

**Performing Barbers, Surgeons and Barber-Surgeons in
Early Modern English Literature**

Eleanor Sian Decamp

Pembroke College
University of Oxford

DPhil in English Literature
Submission: Michaelmas 2011

ABSTRACT

Performing Barbers, Surgeons and Barber-Surgeons in Early Modern English Literature

Eleanor Sian Decamp

DPhil in English Literature

Pembroke College

Michaelmas 2011

This study addresses the problem critics have faced in identifying contemporary perceptions of the barber, surgeon and barber-surgeon in early modernity by examining the literature, predominantly the drama, from the period. The name 'barber-surgeon' is not given formally to any character in extant early modern plays; only within the dialogue or during stage business is a character labelled the barber-surgeon. Barbers and surgeons are simultaneously separate and doubled-up characters. The differences and cross-pollinations between their practices play out across the literature and tell us not just about their cultural, civic and occupational histories but also about how we interpret patterns in language, onomastics, dramaturgy, materiality, acoustics and semiology. Accordingly, the argument in this study is structured thematically and focuses on the elements of performance, moving from discussions of names to discussions of settings and props, disguises, stage directions and semiotics, and from sound effects and music, to voices and rhetorical turns. In doing so, it questions what it means in early modernity to have a developed literary identity, or be deprived of one. The barber-surgeon is a trope in early modern literature because he has a tangible social impact and an historical meaning derived from his barberly and surgery roots, and consequently a richly allusive idiom which exerted attraction for audiences. But the figure of the barber-surgeon can also be a trope in investigating how representation works. An aesthetic of doubleness, which this study finds to be diversely

constructed, prevails in barbers', surgeons' and barber-surgeons' literary conception, and the barber-surgeon in the popular imagination is created from opposing cultural stereotypes. The literature from the period demonstrates why a guild union of barbers and surgeons was never harmonious: they are opposing dramaturgical as well as medical figures. This study has a wide-ranging literary corpus, including early modern play texts, ballads, pamphlets, guild records, dictionaries, inventories, medical treatises and archaeological material, and contributes to the critical endeavours of the medical humanities, cultural materialists, theatre historians and linguists.

Generously funded by The Schools Competition Act Settlement Trust (SCAST)



schools competition act
settlement trust

Acknowledgements

My heartfelt thanks to Professor Laurie Maguire who has been a truly inspiring, meticulous, and wonderfully generous supervisor; for always pointing me in the right direction and for your care, I want to express my deep gratitude. My particular thanks to the trustees and secretary of The Schools Competition Act Settlement Trust (SCAST) for funding my doctorate and for always showing their interest in this project. My thanks for all the support and kindness I have received from Pembroke College and for the Senior Scholarship they awarded. My special thanks to Joy Thomas, archivist at Barbers' Hall, for her terrific help and humour. My thanks to Simon Ware, curator at the Mary Rose Trust, for his consideration and thoroughness. My thanks to the Historical Society at The Worshipful Company of Barbers, Sue Usher at the English Faculty Library, the Bodleian staff (particularly Colin Harris at the Special Collections), Mareike Doleshal at the Shakespeare Centre Library and Archive, and to assistants at the National Archives and Wellcome Collections. Finally, my tender thanks to my dear family (to my mother especially for her eagle eyes) at the Corner House and Cottage – my heart is full; to David for his unstinting support; and to my friends and colleagues in Oxford and beyond, all of whom have shared their ideas with me, disguised their squeamishness, and shown their great patience.

'Thou thought'st to help me'; I am profoundly grateful.

Contents

List of illustrations	<i>page</i> 7
Abbreviations and conventions	8
Introduction: Naming of Parts	10
1 ‘Setting up a shoppe’: Inventories and Props	31
2 ‘Lend me thy basin, apron and razor’: Disguise, (Mis)Appropriation and Performance	94
3 Semiotics of Barber-Surgery in Shakespeare: The Chair and the Basin	157
4 ‘And pleasant harmonie shall sound in your eares’: Ballads, Music and Groans, Snip-snaps, Fiddlesticks, Ear-picks and Wax	217
5 ‘An unnecessary flood of words’?	276
Epilogue: A Necessary Flood of Words	336
Bibliography	338

Illustrations

<i>Figure 1</i>	The barber's 'necessaries', John Woodall, <i>The Surgeons Mate</i> (1617;1639/55)	<i>page</i> 38
<i>Figure 2</i>	'Tonstrina', Johann Comenius, <i>Orbis Sensualium Pictus</i> (1659)	44
<i>Figure 3</i>	'Ars Medica', Johann Comenius, <i>Orbis Sensualium Pictus</i> (1659)	69
<i>Figure 4</i>	Woodcut, William Clowes, <i>A Prooved Practise for All Young Chirurgians</i> (1588)	77
<i>Figure 5</i>	'Tragedy Burlesqued, or The Barber Turned Actor' (1785-1790)	125
<i>Figure 6</i>	Anon, <i>The Anatomical Table of John Banister</i> (1581)	143
<i>Figure 7</i>	Woodcut, François Tolet, <i>A Treatise of Lithotomy</i> (1683)	167
<i>Figure 8</i>	Woodcut, Ambroise Paré, <i>The Workes</i> (1634)	167
<i>Figure 9</i>	Artefacts from the wreck of the Mary Rose	224

Abbreviations and Conventions:

The usual abbreviations are used for journals, e.g. *MLR* = *Modern Language Review*, *ELH* = *Journal of English Literary History*, *RES* = *Review of English Studies*, *N&Q* = *Notes and Queries*.

Barbers' Archive	The Archives of the Worshipful Company of Barbers, Monkwell Square, London
<i>Comedies and Tragedies</i>	Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, <i>Comedies and Tragedies</i> (London: 1647), Wing B1581
The Company	The Worshipful Company of Barbers and Surgeons of London, established in 1540 by an Act of Parliament
<i>Collected Works</i>	Thomas Middleton, <i>The Collected Works</i> , ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007)
<i>Complete Works</i>	William Shakespeare, <i>The Complete Works</i> , ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
<i>Court Minutes</i>	<i>Minutes of the Court of Assistants</i> [of The Company]
dir.	directed [by]
<i>DNB</i>	[<i>Oxford</i>] <i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>Dramatic Works</i>	Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher, <i>The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon</i> , ed. Fredson Bowers, 10 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1966-96)
edn(s)	edition(s)
esp.	especially
FN	footnote
fo.	folio number
<i>MLA</i>	<i>Modern Language Association</i>
MR	Mary Rose [used in catalogue references]
MS	Manuscript
<i>OED</i>	<i>The Oxford English Dictionary</i>
REED	Records of Early English Drama
RSC	Royal Shakespeare Company
s.d.	stage direction
Shakespeare Centre	The Shakespeare Centre Library, Stratford-upon-Avon
sig.	signature number
[E]STC	[English] Short Title Catalogue
t.p.	title page

I retain the choices (and inconsistencies) of the spelling and punctuation marks of the early modern primary texts, including ampersands, with the following exceptions: diacritical marks from early modern type-set conventions are removed; abbreviations are resolved in closed brackets; ‘u’ and ‘v’, and ‘f’ and ‘s’ are distinguished, as is ‘j’ from ‘i’; capitalized words are made lower-case except in speech prefixes; titles of works are given modern spellings in the main text but retain their early modern spelling in referencing, and capitalised first letters are used in accordance with modern titling conventions; ‘The’ is elided from main text referencing to plays’ titles.

Unless otherwise indicated, quotations from Shakespeare (including collaborative works) are taken from *Complete Works* with the exception of *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, *Sir Thomas More*, *Titus Andronicus* and *Troilus and Cressida* which are taken from the Arden editions (because I consider these plays at greater length and interact with editorial gloss) referenced in the bibliography. Unless otherwise indicated, quotations from Middleton (and his collaborators) are taken from *Collected Works*; quotations from Webster are taken from John Webster, *Three Plays*, ed. D. C. Gunby (London: Penguin, 1972); quotations from Fletcher (and his collaborators) are taken from *Comedies and Tragedies* apart from *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), which was not included in the 1647 Folio. Signature and folio numbers from plays printed pre-1700 are first given in footnotes and thereafter included parenthetically in the main text, similarly for ballads’ stanza and line references. Page numbers from lengthy works are preferred if given; errors on the original pagination are signalled where appropriate. STC and Wing numbers of early modern texts are included in the bibliography. Dates of early modern publications are taken from EEBO and compared with the British Library’s ESTC and the English Broadside Ballad Archive (EBBA). The place of publication of books pre-1730 is London unless otherwise indicated.

The fair copies of most of The Company’s constitutional documents are on eight large skins of parchment, mounted at Barber-Surgeon’s Hall, and inaccessible to researchers. References to The Company’s law-making are therefore taken from their *Charter, Act and Ordinance Book* (A/6/1, Folio), begun in 1604 for The Company’s daily reference, and with only slight alterations from the constitutional documents. Whereas on the parchment the clauses of the 1606 Ordinances are numbered 45/46, in the Book they are number 38/39. This is due to certain clauses being amalgamated in the copy book. The 1566 Ordinances are only recorded in *Court Minutes* (1566-1603), B/1/2. NB 1566 ‘rules’ precede the copy of the 1566 Ordinances.

All references to wills and inventories are taken from manuscripts held at The National Archives, Kew, London.

Introduction

Naming of Parts

The name ‘barber-surgeon’ is not given to any character in *dramatis personae*, speech prefixes, or stage directions in extant early modern plays. There are many plays with barbers and many with surgeons (twenty seven and thirty seven respectively).¹ But when Thomas Berger and his collaborators list these characters in their *Index*, they have one option: ‘Barber(s) (*see* Surgeon(s))’, and ‘Surgeon(s) (*see* Barber(s))’.² Only two plays appear on both lists: Francis Beaumont’s *Knight of the Burning Pestle* and William Cartwright’s *Ordinary*. This is not because both a barber and a surgeon character appear in each play; strikingly this never occurs. (In John Fletcher’s *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), stage directions include ‘*Enter three Phis[itians], Apoth[ecary], and Barber*’ (F4v). The barber has been summoned by the physicians to shave Franck; he does not speak and is separated from the medical types who attend to the patient. It seems deliberate that a surgeon is not included in this collection of medical men. In Robert Greene’s *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), the narrator encounters ‘three in a cluster’: ‘the one sayd hee was a barber, the other a surgeon, and the third an Apoticary’.³ The ‘Barber’ in *Monsieur Thomas* stands in for something more than a barber; two actors are not needed.) In the

¹ Compare these numbers with the number of plays which include characters of other trades, ones that were high in contemporary Lists of Precedence: Mercers (11), Grocers (8), Drapers (11), Fishmongers (3), Goldsmiths (17), Skinners (0), Tailors (60, and 3 ‘Botchers’), Haberdashers (8), Salters (1), Ironmongers (1), Vinters (25), Clothworkers/Clothiers (4), Brewers (4), Leathersellers (0), Pewterers (2). (In 1604, the Company of Barbers and Surgeons was positioned sixteenth in the list of Guild Precedence, an all-time high. For additional information on Precedent listings see Sidney Young, *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, 1890), pp. 195-197.) Physicians or Doctors, named interchangeably and without the complications of barber/surgeon naming, are abundant on the early modern stage, featuring respectively in 66/107 plays; there are 22 plays which include an Apothecary.

These numbers reflect the number of plays, and not the number of characters. Barnabe Barnes’s *The Devils Charter* (1607) and George Peele’s *Edward the First* (1593) stage two barbers and fairly frequently a barber’s boy accompanies a barber on stage; there are two surgeons in Philip Massinger’s *A Very Woman* (1634).

² Thomas L. Berger, William C. Bradford, and Sidney L. Sondergard, *An Index of Characters in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), pp. 22, 94.

³ Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), C3v. Cf. Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge, *A Looking Glasse, for London* (1598), B2v.

dialogue of *Burning Pestle* and *Ordinary* the playwrights deliberately confuse the role ‘Barber’/‘Chirurgion’ (the French spelling which was interchangeable with ‘surgeon’ at this time). Nick the barber in *Burning Pestle* transforms into a giant ‘body...bang[er]’ (III.334), although the terms ‘surgeon’/‘surgery’ are never used in Beaumont’s play, and Cartwright’s Chirurgion only refers to himself as a ‘Barber’.⁴ These inconsistencies between characters’ generic names and their characterisation functioned visually through props and/or costume to make sense in performance. Later in this Introduction I examine three instances when the terms ‘barber-surgeon’/‘barber and surgeon’ are applied to characters in other plays which would also merit a place on both lists in *Index*, according to the authors’ logic. Leslie Thomson names Sweetball in Thomas Middleton’s and John Webster’s *Anything for a Quiet Life* a ‘Barber-Surgeon’ in the *dramatis personae* in *Collected Works*, although in speech prefixes she fixes on ‘Barber’ in accordance with the earlier text; the *dramatis personae* of the play’s quarto lists ‘Sweetball, a Barber’.⁵ Officially, there are no barber-surgeons on the early modern stage.

But the barber-surgeon is a common figure both historically and literarily. I want to address the problem critics have faced in identifying early moderns’ perception of the barber, surgeon and barber-surgeon by examining the literature – predominantly the drama – between the 1570s and 1630s. My focus is London because that is where the most profound shifts in guild organisation occurred, and where writers congregated. As *Index* suggests, barbers and surgeons are at once separate and doubled-up characters. The differences and cross-pollinations between their practices play out across the period’s literary corpus and tell us not just about *their* cultural, social and occupational histories but also about how we interpret patterns in language, onomastics, dramaturgy,

⁴ Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002); William Cartwright, *The Ordinary in Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With Other Poems* (1651), E4v.

⁵ Thomas Middleton, *Any Thing for a Quiet Life* (1662), A2r. On authorship of *Quiet Life* see *Collected Works*, p. 1593.

characterisation, materiality, acoustics and semiology. Early modern culture readily drew on the terms of barbering and surgery, producing an allusive idiom of the occupations which exerted attraction for audiences. I want to investigate the discrepancies between representations of barbers and surgeons, how the barber-surgeon is conceived, and what it means to have a developed literary or theatrical identity in this period, or be deprived of one. By exploring these figures' complex representation and social conception we can discuss the elements of representation itself; and by examining figures' medical and civic reputations we can unravel writers' dramaturgic design which leans on barbering/surgery contexts.

**

I begin with the historical scene. In early medieval times, barbering and surgery were legally practised conjointly by members of holy orders. During the thirteenth century papal decree prevented church men from practising any medical works. Surgery was adopted by established barbers of the period whose guild system was developing; these figures were 'barber-surgeons', a title which reflected their amalgamated practices. Around the same time, more specialised surgeons distinguished themselves under an official cohort in London and their licensing was eventually overseen by Bishops.⁶ In 1540 this Fellowship of Surgeons merged with the Company of Barbers forming the 'Mystery and Commonality of Barbers *and* Surgeons of London' [italics mine] under Henry VIII's Act of Parliament.⁷

⁶ See Peregrine Horden, 'Medieval Medicine' in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Medicine*, ed. Mark Jackson (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 40-59 (p. 42).

⁷ Barbers' Archive, 'An Act Concerning Barbers and Surgeons to be of One Company' in *Charter Act and Ordinance Book* (1540), A/6/1. A painting (undated) by Hans Holbein the Younger which commemorates the occasion currently hangs in the Company Hall in Monkwell Square. Historical outlines of events leading to the union and further details on the Holbein are in Young, pp. 51-92; Ian Murray, 'The London Barbers' in *The Company of Barbers and Surgeons*, ed. Ian Burn (London: Farrand Press, 2000), pp. 73-86 (pp. 73-75); Christopher Sprague, 'Introduction' in *Notable Barber Surgeons*, ed. Ian Burn (London: Farrand Press in association with The Worshipful Company of Barbers, 2008), xxvii-li.

The move enabled the barbers to benefit from the growing medical prestige of the surgeons, and the surgeons to benefit from the barbers' civic prominence. The move was also a strategy in public health. Although barbers and surgeons united under one livery, their occupations became formally separated by the charter, which supervised practices in and around London (within a seven-mile radius). Edicts accompanying the new guild stated that the only surgical activity that a London barber could perform was tooth-pulling, while a London surgeon was not permitted to practise barbery. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, expert surgeons challenged what had been the medical and intellectual autonomy of Physicians, and the orthodoxies of medicine at this time were uprooted and anatomized; barbers' medical role was marginalised.⁸ Eventually, in 1745, the surgeons split away from all ties with the barbers and established their Royal College leaving behind 'The Worshipful Company of Barbers', both of which exist today.

In 1568, The Company tried to set a precept to manage the name of its hall: 'It is constituted...that here after at any tyme, none of this said Fellowshipe shall pryvatly nor apartly name...the Com[m]on hall...by any other name...but...the Barbers and Surgeons hall'.⁹ Evidently, however, it was impossible to control how people referred to it. In the margin next to the precept is written, 'this not to be read', referring to the annual reading of The Company's rules which all members were obliged to attend. Indeed, 'Barber-Surgeon's Hall' became the mainstream term for the place where company members united in a civic capacity in Monkwell Square. Correspondingly, a 'Barber-Surgeon' in Shakespeare's London was the civic title of a freeman of The Company. But 'barber-surgeon' was also the name of an irregular, unspecialised, and unchecked practitioner.

⁸ See William Kerwin, *Beyond the Body* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), pp. 133-164; F. David Hoeniger, *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance* (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1992), pp. 17-31; Margaret Pelling, 'Trade or Profession?' in *The Common Lot* (London: Longman, 1998), pp. 230-259; Todd H. J. Pettigrew, *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 61-91.

⁹ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 25v.

Context distinguished which. A person's membership of a guild did not always mean that they practised the occupation for which the guild stood, although, in the case of The Company, freeman who belonged to a guild that did not represent their trade were more prevalent from the mid-seventeenth century, and I have not come across literary references to freemen barber-surgeons who are not characterised as barber/surgeon practitioners. On 14th April 1629 The Company minutes note that 'Walter Clinche useing Barbarye...free of the merchanttailors...had order to forbear that trade untill he were translated into our Companie'.¹⁰ References to a 'barber' or 'surgeon' indicate practice – officially, regular practice. The formal differences between these practitioners are important to our understanding of their civic, casual and abused interrelatedness. The terms barber, surgeon and barber-surgeon have an illusion of stability in the definitions outlined here; in reality, they were unstable, prone to misinterpretation and misuse, just like the practices themselves.

Although the occupations became formally distinct, The Company's efforts to inspect practitioners' workplaces, impose fines, close shops, and voice the hazards about unskilled procedures did not erase irregular practice, which remained common, and barbers continued to practise – not necessarily unsuccessfully – some medical arts besides dentistry.¹¹ Thomas Nashe's *Terrors of the Night* (1594) gives an impression of the practitioners on the peripheries to whom most people had access. These included barber-surgeons.

...they are men which have had some little sprinkling of Grammer learning...or at least I will allowe them to have been Surgeons or Apothecaries prentises, these I say having runne...riotouslie amongst harlots and make-shifts spent the annuitie...that was left them, fall a beating their braynes how to botch up an easie gainfull trade, & set a new nap on an

¹⁰ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 90.

¹¹ Pelling discusses the inadequate medical services available to the proletariat in *Common Lot*. See also Pelling (with Frances White), *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2003), pp. 136-188; Pelling 'Appearance and Reality' in *London 1500-1700*, ed. A. L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986), pp. 82-112.

old occupation....and at length into London they filch themselves prively: but how? Not in the hart of the Cittie will they presume at first dash to hang out their rat-banners, but in the skirtes and out-shifts steale out a signe over a Coblers stall¹²

In his *Whole Course of Chirurgery* (1597) Peter Lowe criticises barbers who persist in performing surgery without training and misname themselves. In the margin he reclassifies them as ‘Land loupers and simple Barbers’:

there are some, who, voyde of knowledge and skill, promise for lucre to heale infirmitie, being ignora[n]t both of the disease, and the remedies thereof. These faultes be often committed of some who usurping the name of Chirurgian, being unworthie therof, have scarce the skill to cut a beard which properly pertayneth to their traide¹³

Both the position of Lowe’s naming of the irregulars in the margin and the modification of ‘barbers’ as ‘simple’ seems a careful means of criticising without offending The Company members of his friend, John Banister. Similarly Thomas Gale, a Barber-Surgeon, publishing through The Company, lists a number of empirics who readily profess themselves as surgeons: ‘some hosiers, taylours, fletchers, mynstrells, souters, juglers wiches, sorceres, baudes’.¹⁴ Barbers seem deliberately left out. But barbers were in fact central to the picture of unlicensed medical practice both historically and to the popular imagination. In the early-seventeenth century ballad ‘The Rimers New Trimming’, the rhymer sings about the precarious treatments barbers perform when they attempt more adventurous works than tooth-pulling or ‘cut[ting] a beard’: ‘Making shew of a cure with a Masticke plaister, / they fro[m] your chaire rising, a leg they scrape after’, implying that the patient’s leg was not scraping along *before*.¹⁵ Offended by the rhymer’s assumption, the barber teaches him a lesson. The ballad’s joke is two-fold: first that barbers continued to practise barber-surgery, and second that barbers resisted this reputation.

¹² Thomas Nashe, *The Terrors of the Night* (1594), Eir-Eiv.

¹³ Peter Lowe, *The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* (1597), B3r.

¹⁴ Thomas Gale, *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), *iiiiv.

¹⁵ Anon, ‘The Rimers New Trimming’ (c.1614), stanza 7, lines 3-4.

Precisely because of the new laws, commentators drew material from the disparities between legal and illegal barbering and surgical practice, and the onomastic distinctions between barber, surgeon and barber-surgeon. Writers knew the value in mixing these three names in terms of applying them formally, through abbreviation, and ironically: barber-surgeon controversies and jokes were a feature in early modernity.¹⁶ I consider how historically shifting practitioner identities correspond to their literary conceptions. We need to set barbers and surgeons against each other because writers' depictions of one occupation usually exploit its association with the other. The barber-surgeon might never officially be on stage, but unofficially he is prevalent.

Modern criticism does not make the distinctions I have illustrated clear. David Crane explains a reference to 'barber-surgeon' in John Marston's *Dutch Courtesan* with, 'the two functions went together at this time, the medical and the cosmetic', smoothing over the complexities.¹⁷ The translators of Roselyne Rey's *History of Pain* use the term 'the surgeon-barber', something I have never seen in my early modern reading; in the French, the term 'barbier-chirurgien' was ubiquitous in the period.¹⁸ Peter Ackroyd's *London* (2001) gives the following synopsis of 'official' medical care in the early-sixteen hundreds:

...there were more genteel, if not more learned, practitioners of healing who came under the aegis of the Company of Barber Surgeons (they were later to split in two, becoming barbers *or* surgeons) or the College of Physicians [*italics mine*].¹⁹

Ackroyd misnames the Company and misconstrues the nature of the 1745 split. Jonathan Sawday cites, 'the unified Barber-Surgeons Company' without explaining what this

¹⁶ See Simon Palfrey on 'jokes about false misidentity' (*Doing Shakespeare* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005), p. 192).

¹⁷ John Marston, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997), FN to II.i.164.

¹⁸ Roselyne Rey, *The History of Pain*, trans. Louise Elliott Wallace, J. A. Cadden and S. W. Cadden (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard UP, 1993), p. 58.

¹⁹ Peter Ackroyd, *London* (London: Vintage, 2001), p. 209.

unification entailed for members or their practices, leaving the modern reader with an impression that The Company formally gathered together practitioners who practised both occupations.²⁰ The misconception is historical but is explained linguistically. It is a matter of syndeton and the implications of linguistic yoking. As conjunctive, in the case of ‘The Mystery and Commonality of Barbers and Surgeons’, ‘and’ highlights co-ordination and connection but it does not compound. A hyphen has a different effect. Although early moderns sometimes used the abbreviated, hyphenated title in naming The Company, they understood its function as short-hand. This understanding has been lost through the linguistic slip and historical distance. An official list of the London Companies’ coats of arms is included in John Stow’s *Survey* (1633). The title for the Barbers and Surgeons at first appears simply to employ the abbreviation; upon closer inspection, the title is not ‘Barber-Chirurgions’ but ‘Barbers-Chirurgions’.²¹ By pluralising ‘Barber’ rather than only the conjunctive ‘Barber-Chirurgion’ Stow subtly signals the independence of the groups. But it is easy to see why modern misconceptions and early modern discrepancies occur.

Viewed simultaneously, this group of practitioners’ work seems culturally stable, familiar and is often linked to domestic practice (the barbery side); at the same time, it seems elitist, obscure, risky and radical (the surgery side). But surgeons also dealt with the mundane realities of a scrofulous society, women emulated surgical activities in the home, and barbery was often characterised as a mystical and specialist art, even without highlighting the alchemical and horoscopol associations which it held.²² Moreover, in reviewing barbers’ and surgeons’ reputations we must think both in terms of the middling-sort and their everyday practices, and the more formal systems which underpinned barber-surgeons’ civic identities. These double-effects, embodied by the barber-surgeon but

²⁰ Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 4, 42, 57.

²¹ John Stow and Anthony Munday, *The Survey of London* (1633), p. 623.

²² See Pelling, ‘The Body’s Extremities’ in *The Task of Healing*, ed. Hilary Marland and Margaret Pelling (Rotterdam: Erasmus, 1996), pp. 221-251.

embedded both in the conception of barber and surgeon, are not only a practical and linguistic consideration; they are also an aesthetic one. Freud's discussion 'The Uncanny' is helpful here: 'the uncanny is that species of the frightening that goes back to what was once well known and had long been familiar', it involves a deep-rooted sense of the double (or *doppelgänger*), and it is relevant to figures who 'co-own...a name'.²³ While I do not attempt psychoanalytic analysis of the works I examine, the raw effects of doubleness which Freud investigates make sense of the kinds of theatrical impact with which my study is concerned. Margaret Pelling argues that

the barber-surgeons were the most independently organised and best-integrated into the civic structure of male-dominated occupations...barber-surgeons had benefited for a long time from the firm legal and fiscal identity which stemmed from a man's being officially defined by his occupation. Barber-surgeons were numerous and therefore familiar as citizen heads of households.²⁴

But literary texts suggest something else which runs concurrently to the reality Pelling highlights: definitions of the barber/surgeon practitioner were easily blurred or misinterpreted – they were not finite. The familiarity of barber-surgeons as citizens was often undercut by the unfamiliarity of their associate practices. If these figures' identities were unchallengeable, why were they of such interest to writers?

**

There are ten more early modern plays with a surgeon character than with a barber, giving the impression that the roles of the first had a greater presence in performance. Despite this, I examine why surgeons' stage performances are minimal compared with barbers'.

²³ See Sigmund Freud, *The Uncanny*, ed. David McLintock and Hugh Haughton (New York; London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 124, 141-142.

²⁴ Pelling, 'Compromised by Gender' in *Task of Healing*, pp. 101-133 (p. 115).

We can sense this difference initially by taking into account characters' names.²⁵ Surgeons on stage rarely have a personal name but retain their generic title. There are only a few exceptions: Dick Surgeon, named by Sir Toby in *Twelfth Night*, although he never materialises, Gisco, who doubles as a poisoner, in John Marston's *Wonder of Women*, and Pock in *All Fools* by George Chapman. When Pock's name is disclosed, Dariotto remarks, 'I know a Doctor of your name maister *Pocke*', and Pock retorts, 'My name has made many Doctors'; Valerio confirms that 'Pock' is 'of an auncient discent'.²⁶ His name's relation to surgery is minimised by its more general relation to medical men and diseases. In the play's *dramatis personae* Pock's first name is 'Fraunces', a joke for the reader of the quarto which plays on 'French Pox'. By comparison, barbers have a variety of personal names in early modern drama, some literal, others rhetorical, most of them comic: Toby, Sweetball (x2), Preist, Cutbeard (x3), Master Suds, Motto, Dello, Don Cockadillio, Holifernes, Tryphon, Poldaris (someone who is 'pold' has been shaven),²⁷ Secco, Barbaroso, Tom, Varillus, Crispino (from 'crisping irons'), and Grimball.²⁸ I discuss several of these names in the chapters that follow. The barbers in early modern drama have stronger onomastic identities than the surgeons. In this sense it is straightforward to think of barbers and surgeons as simply separate performing groups; much of my thesis sets them in direct comparison with each other to demonstrate how they were distinguished. However, when writers name them generically there are complications. I now want to look

²⁵ On names, see Laurie Maguire, *Shakespeare's Names* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), who discusses the oddities and importance of onomastics in early modern contexts (esp. pp. 9-49). On the differences between character names and generic types, see Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 64-66.

²⁶ George Chapman, *Al Fooles* (1605), G1r.

²⁷ See Randle Holme, *Academy of Armory* (Chester: [1688]): 'Poler an ancient term used for the cutter of hair'; 'Pole me, is cut my hair' (p. 128).

²⁸ Respectively in *Quiet Life*, *Preist the Barbar*, *Sweetball his Man*, *May-Day* (in s.d. 'Cuthbert Barber' (E1v) – this variation on the common name is part of the onomastic joke), *Epicoene*, *John Swabber*, *Puritan Widow*, *Midas*, *Noble Soldier*, *Dutch Courtesan*, *Herod and Antipater*, *Witch of Edmonton* (although Poldavis is referenced both in *dramatis personae* and dialogue, he, oddly, never appears), *Fancies Chaste and Noble*, *Burning Pestle*, *Staple of News*, *Love-Sick Court*, *Humorous Courtier*, and *Promos and Cassandra*. Cf. Pelling's discussion of a list of irregular healers' names (typecasts) in London (*Medical Conflicts* (pp. 137-138)).

at three instances when characters' occupational/civic names are made a subject of dialogue.

One of the Queenborough townsmen in Middleton's *Hengist* is a barber, named accordingly in the 1661 quarto's *dramatis personae* (*Mayor of Quinborough*, A2v). In III.iii, a Gentleman tells of a strife in the town 'Between a country barber and a tailor' (III.iii.39). Hengist summons one of the disputants, 'Call in the Barber' (III.iii.43), and within one line, stage directions (consistent with quarto (E4r)) prescribe '*Enter Barber*' (s.d. III.iii.44). Hengist questions, 'Now, sir, are you the barber?' (III.iii.45), catching a laugh if this character has entered fully equipped with barbery gear. The 'BARBER', so named in the speech prefixes, responds with the pun, 'O most barbarous!' (III.iii.46).²⁹ The related activities evoked alongside these addresses are palpably barber-orientated: reducing a long tale is envisaged as being 'cut...short' (III.iii.44), and the barber refers to himself as 'A corrector of enormities in hair' (III.iii.46-7) and 'a promoter of upper lips' (III.iii.47), providing suitable antonyms that reflect his trade. The name 'barber' has not, so far, proved misleading to us. Within fourteen lines, however, the barber redresses his status: 'I am a barber-surgeon' (III.iii.61), he says. The matter of the dispute has emerged. The barber wants formally to be recognised as a member of the town's civic 'body', its 'corporation' (III.iii.55). Hengist says that the barber has no business with the body, punning on the association of the physical body and calling on ordinance decree about barbers' practice. It is at this moment that, to justify his civic status, the barber says, 'I am a barber-surgeon'. He does not use that title to align himself with unofficial practice, although the comic factor in the scene is that this is suggested, but with a bureaucratic title which imbues him with legitimacy in the guild system. Middleton plays on the very theme of medical naming and civic status.

²⁹ See my discussion of this pun in chapter three.

John Lyly's *Midas* incorporates a lively subplot in which Motto, a barber, and his apprentice, Dello, have sustained roles in a comic sequence centring on beards, teeth and gossip. The 1592 quarto does not have a list of characters but in modern editions Motto is 'the barber'.³⁰ Motto's (and Dello's) status as a barber is highlighted often: in a stage direction ('*Enter Dello, the barber's boy*' (s.d. III.ii.9)), twice when Motto/Dello explain their actions in terms of being a barber ('because a barber' (III.ii.55, 84-5)), once when Dello states, 'I am a barber' (III.ii.53), once through reference to equipment ('barber's basin' (III.ii.63)), and several times when Petulus apostrophises Motto with 'Barber'. However, during his quipping with Licio, Dello declares, 'My master is a barber and a surgeon' (III.ii.64-5). The editors' gloss ('Dello protests hotly that his master is a fully professional barber-surgeon, not a mere barber') does not pay tribute to the subtlety of Lyly's humour, and their earlier footnote, 'Professional barber-surgeons...combined the skills of barbering and surgery, whereas ordinary barbers were limited to the letting of blood and extracting of teeth', is misleading.³¹ If Motto is a barber *and* a surgeon, he is not a freeman 'Barber-Surgeon'. Dello's boast, which plays on the difference between syndeton and hyphenation, is ironic, which would have been understood by an audience but is not understood – for the audience's delight – by Licio, whose response 'In good time' (III.ii.66) effectively says that Motto should wait patiently to become irregular. A somewhat confounded entry following The Company's rules and ordinances (1566) indicates that in order to become regular and receive rank, the 'barber and surgeon' association must be discarded:

Also it is ordayned that hereafter Robert Mudsley shall be alwayes elected and chosen to bear any ~~off~~-offyce of govenor or M[aster] of this Mystery for surgery by cause he is only a mere barbar & surgeon although he now excise it not.³²

³⁰ Quotations are taken from Lyly, *Midas* in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David M. Bevington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

³¹ Hunter and Bevington FNs to III.ii.64-65/III.ii.2.

³² *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 13v.

Mudsley was of the generation of apprentices before the Act of Parliament and appears to have oscillated between occupations as a freeman. Earlier on 27th August 1557, he is freed from attending the compulsory lectures on surgery ‘for by cawse he hath gyven over the exercysynge of the arte of Surgery and doth occupy only a sylk shoppe’.³³ He became Warden for The Company in 1567, but during this time he must have returned to surgery because he was an Examiner by 1570 and eventually became Master in 1572 and 1580.³⁴ The ‘barbar & surgeon’ reference in the rules was a way of indicating Mudsley’s earlier mixed tradesman image and lack of professional identity.

In *Dutch Courtesan*, Holifernes Reinscure is, according to the *dramatis personae*, a ‘Barbers boy’.³⁵ Upon his first entrance, he is simply ‘*the Barber*’ (s.d. II.i.162), although Cocledemoy welcomes him as ‘my fine boy’ (II.i.163), and he is armed with barbering equipment.³⁶ Cocledemoy then mocks Holifernes’s status by referring to him as a ‘barber-surgeon’ (II.i.164, 166-7). Holifernes is not an official Barber-Surgeon because he is still in his apprenticeship and cannot be a freeman. By naming Holifernes a ‘barber-surgeon’, Cocledemoy undermines the boy’s legitimacy as an apprentice; this is lost on Holifernes, underlining his juvenility. But Cocledemoy teases out of him his pretensions to a higher status than ‘barber’s boy’ or even ‘barber’. Holifernes boasts that he is ‘an apprentice to surgery’ (II.i.168), unwittingly taking Cocledemoy’s ‘barber-surgeon’ reference as his cue. Under The Company’s official legislation, an apprentice could only train as a barber or a surgeon. In attempting to seem more learned as a trainee surgeon, Holifernes instead makes himself irregular. This scenario and the others would be exaggerated in the plays’

³³ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/1, 33v.

³⁴ See Young, pp. 6, 316, 439, 523.

³⁵ See lists in John Marston, *Dutch Courtesan* (1605), A2v and in the collection, *The Workes of Mr. John Marston* (1633), Z3v.

³⁶ Crane amends the script: ‘*Enter Holifernes the Barber[’s boy]*’ (s.d. II.i.162).

early performances if the parts were given to barbers or apprentices.³⁷ In *Dutch Courtesan*, as in *Hengist* and *Midas*, the playwright pauses over the classification of the barber. While the official onomastics are used in *dramatis personae*, stage directions, speech prefixes and address, they are made unstable or reclassified in the dialogue. Suggestively, this pattern also occurs in the seventeenth-century ballad ‘The Northern Ladd’ in which one of the rejected suitors of ‘a Lass o’th North Country’ is, according to the subtitle, a ‘Barber’.³⁸ In the lyrics, however, the balladeer sings, ‘A Barber-Surgeon came to me’ (stanza 9, line 1), and the ballad emphasises his unsuitability as a lover by identifying him as an irregular practitioner through the adjustment made to his name.

**

This study locates itself within broader fields of academic debate on early modern bodies and the pervasiveness of corporeal language in that period. The pioneering work is Sawday’s *Body Emblazoned*, followed by studies from the 1990s until the present day by David Hillman, Carla Mazzio, Richard Sugg, Andrea Carlino, Gail Kern Paster, Susan Zimmerman, Joseph Roach, Katherine Park and Hillary Nunn, among others.³⁹ Maurizio Calbi summarizes the disparate somatic focuses critics have undertaken so far: “‘bodies

³⁷ See David Kathman, ‘Grocers, Goldsmiths, and Drapers’, *RQ* 55:1 (2004), 1-49, in which Kathman describes two Barber-Surgeon freemen, Thomas Go[ugh]e and Henry Totnell (both barbers), who performed at court (pp. 24-5, 28, 39). Cf. Mark Benbow, ‘Dutton and Goffe versus Broughton’, *REED Newsletter* 6:2 (1981), 3-9. On casting see Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), pp. 40-5.

³⁸ Anon, ‘The Northern Ladd’ (1670-1696), stanza 1, line 1.

³⁹ David Hillman, *Shakespeare's Entrails* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (eds.), *The Body in Parts* (New York; London: Routledge, 1997); Richard Sugg, *Murder After Death* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP; Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2007); Andrea Carlino, *Books of the Body*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1993); Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson (eds.), *Reading the Early Modern Passions* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Susan Zimmerman, *The Early Modern Corpse and Shakespeare's Theatre* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005); Joseph R. Roach, *The Player's Passion* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Katherine Park, ‘The Criminal and the Sainly Body’, *RQ* 47:1 (1994), 1-33; Park, *Secrets of Women* (New York: Zone Books, 2006); Hillary M. Nunn, *Staging Anatomies* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

tremulous”, “bodies single-sexed”, “bodies enclosed”, “bodies intestinal”, “bodies consumed”, “bodies carnivalized”, “bodies effeminized”, “bodies embarrassed”, “bodies sodomized”, “bodies emblazoned or dissected”, “bodies castrated”, or simply “in parts””.⁴⁰

I examine early modern attitudes to, among other things, hair, bloodletting, glisters, warts and ear-wax, and my discussions of the vulnerability of eyes, ears, noses and tongues in the context of barber-surgery corresponds to widening critical interests in the early modern senses, the current subject of the Globe’s education season (Autumn, 2011).

Critics, including some of those listed above, also investigate the medical narratives available in early modern literature.⁴¹ While it is easy to see medical practice as heavily intermixed in the period, differences between practitioners are marked enough for us to investigate the heterogeneity of their discourses; moreover, if these differences were not always clearly delineated, the *potential* for them to be separate was itself literary substance.⁴² My focus on barber-surgeons, therefore, is emblematic of broader medical characteristics and is a direct means by which we can contrast and see as merging ‘the scientific discourse on “elite”...medicine with the...discourse on “non-elite” medicine’.⁴³ In *Beyond the Body* (2005), William Kerwin divides his study into sections by type of medical practitioner; given his scope, the accounts Kerwin actually gives are limited, and he is unable to make much use of the plentiful textual potential not only in Shakespeare but also in Shakespeare’s contemporaries and in Stuart and Caroline drama.⁴⁴ David Hoeniger and Todd Pettigrew face similar difficulties in *Medicine and Shakespeare* (1992)

⁴⁰ Maurizio Calbi, *Approximate Bodies* (London; New York: Routledge, 2005), xiii. Cf. Thomas Rütten, ‘Early Modern Medicine’ in *History of Medicine*, pp. 60-81 (pp. 67-8).

⁴¹ For example, Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010).

⁴² See Rütten on the plurality of medical discourse (p. 63).

