physical attributes are imagined as encroaching upon their European counterparts in multiple ways. Whereas in Chapter Two the English male is at risk because he willingly puts on the clothes of a woman, in Chapter Three I discussed how the threat arises from the outside. These outsiders to the carefully guarded Self in *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Tempest* are called black, licentious, monstrous, and porous. The ways in which Shylock and Caliban are physically feminized illustrates just how vehement, and worried, the early moderns were concerning their own English physical and national salubrity.

Webster's play depicts the most frightening alteration possible through Ferdinand, who goes from man to beast. Although his fur in on the inside, Ferdinand responds to his alteration in ways that harm his material body, such as when he risks physical and mental infection through contamination with corpses. The Doctor describes how "One met the Duke 'bout midnight in a lane / Behind Saint Mark's Church, with the leg of a man / Upon his shoulder" (5.2.13-15). It is not clear whether Ferdinand actually eats the bodies he digs up, but his physical proximity to the decaying bodies of the dead nonetheless renders him at risk in imbibing the qualities and toxicity of the corpse. In a sense, the waxen figures before the Duchess's eyes are more "substantial" and

solid than the characters themselves, particularly Ferdinand, as tangible bodies are poisoned, suffocated, and stabbed in the play, and Ferdinand's madness represents a peak in bodily transformations that takes away any semblance of humanity. In all of the works of literature I have discussed, the gender and status of the body is in question precisely because of its contact with other the elements, clothing, or with other bodies. Ferdinand utilizes the skill of an artist who creates waxen images to torture the Duchess. Fittingly, his punishment involves a physical degradation that is also possible for the other characters I have discussed, for Hermia, Antony, or Miranda is also at risk in the physical ordering of bodies in which masculine concerns are mapped onto the female body, the feminized cross-dressing male body, and the foreign, Othered body in numerous ways. The body may become monstrous, as Ferdinand's does, and this potential transformation is dramatized to reveal the very weak and unstable position of supposedly perfect, male bodies in early modern England.

NOTES

[1] All references from Shakespearean plays are from *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York; London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997).

[2] Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., eds., *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 3.

[3] *OED*, "harsh, *a.*1," The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 Oct. 2010 <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50045660>.

[4] Thus Trinculo bitingly remarks in *The Tempest* (2.2.29-31). I discuss this line and its relationship to early modern notions of Natives-as-spectacle in Chapter Three.

[5] Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London: Routledge, 1995), 2.

[6] Nancy G. Siraisi, "The Fielding H. Garrison Lecture: Medicine and the Renaissance World of Learning," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78.1 (2004), 5.

[7] Helkiah Crooke, *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man, together with the Controversies and Figures thereto Belonging / Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy* (London: 1616), 61.

[8] Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciples of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 9.

[9] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy VVhat It Is. VVith all the Kindes, Causes, Symptomes, Prognostickes, and Seuerall Cures of It. In Three Maine Partitions with Their Seuerall Sections, Members, and Subsections. Philosophically, Medicinally, Historically, Opened and Cut vp* (London: 1621): 20-21.

[10] Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 105-106.

[11] Timothy Bright, *A Treatise of Melancholy* (London: 1586), 59.

[12] Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (London: Routledge, 2005), 111.

[13] Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 77.

[14] Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 4.

[15] Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, 19.

[16] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 211.

[17] Bright, *A Treatise, Wherein Is Declared the Sufficiencie of English Medicines, for Cure of all Diseases, Cured with Medicines* (London: 1615), 15.

[18] Imtiaz Habib, "Elizabethan Racial Medical Psychology, Popular Drama, and the Social Programming of the Late-Tudor Black: Sketching an Exploratory Postcolonial Hypothesis," in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, ed. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 94.

[19] Sean McDowell, "The View from the Interior: The New Body Scholarship in Renaissance/Early Modern Studies," *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2006), 779. For a more comprehensive bibliography on new body scholarship, McDowell's article is invaluable.

[20] McDowell, "The View from the Interior," 779.

[21] Roy Porter, "History of the Body Reconsidered," in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke. 2nd ed. (College Station: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 236.

[22] Michael C. Schoenfeldt, *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 11.

[23] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 21.

[24] Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, 3.

[25] Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds., *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 15.

[26] Mary Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3-4.

[27] Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race*, 132-160.

[28] Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race*, 4.

[29] Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race*, 41.

[30] David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, eds., *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), xv.

[31] Hillman and Mazzio, *The Body in Parts*, xviii.

[32] Jonathan Gil Harris, *Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 3.

[33] Siraisi, "Medicine and the Renaissance World of Learning," 3.

[34] Harris, *Sick Economies*, 15.

[35] Alessandro Massario, *De Morbis Fœmineis, The Womans Counsellour: or, The Feminine Physitian*. Trans. R. T. (London: 1657), 1-2.

[36] William Kerwin, *Beyond the Body: The Boundaries of Medicine and English Renaissance Drama* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005).

[37] Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson, eds., *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), xi.

[38] Moss and Peterson, *Disease, Diagnosis and Cure*, xvi.