⁴³ Rütten, p. 71.

⁴⁴ Earlier studies in the twentieth century placed little emphasis on the distinction between types of medical practitioner in the period: Philip C. Kolin, *The Elizabethan Stage Doctor* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1975); Herbert Silvette, *The Doctor on the Stage*, ed. Francelia Butler (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967); Paul G. Brewster, ‘Physician and Surgeon as Depicted in 16th and 17th Century English Literature’, *Osiris* 14 (1962), 13-32.

and *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (2007). When discussing surgeons, Kerwin, Pettigrew and Hoeniger fail to put surgery's associations with barbering in context. Pettigrew argues that because surgery has no clear medical narrative or social presence, surgeons are essentially 'purposeless' in literature and hold little cognitive interest; he smooths over barbers' association with surgery by claiming that mixed practice belonged simply to a 'bygone age'.⁴⁵ Surgeons may be a dramaturgical dead-end in some respects but this in itself is worth examining further. They may often be offstage, but playwrights did not entirely 'write them off' (writing them off *would* demonstrate 'little cognitive interest'), and their absence and presence is, in part, due to the well-established literary reputation of barbers; surgeons were either incorporated into that established literary type or placed in direct opposition to it. Articles by Patricia Parker and Laurie Maguire have exposed barbering detail and allusion – from blood-letting to cittern references – mainly in Shakespearean works.⁴⁶ Their studies reveal the potential for a grander scope and our need to challenge the narrow view of, for example, the nineteenth-century editor William Gifford, who writes of the barbering material in John Ford's *Fancies Chaste and Noble*, 'This stuff is hardly worth explaining', and then misreads the passage's references to citterns, snipper-snappers, and chequered patterns.⁴⁷ Margaret Pelling's historical studies of barber-surgeons demonstrate that sources are plentiful and that barber-surgeons are significant figures in the studies of our medical heritage.

My literary corpus is diverse and incorporates a range of documents other than early modern play texts, ballads and pamphlets, including archival materials at Barbers'

⁴⁵ Pettigrew, see pp. 133-7.

⁴⁶ Patricia Parker, 'Barbers and Barbary', *RD* 33 (2005), 201-244; Parker, 'Cutting Both Ways' in *Alternative Shakespeares 3*, ed. Diana E. Henderson (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 95-118; Maguire, 'Cultural Control in *The Taming of the Shrew*', *RD* 26 (1995), 83-104; Maguire, 'Petruccio and the Barber's Shop', *Studies in Bibliography* 51 (1998), 117-126. Cf. William Andrews, *At the Sign of the Barbers' Pole* (Cottingham: 1904) which is a collection of cultural tropes, but resists formal argument.

⁴⁷ John Ford, *The Fancies Chaste and Noble* in *The Works of John Ford*, ed. William Gifford, 3 vols (London: James Toovey, 1869) II, FNs 15 and 16 (p. 234).

Hall, performance records, wills, dictionaries, inventories, encyclopaedias, medical treatises, and archaeological material. The danger, as Janet Clare remarks, of the ‘yoking together of the literary text and the non-literary artefact’ is that we can ‘ignor[e] respective rhetorical situations’ which results in making arbitrary connections.⁴⁸ My investigations make sense of the rhetorical situations by focusing – primarily – on dramaturgical impact. By concentrating on how these medical men were represented physically, we can explore how the stage re-constructed medical scenes, not merely how it interweaved medical narratives. Ultimately, the literature from the period shows us why the union of barbers and surgeons was never harmonious: they are opposing cultural as well as medical figures.

Explorations of barbering and surgery are well situated within theatrical analysis because the practices associated with performances, often public ones. Lively homosocial barbers’ shops are renowned as gossip centres and surgery is affiliated with public anatomisations and felon acquisition from the scaffold, although the extent to which the latter is *theatrical* performance will be reviewed. Jean Howard’s reaction to a collection of essays on ‘working subjects’ is relevant to my investigations: ‘they reveal a great deal about the often conflicting stories told...at the site of the early modern stage. The contradictions and occlusions of those stories are a window onto the pressure points of a changing social formation’.⁴⁹ Building on criticism on early modern staging by R. A. Foakes, Andrew Gurr, Alan Dessen and Tiffany Stern, among others, my study also demonstrates that, despite limited evidence, speculation about the practicalities and effects of contemporary performance is imperative and unlocks early modern perceptions.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Janet Clare, *Art Made Tongue-Tied By Authority* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990), p. 1.

⁴⁹ Jean E. Howard, ‘Early Modern Work and the Work of Representation’ in *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 243-250 (p. 245).

⁵⁰ See various edns of Shakespeare by Foakes, and Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe’s Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2002); Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992); Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging Shakespeare’s Theatres* (Oxford: OUP, 2000); Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare’s London*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2004); Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); Alan C. Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*

Equally important to my work are on-going discussions by critics, including those listed above, about the material life of early modern theatre and culture. This criticism follows in the wake of Walter Greg's (and after him, E. K. Chambers with *The Elizabethan Stage* and Gerald Bentley with *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*) interest in documents of performance, and later Bernard Beckerman's cautionary points about large scenic objects on the early modern stage.⁵¹ Smaller objects, particularly those of the everyday, are now 'the thing'. Recent criticism has prioritised the stage prop as a focus of study which facilitates interpretations of individual scenes, entire plays, and wider social interaction. Two publications stand out: essays in *Staged Properties* (2002) collected by Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda, and Andrew Sofer's *The Stage Life of Props* (2006).⁵² Sofer examines how a 'material sign-vehicle absorbs the abstract connotations associated with the object it represents', while Harris and Korda make the material dimensions of props central to their interest in contemporary notions of property and production.⁵³ We are encouraged to think about the practicalities of staging as well as the immediate impact of objects. *Henslowe's Diary* is, unsurprisingly, a crucial text for many of these critics, but the interest in properties also stems from the attention that is given to stage directions, undertaken in particular by Alan Dessen and given authority in the reference work, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions*.⁵⁴ Material-culture studies have gained momentum over the

(Cambridge: CUP, 1984); Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995); Stern, *Rehearsal From Shakespeare To Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000); Stern, *Making Shakespeare*; Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009).

⁵¹ W. W. Greg, *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1931); Bernard Beckerman, *Shakespeare at the Globe* (New York: Collier Books; London: Collier-Macmillan, 1962), pp. 101-8, 157-68. For an overview see Stern, 'Re-patching the Play' in *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 151-177 (pp. 151-4). Cf. *Documents of the Rose Playhouse*, ed. Carol Chillington Rutter (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1999), pp. 1-35.

⁵² Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (eds.), *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002); Andrew Sofer, *The Stage Life of Props* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003).

⁵³ Sofer, p. 7. Cf. Stern (*Making Shakespeare*, pp. 92-100) and Gurr (*Shakespearean Stage*, pp. 187-193) who discuss props' to-and-fro movements.

⁵⁴ Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999). This publication, however, does not discuss or catalogue stage business implicit in dialogue.

past decade promoting cross-pollination between the research undertaken by archaeologists, art historians, social and cultural historians, literary scholars, museum curators and conservators.⁵⁵ The works of Catherine Richardson and Peter Stallybrass and their collaborators in particular have propelled the literary studies in this field.⁵⁶ The material culture was on the rise in early modernity. Examining a variety of texts from this period, Korda concludes that ‘linguistic and material economies of words and things...are inextricably intertwined’.⁵⁷ My thesis explores these connections, keeping in mind Sue Wiseman’s reminder that we need to look at who uses objects and how.⁵⁸ Also important is a question of who owns objects. Such studies have not yet brought medical equipment into discussions. Those barbery/surgery objects which have iconic and metonymic value emerge in my thesis, as do those which have the most discernible physical characteristics, and those which are likely to encourage the most jokes (or linguistic attention).⁵⁹ I explore the nexus of visual, verbal, kinesthetic and acoustic forms of communication which surround the objects under discussion and would have stimulated the early modern imagination. In particular I examine the material signs (linguistic and visual) of the occupations in early modern drama because through the stage the public is asked, collectively, to interact with these signs.

⁵⁵ See Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (eds.), ‘Introduction’ in *Everyday Objects* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 1-23 (p. 2).

⁵⁶ See Catherine Richardson, *Shakespeare and Material Culture* (Oxford: OUP, 2011); Richardson, *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Early Modern England* (Manchester; New York: Manchester UP, 2006); David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (eds.), *Staging the Renaissance* (New York and London: Routledge, 1991); Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (eds.), *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996); Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000). For a comparative study, see *The Material Renaissance*, ed. Michelle O’Malley and Evelyn Welch (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), which investigates ‘production [in Renaissance Italy] from the viewpoint of demand’ (p. 2) through a collection of essays on the shifting values of basic as well as luxury goods.

⁵⁷ Natasha Korda, *Shakespeare’s Domestic Economies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), p. 5.

⁵⁸ Sue Wiseman, “‘Popular Culture’” in *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 15-28 (p. 26).

⁵⁹ In *Domestic Life* Richardson highlights early modern conceptions of objects as simultaneously practical and symbolic.

I consider a range of practical and conceptual options, discussing the material thematically to avoid repetition and to ensure a unifying effect on the materials examined. I move from this Introduction's discussions of names, *dramatis personae* and speech prefixes, to discussions of settings and props, disguises, stage directions and semiotics, and from sound effects and music, to voices and rhetorical turns. In all of the chapters, other than chapter three, I discuss the barbery and then the surgery material, signalling connections throughout.

In “‘Setting up a shoppe’: Inventories and Props’, I explore how barbery and surgery practices are represented and defined through tool sets. In particular, this chapter is interested in inventories, and reflects on creative and cognitive processes in theatrical production which draw on acts of list-making. Its study of objects, both referenced and seen (or not referenced/seen), incorporates discussions about the extra-theatrical histories of the occupations’ equipment, as set down in contemporary wills, medical tracts and encyclopaedias.

The second chapter, “‘Lend me thy basin, apron and razor’: Disguise, (Mis)Appropriation and Performance’, takes disguise motifs as its point of reference for its ideological focus on the practitioner as a theatrical construction. It argues that, in particular, characters on stage who present themselves as a barber establish a barbery context self-reflexively. A binary effect emerges which corresponds to the first chapter’s interest in absent surgery: while barbery often functions as a disguise (and, as such, is readily expositied), surgery is frequently the covered-up process in dramatic action, remaining an offstage phenomenon. Only the practitioner of lewd, accidental or ineffectual surgery is manifest; invariably this is an allusion to the barber-surgeon through whom barbery shrouds surgery.

Chapter three is divided into two case studies. I explore how in *King Lear* and *Titus Andronicus* Shakespeare represents methods of abuse and retributive actions through the semiotics of barber-surgery, and demonstrate how by recognising these sign systems, thematic structures in the play at large, as well as in specific scenes, are illuminated. The linchpin of each case study is a prop, respectively a chair and a basin, and I examine these props' wider cultural impact.

'And pleasant harmonie shall sound in your eares': Ballads, Music and Groans, Snip-snaps, Fiddlesticks, Ear-picks and Wax' is the fourth, exploratory and historically-driven chapter which investigates the associations between barber/surgery and aural/acoustic matters. Clients' ears are another point of focus for the barber; a variety of figurative depictions of blocked and unblocked, clean and over-picked ears in early modern idiom have a barber context. While barber is inscribed with aural/acoustic signifiers, surgery is censored in performance by pre-verbal sounds and music.

The fifth and final chapter, "'An unnecessary Flood of Words'?", investigates the verbal and written cultures which divide barber and surgery. Barbers are characterised by generating excessive amounts of speech: there is faux worth in their garrulousness 'as purse[s] that cannot be shutte'. Surgeons are satirised for using technical language but are also 'thrift[y] in be[ing] mute'. The chapter reflects on the verb 'trim' and its paradoxical semantics meaning both to cut back and to adorn which can be applied to language as well as to hair. Ironically, barber acts as a conceptual blueprint for rhetorical and punitive gestures whereby a verbose talker is told to trim back his expression; at extreme levels these gestures are surgical and so cutting back language is dramatic amputation.

Chapter 1

‘Setting up a shoppe’: Inventories and Props

‘Many Barbers and Surgeons were fined in London for presuming to “sett up shoppe” without a license’.¹ Court minutes of The Company’s records show a flurry of such fines in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century: on 24th July 1599 ‘Richard Samborne complayned of one Phillip Winter for settinge upp a shoppe in paules church yarde beinge not free’.² The record’s wording suggests that the threat of unlicensed practice lay in its material manifestation as much as in the figure of the practitioner. Unlicensed barber Wheekes was ordered on 4th November 1600 to ‘take downe his basons and macke no shewe twowards the streete’.³ Barbers were not only instructed not to ‘shave wasshe, poule or trymme’ customers on Sundays (and other holy days), but they were not allowed to use any ‘Instrument to make cleane teeth’ and were also forbidden to ‘hange upp set or put out any...Basons or...potts upon...poule Racke shoppe windowes or otherwise’ on these days.⁴ Barber Marmaduke Jefferson is fined on 8th May 1599 ‘for hangeing oute his basones on Maye daie’.⁵ At all times, surgeons were forbidden to display vessels of blood, which were deemed ‘to stand to the annoyaunce of the people’.⁶ The Company attempted to control the visibility of the occupations by managing its sense of decorum as a matter of materiality as well as practice. This chapter is a materialist examination of barbering and surgery gear in early modernity which focuses on the differing visibility of the practices, both historically and literarily.

¹ Sidney Young, *Annals* (London: Blades, 1890), pp. 192, 191.

² Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 28. A practitioner could only keep shop (just one) after the completion of his apprenticeship and at least one year in service as a Journeyman.

³ *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 81.

⁴ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 4r. Fining for this offence was common; numerous cases are recorded in 1598, for example (*Court Minutes*, B/1/3, pp. 9-16).

⁵ *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 19.

⁶ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 4v.

I am concerned with inventories, and reflect on creative and cognitive processes in theatrical production which draw on acts of list-making. In ‘Thinking with Lists in French Vernacular Writing’, Rowan Tomlinson investigates the function of lists in a wide range of writing including more literary, imaginative texts. Exploring how early modernity was encountering objects by first-hand observation, which she terms more generally ‘autopsy’ – the argument, indeed, that Jonathan Sawday makes in *Body Emblazoned* – Tomlinson explains that early modernity’s perception of the world was moving from unity into pieces.⁷ The period’s increasing influence of ‘expert, practical, artisanal knowledge’ is part of her focus, but most interesting for my study is Tomlinson’s discussion about lists which posit an ‘observing eye’, implicit in non-dramatic texts, but in dramatic texts an actualised factor.⁸ William West examines the relationship between the theatre and the encyclopaedia culture in the same period, viewing the ‘encyclopaedia as the repository of the elements that made up the world and the theatre as their place of display’, and both as sites of compression and ‘impossible completeness’.⁹ In particular, West’s evaluation of the corresponding spatial realms of theatres and encyclopaedias which produce a space for the discovery, rehearsal and authorization of knowledge, and his interest in imitation and the visual are relevant here.¹⁰ But while West’s theoretical assertions are persuasive (specifically he argues that ‘*Theatre* shares its stem with the word *theory*, meaning literally “a looking”’), he avoids discussion of the practical implication of early modern dramatic texts and his focus is knowledge rather than, as it is for Tomlinson, material items.¹¹ I

⁷ Rowan Cerys Tomlinson, ‘Thinking with Lists in French Vernacular Writing, 1548-1596’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2008), p. 2; Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned* (London: Routledge, 1996).

⁸ Tomlinson, pp. 19, 27.

⁹ William N. West, *Theatres and Encyclopedias in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 1, 41.

¹⁰ See West, pp. 14-78 (esp. pp. 19-23, 43-9). Cf. Peregrine Horden’s depiction of the Middle Ages with ‘no schools, no canonical texts, and no encyclopaedic reference works’ in terms of medical fragmentation and mutability (‘Medieval Medicine’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Medicine*, ed. Mark Jackson (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 40-59 (p. 51)).

¹¹ West, p. 47.

explore the disparity between implied and actual forms of materiality in theatre, asking whether or not the ‘observing eye’ is rewarded (and what the dramaturgical or thematic effect of this is in performance), and reflecting on how touch is represented (as the embodiment of ‘impossible completeness’). Of stage properties, Andrew Gurr writes, ‘Shops, studies and cells in all the playhouses appeared furnished to show what they were’.¹² But writers and players also relied on audiences’ ability to project on to the stage their own (pre-)conceptions of particular work spaces – an audience’s imagination is pre-furnished. With that in mind, first I examine lists that appeal to a sensitive nose.

Olfactory Records

In 1545 the Mary Rose sank; it was raised in 1982. The best preserved part of this ship is the Barber-Surgeon’s cabin: ‘the barber-surgeon’s chest [which included over sixty items] is one of the most remarkable objects recovered’ from the vessel.¹³ From these remains, curators, historians and archaeologists have assembled a materially-endorsed inventory of the ship’s Barber-Surgeon’s equipment. But they were not necessarily able to distinguish between the barbery and surgery materials that survived: ‘it is not possible to state...whether all the razors found within the Barber-Surgeon’s cabin and chest were...for shaving or whether they functioned as surgical scalpels’.¹⁴ Moreover, it is not possible to establish how the practices were divided between the resident Barber-Surgeon (who, despite the Trust’s efforts, remains unnamed) and his mate.¹⁵ An inventory is also, inevitably, defined by its limitations.

¹² Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), p. 187. See also Alan C. Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare’s Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), pp. 155-64..

¹³ Julie Gardiner and Michael J. Allen (eds.), *Before the Mast* (Portsmouth: The Mary Rose Trust, 2005), pp. 14, 189-90.

¹⁴ *Before the Mast*, p. 217.

¹⁵ See *Before the Mast*, pp. 176-9, 208-9.

What is clear from the contents of the cabin, however, is that barbers and surgeons were furnished with a variety of ointments, unguents, lotions and exotic ingredients.¹⁶ Smells make an occupational and social statement, and so barbers' and surgeons' work spaces had an olfactory identity. The Trust's Collections Manager, Andrew Elkerton, compiled a catalogue of the smells, colours and consistencies of substances he encountered when opening the sealed containers recovered from the Barber-Surgeon's storage chest. He describes the smells as "'tarry'", "'herbal'", "'fatty'", "'peppery'", "'metallic'".¹⁷ These smells are unclear, 'vague', 'ish' and '-like' pre- and post-modify adjectives. Moreover, the speech marks in Elkerton's list, his frequent use of parentheses to qualify his descriptions, and plentiful question marks demonstrate the difficulty he has in assimilating a sensory catalogue with accuracy. I will discuss surgery's involvement with herbs later in this chapter, but the fact that Elkerton is uncertain in encountering the bottled substances is a helpful blueprint for my explorations of surgery's illegibility to non-professionals and the cultural anxieties about the recognisability of things, the result, in early modernity, of a thriving (but not always welcome) trade of foreign ingredients.¹⁸

Elkerton's attempts also draw our attention to a difficulty writers face when they have to reproduce olfactory sign posts. Barbery, in particular, was involved in, as Emily Cockayne describes, the 'healthy market in products to mask the smell of human discharges' for which perfumers produced 'washes, pomatums, soft soap, powders and essences'.¹⁹ Barbers' equipment included '*Wash Balls*', '*Sweet Balls*' (soaps), 'sweet Powder', 'sweet Oyle' 'Oyle Olive', 'sweet Water, *Benjamin Water*, &c.' (made from a

¹⁶ See *Before the Mast*, pp. 219-223. In William Bullein's, 'Dialogue Between Soarenes, and Chirurgi' in *Bulleins Bulwarke* (1579), the interlocutor, *Chirurgi*, gives a number of recipes for digestives and cures which incorporate scented oils or syrups; their ingredients include rose, saffron, camomile and 'odorant Wine' (22r). [This dialogue is the second book within *Bulleins Bulwarke* and has separate foliation.]

¹⁷ Andrew Elkerton, 'Descriptive Analysis of Samples Related to Barber/Surgeon Chest (A1530)' (unpublished, The Mary Rose Trust, Portsmouth, undated). With thanks to Andrew Elkerton for giving me a copy.

¹⁸ See Farah Karim-Cooper, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006), pp. 41-3, 126-9.

¹⁹ Emily Cockayne, *Hubbub* (New Haven; London: Yale UP, 2007), p. 63.

type of resin), and ‘*Water* made sweet with having Bay Leaves...heated therein’.²⁰ In Robert Greene’s and Thomas Lodge’s *A Looking Glass for London*, Clown says that the Smith’s occupation is that of ‘a Physition, a Surgion and a Barber’, provocatively assimilating the three professions. He concludes by isolating a difference: ‘[smiths] never use any musk-balls to wash [the horse] with, & the reason is sir, because he can woe [*sic*] without kissing’.²¹ In part, customers leave the barber smelling like his setting, a discernable sign that they have been treated.

Smells customers associate with barbering perform mnemonically. The authors of *Aroma* (1994) explain that smells ‘tap into memory and all the effects that that faculty holds within us’ enabling us to identify through smelling.²² The early modern barber is a recognizably smelly practitioner. To Francisco’s question in Robert Daborne’s *A Christian Turn’d Turk*, ‘How do you know hee is a Barber?’, Ranshake responds, ‘He smels strong of Rose-water’.²³ In the opening of the university drama *Preist the Barber, Sweetball his Man*, Preist asks ambiguously, ‘What Sweetball where are you?’, to which his apprentice responds, ‘Under yo^r nose Sir’, doubling the sense of the clichéd response.²⁴ Later in the play, Sweetball enters with ‘glasses’ in which Preist keeps different oils: ‘oyle of Swallowes’, ‘Sallet oyle’, ‘oyle of Mace’, ‘oyle of Broome’ and ‘precious [oyle]’ (lines 52-72). In John Ford’s *Fancies Chaste and Noble*, Secco the barber lists the fragrances which emanate from the ‘ingredients’ of ‘the composition of [a] ball’, and he gives a breakdown of this, providing an inventory of scents: ‘Camphire, pure sope of *Venice*, oyle

²⁰ Randle Holme, *The Academy of Armory* (Chester: [1688]), pp. 127-8. Cf. ‘A Barber after trimming...lave[s] your face with sweete water’ (Thomas Dekker, *The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609), F2v).

²¹ Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge, *A Looking Glasse, for London* (1598), B2v. Cf. *The Owl’s Almanac*, 2053-2054. [See Neil Rhodes’s case for Middleton – as opposed to Dekker – authorship (*Collected Works*, p. 1272).]

²² Constance Classen, David Howes and Anthony Synnott, *Aroma* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 2.

²³ Robert Daborne, *A Christian Turn’d Turke* (1612), G3r.

²⁴ Thomas Tomkis, *Preist the Barbar, Sweetball his Man* in *Collections*, ed. Suzanne Gossett and Thomas L. Berger (Oxford: Malone Society, 1988), XIV, lines 1-2.

of sweet Almonds, with the spirit of Allome’.²⁵ But signposting smells is difficult because smell is an ‘elusive phenomenon’.²⁶ In order, therefore, to draw the audience’s attention more effectively to smells which cannot be smelt and in order to make these smells perform, writers do something else: they convert their descriptions, distorting what should be understood by audiences as one type of smell into another. Instead of depicting something pleasant, they depict something reeky and reify the reality that ‘Masking and concealing [bodily scents] carried risks – they might make the situation worse’.²⁷ By reversing the implied quality of a smell, writers draw their audience into the process of inventorying because they ask them to re-evaluate and re-imagine scents. In *Fancies* the ‘odorous’ ball is actually ‘none of the sweetest’ and does not live up to its promise. The audience’s reaction to the ball’s material quality as a prop transforms when Secco and his boy, Nitido, redefine its composition:

SPADONE	Camphire and soape of Venice say ye.
SECCO	With a little <i>grecum album</i> for mundification. ²⁸
NITIDO	<i>Grecum album</i> is a kinde of white perfum’d powder, which plaine Countrey people, I beleeeve, call dog-muske.
SPADONE	Dog-muske, poxe o’the dog-muske, what dost meane to bleach my nose, thou giv’st such twitches to’t? (K1r)

In a parody of barbery in *Damon and Pithias*, Grimme the collier is alarmed to find that the water he is about to be washed with is not sweet, but ‘vengeaunce sower’.²⁹ Barber Tryphon embodies stench in Gervase Markham and William Sampson’s *Herod and Antipater*: when asked what he would do ‘but for a kisse of [Salumith’s] hand’, Tryphon responds, ‘What would I do?...A Breath more loathsome then the Stench of *Nile*, / Ile

²⁵ John Ford, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (1638), 14v.

²⁶ *Aroma*, p. 3.

²⁷ Cockayne, p. 63.

²⁸ Mundification] the act of cleansing or cleaning a wound or ulcer: the reference draws attention to the noisome, foul body. *OED*, †Mundification, *n*, 1.

²⁹ Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pithias* (1571), Fiiiir.

rectifie, and, for her sake, make pleasant'.³⁰ Similarly in *Noble Soldier*, Balthasar describes barbers as a group of smelly practitioners: 'And Pothecary drugs to lend [barbers'] breaths / Sophisticated smells, when their ranke guts / Stinke worse than cowards in the heat of battaile'.³¹ By inverting barber's familiar, regular scents, Balthasar introduces the gross smells of barbers' surgical counterparts who deal in guts. The linguistic solution to referencing or cataloguing fragrant barber shops (and their occupants) is to make a joke which works through reclassification. Moreover, because of scents' cosmetic associations this makes symbolic the dangers of misshapen identities: writers' reversing of scents feeds into contemporary commentary on the superseding of vanity over religious effort which results in a stinking soul.³² The practical implications of representing smell and the period's pressing discourse on the distorting effects of scent here combine as both solution and paradox, making light of unacceptable forms of deception.

'these following necessities'

In two texts barber equipment is inventoried alongside lists of surgical equipment. That the authors separate these lists reinforces my point that, while recognising their relatedness, we must think about barber and surgery as discrete practices. John Woodall rose through the ranks of The Company and in 1632 he was appointed master.³³ In 1617 Woodall published *The Surgions Mate, or A Treatise...of the Surgions Chest*, which was written as an aid for young sea surgeons (he had served as a surgeon with the English merchants), but which could serve more generally as a basic surgical textbook. He produced a second, expanded edition of this work in 1639, which was reprinted

³⁰ Gervase Markham and William Sampson, *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater* (1622), G2r.

³¹ Dekker [S. R. initials on t. p., quarto], *The Noble Souldier* (1634), G2r.

³² See Karim-Cooper, p. 42.

³³ See James Watt, 'John Woodall' in *Notable Barber Surgeons*, ed. Ian Burn (London: Farrand Press in association with The Worshipful Company of Barbers, 2008), pp. 153-177.

posthumously in 1655.³⁴ One page, the text of which I have included below, inventories barbers' equipment.

1617 edition (sig. A4r)	1639/1655 edition (sig. D1v)
And for that the Surgions Mate <i>by due consequent is to be Barber to the Ships Company</i>, he ought not to be wan-ting of <i>these following ne-cessaries</i>. <i>One Barbers case containing.</i> <i>Raisors.</i> <i>Sizers.</i> <i>Combes.</i> <i>Combe-brush.</i> <i>Eare picker.</i> <i>Mullets.</i>³⁵ <i>Gravers.</i>³⁶ <i>Flegmes.</i>³⁷ <i>Paring knives.</i>³⁸ <i>Looking glasse.</i> <i>Also Aprons.</i> <i>Shaving linen.</i> <i>Water-pot.</i> <i>Sweet-water.</i> <i>Washing-bals.</i> <i>Hoanes.</i>³⁹ <i>Whet-stones.</i> <i>Basons</i>, and what else is necessarie to the Barbers profession.	If the Surgeons Mate cannot trimme men, then by due consequence there is to be a Barber to the Ships Company, and he ought not to be wanting of these following necessities. One Barbours case, containing, <i>Rasours foure.</i> <i>Scissers two paire.</i> <i>Combes three.</i> <i>Combe-brush one.</i> <i>Eare-picker one.</i> <i>Curling Instruments.</i> <i>Turning Instruments and Spunges.</i> <i>Mullet one.</i> <i>Gravers two.</i> <i>Flegme one.</i> <i>Paring knives two.</i> <i>Looking glasse one.</i> <i>Aprons 'hree</i> <i>Shaving towels twelve.</i> <i>Water-pot one.</i> <i>Sweet water one.</i> <i>Washing-bals lesse or more.</i> <i>Hoane one.</i> <i>Whet-stone one.</i> <i>Basons two.</i> And what else is necessary to the Barbers profession, as the expert Barber better knoweth.

Figure 1: Text of the barber's 'necessaries', John Woodall, *The Surgeons Mate* (1617;1639/55).

³⁴ John Woodall, *The Surgions Mate* (1617); Woodall, *The Surgeons Mate, or, Military & Domestique Surgery* (1639); Woodall, *The Surgeons Mate or Military & Domestique Surgery* (1655).

³⁵ *Mullets*] pincers or tweezers for hair, *OED*, n.⁵

³⁶ *Gravers*] could be a general cutting tool, but more than likely a specific instrument for scraping plaque from teeth (could also be referred to as a 'scraper'), *OED*, 3.a.

³⁷ *Flegme*] a type of watery distilled liquid that was used as a cleaning substance, *OED*, n. 2. However, more likely is that 'Flegme' is a variant spelling of 'fleam[e]', a type of lancet used on human gums and here logically included after another piece of dentistry kit ('Gravers'), *OED*, n.¹.

³⁸ *Paring Knives*] a variety of long-bladed knives.

³⁹ *Hoanes*] types of whetstone with a very fine edge, *OED*, n.¹, 7.

Woodall's lists tell us that barbery had, as an established occupation, a definitive language and materiality. Some differences between the editions of *Surgeon's Mate* are worth highlighting. Woodall stipulates in the second edition the number required of most items, reinforcing the fact that the text was of practical use. While in the 1617 edition it is evident that the surgeon's mate takes the role of the barber, in the second edition this is not expected. Instead, Woodall indicates that a ship's company required a separate practitioner, even in cramped quarters at sea. Barbering demands training (a seven-year apprenticeship), and by referring to 'the expert Barber' in his later editions, Woodall acknowledges this figure's singular knowledge of his trade.⁴⁰ He also includes in his second edition three extra items with which the 'expert barber' should be equipped: 'Curling Instruments', 'Turning Instruments and Spunges'. Hair styling equipment seems more to define these barbery particulars suggesting that the practice adjusted to help assert its independence from surgery and to compensate for its loss of activities of a medical nature. Effectively, Woodall garnishes the end of his second inventory ('and what else is necessarie...') with an *et cetera*. In this way he distances himself (as a surgeon) from giving an exhaustive definition of the 'other' trade, appeasing and complimenting the 'expert barber' with whom he would have worked alongside in a civic capacity in The Company, which was supposed to be equally governed by two elected barbers and two surgeons.

The Heraldist Randle Holme (1627-1700)⁴¹ printed at his Chester home over half of his *Academy of Armory* (the manuscript of which is dated from 1649) in 1688.⁴² This

⁴⁰ Sandra Cavallo re-evaluates the position of Italian barbers in relation to surgeons by asserting their independent knowledge-base of the body (*Artisans of the Body in Early Modern Italy* (Manchester; New York: Manchester UP, 2007), pp. 38-63).

⁴¹ Randle Holme was one of four Chester-based Randle Holmes from the period. The author of *Armory* is the third.

⁴² See 'Introduction', Randle Holme, 'The Manuscript of the Third Book of *The Academy of Armory* as it was for the Printing' in *Academy of Armory or A Storehouse of Armory and Blazon*, ed. I. H. Jeaynes, Vol II (London: Roxburghe Club, 1905), v-xii. The collection of Holme's manuscripts is held at the British Museum (Harl. 2026-2035).

vast encyclopaedic work includes substantial entries relating both to barbery and surgery. Holme stipulates differences and similarities between these practices' equipment, and indicates that while some tools could be seen to double-up, essentially practitioners regarded their instruments as professionally discrete.⁴³ Natasha Korda notes that 'the diversification of things requires a diversification of terms', and she argues that this diversity renders Holme's 'system of classification' simply 'unstable' because of its 'semantic superfluity'.⁴⁴ Old and new terms intertwine, reminding readers that new terms do not automatically replace old ones, but add to them and sometimes modify them, inflecting and augmenting the possibilities of contemporary diction. The difficulties faced in classifying the period's material cultures contribute to the complexities in which I am interested associated with classifying, representing and alluding to barbery, surgery and barber-surgery, or to the barber, surgeon and barber-surgeon, more generally.

On barbery, Holme records nearly thirty tools (or pieces of furniture), over forty phrases specific to the profession, and a further six examples of diction.⁴⁵ The detail provides a sense of performance in which sounds (voices), human movements, tools and *mise-en-scene* (furniture) interact. We can tell from some of the entries that in cataloguing the trade Holme does not give a limiting snapshot of barbery (i.e. recording what is present in one barber's case or shop), but is capturing a sense of the trade *to date*. Entries include 'the like *Bottle* with sweet Powder in; but this is now not used' and more antiquated terms, such as 'poler' and 'pole' (meaning 'a shaver' and 'to shave', respectively). For some instruments Holme gives two names that stand for essentially the same tool (or at least no differentiation between the following are given): 'A *pair of Tweesers*, or *Twitchers*', 'A

⁴³ Holme (1688), pp. 420-438.

⁴⁴ Natasha Korda, *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp. 4-7.

⁴⁵ Holme (1688), pp. 127-9.

Rasp or File’ and ‘A *Puff or Tuff*’.⁴⁶ Holme does not include a plate of illustrations of barbers’ tools because his readership presumably did not need assistance in visualising the objects which were not under doubt; he does, by comparison, include plates of surgical instruments, discussed later. At the end of his section on surgery, Holme inserts a concise list of barbers’ instruments that is almost a reproduction of Woodall’s list, referring to instruments ‘much used and approved off by Mr. *John Woodall* and prescribed in his *Surgeons Mate*’.⁴⁷ In the context of the *Armory*, the shorter list of barbery tools functions as a summary; abridged, rather than truncated, it gives a sense of inclusivity and suggests the manageability and completeness of this list on record.

Although specialised, barbers’ tools were very recognisable and their basic inventories were familiar and legible to early moderns. Customers of other tradesmen (pewterers, ironmongers, clothiers and goldsmiths, for example) were more likely to see the product of the trade than the methods and tools of the practice. The apparatus of the tailor’s occupation was perhaps more discernible than others because customers, whose bodies were part of the practitioners’ business, witnessed the tools used when they were measured up; but they did not necessarily witness the tailor at work on a garment. Most visible to the public was the barber’s trade.⁴⁸ Cuddy Banks says of the barber’s boy in *Witch of Edmonton*, ‘he can shew his Art better then another’.⁴⁹ In Phillip Stubbes’s *Display of Corruptions* (1583), Amphilogus tells Theodorus that barbers ‘have invented such strange fashions and monstrous maners of cuttings, trimmings, shavings, and washings, that *you would wonder to see*’ [italics mine].⁵⁰ Barbery is something to watch, a

⁴⁶ Holme (1688), pp. 127-8.

⁴⁷ Holme (1688), pp. 438, 433.

⁴⁸ Many barbers at the time were itinerant. However, playwrights tend to fix on more permanent figures of the trade for whom a shop or indoor workspace is implicit – this helps to structure their depictions.

⁴⁹ Thomas Dekker, John Ford and William Rowley, *The Witch of Edmonton* (1658), E1v.

⁵⁰ Phillip Stubbes, *The Second Part of the Anatomie of Abuses Containing the Display of Corruptions* (1583), G8r.

process which is, in Stubbes's conception, put on as a show.⁵¹ The idea of mystique and rarity ('strange' and 'monstrous' activities) in Stubbes's description is amusing; in reality everything in a (regular) barber's shop was visible and recognisable to the customer. Moreover, the environment is not an alien realm in which transformations miraculously occur, but a place where clients have a role in organising their own subjectivity. To some degree, customers would need to be familiar with the language of the trade, and with the instruments it employed so that they could instruct the barber on what manner of cut, shave or treatment they required.⁵² 'Cut it up in heights', according to Holme, means 'to cut as each person will have it, for there is variety of ways'. After the barber has finished, he 'Hold[s]...the Glass [for the client] to see his new made Face, and to give the Barber instructions where it is amiss'.⁵³ The terms of barbery also circulate in the air of a shop before a clientele: writers often portray the barber giving instructions to his boy and requesting certain instruments. Moreover, barbery equipment found its place in the household for ablutionary purposes. When Preist and Sweetball, depart from the stage to shave their scholars, they leave behind certain instruments of which they decide 'There's inough all ready att y^e Colledge' (line 79): 'Comb[s]' and 'Raysours' (see lines 78-82). In some ways, therefore, the joke about barbers is that they do not own anything that was not automatically available to anyone else (excepting, perhaps, their dentistry materials); but by registering barbers' tools as a collective body in a context-centric location (shop or case), rather than as a dispersed set of objects in the diversely-orchestrated home, writers can shape the tradesman's image.

Language manuals in the period show us that barbery diction was in general use. But whereas in mid-sixteenth-century dictionaries, such as Thomas's Elyot's *Bibliotheca*

⁵¹ On the barber's shop as a social centre, see Margaret Pelling, 'Appearance and Reality' in *London 1500-1700*, ed. A. L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986), pp. 82-112 (p. 85).

⁵² Contemporary literature satirises the working, available language of the trade (see chapter five).

⁵³ Holme (1688), p. 128.

(1542) and Richard Huloet's *Dictionarie* (1572) the vocabulary relating to barbers consisted mainly of references to the names for the practitioner (barber, shaver, pouler), his place of work (the shop) and verbs attributable to the trade (such as to shave, poole or clip), later-sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuals collectively listed the instruments of barbery.⁵⁴ Like Holme's *Armory*, the thirty-four terms in John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593) perform (and also parody) a sequence in a barber's shop.⁵⁵ The phrases also provide the French for twelve barbery instruments/equipment ('*cleane cloathes*', '*combe*', '*Pomander*', '*soape*', '*bason*', '*Cizars*', '*Ivorie combe*', '*rasor*', '*eare-picker*', '*tooth-picker*', and '*glasse*'). Plate LXXV, below, from the educationalist and Latin scholar Johann Comenius's *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (1659) is one-of-a-kind in that it describes and illustrates the features of a barber's shop (*Tonstrina*).⁵⁶ In English, the inventory boils down to 'Case', 'Basen', 'Sope', 'Laver', 'Towel', 'Comb', 'Crisping-Iron' and 'Pen-knife'. The image depicts two customers in the shop, underlining clients' vantage points in their upright positions. Moreover, in translating '*tonstrina*', the author has named the space 'Barbers-shop', hyphenating a modified noun to suggest the single proper name: barbery inherently attaches itself to this sense of definitive space. By comparison, the entry, 'The Chirurgion cureth Wounds', which highlights the implicit double sense of both practices, is unnumbered on the list and is not realised in the woodcut. ('*Sometimes* [the barber] cutteth a vein' [*italics mine*] in the illustration differentiates this procedure which is shown in shadow.)

⁵⁴ Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca Eliotae* (1542), see Ffiir, Llviir; Richard Huloet, *Huloets Dictionarie* (Oxford: 1572), see Div, liiv.

⁵⁵ John Eliot, *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), H4v-I1r. For notes on the compilation and printing of this text (which is effectively two manuals in one), see Frederic Hard, 'Notes on John Eliot and his *Ortho-epia Gallica*', *HLQ* 1:2 (1938), 169-187 (pp. 181-182). Holme does not cite Eliot although we know that it was a popular text seen as a source for Shakespeare's *Love's Labours Lost*, *Henry V* and even *King Lear*, and an extant copy contains the signature and copious notes of Gabriel Harvey. See Hard's article and Joseph A. Porter, 'More Echoes from Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica*, in *King Lear* and *Henry V*', *SQ* 37:4 (1989), 486-488.

⁵⁶ Johann Amos Comenius, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, trans. Charles Hoole (1659), pp. 154-155.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 2: ‘Tonstrina’, Johann Comenius, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (1659), pp. 154-5.

The translator of *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, Charles Hoole, published *An Easie Entrance to the Latine Tongue* (1649) which includes a similar list of materials attributed to the barber: ‘a barbers-box...towel...rasor...barbers-basin...sweet-powder...crisping-iron....pair of scissors... pair of pinsers to pull away hairs...pair of pinsers to pull out teeth...a porringer’.⁵⁷ These inventories point towards an increasingly materially-determined occupation which was characteristic, because of its visibility, of the growing material climate.

Depictions of barbering naturally lean on the trade’s material aspects. Ford’s *Fancies* is one of the later texts considered in this thesis and the barbering props designated in its stage directions are the most detailed. *Fancies* represents both domestic barbering and commercially-driven barbering through barber Secco, who initially enters ‘with a

⁵⁷ Charles Hoole, *An Easie Entrance to the Latine Tongue* (1649), pp. 299-300.

Castingbottle, sprinckling his Hatte and Face, and a little lookeing glasse at his Girdle, setting his Countenance' (s.d. A4v). These objects do not represent the barber shop, but tell the audience something about the vanity and naivety of the young barber who will not be without ablutionary materials for his own upkeep. In Huloet's *Dictionarie* a 'Tonstriculus' is '*A young barbour, which is not perfect in the occupation*'.⁵⁸ Later, when Secco realises how he has been duped by Spadone, he assembles his barber shop on stage as a location in which he can punish his meddling friend. The theatrical realisation of Secco's shop is a tangible sign that the barber is ready for business; before this he appears ungrounded in his occupation. His later props are an adjustment: Secco enters with '*his apron on, Bason of water, Scissers, Combe, Towels, Razor, &c.*' (s.d. I4r), and in the scene he calls for his barber's chair to be brought out. Moreover, he gives his own mock-classification of one of his tools: '[this is] a kinde of steele instrument ycleped a Razor, a sharp toole and...keene' (K1r), which highlights the role that classification plays in characterising Secco's changed fortunes and acquired control over his trade. Comparable to Woodall's 'and what else' is '&c.' in *Fancies*'s stage directions. Given the inventories I referenced above, the items implied under the *et cetera* could be numerous. In *Preist the Barber* the barber's shop is the only venue that needs to be represented in performance. At the end of the play items that we assume were part of the scene-setting are gathered up. Sweetball collects 'linnen, the comb, and glasse', asks if his master will need the 'Curling iron', and points to the 'Bason' (lines 76, 83, 89). The editors of *Preist the Barber* note that the college drama 'requires no special machinery for production'.⁵⁹ These plays suggest that barbery objects were straightforwardly theatrical commonplaces and ultimately convention.

⁵⁸ Huloet, Div.

⁵⁹ Gossett and Berger, p. 142.

Throughout this thesis I explore how that convention variously manifested itself. First I want to investigate how playwrights use inventory as a (linguistic) tool in their dramas. Peter Burke refers to popular culture ‘in terms of inventories of a stock or repertoire of the forms and conventions’ as well as being a stock of genres. His analogy of the musical ‘variation on a theme’ is useful to my discussion which explores the artistic impulses behind writers’ use of inventory in scenarios on stage. Burke concludes, ‘combining formulae and motifs and adapting them to new contexts is not a mechanical process’ but a ‘creative act’.⁶⁰ In the following three examples the barber’s shop is not an actualised factor on stage, but linguistically the barbery context evoked is creative in its emphatic materiality and is thematically embedded in each play. Setting up a barbery space in theatre involves more than a furnished stage to show what things were; it involves a furnished script as well. An inventory negotiates itself between physical and linguistic reference points.

Sham Materiality in the Subplot of *Midas*

Lyly’s main source for both stories in *Midas* is Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (XII.85-193). The first story is about Midas’s golden touch, granted by Bacchus, and the second is how the King grows ass’s ears as a punishment for erroneously judging a competition between Pan and Apollo (the God of Music).⁶¹ A barber features at the end of Ovid’s tale and although his role is restricted to a few lines, he is crucial to the original conception of the tale’s circulation: through the barber, Ovid explains how the secret of the King’s ass’s ears surfaces. The few lines in Ovid are rearranged in Lyly’s *Midas* as an entire subplot, centred on the barber (Motto), which parodies the greedy politics of the main Midas story

⁶⁰ Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3rd edn (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 163-200 (pp. 163, 173, 198-199).

⁶¹ See Elizabethan and modern translation: Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, trans. Arthur Golding (1567); Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. A. D. Melville (Oxford, New York: OUP, 1998).

by exploiting barber's association with cozenage, misappropriation and materiality. Motto's role (one of the lengthiest characterisations of a barber of any surviving early modern play) is not to spread the news as in Ovid. Instead, Lyly fleshes out the barber's part, making it a double-act with Dello, his apprentice, and providing an additional context in which to exercise the themes and moral stance of the story as well as Lyly's linguistic predilections. When the characters of this subplot first appear, Motto has shaved Midas of his golden beard but has been cheated of it by Court servants, Petulus and Licio. The supposedly valuable item is the central cause of the rivals' attempts to outwit each other. In the end, Petulus and Lucio claim the beard, which is their bribe in return for not reporting Motto's treasonable slip of the tongue.

The main subject of the play's subplot is Midas's golden beard but, oddly, this item is not a prop or a prosthetic object in a production. Here, I differ from Mark Johnston's reading of the beard: he imagines that in early scenes the actor playing Midas must wear a golden beard, commenting that this prosthesis 'never appears again after Motto removes it from Midas's face'.⁶² But the play never reveals when Midas touches his beard, or when Motto has the opportunity to shave it off. Its elusiveness in the play is entire. When the audience first hears of the beard, they learn that it is at Petulus's pawnbroker. Towards the end of the play, Motto leads Petulus and Licio offstage with the line, 'Then follow' (V.ii.196) in order to retrieve the beard from Motto's safe-keeping.⁶³ The beard switches hands, but not before the audience's eyes and dialogue updates the audience as to who has the item. Indeed, Petulus's desire for the golden beard is conflated with his desire to have a beard at all (a reference to the smooth-faced boy-actor of St Paul's playing his role): like the golden beard, Petulus's is 'concealed' (V.ii.7). Johnston argues that the beard is 'refetishized as a commodity' in the subplot having been removed from the courtly

⁶² Mark Albert Johnston, 'Playing with the Beard', *ELH* 72:1 (2005), 79-103 (p. 91).

⁶³ John Lyly, *Midas* in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David Bevington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

economics of the main plot, and points towards the ‘artificial stability’ of the beard in its various contexts.⁶⁴ But the golden beard hardly has a context in the main plot. Bacchus’s reference to the hairs on Midas’s head is not a reference to his beard and is made before the King’s golden wish, and Mellecrites’s mention of Aesclepius’s honoured golden beard is a passing remark (see I.i.13; I.i.77-79). The beard is instantly appropriated in the subplot (unnoticed in its literal form before III.ii). Because it does not materialise, the suggestion is that the golden beard has faux worth. It is deceptive, and is emblematic of the false worth of Midas’s golden touch which does not generate value and deprives Midas of gaining greater status at court.

But the golden beard’s physicality has the illusion of being existent during a performance of *Midas*: goldenness is characteristic not just of the beard’s colour but also of its physical property. It is a weighty object and corresponds to currency and the materially-meaningful coin. Second, Petulus speaks of the beard in terms of it being pawned: it supposedly produces economic results in cash value (see III.ii.22-4). Third, referred to as a ‘hairbadge’ (III.ii.28), the beard has an intensified material status: it is like a piece of jewellery that pronounces status. Moreover, the term ‘hairbadge’ puns on ‘harbourage’ and its implication of safe-keeping.⁶⁵ Fourth, the beard is discussed in direct relation to Petulus’s teeth, which reminds audiences of the beard’s original bodily tangibility. And fifth, characters refer to the beard in terms of possession, usually in terms of handling the object. In the end, the beard is the one item on Petulus’s wish list: ‘Remember now our inventory’, he says to Motto, ‘Item: we will not let thee go out of hands till we have the beard in our hands’ (V.ii.193-5). Petulus’s reminder is couched in terms of formal list-making. Tomlinson explains that techniques such as ‘*anaphora*, *occupation*, and *deixis*, or the reliance on...the term “*item*”’ are frequently used by list-

⁶⁴ Johnston ‘Playing with the Beard’, pp. 91, 96.

⁶⁵ See Hunter and Bevington, FN to III.ii.25-8.

makers to impose order.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, all of these seeming endorsements of the beard's material worth and investment are each undermined 1. Gold may initially in the play be likened to rarity and to coins, but this distinction is lost in multiple puns on 'crowns' and the dissolving of gold as a feature in a fully golden world. 2. Rather than focusing on the capital generated from pawning the beard, Petulus bemoans the fact that he must pay a heavy charge on it per month (see III.ii.24). 3. It is never in safe-keeping (in 'harbourage') because it is the subject of cozenage in a world of tricks. 4. Petulus's teeth (to which the beard is related) are not durable bodily members. Instead, they cause problems for Petulus, who has chronic toothache, and they need to be extracted. 5. The audience never sees that the beard is possessed by anyone, and its supposed to-and-fro trajectory and appropriation in the dramaturgy is offstage, switching hands without any witnesses. That the beard never materialises makes ridiculous the exertions of the subplot characters who are driven by their desire to keep a hold on it.⁶⁷ Writing on touch, Carla Mazzio explains that 'The cost of a touch that "grasps" in a non-reciprocal manner is embodied in the myth of Midas'; Lyly extends this 'cost'.⁶⁸ The themes of the subplot centre on material possession, but more specifically, on the absence of the material reality of possessions which translates to a theatrical trick. Throughout *Midas*, Lyly entertains his audience with things that are not there but which appear to have social value. Andrew Sofer writes,

stage props become a concrete means for playwrights to animate stage action, interrogate theatrical practice, and revitalize dramatic form...A prop exists textually only in a state of suspended animation. It demands actual embodiment and motion on the stage in order to spring to imaginative life.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Tomlinson, p. 10. Cf. Olivia's unveiling to Viola (Cesario) in *Twelfth Night* soon after which she inventories her facial features as a mock copy for the world, 'every particle and utensil labelled' (I.v.234-235). Her playful itemising, a sarcastic use of formality, is her attempt to gain control in her first exchange with Viola and to displace what she anticipates as Orsino's conventional praise-giving.

⁶⁷ Volpone's recognises that he enjoys 'More in the cunning purchase of [his] wealth / Than in the glad possession' (Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, ed. Robert N. Watson, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2003), I.i.31-32).

⁶⁸ Carla Mazzio, 'The Senses Divided' in *Empire of the Senses*, ed. David Howes (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005), pp. 85-105 (p. 86).

⁶⁹ Andrew Sofer, *The Stage Life of Props* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003), p. 3.

And yet a prop, as I have described, can also exist *theatrically* in a state of suspended animation.

I now want to explore the interrelation between the play's absent beard and its barbery setting in which inventories and the theatrical construction of a barbers' workspace also play with audience expectations. Lyly's play is distinct from earlier and later plays: George Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*, *Damon and Pithias*, *Preist the Barber*, Francis Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, John Jones's *Adrasta*, and *Fancies* rely on physical properties to establish their barbery settings. In *Midas*, however, absent barbery underscores the absent beard, and, by implication, the absence of material worth in the play. Parody in the subplot is multiply created: textually, in its relation to the main plot; intertextually, in relation to Ovid; theatrically, in relation to theatre convention; and contextually, in relation to barbery's social history. But here, absence is effectual primarily because an audience knows what should be materially manifest.

Nothing in the script of *Midas*, either in the limited stage directions or in the dialogue, suggests that any of the subplot scenes should take place in a barber's shop. An atmosphere of barbery and a context for the barber is established through language: Motto and Dello exercise 'Tully *de Oratore*, the very art of trimming' (III.ii.49-50), which is linguistic trimming, rather literal barbering (see chapter five). Motto's pulling of Petulus's tooth does not occur on stage; instead, a song about aching teeth yanks the scene to a halt. Items that audiences might usually associate with barbery are referred to but are projected onto other objects. Petulus's teeth are supposed to 'look like a comb', but can also act as 'scissors' (V.ii.99-100); a woman's tongue 'will prove a razor' (V.ii.103-4). Musical instruments that might have furnished a barber's shop are also displaced: Petulus's

‘mouth’ is ‘the instrument’ (III.ii.94-5) and his teeth ‘virginal keys’ (III.ii.97-8).⁷⁰ The similes accumulate. The only barbery item that we might see on stage is a medicinal leaf with which Motto rubs Petulus’s gums, but the humour of the scene relies on a sense of it being ‘any old leaf’, which undermines rather than confirms the practitioners’ working setting.

But there is another prop for the subplot characters to handle. In V.ii, Petulus carries a document on stage. It is supposed to be ‘an inventory of all [Motto’s] goods’ (V.ii.4), which Petulus and Licio receive in exchange for the golden beard. The paper is not simply a single hand prop; it is also supposed to be an assurance of ‘household stuff’ (V.ii.25) for the court servants to possess, comparable in value to a golden lump of beard. We know what is usually included in an early modern barber’s inventory from the formal lists examined earlier; wills from the period, and their accompanying inventories, also provide some evidence. On the 3rd July, 1544, Charles Whyte, who was a Warden of the Barbers’ Company, lists in his will only a handful of belongings, but his barbery equipment comes first. He specifies, ‘six barbours basons’, ‘a kettyll with a cork in yt to wasshe heddes wyth’ (primitive shampooing furniture), and ‘three barbours chayres’.⁷¹ Books are also listed in Whyte’s inventory, suggesting that the barbery objects have value. John Vignes’s inventory from the late-seventeenth century details the contents of a barber’s shop:

Item six Razors tipt with silver
twenty other Razors one looking glass
four case of Razors a
parcel of Combs two powder boxes
eight old chaires three brushes
two Tables one iron Grate a paire
of Tonges two brass potts three

⁷⁰ On music and the barber’s shop see chapter four.

⁷¹ Charles Whyte, City of London (14th February, 1545), PROB 11/30.

peuter basons two brass Candlesticks
 two iron hangers for Candlesticks two
 peuter boxes for wasbolls five
 brass basons to hang in the street
 one peuter Cisterne 1 glass bottle
 for powder a darke Lanthorne
 one brass branch in the window⁷²

The items on Vignes's shop-inventory were valued at £3.10 (the equivalent of approximately £300 today). Antipater says of the court barber, Tryphon, that he 'Will begger himselfe with buying new Instruments' (*Herod and Antipater*, G2r). In *Dutch Courtesan* Cocledemoy asks a pertinent question when he demands of the barber's boy, 'what's thy furniture worth?' (II.i.188-9)⁷³ The variety of materials (silver, pewter, brass, glass and iron) in the Vignes inventory correspond to the pattern discussed by Korda and others who study the 'increasing volume, value, and variety of goods available' throughout the seventeenth century.⁷⁴ This variety could enable barbers to differentiate their equipment from everyday items: a question of the value of barbers' materials was relevant, although seemingly also a joke in the period. The document in Petulus's hand carries certain promises of material objects, both for Petulus and for the audience.

But this document is a sham. It does not conform to the legal requirements of an inventory and Lyly satirises early modern consumerism and its developing property market. 'Of divers questions about the making of an inventarie', ecclesiastical lawyer Henry Swinburne states first that 'All goodes, c[h]attels, wares, merchandizes, moveable

⁷² John Vignes, Westminster (1699), PROB 4/13107. (Records at the National Archives show that very few inventories survive between 1583 and 1640.)

Cf. the inventory of Stafford Tyndall which includes 'Five box combs two raisors one paire of sisers two beard irons and one little silver plate Item one...one steele instrument for cleaning the teeth...two hones a beard brush and some hair powder..a looking glass foure combs for the haire' (Stafford Tyndall, Lambeth (1665), PROB 4/7218).

⁷³ John Marston, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997).

⁷⁴ Korda, *Domestic Economies*, pp. 1-14.

and immoveable, are to be put into [it]'.⁷⁵ But Swinburne's attempts to classify 'moveables' and 'stuff', argues Korda, are not straightforward; terms are slippery, causing the lawyer to clarify matters in his second edition of *Testaments and Last Willes* in 1611.⁷⁶ Terms in *Midas* are also prone to shift and resist definition and Lyly's satire works on the level of the household while making broader comments about social interaction. Motto's inventory is categorised, comically, as a list of '*bads* and goods' [italics mine] (V.ii.23-4), 'bads' being 'a nonsense term...for comic antithesis'.⁷⁷ But it does not actually list any barber's 'goods' (V.ii.4) or 'household stuff'. Instead, it itemises only the unwanted, and suggestively immoveable, contents of his house, including "one foul wife and five small children" (V.ii.26), and lists his vicious debts ('a broken pate owing' (V.ii.42) and 'an hundred shrewd turns owing' (V.ii.46-7)).⁷⁸ Along with the foul wife, Petulus discovers other undesirable items listed:

PETULUS	'Item: in the servants' chamber, two pair of curst queans' tongues.'
LICIO	Tongs, thou wouldst say.
PETULUS	Nay, they pinch worse than tongs. (V.ii.31-34)

Licio expects to find equipment on the list. Tongs were barbers' curling instruments (see John Vignes's inventory), and sometimes referred to as irons, but here playing to the graphemic and phonetic similarity of 'tongues'. Once again, the comedic effect relies on a process of transference. What is first thought to be a material item (the tongs) and of practical use, is actually something else, incorporeal and dysfunctional – the painful voices

⁷⁵ Henry Swinburne, *A Briefe Treatise of Testaments and Last Willes* (1591), 217r, 218r. This work survives in nine editions from 1591 to 1803.

⁷⁶ Korda, *Domestic Economies*, pp. 2-3.

⁷⁷ Hunter and Bevington's FN to V.ii.23.

⁷⁸ Despite our contemporary predilection to see women characterised primarily in terms of property in early modernity, domestic subjects (wives, children and servants) were not conventionally classified in probate in the period. Cf. 'Cocledemoy, consorted with his moveable chattel, his instrument of fornication, the bawd Mistress Mary Faugh' (*Dutch Courtesan*, I.i.14-16).

of slutty female servants.⁷⁹ Interpretations shift between subject and object. In *A Search for Money* (1609), William Rowley describes a barber as ‘treble-tongu’d’: ‘hee has a reasonable Mother tongue, his Barber-surgions tongue, and a tongue betweene two of his fingers’.⁸⁰ ‘Immoveable’ and ‘incorporall’ items were officially part of inventorying, as were the listings of debts, but these alone would not constitute a legally sound document; the emphasis of an inventory was supposed to be primarily on materials.⁸¹ There is nothing of material value for Petulus and Licio to possess; the ‘goods’ are without commercial, social or civic worth. While Lyly’s *Midas* deals, in its main plot, with Phrygian legend, its subplot is satirical of contemporary material culture in a world that has become a ‘hodgepodge’ (Prologue, 22).

Only later in *Midas* is there reference to a more familiar barber’s inventory. In V.ii, Motto is distressed because he has been tricked into saying, expexegetically, ‘Nay, I mean the King’s are ass’s ears’ (V.ii.157). He hopes that Petulus will not relate his slip of the tongue to the authorities, and secures this by offering Petulus the golden beard.

MOTTO I protest by scissors, brush and comb, basin, ball and
apron, by razor, earpick, and rubbing clothes, and all the
tria sequuntur triaes in our secret occupation...
that [Petulus] shall have the beard (V.ii.177-180).

This list points to everything that has so far been absent in the barbery subplot. Apparently it is all that Motto has to swear upon. To the subplot characters, material objects should add gravitas; material items, however, have not been physical or stable commodities in the play and characters have had double standards about material possessions. Like the sham document Motto gives Petulus earlier on, this verbal inventory, too, is misleading and lacks true weight in formulating Motto’s pledge. The audience is not led to think that

⁷⁹ Moreover, ‘tongues’ are notoriously an ambivalent part of a bodily whole.

⁸⁰ William Rowley, *A Search for Money* (1609), B3r.

⁸¹ Swinburne, 218r.

Petulus has finally triumphed. Just as the opening squabbles over the golden beard begin midway through the action, so the conclusion of that plot is open-ended, reflecting the non-teleological aspect of touch which Mazzio explores, and highlighting the problematic nature of untouchable and well as touchable objects. The golden beard is therefore re-absorbed as an intangible on an unwritten inventory: ‘Remember now our inventory. Item: we will not let thee go out of hands till we have the beard in our hands’ (V.iii.193-5).

Lyly’s play is an exploration of the relationship between a playwright’s linguistic and material investment in his drama. Primarily a literary artist, Lyly underlines his moralising and thematic concerns in the Midas story without neglecting the substance of theatre. (Stage directions in Lyly’s works show that properties are not generally absent from his stage.) If, as Douglas Bruster argues, hand properties are a symbol of decorum on the early modern stage, then by not supplying the subplot with the properties on which it focuses, Lyly challenges theatrical decorum, and, at the same time, the climate of his era that consumed the material.⁸² Writing on the prologue in *Midas*, Bruster and Weimann discuss Lyly’s consciousness in confronting representation’s forms of authority and communication: ‘What the prologue himself conveys is...the energizing interplay, in his own text and in the theatre, between the representing and the represented, but also, and simultaneously, between showing and writing’.⁸³ The subplot’s material world in *Midas* is referential, not visual, and the subplot characters are rhetorically dealing with things that are not there; that is material things that are physically absent but which are concrete in the minds of an audience which fits the image of the playwright ‘groping towards a new cultural stock-taking’.⁸⁴ ‘For Midas’, Mazzio explains, ‘as for any theorist of touch, to get

⁸² Douglas Bruster, ‘The Dramatic Life of Objects in the Early Modern Theatre’ in *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 67-96 (pp. 74-5).

⁸³ Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann, *Prologues to Shakespeare’s Theatre* (London; New York: Routledge, 2004), see pp. 117-134 (p. 121).

⁸⁴ Bruster and Wiemann, p. 119.

a “handle” on touch, to reify it, may be to eclipse its power’, the very effects on which Lyly plays.⁸⁵ The play’s barbery context makes these effects possible.

Inventory as *Cataplexis* in *Epicoene*

Juana Green investigates the material properties of marriage which feature in Jonson’s *Epicoene*, highlighting the distinctive types of wedding objects that were required in production, and exploring gendered meanings of ownership.⁸⁶ Green argues that Jonson’s choice of stage properties (Nuremberg animal cups) is calculated, and she traces their trajectories onto the commercial stage; her chapter emphasises Jonson’s ability to produce theatrical impact through the presence of stage objects. In this section I examine how Jonson also denies the materialisation of objects in *Epicoene* for rhetorical effect.

Cutbeard is barber and confidant (‘chief of...counsel (I.ii.39)) to Morose, for whom he supplies an unsuitable spouse.⁸⁷ Morose marries Epicoene not realising that she is a he and that s/he can, contrary to Cutbeard’s guarantee, talk. At the end of the play, a disguised Cutbeard spawns confusion when Morose seeks a legal way out of his marriage. Jonson satirises stereotypical representations of the blabbering barber by suggesting at the beginning of the play that Cutbeard is as silent as Epicoene, but later, Morose realises that the ‘impostor, Cutbeard’ (III.iv.47) is indiscreet. In III.v’s final sixty lines, Morose and Truewit wish calamity on Cutbeard: ‘May he get the itch, and his shop so lousy as no man dare come at him’ (III.v.70-71). They focus half of their cataplexis on Cutbeard’s body, which they hope will develop botches and gout, and the other half on the objects of his trade. In the midst of their invective they envisage the deterioration of Cutbeard’s shop, the contents of which they hope will ‘rust’, ‘mould’ and get ‘broken’ (III.v.79, 80, 104). To be practising with faulty instruments was an offence; Morose and Truewit’s attack is social as

⁸⁵ Mazzio, p. 87.

⁸⁶ Juana Green, ‘Properties of Marriage’ in *Staged Properties*, pp. 261-287.

⁸⁷ Ben Jonson, *Epicoene*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

well as personal. The Company Ordinances (1606) reveal that such practice had been sometime noted. A clause seeks the ‘Reformacon of abuses in disobedient M[asters] & Servants’ in the trade who are partly classified by their use of ‘uncleane naperye & combes and rusty Instruments’.⁸⁸ The durability of material items would not have been as it is today, requiring practitioners to re-furnish their shops and keeping active the consumer market. A fifteen-piece inventory of barbery items emerges from Truewit and Morose’s exchange: ‘curling-iron’, ‘balls’, ‘warming-pan’, ‘chairs’, ‘scissors’, ‘combs’, ‘cases’, ‘basin’, ‘sponge’, ‘lotium’⁸⁹, ‘lute-string’, ‘linen’, ‘lint’ (and reference to ‘rag[s]’), ‘pole’, ‘glass’, ‘razor’ (III.v.69-110). Ford incorporates a similar passage in *Fancies*. For a moment, Spadone believes that Secco the barber has insulted him. In response, he utters a condensed invective against the barber that also takes the form of an inventory: ‘I will blow my nose in thy casting bottle, breake the teeth of thy combes, poyson thy camphire Balls, slice out thy towels with thine owne razor, betallow⁹⁰ thy tweezees, and urine in thy bason’ (B1r). Indeed, Ford encourages us to see the influence of *Epicoene* on *Fancies* by naming Secco’s wife Morosa, a female counterpart to Morose. Although scenes in *Epicoene* are never set in a barber’s shop (in II.vi, characters are loitering either in or near Cutbeard’s house), Morose and Truewit invite audiences to construct in their minds a comprehensive *mise-en-scene*. (In *Fancies*, the diatribe against the barber occurs before Secco has officially set up shop on stage.) The characters hope that Cutbeard ‘never set[s] up again’ (III.v.96), but, ironically in this passage, their allusions assemble the play’s most tangible sense of the barber’s shop work space. The audience’s enjoyment of the sequence relies on their ability to share in Jonson’s resourceful construction of the characters’ diatribe.

⁸⁸ Barbers’ Archive, *Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 30r.

⁸⁹ lotium] ‘stale urine used by barbers as a “lye” for their hair’, *OED*, *obs*.

⁹⁰ betallow] to make greasy.

This barbery inventory, used as a mnemonic of the tradesman's status, is incorporated as a playful reminder that the practitioner should not get above his station.⁹¹ Before III.v, Morose privileges Cutbeard hardly acknowledging him as a barber; when Cutbeard is scorned his occupational identity is underlined materially. Green argues that Jonson uses household property to dramatise 'anxieties surrounding shared...property' and reflect 'cultural concerns'.⁹² Morose and Truewit turn to the barber's material property to underline social order in the face of transgression. The effectiveness of the scene lies in this process of decontextualization within the play, and also relies on the audience's unsurprise at the unreliability of the barber. In literature, if there is ever a question over a barber's honesty, it concludes only one way. Inventory here functions as a reality check.

The scene might cause audiences to squirm. Morose and Truewit imagine that Cutbeard will only be able to survive his degradation by consuming the items and materials in his shop. In part, the inventory they draw up is also a repulsive recipe. They think that Cutbeard should, with obvious pun intended, 'swallow all his balls' (III.v.73), 'eat his sponge for bread' (III.v.84) 'drink lotium' (III.v.85), 'Eat ear-wax' (III.v.87) and 'beat [old teeth]...to powder'⁹³ and make bread of them' (III.v.89). The first two examples synthesise the flesh of the barber's body with his occupational equipment ('balls' and 'sponge'), while final three invite an audience to recognise substances they might themselves contribute to the contents of a barber's shop: urine (lotium), ear-wax and teeth. Inventories' implied material site readily transposes to a bodily and corruptible one, and what is regarded as worth recording materially is re-identified as transient, waste-matter.

⁹¹ This 'playful reminder' is also in 'The Rimers New Trimming' (c.1614), an anonymous ballad in which a Rhymer mocks the barber's trade. The balladeer incorporates an inventory of barbery objects ('Sissors', 'Rasor', 'Combes', 'Ball' (also 'Balles' and 'Musk-ball'), 'Bason', 'Cloths' (also 'Cloaths' and 'Clothes'), 'Pan', 'Chair' (three times) and 'Glasse') which paints a picture, through song, of predictable practice and a battle of social precedence between barber and rhymer.

⁹² Green, p. 284.

⁹³ The word is 'poulder' in Folio/quarto edns (*Epicoene* in *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson* (1616), p. 561; *Epicoene* (1620), G4r) which, according to the *OED*, is found in forms of 'pewter' as well as 'powder'. The association with pewter is befitting of barbery for which equipment was often made of the metal alloy.

In this instance, inventory catalogues the collapse of things, specifically Cutbeard's good repute, but also general order. Moreover, the inventory available in the scene is uncomfortable because it goes against what theatre wants to do: the actor wants to show and the audience wants to see. (On the subject of hands, Bruster notes that 'illustrators preferred that hands be used for gestures, or rest on something, or grasp an object, rather than remaining empty'.)⁹⁴ On a page, an inventory is static and flat; on stage it wants to be physical. Tomlinson asserts that 'listing is often, either implicitly or explicitly, figured as the product of a process of observation'.⁹⁵ Items listed in an inventory can at once be there and not there, catalogued (having been witnessed) but not necessarily in view, as can a theatrical prop. Theatre, therefore, uses inventory to play with the notion of the witness and potential for material embodiment. By denying the possibility of animation in III.v *Epicoene*, the characters' curse on Cutbeard prevents any real violence from occurring. On a practical level, this prevents a theatre company from having to replace damaged props after every performance. But the effect of the inventory can be ideological rather than physical.

In my next example I investigate the effect a playwright achieves when he combines the formal structures of a barber's inventory in a character's lines with the presence of hand props on stage. This double effect in a scene from *Herod and Antipater* produces a bizarre sense of effictio. The objects' relationship with bodies is different again. In *Midas*, tools are, as it were, projected on the body or re-configured as aspects of speech and Lyly explores questions of surface value. In *Epicoene*, barbery objects and waste products are depicted in relation to the less socially-acceptable body. In *Herod and Antipater*, tools seem to be extensions of the body: they are prostheses with the potential to stimulate sexually and also to kill. They stick out.

⁹⁴ Bruster, 'Life of Objects', p. 74.

⁹⁵ Tomlinson, p. 35.

‘strange idolatry’ in *Herod and Antipater*

The overreaching illegitimate, Antipater, determined to possess the Crown in Jerusalem, propels the tragedy in Markham and Sampson’s play. Antipater sets in motion fears of treachery in the King’s court, causing Herod – out of terror – to authorize executions, including that of his own wife, Marriam. Antipater gains his Aunt Salumith (Herod’s sister) for an accomplice by convincing her that her husband is unfaithful with Herod’s wife, and that her ‘state [at court] is slippery’ (G1v). Salumith procures for Antipater a naive agent with whom Antipater can further stir trouble in the royal household: the king’s barber, Tryphon, is infatuated with Salumith and obedient to her command. She asks Tryphon to give a false message to Herod, which he does:

TRYPHON	I must disclose A treason foule and odious: these your Sonnes, ... By fearefull threats, and golden promises, Have labour’d me, that when I should be cald, To trim your Highnesse beard, or cut your hayre; I then should lay my Razor to your throat (G4r)
---------	--

Because Tryphon confesses he knows a means of killing Herod, he is stabbed. The barber does not have a lengthy role in the drama, but he is more than a walk-on part. He utters over sixty lines and has three stage entrances; his longest spoken passage is, in effect, a soliloquy; he is a catalyst to double filicide; in his third appearance during the performance he enters ‘*like [a] Ghost*’ (s.d. L1v) to remind Antipater of his unnatural deeds, and so his theatrical status shifts during a performance. The playwrights mark the barber’s part in the play by equipping him with more than a message for Herod: the player of Tryphon must perform with a variety of props.

Tryphon first enters *solus*, although he is watched by Salumith and Antipater: ‘Enter Tryphon the Barber, with a Case of Instruments’ (s.d. G1v). Tryphon’s ‘Case’ at first appears like a single hand prop, but it is itself full of hand props which Tryphon takes out, apostrophises and, presumably, holds up for an audience to see, inventorying the contents of the case. Salumith’s comment, upon Tryphon’s arrival, ‘heere comes mine Instrument’ (G1v) is a visual and semantic joke, drawing attention through the possessive adjective to the difference between, and doubleness of Tryphons’ tools and hers, between objects and a subject. Indeed, there are three layers of materiality in Tryphon’s entrance: the ‘Case’; the instruments within, which have a relationship with the ‘Case’ – out of which and into which they move on stage; and Tryphon, who is Salumith’s instrument. Although stage directions do not stipulate the contents of Tryphon’s case, we know the minimum number of items that must be inside: a ‘Combe’, ‘Sizers’, a ‘Tooth-pick’ and ‘Eare-pick’, and ‘Crisping-Irons’. Tryphon also refers to his ‘glasse’, ‘Razor’, ‘Bason’ and ‘Balls’, but he says he has either destroyed or thrown away these items; they are no longer in his case, or he discards them on stage as he pulls them out.

A female is the main subject of the barber in *Herod and Antipater*. Privileged women such as Salumith were unlikely to attend to their own coiffeuse, but their ablutionary routines were usually performed by other women.⁹⁶ Farah Karim-Cooper explains that ladies in upper social levels were ‘expected to have a working knowledge of the rituals and intimate secrets of the female dressing chamber’.⁹⁷ In Barnabe Barnes’s *Devil’s Charter*, Lucretia is attended by ‘two Pages’ who enter ‘with a Table, two looking

⁹⁶ Cf. Carol Chillington Rutter’s analysis of Trevor Nunn’s 1989 production of *Othello* which celebrates the familiar and ‘unique privacy of [the] women’s scene’, where Emilia (Zoe Wanamaker) attends on Desdemona (Imogen Stubbs) (*Enter the Body* (London; New York: Routledge, 2001), pp. 142-177 (pp. 144-5)). Significantly, perhaps, Desdemona’s mother’s maid, whose story Desdemona shares with Emilia, is called ‘Barbary’ (IV.iii.25).

⁹⁷ Karim-Cooper, p. 35.

glasses, a box with Combes and instruments, a rich bowle'.⁹⁸ But it is Motticilla who 'smooth[es] [Lucretia's] browes'; while Motticilla 'correct[s] these arches with this mullet', Lucretia warns her maid, 'Plucke me not to[o] hard' (H1r-v). For the most part we assume that women preened themselves.⁹⁹ Licio lists twenty-four 'purtenances' belonging to women for their upkeep, including 'curling irons', 'hair-laces', '[looking-]glasses' and 'combs' (*Midas*, I.ii.79-83).¹⁰⁰ In the domestic transactions of *Henslowe's Diary*, an entry lists what could be a typical female's set of equipment. On 20th January 1593, the household lent upon 'a gilte box wher in is a lockinglasse a new combe a paier of siseres & 3 eare pickers...of the midwifes dawter'.¹⁰¹

But in literature, those women for whom ablutions and external upkeep are a public matter make a social statement about female mobility. Captain Otter suggests in *Epicoene* that his wife (in his terms, 'a scurvy clogdogdo' (IV.ii.68)) is groomed or reconstructed facially by a variety of practitioners (probably barbers) across town: 'All her teeth were made i' the Blackfriars, both her eyebrows i' the Strand, and her hair in Silver Street' (IV.ii.84-86), he says.¹⁰² (This last location is adjacent to Monkwell Street where resided Barber-Surgeon's Hall.) By inventorying his wife's body topographically Captain Otter makes excessive-seeming the performance in putting her together, and blazon is so dispersed as to be distorted. Truewit encourages women to 'practise any art to mend breath, cleanse teeth, repair eyebrows' (I.i.105-6) but upon Clerimont's interjection, 'How! publicly?' (I.i.107), he responds, 'The doing of it, not the manner: that must be private. Many things that seem foul i' the doing, do please, done...when the doors are shut, [men

⁹⁸ Barnabe Barnes, *The Devils Charter* (1607), s.d. H1r.

⁹⁹ See Sandra Cavallo, 'Health, Beauty and Hygiene' in *At Home in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis (London: V&A Publications, 2006), pp. 174-187.

¹⁰⁰ For a discussion of the substances (rather than the tool-sets) women used in cosmetics, see Karim-Cooper, pp. 34-63.

¹⁰¹ Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), p. 146.

¹⁰² William Kerwin discusses (barber-)surgery's work on the body's surfaces in early modernity which caused, he argues, anxiety about their role in socioaesthetics, 'particularly [in] narratives about faces that present themselves as readable and unreadable in various culturally inflected ways' (*Beyond the Body* (Amherst and Boston: University of Manchester Press, 2005), pp. 97-129 (p. 100)).

should not] be inquiring; all is sacred within' (I.i.108-9, 111-12). Truewit's satirical judgements correspond to the play's larger theme of the private, public and contested performing spaces of women, and the open cataloguing of appliances and bodily practices is comparable to Truewit and Morose's diatribe against Cutbeard which makes grotesque those things commonly associated with beautification.¹⁰³ When in *Fancies*, Secco the barber and his man Nitido explain that they 'light on some offices for Ladies, too, as occasion serves' (this, according to Nitido, might be to 'frizzle or powder their haire, plane their eye-browes, set a napp on their cheekes, keepe secrets, and tell newes' (I4v)), Ford deliberately fuels the assumption that Octavo's nieces and wards, who are under Secco's wife's protection, are a harem.¹⁰⁴ In *Herod and Antipater*, the relationship between the male barber and Salumith instantly indicates her sexual ambivalence and – in this play, hazardous – mobility at court. That Tryphon is Salumith's prosthetic object, jabbing at the king so as to destabilize his authority, complicates the play's sexual politics.

Tryphon fantasises about how his barbery instruments have touched and probed Salumith's body. He fetishizes each object, and his 'strange Idolatry' (G2r [the remaining quotations in this paragraph are taken from G1v/G2r]), so termed by Salumith, suggests that he gains masturbatory pleasure from handling his tools. Karim-Cooper examines what it means for women to be rendered 'prosthetic beings', but in this passage, the male simultaneously is constructed prosthetically.¹⁰⁵ Although he regards his 'Combe' as 'blessed' and 'spotless', a 'comb' refers to the crest of a cockerel and is allusive of the penis: Tryphon combines sacred subjects with the material. He thinks of this instrument unknotting the tangles ('felters') of Salumith's hair. But these tangles are 'curious'; an allusion to pubic hair, they arouse Tryphon. His 'Sizers' are 'sweete' because they 'once did cut the Locks of Salumith'. 'Cut' can mean to 'help oneself sexually', and as a noun

¹⁰³ Cf. Karim-Cooper, pp. 111, 125-6.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Johnston, 'Bearded Women in Early Modern England', *SEL* 47:1 (2007), 1-28 (p. 6).

¹⁰⁵ Karim-Cooper, pp. 112-118.

was synonymous with ‘vagina’, while a ‘lock’ was allusive of chastity.¹⁰⁶ Tryphon mixes barbery tropes of snipping hair with sexual innuendo, fantasising that he once took Salumith’s virginity. The scissors are ‘sharpe, but gentle ones’. He envisages that Salumith’s hair hung down ‘in humility.../ On either side her cheekes, as ’twere to guard / The Roses, that there flourish’, aligning his image of her with that of the stereotypical, blushing newly-taken virgin. His ‘Tooth-pick’ is ‘deare’, and both ‘Tooth-pick’ and ‘Eare-pick’ are deemed Salumith’s ‘sweet Companions’; it is little surprise that Tryphon lights on instruments that can penetrate. The ‘Tooth-pick’ he imagines in Salumith’s mouth suggests that he attains oral pleasure, while his description of the ear pick again draws on typical tropes of lost innocence: it ‘Wriggle[s] so finely worme-like in her Eare; / That [he] wisht, with envy.../ [he] had beene made of [the pick’s] condition’.¹⁰⁷ Rather than an inventory cataloguing monetary value, Tryphon’s list attributes emotional or sexual value to each item, and inventorying doubles as blazoning. Parts of Salumith’s body are celebrated through Tryphon’s meditation on his barbery instruments: ‘her hayre’ or ‘Locks’, ‘her cheekes’, ‘her white Teeth’, ‘her Eare’ and her ‘corrall Lips’. Writing on Thomas Thomkis’s play *Lingua*, Mazzio comments on its long list of ‘touchable’ items in bodily dressing: ‘The heap of absent objects clearly displaces the representational problems of touch onto the female sex’.¹⁰⁸ But it is not only the absence of these objects, as my example from *Herod and Antipater* shows, but the abundance of objects that can problematize touch, which is multiply-envisaged.