[39] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 29.

[40] Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, 16.

[41] Historically, the Queen was actually courted by François, Henri's younger brother, and Elizabeth never met Henri in person: likewise, the extent to which the Queen actually cared for François or used him as a political toy to frustrate or appease her Privy Council is hotly debated among historians. See Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003): 154-194, who discusses in detail the courtship practices of François and the various opposition from foreign ambassadors, the Privy Council, and the public to the proposed marriage. Certainly religious, nationalist, and political authorities lodged complaints against both Henri and François as potential husbands for the Queen, though François's specific apparel is not mentioned in John Stubbs's verbose pamphlet, *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gvlf*, which inveighs against the possibility of marriage between François and the Queen. See John Stubbs, *The Disccoverie of a Gaping Gvlf whereinto England is like to Be Swallovved by an other French Mariage [sic], if the Lord Forbid not the Banes, by Letting Her Maiestie See the Sin and Punishment thereof*. (London: 1579). Stubbs does, however, subtly critique the physical appearance of the Duke by averring that he will not dwell on the Duke's body: "And for the presence of shewe of this mans person […] I humbly besech hir [the Queen], that she wyll vievv it and suruieu it, and in vieuing she vvil fetch hir hart vp to hir eyes and cary hir eyes down to hir hart" (E.2).

[42] Leah Marcus notes that we only have evidence that Elizabeth wore armor before the battle of Tilsbury. Nonetheless, Marcus describes the many ways in which Elizabeth presented herself as both male and female. See

Leah Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare, Local Reading and Its Discontents* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), 51-105.

[43] Crooke, *Microcosmographia*, 249.

[44] Phillip Stubbes, *The anatomie of abuses contayning a discouerie, or briefe summarie of such notable vices and imperfections, as now raigne in many Christian countreyes of the worlde: but (especiallie) in a verie famous ilande called Ailgna: together, with most fearefull examples of Gods iudgementes, executed vpon the wicked for the same, aswell in Ailgna of late, as in other places, elsewhere. Verie godly, to be read of all true Christians, euerie where: but most needefull, to be regarded in Englande. Made dialogue-wise, by Phillip Stubbes. Seene and allowed, according to order* (London: 1583), No Pagination.

[45] Will Fisher, *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 3.

[46] William Prynne, *Histrio-mastix The players Scourge, or, Actors Tragaedie, Divided into Two Parts* (London: 1633). Prynne uses the term "degenerate" frequently in his diatribe, as, for example, in the following lines: "the verdict of human nature condemnes mens degenerating into women" (200). The word "degenerate," according to the *OED*, had the same negative connotations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as it does today. See *OED* "degenerate, *n.*, *a.*, and *v*." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 June 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50059713>.

[47] Jean E. Howard, "Crossdressing, the Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988), 148. Howard's article was also reprinted in *Crossing the Stage: Controversies on Cross-Dressing*, ed. Lesley Ferris (London and New York: Routledge, 1993): 20-46. Howard expands and complicates this question further in her book *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1994).

[48] On early modern cross-dressing, see Steve Brown, "The Boyhood of Shakespeare's Heroines: Notes on Gender Ambiguity in the Sixteenth Century," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 30 (1990): 243-63; David Cressy, "Gender Trouble and Cross-Dressing in Early Modern England," *The Journal of British Studies* 35.4 (1996): 438-465; Marjorie Garber, "The Logic of the Transvestite: *The Roaring Girl* (1608)" in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991): 221-234; *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Ursula K. Heise, "Transvestism and the Stage Controversy in Spain and England, 1580-1680," *Theatre Journal* 44 (1992): 357-74; Lisa Jardine, "Boy Actors, Female Roles, and Elizabethan Eroticism," in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991): 57-67; Katherine E. Kelly, "The Queen's Two Bodies: Shakespeare's Boy Actress in Breeches," *Theatre Journal* 42 (1990): 81-93; Laura Levine, *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Phyllis Rackin, "Androgyny, Mimesis, and the Marriage of the Boy Heroine on the English Renaissance Stage," *PMLA* 102 (1987): 29-41; Mary Beth Rose, *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988): 43-92; Michael Shapiro, *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994); Peter Stallybrass, "Transvestism and the 'Body Beneath': Speculating on the Boy Actor" in *Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage*, ed. Susan Zimmerman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992): 64-83; Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984): 139-271.

[49] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 2.

[50] Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 2.

[51] Stephen Orgel, *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 18.

[52] Fisher, *Materializing Gender*, 87.

[53] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 10.

[54] Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory" in *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. ed. Sue-Ellen Case (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 272.

[55] Laqueur, *Making* Sex, 8.

[56] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 87.

[57] Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 134.

[58] Ambroise Paré, *On Monsters and Marvels*, trans. Janis L. Pallister (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 32.

[59] Paré, *On Monsters and Marvels*, 32.

[60] Philip Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (London: 1583), Sheet 91 (No Pagination).

[61] William Prynne, *Histrio-Mastix The Players Scourge*, 208.