Tryphon returns his instruments to the case, which, for the audience, transforms from a tradesman’s equipment box to a lover’s collection of tokens: a ‘Shrine’, as Tryphon calls it. He explains, ‘Ile number all those Hayres my Sizars cut, / And dedicate those

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Williams, *A Glossary of Shakespeare’s Sexual Language* (London: Athlone, 1997), pp. 89-90, 192.

¹⁰⁷ Tryphon’s ear-pick is discussed further in chapter four.

¹⁰⁸ Mazzio, p. 90.

Numbers to her Shrine' (G2r); this numerical itemisation parodies formal inventoring. Whereas a barber entering a scene with instruments often denotes stage activity (see chapter two), the barber entering in *Herod and Antipater* demonstrates the reverse. The instruments are devotional relics rather than realistic appliances underlining the inherent deficiency of prostheses. Lime and Handsaw in the play, by comparison, epitomise the practical labourer. The case and the untouched tools within it symbolise Tryphon's celibacy or failed erection. Of the comb he says, 'let no hand / (But mine henceforth) be ever so a[u]dacious, / Or daring as to touch thee' (G1v), and of the scissors, similarly, 'O, goe rest, / Rest in this peacefull Case; and let no hand / Of mortall race prophane you' (G1v-G2r). The case is an archive.¹⁰⁹ This action makes biting irony the reason for Tryphon's death in the next scene. Herod, whose anxiety is misplaced, kills Tryphon because he believes the barber can 'cut [his] throat, / When [he] should trim or shave [him]' (G4r). Tryphon's scene dramaturgically highlights the transformation of trade equipment into a non-functioning state: instruments become records with a memorialising effect. In *Refiguring the Archive* (2002), Carolyn Hamilton et al emphasise that 'today scholars pay greater attention to the particular processes by which the record was produced and subsequently shaped, both before its entry into the archive, and increasingly as part of the archival record'.¹¹⁰ The authors discuss record-making as a process, which they see being produced in 'literature, landscape dance and art and a host of other forms' as well as in more historically-focused documents. Here we see this process on stage which structures a message, further embedding the play's reflection on legitimacy: the barber who forsakes his tools makes himself, and therefore his labour, vulnerable.

Finally, Tryphon's name (he is the only character of this name in plays from the period) is of interest to this discussion and draws us to the playwright's sources. Fictional

¹⁰⁹ The only barbery tool Tryphon retains for his mistress are 'the Crisping-Irons'.

¹¹⁰ Carolyn Hamilton et al, *Refiguring the Archive* (Cape Town, South Africa: David Philip; Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002), p. 9.

barbers easily gain comic names – discussed in the introduction – but ‘Tryphon’ is of a different type of onomastics, in being historically rather than generically constructed. Peter Morwen’s translation of Josephus’s Jewish and Roman history in *A Compendious and Most Marvellous History of the Latter Tymes of the Jewes* (1558), is Gervase Markham’s source for *Herod and Antipater* (Sampson was the play’s later reviser).¹¹¹ Amidst the narratives of Antipater’s persistent foul play against Herod, the *History* refers to the court’s barber who acts as one of many false witnesses for Antipater, but who alone out of these witnesses is accredited with an occupational identity. But this character in Josephus is not associated with Salumith, and is called simply ‘barber’.¹¹² Markham (and Sampson) embellish this barber’s part from history not only with a motive, speech and accessories, but also with an onomastic identity, as Lyly does with the barber in *Midas* (see chapter five). In Jewish history, a ruler called Diodotus but also known as Tryphon (the name under which Diodotus assumes his kingship) is renowned for usurping the kingdom of Syria in 143/4 BC; his later failed attempts upon Jerusalem and the various uprisings against him drive him to suicide in 143 BC.¹¹³ But the relationship of the barber in *Herod and Antipater* to this historic Syrian ruler does not offer an illuminating interpretation of the part. The barber in the play is a fop; he cannot act for himself. If Markham and Sampson intended a connection between their barber Tryphon and the demonic Syrian ruler, Tryphon, the effect is muddling rather than witty; the playwrights’ emphasis is on Antipater and Herod’s abusive methods, rather than another figure from antiquity. The name Tryphon in this context simply evokes a sense of the period, as set down by Josephus; historically it sounds plausible.

¹¹¹ *A Compendious and Most Marvellous History of the Latter Tymes of the Jewes*, trans. Peter Morwen (1558), xxvii-lxv.

¹¹² See Morwen, lvii.

¹¹³ See James Ussher, *The Annals of the World* (1658), pp. 470-483.

More interestingly, the name Tryphon is associated with men of surgery. Celsus refers to father and son surgeons, both called Tryphon, who are named alongside Meges and Euelpistus as followers of famous Hellenistic anatomists.¹¹⁴ In surgeon Thomas Gale's *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), the first Roman surgeon named (one of the ancient 'noble persons who daylye more, and more, did augment the art [of chirurgerie]') is 'Tryphon'.¹¹⁵ In William Bullein's *Bulwarke* (1579), the interlocutor Chirurgi lists 'the most worthy Fraternity of the *Chirurgians*, of the moste aunciente and famous Citty of London': one of the 120 names recorded is 'Tryphon'.¹¹⁶ In Boccaccio's *Genealogia*, Tryphon was the brother of Aesculapius, the God of Medicine.¹¹⁷ And tellingly, the mythical sea surgeon of Books III and IV of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1590/6), is called Tryphon, who – albeit after six years – cures Marinell's bleeding wound.¹¹⁸ Gervase Markham was of an educated family, took responsibility for the prose completion of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, and was noted as a poet as early as 1598.¹¹⁹ It seems likely, given his background and the poetic circles in which he moved, that Markham was exposed to *Faerie Queene*. If Markham drew on Spenser's surgically-associated Tryphon, he was not the only one: the poet Michael Drayton refers to Spenser's Tryphon when alluding to surgeons in *Poly-Olbion* (1612), and in Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* (1633) Tryphon is referred to several times associated with the sea, salves and healing strong infections.¹²⁰ Although Tryphon's part in *Herod and Antipater* is straightforwardly a barber's role, through his name, the dramatists encourage knowledgeable listeners and

¹¹⁴ See Plinio Pioreschi, *Roman Medicine*, vol 3 (Omaha, NE: Horatius Press, 1998), pp. 175, 285.

¹¹⁵ Thomas Gale, 'An Institution of A Chirugian' in *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), 4r.

¹¹⁶ Bullein, 4r, 5v.

¹¹⁷ See Hamilton's FN to III.iv.43: 7-9 and *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: Routledge, 1990), p. 10.

¹¹⁸ Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton, 2nd edn (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2007), Book III, canto iv, from stanza 43; Book IV, canto x, from stanza 6.

¹¹⁹ See Matthew Steggle, 'Markham, Gervase (1568?–1637)', *DNB*, OUP, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18065>, accessed 16 July 2010].

¹²⁰ Michael Drayton, *Poly-Olbion* (1612), R2r. Phineas Fletcher, *The Purple Island* (Cambridge: 1633), see Eclog. III, stanza 5; Eclog. V, stanzas 6, 19; and Eclog. VI, stanzas 18, 25.

readers to note his connection with surgical men, both contemporaneously fictional and of ancient times.

Tryphon's name injects the double effect of the 'barber-surgeon' into the play. When Tryphon re-enters like a ghost (with Pheroas, Achitophel and Disease), Antipater says that the ghosts 'transfigur[e]' him, declaring, 'O, you doe breake my brest up, teare my Soule; / And burne Offence to an Anatomy' (L1v). If ghost-Tryphon still carries a case of instruments, Antipater reconfigures the prop: Tryphon, it appears to him, is now equipped to anatomise. The barbery instruments that were archived now threaten Antipater. Unlike earlier, in his re-emergence, Tryphon is silent about his equipment. If to Antipater Tryphon is now like an unlicensed practitioner, his implied tool-set is also unfamiliar. Barbery equipment that was once catalogued and held up for view is now hidden or unnamed. In this context, the '*case of instruments*', an unstable archive in this play, is reclassified to suit the practitioner of surgery, and pale Tryphon appears, in accordance with contemporaries' favoured depictions, like a gaunt medical man.

'cover'd over with surgeons Instruments'

Surgery naturally intermingled with the worlds of physicians and apothecaries, although their relationships were often strained and they each sought to differentiate themselves. In an image from Comenius (below), a surgeon (top left), physician (top right with the patient) and apothecary (bottom) are represented in the single woodcut, although spatially they are separated.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 3: ‘*Ars Medica*’, Johann Comenius, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (1659), p. 260.

The apothecary is depicted in a shop full of jars and drawers: his workspace appears established, even personalised (comparable to the barber’s).¹²¹ The place in which the surgeon is located is the least well situated: his workspace is truncated and with his back to the room he seems disconnected from the patient’s treatment space, which is divided by the door in its centre, marking a conceptual as well as physical threshold.¹²² Lisa Silverman notes of French surgical procedures in the seventeenth century that they ‘took place in a mutually agreeable location. Phlebotomies, for example, were generally performed in the patient’s home’.¹²³ Unlike the barber who is associated with an established, familiar, visible workspace which promoted itself on the street, the surgeon is associated with visiting patients, attending to the injured on the battlefields, practising in

¹²¹ Cf. Romeo’s description of the apothecary’s ‘needy shop’ filled with horoscopal objects in *Romeo and Juliet*, V.i.42-48.

¹²² Cf. the inner-cover woodcuts of *The Expert Doctors Dispensatory* (1657), A1v. The text purports to ‘open’ the ‘Apothecaries Shop’ and ‘Chyrurgions Closet’ but only depicts the Physicians’ and the Apothecary’s workspaces pictorially.

¹²³ Lisa Silverman, *Tortured Subjects* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 135.

hospitals and sometimes working from home (this being the ‘shop’ to which The Company records usually refer). In Chapman’s *All Fools*, the surgeon offers to treat Darioto’s wound: ‘if you please to come home to my house till you be perfectly cur’d, I shall have the more care on you’.¹²⁴ Today we associate surgeons with the surgical theatre, but in early modernity they were not associated with an equivalent space in their daily works. So when the editor of *Works of Beaumont and Fletcher* (1866) added ‘A Room in the House of the Surgeon’ to the stage directions of V.iii in *Love’s Pilgrimage*, what might he have conceived a surgeon’s furnished space to be?¹²⁵ And is it practical to think that the early modern stage would have reproduced this space? In the Folio edition of this play, no such direction is included (see Cccccccc4r). The second part of this chapter examines how the absence of surgery’s definitive workspace is supplemented by the absence of a definitive or manageable inventory of surgical equipment, making the conceptualisation of the profession mostly intangible.

Peter Lowe distinguishes between the two main types of equipment with which the surgeon is customarily furnished: ‘instruments or remedies common be...of two sortes, for some be medicinals, & some be ferramentalls’ (made of iron, specifically, or metal, more generally).¹²⁶ Receipts, or recipes, are commonly in the surgeon’s making, and, as Peregrine Horden notes, the ‘distinction between surgery and medicine is blurred’.¹²⁷ In his *Bulwarke*, Bullein explains his alternative methods for opening sores without tools. Describing ‘a potential cautery’, he names a variety of substances that are distilled together to treat an apostumation. My interest is in his use of the word ‘potential’. A cautery usually

¹²⁴ George Chapman, *Al Fooles* (1605), G1v.

¹²⁵ Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. George Darley, 2 vols (London: Routledge, 1840) II.

¹²⁶ Peter Lowe, *The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* (1597), B3v. The ‘instruments of metal’, according to Gale, could be of ‘Iron, leade, tynne, copper, silver & gold’ (12v).

¹²⁷ Horden, p. 46. A variety of unusual substances were collected by surgeons in their expeditions, noted by the authors of *Before the Mast* (pp. 219-223). In 1597, a herbalist, John Gerarde, suggested to the Company that a ‘peece of ground’ by the Hall should be set aside ‘for to plant all kinde of herbes in route plants’ (*Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 63v). Company Ordinances (1606) refer to the Surgeon’s responsibility not to make use of ‘unwholesome...medycynes & receiptes’ (*Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 30r).

refers to a heated, metal instrument which is applied to seal a wound, commonly referred to as a cauterizing iron. The surgeon compromises by making a pseudo-cautery. Bullein distinguishes between a 'potential cautery' and an 'actual cautery' for severe ulcers: the actual cautery is 'a hoat iron'.¹²⁸ This iron is associated with causing irreversible damage because it burns flesh. In *Anything for a Quiet Life*, Ralph's penis is nearly dismembered (in error): one of two instruments needed for the operation is a 'cauterizer' (II.iv.3): a 'cauterizing iron, red hot' (II.iv.47). In IV.i of *King John* Hubert prepares 'hot irons' (IV.i.1, 39, 59) with which to gouge out Arthur's eyes. The 'actual' cautery – the instrument – embodies the threat and, because of its reputation, is appropriate to spectacle.¹²⁹

Whatever the realities of surgery, which was systematically challenging medical hierarchies, the default materials associated with surgeons which shaped their cultural identity are the ferrementals, not the medicinal substances. That there was a strict divide between surgeons working on the outer body with tools and physicians attending to the inner body with medicines was illusionary in practice, but in the popular imagination, the surgeon could be straightforwardly separated. In Robert Armin's *History of Two Maids of More-Clacke*, the tinker, Toures, sings of a maid who suffered from a stone: '*Docters came her pulse to feele, / And Surgions with their tooles of steele, / To dig, to delve*'.¹³⁰ Surgeons would never shake off their association with craftsmanship wherein skill lay in their hand's dexterous use of an instrument.¹³¹ The French and Middle English word 'c[h]irurgien' is from the Greek word 'chiros', meaning hand. Bullein writes, 'Because it taketh the name of a Greeke Nowne, cal-*Chir*, an hand in English...[it] should be rather

¹²⁸ Bullein, 14r, 17r, 32v.

¹²⁹ Cf. Phillip Stubbes, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1583), H6r, on branding whores.

¹³⁰ Robert Armin, *The History of Two Maids of More-Clacke* (1609), C4v.

¹³¹ See Kerwin, pp. 100-101, who gives an overview of Lanfrank's and later Thomas Ross's insistence on the 'symbolic importance of the [surgeon's] hand' (p. 101). Although Kerwin rightly insists that much happened in early modernity to help overturn the image of the surgeon as the artisan, the legacy of their practice was strong.

hand craft, and not a Science’: a ‘hand mistery’.¹³² In Horatius Morus’s *Tables of Surgerie* (translated in 1585), distinctions are made between cures by physicians’ means, which involve administering ‘drinks’ and ‘diets’, and cures ‘by surgerie’ which involve ‘cut[ting]’, using an ‘instrument’ and ‘skilfull handling’.¹³³ In describing surgeons, Bullein highlights their fundamental analogy to tools: ‘Nature in the tyme of *Soarenesse*, can no more be without [th]e *Chirurgian*, than the Smith can be without hys hammer, or the Tayler wythout his Sheeres’.¹³⁴ ‘*Chirurgian*’ here is equivalent to ‘hammer’ and ‘Sheeres’ rather than to ‘Smith’ or ‘Tayler’ and Bullein suggests that surgery is metonymic of tools, rather than vice versa. Petronell summarises the ideal surgical instrument in Chapman’s *Eastward Ho!*: ‘...hee that wayes mens thoughts, has his handes full of nothing: A man in the course of this worlde should bee like a Surgeons instrument, worke in the woundes of others, and feele nothing himselfe. The sharper, and subtler, the better.’¹³⁵ The instrument, here personified but non-specific (similar to Toures’s reference to ‘toolles of steele’), is disconnected from the hand of the surgeon (who feels nothing), epitomising surgical procedure autonomously and distancing the problematic effects of touch that accompanied medical works on the body. The tool rather than the hand is an effective motif.

Surgical treatises which reference surgeons’ tools are abundant.¹³⁶ In his treatise on lithotomy, French surgeon François Tolet lists over twenty-five objects for stone removal

¹³² Bullein, 5r. Cf. the surgeon should ‘have a good hand, as perfit in the left as the right...[and] that he tremble not in doing his operations’ (Lowe, B3v).

¹³³ Horatius Morus, *Tables of Surgerie*, trans. Richard Caldwell (1585).

¹³⁴ Bullein, 7v.

¹³⁵ Chapman, *Eastward Hoe* (1605), E1v.

¹³⁶ See Ambroise Paré, *The Workes*, trans. Th[omas] Johnson (1634); and Jacques Guillemeau (Paré’s pupil and son-in-law), *The Frenche Chirurgerye* (1598), which includes ten plates of diagrams. I refer to Paré’s works a number of times in my thesis. We know that The Company had access to his works in translation from at least 1591 (only a year after his death), and it must be assumed that several surgeons would have owned copies of his works owing to the following entry in surgeon Robert Balthropp’s will of 1591: ‘the chirurgerie of the expert and perfect practitioner Ambroise Parey...I have written into Englishe for the love that I owe unto my brethren practisinge chirurgerie and...[I have given] unto the hall for their Daylie use and Readinge’ (Robert Balthropp, Saint Bartholomew the Less (16th December, 1591), PROB 11/78). Cf. Lowe’s *Chirurgerie*, B3-C; Johannes Scultetus, *The Chyrurgeons Store-House*, trans. E. B. (1674); John Woodall, ‘The Particulars of the Surgeons Chest’ in *The Surgeons Mate* (1639). NB the pictorial references in Woodall are not in the earlier 1617 edition of *Surgeons Mate*.

alone.¹³⁷ ‘In Praise of the Author’, in Lowe’s *Course of Chirurgerie*, refers to ‘instrume[n]ts to search ech joynt, / Ech skull or brused bone’, implying that ‘ech’ part of the body demands a different instrument.¹³⁸ Lowe gives a general sense of the instruments: ‘Some are to cut as rasures, some to burne as cauters actuals, some to drawe away, as tenells incisives, pincetts, tirballes, some are to sound’.¹³⁹ These are ‘common’ instruments to which the ‘proper’ instruments, specific to ‘one part onley’, are added.¹⁴⁰ We cannot easily draw from the publications a manageable list of surgeon’s essentials as we could for barbers: lists of instruments in the surgical tracts fill pages rather than a page. The responsibility, according to a new clause of The Company’s 1606 Ordinances, was on governors and masters to check that surgeons went to sea with their ‘cheste, boxes and oth[er]lyke for that voyage....sufficiently furnished with wholesome and good medycynes & receipts and w[i]th apte and fit Instruments’: conducting inventorying of the surgeon’s chest required a collective effort by specialists.¹⁴¹ In many surgical tracts the surgeon’s tool sets are not given as an inclusive inventory; instead, authors’ references to instruments are dispersed, in correspondence to the practice they describe. For the non-professional the lists of surgeons’ tools are alienating. Thomas Rütten refers to the ‘enormous and sometimes untouched archival inventories of doctors’ personal files’ from the period: this hiddenness has endured.¹⁴²

The unpublished work of the third and fourth books of Holme’s *Armory*, published first by the Roxburghe Club (1905) from the ten volumes of Holme’s manuscripts, includes five pages (folio) of sketches and short descriptions of surgical equipment required by a battlefield surgeon. Unlike the lengthy lists of surgical materials in Book III

¹³⁷ François Tolet, *A Treatise of Lithotomy*, trans. A. Lovell (1683), see E4v-E7v and E8v-F2r for inventories, descriptions and diagrams.

¹³⁸ Thomas Churchyard, ‘In Praise of the Author and his Worke’ in Lowe’s *Chirurgerie*, ¶3r.

¹³⁹ Lowe, B4r. In the margin of this copy the owner of the book has written ‘probe’.

¹⁴⁰ See Lowe, B4r. Cf. 13r-14r of Gale in which he distinguishes between general and particular instruments.

¹⁴¹ *Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 29v.

¹⁴² Thomas Rütten, ‘Early Modern Medicine’ in *History of Medicine*, pp. 60-81 (p. 69).

of Holme (1688), this section *attempts* to give a condensed list that suggests what is suitable for the surgeon to carry.¹⁴³ Some technical terms are used in the unpublished inventory: ‘Directory’ (a silver probe), ‘Dilatory’, ‘Terrebellum’ (a hook probe) and ‘Lipidilum’ (a spoon for stone removal), for example.¹⁴⁴ The list, however, is incomplete, and descriptions are entirely left out. One illustration is named ‘Probe with a’. The editor, Jeaynes, notes next to another, ‘[Not described]’. The structure and use of a ‘Spatula’, ‘Stitching Quill’, ‘Uvula Spoon’ and ‘Levatory’ are not given.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, whereas the more detailed descriptions of the first set of instruments begin with ‘The’ in naming the item (‘The cataract needle’, ‘The Hollow scraping Levatorie’, ‘The Hollow Forcep’), the naming of instruments on the last two pages begin with ‘A’ (‘A Spoon catheter’, ‘A Plychon’, ‘A Bow Tongs’). Holme does not complete his draft and does not standardise his inventory-giving. The list drifts off, making it truncated rather than abridged. These textual ellipses would not be so striking were it not that other chapters in the works are not incomplete.

Instead of providing a technical term for one item, Holme describes ‘An Instrument to be put into an handle to press down the *Dura Mater*; it is used after Trepanning of the skull, as often as you dress the wound’.¹⁴⁶ Holme’s annotation is taken from a translation of Ambroise Paré, who refers in his *Works* to ‘a fit instrument to presse and hold downe the *Dura Mater*’ without selecting a specific name.¹⁴⁷ Holme is evidently struggling to construct his own manageable inventory by excavating key items from the French surgeon’s vast works. He might have done better with Lowe, who lists the essentials that a ‘Chirurgian commonly [should] carrie with him’, and provides a more manageable

¹⁴³ See Holme (1688), pp. 420-438, including over 80 illustrations.

¹⁴⁴ Holme (1905), pp. 235-7.

¹⁴⁵ Holme (1905), p. 238.

¹⁴⁶ Holme (1905), p. 236.

¹⁴⁷ Paré, p. 373 [misnumbered 323]. Paré writes that this instrument should ‘have the end round, polisht and smooth as it is here exprest’, and Holme (1905) writes that ‘this Instrument must have the end round, smooth and polished’.

inventory for the ambulant practitioner: ‘a paire of sheeres, a rasor, a lancet, a sound, a tirball, & a needle’.¹⁴⁸ In the left margin of this copy, one of Lowe’s readers has written ‘Instrumets’ [*sic*] indicating that these are the crucial, most basic objects to recall for surgical activity, but the list needs highlighting because it is embedded in dialogue.¹⁴⁹ Holme confronts surgeons’ own difficulties in managing the instruments of their profession. Paré suggests a resourceful approach to getting equipped appropriately which sometimes results in the instrument not attaining a name for general circulation. Lists of surgical instruments are lengthy and technical, but they are also constantly under construction, and they can differ significantly between practitioners who developed their tool sets independently. Rütten explains that ‘Technological advances in refining glass-grinding, metal processing, and the construction of measuring apparatuses have an immediate effect on...the construction of surgical instruments and the feasibility of physiological experiments’.¹⁵⁰ Of medical procedures, John Cotta notes that ‘There can be no endeavour, meanes...or instrument of never so complete perfection or tried prooffe...that receiveth not ordinarily impediment, opposition, and contradiction’.¹⁵¹ John Banister refers in the title page of one of his surgical tracts to ‘*certaine* experiments of my owne invention, truly tried’, and Helkiah Crooke refers to the instruments of ‘the new Chyrurgeons inventions’.¹⁵² Woodall advocates the German example of surgeons practising their tool-making capabilities by fashioning the perfect lancet.¹⁵³ There was

¹⁴⁸ Lowe, B4r-v.

¹⁴⁹ Lowe, B4v.

¹⁵⁰ Rütten, p. 62.

¹⁵¹ John Cotta, *A Short Discoverie* (1612), D2v.

¹⁵² John Banister, *A Needefull, New and Necessarie Treatise of Chirurgerie* (1575); Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia* (1615), Preface.

¹⁵³ Woodall (1617), B2r. On the invention of midwifery’s technical instruments see Eve Keller, *Generating Bodies and Gendered Selves* (Seattle; London: University of Washington Press, 2007), pp. 158-165: ‘Chapman [a surgeon] announces his wondrous ability to extract obstructed infants alive with the use of the fillet but, it being an instrument of his own invention, he refuses to divulge the details of its construction or the manner of its use’ (p. 165); ‘[Midwife Jane] Sharp’s chapter...is filled with general instructions on how to use “Chirurgeons Instruments”...Yet, oddly...Sharp provides very little actual instruction’ (p. 163). Cf.

little communal endeavour for surgeons to define their profession's material identity. Barbers, by comparison, would have purchased their standard materials from 'comb-maker[s]' (see *Epicoene*, III.v.102), pewterers, and iron-mongers; they were not constructing the look or material value of their profession from within the occupation.

Accounts of or references to surgical tools in other documents are usually absent. At the end of Robert Balthropp's will of 1591, 'such thinges of [his] belonginge and appertayninge to Chiururgerie...are by [him] given and appointed [to those that have been his servants of the art]...in a Schedule hereunto annexed'.¹⁵⁴ Balthropp evidently bequeaths a large number of instruments but, for all but in a few instances, his inventory names items collectively in terms of the chest, case or box they occupy. The passage of these instruments' circulation is a privileged channel. And there is an archival gap in inventories which accompany wills in the period. Most inventories of the later-seventeenth century refer to 'instruments' as one entry, unlike the inventory taken of barber Vignes's shop of the same period. In Edward Piper's inventory 'Item all the Bookes and Chirurgical Instruments' come collectively to £4.14s.4d; 'Item All Medicines, mortars, stills and all other utensills belonging to the Shop' of surgeon William Worland come to the considerable sum of over twenty-four pounds; in the shop of Richard Gunning, although the inventory specifies some basons and blood dishes, we assume that most of the items are those unnamed in 'two cases of Instruments', listed first.¹⁵⁵ Unlike Tryphon's barbery case from which a limited number of tools are pulled and named, surgery cases appear to be filled with a tremendous variety of items which for the most part remain concealed. Moreover, because these collections were variably priced, there was a range of quality in

Maja Korica and Eamonn Molloy, 'Making Sense of Professional Identities', *Human Relations* 63:12 (2010), 1879-1901.

¹⁵⁴ Balthropp was a prominent figure in The Company and served as Master from 1565. In 1570 he was appointed an examiner in Surgery. See Young (pp. 18, 316) and the biography of Balthropp by Harvey White in *Notable Barber Surgeons*, pp. 81-93.

¹⁵⁵ See Edward Piper, Dorking (1662), PROB 4/3176; William Worland, Dorking (1690), PROB 4/2817; Richard Gunning, Dorking (1677), PROB 4/6693. Cf. George Laye, New Windsor (1684), PROB 4/8380.

the goods and also, therefore, a suggestion that some surgical instruments were designed for collection rather than use – some (made of silver) were probably status symbols.

A depiction of the surgeon's chest (for the battlefield) appears in William Clowes's *A Prooved Practise* (1588), below.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 4: Woodcut, William Clowes, *A Prooved Practise for All Young Chirurgians* (1588), inserted after Clowes's address 'to all the young Practizers of Chirurgerie'. A similar woodcut appears in the 1596 edition of Clowes's *Observations* (p. 140), but differs in small respects. Neither the 1591 edition of *Prooved Practise* nor the 1637 edition of *Observations* contain the image.

The illustration shows unnamed instruments arranged around the chest, suggesting the abundance of equipment. But an illusion of openness pervades. The chest's compartmentalised inner spaces are closed despite its undone lock, and the depiction is without visual sense of the number of items stored within. Its physical scale on the page is disproportionately large, while a second, smaller chest (perhaps representing a portable case) mirrors the larger one's false suggestion that its contents are decipherable; its smallness in comparison underlines the lack of material or physical sense of the

illustration. To the right of the chest, a surgeon and his assistant attend to a wounded soldier but it is unclear which tools are being used; the image's focus is on the object (spear/arrow) which has impaled the soldier's shoulder.

In *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), Cloth-breeches entirely foregoes making any comment about surgery. He says, 'For you maister surgeon...alas, I seldome fall into your hands...I knowe you not...you shal have nothing to doe with my matter'.¹⁵⁶ Greene deals with the elision practically. In Thomas Lupton's utopian-envisioning dialogue, *Too Good To Be True* (1580), fourteen pages discuss surgeons and their practises. But Lupton's interlocutors, Sivqila and Omen (*nemo*), use few technical terms and hardly mention instruments during their exchange. Lupton, of course, is not a medical figure so that in depicting the profession he avoids detailing the practice, focusing instead on the morality of the professional surgeon and money matters to characterise the state of a community. Omen describes a patient's reaction following an operation: 'Then the pore wounded man saide, I knowe not howe [the surgeon] practised with me, but ever when he dressed me...I was in such extreme paines, and intollerable torments, for eight or nine houres after'.¹⁵⁷ The patient cannot fathom the process by which he is treated and is distracted from observing or interpreting surgical procedures; his pain conceals the technical detail. The late-seventeenth-century French fictional work, *The Memoirs of the Count de Rochefort* (translated into English in 1696), describes events following the challenge to a duel by Madaillan to the Marquis de Rivarolles. Before the contest, the Marquis sends a messenger to Madaillan:

The man, as soon as he was come in...laid down some things [on the Table] which he had under his Coat; *Madaillan* began to laugh at the fellow, and lifting himself up to look what it was he laid down, he was amaz'd to see all the Table cover'd over with surgeons Instruments...*No Sir*, says the man, *it is no mistake...[the Marquis] sent me to desire you*

¹⁵⁶ Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), C4r.

¹⁵⁷ Thomas Lupton, *Too Good, To Be True* (1580), Siir.

to let me cut off one of your Legs; for having sent him a Challenge to fight to day, he supposes you are more of a Gentleman than to fight with an advantage...[The man] was really a Surgeon.¹⁵⁸

The surgical instruments have a marked impact on the beholder: they are abundant in that they are able to cover a table and they *seem* visible in the passage because the author describes Madaillan straining to view them. But in seeking to depict this spectacle (a spectacle that amazes Madaillan and is pre-punctuated by laughter), Sandras actually suggests to the reader the indefinite nature of the display. I began this chapter by citing Tomlinson's argument about the 'observing eye' that the compositors of an inventory invoke; here, however, nothing can be 'observed' because nothing is specifically evoked. The instruments are smuggled into the scene and there are too many to name; consequently the surgeon's identity comes as a revelation.

Instruments' threatening effects are inherently manifest in their implied functionality and sheer facility. In an image from the seventeenth century of a surgeon operating on a patient's head, four lines of annotation characterise the practitioner's touch, ending with, 'No! Man 'tis hell it self to feel / instead of a Girl the Surgeons steel'; here, again, touch is problematically sexual and the writer's inability to name an instrument translates into mock-prudishness.¹⁵⁹ Woodall instructs surgeons, keep 'the sharpe Instruments...as neere as you can, ever hidden from the eyes of the Patient'; Bullein's 'potential cautery' is for someone who can not endure the sight of surgical instruments.¹⁶⁰ On the subject of cauterizing irons, Woodall confesses that despite their usefulness he 'make[s] no use of them...because of the feare they put the Patient unto': in early modernity, they embody historical crudity to the public mind.¹⁶¹ The irons needed as props

¹⁵⁸ Gatien Courtilz de Sandras, *The Memoirs of the Count de Rochefort* (1696), p. 356.

¹⁵⁹ Wellcome Trust, London, 'A barber-surgeon operating on a man's head' (16--), Iconographic Collection: V0007694EL (ICV No. 7915L).

¹⁶⁰ Woodall (1639), Cc1r; Bullein, 14r.

¹⁶¹ Woodall (1617), C1v.

in *Quiet Life* and *King John* do not represent the surgeon's technical equipment. (In the former, material referencing points are questioned: when Ralph asks, 'Do you see my yard, Barber?' (II.iv.40-41), the Barber believes he is referring to his penis rather than his measuring stick, and a similar misclassification occurs when Ralph mentions his 'ware'.) Later in the seventeenth century, surgeons evidently addressed the look of and apparent irregularity in the materials of their profession. In *A Course of Chirurgical Operations* (1710), Pierre Dionis, a French surgeon, explains that 'we separate from [surgery] whatever is rough and *barbarous*, we retrench those burning irons and horrible instruments, which not only the patients, but the bystanders could not see without trembling' [*italics mine*].¹⁶² The patient of surgery could not be a witness.

In Act III of Fletcher's *Mad Lover*, the surgeon enters without his instruments. Memnon, who has summoned the practitioner, first enquires of him, 'Have you brought your Instruments', to which the surgeon responds, 'They are within Sir' (C2r [all subsequent quotations from *Mad Lover* in this paragraph are from this sig.]). It is tempting to conjecture that at this moment the surgeon points to a portable case that he carries in the scene. What good is a surgeon without his tools? But Memnon later instructs the surgeon, 'fetch your tooles', indicating that they are offstage and providing the surgeon with his excuse to abandon Memnon's bedside and the impossible task he sets: Memnon wants the surgeon to extract his heart 'whole' from his body without damaging it 'i'th' cutting', calling on the surgeon's professed ability to 'incise / To a haire bredth without defacing'. He evokes the technical skills of the surgeon and his instruments to an impractical degree: the surgeon *cannot* perform. Moreover, the reference to a 'haire bredth' subtly connects this surgeon with the barber's task. The dramaturgy of the sequence lies specifically in the surgeon not bringing instruments onto the stage.

¹⁶² Pierre Dionis, *A Course of Chirurgical Operations* (1710), p. 6. Cf. on the 'Situation of the Patient' before an operation: 'The instruments are to be prepar'd in an adjoining Chamber...that [the patient] may not be affrighted by the sight of them' (Dionis, p. 282).

‘all my / Instruments are lost’

Like *Tempest*, Fletcher and Massinger’s *Sea Voyage* begins with a storm at sea: a group of sailors narrowly escape being drowned as their vessel struggles and they are swept to an unknown shore. Unlike in Shakespeare’s play, one of the crew in *Sea Voyage* is a sea surgeon, a standard member of sailing squads.¹⁶³ Surgeons evidently did not necessarily aspire to a position on a ship. It was a dangerous, cramped, and testing environment in which to work. At the end of John Webster’s *Devil’s Law-Case*, Ariosto determines the punishment for the two surgeons who concealed Contarino’s recovery: they ‘Shall exercise their art at their own charge, / For a twelvemonth in the galleys’ (V.v.88-89). This section will first examine how a surgical climate structures (plot, atmosphere and vocabulary in) *Sea Voyage*, and then discuss the absence of surgery in the play’s dramaturgy, specifically the absence of the surgeon’s material properties. My analysis of *Sea Voyage* works alongside my earlier section on *Midas*, but concludes something different. Whereas in *Midas* the persistent denial of barber’s material properties in the play makes a joke about unrealised but known inventories, in *Sea Voyage* the lack of materials equipping a surgeon underline his lack of ability to perform surgically as well as theatrically.

Sea Voyage’s use of anatomical imagery, endorsed by the embodied presence of ‘Surgeon’ and characters’ interest in performing surgical acts, is noticeable throughout. Although in *Tempest* repeated cries of ‘We split, we split!’ (I.i.58) echo on stage, and Miranda refers to ‘a brave vessel.../ Dashed all to pieces’ (I.ii.6-8), the ‘direful spectacle of the wreck’ (I.ii.26) in Shakespeare is less visceral than in *Sea Voyage*. The authors of *Sea Voyage* invite their audience to envisage a ship of anatomical composition. Describing his ‘split’ vessel, the Master observes, ‘We have sprung five leakes, and no little ones;

¹⁶³ See William Davies, *A True Relation of the Travailes and Most Miserable Captivitie of William Davies* (1614); Elizabeth Baigent, ‘Davies, William (fl. 1598–1614)’, *DNB*, OUP, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7272>, accessed 28 Oct 2010]

...besides, her ribs are open' (Aaaaa1r). Gail Kern Paster discusses 'early modern English culture's complex articulation of gender': 'weaker vessel [is] leaky vessel', she summarises.¹⁶⁴ Karim-Cooper explores the early modern comparison of women to ships with regard to their external upkeep.¹⁶⁵ But they are also analogous in their internal conception. In *Tempest*, the ship is 'as leaky as an unstanch'd wench' (I.i.45-6). The simile in Shakespeare is more overt than the comparison drawn in *Sea Voyage*; but in *Sea Voyage* the bark *is* – rather than *is like* – a leaky female. Moreover, *Sea Voyage*'s reference to the ship's open ribs intensifies the (gendered) somatic iconography available in the text. A reference to a leaky vessel need not necessarily suggest a damaged body because it feeds into common 'symptomatology discourse' on females.¹⁶⁶ But ribs can have a right and wrong place in (or out of) the body. Because, biblically, the rib illustrates how the first female body was created, descriptions of exposed female ribs suggestively symbolise 'un-creation' or dissection: we perceive a body turned inside out. The 'toss[ing]' ship is also metaphorically cast as pregnant female: 'Shees so deep laden, that sheele buldge' (Aaaaa1r).¹⁶⁷ The crew's disgorging of their vessel's goods ('It must all over boord'(Aaaaa1v)) is both a necessary step for the ship's labour (watching the events from the shore, Sebastian observes, 'She has wrought lustily for her deliverance' (Aaaaa1v)), and a precautionary disembowelling. The Master in *Sea Voyage* also refers to 'our Ships belly' (Aaaaa1r), sustaining the corporal focus. This 'belly' is not only full of water, but is also poisoned by 'sweet sin-breeder', Aminta, whose presence, the Master believes, burdens the ship with iniquity, the weight of which 'tumbl[es] like a potion' (Aaaaa1r). The Master's depiction of chaos, characterised by a female condition, makes the image of unruly and upset innards a metaphor for riotous waves. Later, Lamure reverses this

¹⁶⁴ Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1993), p. 24.

¹⁶⁵ Karim-Cooper, p. 37.

¹⁶⁶ Paster, p. 25.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Salerio in *Merchant of Venice* who describes a 'miscarried...vessel of our country' (II.viii.29-30).

metaphor, declaring in his hunger, ‘Oh! what a tempest have I in my stomach? / How my empty guts cry out? my wounds ake’ (Aaaaa4v). The fleshy, bulging, broken, leaking, carcass-like, exhausted bodily bark is, as Richard Sugg explains on the subject of anatomical references in early modern literature, particularly from 1600s onwards, part of the ‘compulsive’ anatomical rhetoric which ‘sometimes lack[ed] an integral semantic motivation’.¹⁶⁸ The rhetoric in *Sea Voyage* is concocted from a mixed bag: cracked bones, upset tummies and pregnancy pangs. But the bark sets a precedent: bodies in *Sea Voyage* are often under threat and how these bodies are addressed in the play is governed by a surgical response which is similarly without a fixed sense of practice. When the sailors decide to ‘finde [the ship’s] Leakes’(Aaaaa1v) and take remedial action by throwing over her goods, the surgeon has made his first appearance on stage.

But the enforced spewing of the ship’s contents challenges and ultimately defines the play’s representation of surgery and informs the intrinsic list of props necessary for its performance: the surgeon, like Lamure and Franville, loses all his goods. In *Sea Voyage*, ‘Surgeon’ on stage, therefore, is not distinguished by any equipment of his profession; only his attire probably differentiates him from the other sailors. Tibalt mocks the surgeon’s misfortune by saying that he ‘has lost his Fidlestick’ (Aaaaa2r), he has lost a mere nothing.¹⁶⁹ But the derisive remark nevertheless encourages listeners to think of surgeon-plus-tool. At one level Tibalt’s humour is phallic, but at another it satirises the more sober (and reverential) image of a professional in possession of the apparatus of his occupation: the dissection knife in the hand of a surgeon, for example, hovering above a cadaver, as in Rembrandt’s famous work.¹⁷⁰ Without his equipment, the surgeon is

¹⁶⁸ Richard Sugg, *Murder After Death* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press; Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2007), p. 2. In his study of *Sejanus*, William W. E. Slights is struck by Jonson’s ‘total absence of the anatomist’s systematic and orderly presentation of the human body and its parts’ (‘Bodies of Text and Textualized Bodies in *Sejanus* and *Coriolanus*’, *MaRDiE* 5 (1991), 181-193 (p. 185)).

¹⁶⁹ *OED*, ‘fiddlestick, *n*’, 2: ‘*humourously*. Something insignificant or absurd’.

¹⁷⁰ Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp* (1632).

incomplete and worthless as a professional presence, a fact endorsed by Tibalt's reference to his unhealthy state: 'Hee's damnable Sea-sick' (Aaaaa2r). Later, the surgeon enters with the words, 'I am expiring' (Aaaaa4v). More straightforwardly, he laments, 'My salves, and all my Instruments are lost' (Aaaaa3r).

When the surgeon enters part-way through the first scene of Act Three, the sailors and he are more specific about the losses from the surgeon's chest. Their references to surgical equipment provide the audience with a part-inventory of what was stocked on board ship. But most of the items listed are made from linen or towel (these materials are used in a variety of ways to cover up and clean or probe wounds), or are generic terms for medicinal substances: 'boxes' and 'lints', 'stupes' and 'tents', 'sweet helps of nature', 'cordial', 'potion', 'pills', 'searchcloths' and 'poulties' (Aaaaa4v). It is clear from Holme's *Armory* that some of the terms for surgeons' gear used in *Sea Voyage* are fairly rudimentary, or at least are not the ones applied by 'the learned': when Holme mentions '*Lints*', in parentheses for the more technically-minded he notes, '(which are termed *Plagets*)'.¹⁷¹ And when describing the probe used for searching wounds and ulcers, he explains that it 'hath severall denominations of some termed a *Mela*, others a *Specillum*, the vulgar call it *Tenta*, a Tent, from trying'.¹⁷² He writes further,

That in this square between them aforesaid, is called a *Tent*, it is made of old linnen cloth scraped...called *Lint*; which is rowlled gently up like a naile, and the end being dipt in Salve...It is thrust into a deep wound...Of the learned it is termed *Carpia*, *Tenta*, or *Turunda*, and *Turundula*.¹⁷³

Holme highlights an implicit hierarchy in surgical terminology, signalled by repeated phrases such as 'the learned term it' or 'called by the learned'. We do not find this kind of

¹⁷¹ Holme (1688), p. 426.

¹⁷² In *Troilus and Cressida*, Patroclus asks, 'Who keeps the tent now?' (V.i.10) to which Thersites responds, 'The surgeon's box, or the patient's wound' (V.i.11) and Middleton describes 'a proud match at football shall send many a lame soldier to your tent' in reference to the surgeon (*Owl's Almanac*, 2017-2018).

¹⁷³ Holme (1688), p. 434.

linguistic hierarchy in the inventories of barbery gear which, at most, has two names for the same item. The difference is, of course, not surprising: I do not need to spell out the greater complexities of surgery compared to barbery. But the fact that there is a difference in how writers refer to the equipment of these particular professions affects how we interpret respective barbery and surgery signs (whether verbal or material): what ‘degree’ of technicality is being applied by writers, and to what effect?

The only surgical instruments named in *Sea Voyage* are those associated with rectal treatments: ‘an old suppository’ and a ‘Glister-pipe’ (Aaaaa4v/Aaaaa2). Stephen Gosson writes, ‘It is the custome of the flye to leave the sound places of the Horse, and suck at the Botch’ to characterise the abuses of poets.¹⁷⁴ Eliot defends the contents of his *Ortho-epia* by saying that he has selected his materials ‘in a merrie phantasticall vaine, and to confirme and stir up the wit and memorie of the learner’.¹⁷⁵ In his list of terms suitable for use in the apothecary’s shop, he includes the phrase, ‘*I am alwaies bound in my bellie almost, bring me a glister to morrow morning*’ (‘je suis tousjours quasi constipé du ventre, apportez moy un clystere demain au matin’).¹⁷⁶ (‘Clyster’, the French word, was used interchangeably with ‘glister’/‘glyster’.) Early moderns were familiar with this procedure and therefore with the instrument. But there is a distinction to be made between types of glisters, similar to the difference between the potential and actual cautery. Cotta refers to the ‘everyday-glysters’ (comparable to ‘astringent medicine’) which a woman applied to herself daily who believed she had ‘dysenterie or abrasion of her guts’; this was the wrong treatment for the worms from which Cotta discovered her to be suffering.¹⁷⁷ Her ‘everyday-glyster’ was probably a laxative (a herbal concoction) and need not necessarily have been administered to the body via an instrument. Although Paré describes (for his

¹⁷⁴ Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579), A1v.

¹⁷⁵ Eliot, B1v.

¹⁷⁶ Eliot, L3v-L4r.

¹⁷⁷ Cotta, D1v. Cf. complaining of the surgeon, Antonio says, ‘Has given me a dam’d Glister...Has almost scour’d my guts out’ (Fletcher, *The Chances*, Bbb2v).

technical audience) the injection of glisters for enemas, he also refers to glisters ‘commonly taken by the mouth’.¹⁷⁸ When Wendy Wall imagines an early modern female’s domestic day, drawing on a number of cookbooks and household manuals, she writes, ‘*The second object on the dresser is a glister-pipe, used to administer enemas to servants, guests, and family*’.¹⁷⁹ But it might not have been that the pipe (a receptacle for mixtures as well as a probing device) was an object in the household, although the glister recipes certainly were common to household manuals.¹⁸⁰ If the pipe were a regular household instrument, we might expect similar advice to Woodall’s included in the women’s manuals, which is missing: ‘when you have used it you wipe it cleane, and hange it up...in two parts...for if it bee kept close it will be mustie and...rotten’.¹⁸¹ The instrument should not be ‘on the dresser’. A glister-pipe might evoke the surgeon, but the notion of a glister was not technical knowledge. Ultimately, a glister-pipe reference, such as in *Sea Voyage*, makes a level playing field of medical equipment: the technical instrument never makes it onto the stage.

While the surgeon’s equipment is needed to heal bodies in *Sea Voyage*, the sailors begin their longing for the medical materials in earnest when they lack nourishment. In the same way that in *Epicoene* the inventory of the barber’s shop is reconstructed as a repulsive recipe, so here the surgeon’s equipment is grotesquely imagined as a food source, and the strange pharmacopoeial allusions prompt cannibalistic appetites. Sugg terms this ‘famine cannibalism’, which he differentiates, in line with anthropologists, from ‘ritual cannibalism’.¹⁸² The surgeon laments, ‘What dainty dishes could I make of ’em’ (Aaaaa4v [all quotations in this paragraph are taken from this sig.]). This equipment

¹⁷⁸ Paré, p. 1051.

¹⁷⁹ Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), p. 20.

¹⁸⁰ See Anon, *A Closet for Ladies and Gentlewomen* (1608), F8v-G1v; Anon, *The Ladies Cabinet Opened* (1639), C1v.

¹⁸¹ Woodall (1617), D1v.

¹⁸² Sugg, pp. 36-37.

(‘em’) is more legible to the players and their audience in a culinary context than in a surgical one. Latching onto this idea, the sailors begin naming materials they can envisage eating, including ‘Potion’, ‘Pils’ and ‘Searchcloths’, listed above; ‘We care not to what it hath bin ministred’, Franville admits, but the surgeon responds, ‘Sure I have none of these dainties’, transposing his earlier reference to ‘dainty dishes’ to a different context: surgical instruments are envisaged as food, rather than as a utensil. Because the sailors do not evoke tools for their technical use, the scene underlines the ambiguity of the surgeon’s lost equipment in the play and the uncertain relationship between the early modern body and surgical tools. A popular challenge emerges at a time when going to the surgeon was a last resort: what are all these tools good for? It was harder then than it is now for an early modern to comprehend a surgical tool’s implicit serviceability.

Franville has another idea. Addressing the surgeon, he asks, ‘Wher’s the great Wen / Thou cutst from *Hugh* the saylers shoulder? / That would serve now for a most Princely banquet’ (Aaaaa4v).¹⁸³ Surgical waste materials are not simply textile but are also somatic; both are deemed edible here. It is uncommon to find that the surgical advice given is to cut out a wen; herbal remedies are preferred and, by implication, a ferremental tool should not be used. Indeed, William Clowes prefaces his manual with a tale about Johannes Petrus who

would needes take upon him to cut of a great Wenne...with his flattring speeches...[he] brought...[the] patient to agree to have his wenne taken away...And to shewe the worthines of his handy worke, presently did cut off the top...of the Wenne, which done...he tyed it round about the roote with a strong ligature, to cause it beare out, & to shew the more ugglie unto the beholders: Then he trayned his patient into the Market place...for the market folkes to beholde. But God knowes, within fewe daies his poore patient, by his beastly usage, dyed: for which lewd abuse...an Atoorney...upon an honest zeale...banished this abuser out of the Countrey.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ Sugg cites William Harvey’s reference to the “3rd divide banquet of the brain”, which, he asserts, is the ‘last seemingly cannibalistic presentation of the anatomized body’ in anatomical tracts (p. 36).

¹⁸⁴ William Clowes, *A Prooved Practise* (1588), D1r.

Clowes concludes his admonition by terming the surgeon of the tale a monster. Two of Clowes's cautionary points are of particular interest to this thesis: first, the warning against surgical action, especially with ferramentals, for any type of display or performance; second, the warning against unnecessary surgical action on the body. 'Performing' surgery is a 'lewd abuse' which, in Clowes's tale, results in negligence. Good surgery is no longer worthy of its reputation if contextualised theatrically, for spectacle or for swanking. The sailors' knowledge of the surgeon's removal of Hugh's 'great Wen' indicates the publicity of the event. The second trait of poor surgery is characterized by Clowes as 'handy work', and although he does not specifically name a surgical instrument (the context of storytelling normalises the eliding of the technical detail), he implies that the work of the hand in this case is the management of a cutting implement. Although we cannot tell whether an audience would know that cutting off a wen was an ill-advised procedure, early modernist's general understanding was that any kind of surgical interference with the body was done as a last resort because of the unimaginable pain and risks it carried. Unfortunately for Franville and the other starving sailors, the surgeon has failed to retain the wen delicacy, declaring that he 'flung it over-board, slave that [he] was' (Aaaaa4v). The surgeon's action is not merely a case of being careless. It is also a timing issue: he does not specify when he threw out the wen. That this wart was deemed by the surgeon heavy enough to contribute to the lightening of the ship's load is amusing. Hugh's 'great Wen' is not only comparable to the materially valuable merchant treasures, but it is characterised as weighty and, by implication, huge (the comic value of a 'great Wen') – an anatomical curiosity which can feed sick appetites. In *Mad Lover*, Memnon highlights the kind of surgical activity that befits comedy: he 'will not have [his surgeon] smile...As though [he] cut a Ladies corne' (C2r). There is little surgical discipline about the conception of Hugh's wen: it is ill-advisedly extracted, edible, expensive, and enormous.

The surgeon's instrument is evoked in *Sea Voyage* when his activities are distinctly unprofessional: for cutting the wen and for feeding the sailors. Tibalt's early promise that 'the Surgeon will supply [them] presently' (Aaaaa3r) is never realised, but the surgeon gets very close when Morillat instructs him to get meat from the (living) body of Aminta: 'Wake her *Surgeon*, and cut her throate, / And then divide her, every man his share' (Bbbbb1r), threatening to actualise the play's image of a seeping female wreck. Here, Morillat assumes that the surgeon is suddenly furnished, or, alternatively, he provides the surgeon with a knife. How the instrument emerges is unclear but the scene requires a prop. Within a few lines the surgeon addresses Aminta himself: 'Will ye say your prayers, that I *may perform* Lady? / We are wondrous *sharp set*' [italics mine] (Bbbbb1r). The surgeon's metaphorical language – that he and the sailors are 'sharp set' – corresponds to the literal sharpness of the instrument he now wields. Like Shylock's knife, this instrument creates tension and awaits a Portia-like interruption, 'Tarry a little' (IV.i.302). The surgeon's 'Come come', in *Sea Voyage*, indicates the imminence of the cut for which his instrument is a stimulant. Now, he '*may perform*', but the context of this performance is obscene. The surgeon's instrument is made miraculously manifest from an absent tool set: it is a single instrument without its corresponding objects or materially-standardised place on a surgical inventory. The surgeon is not equipped when he needs to heal the sailors, but he is furnished when theatre needs a spectacle. Like Shylock, however, *Sea Voyage*'s surgeon is interrupted and will not 'perform' (in *Merchant* the surgical context is underlined by Portia's appeal to Shylock to have by some surgeon). In *Sea Voyage* the prop simultaneously signals the awakening and the shutting down of the surgeon's representation on the stage. Not only is he without a speaking part for the rest of the play but it is unclear whether he remains a stage presence at all: none of the island's women select the surgeon as their new mate. The prop the surgeon eventually discloses manifests,

paradoxically, only his potential, and on stage, the surgeon embodies failed medical performance: surgery is absent without its technical detail and equipment, and it is irregular when couched in performance terms. The medical object can be a scene's shock factor, primarily because it resists definition and therefore has the potential to do anything.

Two Rare Props

In only a couple of plays, rarely specified props which evoke a surgical context are named in stage directions. Throughout this thesis I examine surgery's absence on the early modern stage, but I am equally interested in the few moments when it is more materially conceived. The most unusual example is one from Barnabe Barnes's *Devil's Charter*. For all her interest in lancets (launcets/lancelets), it is surprising that Patricia Parker does not refer in her article, 'Cutting Both Ways', to the following early stage direction in Barnes's play:

*after more thunder and fearefull fire, ascend in robes pontificall...: a dev[i]ll him ensuing in blackerobes like a pronotary, a cornerd Cappe¹⁸⁵ on his head, a **box of Lancets** at his girdle..., who beeing brought unto Alexander, hee willingly receiveth him; ...presentl[y] the Pronotary strippeth up Alexanders sleeve and letteth his arme bloud in a saucer [bold mine] (A2v)¹⁸⁶*

Francesco Guicchiardine's accompanying narration tells us that the pronotary figure is 'Sathan transfigur'd'. While the activity of lancing was theologically adopted as a sign of Christian commitment – Parker comments on 'the redemptive lancing or bloodletting of Christ' which is evoked in doctrine¹⁸⁷ – here, Barnes reverses this symbolism. The other object of note (because of its association with surgical activities) in the passage is the 'saucer' (see chapter three). In his edition of *Devil's Charter* Ronald McKerrow calls the

¹⁸⁵ The four-cornered cap was a common symbol of divine office, a symbol satirised throughout, for example, the Marprelate tracts. It was often interpreted as a sign of pomposity in ecclesiastical office.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Patricia Parker, 'Cutting Both Ways' in *Alternative Shakespeares* 3, ed. Diana E. Henderson (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 95-118.

¹⁸⁷ Parker, p. 107.

‘signature in blood’ a ‘commonplace’, but the specificity of the instruments is unusual.¹⁸⁸ This episode is different from the blood contract in *Doctor Faustus*: Mephostophilis instructs Faustus to ‘stab [his own] arm’ (V.49) and write directly with the blood that ‘trickles’ (V.57) from it. Nothing in the text indicates that this blood is collected directly or that a medical instrument is used for the incision.¹⁸⁹

Parker’s article is comprehensive in its references to a number of early modern medical tracts, including Gyer, Woodall, Guillemeau and Lowe, which illustrate, name or discuss lancets, the instruments which are most commonly associated with the surgeon: Rabelais, Parker notes, refers to ‘*le lancelet qu’utilisent les chirurgiens*’, and the lancet is one of the six instruments Lowe names as essential in a surgeon’s portable case.¹⁹⁰ One of the objects held in the special reserve of the Mary Rose Trust is categorised as a ‘Fleam Wallet’ (fleam was another term for a lancet), measuring 20cm, which was found in the Barber-Surgeon’s cabin.¹⁹¹ This instrument is technical in *Devil’s Charter* (and unusually so, despite the fact that its quarto (1607) has some of the richest in stage directions of early modern plays). Even though lancets could be rough tools, the ‘box’ in which they are stored in this instance suggests scientific detail and authenticity. We cannot tell from where the King’s Men would have obtained this specialist’s set of lancets which, unlike razors, basins and aprons, were not common household ware. The dialogue in *Devil’s Charter* does not refer to the lancets that are scripted in the stage directions making the impact of these objects purely visual in performance. We might wonder whether there was anything distinctive about the box which might have provided an additional sign (a depiction of lancets, perhaps) for the audience. *Devil’s Charter* was first performed by the King’s Men at Court for James I, and therefore was originally staged for a fairly intimate

¹⁸⁸ ‘Introduction’ in Barnabe Barnes, *The Devil’s Charter*, ed. Ronald Brunless McKerrow (London: David Nutt; Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1904), p. x.

¹⁸⁹ Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. John D. Jump (London: Methuen, 1968), see V.49-65.

¹⁹⁰ Parker, pp. 97-104 (p. 97).

¹⁹¹ Mary Rose Trust, Portsmouth, ‘Fleam Wallet’ (MR 80 A 1564).

audience: the object was probably visible if it were life-sized. The emergence of the lancets and saucer in the supernatural dumb show corresponds to the ethereal nature of Tryphon's ghostly second (muted) entrance in *Herod and Antipater* which reclassifies the barber as a dangerous surgeon. The contexts underline the unfamiliarity and threatening effect of surgical contexts which are made manifest with instruments on stage but which are without linguistic classification for the audience.

One instrument which would ordinarily be associated with surgery makes a stage appearance because of a barber(-surgery) context. In *Burning Pestle*, another play performed in an intimate playing space, at Blackfriars, one of the giant mythological barber-surgeon's patients enters (as if from the barber-surgeon's lair) with a 'slender quill' (III.453), described in the stage directions as '*a syringe*' (s.d. III.452), a typical piece of equipment listed in surgical manuals but never catalogued in barbery ones. The syringe is not part of the mainstream barbery furnishings set up by the players (see chapter two), but emerges from an undefined, offstage space, a space that represents obscure surgery: in other words, it is not part of an inventory. Indeed, stage directions in *Burning Pestle*, '*Pulls out a syringe*' (referring to the knight), suggest that the instrument is brought on stage hidden in the knight's garments (similar to the smuggling in of surgical instruments in the example from Sandras's *Count de Rochefort*). The object refigures Barbaroso's barbery space materially. These surgical props appear as abstractions: they are dislocated from larger collections of tools and are characterised by ambiguous referencing. Moreover the handler of these objects is not a straightforward surgeon figure: one is a devil and the other is a knight.

**

Conceptually, the surgeon's chest or case functions as a blueprint for my examination of early modern theatre's representation of surgery's materiality. The chest gives the impression of the structurally-determined, inclusive tool set, and yet as an object it is often referenced or depicted as an impenetrable container, and its formal structure is undermined by spatial ambivalence. The tools of surgery are mainly evoked collectively by writers, who elide inventorial detail, or are evoked through reference to an abstracted property. In the same way that Sugg argues that most anatomical references in early modernity's literary corpus were without semantic logic, so here we find that references to surgery are without material sense or technicality and they cannot provide stable content for a scene.¹⁹² Instead, the appearance of surgical tools signals short-lived crisis moments, sometimes coaxed by a barbery context's insistence on the material. By comparison, barbery's material status provides recyclable content for writers; theirs and their audiences' familiarity with the barber's shop and its material investments means that there is greater flexibility in barbery's theatrical realisation. The identity of both practices is embedded in their material properties. If the practice's materiality is recognisable and envisaged as an accessible inventory then its conception is public and readily appropriated by the popular imagination. If the practice's materiality is hidden, then it resists identification in a context other than its own and ultimately resists the 'creative act'. When early modern writers represent the physical properties of barbery and/or surgery they communicate two anxieties as one, which inventory (realised or not) embodies: the unstable growth of materiality in the period and the uneasy attitudes towards the body.

¹⁹² Cf. Katherine Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), who argues that early modern subjects were aware of their inner-self, but that this interior was often unexpressed, something Hamlet names as 'that within which passeth show' (I.ii.83).

Chapter 2

‘Lend me thy basin, apron and razor’: Disguise, (Mis)Appropriation and Performance

Writers employ disguise motifs in representing barbers and surgeons in the theatre. There is a binary effect: while barbering often functions *as* a disguise, surgery is frequently a covered-up process in dramatic action, remaining an offstage phenomenon. Both, therefore, expose something inherent about constructions of performance. The themes of presence and absence that I investigated in the previous chapter in relation to materiality are also an ideological concern about the characterisation of the professional as well as the conception of the profession.

Discussions of attire and disguise on the early modern stage have encouraged scholars to examine broader social and gender issues.¹ But criticism in this field has done more than raise our awareness of the sumptuary concerns prompted by dressing, dressing-up, cross-dressing and undressing in the period: it has also increased our dramaturgical attentiveness to the duplicity and self-reflexivity of performing and representing in early modern theatre. Of disguise conventions, Jeremy Lopez concludes that they are ‘sites for admiring the act of representation itself’.² He asserts that the ‘disguise, for characters and audience, creates a space where there is a vast amount of things to see and a space from which to see them’, arguing that disguise is often compelling to watch because it increases levels of perception.³ The ‘vast amount to see’ transpires from an increased and self-promoting materiality on stage, required in assembling disguises. These discussions

¹ See Jean Elizabeth Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994); Stephen Orgel, *Impersonations* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996); Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (New York; London: Routledge, 1999).

² Jeremy Lopez, *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), p. 128 (see pp. 117-128). Cf. Robert Weimann, ‘Textual Authority and Performative Agency’, *NLH* 25:4 (1994), 789-808.

³ Lopez, p. 119.

prompt practical questions about the contextual (economic, social and theatrical) influences surrounding text, production, costumes and materials.⁴ This chapter asks, for example, from where certain properties, including beards and skeletons, for theatre were sourced. The mixed bag of questions in this field invites us to consider the duplicitous nature of ‘values’ (a social consideration) and ‘value’ (an economic one), and to historicise them accordingly; here I also question what constitutes theatrical value.

In *Shakespeare’s Opposites* (2009), Andrew Gurr explores the economies offstage and customs onstage of theatrical practice in the Admiral’s Company, theorising that the culture of stardom, engendered by Marlovian plays and motivated by the fame of actors such as Edward Alleyn, prompted the Admiral’s Company to build a repertoire which incorporated multiple and more sophisticated disguise plots, an argument also posed by Victor Freeburg at the beginning of last century.⁵ This enabled star figures to appear in a variety of habits and was a means of showcasing their celebrity status and adaptability as actors.⁶ Although Gurr has been criticised for some of his analyses of disguise tricks, his pragmatic attempts to find explanations for the practice not only by examining plot devices, but by studying a wider historicised context is persuasive. Moreover, his argument based on ‘showcasing’ is relevant: here I investigate an equivalent effect whereby forms of disguise which accompany the representation of a specific character (a barber/surgeon), as

⁴ See Peter Stallybrass, ‘Worn Worlds’ in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), pp. 289-320; Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), pp. 182, 197; Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), pp. 187-200. For discussions on the early modern circulation of costume/clothing and Henslowe’s costume department accounts see Natasha Korda, ‘Household Property/Stage Property’, *Theatre Journal* 48:2 (1996), 185-195 (esp. pp. 188, 194-5); Korda, ‘Women’s Theatrical Properties’ in *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 202-229; Stallybrass, ‘Properties in Clothes:’ in *Staged Properties*, pp. 177-201; Will Fisher, ‘Staging the Beard’ in *Staged Properties*, pp. 230-257. On early modern costume see Phillis Cunningham and Catherine Lucas, *Occupational Costume* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1967).

⁵ Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); Victor Oscar Freeburg, *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama* ([New York]: Benjamin Blom, 1965), pp. 121-2. [Freeburg’s monograph was first published by Columbia University Press in 1915.]

⁶ Cf. Michael Hattaway’s analysis of Tamburlaine and the dangers of self-fashioning in terms of investiture and disinvestiture (‘Playhouses and the Role of Drama’ in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 133-147 (p. 138)).

opposed to a specific actor, showcase production itself, as well as makes those characters discernable theatrical constructs, on or off the stage. In the previous chapter I explored how material properties signalled the context of a practitioner. In this chapter, following Douglas Bruster's argument, I find that they also make the character: 'Sometimes this link between character and prop is so strong that certain objects can gesture towards a drama, character, and scene'.⁷ Barber disguises fit into this mould, but surgeon ones do not, and I question how disguise functions figuratively as well as visually. My use of the term disguise, therefore, is fairly fluid in conceptualising theatrical identity shifts. As well as examining instances when characters straightforwardly dissemble, I investigate scenes in which characters assume the role of a barber or a surgeon, dissimulating their theatrical persona as they become engrossed in a self-conscious representation of another.

'By a mere barber, and no magic else'

The barber is commonly associated with knavish antics, routines, and processes of altering outward appearances, which I discussed in the previous chapter in relation to *Epicoene*. In short, a barber who is involved in identity-making encourages theatre-making. The barber can both expose and conceal a client's nature. Samuel Rowlands's conceit for his variety of epigrams in *Humors Looking Glasse* (1608) appropriates a barbery context:

As many antique faces passe,
From Barbers chaire unto his glasse,
There to behold their kinde of trim,

⁷ Douglas Bruster, 'The Dramatic Life of Objects in the Early Modern Theatre' in *Staged Properties*, pp. 67-97 (pp. 75, 67). 'The change in costume is always a change of identity' (Stallybrass and Jones, p. 198). See Tiffany Stern's discussion on changes of clothes in *Making Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 105-107, and on clothes as visual props which have both 'straightforward representation and, often, a symbolic subtext' (pp. 103-105 (p. 104)). Cf. Fleir describes city of actors: 'for hee that yesterday played the Gentleman, now plays the Beggar...Then for their apparell, they have change too: for shée that wore the Petticote, now weares the Breech' (Edward Sharpham, *The Fleire* (1607), D1v); and Truewit's observation in *Epicoene* when setting up a mock court scene: 'I have fitted my divine and my canonist, dyed their beards and all; the knaves do not know themselves, they are so exalted and altered. Preferment changes any man' (Jonson, *Epicoene*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002), V.iii.2-5).

And how they are reform'd by him...⁸

Writing on the reputation of beards and the place of the barbershop in Renaissance Italy, Douglas Biow explains that 'the barbershop...is the place where the male self is not only crafted in bodily form. The barbershop is also the place where the identity of a man is potentially revealed in the very moment that a beard is stylishly refined'.⁹ In the ballad 'The Rimers New Trimming' the barber sends the rhymer from his shop having altered his appearance to reflect his 'awdacious and base' behaviour.¹⁰ But the barber is also associated with the cosmetic climate of the entertainment world where he is perceived as an early modern make-up artist. In the epilogue to Jonson's *A Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies* (1621), the audience learns that barbers control theatrical transformations:

To see a gipsy, as an Aethiop, white,
 Know, that what dy'd our faces was an ointment
 ...
 By a mere barber, and no magic else,
 It was fetch'd off with water and a ball,
 ...
 Who doth disguise his habit and his face,
 And takes on a false person by his place,
 The power of poetry can never fail her,
 Assisted by a barber and a tailor.¹¹

The barber's work also corresponds to theatrical decisions about the suitability of a beard to denote a character, which Bottom readily identifies in *Midsummer Night's Dream* as he prepares for his role as Pyramus.¹² It is not clear, however, whether barbers supplied

⁸ Samuel Rowlands, *Humors Looking Glasse* (1608), A2v. On the glass, self-reflection and refashioning, see Farah Karim-Cooper, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006), pp. 37-39.

⁹ Douglas Biow, 'Manly Matters', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40:2 (2010), 325-346, p. 334.

¹⁰ Anon, 'The Rimers New Trimming' (c.1614), stanza 18, line 3.

¹¹ Ben Jonson, 'Epilogue at Windsor' in *A Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies* in *Works*, ed. William Gifford (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Company; New York: J. C. Derby, 1855), line 7 to the end.

¹² On Bottom's beards, see Fisher, pp. 243-4.

theatre houses with prosthetic beards. Will Fisher examines the circulation of beards in boy companies, asserting that its culture of prosthetic beardedness added to the stage effects of malleable gender, and citing the Revels Office as housing one of the main collections of beard stocks.¹³ Haberdashers (Kendall and Ogle, the latter named in *Sir Thomas More*) were involved in trafficking costumes and properties and supplying beards, but whether they actually constructed the beards is uncertain.¹⁴ Despite the lack of evidence associating the manufacture of prosthetic beards with the barbers' trade, the business of beards inherently affiliates the two.

In turn, this association has a double effect. When a barber is conceived on stage through disguise, the focus is not only on the shaping of a client's identity but also his own. For a character to become a barber on stage is for him to make a full theatrical commitment to a part. In these instances the actors do far more than simply don an apron, the typical, tradesman's habit and a sartorial signifier of the occupation.¹⁵ In scenes when characters disguise as barbers the result is a detailed exposition of the barbery context they evoke, and I show that the barber's disguise draws attention to different literal and figurative performing spaces for the actors on stage. The staging of the barber becomes a metaphor for the staging of theatre itself.

'To be come now fine and trimme Barbers'

Characters off stage and on play the role of the barber in Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pithias*. This play is the earliest one I examine in this thesis – its first performance (for Elizabeth I) by the Children of the Chapel Royal has been dated to 1564-5, as the 1571 title page indicates – and its theatrical reputation influenced later sixteenth-century works

¹³ Fisher, pp. 238-241.

¹⁴ Fisher, pp. 240-1.

¹⁵ Thomas Nashe directs the barber, 'Wherefore (good *Dick*) on with thy apron' (*Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), A3v.). Middleton refers to 'a lick with the barber's apron' (2053) in *Owl's Almanac*. See *Occupational Costume* for a discussion of the prevalence of aprons in the period (pp. 328-333).

like John Lyly's *Midas* and George Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*.¹⁶ In the play, King Dionisius's daughters barber their father offstage because he 'trusteth none, to come nere him' since he is terrorised by an (unfounded) threat of foreign invasion.¹⁷ We learn that in adopting the role of barber, the daughters improvise new methods of barbering to suit their client: they tidy his beard 'Not with Knife or Rasour, for all edge tooles he feares, / But with hote burning Nutshales, they senge of his heares' (Eiiiiiv): like the surgeon's nervous patient, the King fears the instrument. The unconventionality of the daughters' task is matched by the unconventionality of their parts as 'fine and trimme Barbers' (Fiiiiv); they appropriate the role by making adjustments. Young, unmarried females were not eligible to enter the trade, but widows of barbers sometimes adopted their husband's apprentices and continued to oversee their husband's shop. Their involvement, however, was not always welcomed, and they were never, 'of course' (according to Sidney Young), admitted to the livery of The Company.¹⁸ On 5th October 1557, Mrs Dawson, newly widowed of one Bryckett, 'a Toothe drawer', is instructed to 'paye no quartryge to the [Company] hawle nor hange oute any signe or clothe w[i]th teethe as she hearetofore hath don'.¹⁹ In John Marston's *Dutch Courtesan*, the ill-trained barber's boy is 'Widow Reinscure's man' (II.iii.14), making a joke of female capabilities in guiding apprentices.²⁰ Johnston asserts that the notion of a homosocial space which usually accompanies barbering activities is problematised in *Damon and Pithias* not only by the allusion to young female practitioners and, as I have suggested, their alternative methods, but also by the pseudo-incestuous and homoerotic suggestions that necessarily follow: Grimme fantasises that if he were the King he would 'steale one swap at their [his daughters'] lippes' (Fiiiiv), and he

¹⁶ See the comparisons drawn by Mark Albert Johnston, 'Playing with the Beard', *ELH* 72:1 (2005), 79-103 (pp. 82, 88).

¹⁷ Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pithias* (1571), Eiiiiir.

¹⁸ Sidney Young, *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, 1890), p. 260.

¹⁹ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/1, 33r.

²⁰ John Marston, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997).

gains some degree of (sexual) satisfaction (in accordance with his fantasy) when indeed he is barbered in a parodic sequence by two court lackeys, ‘pretie men’ (Fiv) Will and Jack.²¹ Edwards straightforwardly shows that when a practice is appropriated by the wrong hands the conception of that practice shifts. An audience senses the gap between the realistic forms of practice and the mis-appropriated ones, between occupation and play.

Grimme the collier happens upon Will and Jack (servants of the eponymous friends) in the midst of a ‘fallinge out’ (Fir). But the lackeys unite against the collier when they decide, irritated by his smugness about his ‘heavy pouch’, to get him drunk on ‘filling ale’ and humiliate him (see Fiir-Fiir). They bring on stage a number of barbery props, trim Grimme’s beard, sing ‘The song at the shaving of the Colier’, and steal his pouch of money. Once he discovers that he has been duped, Grimme resolves to find Will and Jack, but after the trimming scene, none of these characters speak or is scripted to enter on stage again, and the play concludes its tale of tested friendship. While the parodic barbery scene mirrors some of the themes of humiliation, (false)-collusion and victimisation of the main plot, the scene occupies a different performance register from the rest of the play: put simply, it functions as interlude. Set ‘at the Court gate’ (Fir), the scene also occupies a different performing space from the rest of the play, akin to the *platea* of medieval theatre – a space in which performance boundaries are challenged, ‘a space in which’, Janette Dillon explains, ‘performance can be recognised as performance rather than as the fiction it intermittently seeks to represent’, and a space where humour often thrives.²² And while the physical site and dramaturgy of this sequence suggest a threshold (in performance terms), the conceptual space (a *locus*, in the sense that it is specifically defined) of the collier’s ‘pouche’ (Fir) in the scene is also a site of unease. The pouch is supposed to represent a closed, private space, and yet Grimme’s brag about its weightiness and the

²¹ See Johnston, ‘Playing with the Beard’, pp. 84-5.

²² See Janette Dillon, *The Cambridge Introduction to Early English Theatre* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), pp. 4-16 (pp. 4-5).

lackeys' pick-pocketing antics (they are 'quick carvers' (Giv)) suggestively opens up this contained realm so that it too becomes a space for performance activity. The barbery sequence, therefore, stages systems of exposure.

In *Damon and Pithias* the barbery setting is, according to stage directions, made manifest part way through: '*Here Wyll fetcheth a Barbers bason, a pot with water, a Raysour, and Clothes and a payre of Spectacles*' (s.d. Fiiiir). But this stage direction and the ensuing dialogue leave many questions unanswered about how the boy actors would have performed this scene, and how an audience could enter into their revelry. It is not clear, for example, whether the '*Clothes*' are meant only to 'dresse' Grimme, or whether they double up as protective clothing for the would-be barber (Jack) and his boy (Will). This leads us to question whether Jack and Will change their attire in order to play barbers: neither stage directions nor dialogue mention aprons. The greatest difficulty with the passage is how to interpret Grimme's reaction to Will and Jack in their adopted roles: does the fact that Grimme is drunk mean that the representation of a barbery illusion is shaped by alcohol and that any gaps in the barbery setting are filled in by the effects of drink (not (necessarily) shared by an audience)? Or, does drunk Grimme become not so much fooled by illusions produced by drunkenness as creative through intoxication, and receptive to improvisation and a collection of props? Ultimately, when Will and Jack 'are barbers' is this guise or disguise?²³ Michael Hattaway argues that 'if Renaissance playwrights treated of illusion they were concerned to treat of the effects of illusion upon characters rather than creating chimeras for the audience'.²⁴ The scene is a parody of barbery, but there are options as to how that parody is organised. In addition, Grimme keeps in mind another barbery performance while he is initiated into his own: Dionisius's daughters and their appropriated barbery role (which are 'true' appropriations, if irregular ones) are on his

²³ See Lloyd Davis, *Guise and Disguise* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1993), pp. 3-18. For Davis, 'Dis-guise...suggests a doubled guise, which exceeds a "usual manner" of self-presentation' (p. 11).

²⁴ Hattaway, 'Playhouses and the Role of Drama', p. 142.

mind. It is even possible that Will and Jack make ‘Clothes’ into womanly garments as they enter into barbering ‘even after the same fashion as the kings daughters doo’ (Fiiiiv). If Will and Jack are these daughters, does Grimme assume the role of mock king (perhaps as Falstaff will do in *Henry IV Part I*)? A few lines in *Damon and Pithias* suggest the complicated layers of a scenario’s representational order. Of course, Grimme, Will and Jack need not be united in their interpretation of the barbering performance they undertake and they could repeatedly shift their roles. So, like Grimme, it can ‘seeme [our] head[s]...swimme’ (Fiiiir) when confronted with the scene, particularly in text.

There are options too for the characters’ conception of barbering gear in the scene. Will and Jack have props, but illusions surround the items’ manifestation. For example, Grimme finds himself ‘a trimme chayre’ (Fiiiir), a piece of furniture not stipulated in the main list of ‘gear’ and likely to be unspecified on stage until Grimme re-imagines its function – perhaps it is not even a chair. The descriptions are at odds with stage directions. Apparently wholesome and sweet smelling ‘trimme water’ is ‘vengeance sower’ and a razor is ‘a chopping knife’ (Fiiiir-v). But the ‘*pot of water*’ is not suggested to be a filthy piss-pot and the ‘*raysour*’ is straightforwardly listed. Mikhail Bakhtin examines the ‘debasement, uncrowning, and destruction’ of objects in the list of Gargantua’s swabs in Rabelais which asks for a re-evaluation of objects in the ‘dense atmosphere of the material bodily lower stratum’, and encourages laughter, challenging the pitiful seriousness of medieval man.²⁵ So what do we see on stage in *Damon and Pithias*? 1. Will and Jack handle standard appurtenances (as listed in stage directions) and in his drunken state Grimme mis-reads/identifies them; 2. Will and Jack handle standard appurtenances and Grimme re-imagines them, self-consciously playing to cultural jokes about hazardous barbering as he exuberantly enters his role; 3. Unable to provide authentic barbering

²⁵ M. M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1984), pp. 371-381 (pp. 372-3, 380).

equipment, Will and Jack have an assortment of objects that appear irregular (visually/materially parodic of barbery gear) and are in keeping with Grimme's descriptions, and therefore are at odds with stage directions. The addition of spectacles in the lackeys' barbery gear (an item absent from other lists of barbery props) embodies the scene's theme: we are asked to look and relook at objects and stage action through more than one lens. In practice, barbery deals in bodily transformations, but as a theatrical context it more generally invites interpretation of transformation which underlines the choices in performance.

This scene parodies a host of barbery contexts including: standard barbery and normal/familiar routines of the trade (an examination of Grimme's 'Butter teeth'); stereotypes of barbery, which centre on the trade's synonymy with cozenage; female barbers and erotic barbering, which highlights barbery's association with pimping; and dangerous or irregular barbery (treatment of venereal disease (the 'pippe')) performed by non-professionals with their own agenda, and potentially embodied in this scene by the threatening 'chopping knife' (see Fiiiir-Fiiiiv). Later playwrights 're-dress' these barbery motifs. In *Midas*, a feature of the barbery sequence is a song about shaving/cozenage, as it is in *Damon and Pithias* (both discussed in chapter four). Barbers are associated with staged purse-stealing stunts in *Promos and Cassandra* and *Dutch Courtesan*, and more generally the barber shop is used as a location for feats of knavery in Middleton and Webster's *Anything for a Quiet Life* and John Day's *Knave in Grain*.²⁶ Spadone asks barber Secco in John Ford's *Fancies Chaste and Noble*, 'What's that so cold at my throat; and scrubs so hard?' echoing Grimme's protestation, 'Doth the Kinges daughters rubbe so harde?' (Fiiiir)²⁷ Throughout Francis Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, discussed later in this chapter, parallels with Edwards's texts are also apparent. Thomas Randolph's

²⁶ See George Whetstone, *The Right Excellent and Famous Historye, of Promos and Cassandra* (1578), Fiiiiv; John Day, *The Knave in Graine* (1640), I1v-I3r.