[62] John Rainoldes, *Th' Overthrow of Stage-Playes* (Middleburgh: 1629).

[63] Prynne, *Histrio-Mastix*, 171.

[64] "Part, *n., adj., adv., v*." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 June 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50172081>.

[65] Prynne, *Histrio-Mastix*, 187.

[66] Ambroise Paré, *The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*, trans. Thomas Johnson (London: 1634).

[67] Paré, *The Workes*, 553.

[68] Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, 32.

[69] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 103.

[70] Interestingly, besides Portia, Nerissa, and Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the other cross-dressing females in Shakespeare's works do not specify from whom they receive their male clothes, thus eliding the issue of how a typically lower-class male's body might affect the cross-dressing females via their clothing. Hence, although Rosalind, Viola, Jessica and Innogen all contemplate the unbecoming, here potentially literal, aspects of dressing as a man, they do not point to a particular person who supplies these clothes. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Julia is careful to emphasize the fact that her Nurse is making the clothes, thus they are untainted with another's attributes. Pisanio obtains Innogen's disguise for her, but he does not indicate whether these are his clothes or from another man.

[71] Crooke, *Microcosmographia*, 131.

[72] Paré, *The Workes*, 28.

[73] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, 210.

[74] Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. Maurice Evans (New York and London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977), 130-131.

[75] Sidney, *Arcadia*, 133.

[76] Sidney, *Arcadia*, 327.

[77] Paré, *The Workes*, 276.

[78] Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, 275.

[79] On early modern punishments for "unruly" women, see D.E. Underdown's "The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England" in *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* ed. Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 116-136.

[80] The specific language of the proclamation is interesting for the clear class divisions it perpetuates in who does or does not have to wear a cap: "[…] all and euerye person and persons aboue the age of five yeres, (excepte maydens, Ladyes, and Gentlewomen) inhabityng, commoratyng, and abydyng within any of the Cities, Boroughes, Townes, Villages, or Hamlettes, of this Realme of Englande: and except also all noble personages, and euery lord, knight, and gentleman, of the possessions of twentie markes land by the yere, and their heyres […] shall bse and weare uppon the Sabbath and Holye day […] uppon their heade one cappe of wooll knitte, thicked, and dressed in Englande […]" (Ch. xix). *Anno xiij Reginae Elizabethe at the Parliament begunne and holden at Westminster the second of Apryll, in the xiij yere of the raigne of Our Most Gratious Soueraigne Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of Englande, Fraunce, and Ireland Queene, defendour of the fayth, &c., and there continued vntyll the dissolution of the same : to the hygh pleasure of almyghtie God, and the weale publique of this realme, were enacted as foloweth* (London: 1571).

[81] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 125.

[82] Thomas Alfred Spalding made this observation in 1880 in his work *Elizabethan Demonology* (Boston: Dodo Press, rep. 2009), citing Banquo's bewilderment at the three witches beards in *Macbeth*: "You should be women, / And yet your beards forbid me to interpret / That you are so" (1.3.43-44).

[83] Rosalind explicitly avers that, while she might seem to look and act like a man, her inner womanhood will not be compromised while she is cross-dressed: "in my heart / Lie there what hidden woman's fear there will. / We'll have a swashing and a martial outside, / As many other mannish cowards have / That do outface it with their semblances" (1.3.112-116). For Shakespeare's cross-dressing women, there is a repeated need to differentiate the inner woman from the alias and masculinity of their male personas. However, this does not appear to be the case with the cross-dressing males in early modern works, who do not attempt to maintain a boundary between what gender they are and what gender they put forth to the world.

[84] In his notes on *The Duchess of Malfi*, David Bevington notes that "De Flores suffers from a disfiguring skin ailment" (1.2 n.9), which is supported throughout the text in references to De Flores's skin coming off or offending the sight of others. See, for example, when Beatrice offers to cure him of this disfiguring disease "I'll make a water for you shall cleanse this" (2.2.83). See John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi* in *Renaissance Drama* ed. David Bevington et al. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002).

[85] Sidney, *Arcadia*, 846.

[86] Thomas Thorowgood, *Iewes in America, or, Probabilities that the Americans Are of that Race* (London: 1650), a3.

[87] Thorowgood, *Iewes in America*, 17.

[88] Thorowgood, *Iewes in America*, 17.

[89] Not all early modern authors demonized the Jew or the Native American. For example, Robert Wilson's 1584 play *The Three Ladies of London* features a Jewish moneylender named Gerontus whom most critics cite as a positive Jewish figure and a source for Shakespeare's Shylock. According to Aaron Kitch, "there are other, more positive accounts of Jewish integration that have been overlooked" (132). Kitch, "Shylock's Sacred Nation," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.2 (2008). In this same manner, some authors were horrified at the treatment South American Indians received at the hands of the Spanish and Portuguese. In 1583 a translation of Bartolomé de las Casas' work *The Spanish Colonie* described the moral violations of the colonizers in America: "Vpon these lambes so mecke, so qualified & endewed of their maker and creator, as hath bin said, entred the Spanish incontinent as they knewe them, as wolues, as lions, & as tigres most cruel of long time famished" (19). Bartolomé de las Casas, *The Spanish Colonie, or Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and Gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies, Called the Newe World, for the Space of XL. Yeeres: Written in the Castilian Tongue* (London: 1583).

[90] For a thorough examination of how the early moderns conceived of Jewish threats, see James Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 33-42. However, Lara Bovilsky rightly points out that there was no constant, or fixed, understanding of Jewry or race in early modern England. Nevertheless, this does not limit us in exploring how these indefinite conceptions of race are articulated onstage: "Dramatic representations of racial identity are no less important, no less powerful—both compelling and punitive—for being fluid, variable, and often contradictory" (33). *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

[91] According to the *OED*, the early modern usage of the term "savage" also encapsulated the meaning of "savagery" as a pejorative term: "Of peoples or (now somewhat *rarely*) of individual persons: uncivilized; existing in the lowest stage of culture." See *OED* "savage, *adj.*and *n.* 5a." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 March 2011. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/view/Entry/171433?rskey=SQ2R7i&result=2&isAdvanced=false#>.

[92] As Meredith Skura argues, Caliban's race is unspecified. We are only provided the clue that his mother is from Algiers, a country in Africa. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.1 (1989): 42-69. However, as this paper will explore in greater depth, I see particular descriptions of Caliban and his relationship with the Europeans as more resonant with similar accounts of the early modern English's encounter with Native Americans. Hence, although Caliban is certainly not "savage" in his language or humanity, he is a native of the island in *The Tempest*, just as Native Americans were (and are still) indigenous populations of both South and North America. The specific race of Caliban is not so much at issue here as are the physical descriptors that are forcibly attached to his body—the same descriptors employed to represent Native Americans in other early modern literature.

[93] See Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare: Studies in the Archetypal Underworld of the Plays* (New York: Barns & Noble Publishing, Inc., 2006).

[94] Said specifically locates the starting point of Orientalism in the eighteenth century. See Edward Said, *Orientalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage, 2003), 3. Of course, the early modern era predates any wide-scale institutionalization of colonization and to speak about the concept of orientalism *per se* before the late eighteenth century is inaccurate. However, we can explore the ways in which characters and/or texts epistemically and physically colonize Othered bodies even before the widespread imperialistic campaigns of the late eighteenth century took place. See also Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East 1576-1626* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[95] Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, 29.

[96] Barbour instead suggests that we look to "English constructions of 'the East,' not as figures in a self-regulating cosmos of language, but as flexible elements of discursive networks that are recurrently crossed, challenged, and inflected by others" (6).

[97] Scholars like Peter Hulme, Stephen Greenblatt, Ania Loomba, and Nabil Matar contribute to locating imperialist discourse, colonizing desire, or racial prejudice in early modern texts. These early modern studies expand upon foundational work in post-colonial theory as set forth by Said and further developed (albeit with different foci in terms of subjectivity, identity, and hybridity) by scholars such as Homi K. Bhabha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Borrowing from these theorists, early modern post-colonial studies have produced remarkably fruitful analyses concerning early modern England's relationship with such disparate localities as China, the Middle East, Africa, and, of course, America. Nonetheless, more attention needs to be paid to how embodiment plays a role in establishing power dynamics and hierarchal subjections in early modern drama. For representative post-colonial or anti-post-colonial critiques of early modern literature, see Catherine M. S. Alexander and Stanley W. Wells, eds., *Shakespeare and Race* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, "Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: The Discursive Con-texts of *The Tempest*," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London and New York: Methuen, 1985); Paul Brown, "'This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," in *Political Shakespeare: New essays in Cultural Materialism* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985), 48-71; Stephen Greenblatt, "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century," in *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 16-39; Imtiaz H. Habib, "Introduction: Race in Tudor England and Shakespeare: The Historical Ground and the Critical Tools," in *Shakespeare and Race: Postcolonial Praxis in the Early Modern Period* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2000), 1-21; Kim F. Hall, "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner? Colonisation and Miscegenation in *The Merchant of Venice*," in *The Merchant of Venice: Contemporary Critical Essays*, ed. Martin Coyle (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 92-116; Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, eds., *"The Tempest" and Its Travels* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin, eds., *Post-Colonial Shakespeares* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Ania Loomba, *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Joyce Green MacDonald, ed., *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1997); Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). See also Said,

Orientalism; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988); Homi K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

[98] See, in particular, Said's claim that "Orientalism […] is not an airy European fantasy about the Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment" (6).

[99] Alden T. Vaughan, "Trinculo's Indian: American Natives in Shakespeare's England," in *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*. Ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000): 49-59.

[100] John Fletcher and Nathaniel Field, *Four Plays, Or Moral Representations, in One*. Ed. Cyrus Hoy in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* vol. VIII. Ed Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992): 223-344.

[101] Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. Tom Griffith (Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1999). Parenthetical citation refers, in order, to book, canto, stanza, and line numbers.