²⁷ John Ford, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (1638), K1r.

short drama, *Aristippus*, includes a sequence in which the drunk eponym is attended to in a chair by a barber-surgeon who declares, 'I pray Sir bring [Aristippus] out in his Chaire, and if the house can furnish you with Barbers provision, let all bee in readinesse', suggesting that things can happen theatrically if barbery gear is on standby.²⁸ Similarly Young Cressingham's 'Is the barber prepared?' (*Quiet Life*, II.ii.74) is a pertinent question for Young Franklin (who has informed the barber about his forthcoming role), but also a pertinent question theatrically in anticipation of Sweetball and his shop's immanent manifestation; Young Franklin later reiterates, 'will you see if my cousin Sweetball...be furnished' (II.ii.177-178), meaning with money, but the double implication of being materially furnished for theatre is tempting. Young Cressingham returns with the news that the barber is 'half angry that [they] should think him unfurnished or not furnished' (II.ii.221-223). Early modern barbery underscores the theatre's preparation to play.

'Lend me thy basin, razor, and apron'

In *Dutch Courtesan*, city wit, foul-mouth and prankster Cocledemoy is engrossed in feats of knavery. His chief concern is to cozen Mulligrub, a vintner, and he adopts a number of disguises to trick his rival: Cocledemoy is a wares-selling French pedlar, a fish-supplying cook's man, a cloaked vintner, a bellman and a sergeant. In his first and most developed disguise he is a barber.²⁹ Marston draws attention to Cocledemoy's barber disguise in a way unlike the attention he gives Cocledemoy's other disguises. No one visibly provides Cocledemoy with his pedlar's merchandise, 'jowl of fresh salmon' (III.iii.33), cloak, bellman gear or sergeant's uniform. But fifty lines are dedicated to Cocledemoy's acquisition of his barber's disguise in advance of his trick on Mulligrub; and a further 115

²⁸ Thomas Randolph, *Aristippus* (1630), D1v.

²⁹ Darryll Grantley regards Cocledemoy's trickery 'more purely as exemplification of the skills required in an urban context'; 'skilful deception', he concludes, 'ha[s] become a dramatic trope' (*London in Early Modern English Drama* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 134).

lines – the entirety of III.iii – are focused on the mock barbery setting Cocledemoy establishes to fool Mulligrub and trim him of his purse (rather than his beard). Moreover, Cocledemoy interacts with the tradesman he mimics so that the barbery context is not simply thrown on but passed between characters: often disguises are assembled on stage without such logic as to demonstrate from where a costume is purchased, stolen or borrowed.

Cocledemoy requests of the apprentice barber, Holifernes Reinscure, ‘Lend me thy basin, razor, and apron’ (II.i.186), discovering that Holifernes is en route ‘to trim Master Mulligrub the vintner’ (II.i.180). Although stage directions in quarto (1605) and Folio (1633) do not specify the handover of these items, the end of the scene in both editions stipulates that Cocledemoy exits ‘*in his Barbars furniture*’.³⁰ The props must be brought on stage. When Cocledemoy asks Holifernes what his furniture is worth, a question Holifernes cannot answer, the transaction takes shape. Cocledemoy gives Holifernes a token, ‘Hold this pawn’ (II.i.191) he says, in return for the gear, and later offers a bribe (‘Drink that’ (I.ii.198)). We cannot tell the nature of the pledge, but Marston probably intended a visual joke at this moment in which Cocledemoy (amused to find that the apprentice knows very little about his trade) offers Holifernes something trifling in exchange for the equipment. Cocledemoy’s acquisition of a disguise results in a mock-economic exchange, a loan. Here, Marston parodies the pawning activities that enabled theatre practitioners to assemble costumes, wardrobes and props, perhaps even suggesting the role of the barber in supplying props for the theatre.³¹ Cocledemoy’s ‘lend me’ is reminiscent of the numerous entries beginning ‘lent upon’ that are characteristic of *Henslowe’s Diary*.³²

³⁰ See Marston, *The Dutch Courtezan* (1605), C2v; *The Dutch Courtezan* in *The Workes of Mr. John Marston* (1633), Aa4r-Aa4v.

³¹ See *Renaissance Clothing*, pp. 181-191.

³² See Neil Carson, *A Companion to Henslowe’s Diary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), pp. 14-30.

The barber's appurtenances equip Cocledemoy with what he needs for a disguise. As named properties, however, they also are incorporated into the dialogue of the scene wherein they are given additional semantic contexts. The razor is re-envisioned in Holifernes's reference to 'the sign of the Three Razors' (II.i.193): the place where he dwells, which is noteworthy enough to merit a second mention in the scene (II.i.201). In quarto, this second reference is abbreviated to 'the 3.razers' (C2r), drawing attention, albeit textually, to a quantity of instruments and appearing more like an item on an inventory. The reference to the sign of The Three Razors pulls together words, digits, images and objects, inviting an audience to visualize the sign, and therefore razors, in the form of lexemes and illustrations. This sign is not a casual denotation of a barber dwelling, but is an allusion to the site of The Company: *the* place of Holifernes's profession, although here functioning comically. The Company's coat of arms was a triad of fleams, of which Sidney Young writes, 'from their shape they have sometimes been thought to represent razors'.³³ The prop razor on stage, meanwhile, remains a visual point of reference and the audience might imagine the razor as a geographical, civic and pictorial site. Cocledemoy, who regards the 'Three Razors' as 'A sign of good shaving' (II.i.194), asserts its signification: it is a sign of authentic barbery (i.e. where the real barber's boy lives or where The Company meets, and where the razor and the rest of the equipment will be returned); it is also a symbol of perfect trickery (i.e. the razor used in a disguise for fleecing Mulligrub) which plays on the duplicitous nature of certain signifiers. The prop razor interacts with imagined performing spaces and metonymic signs of barbery.

Once Holifernes exits, Cocledemoy exclaims, 'and if I shave not Master Mulligrub, my wit has no edge, and I may go cack in my pewter' (II.i.203-4), attributing an additional,

³³ Young, p. 432. Cf. George C. Boon, 'Tonsor Humanus', *Britannia* 22 (1991), 21-32. Boon, an archaeologist, investigates the difference between small knives, twin blade instruments and razors in ancient barbery practice. His findings suggest that misidentification of such tools is easily done, resulting in misconceptions about the skills which a practice requires.

metaphorical significance to the image of the razor: it should be sharp like his wit. On 17th April 1599, barber Henry Needham, a member of the London Company, is warned for continuing to let ‘forren brother’ William Webbe ‘grinde...rasares’ (which is to polish and make razors sharp using a hone or whetstone).³⁴ In London, for a non-barber to engage in sharpening razors for use within the barbery trade was irregular, and liable to be punished by The Company officials. Cocledemoy’s razor is as much rhetorical and emblematic as physical in constructing his disguise. The razor’s extra-theatrical history highlights Cocledemoy’s blatant misappropriation of the object. And with his newly-acquired basin in hand, Cocledemoy’s determination to ‘shit in [his] cup’ (David Crane’s paraphrase) should his task fail has an unpleasant literal semantic.³⁵ Cocledemoy’s ‘pewter’ is his basin: in an inventory taken of a seventeenth-century barber’s shop, ‘three peuter basons’ are listed.³⁶ The basin Cocledemoy acquires from Holifernes, therefore, embodies a paradox. At once the audience is invited to view it as a bolster to Cocledemoy’s trick in disguise; at the same time it proleptically represents failed trickery/disguise. Cocledemoy doubly abuses its standard function as a washing bowl: it is no longer a legitimate object of the trade because it is in the wrong hands, and its function in hygiene routines is turned on its head as Cocledemoy’s execratory humour implies that he can fill it with filth.

In his final observation, Cocledemoy declares, ‘All cards have white backs, and all knaves would seem to have white breasts. So, proceed now, worshipful Cocledemoy’ (II.i.209-211). Cocledemoy makes the apron metonymic of the context in which he wears it, rather than the context in which Holifernes’s apparently less threatening barbery activities take place and it has an universalising effect. He appropriates cultural stereotypes (as well as standard physical items) in assembling his disguise. Indeed, to a contemporary audience Cocledemoy embodies the ‘false’ barber role in a way that makes him, ironically,

³⁴ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 17.

³⁵ See Crane’s FN to II.i.204.

³⁶ See John Vignes (1699), PROB 4/13107.

more authentic in terms of theatrical and satiric convention. By comparison, Holifernes, supposedly the ‘true’ barber figure in the play, does not live up to such expectations. The city wit takes more than Holifernes’s props: he appropriates his very part. Having liberally referred to characters mockingly as ‘worshipful’ throughout, Cocledemoy now, for the first time, adopts for himself the faux formal title, contextualising his character as one who is a freeman of the Worshipful Company of Barbers and Surgeons: ‘proceed now, worshipful Cocledemoy’.

As I have suggested, the objects alone that Cocledemoy receives are not enough to complete his barber disguise. He mutters, ‘must dissemble, must disguise’ (II.i.205-6) after Holifernes has left him. Typical disguises on the early modern stage rely on a character putting on a prosthetic beard (sometimes this is their only form of cover).³⁷ Cocledemoy indeed gains a beard but from where he obtains it is not clear. Moreover, he does not risk playing a London barber. He thinks that his ‘scurvy tongue will discover [him]’ (II.i.205) deciding instead to play ‘a Northern barber!’ (II.i.207) and naming himself ‘Andrew Shark’ (II.iii.15).³⁸ But this is ironic: when Cocledemoy chooses to be northern, he effectively gives himself free license to keep his ‘scurvy tongue’. Jonathan Hope tells us that early modernists’ understanding of the term ‘accent’ related to ‘verbal content rather than phonetic form’ which carried a general sense of performance.³⁹ A northern barber (one of the many northern suitors of ‘a Country Lass’) appears renowned for vulgarity in a ballad:

³⁷ See Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), pp. 22-3; Fisher, pp. 243-4 when he speculates on blatant artificiality of beard wearing on the early modern stage and the difference between beard prostheses; Mark Albert Johnston, ‘Prosthetic Absence in Ben Jonson’s *Epicoene*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholmew Fair*’, *ELR* 37:3 (2007), 401-428.

³⁸ A ‘sharking “Andrew”’ is ‘a cheating Scot’, Crane (FN to II.iii.15). Cf. Mark Thornton Burnett’s discussion of the ‘political embeddedness’ of productions of *Dutch Courtesan* that were performed several times before the monarch Scot, James I (‘Calling “things by their right names”’ in *Renaissance Configurations*, ed. Gordon McMullan (Basingstoke; London: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 171-188 (p. 175)).

³⁹ Jonathan Hope, *Shakespeare and Language* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010), pp. 99-113 (p. 106). Cf. Nashe’s description of the ‘rude simple country’ of the North (*Terrors of the Night* (1594), Eir).

A Barber-Surgeon came to me,
 whom I did take in great disdain,
 He said his art I soon should see,
 for he would prick my master-Vein.

...
 But I repell'd his rude address...⁴⁰

Cocledemoy's rude barber conversation later with Mulligrub includes allusions to sodomy (he says he 'sometimes poll[s] a page or so' (II.iii.31) in court), and a suggestive number of mentions of 'holes' (II.iii.38, 41, 42). In Middleton's *Michaelmas Term*, written either just before or after *Dutch Courtesan* (that is, according to Theodore B. Leinwand in *Collected Works*, between 1604 and 1606), Andrew Lethe, born Andrew Gruel, is a Scottish, venison-devouring upstart, a 'gentleman of most received parts, / Forgetfulness, lust, impudence, and falsehood' (I.ii.159-160). Andrew's mother informs the audience that her husband (and Andrew's father) was a 'tooth-drawer' (I.ii.267), information which Hellgill repeats, calling Andrew 'a tooth-drawer's son' (II.i.158), and Mother Gruel reiterates at the end of the play (V.iii.157). The Scottish Andrews are contextualised by filthiness and barbering.

Cocledemoy does not don and then discard his barber's habit; his disguise, not an elaborate covering-up so much as an early disclosing of the role he adopts for the length of the drama, actually makes sense of his character, and, moreover, of the interplay between sub and main plots. Throughout the play, Cocledemoy is like a cozening, mouthy barber, absorbed in the world of foolery, purse-pinching, prostitution, venereal diseases and foul bodies; his barber(-surgeon) disguise is actually a revelation. Early in the play one of his bawdy mottos is 'keep your syringe straight and your lotium unspilt!' (I.ii.74-75), and he addresses Mary Faux: 'What, my right precious pandress, supportress of barber-surgeons and enhanceress of...diet-drink!' (I.ii.23-5). From the start he associates himself, as does

⁴⁰ Anon, 'The Northern Ladd' (1670-1696), stanzas 9-10.

Andrew Lethe in *Michaelmas Term*, with the ‘bawdy house[s]’ (II.i.169), paralleling the prostitutes’ world of the main plot. A barber’s shop was synonymous with a brothel in which ‘a barber’s chair fits all buttocks’; the conceit could run in both directions and thus a woman could be ‘As common as a barber’s chair’.⁴¹ The Company’s Court Minutes reveal the sensitivity of the association: on 4th December 1599 Robert Morrey complained of William Foster ‘for callinge him Pandor and Bawde and for sayeing he was...keepinge a bawdye house’.⁴² Cocledemoy straddles this seedy underworld. Later in *Dutch Courtesan*, Mistress Mulligrub seems available to Cocledemoy – who bids for her – upon Mulligrub’s imminent execution.⁴³ Effectively, Mistress Mulligrub’s ‘sell[s] the pleasure of a wanton bed’ (I.i.129): her ‘featherbed’ (V.iii.93) can be appropriated by Cocledemoy and she becomes, effectively, one of the ‘supportress[es] of barber-surgeons’. By exploiting the barbery contexts, Cocledemoy plays with the notion of sexual trading. Engrossed in a dissolute civic world, he navigates himself accordingly and re-imagines the guilds’ precedence by calling a bawd the ‘most worshipful of all the twelve companies’ (I.ii.31).

Many of Cocledemoy’s later disguises are as a corollary with the first. Cocledemoy’s protracted joke is how well and how many times he can ‘trim’ or ‘shave’ Mulligrub: after he has disguised himself like a French pedlar, Cocledemoy remarks, ‘I’ll shave ye smoother yet!’ (III.ii.29-30); when Cocledemoy tricks Mistress Mulligrub with the salmon, the token he gives her as assurance – as if from Mulligrub – is ‘that he was

⁴¹ See Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs* (Michigan: University of Michigan, 1950), p. 29; Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols (London; Atlantic Highlands NJ: Athlone, 1994), I, p. 70. Cf. ‘some Whores...with their fained teares / will you deceive: / And yet as common be / as a Barbers chaire’ ([Robert Guy], ‘A Warning for all Good Fellowes to Take Heede of Puncckes Inticements’ (1615?), ‘The Second Part’, stanza 7, lines 2-6).

⁴² *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 42. On the subject of interchangeable family spaces and ‘houses’ in *Dutch Courtesan*, see Majorie Rubright, ‘Going Dutch in London City Comedy’, *ELR* 40:1 (2010), 88-112 (pp. 94, 101-106).

⁴³ Cf. ‘The play...link[s] the Mulligrubs to the Family of Love and the Family of Love with the bawdy house’ (Rubright, p. 109).

dry-shaven this morning' (III.iii.39-40).⁴⁴ Disguised as a pedlar, Cocledemoy is selling very particular wares:

COCLEDEMOY	Monsieur, please you to buy a fine delicate ball, sweet ball, a camphor ball?
	...
COCLEDEMOY MULLIGRUB	One-a ball to scour, a scouring ball, a ball to be shaved? For the love of God, talk not of shaving! (III.ii.22-26)

In an attack on 'cunning cutbeards' (2013) in *Owl's Almanac*, Middleton makes the ball metonymic of the barber's shop, referring to men who 'goe to the Barbers ball oftener than to church' (2051-2052); the 'love of God' was judged in terms of barbering.⁴⁵ Mention of Master Suds the barber in *Puritan Widow* prompts Simon to comment, 'a good man, he washes the sins of the beard clean' (III.i.13-14) aligning the barber and his soap with religious transformative rituals. Holifernes does not seem to equip Cocledemoy with a ball in II.iii, but it is a significant addition. Cocledemoy instructs Mulligrub at the time of his trimming, 'Shut your eyes close; wink! Sure, sir, this ball will make you smart' (II.iii.67-8); the trick with the ball (which causes Mulligrub to be blind to Cocledemoy's purse-pinching) is crucial to the scene. If Cocledemoy supplies his own soap balls for the trick of II.iii this reinforces my point that we should regard Cocledemoy as most successfully defined in the role as barber in the play: he packs out this part. The balls Cocledemoy tries to sell as a pedlar are an unwelcome reminder to Mulligrub: 'they materialize memory'.⁴⁶ Moreover, Cocledemoy modifies balls with 'scouring', again reminding audiences of the earlier barbering scene when Mulligrub observed that barbers 'scour all!' (II.iii.58-9).

⁴⁴ Sensing that the barber has tried to get the better of him, Spadone calls him 'a drie shaver' (*Fancies*, B1r), insulting his occupational identity. But Spadone merely reflects what is already implicit in Ford's choice of the barber's name: Secco means dry. Complaining of her barber husband, Morosa refers to when he 'lies by [her] as cold as a dry stone' (H1r).

⁴⁵ The comment refers to the fact that barbers were not permitted to practise on Sundays.

⁴⁶ Jones and Stallybrass, p. 205. The authors explore how certain objects (fragments, usually) have the power to haunt on stage and shift from 'neuter' to 'haunting'. 'Material memories' in the examples these authors investigate are solemn reminders; in *Dutch Courtesan*, they are comic.

Another reference completes the depiction of Cocledemoy's habitual barber-surgeon association. Overhearing his rival and believing he is about to get the better of him, Mulligrub exclaims, 'It was his voice; 'tis he! He sups with his cupping-glasses...He shall be hanged in lousy linen' (IV.v.9-12). Cupping-glasses were used in phlebotomy – here, an unlicensed barbery procedure. Mulligrub imagines that Cocledemoy socialises with 'his fellow "drawers of blood"'.⁴⁷ Moreover, his reference to 'lousy linen' is common to parodies of barbery. In *Fancies*, the barber Secco gives his surety 'as [he] love[s] new cloathe[s]' (B1r), a joke. One of the 'lousy' items that Truewit and Morose imagine in Cutbeard's shop is 'linen' (*Epicoene*, III.v.71, 94). Nashe comments on barbers' 'lousy naprie they put a-bout me[n]s neckes while they are trim[m]ing'.⁴⁸ The lousy linen trope (repeated at V.iii.125) suggests that Mulligrub means to assault Cocledemoy by exploiting the milieu of his own low methods.

Lloyd Davis claims that guise points in two directions: to the 'consistent self-hood' and 'usual manner' of a character, and to disguise, which is a matter of 'changeable external appearance[s] that might be purposefully falsified and manipulated'.⁴⁹ Simon Palfrey asserts that 'disguise [can] make it difficult to judge exactly where a particular character begins and ends'.⁵⁰ A medley of disguises, such as Cocledemoy's, could initially suggest the ways in which a playwright stages a fragmented, 'false' character.⁵¹ Nonetheless, as the Lord of Misrule, Cocledemoy ironically is also context-centric: barber-surgery (a mixture of props and contexts) is his touchstone and tricking Mulligrub is his persistent motivation which gives his character its infrastructure.⁵² His disguise is not a

⁴⁷ Crane, FN to IV.v.9.

⁴⁸ *Saffron-Walden*, A3v [margin].

⁴⁹ Davis, p. 8.

⁵⁰ Simon Palfrey, *Doing Shakespeare* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005), p. 199.

⁵¹ Palfrey similarly refers to the fact that 'the usefulness of disguise...can...challenge...the very idea of coherent individuality' (p. 200).

⁵² Cf. James Berg on the reliance of character on properties which shape the person ('The Properties of Character in *King Lear*' in *Shakespeare and Character*, ed. Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 98-116.

matter of shifting his theatrical identity, but about locating it, in the sense that he adopts the entire rhetoric implied by his role. Palfrey questions, ‘Is the disguise an expression of the person behind the mask? Or does the disguise develop its own distinct identity?’⁵³ For Cocledemoy in *Dutch Courtesan* the answer is not “either or”, but “both”. The audience never sees Cocledemoy fulfil his promise and ‘return [the] things presently’ (II.i.196) to Holifernes at the sign of the Three Razors: instead, he fully appropriates the barber’s role.

**

The subplot of *Dutch Courtesan* forms one of the longest drolls in the second volume of *The Wits* (1673), collected in its first volume by Henry Marsh in 1662, and later reprinted in 1672 by his collaborator Francis Kirkman (who also compiled the 1673 volume).⁵⁴ These drolls, the preface to *Wits* explains, were performed throughout the interregnum (1642-1660) ‘when the publique Theatres were shut up’ and many actors continued their trade clandestinely. Intended for light entertainment ‘because’, according to Kirkman, ‘the Actors [were] forbidden to present us with any of their Tragedies’, the drolls were also selected for practical purposes from a variety of authors’ works which had ‘been of great fame in this last Age’. That they were vignettes which had ‘little cost in Cloaths’ (‘it was hazardous to Act any thing that required any good Cloaths’ which soldiers might seize), did not mean that they were prop-free; much of the entertainment they provided was physical.⁵⁵ The two volumes of *Wits* include extracts from *Hamlet*, *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *Custom of the Country* and *Philaster*, and various Falstaff routines. Significantly, three of the playlets are barber scenarios. ‘The Cheater Cheated’ is the title given to the

⁵³ Palfrey, p. 199.

⁵⁴ Francis Kirkman, *The Wits* (1673) [Vol II], see pp. 58-80; Kirkman, *The Wits* (1672) [Vol I]; Henry Marsh, *The Wits* (1662).

⁵⁵ *Wits* (1673), Preface: A2r-A3r.

Mulligrub and Cocledemoy antics from *Dutch Courtesan* (numbering twenty two pages in a volume in which most of the drolls number less than ten pages, and only ‘The Humours of Bottom the Weaver’ is a lengthier passage). In *Wits* (1662/72), ‘The Humour of John Swabber’ (about a sailor who is tricked by Cutbeard) is taken from Robert Cox’s *Acteon and Diana...Followed by Several Conceited Humours* (1656) (the conceits section accounting for the Swabber droll).⁵⁶ The third barber extract (also in the first volume of *Wits*) is from *Burning Pestle*, named ‘The Encounter’, and is the sequence when Rafe challenges the giant barber, Barbaroso, to a duel, discussed in the next section of this chapter.⁵⁷ *Burning Pestle* as a full-length play was not particularly successful in the eyes of its first audience in 1607, but evidently one part of it was deemed worth revisiting and accrued its own popularity independently from its whole.⁵⁸ At a time when theatre players – in the absence of their architectural bases – entertained audiences in make-shift venues or temporarily appropriated spaces (at fairs or in taverns or in the country, for example), barber scenarios helped to perpetuate the process of creating and constructing theatrical performance – the *ad hoc* practice that had once characterised most early English theatre.⁵⁹ This light-hearted playing was part of a bigger picture of shifting theatre practice during the Interregnum which Susan Wiseman explores: a change in drama rather than mere ‘empty years’.⁶⁰ Amid her discussions of ‘political playing’, Wiseman draws attention to ‘less formal street theatre’, some playing at the Red Bull, a revival of the ‘codes of comedy

⁵⁶ *Wits* (1662), pp. 121-133. Robert Cox, *Acteon and Diana...Followed by Several Conceited Humours* (1656), E2r-v. It is not clear whether Cox is author or adaptor.

⁵⁷ *Wits* (1662), pp. 93-97.

⁵⁸ See Grantley, p. 96; Lucy Munro, ‘The Knight of the Burning Pestle and Generic Experimentation’ in *Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr, Patrick Cheney and Andrew Hadfield (New York; Oxford: OUP, 2006), pp. 189-199 (p. 190); Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare’s London*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), pp. 121-4.

⁵⁹ See Dillon, *Early English Theatre*, pp. 16-23. Most early plays (pre-1580), Dillon asserts, ‘had to be adaptable to a number of different performance locations’ (p. 3).

⁶⁰ In *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998) Susan Wiseman argues that much more than the ‘cavalier’ productions prevailed throughout the interregnum, and asserts that there was ‘no singular “Puritan” politics of theatre’ (p. 7). Assuming reciprocity between political and cultural spheres she recognises the potentially democratising effects of public performance and print culture. Cf. Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), esp. pp. 181-250: ‘It is helpful to see the open-air stages as catering for older tastes rather than merely as backward’ (p. 183).

found in civic comedies', 'satirical puppetry at Bartholomew Fair', and 'improvisation[s]': a mixture.⁶¹ She cites the period's 'acute self-consciousness about playing' which related to political re-enactments, but also related to the favoured forms of playing which re-enacted theatre.⁶² Barbary playlets contributed to this. All of the scenarios in *Wits* which involve barbers take up the theme of disguise which, in turn, correspond to the period when theatre was often itself 'covered up'.

'The Humour of John Swabber' in *Wits* begins with Swabber's threat to enact diabolical barber activities upon Cutbeard who has cuckolded him. Although the *Wits* version omits the stage directions from Cox's edition, '*Enter John Swabber, armed with a sword, a gun, a pair of tongs and other ridiculous weapons*' (s.d. p. 27), Swabber must still begin the droll sequence with props because Francisco remarks on his 'weapons' and Swabber refers to his 'instrument called a pair of tongs' (*Wits* (1662), pp. 121-2.).⁶³ Swabber appears like a barber (equipped), a role he initially adopts to maim and possibly kill Cutbeard by haphazard tooth-removal and unskilled bloodletting in retaliation for cuckolding him, whereas the actual barber (Cutbeard) is '*within*', to emerge later and challenge Swabber to a fight. The droll oscillates between representing Swabber's appropriation of the role of barber and Cutbeard's enactment of it. Swabber declares, 'I will have an inch of every tool [Cutbeard] has' (*Wits* (1662), p. 123), claiming his right to perform. In the wake of Swabber's threat to appropriate the barber's part, Cutbeard in turn pretends to play a different barber role: that of the client-sympathetic, miracle-working barber. Performance in 'John Swabber' is a matter of upmanship in playing the barber.

The passage displays the barbary stereotypes that emerge in the mid-seventeenth century but which are not active in earlier representations discussed in this thesis,

⁶¹ Wiseman, see pp. 6, 54, 83-84, 210-212.

⁶² Wiseman, pp. 86-7.

⁶³ In Cox's edition, Francisco remarks on his 'several instruments of death' (E2r-v). It is not clear why this is excised in *Wits* but perhaps the practicalities of performing this droll under cover meant that sometimes the props were limited.

indicating that if Cox were the adapter rather than the author of ‘John Swabber’ in *Actaeon and Diana*, he was adapting from fairly contemporary material. Cutbeard’s trick upon Swabber makes use of powder rather than soap suds (powder becoming more fashionable throughout the century alongside the growing demand for elaborate wigs), and the barber is cast as the philanderer, something that characterises depictions of barbers in ballads surviving from the late-seventeenth century.⁶⁴ Although the barber’s shop is associated with sexual activities in the sixteenth and early-seventeenth century, the barber figure of that period is not commonly portrayed as the adulterer. Nevertheless, the passage relates to earlier sequences, asserting its association with barbery’s well-established performative life. Cutbeard’s trick in blacking Swabber’s face is the same trick used by the barber in ‘New Trimming’; Grimme is a collier in *Damon and Pithias*, possibly providing additional theatrical substance in the scene; and the barber is a theatrical face-blackener according to Jonson in *Metamorphosed Gypsies*.⁶⁵ References to Cutbeard instructing John to wink relates to *Dutch Courtesan* among other plays, and the earlier challenge by Swabber to a duel with the barber, which never takes place, is a pastiche of the *Burning Pestle* barber parody.⁶⁶ Gerard provides the commentary in ‘John Swabber’: ‘The Barber is preparing for the combat: he has took his pole to serve him for a lance, and one of his basons for a buckler, and vows to make you [Swabber] the wind-mill, whilst he plays *Don Quixote* against you furiously’.⁶⁷ In the end, Cutbeard only enters ‘*with a Razor*’ but the offstage threat is that players are preparing to perform a scenario from a different play (and droll). Barbery sequences characterise the essence of the interregnum droll because they make ‘pretending’ their theme to cover up part playing and parody/pastiche; in doing so, they flagrantly appropriate the stage.

⁶⁴ For example see Anon, ‘The St. James’s Frolick; or, The Barbers Merry Meeting with the Poulterers Buxome Young Wife’ (1683-1703[?]) and Anon, ‘The Crafty Barber of Debtford’ (1685-88).

⁶⁵ Cf. ‘the tantara flash sea-coal’ (*Owl’s Almanac*, 2049-2050).

⁶⁶ *Wits* (1662), pp. 126-7.

⁶⁷ *Wits* (1662), p. 124.

‘go to Nick the barber, and bid him prepare himself’

Of all extant early modern plays, one of the most self-reflexive of the different kinds of representation it explores is *Burning Pestle*. With its multiple theatrical framing devices, seeming dissolve into improvisation, double effects, diverse dramatic conventions, unique demands upon the audience, layers of illusion, and hybrid generic influences, the revelry unleashed by this play has captured the scholarly imagination. As ‘knight errant’ (I.282), one of Rafe’s adventures, configured by the players of *London Merchant*, involves challenging a giant barber (Barbaroso) and rescuing from his dwelling several knights.⁶⁸ Setting up the sequence, the Host instructs Tapster, ‘go to Nick the barber, and bid him prepare himself as I told you before’ (III.213-4): a barber (Nick) in the play will take the role of barber (Barbaroso) in the knightly romance. Perhaps Nick is supposed to be the ‘regular’ barber of *London Merchant* in which practitioners and their apprentices have a distinct social order. But Ronald Miller highlights the difficulty we face in trying to place Nick within either the performing realms of *Burning Pestle*, *London Merchant* or the *Citizens*; by unravelling the logic of the Host’s interactions with Rafe (and his troupe) and the *Citizens*, Miller concludes that where the barber ‘might have come from, is far, far beyond our dizzied ken’ – the *platea* effect again.⁶⁹ Hattaway also reminds us of another, intertextual frame in which to imagine Nick: Don Quixote’s barber was called Master

⁶⁸ Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black, New York: WW Norton, 2002).

Ronald F. Miller, ‘Dramatic Form and the Dramatic Imagination in Beaumont’s *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*’, *ELR* 8:1 (1978), 67-84; Lee Bliss, “‘Plot me no Plots’”, *MLQ* 45:1 (1984), 3-21; Glenn A. Steinberg, “‘You Know the Plot / We Both Agreed On?’”, *MaRDiE* 5 (1991), 211-224; Gurr, *Shakespearean Stage*, p. 181. Bliss comments of George and Nell, ‘They remain comic in their mistaken self-assurance, but as dramatists they begin to charm us; through them we reexperience the theater’s seductive magic’ (p. 9), while Miller sees Beaumont’s dramatic worlds ‘hopelessly scrambled’ in the play in ‘its mix of literalism and mad fancy’ (pp. 74-5); Munro oversimplifies the generic substance of the play, although she refers to its ‘generic experimentation par excellence’ (*The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and Generic Experimentation’ in *Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr, Patrick Cheney and Andrew Hadfield (New York; Oxford: OUP, 2006), pp. 189-199 (p. 190)); and while Steinberg paints a somewhat arbitrary battle between *The London Merchant* and *Burning Pestle*, he lucidly describes the interplay between plot and improvisation.

⁶⁹ Miller, p. 77-8.

Nicholas (also referenced in ‘John Swabber’).⁷⁰ The player, possibly playing an actor in *London Merchant* performing within *Burning Pestle*, playing the part of a regular barber, parodying the barber of Cervantes’s story, becomes disguised as a giant barber. The character Nick does not feature in *Burning Pestle* before he is required to play the part of the aberrant barber in Rafe’s adventure. Moreover, the characters merge onomastically in speech prefixes and stage directions (Nick and Barbaroso are named simply ‘Barber’) giving a textual effect of part-doubling, and effectively making the role generic – an ironic flattening of the barber in the text given the pained exposition of his part. The barbery setting is, at once, mythical, historical, and contemporary, bizarre and unextraordinary. Barbaroso is folklorishly large (and associated with folk-tale figures such as Gargantua), but he is also historically active: he is likened to Frederick I of Germany (who was renowned for his red beard, his *Barba-rosso*). ‘On one level of reality’, explains Miller, the giant is simply ‘a barber and his victims his poxy patients’, making laughable the idea that the knights are embodiments of chivalry.⁷¹ But Barbaroso is also the archetypal, contemporary irregular practitioner, the barber-surgeon, who attempts more in his practice on the body than trimming and tooth-pulling, and whose crude activities can be demonised in the mind of the early modern imagination: he is not simply ‘medieval’, as Todd Pettigrew suggests.⁷² Indeed, Barbaroso does not conform with Paracelsus’s notion of the decent surgeon who, according to Paracelsus, ‘must not have a red beard’.⁷³ The performance of a barber and barbery in *Burning Pestle* is bound within a complex theatrical nexus and social conception.

⁷⁰ Hattaway, *Burning Pestle*, FN to III.213.

⁷¹ Miller, p. 77. Cf. ‘the “gentle souls” that Rafe rescues from Barbaroso represent venereal disease’ (Steinberg p. 219).

⁷² Todd H. J. Pettigrew, *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), p. 137.

⁷³ See J. R. R., ‘The Paracelsian Body’ in *Paracelsus*, ed. Ole Peter Grell (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 269-292 (p. 274)).

Common barber names, terms and objects are redefined as mysterious and primeval by the Host, Rafe and the Knights (matching Rafe's misinterpretation of the Inn as a castle in the previous scene). Barbaroso's dwelling is 'a lowly house / Ruggedly built' (III.230-1), 'a cave' (III.231, 392, 399, 442), a 'dismal cave' (III.255), a 'loathsome place' (III.264), a 'mansion' (III.309), a 'cell' (III.324), 'a sable cave' (III.359), 'a dreadful cave' (III.361), a 'loathsome den' (III.374), a 'sad cave' (III.433), and an 'ugly giant's snare' (III.449): anything but a barber's shop. The point of the scene is that the character of the barber setting is creative, not merely reflective – the setting cannot possibly *be* on stage all that it claims to be. Glenn Steinberg asserts, 'although the Citizens' improvisations seem at first creative and fresh, they are, upon reflection... conventional, disruptive, and troubling', while Dillon more precisely argues that 'Space, the play emphasizes, is occupied by minds as well as bodies, and the treatment of physical boundaries may call into question conceptual ones'.⁷⁴ Grantley examines the specific geographical terms of the play commenting on its sharp satire of London and its setting 'not in any remote or semi-mythical land, but in the prosaically familiar locality of Waltham Forest'.⁷⁵ But Barbaroso's indistinct location, which is potentially meant to be envisaged outside of The Company's jurisdiction, renders Rafe's confrontation of irregular practice idealised and problematic.

Costume was the more common method by which a production denoted settings: Barbaroso wears an apron, appearing 'With sleeves turned up, and him before he wears / A motley garment to preserve his clothes' (III.235-6). Although the Host's description is inflated, it seems that Nick the barber does not actually have to 'prepare himself' to become the barber. It is, after all, an odd request for an actor, having not yet been seen in a role on stage, to disguise himself as essentially the same character. But does the audience

⁷⁴ Steinberg, p. 218; Dillon, "'Is Not All the World Mile End, Mother?'" , *MaRDiE* 9 (1997), 127-148 (p. 130).

⁷⁵ Grantley, pp. 94-5.

see Nick's (mock)-transformation? The Host's reference to 'as I told you before' draws attention (similarly to Cocledemoy) to appropriated and reclassified performances. Perhaps these instructions to Nick are only to arrange props and do not require him to change his garments. The options, again, are multiple. However, each possible scenario draws attention to the processes by which a customary setting requires an imaginative response on stage in order to differentiate it theatrically.

Throughout the setting-up section, the Host's reference to barbery tools is like another inventory. The objects are those of an armoury. Barbaroso's fleam is 'a naked lance of purest steel' (III.234), his barber's pole is 'a prickant spear' (III.239), his chair is 'enchanted' (III.243), his comb is 'an engine.../ With forty teeth' with which to 'claw...courtly crown[s]' (III.244-5), his basin is 'a brazen pece of mighty bord'⁷⁶ (III.247), balls of soap are 'bullets' (III.248), and his scissors are 'an instrument / ...which...snaps...hair off' (III.249-50).⁷⁷ Instruments (including the 'pole', a 'basin' and a 'syringe' (s.d. 333, 366, 452)) are stipulated for later stage business, suggesting a material investment in the scene: script and stage are furnished. In describing the barbery objects, the Host may well direct the players to bring on props or be responding to their setting up of Barbaroso's house (and the players have an interlude of about forty lines to finish their preparations). Either the Host's inflated descriptions of barber furnishings are given whilst regular barber's gear is brought on stage, or the scene relies on a doubly hyperbolic effect whereby standard instruments and their names are made fantastical in reference and in appearance, and the players bring out distorted barbery objects.⁷⁸ The inventories from

⁷⁶ Bord] referring to thinly hammered metal. 'Bord' is unusual as it more commonly refers to wood; possibly Beaumont intends a pun on 'bord', or 'bourd', 'an idle tale, a jest, a joke', *OED*, *obs*, n.

⁷⁷ In *Fancies*, Secco declares, 'My Razer shall be my weapon, my Razer' (F1v).

⁷⁸ Spectacle was common in early modern pageantry in the city, but so were special effects on the stage. See Gordon Kipling, 'Wonderfull Spectacles' in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia UP, 1997), pp. 153-171; Gurr, *Shakespearean Stage*, pp. 180-187, who discusses the 'hell-mouth' in the 1616 text of *Faustus* (p. 185); and Karim-Cooper who underlines the period's 'pathological addiction to display' (p. 74). Jean MacIntyre and Garrett P. J. Epp merely assume that

Henslowe's Diary do not suggest the size of stage properties, yet, a question of objects' scale is pertinent.⁷⁹ In *Burning Pestle*, the Host and Barbaroso refer to 'that string on which hangs many a tooth' (III. 311, 335). In a medieval depiction of tooth extraction the practitioner has 'Slung from his shoulder...a rope of enormous teeth advertising his profession', the essence of the cartoon.⁸⁰ Perhaps the same effect applies to staged representation. After all, size already adds to the comedy of the scene because a boy actor takes the part of a giant.

The barbery space on stage is easily transposed into a wondrous setting because of the detail Beaumont can give in re-setting and distorting familiar objects. The Host provides a barber's inventory not by naming items, but, perversely, by un-naming them. The barbery items' faux-displacement as 'other objects' underlines their meta-theatricality.⁸¹ Two of the barbery props in Act III of *Burning Pestle* are used for non-visual special effects. Rafe instructs Tim, 'Knock, squire, upon the basin till it break / With the shrill strokes, or till the giant speak' (III.320-1). The resounding basin is an acoustic initiation to the sequence – discussed further in chapter four – and a barber's performing space. When Rafe challenges Barbaroso, the giant '*takes down his pole*' (s.d. III.333) with which he '*fight[s]*' (s.d. III.338)). The Host's earlier references to barbery tools as weaponry now have tangibility. The erection of a barber's pole on stage in *Burning Pestle* is unique in extant early modern plays' stage directions. But a barber's pole would not be out of place in a production of *Quiet Life*, *Fancies*, and *Knave in Grain*; we cannot tell whether this prop was a familiar sight on stage or not. Poles were commonly associated

properties simply became 'increasingly naturalistic' from the late-sixteenth century but this seems unimaginative ("Clothes Worth All the Rest" in *New History*, pp. 269-285 (p. 282)).