[102] Although there may have been Native American cadavers on display in early modern England, there was, for a few, at the very least the opportunity to witness a live "Native" on the English shore. Several expeditions brought back Natives. Perhaps the most closely connected to Shakespeare, chronologically, would have been the Inuit man, woman, and child brought to Bristol by Martin Frobisher returning from his second expedition. According to Michael Leroy Oberg, these three individuals sparked a wide array of interest from various fields: "They were subjected to experiments, and observers recorded their cultural attitudes and child-rearing practices, motor skills and coordination, and anatomy and physiology" (23). Michael Leroy Oberg, *Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585-1685* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

[103] Thorowgood, *Iews in America*. The Epistle Dedicatory (a 3).

[104] Richard W. Cogley, "'Some Other Kinde of Being and Condition': The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England over the Peopling of Ancient America," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68.1 (2007), 36.

[105] For an explication of the legend of the Red Jews, see Andrew Colin Gow, *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600* (Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1995).

[106] James Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 180.

[107] David S. Katz, "Shylock's Gender: Jewish Male Menstruation in Early Modern England," *The Review of English Studies* 50.200 (1999): 441.

[108] On stage and in other literature, Jews were cast as the villains, moneylenders, and, occasionally, as sympathetic characters or heroes. Of course, Barabas and Shylock are the most famous Jewish characters from the early modern stage. However, other, more amenable Jews appeared onstage, including Gerontus in Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* (1584), Abraham in Robert Greene's *Selimus* (1592), and the many Jewish characters in Elizabeth Cary's closet drama *The Tragedy of Mariam* (1613). What is perhaps most remarkable about this brief survey of early modern Jewish characters is the wide diversification in the characteristics of these figures.

[109] Ruth Samson Luborsky, "The Pictorial Image of the Jew in Elizabethan Secular Books." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.4 (1995): 452.

[110] Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 82.

[111] The literature on Jews in early modern England, particularly concerning Shylock or Barabas, is vast. Some representative works include Janet T. Adelman, *Blood Relations: Christian and Jew in 'The Merchant of Venice'* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008); Peter Berek, "The Jew as Renaissance Man," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51.1 (1998): 128-62; Matthew Biberman, *Masculinity, Anti-Semitism, and Early Modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Allan Bloom, "Shakespeare on Jew and Christian: An Interpretation of *The Merchant of Venice*," *Social Research* 30.1 (1963): 1-22; Edmund Valentine Campos, "Jews, Spaniards, and Portingales: Ambiguous Identities of Portuguese *Marranos* in Elizabethan England," *ELH* 69 (2002): 599-616; Thomas Cartelli, "Shakespeare's *Merchant*, Marlowe's *Jew*: The Problem of Cultural Difference," *Shakespeare Studies* 20 (1988): 255-60; Charles Edelman, "Which Is the Jew That

Shakespeare Knew? Shylock on the Elizabethan Stage," *Shakespeare Survey* 52 (1999): 99-106; John M. Egan, *The Stereotyped Jew in English Literature* (Philadelphia: Xlibris, 2002); Michelle Ephraim, *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Stephen Greenblatt, "Marlowe, Marx, and Anti-Semitism," *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 291-307; Mary Janell Metzger, "'Now by my hood, a gentle and no Jew': Jessica, *The Merchant of Venice*, and the Discourse of Early Modern English Identity," *PMLA* 113 (1998): 52-63; Joseph Shatzmiller, *Shylock Reconsidered: Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society* (Southampton: University of Southampton, 1992).

[112] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 18-19.

[113] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 80.

[114] Katz, "Shylock's Gender," 454.

[115] For example, Solanio purposely misconstrues Shylock's lament "My own flesh and blood to rebel" (3.1.30) as a pun on the Jewish stereotype of carnality: "Out upon it, old carrion! rebels it at these years?" (3.1.31).

[116] Arthur Bury, *The bow, or, The lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan* (London: 1662), 25.

[117] Ania Loomba, *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, 168.

[118] Sebastian Münster, *The Messias of the Christians and the Jewes held forth in a discourse between a Christian, and a Iew obstinately adhering to his strange opinions* (London: 1655), 2.

[119] See "complexion, *n.*1" The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 Apr. 2010 <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50045660>.

[120] Roxann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 23.

[121] M. Lindsay Kaplan, "Jessica's Mother: Medieval Constructions of Jewish Race and Gender in The Merchant of Venice," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.1 (2007), 16.

[122] Kaplan, "Jessica's Mother," 16.

[123] Ben Jonson, John Marston, and George Chapman, *Eastward Ho!* (London: Nick Hern Books Limited, 2002).

[124] Skura, "The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*," 51.

[125] Pierre Boaistuau, *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Descriptio[n] of Sundry Strange Things* (London: 1569), 27.

[126] Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica: or, Enquiries into very many Received Tenents, and Commonly Presumed Truths* (London: 1646), 200.

[127] Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, 33.

[128] Kaplan, "Jessica's Mother," 22 n. 59.

WORKS CITED

Adelman, Janet T. *Blood Relations: Christian and Jew in 'The Merchant of Venice.'* Chicago and London: University Chicago Press, 2008.

Alexander, Catherine M.S. and Stanley W. Wells, eds. *Shakespeare and Race*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Anonymous. *Anno xiij Reginae Elizabethe at the Parliament begunne and holden at Westminster the second of Apryll, in the xiij yere of the raigne of Our Most Gratious Soueraigne Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of Englande, Fraunce, and Ireland Queene, defendour of the fayth, &c., and there continued vntyll the dissolution of the same : to the hygh pleasure of almyghtie God, and the weale publique of this realme, were enacted as foloweth.* London: 1571.

---*Of the newe la[n]des and of ye people founde by the messengers of the kynge of porty[n]gale named Emanuel Of the. x. dyuers nacyons crystened. Of pope Iohn and his landes, and of the costely keyes and wonders molodyes that in that lande is.* London: 1520. Title Page. From the British Library.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Barker, Francis, and Peter Hulme. "Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: the Discursive Contexts of *The Tempest*." In *Alternative Shakespeares*. Edited by John Drakakis. London and New York: Methuen, 1985.

Berek, Peter. "The Jew as Renaissance Man." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51.1 (1998): 128-162.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Biberman, Matthew. *Masculinity, Anti-Semitism, and Early Modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Bloom, Allan. "Shakespeare on Jew and Christian: An Interpretation of *The Merchant of Venice*." *Social Research* 30.1 (1963): 1-22.

Boaistuau, Pierre. *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Descriptio[n] of Sundry Strange Things, Seming Monstrous in Our Eyes and Iudgement, Bicause We Are not Priuie to the Reasons of Them. Gathered out of Diuers Learned Authors as well Greeke as Latine, Sacred as Prophane.* London: 1569.

Bovilsky, Lara. *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Bright, Timothy. *A Treatise, Wherein Is Declared the Sufficiencie of English Medicines, for Cure of all Diseases, Cured with Medicines*. London: 1615.

---*A Treatise of Melancholy*. London: 1586.

Brown, Paul. "'This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism." In *Political Shakespeare: New essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985: 48-71.

Brown, Steve. "The Boyhood of Shakespeare's Heroines: Notes on Gender Ambiguity in the Sixteenth Century." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 30 (1990): 243-63.

Browne, Thomas. *Pseudodoxia Epidemica: or, Enquiries into very many Received Tenents, and Commonly Presumed Truths*. London: 1646.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. *Constructing 'Monsters' in Shakespearean Drama and Early Modern Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy VVhat It Is. VVith all the Kindes, Causes, Symptomes, Prognostickes, and Seuerall Cures of It. In Three Maine Partitions with Their Seuerall Sections, Members, and Subsections. Philosophically, Medicinally, Historically, Opened and Cut vp*. London: 1621.

Bury, Arthur. *The bow, or, The lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan*. London: 1662.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

---"Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." In *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. Edited by Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York: Zone Books, 1992.

Campos, Edmund Valentine. "Jews, Spaniards, and Portingales: Ambiguous Identities of Portuguese *Marranos* in Elizabethan England." *ELH* 69 (2002): 599-616.

Cartelli, Thomas. "Shakespeare's *Merchant*, Marlowe's *Jew*: The Problem of Cultural Difference." *Shakespeare Studies* 20 (1988): 255-60.

Cary, Elizabeth. *The Tragedy of Mariam, the Fair Queen of Jewry*. Edited by Barry Weller and Margaret W. Ferguson (Ewing, NJ: University of California Press, 1994).

Casas, Bartolomé de las. *The Spanish colonie, or Briefe chronicle of the acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies, called the newe world, for the space of xl. yeeres: written*

in the Castilian tongue by the reuerend Bishop Bartholomew de las Cases or Casaus, a friar of the order of S. Dominicke. And nowe first translated into english, by M.M.S. London: 1583.

Cogley, Richard W. "'Some Other Kinde of Being and Condition': The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England over the Peopling of Ancient America." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68.1 (2007): 35-56.

Cressy, David. "Gender Trouble and Cross-Dressing in Early Modern England." *The Journal of British Studies* 35.4 (1996): 438-465.

Crooke, Helkiah. *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man, together with the Controversies and Figures thereto Belonging / Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy*. London: 1616.

Doran, Susan. *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Edelman, Charles. "Which Is the Jew That Shakespeare Knew? Shylock on the Elizabethan Stage." *Shakespeare Survey* 52 (1999): 99-106.

Egan, John M. *The Stereotyped Jew in English Literature*. Philadelphia: Xlibris, 2002.

Ephraim, Michelle. *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly and Other Writings*, trans. and ed. Robert M. Adams. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1989.

Fiedler, Leslie A. *The Stranger in Shakespeare: Studies in the Archetypal Underworld of the Plays*. New York: Barnes & Noble Publishing, Inc., 2006.