⁷⁹ Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).

⁸⁰ Tony Hunt, *The Medieval Surgery* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), p. 68.

⁸¹ See Andrew Sofer's comparison between Frances Teague's definition of stage properties' "dislocated function" and the Russian formalist concept of '*ostranenie* (making strange), which defines the "poetic" function of language' (*The Stage Life of Props* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003), pp. 12-13). Cf. 'with my launce in my hand to tortour thee...I shall carrie on my launce-pointe thy bones to hang at my shop windowe' (Richard Lichfield[?], *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe Gentleman* (1597), E1v).

with weapons and punishment: ‘Enter two with the Lord Saye’s head and Sir James Cromer’s upon two poles’ (2 Henry VI, s.d. IV.vii.147). When Macduff re-enters with Macbeth’s head, can it, as Macduff describes, ‘stand’ (V.ix.20) because it has been mounted on a pole, as in Holinshed? Barbaroso’s pole could be a metatheatrical prop: a weapon pole which ‘plays’ a barber’s pole that transforms into a weapon pole (a layering comparable to the construction of the barber in the scene). Basin and pole are more than a material manifestation on stage: they have auditory, kinetic and spatial effects and are hyper-theatrical. Additionally, these properties signify a performance threshold. Rafe encounters the barber at the doorway of his house and his success in defeating the giant is accentuated because his trial incorporates a rite of passage. The spatial configuration of the scene gives the impression that the released knights emerge from a disguised space: ‘In the urban setting, consulting a practitioner in private was closely associated with suspicion of venereal disease’.⁸² Barbaroso’s backroom practices include ‘cut[ting] the gristle of...nose[s]’ (III.401) of the appropriately named Sir Pockhole.⁸³ Particularly relevant here is Grantley’s observation that the play heralds a ‘more hard-headed form of urban self-consciousness in the drama’.⁸⁴

Burning Pestle was not a theatrical success in its day, but more recent productions have been praised. In 1982 Michael Bogdanov plays to his audience’s collective sense of barbering and its stereotypes.⁸⁵ Nick the barber’s disguise as Barbaroso is a donning of cultural vestments. Bogdanov’s Barbaroso (Malcolm Storry) occupied a barber’s shop that had copious amounts of shaving foam, a ‘red striped pole’, several chairs on wheels and

⁸² Margaret Pelling, ‘Public and Private Dilemmas’ in *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600-2000*, ed. Steve Sturdy (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 27-42 (p. 36); see pp. 36-38 on ‘contractual medicine’.

⁸³ The barber-surgeon’s tub, evoked in this scene (III.418, 443-4), and also in the background of *Aristippus* is never seen on stage and is not referenced in non-fictional texts begging the question whether it is an invention of fictional sources to evoke another disguised irregular working space for the barber-surgeon or whether it was a historical part of their equipment. Cf. Munro, p. 197.

⁸⁴ Grantley, p. 96.

⁸⁵ *Burning Pestle*, by Beaumont, dir. Michael Bogdanov for the RSC (Aldwych Theatre, London: 1981).

barber's assistants (clothed in black trousers, white shirt and tie).⁸⁶ The production was in modern dress and updated in all aspects. Bogdanov's barber did not have a 'copper basin' or a 'prickant spear', references to which are cut from the text; neither was there mention of the 'brazen pece of mighty bord', nor the effect of soapy 'bullets' applied to customer's cheeks which make them 'wink', nor to 'string' upon which victims' 'teeth shall hang'. Updated responses to the barber's appearance were incorporated: 'Fucking Hell' cried Wife at the appearance of the giant. Most significantly, references to the treatment of venereal diseases were cut. Knights in Bogdanov's production did not have the itch, but bad haircuts and wanted their hair 'replace[d]': the worst a barber can do today is to spoil temporarily someone's appearance (hardly an intrusive action), and it is from this reality that Bogdanov drew out the scene's humour. These adjustments and anachronisms suit a modern production that wants audiences to engage with the effect of making a familiar setting amusingly uncomfortable: the general concept was temporally transportable. For Bogdanov, however, this meant erasing the irony of the chivalric romance. The modern production has thinner grounds for parody and for representations of barber's threat. Similarly, the Globe's recent play-reading of *Herod and Antipater* saw a thinning of the barber's potential: equipped with an effeminate pink washbag, Tryphon's heterosexually-charged language and re-appearance as a ghost who threatens to anatomize was lost.⁸⁷ Bogdanov's alterations to *Burning Pestle* prove that barber semiotics are so ingrained in our culture as to be readily exploitable as artistic currency, even if this currency changes: because the play represents how we can represent barber's threat, barber props and costumes in performances of *Burning Pestle* are intrinsic to showing how theatre itself 'puts on' its false reality.

⁸⁶ See Shakespeare Centre, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, dir. Michael Bogdanov (1981), 'Production Prints' (RSC/PR/3/1/1981KNI1), 'Prompt Book' (RSC/SM/1/1981KNI), and 'Barbers Assistant Costume Design' (RSC/DE/1/1981/KNI1/31).

⁸⁷ *The Tragedy of Herod and Antipater*, by Gervase Markham and William Sampson, co-ordinated by James Wallace for 'Read Not Dead' (Globe Theatre, London: 31 July 2011).

**

The examples given here each highlight something different. Will and Jack play the cheats in *Damon and Pithias* and therefore assume barber and apprentice roles; in *Dutch Courtesan* Cocledemoy is a body-obsessed cheat and therefore redefined as a barber; the barber in ‘John Swabber’ finds his disguise embedded within his own occupation; and in *Burning Pestle*, Nick dons a theatrically and culturally fashioned disguise so that he can be identified simultaneously as familiar and other in the audience’s and characters’ imaginations. Because the staged barber brings with him a richly performative association, he is akin to staged actor characters: like Hamlet’s troupe of actors and the mechanicals in *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, through whom Shakespeare invites his audience to see how performances – however terrible – are pieced together, the dramaturgies surrounding these barber characters draw attention to double guises and processes of theatricality, and they confront audiences with the demands of the playwright and players.⁸⁸ A mezzotint print of the late-eighteenth century epitomises this argument. ‘Tragedy Burlesqued, or The Barber Turned Actor’ (1785-1790) is a pictorial droll depicting a barber’s shop in which the practitioner strikes a pose with tongs in one hand (ready to lunge), with scissors and comb strung round his apron and with a play text to which he turns for his line in the other hand. Vigorous overplaying is suggested by the upset table and jug, and frightened cat. The barber’s boy is ready with wigs for his master’s character changes and in the background there are two boxes labelled ‘Tragedy Wigs’ and ‘Comedy Wigs’ respectively. The sense of the barber’s performance is authenticated by his audience: two spectators look on from a stairwell, as if elevated in a

⁸⁸ *Wits* (1673) includes the rehearsal passages from *Midsummer Night’s Dream* (pp. 29-40).

curved theatre gallery. The candle in the background suggests lighting, although natural light pervades, typifying eighteenth-century performances.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 5: ‘Tragedy Burlesqued, or The Barber Turned Actor’ (1785-1790), British Museum, Satires 7473.

The image successfully blurs the boundaries between the inherent theatricality to be found in barbers’ shops and the theatrical potential of a scene which is set in the barber’s shop. Every figure in the scenario self-consciously plays a part, besmeared as they are in thick face paints; but whether these paints represent the transformed faces that the barber supplies or that theatre demands is not clear. We identify the wig boxes as either a collection of stage props or as part of a barber’s inventory. The barber’s stripey, blue, white and red attire colour codes barbery, but his torn yellow breeches suggest another layer of costume. The Wellcome Collection’s annotations of the image suggest that the

print is of ‘a barber playing David Garrick’, leaving us with the double effect of a barber playing an actor and an actor playing a barber.⁸⁹

‘under y^e name of Chirurgi’

In Webster’s *Devil’s Law-Case*, surgery and surgeons are disguised. Romelio inadvertently performs a successful surgical act (disguised as a physician) which the actual surgeons of the play failed to carry out. And the two surgeons of the play adopt disguises. The barbery examples showed how barber disguises resulted in the textually and theatrically vibrant exposition of the barbery context; the case is not the same in the disguise motifs which evoke a surgical context. The surgeon figure is concealed in performance in a number of ways: he can irregularly perform masked by barbery; enact an accidental procedure, missing regulation or expertise; perform as non-specialist who successfully ‘plays’, or offers to play, the surgeon without actually appropriating the tools or the look of the profession; cover-up his theatrical identity; and he is often an offstage phenomenon disguised by the theatre itself. The pattern is simple: (mis)appropriated, irregular and lewd surgery occurs in a variety of capacities on stage, whereas regular surgery is an event offstage. Surgery in the theatre forms an opposing episteme to the practice itself which is engaged in opening up the body. Managing the theatricality of surgery is comparable to managing the publicity of altering the body; like the woman who puts her make-up on in private and then shows her face, surgery is effective and closed to criticism when off-stage, but like the woman who attends to her image performatively, on-stage surgery is reconceived as the frivolous and often unwise attempts of the barber. In

⁸⁹ Wellcome Images, ‘A barber pretending to be David Garrick’ (1788), Iconographic Collection: V0019637 (ICV No. 20036).

his anatomy of English manners, Richard Whitlock isolates his criticism of those who usurp the ‘title’ of medical men with theatrical motif: they wear ‘Visards’.⁹⁰

Outside the theatre, Phillip Stubbes highlights in *Display of Corruptions* (1583) the prevalence of misappropriated surgical activities:

For every man though he know not the first principles, grounds or rudiments of his science, y^e lineaments, dimensions, or compositions of mans body...will yet notwithstanding take upon him the habite, the title, y^e name, and profession of a...surgean. This we see verified in a sort of vagarants, who run stragling...over the countries...By which kind of theft, (for this coosoning shift is no better) they rake in great somes of mony...And thus be...surgerie utterly reproched, the world deluded, and manie a good man and woman brought to their endes, before their time.⁹¹

Stubbes first refers to misappropriated activity as being an adopted ‘habite’ of the professional which ‘delude[s]’ the patient-to-be: the nonprofessional first works on a visual level as he assumes or imitates the look of the surgeon. A character walking on stage as a surgeon (as in Fletcher and Massinger’s *Sea Voyage*) was probably easily distinguishable from other characters as being a medical figure simply by his robes. The coif, a piece of headwear visible on every head in Holbein’s portrait of Henry VIII and the Barber-Surgeons, is also associated with the working surgeon; it was probably more a status symbol than a hygiene precaution. Two coifs astonishingly survive from the Barber-Surgeon’s cabin on the Mary Rose. Made respectively of good quality silk velvet and pure silk, the coifs are unique examples of Tudor headgear. Archaeologists of the Mary Rose deduce that ‘stretch and ware [*sic*] in the crown area show that [the one of silk velvet] had been worn a great deal’, confirming that at least one of them was customary attire.⁹² Stubbes terms the misappropriated surgery a ‘theft’ or a ‘coosoning’. Whereas by misappropriating barbery, characters often enact thefts, the misappropriation itself for

⁹⁰ Richard Whitlock, *Observations* (1654), p. 93.

⁹¹ Phillip Stubbes, *The Second Part of the Anatomie of Abuses Containing the Display of Corruptions* (1583), H3v-H4r.

⁹² Julie Gardiner, Michael J. Allen, and Mary Anne Alburger (eds.), *Before the Mast* (Portsmouth: Mary Rose Trust, 2005), p. 198.

surgery is characterized as serious law-breaking which had an uncomfortable reality: ‘under y^e name of *Chirurgi*’, writes William Bullein, ‘many yong men, lyve in the Saintuarie of Idlenes, forsaking their owne handy craft...to buy some grosse stuffe, with a boxe of Salve, and cases of tooles, to sette forth their slender market with all’.⁹³ These are inadequate surgeons in terms of training and in terms of the tool set from which they work. We know from the last chapter that a surgeon’s collection of tools cannot be ‘slender’. Bullein’s reference to a ‘market’ reinforces the sense that in these situations there is monetary as well as medical abuse.⁹⁴ Outside the theatre, the notion of counterfeit surgeon-playing is a social and medical anxiety.

‘Pray give me leave / To play the Surgeon’

Fletcher’s *Monsieur Thomas* is riddled with medical satire. The transgressive *tour de force* eponym in the play ridicules the common alarm calls for a surgeon on stage. He fakes a moment of high crisis by pretending that his leg is ‘broken in twenty places’:

THOMAS	O I am lam’d for ever: O my leg, ...oh, a Surgeon, A Surgeon, or I dye:
	...
LAUNCELOT	Be patient sir, be patient: let me binde it.
	...
THOMAS	Oh doe not touch it, rogue. ⁹⁵

For Launcelot, Thomas will be neither patient nor the patient.⁹⁶ While the audience knows that Thomas’s refusal to be treated by Launcelot is because he is not damaged, his quick

⁹³ William Bullein, ‘Dialogue’ in *Bulleins Bulwarke* (1579), 5v.

⁹⁴ For commentary and satire on surgery’s fiscal abuses, see Stubbes (H2r-H2v) and Thomas Lupton (*Too Good, To Be True* (1580), Riiv-Siiijv).

⁹⁵ John Fletcher, *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), H2r.

⁹⁶ On the name Lancelot/Lancelet and its association with incisions and conversions, see Patricia Parker, ‘Cutting Both Ways’ in *Alternative Shakespeares 3*, ed. Diana E. Henderson (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 95-118. Parker does not refer to *Monsieur Thomas* (‘Launcelot’ in this play does not have the alternative spelling of ‘Launcelet’), but the play parodies social – rather than religious – conversion

response – ‘do not touch it, rogue’ – also parodies the alarm caused when a non-specialist offers to assist in medical procedure: it is an instructive reaction, even within the parody. This section investigates what happens when the offer to help in a surgical context, ‘Let me...’, is taken up by a character on stage. An impression of surgical expertise on stage need not necessarily be harmful, depending on how it is constructed.

Female characters adopt surgical roles in early modern drama. This should not surprise us. Females have long been associated with healing, medical as well as magical, and, as Deborah Harkness argues, women play the universal but often under-acknowledged role of chief medical practitioner in the domestic household, a role that readily extended into the streets, churches and hospitals of the period.⁹⁷ A ballad on the plight of married women describes a husband who, ‘now and then, to his wonderfull peril, / he meetes with knocks and disgraces; / And then his poore wife his Surgeon must bee, / To cure his infirmities ready is shee; / Yet for her endeavour ingratefull is hee’.⁹⁸ The ballad’s heedless husband characterises a wider social norm. Harkness shows how limited the official medical tracts of the time are in highlighting women’s responsibilities in medicine; the male and his writing desk upheld an ‘official’ urban view of medical practice. M. A. Katritzky approaches the matter from a theatrical viewpoint by investigating the growing prevalence of female actors which she links to women’s understated medical performing arena: their presence in both performing spaces has been

with the eponym attempting to reform his wild self and become a gentleman under the eyes of his man, Launcelot.

⁹⁷ Deborah E. Harkness, ‘A View from the Streets’, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 81:1 (2008), 52-85. Cf. D. A. Evenden, ‘Gender Differences in the Licensing and Practice of Female and Male Surgeons in Early Modern England’, *Medical History* 42:2 (1998), 194-216. A. L. Wyman, ‘The Surgeoness’, *Medical History* 28:1 (1984), 22-41; Pelling, ‘Compromised by Gender’ in *The Task of Healing*, ed. Hilary Marland and Margaret Pelling (Rotterdam: Erasmus, 1996), pp. 101-133 (pp. 112-114, 119-120); Pelling, ‘Defensive Tactics’ in *Communities in Early Modern England*, ed. Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000), pp. 38-53; Pelling (with Frances White), *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2003), pp. 189-224; M. A. Katritzky, *Women, Medicine and Theatre* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), esp. pp. 135-150. William Kerwin’s third chapter in *Beyond the Body* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), pp. 62-96, joins revisionist historians in highlighting women’s ubiquitous presence in medical practices throughout the period, although his focus is on ‘wisewomen’, or ‘woman healers’ rather than the domestic pursuits of females of the household.

⁹⁸ M. P. [Martin Parker], ‘The Married-Womans Case’ (c.1625), stanza 5, lines 3-7.

marginalised but is significant, she argues. Writing on the subject ‘of women that meddle in...Surgery’ in the seventeenth century, James Primerose asserts that ‘women ought not so rashly and adventurously to intermeddle with’ treating tumours, ulcers, wounds, putrefactions and fistulas, which require much ‘art’.⁹⁹ Although women were not permitted to wear the livery of The Company, apprenticeship, marriage and patrimony secured their presence in the practice, and, as Harkness argues, this guild tolerated females’ roles more readily than the College of Physicians.¹⁰⁰ But edicts which were rarely acted upon suggest that the legal stance taken was to encourage female’s practice to be covered-up rather than abolished and punished: ‘some wise women worked incognito, behind veils and slatted screens’.¹⁰¹ The one acknowledged role that women played in surgical activities was the midwife’s duty in cutting a baby’s umbilical cord, but midwives were, too, subject to criticism and surgeons encroached upon their domain.¹⁰²

In chapter one, I examined the role of the surgeon in *Sea Voyage* and showed that despite the presence of a surgeon character, surgery is less concrete in the play due to the absence of surgical instruments and the surgeon’s deficiencies. But other characters in the play fill this gap. These characters are female, who are, because of the surgeon’s failings, readily framed as the legitimate, or at least the successful, surgical practitioners in the drama. Aminta finds her lover, Albert, in a poor state after he has fought with Lamure and Franville. The surgeon is on stage at the time, and yet Tibalt ushers Aminta into caring for Albert: ‘Help him off Lady; / And wrap him warme in your Armes, / Here’s something that’s comfortable’ (Aaaaa3r). The surgeon is himself hurt, lying ‘in the same pickle too’ (Aaaaa3r) and he has, of course, lost all his instruments. His double failing – represented by his bodily handicap and his lack of tools – leaves a void for Aminta to fill. Albert is

⁹⁹ James Primerose, *Popular Errours*, trans. Robert Wittie (1651), pp. 19-21 (p. 20).

¹⁰⁰ Young, p. 260. Harkness, pp. 56-59. Pelling, ‘Compromised by Gender’, pp. 103.

¹⁰¹ Katrintzky, p. 137.

¹⁰² See Caroline Bicks, *Midwiving Subjects in Shakespeare’s England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 42-59.

possible that Aminta is equipped with a needle for the purposes of this action?¹⁰⁶ Binding a wound is, of course, not the same as sewing it: the former usually refers to a motion of encircling and the latter of piercing. Later Clarinda observes, ‘Some soft hand / Bound up these wounds; a womans haire’ (Aaaaa4r). Although she is pricked with jealousy over Albert, Clarinda recognises some skill in the manual operation and is as a fellow surgeon admiring another’s inventiveness. Aminta’s surgical talents are deliberately under-defined but it is also the under-theatricality of this event that adds credence to her surgical performance.

Aminta is not the only female to adopt a surgical role in the play. The women of the island also treat Albert’s body which becomes a contested site of female agency: a sexual as well as surgical site. To Crocale’s timid response, ‘Nor durst we be Surgeons’ to wounded Albert, Clarinda revokes, ‘rub his temples; / Nay, that shall be my Office: how the red / Steales into his pale lips! run and fetch the simples / With which my mother heald my arme / When last I was wounded by the Bore’ (Aaaaa4r), and in doing so revokes the official response to the ‘surgeoness’. Clarinda’s surgical role is the appropriation, more specifically, of her mother’s surgical function, suggesting a genealogy of practice which points towards training. Hippolita exits on Clarinda’s commands and reappears some lines later, presumably with the ‘simples’: there is an offstage supply. The hive of female surgical activity in the play nestles between scenes in which the actual surgeon on stage is functionless and unequipped, and the females’ works and materials, and Albert’s body are visible. The ‘Surgeon’ is female in *Sea Voyage*.

A similar pattern occurs in Thomas Heywood’s *Edward IV, Part II*. After Shore is hurt in a fight (disguised as Flood), his bleeding arm requires attention: Brackenbury

¹⁰⁶ One of the sea surgeon’s items recovered from the Mary Rose was a needle (MR 80 A 1733). On the needle as a sexualised object, see Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 65-8. Lowe stipulates instruments necessary to the surgeon as ‘some...to sow wounds, and knit veins & arters as needles’ (B4r).

and Barabas-esque boasts.¹⁰⁹ Left alone with Contarino (*‘in a bed’*, according to stage directions), Romelio brandishes a weapon he has thus far concealed and stabs the patient, only to be discovered by the surgeons whom he must blackmail to keep silent. To a contemporary audience, the surgeons appear foolish in that they let a suspicious Jewish Physician attend on their patient. The First Surgeon declares, ‘There’s some trick in’t. I’ll be near you, Jew’ (III.ii.74) and yet stage directions indicate that both surgeons exit immediately after this line; they reappear too late to have prevented Romelio from stabbing Contarino.

After Romelio leaves, the surgeons find that Contarino is saved by Romelio’s violent incision.

FIRST SURGEON Ha! Come hither, note a strange accident:
 His steel has lighted in the former wound,
 And made free passage for the congealed blood.
 Observe in what abundance it delivers
 The putrefaction. (III.ii.147-151)

Lee Bliss concludes that ‘chance has made Romelio a physician instead of a murderer’.¹¹⁰ But despite his disguise as Physician, chance has made Romelio a surgeon instead of a murderer. Romelio achieves what the surgeons, believing Contarino to be too weak, have feared to try, even though the art of incision-making officially falls within their professional capacities. He has made ‘[incision] / By the orifix’: ‘His steel has lighted in the former wound’. Soarenes pertinently asks Chirurgi in *Bulwarke*, ‘Now I pray you tel me how you make an Incision?’¹¹¹ In 2 *Return from Parnassus* Ingenioso observes that the satiric healer is ‘So surgeon-like that dost with cutting heale / Where nought but lancing

¹⁰⁹ See Jonathan Gil Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), pp. 79-106, for a discussion of early moderns’ view of Jews’ interaction with poisons and remedies. Cf. James Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews* (New York: Columbia UP, 1996), pp. 89-130; Peter Berek ‘The Jew as Renaissance Man’, *RQ* 51:1 (1998), 128-162 (p. 158).

¹¹⁰ Bliss, ‘Destructive Will and Social Chaos in “The Devil’s Law-Case”’, *MLR* 72:3 (1977), 513-525, p. 518.

¹¹¹ Bullein, 13r.

can the wound awayle' (I.i.93-4).¹¹² And the Surgeon in Middleton's *Fair Quarrel* boasts to the Captain, 'And if your worship at any time stand in need of incision, if it be your fortune to light into my hands, I'll give you the best' (V.i.406-408). If Romelio had fulfilled his misappropriation of the role of Physician – 'All my study has been physic' (III.ii.46) – his attempted murder of Contarino would have been based on 'an extraction' which could have been a poison rather than something curative. Indeed, Romelio even uses the term 'incision' (III.ii.98) when contemplating how small the hole will be – made by his weapon – that will Contarino's 'soul let forth' (III.ii.97). Romelio refers to 'an absolute cure' (III.ii.108), echoing the language of, while simultaneously debunking, the surgeons' conclusion that Contarino was 'past all cure' (III.ii.22).

We are reminded of Stubbes:

There is to great libertie permitted herein. For now a daies everie man tagge, and ragge, of what insufficiencie soever, is suffered to exercise the misterie of phisick, and surgerie...But if they chance at any time to doe any good...it is by meere chance, and not by any knowledge of theirs.¹¹³

John Cotta relates a story of a man suffering from a head-ache and giddiness who '*By chance...*met with an angry Surgeon, who being by him in some words provoked...with a staffe unto the utmost peril of life soundly brake his head...[but] thereby delivered him of his diseases' [italics mine].¹¹⁴ This surgeon's action is driven by frustration rather than professionalism and surgical success is characterised by randomness. Romelio is Webster's satiric embodiment of what Stubbes and Cotta describe: 'meere chance' dictates events and Contarino's successful recovery. Moreover, in the same way that, as Jonathan Gil Harris argues, the Jew is used 'both as a whipping-boy *and* as a weapon with which to scourge Christian behavior', so here Romelio as a Jewish surgeon is both demonised and

¹¹² Anon, *2 Return from Parnassus* [*The Scourge of Simony*] in *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. J. B. Leishman (London: Nicholson & Watson, 1949).

¹¹³ Stubbes, H3r.

¹¹⁴ John Cotta, *A Short Discoverie* (1612), G1v-G2r.

characterised as the superior medical man.¹¹⁵ Later, Romelio boasts to Leonora that he killed Contarino ‘in the absence of his surgeon’ (III.iii.215), marking his territory through the satire (i.e. he does not need surgical training to kill Romelio). Winnifred’s reference to ‘Romelio’s practice / At the surgeons’ (III.iii.343-44) spatially locates Romelio and his activities in a surgical context. By comparison, much surgical activity that occurs within early modern drama is an offstage event, discussed below. And if not an offstage event, then, like Shylock’s knife, is rarely performed on stage despite the proximity of a surgical action. In this example from *Law-Case*, however, Webster challenges convention: two surgeons work together on stage, something more akin to the barber and apprentice double acts that are common in the plays I have examined, and the audience is witness to a violent, but successful surgical feat. By making surgery accidental in the scene, that is by disguising the surgeon as something else (a physician, but also a murderer) – Harris characterises Romelio’s performance as ‘the imitation of an imitation’ – Webster stages a rare moment of a successful, if unorthodox, surgical performance.¹¹⁶

‘If there live ere a surgeon that dare say / He could doe better’

Richard Sugg examines the early-seventeenth century ‘crowd pleaser’ *Hoffman*, probably written in the wake of *Hamlet*’s (and also *Jew of Malta*’s and *Spanish Tragedy*’s) success, by Henry Chettle in 1602.¹¹⁷ Sugg suggests that Chettle not only capitalized on *Hamlet*, but also on the appetites of the Tyburn crowds and their fascination for the ‘new’ anatomy of the period – the culture of dissection, which Jonathan Sawday explores.¹¹⁸ The play has a high body count, but is also highly contemplative of the deaths it catalogues, these

¹¹⁵ Harris, *Foreign Bodies*, p. 81.

¹¹⁶ Harris, *Foreign Bodies*, p. 99.

¹¹⁷ Henry Chettle, *The Tragedy of Hoffman* (1631). For an account of the play’s manuscript and printed history, see Gurr, *Opposites*, pp. 115-9.

¹¹⁸ Richard Sugg, *Murder After Death* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press; Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2007), pp. 19-31; Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned* (London: Routledge, 1996).

‘image[s] of bare death, joyne[d] side, to side’ (C2v). Characters’ gruesome somatic language and the drama’s visual attention to (dead) bodies ensure that innards, bones and flesh are all on display. Sugg questions what the ubiquitous term ‘anatomy’ actually refers to in the period, asserting that it was, in fact, ‘up for grabs’.¹¹⁹ The early moderns’ unsteady relationship to anatomy is material for Chettle, but he contextualises his most striking body scenes within a frame of barber-surgery which shapes the imagery and traces the afterlife of a Tyburn body.

Within six lines of the play’s opening, Clois Hoffman, ‘*strikes ope a curtaine where appeares a body*’ (s.d. B1r). This body is the remains of his father who was killed publicly by the Duke of Luningberg for turning pirate. Hoffman, we are told, ‘stole downe his fathers Anotamy [*sic*]¹²⁰ from the gallowes’ (B2v). For a Tyburn crowd, this might suggest (despite the anachronism) that Hoffman had anticipated a Barber-Surgeon representative in claiming the body; it is commonly known that each year The Company was permitted four corpses to dissect. Originally, according to The Company’s Minutes in 1577, the bodies were ‘alwaies fetched from the place of execucon by the M[aster] and Stewards’, high profile surgical figures.¹²¹ Certainly Hoffman suggests that his acquisition of the body was a feat, which corresponds to contemporary depictions of the tussles in the crowds after executions.¹²² Sweetball in *Quiet Life* hopes that he will successfully ‘beg’ Young Franklin’s ‘body...of the sheriffs’ after he has been hanged ‘for at the next lecture [he is] likely to be the master of [his] anatomy’ (III.ii.27-29).

¹¹⁹ Sugg, p. 13. Cf. Susan Zimmerman, *The Early Modern Corpse and Shakespeare’s Theatre* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005), who explores the paradoxical nature of the ‘dynamic’ cadaver in early modern England and discusses the unsteady boundaries between life and death which are examined with reference to the problematic vitality and sexuality of the staged corpse (pp. 1-23; 130-33).

¹²⁰ Gurr discusses the poor state of the play’s manuscript and remarks on the ‘sloppy presswork’ in the one surviving quarto (*Opposites*, p. 116).

¹²¹ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 25v.

¹²² For descriptions of contemporary transportation of cadavers by the Company Beadle, see Young, p. 301; Sawday, pp. 60-61.

The son determines to assassinate all of those persons who were associated with his father's execution, and for the most part he is assisted by his collaborator, Lorrique. Their first victim is the Duke of Luningberg's son, Otho, whom they murder in the same way that Hoffman senior was killed: by placing a burning crown on his head.¹²³ When Hoffman returns on stage a scene later with Otho's body, it is not as we saw it last – Hoffman has appropriated a role:

HOFFMAN If there live ere a surgeon that dare say
 He could doe better: ile play Mercury,
 And like fond Marsias flea¹²⁴ the Quacksalver,
 There were a sort of filthy Mountebankes,
 Expert in nothing but in idle words,
 Made a daies worke, with their incision knives
 On my opprest poore father: silly man,
 Thrusting there dastard fingers in his flesh (C2v)

Sugg asserts that 'anatomists become, in Chettle's mind, a peculiar composite of Surgeons and Physicians'. This is true to some extent, but in the passage 'surgeon' resonates, and 'physician' does not. 'Mountebanke' is a generic, abusive name for a medical man and the passage's reference to Mercury, renowned for his volatility in mythology, symbolises general indiscretion. Sugg defines Hoffmann's description of men 'Expert in nothing but in idle words' as a description of physicians only, whose 'Latinate and classical medicine', he says, 'was deficient because it was theoretically top heavy, and had little or no foundation in empirical anatomy'.¹²⁵ But, as I discuss in the fifth chapter of this thesis, surgeons were also satirised for their inaccessible language: in Middleton's *Fair Quarrel*, the Colonel's Sister is 'ne'er the better for [the surgeon's] answer' (IV.ii.13) because he will not speak in 'plain terms' (IV.ii.25). Moreover, Sugg's assumption that Chettle is

¹²³ Otho is also referred to as Charles on occasion in the printed text. Gurr explains these variant names (*Opposites*, pp. 117-118). Although Charles is the original name given to this character (which is preferred in the play's metre) I will refer to the character as Otho because the printed 1631 stage directions and prefixes refer to him as such in the passage in which I am most interested.

¹²⁴ Flea] flay.

¹²⁵ Sugg, p. 27.

satirising physicians' distance from 'empirical anatomy' seems a leap in this passage: the division between surgeons and physicians in terms of their anatomical understanding was not clear cut, and indeed public anatomies were often undertaken in Barber-Surgeon's Hall by physicians such as John Caius, who studied anatomy in Padua for several years and shared lodgings with Andreas Vesalius. Caius eventually had a seventeen-year tenure (1546-1563) with The Company as their lecturer while holding presidency of the College of Physicians from 1555-1560 and in 1562, 1563, and 1571.¹²⁶ While Sugg is right to point out the 'peculiar' composite effect of the passage, the combination of 'surgeon', 'flea [flay]', 'incision knives' and the line, 'Thrusting their dastard fingers in his flesh' seem to point more evidently to one side of the medical profession: the surgical side. Offstage, Hoffman has appropriated a surgeon's role in anatomisation and, ultimately, skeleton-making.

We know what Hoffman has appropriated, but what does the theatre appropriate? Sugg asks what the objects were on stage that represented the remains of Hoffman senior and Otho, and he raises important questions about theatrical convention in the period: did authentic skeletons appear on stage and from where would they have been sourced? Could the skeletons have been replicas? Would an audience be satisfied with a pictorial representation of a skeleton? 'Was the Renaissance *State*...necessarily set against such displays?' Sugg's discussion of Chettle's visceral language which supplements the 'dry bones' on stage (the language pertains to the 'nerves and arteries of an écorché') suggests that stage skeletons (or bones) could be 'effectively reclothed' to give an effect of soggy, disintegrating bodies, something that would appeal to the contemporary audience, he

¹²⁶ See Ian Burn, 'John Caius' in *Notable Barber-Surgeons*, ed. Ian Burn (London: Farrand Press in association with The Worshipful Company of Barbers, 2008), pp. 59-80 (esp. pp. 68-70)). Indeed Caius seems to have a presence in *Hoffman* which is reminiscent of the 'by [or be] gar[ring]' Dr Caius of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*: Lorrique disguises himself 'like a French Doctor' in *Hoffman* and also adopts the tag expression, 'By gar', when employed by Sarlois to distribute poisons to Jerome and Stilt and trick them into thinking they will poison Prince Otho (Hoffman) (F4r-v). Cf. Anon, *The Wisdome of Doctor Dodypoll* (1600) in which the eponym is also characterised by his 'by garr[ing]'.

argues.¹²⁷ Although stage directions do not stipulate that Otho's remains are brought out or are disclosed on stage so that they are visible during Hoffman's soliloquy, it makes little sense for the dramaturgy to be otherwise: Hoffman directly addresses his father whose body has dangled before an audience before and earlier he has referred to the remains of Otho and Hoffman senior 'side, to side' (C2v). The soliloquy represents the practitioner and his work. If skeletons in the early modern productions of *Hoffman* were sourced from The Company, then the theatrical and extra-theatrical reputation of the item work against each other in performance: the skeleton is the product of misappropriated surgical activity offstage (but in the theatre), but it is also (possibly) the product of authentic surgery offstage, outside the theatre.

It seems unlikely that the skeleton was a prop simulacrum. Skeletons might be made by The Company following an anatomisation, although they required careful authorisation. In 1566, the 'Rules' note that 'all private Anathomies shall reverently from henceforth be buried as publick Anatomies as for the worshippe of the said mystery. Any skelliton to be made onelye excepted uppon payne of forfeiture of ten poundes'.¹²⁸ Not abiding by the licensing rules incurs a hefty forfeit – a skeleton, we may assume, was not made recreationally. In 1606, the ordinance clause reads that all anatomies from The Company's Hall should be given a Christian burial 'except such as at any tyme hereafter it shall please the M[aster] or Governors to make or lycence to be made any skelliton of'.¹²⁹ Perhaps there could have been some kind of circulation from which theatre owners could benefit – in its basest manifestation, a black market. Dekker gives a Shelley-like description of a Usurer in *A Knight's Conjuring*: it seemed as if 'the Barber Surgions had beg'd the body of a man at a Sessions, to make an Anatomie, and that Anatomy this

¹²⁷ Sugg, p. 26.

¹²⁸ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 3r.

¹²⁹ Barbers' Archive, *Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 32v. In 1737, Young notes that Mr Babbidge (a surgeon and company member) was paid for 'making a skeleton of Malden's Bones' (p. 418). Malden was a criminal hung at Tyburn.

wretched creature begged of them to make him a body'.¹³⁰ The Barber-Surgeons appear open to negotiation. A skeleton is a fragile object and is unlikely to make any impact if, having been weathered down after hanging on the gallows or crumpled-up in a grave, it is purloined for the stage. If the stage object were sourced illegally (i.e. without the permission of an authority in The Company), the implication of Hoffman's activities produces a double dramaturgical effect of misappropriation. Either way, a skeleton reified the body precluded from Christian burial which exerted unease on stage and off.¹³¹

In Christopher Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* one body (the Admiral's) is hauled up on a tree for the space of eight lines only (xi:491-9) suggesting that the effect of raised remains in the theatre was worth the effort.¹³² The two bodies side by side in *Hoffman* are visually arresting. They remind us of cabinets of curiosities and, more particularly, they are like the display items in Barber-Surgeon's Hall which have a particular mix of art and instruction. In 1568, The Company's Court Minutes take note of a new display arrangement (during a general refurbishment in which seating was added to the Hall for the 'good prospect' of the anatomisations) for a skeleton: 'there shalbe [in the Hall] a case of weynscot made w[i]th paynters work...as seemly as maye be don For the skellyton to stand in'.¹³³ In Barber-Surgeon's Hall, a skeleton was not only made, but also prepared for display: a double skill set is required. In 1581, an artist (unknown) paints John Banister giving an anatomy lecture in Barber-Surgeon's Hall, which might depict the painted structure around the mounted skeleton (below). The artist has shown the skeleton's right hand holding onto the striped frame (The Company colours were black and white) which adds dynamism and mimics the coherence of the surgeons' hands in the image. The

¹³⁰ Dekker, *A Knights Conjuring Done in Earnest* (1607), H2r.

¹³¹ See Florike Egmond's argument on the transcendence of honour over death in her re-evaluation of the place of pain in punishment in 'Execution, Dissection, Pain and Infamy' in *Bodily Extremities*, ed. Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 92-127.

¹³² Marlowe, *The Massacre at Paris* in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1981), vol 1.

¹³³ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 24v.

skeleton's huge smile also suggests the playful arrangement of the display which depicts it as seeming self-conscious of its role in the demonstration and confident of its status as 'skeleton'.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 6: Anon, *The Anatomical Table of John Banister* (1581). Andrea Carlino speculates that it was executed by Nicholas Hilliard in c.1580 in *Books of the Body*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. 59.

In later years, several skeletons (not just human ones) evidently adorned The Company's Hall. An inventory taken c.1710 lists the objects in the Theatre:

Four fixt skeletons. One of them in a Frame. One new skelton pendent from the Center of the Roofe. Two humane skins upon figures of wood. One figure of Anatomy in a Frame...A skeleton of an Ostrich the gift of Mr Hobbs. A skeleton in a frame the gift of Mr Knowles.¹³⁴

¹³⁴ Barbers' Archive, *Inventories Book* (1711-1745): F/11. The first entry from which this quotation is taken is not dated, the second entry being dated 1711. Because this is Book 5 of Inventories taken (the four before this one being missing), the first entry in F/11 is probably from 1710.

When The Company discusses the need for a new dissection theatre in the mid-seventeenth century, it notes on 11th February 1636 the ‘want of a publique Theater for Anatomycall exercises & Sceletons and a lesser roome for private dissections [sic]’: skeletons were central focal points in the new Anatomy Theatre.¹³⁵ But they were not only used to adorn this space. In 1728, The Company’s inventory records ‘A skeleton frame with black curtains around it, a pulley & cord, a skeleton’ in the Long Gallery.¹³⁶ In this display, a skeleton has a stage space, marked by a curtain. While the activities of anatomists and surgeons usually occurred in private, ‘lesser room[s]’, the product of this work (the skeleton) reaches a platform. Paradoxically, however, this product, in its stripped down form, disguises the intricate work which would have constituted its manufacture: and it is more external and superficial than investigative in its representation. In the picture showing John Banister’s lecture, the skeleton is a point of reference, but the body under dissection in the centre of the image is the active, industrious site of the surgeon’s skill around which instruments are strewn. This brings us back to Sugg’s speculation about how skeletal the *Hoffman* skeletons appeared: could one of these bodily remains be skeletal and the other more like an *écorché*, mirroring the anatomy lecture scene?