Fisher, Will. *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Fissell, Mary E. *Vernacular Bodies: The Politics of Reproduction in Early Modern England*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Fletcher, John, and Nathaniel Field. *Four Plays, Or Moral Representations, in One*. Ed. Cyrus Hoy. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* vol. VIII. Ed Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Floyd-Wilson, Mary. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

---Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., eds. *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Garber, Marjorie. "The Logic of the Transvestite: *The Roaring Girl* (1608)." In *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*. Edited by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York and London: Routledge, 1991: 221-234.

---*Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Gillies, John. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Gow, Andrew Colin. *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600*. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1995.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century." In *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992: 16-39.

---"Marlowe, Marx, and Anti-Semitism." *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 291-307.

---*Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Greene, Robert. *Selimus*. London: 1594.

Habib, Imtiaz. "Elizabethan Racial Medical Psychology, Popular Drama, and the Social Programming of the Late-Tudor Black: Sketching an Exploratory Postcolonial Hypothesis." In *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*. Edited by Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson:93-112. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

---"Introduction: Race in Tudor England and Shakespeare: The Historical Ground and the Critical Tools." In *Shakespeare and Race: Postcolonial Praxis in the Early Modern Period*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2000: 1-21.

Hall, Kim F. "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner? Colonisation and Miscegenation in *The Merchant of Venice*." In *The Merchant of Venice: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Edited by Martin Coyle. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998: 92-116.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

---*Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism, and Disease in Shakespeare's England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Heise, Ursula K. "Transvestism and the Stage Controversy in Spain and England, 1580-1680." *Theatre Journal* 44 (1992): 357-74.

Hillman, David and Carla Mazzio, eds. *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Hirsch, Brett D. "'A Gentel and No Jew': The Difference Marriage Makes in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Parergon* 23.1 (2006): 119-129.

Hoeniger, F. David. *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.

Howard, Jean E. "Cross-dressing, the Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 418-40.

---"Cross-dressing, the Theater, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England." In *Crossing the Stage: Controversies on Cross-Dressing*. Edited by Lesley Ferris. London and New York: Routledge, 1993: 20-46.

---*The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Hulme, Peter and William H. Sherman, eds. *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Israel, Menasseh ben. *The Hope of Israel*. London: 1650.

Jardine, Lisa. "Boy Actors, Female Roles, and Elizabethan Eroticism." In *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*. Edited by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York and London: Routledge, 1991: 57-67.

Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Jonson, Ben, John Marston, and George Chapman. *Eastward Ho!*. London: Nick Hern Books Limited, 2002.

Kaplan, M. Lindsay. "Jessica's Mother: Medieval Constructions of Jewish Race and Gender in The Merchant of Venice." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.1 (2007): 1-30.

Kastan, David Scott. "'The Duke of Milan / And his Brave Son:' Old Histories and New in *The Tempest*." In *Shakespeare after Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1999: 183-197.

Katz, David S. "Shylock's Gender: Jewish Male Menstruation in Early Modern England." *The Review of English Studies* 50.200 (1999): 440-462.

Kelly, Katherine E. "The Queen's Two Bodies: Shakespeare's Boy Actress in Breeches." *Theatre Journal* 42 (1990): 81-93.

Kerwin, William. *Beyond the Body: The Boundaries of Medicine and English Renaissance Drama*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.

Kitch, Aaron. "Shylock's Sacred Nation." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.2 (2008): 131-155.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Levine, Laura. *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Loomba, Ania and Martin Orkin, eds. *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

--- *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Luborsky, Ruth Samson. "The Pictorial Image of the Jew in Elizabethan Secular Books." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.4 (1995): 449-453.

MacDonald, Joyce Green, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1997.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Jew of Malta*. Ed. David Bevington et al. *English Renaissance Drama*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002.

Marcus, Leah. *Puzzling Shakespeare, Local Reading and Its Discontents*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Massario, Alessandro. *De Morbis Fœmineis, The Womans Counsellour: or, The Feminine Physitian*. Translated by R. T. London: 1657.

Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

McDowell, Sean. "The View from the Interior: The New Body Scholarship in Renaissance/Early Modern Studies." *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2006): 778-791.

Metzger, Mary Janell. "'Now by my hood, a gentel and no Jew': Jessica, *The Merchant of Venice*, and the Discourse of Early Modern English Identity." *PMLA* 113 (1998): 52-63.

Middleton, Thomas, and William Rowley. *The Changeling*. In *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*. Edited by David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002.

Moss, Stephanie and Kaara L. Peterson, eds. *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Münster, Sebastian. *The Messias of the Christians and the Jewes Held Forth in a Discourse between a Christian, and a Iew Obstinately Adhering to His Strange Opinions*. London: 1655.

Oberg, Michael Leroy. *Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585-1685*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

OED. "complexion, *n.*1." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 Apr. 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50045660>.

---"degenerate, *n*., *a*., and *v*." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 Apr. 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50059713>.

---"harsh, *a.*1." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 Oct. 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50045660>.

---"part, *n., adj., adv., v*." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 June 2010. <http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/cgi/entry/50172081>.

--- "savage, *adj.*and *n.* 5a." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2 ed. 1989. OED Online. Oxford University Press. 15 March 2011. <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.tcu.edu/view/Entry/171433?rskey=SQ2R7i&result=2&isAdvanced=false#>.

Orgel, Stephen. *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Paré, Ambroise. *On Monsters and Marvels*. Translated by Janis L. Pallister. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

---*The workes of that famous chirurgion Ambrose Parey translated out of Latine and compared with the French*. Translated by Thomas Johnson. London: 1634.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciples of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

---*Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

---Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds. *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Porter, Roy. "History of the Body Reconsidered." In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Edited by Peter Burke. 2nd ed. (College Station: Penn State University Press, 2004): 233-260.

Prynne, William. *Histrio-mastix The players scourge, or, actors tragaedie, divided into two parts*. London: 1633.

Rackin, Phyllis. "Androgyny, Mimesis, and the Marriage of the Boy Heroine on the English Renaissance Stage." *PMLA* 102 (1987): 29-41.

Rainoldes, John. *Th' Overthrow of Stage-Playes*. Middleburgh: 1629.

Rose, Mary Beth. *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. 2nd ed. New York: Vintage, 2003.

Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Schoenfeldt, Michael C. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*As You Like It*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*The Comedy of Errors*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Cymbeline*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Hamlet*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Macbeth*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*The Tempest*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Twelfth Night*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

---*Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company (1997).

Shapiro, Michael. *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Shapiro, James. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Shatzmiller, Joseph. *Shylock Reconsidered: Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society*. Southampton: University of Southampton, 1992.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. Edited by Maurice Evans. New York and London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977.

Siraisi, Nancy G. "The Fielding H. Garrison Lecture: Medicine and the Renaissance World of Learning." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78.1 (2004): 1-36.

---*Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Skura, Meredith. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.1 (1989): 42-69.

Sousa, Geraldo U. de. *Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Spalding, Thomas Alfred. *Elizabethan Demonology*. Boston: Dodo Press, rep. 2009.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by Thomas P. Roche and C. Patrick O'Donnell. New York: Penguin Classics, 1979.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Stallybrass, Peter. “Transvestism and the ‘Body Beneath’: Speculating on the Boy Actor.” In *Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage*. Edited by Susan Zimmerman. New York and London: Routledge, 1992: 64-83.

Stubbs, John. *The Disccoverie of a Gaping Gvlf whereinto England is like to Be Swallovved by an other French Mariage [sic], if the Lord Forbid not the Banes, by Letting Her Maiestie See the Sin and Punishment thereof*. London: 1579.

Stubbes, Philip. *The Anatomie of Abuses*. London: 1583.

Thorowgood, Thomas. *Iewes in America, or, Probabilities that the Americans are of that Race*. London: 1650.

Underdown, D.E. “The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England.” In *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*. Edited by Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985: 116-136.

Vaughan, Alden T. “Sir Walter Ralegh’s Indian Interpreters, 1584-1618.” *William and Mary Quarterly* 59.2 (2002): 341-376.

---“Trinculo’s Indian: American Natives in Shakespeare’s England.” In *“The Tempest” and Its Travels*. Edited by Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000: 49-59.

Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi*. *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology* ed. David Bevington et al. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002.

Wheeler, Roxann. *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Wilson, Robert. *A right excellent and famous comoedy called the three ladies of London*. London: 1584.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Urbana, IL and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

VITA

Personal Background	Katherine Nicole Walker Born September 17, 1987, Denton, Texas Daughter of Steve Wilson and Darlene Keating Wilson Married Ryan Joseph Walker May 17, 2008
Education	Diploma, Aubrey High School, Aubrey, 2006 Bachelor of Arts, English and Philosophy, University of North Texas, Denton, 2009 Master of Arts, English, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, 2001
Experience	Writing Lab Tutor, UNT, 2008-2009 Teaching Assistantship, Texas Christian University 2009-2011
Professional Memberships	Renaissance Society of America Shakespeare Association of America Modern Language Association Sigma Tau Delta

ABSTRACT

ABERRATIONAL BODIES: DRAMATIC AND LITERARY REPRESENTATIONS OF EARLY MODERN HUMORALITY

by Katherine Nicole Walker, M.A., 2011
Department of English
Texas Christian University

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Ariane Balizet, Assistant Professor of English

For early modern authors, the body and its many associated fluids, functions, and forms elicited anxiety concerning the body's purity and the threats that could change or harm an individual. Many early modern authors depicted characters with mutable bodies who express a desire to maintain physical solidity. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the many patriarchal strictures placed upon aberrational bodies. This thesis examines masculine anxiety concerning the many bodily possibilities available in early modern medical ideologies: including the possibility that a woman may direct own desires via her changeable body, that a male might become humorally saturated and feminized if he cross-dressed or, conversely, if he appropriated a woman's clothing for his own sexual satiation, and that a Native American or Jewish body could, on the early modern stage, become indistinguishable through their shared physical humiliations.