In the middle of his soliloquy, Hoffman announces, ‘So shut our stage up, there is one act done’ (C2v). He is referring to the ending of the first part of the play: Gurr explains that ‘the 1631 text despite being composed at a time and for a playhouse using continuous staging was printed showing five act breaks...this must indicate later revision to fit it for an indoor play’.¹³⁷ But the line also implies something else. The space in which Hoffman performs or has displayed his gross surgical activities (the ‘act’) is briefly disclosed in the soliloquy. ‘Act’ has double resonance. It is possible that shutting up ‘this’ stage is also Hoffman’s reference to a discovery space on set or a frame akin to the one in the Barber-

¹³⁵ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 204.

¹³⁶ Young, p. 486.

¹³⁷ Gurr, *Opposites*, p. 116.

Surgeons' Long Gallery. The appropriation of the skeleton in *Hoffman* is underlined by the fact that it is displayed on the wrong stage: the commercial one, rather than in the surgical theatre.

In the scene immediately after Hoffman's surgery soliloquy Jerome, the would-be heir of Luningberg, and Stilt discuss barbers and barbering objects. If we understand Hoffman's soliloquy as surgery-orientated Chettle's semantic leap to barbering is not surprising. Jerome announces that for almost ten years he has been writing a new poem 'in prayse of picke-toothes' (C3v). Pick teeth, or tooth picks, could function as a sign of frivolity and artificial gallantry. John Earle's description of the Gallant (one who was 'born and shapt for his cloathes') mocks this figure's use of his 'Pick tooth...in his discourse'.¹³⁸ Tooth picks are especially linked with barbering: 'The crocodile...hath a worm breeds i'th' teeth of't...a little bird...is barber-surgeon to this crocodile; flies into the jaws of't; picks out the worm; and brings present remedy' (Webster, *White Devil*, IV.ii.220-225).¹³⁹ Stilt remarks, 'the barbers will buy those poems abominably' and Jerome believes that he can patent the item so 'that no man shall sell tooth pickes without [Stilt's] seale' (C3v). Chettle ridicules the supposed speciality of the humble and ubiquitous tooth pick in order to mock barbers who over-emphasised the value of this common household equipment. Like young Secco in *Fancies*, Jerome also has his 'beard brush and mirror' and a 'casting bottle', and he instructs Stilt (now a barber figure) to 'sprinkle' him after he has 'set [his] countenance right to the mirror' (C3v). It is likely that there is equipment on stage for this scene. In describing the frivolities of a barber's shop, Stubbes writes, 'You shall have...your fragrant waters for your face, wherewith you shall

¹³⁸ John Earle, *Micro-cosmographie* (1628), see Character 19.

¹³⁹ A tooth pick is a prop to Tryphon in *Herod and Antipater* and in George Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) barber Rowke declares, 'Heare's the toothpick', and leaves Rosko to pick Grimball's teeth on stage (Fiiiv-Fiiir).

bee all to besprinkled'.¹⁴⁰ In a staged reading of *Hoffman* (Oxford, 2010) the director arranged for Jerome to prance around on a hobby horse, picking up on the scene's early mention of 'stumpes', 'runn[ing] a tilt', 'hobby' and 'tilthorse'.¹⁴¹ Hobbyhorses archetypically represented a whore.¹⁴² Jerome's ridiculous status on stage makes a mockery of chivalry and princely refinement (a veritable 'mirror of magistrates'). However, that it is possible for Jerome to be astride a hobbyhorse in the scene potentially adds to the barbery dynamic: the barber's chair stylistically realised as the proverbial prostitute. Upon the Cuddy Banks the Clown's mention of the 'Hobby-horse' in *Witch of Edmonton*, Poldavis, the barber's boy, is first referenced.¹⁴³

Although the surgery context of Hoffman's role may not at first seem clear cut, the context drawn by Chettle after the soliloquy marks characteristic barber-surgery territory: Hoffman dabbles in surgery, Stilt and Jerome play with barbery. Usually this context is evoked by first establishing a barbery context and then introducing surgery. But here Chettle allows us to sense disreputable surgical activity which is then given a bathetic twist by descending into daft barbery. The play is full of disguise stratagems, some very dubious, argues Gurr.¹⁴⁴ Characters take on the habits of a hermit, Grecians, the dead (Hoffman as Otho), and a French Doctor. But, as I have shown, characters do not have to be disguised to appropriate a role or a particular context in which they can manoeuvre on stage. The difference in this instance between a character's appropriation of a surgical role and characters' appropriation of a barbery context is simple: to play a surgeon is a diabolical act; to play with barbery is harmless foolery.

¹⁴⁰ Stubbes, H1r.

¹⁴¹ *Hoffman*, by Henry Chettle, dir. Elisabeth Dutton for 'Hoffman or, Hamlet Without the Prince' (Magdalen College, Oxford: 25 September 2010).

¹⁴² See Williams, II, pp. 669-670.

¹⁴³ Dekker, Ford, W. Rowley, *The Witch of Edmonton* (1658), E1v.

¹⁴⁴ Gurr, *Opposites*, see pp. 116-119.

‘How far *off* dwells the house-surgeon’?

In *Quiet Life* a performing space for barbering disguises performance space for surgery thereby cushioning the effect of a diabolical act. Sweetball refers to the ‘more private chamber’ (II.iii.16) in his shop into which he ushers the unknowing Ralph to be dismembered.¹⁴⁵ The implied privacy is as much to do with keeping clandestine the surgical activities of an unlicensed practitioner who could be fined for abusive, unregulated practice, as it was to do with maintaining privacy for the patient. The dialogue in II.ii between Sweetball (within the chamber) and his apprentice boy (still on stage in, as it were, the main part of the shop) generates the sense of divided work space and acoustically divulges space beyond the stage. Alternately, within and without could be realised simultaneously on stage; an implicit ‘entering in’, therefore, results when Sweetball takes Ralph into his private chamber, comparable to the unusual stage direction ‘*Enter out*’, explored by Michela Calore.¹⁴⁶ In modern editions the shift from the shop to the ‘private’ space merits a shift in scene (from II.iii to II.iv), making explicit the re-entry of characters (‘*Enter Sweetball the barber, Ralph, Boy*’ (s.d. II.iv.0)) after Young Franklin’s exit from the shop. The comic factor of the scene is that Ralph does not understand the implication of being taken into the barber’s private room – something which the audience would have understood and the playwrights’ dramaturgy exploits. Because Ralph does not recognise the shift in performance space, the disguised surgery space temporarily fools him. Like Grimme the collier, he is complicit in the initial performance.

Ultimately, Ralph is able to reject the offer of surgery because he is not endangered. But on many occasions in early modern drama a character does require the

¹⁴⁵ Cf. John Day, *The Knave in Graine* (1640), IIv-IIIr, for a similar sequence involving a ‘withdrawing Room’ (I2v).

¹⁴⁶ Michela Calore, ‘*Enter Out*’, *MaRDIE* 13 (2001), 117-135 (esp. pp. 128-130). Cf. Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare’s Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), pp. 164-168 on the “‘inside” scene’.

attention of a skilled surgeon: an injury often marks a crisis point in a play and at these moments a surgeon is usually called for, fetched, or is the figure to whom the injured party is directed. But rarely in these instances does a surgeon materialise. In *Michaelmas Term*, for example, when Easy of Essex is struck in the shoulder upon being arrested by Shortyard, the boy finds his excuse to exit: ‘Alas, a surgeon!’, he cries, ‘He’s hurt i’t’h’shoulder’ (III.iii.31). The injury evidently does not require surgical attention (Easy’s ‘Ha?’ (III.iii.30) upon being arrested does not correspond to a badly injured man’s cries (see chapter four)), but the conventional placing of the surgeon offstage gives the boy his (dramaturgical) excuse to flee. The offstage surgeon is his cover. An exception to the unrealised summoning of a surgeon is in *Massacre at Paris*. At the end of the play, a surgeon enters, following Navarre’s instruction (‘Go call a surgeon hither straight’ (xxii:1179)), to ‘search [Henry’s] wound’ (xxii:1191). (While the surgeon searches, an English Agent enters to whom Henry assigns a duty, shifting the scene’s focus away from the bodily examination.) Determining that Henry’s injury, made by a poisoned knife, means he ‘cannot live’ (xxii:1223), the surgeon does not attempt to restore the King. In this way he does not have to perform and nothing in the text suggests that he should administer a salve or place a tent on the wound, and the King dies twenty lines later. Usually, however, surgeons perform (i.e. do something more than ‘search’) in ‘extrascenic space’ (envisioned by William Gruber): early modern theatre ‘off-stages’ them.¹⁴⁷

In Kyd’s *Tragedy of Solymán and Perseda*, Basilisco is injured in the shin. He instructs his page, Piston, ‘run, bid the surgion bring his incision. / Yet stay ile ride along with thee my selfe’.¹⁴⁸ The initial idea that the surgeon can be physically summoned onto the stage is superseded by Basilisco’s altered determination. When he returns to the stage some scenes later, Basilisco’s injury is not mentioned and the audience assumes his

¹⁴⁷ William Gruber, *Offstage Space, Narrative, and the Theatre of the Imagination* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

¹⁴⁸ Thomas Kyd, *The Tragedye of Solymán and Perseda* (1592), B4v.

treatment by the surgeon is successful. In V.i. *Othello*, Iago's trick in setting Roderigo against Cassio results in Cassio being mangled (his leg presumed 'cut in two' (V.i.71)). Cassio is transported to 'the general's surgeon' (V.ii.99) and he reappears, treated, some 300 lines later to witness Othello's and Iago's downfall, shedding light on Iago's gross actions. Edward IV instructs Howard, in part two of Heywood's history plays, to convey Lord Scales (who is seen '*struck down*' on stage '*with great-shot from the [French] town*' (s.d. 4:46)) 'to [his] pavilion, / And let [his] surgeons use all diligence' (4:64-5), commenting, 'They can devise for safeguard of his life' (4:66). Edward's specificity of the 'pavilion' encourages the audiences to visualise an inner space beyond the stage. Howard reports to the King forty lines later that 'now [Scales's] wound is dressed; / And by the opinion of the surgeons, / It's thought he shall not perish by this hurt' (4:106-8). Scales never re-enters but by evoking the competence of Edward's surgeons Heywood signals some strength in Edward's battlefield presence despite, as Richard Rowland terms it, the 'slightly embarrassing non-event' of the King's French expedition.¹⁴⁹ Expert, licensed surgical works take place in an equivalent space of time to the dialogue onstage but 'offstage' appropriates the activities.

The appalling crimes of Walter Calverley (who attacked his wife, maid, and three children, killing two of the young ones) in 1605 provoked a number of literary responses at the beginning of the seventeenth century, two plays included: *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* by George Wilkins and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* entered in the Stationers' Register and printed on the first quarto's title page as written by Shakespeare, but now believed to be the work of Middleton.¹⁵⁰ Both plays refer to a surgeon who attends injured parties, but this reference is absent from the narration of events in the first publication about the crime,

¹⁴⁹ Richard Rowland, 'Introduction' to *King Edward IV*, p. 51.

¹⁵⁰ See Introduction by Stanley Wells in *Collected Works*, pp. 452-454.

an anonymous pamphlet of 1605 on which the plays are thought to have been based.¹⁵¹ In *Enforced Marriage*, the butler enters ‘bleeding’, explaining that he is on his way ‘to the Surgeons to seeke salve’ after his volatile, jealous-riddled master has attacked him.¹⁵² He exits reminding his company and the audience that he will ‘first to the surgeons’ (F1r); in his next entry (from F2r), the butler appears to show no sign of his recent hurt – he lurks in trees – and it seems the surgeon has done his bit. In *Yorkshire Tragedy*, a short work, some 700 lines long, but with – as Wells argues – ‘a fuller history of production than many Jacobean dramas’, the events represented have a closer affiliation with the pamphlet (in *Enforced Marriage* only a suicide accounts for a death in the action).¹⁵³ On stage in *Yorkshire Tragedy*, the master of the College finds the wife in a critical condition following her husband’s violent assault upon his family and household: the stage is a bloodbath. The Master exclaims, ‘Surgeons, surgeons! She recovers life’ (5:61) and some lines later a servant enters appealing to her, ‘Please you leave this most accursèd place. / A surgeon waits within’ (5:85-86). The servant invites the audience to conceptualise space beyond the stage, but still within the theatre and the household; his reference to ‘*this* most accursèd place’ [italics mine] highlights movement between designated spatial realms. Catherine Richardson suggestively writes, ‘the house in *Yorkshire Tragedy* exists entirely “on the stage”. “Within” in this play means “off-stage”, rather than further into the more private domestic spaces of the house’, which highlights the nearness of the surgeon’s activities and a different politics of secret action in the household.¹⁵⁴ Freevill’s question in *Dutch Courtesan* is apt: just ‘How far *off* dwells the house-surgeon...?’ [italics mine] (II.ii.69) If the domestic house space in *Yorkshire Tragedy* is – following Richardson’s

¹⁵¹ Anon, *Two Most Unnaturall and Bloodie Murthers* (1605). Catherine Richardson argues that *Yorkshire Tragedy* ‘lacks any kind of particularity’ to the historical events of the case (*Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Early Modern England* (Manchester; New York: Manchester UP, 2006), p. 180).

¹⁵² George Wilkins, *The Miserie of Inforst Mariage* (1607), see E4r-v. The butler paraphrases his attack by saying his master ‘sent me to the Surgeons’ (E4v).

¹⁵³ Wells, p. 454.

¹⁵⁴ Richardson, p. 185.

argument – not conventionally private because in the play rumour has been ‘swift and effective’ and the playwright has flouted the conventional dramaturgies of closet drama and domestic tragedies, then the unseen scene with the surgeon is also distinctive, offering discretion which has hitherto been lacking.¹⁵⁵ After the husband has been apprehended and his wife is brought before him she, as the Gentleman observes, is ‘of herself’ (8:5), illustrating the success of the unseen surgeon’s practices *within*. Both plays’ off-stage surgeons’ (unseen) works are necessary to characters’ re-appearances, contrary to Richardson’s general observation of *Yorkshire Tragedy* that its ‘offstage activity...[seldom] bears upon what the audience see.’¹⁵⁶ Gurr and Ichikawa emphasize that ‘speeches around entrances and exits are more often than not highly theatrical, and that they therefore rarely lend themselves to a literal-minded or “realistic” interpretation’.¹⁵⁷ However, in the examples discussed in this section, when a character determines he will go to the surgeon’s the audience *is* invited to be literal-minded. Whereas in the pamphlet, *Two Bloody Murthers*, the reader does not need the detail of the surgeon for the purposes of narration, in theatre, where bodies are seen before and after events, the surgeon’s dramaturgical presence makes sense of bodies’ transitions.

Unlike many other instances of offstage action, discussed by Gruber – who begins his study of ‘offstage space’ by examining responses to the unstaged reunion of Perdita with Leontes in *Winter’s Tale* – the activities involving surgeons are not represented in hindsight through diegesis on stage.¹⁵⁸ Gruber is interested in ‘retrospective narrative’ as a ‘secondary kind of representation, a verbal construction that is commonly taken to be feeble and second-rate in comparison with the immediate perception of direct scenic

¹⁵⁵ Richardson, pp. 183-5.

¹⁵⁶ Richardson, p. 186.

¹⁵⁷ Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging in Shakespeare’s Theatres* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), p. 88.

¹⁵⁸ See Gruber, pp. 1-2.

enactment’ which he re-evaluates.¹⁵⁹ But representing surgeons offstage is a matter of elided narrative as well as spectacle. In this way it corresponds to Celia Daileader’s reading of off-stage rape and sex sequences: although on the early modern stage sexual intercourse presents itself ‘largely through verbal testimony’, it is ‘designed, in some cases, to titillate more than narrate, and, in some cases, narrat[es] little at all’. Daileader rightly asserts that ‘technically nothing “happens” offstage’, but nevertheless theorizes the gap through which absence comes to signify.¹⁶⁰ Her focus on offstage activities which occur ‘out there or “within”, in the space between “*exeunt*” and “*enter*”’ feeds feminist analysis of the voyeur and Derridean theory of absence that cradles infinitely diverse signifying powers, allowing her to conclude that ‘the world offstage looms largest’.¹⁶¹

As well as being interested in offstage surgical activities, I am also implicitly interested in offstage ‘characters’ – the figures that are unnamed in *dramatis personae* but whose actions (so we witness) impact other characters and are part of the stylistic fabric. Palfrey argues, in an aptly titled chapter for this discussion, ‘Where is a character?’, that ‘the basic substance of any character before us is always being augmented or adjusted by memories or expectations of neighbouring scenes’. But for these offstage surgeons, their ‘characters’ are a matter only of ‘absent stimuli’.¹⁶² Perhaps the successful referencing to these surgeons lies in, what Daileader also cites as, the ‘*proximity*’ of their offstage performances, which are always an encounter.¹⁶³ In his discussion of divine absences, Gary Taylor clarifies that he has been describing ‘moments of *proximity to presence*’ arguing that ‘presence itself is multi-dimensional [which] can be approached along multiple

¹⁵⁹ Gruber, p. 6.

¹⁶⁰ Celia R. Daileader, *Eroticism on the Renaissance Stage* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), p. 23 (see pp. 23-50).

¹⁶¹ Daileader, pp. 24, 50. For a discussion on what may or may not be seen on stage, see Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), pp. 130-55, where he examines differences in and absence of stage directions and draws on the imagist’s receptiveness to combined visual and verbal motifs.

¹⁶² Palfrey, pp. 195, 191.

¹⁶³ Daileader, p. 25.

axes'.¹⁶⁴ Usually surgical activities are forecast on stage and, therefore, in the audience's imagination take place concurrent to continuing stage action, endowing activities with an impression of duration and the character with a sense of purpose: representation relies on a 'consciousness of absence'.¹⁶⁵ Licensed surgeons seem close by and 'in action', and on stage we witness their handiwork as an 'afterwards': characters never re-appear with botch-jobs (only in *Edward IV*, Blage and Jane reproach the surgeon who took no action) having been treated at the surgeon's offstage.

The convention of the offstage surgeon whose activities repair injured characters equips playwrights with opportunities to play with and break convention. After his fight with Moll in Middleton and Dekker's *Roaring Girl*, Laxton laments, 'I would the coach were here now to carry me to the surgeon's' (5:130-131). His aside enables him to bemoan that the playwrights have not included instruction for a trip offstage to a surgeon where his wounds could be fixed – he feels his character is neglected. Lady Ager's three frantic calls for a surgeon to tend on her Captain in IV.iii *Fair Quarrel* are premature: Captain Ager has come off, as he explains, 'untouched' (IV.iii.28) in his fight. Middleton's scene withdraws from representing the surgeon as soon as he is evoked and Lady Ager's cries seem ridiculous: someone offstage is, perversely, not needed. In *A Woman is a Weather-Cock*, Nathaniel Field repeatedly delays the injured Captain's transport to a surgeon. Both the method of carrying – the Captain is on Strange's back – and the fact that we never know if they get to the surgeon makes comic the surgeon as a destination point, referred to three times, in the play.¹⁶⁶ At the end of *Twelfth Night*, Andrew appeals, 'For the love of God a surgeon – send one presently to Sir Toby' (V.i.170-171). When Toby appears some lines later, he asks for 'Dick Surgeon' (V.i.195). Andrew and Toby exit together with

¹⁶⁴ Gary Taylor, 'Divine []sences' in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 54: Shakespeare and Religions*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 13-30 (p. 30).

¹⁶⁵ Taylor, 'Divine []sences', p. 29.

¹⁶⁶ Nathaniel Field, *A Woman is a Weather-Cock* (1612), see G4r and I1r-I2v.

Andrew's resolution that they will be 'dressed together' (V.i.202); their final logical narrative (being treated at the surgeon's) is not only offstage, it is also out of the range of the play and, because Dick Surgeon is apparently unavailable (according to Feste's quip about his drunkenness), begs questions about the surgeon's authority and identity. In the last two plays, surgery and the surgeon dangle beyond the bounds of the play as well as the stage. The surgeon's expected performance is mocked in advance and his work is unfinished.

Various factors might contribute to this convention of off-staging surgeons. It could be a matter of decency in representation, equivalent to offstage sexual encounters: physically representing surgeons felt, quite literally, too close to the bone. The period's general unease about surgical works is captured by Flamineo in *White Devil* who sees the surgeon's house as a place where the body disintegrates: 'Would I had rotted in some surgeon's house at Venice' (III.iii.8). In mockery, Flamineo, who does not trust surgery, says he will send a surgeon to Marcello (whom he has just stabbed) (see V.ii.10-17) viewing the surgeon as a figure of certain death. Perhaps surgeons' absence from the stage is the upshot, as I discussed in the previous chapter, of playwrights' lack of technical knowledge of surgical activities – an ambiguity which translated to the stage. Surgeons themselves, who numbered few in London, were often assisting on the battlefield or at sea. Historically and socially, therefore, they were quite literally off set, unlike the female medical aid which was domestic and (at least in theory) omnipresent. Ultimately, by not fashioning the licensed, legal, skilful surgical practitioner into material representation, theatre covers up its own dangers of misrepresentation which are availed offstage. As Jean Howard argues in relation to women and racialized and working subjects (drawing on arguments by Dymphna Callaghan), 'it is not always a good thing to be thrust to the representational foreground as if being in the center of the picture means that one's

interests are adequately advanced'.¹⁶⁷ The theatrical world of counterfeiting inevitably implicates staging a performance (of a surgical nature): it can automatically seem deceptive and undermine any sense of the upright practitioner. Hence surgery's irregular conception under the banner of barbery. Tanya Pollard argues that medicine on stage is often a code for charlatanism and parody: sham medicine and medicine's ability to conceal poisons produces a two-way threat.¹⁶⁸ She reads early modernity's theatrical interest in medical dangers as a response also to plays themselves, which have been widely likened to drugs: 'dangerous medicines offer a compelling vocabulary for examining the workings of seductive deceptions, with a special emphasis on the deception of the theater'.¹⁶⁹ This correlates with Taylor's observation that 'God is truth, the theatre is falsehood, falsehood cannot represent truth, the theatre therefore cannot represent God...It is no violation of decorum for a false god to be represented by lies and disguises'.¹⁷⁰ Surgeons are, of course, not deities, but the early modern theatre treats them with similar caution which perhaps derives from a corresponding belief system that 'out there' someone can supply our needs, however unfathomable the cure.

**

This chapter has explored how the process of making theatre itself is characterised by the different demands of barbery and surgery on the early modern stage. Barbery scenarios are self-reflexive of theatrical production, and they externalise theatre's content and stylistic features. Disguise scenarios suggest how to put on a play, made manifest in the disguise

¹⁶⁷ Howard, 'Early Modern Work and the Work of Representation' in *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 243-250 (p. 247).

¹⁶⁸ See Tanya Pollard, "'No Faith in Physic": Masquerades of Medicine Onstage and Off" in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, ed. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 29-41 (pp. 34-5).

¹⁶⁹ Pollard, p. 38.

¹⁷⁰ Taylor, 'Divine []sences', p. 13.

playing of the interregnum which leant on these sequences. If, as Taylor argues, ‘meta-theatricality relieves the audience of any burden of belief’, theatre represents the barber for theatrical playing’s sake.¹⁷¹ ‘Making shew of a cure’ (‘New Trimming’, stanza 7, line 3) occurs most readily in the barber’s shop. In contrast, the early modern stage represented the surgeon by asking audiences to envisage him in an alternative performing space. Often this space remained entirely disclosed offstage. Today we refer to the surgical *theatre*, surgeons *performing* operations and the past *entertainment* of *staging public* anatomisations, readily using the language of theatre in association with surgery and assuming, perhaps swayed by the ubiquity of hospital dramas and their racy, technical dialogues, that the profession translates seamlessly to the stage or to the popular imagination. But although the language of architecture provided correspondences between surgery and theatre, their performing spaces were demonstrably separate: whereas barbers draw our attention to theatrical content, surgeons invite us to think about its structure.¹⁷² But both representations of barbers and surgeons on the early modern stage invite audiences to engage with the transformative effects of theatre.

¹⁷¹ Taylor, ‘Divine []sences’, p. 15.

¹⁷² See Christian Billing, ‘Modelling the Anatomy Theatre and the Indoor Hall Theatre: Dissection on the Stages of Early Modern London’, *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13: Special Issue (2004), 1-17.

Chapter 3

Semiotics of Barber-Surgery in Shakespeare: The Chair and the Basin

On 27th November 1599, Robert Thompson, a practising, foreign surgeon, was hauled before The Company's officials and warned for 'useinge surgerie *without a signe*' [italics mine].¹ The masters and governors determined that Thompson should be examined, but it was not until 17th July 1600 that he was 'approved', following assessment, 'admitted & sworne'.² I am interested in The Company officials' concern that surgery could be carried out without the formal proof that the practitioner was trained and regular: the 'signe' of the practitioner's practice was important. This sign was something people could see, comparable to a degree certificate – a physical indication of the authorized surgeon. By investigating the physical signs on stage of barber and surgery (in the examples explored, this abstractly equates to barber-surgery) in situations when the practice is not explicitly marked in the text, I suggest how the practices are conceived of as irregular by the very nature of the sign-system they evoke. These signs on stage are not obscure; rather, as I demonstrate, they are very readable but, as in Thompson's case, they are missing the label which confirms regularity.

In my explorations of offstage surgeons I drew from Gary Taylor's analysis of absent gods. His understanding of the theatrical signs of Catholic or episcopal ceremony is that although they might metonymically be associated with religious ritual (as signifiers), they are, primarily, 'a theatrical and experiential effect rather than allegory'.³ Here I

¹ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 41.

² *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 65.

³ Taylor, 'Divine []sences' in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 54*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 13-30 (pp. 17-18, 27-28).

slightly depart from Taylor insisting, instead, that while theatrical and experiential effect is the upshot of certain signifiers, their efficacy often relies on the signifiers' extra-theatrical 'cultural biographies', the term used by Igor Kopytoff, from which they are (consciously or unconsciously) conceived, and, importantly, condensed, and on which they lean, making stage business at once familiar and extra-ordinary.⁴ Andrew Sofer provides a lucid overview of the critical theory of stage signs from the mid-1900s illustrating the complexity of theatre's 'sign language' as multiply abstracted and representative.⁵ Behind the moment's 'theatrical effect', stage signs are in correspondence with both the play's design (and, as Taylor argues, the moment of enactment) and with dimensions beyond the stage. Looking primarily at textual signs in Shakespeare, Alessandro Serpieri underlines the importance of orienting 'structures towards a semiotic co-operation with non-verbal systems, those specific to the theatrical performance *for which* the drama is written: 'all the semiotic systems work', he writes, 'in a given culture'.⁶ The 'given culture' here is the theatre itself. Taylor's view is that 'between 1576 and 1642 the London theatres institutionalized "the first larger-scale, capitalized, routinized commodification of affect in human history" [Taylor quoting himself]. That commodified affect is "portable", carried out of the theatre into the world, but also carried into the theatre from the world'.⁷ I rely on the premise that audiences like to recognise signs in the theatre and playwrights are opportunistic in this regard, as Jean Howard summarises: 'In the theatre, the audience

⁴ Igor Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things' in *The Social Life of Things*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: CUP, 1986), pp. 64-91. Cf. David K. Anderson's exploration of the presentation of persecutory violence in *King Lear* that 'reflects perhaps the most significant crisis of conscience of the English Reformation' and latches onto the idea that 'theological concepts gave writers "a repository of rhetorical triggers"' ('The Tragedy of Good Friday', *ELH* 78:2 (2011), 259-286 (pp. 260-2)).

⁵ Andrew Sofer, *The Stage Life of Props* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003), pp. 6-11.

⁶ Alessandro Serpieri, 'Reading the Signs', trans. Keir Elam, in *Alternative Shakespeare*, ed. John Drakakis, 2nd edn. (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 121-146 (pp. 124, 123).

⁷ Taylor, 'Divine []sences', p. 22.

responds, not just to the syntax or images of dramatic speech, but to all the sights, sounds, and rhythms of a three-dimensional stage event'.⁸ This chapter draws on these theorists' sense of the compactness of stage signs and unravels their make-up with regard to the semiotics of barber-surgery. The analyses made here have ramifications for the way in which a modern director might conceive of the scenes as well as help to revivify early modern perceptions; they also highlight a Shakespearean model hitherto unregistered by critics.

In the opening chapters of this thesis I explored passages when the context of barbering or surgery was unambiguous. In this chapter I examine scenarios in which the playwright does not name the practitioners but nevertheless employs the language and objects of the occupations, endowing scenes and the plays at large with another, intergraded layer of meaning. Shakespeare does not include a barber or a surgeon in any of his *dramatis personae*, but these figures are named several times throughout his canon. Significantly, he refers to them in a manner consistent with official onomastics of the period that reflects division of practice, never making direct reference to the 'barber-surgeon'. Whenever Shakespeare references a barber, he always contextualises it by mention of beards, hair, or teeth; with regard to surgeons, he only once (with Dick Surgeon in *Twelfth Night*) makes his reference to the profession satirically, and avoids representing the professional as irregular or ineffectual. Bottom 'must to the barber's' (IV.i.23) in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* finding himself 'marvellous hairy about the face' (IV.i.24-5). Claudio remarks about economic-efficient work in the barber's trade when he envisages the 'old ornament of [Benedick's] cheek' as having 'already stuffed tennis balls' (*Much Ado About Nothing*, III.ii.42-3). Hamlet threatens that the First Player's speech 'shall to th'

⁸ Jean E. Howard, 'Figures and Grounds', *SEL* 20:2 (1980), 185-199 (p. 186).

barber's with [Polonius's] beard' (Folio (1623), II.ii.495). Falstaff remarks on Hal's lack of a beard saying that 'a barber shall never earn sixpence out of [his chin]' (2 *Henry IV*, I.ii.25). In *Measure for Measure*, analogy of the corrupt systems in authority is made in barbery terms: the Duke explains that Viennese statutes have been 'As much in mock as mark' as 'the forfeits in a barber's shop (V.i.319, 318).⁹ Portia suggests that Shylock charitably 'Have by some Surgeon... To stop his [Antonio's] wounds, lest he do bleed to death' (IV.i.254-5). Her rhetorical bluff exposes Shylock as the untrained dissector (or vivisectionist) whose failure even to summon a surgeon is substance for further criticism against the Jew in *Merchant of Venice*.¹⁰ On the imagined battlefield in *Henry V*, Williams describes soldiers with 'legs and arms...chopped off...crying for a surgeon' (IV.i.134-37): offstage in an imaginary narrative, the surgeon is doubly out of sight. In *Othello*, characters know to call on a surgeon to attend stabbed Cassio, Duncan sends his bleeding Captain to surgeons in *Macbeth*, First Servingman says 'I'll to the surgeon's' (III.i.149) after civil dissent breaks out in *1 Henry VI*, and Mercutio acknowledges he needs a surgeon for his 'scratch' (*Romeo and Juliet*, III.i.93). Referenced barbers and surgeons in Shakespeare's canon are separate.

Shakespeare's works are distinct from his contemporaries in this respect. Dekker, Marston, Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, Rowley and Middleton, by comparison, either name or play on the naming of the barber-surgeon, or portray barbery practice as irregular and necessarily understood as barber-surgery. Transparent barber-surgeon controversies fit a particular genre: the city comedy for which Shakespeare does not write. However, a

⁹ 'Forfeits', here, denote the teeth hanging in the barber's shop window. Laws/teeth are equally a source of amusement as a source of warning. Cf. William Andrews, *At the Sign of the Barbers' Pole* (Cottingham: 1904), pp. 14-6.

¹⁰ Cf. Todd H. J. Pettigrew *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 125-6.

consciousness of irregular barber-surgery practice is not absent in Shakespeare's works. He gives impressions of dangerous, conjoined practice and audacious, untrained practitioners without naming professions. My discussion falls into two case studies. In *King Lear* and *Titus Andronicus* scenes pull together barbering and surgery objects, language and activities to communicate hazard in the form of irregular barber-surgery at instances of trauma in the drama. John Staines's comment, on the subject of revenge, that *King Lear* 'Push[es] parody to its limits', is appropriate to both plays.¹¹ The linchpin of each case study is a prop, respectively a chair and a basin which, in the contexts I investigate, are objects steeped in cultural symbolism. Today's equivalents might be the dentist's chair (with all the usual cultural terror associated with that) and a blood transfusion bag. Because Shakespeare is not drawing on barber-surgery contexts within comic genres, the basin and chair are aligned with a list of statement props we associate with Shakespeare's tragedies: Desdemona's handkerchief and her curtained bed, Macbeth's dagger, the Apothecary's vial, Hamlet's skull, and Lear's crown of weeds, for example. In Sasha Roberts's examination of the bed in Shakespearean tragedy she refers to this prop's 'rich source of image-making' which derives from audiences' sensitivity to specific objects' complicity in, marking of, or manipulation for characters' downfall.¹² The prop itself 'must give us pause'. This is different from the clutter-effect of material goods in city comedies, particularly in a play like Middleton and Dekker's *Roaring Girl* which stages 'three shops open in a rank: the first a pothecary's shop, the next a feather shop, the third a sempster's shop' (s.d. III.0). William West draws on definitions that describe comedy as the 'display

¹¹ John D. Staines, 'Radical Pity' in *Staging Pain*, ed. James Robert Allard and Mathew R. Martin (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 75-92 (p. 85).

¹² Sasha Roberts, "'Let Me the Curtains Draw'" in *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 153-174 (p. 153).

of every aspect of existence, in terms that recall those used of encyclopaedic texts – distance from risk, compression, viscosity'.¹³ Moreover, the commercial, commodity-rich world of such comedies (*Bartholomew Fair*, *Anything for a Quiet Life*, *Shoemakers' Holiday*) places more under scrutiny properties' economic than emotional value, or at least the joke is that items' personal value is undermined by their marketplace one.¹⁴

By removing barbering from the comic context with which it is usually associated (with its prop-rich setting), Shakespeare makes sinister that which other playwrights habitually make humorous. The barber-surgery contexts discussed rely on a single, anomalous subject (as patient/client/victim) and on this subject's restriction, on the sway of a master figure and his/her assistants, on notions of procedure and operation, on some kind of interference with the body (eyes and throats in these examples), and on a specific prop that enables the operation. Central to the performances I investigate is visceral rawness. By not naming the context, but by relying on semiotics, Shakespeare makes alarmingly murky yet highly recognisable the system of abuse he stages.

Gloucester's Blinding in *King Lear*

Beards and hair removal, a chair, physical restraint, practitioners and apprentice figures, and double enucleation confront the audience of III.vii, *King Lear* in the space of 106/97 lines (quarto (1608) / Folio (1623)).¹⁵ The dramaturgy of III.vii intensifies Gloucester's isolation on stage and amplifies the horror of the scene. Gloucester is victim of ruthless

¹³ William N. West, *Theatres and Encyclopedias in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), p. 46.

¹⁴ See Natasha Korda, *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), p. 10; Kathleen E. McLuskie, 'The Shopping Complex' in *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare*, ed. Edward Pechter (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996), pp. 86-101.

¹⁵ Quotations from the play are from a conflated text (unless otherwise indicated), but I will highlight any significant departures between quartos and Folio: *King Lear*, ed. R. A. Foakes (London: Thomas Learning, 1997).

characters, but also of dangerously compounded and unchecked barbery and surgery procedures, the literal and symbolic implications of which conflate on stage. Unlike a reading of sacrificial violence which David Anderson has recently advocated, this section examines the ritual effects, to which Anderson is drawn, of III.vii – and their interaction with the play at large – as perverted urban processes, shifting the context from the sphere of martyrdom. Torture is evoked through Edmund's vile trick, a parody of the scenes explored in the previous chapter when the prankster sets up a hoax under the cover of barbery. The scene's savagery is notorious and, as R. A. Foakes points out, was cut from most Victorian productions or was carried out offstage contributing to the argument of my previous chapter that surgical events are not routinely stomachable as visible activities.¹⁶

III.vii *King Lear* and much of the substance of the subplot was influenced by the narration in Book 2, Chapter 10 of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590) when the once Prince of Paphlagonia explains how his bastard son, Plexirhus, blinded him before usurping the kingdom.¹⁷ Shakespeare, never a playwright who would blithely follow a single (so-called) 'source', not only stages the narrated event, but gives it a context visible to early moderns: something that, because of its induced intimacy and underlying familiarity to audiences, could rub against the common bone.¹⁸

The main events of III.vii begin with hair-plucking and degenerate to eye-plucking. References to 'pluck', either in accord with eyes or beards, occur three times in the scene (lines 5, 36, 56), while modern editions commonly include the stage direction '[Regan

¹⁶ Foakes (ed.), *King Lear*, p. 61.

¹⁷ Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (1590), from 142r. The *King Lear* subplot, of course, was not developed in *The True Chronicle History of King Leir, and his Three Daughters* (1605).

¹⁸ See Jonathan Bate's argument about Shakespeare's sheer receptiveness and peculiarity with regard to his handling of sources, and his innate sense of what works on stage which dismisses the need for persistently authorized motivation in favour of the theatrical event (*The Genius of Shakespeare* (London: Picador, 1997), pp. 133-153).

plucks his beard]' (s.d. III.vii.34), which is taken from Samuel Johnson. Practitioners are at work: Regan, the barber figure, pulls at Gloucester's beard, and Cornwall, the diabolical surgeon (a dangerous oculist), amputates healthy organs. Such ordering suggests that the scene transmutes from an implied barbery context to a surgical one. However, a number of points show that barbery and surgery contexts double up in production: Regan and Cornwall are collusory, the chair is a location for both barber and surgeon subjects, and the scene's focus on Gloucester's eyes draw together the barbery and surgery threads. This simultaneity of signs is III.vii's theatrical strength, but also its complexity, and demands detailed investigation.

III.vii's early dynamics, interfaces and conversations have repercussions in the ensuing action.¹⁹ The scene begins without Gloucester, although he is not entirely absent: he is discussed by characters on stage, and named twice when Cornwall commands servants to find him (III.vii.3, III.vii.23). Gloucester is firmly the subject matter in the scene, the candidate for its operation. Cornwall and Regan establish a work space in which they will interrogate and perform horrific acts. They allude to hanging and plucking and, most ominously, to exploits that are unnamed: Cornwall's 'Leave him to my displeasure' (III.vii.6) is threateningly ambiguous. Goneril plants the idea, 'Pluck out his eyes' (III.vii.5) in the beginning of the scene, so at the very least this option is aired. Cornwall takes up the theme of repressed sight, warning, 'the revenges [they] are bound to take...are not fit for [Edmund's] beholding' (III.vii.7-9). Gloucester enters as a stranger to the space (like characters in the plays I discussed in the last chapter who do not understand the context in which they are placed) which has been configured as an abusive arena in his

¹⁹ For an account of the quarto and Folio options in performing III.vii, see Thomas L. Berger, 'The (Play) Text's the Thing' in *Teaching Shakespeare Through Performance*, ed. Milla Cozart Riggio (New York: MLA, 1999), pp. 196-219.

absence. Moreover, Cornwall's repeated orders anticipate the scene's thorny interactions between masters and assistants, or practitioners and apprentices: the scene dramatises a battle of instructions.²⁰ If instructions are followed, servants 'Bind fast [Gloucester's] corky arms' (III.vii.29) and depictions of binding in the scene shift: Cornwall's metaphoric reference to actions they are 'bound to take' (echoed in 'we are bound to the like' (III.vii.10)), transposes to the physical reality of an inhibited body. III.vii's verbal and visual signs closely interact.

Customers often found themselves restrained in a barber's shop if they needed a tooth pulled. III.vii is not without reference to dangerous teeth that would be better extracted: Regan's 'boarish fangs' (III.vii.57). More generally, early moderns were familiar with scenarios in which a sense of threat is engendered by a barber who restrains his subject. One of George Peele's stories in *Merrie Conceited Jests* (1627) relates Peele's punishment by a Gentleman he tried to dupe: the Gentleman's men 'binde *George* hand and foot in a Chayre', where, against his will, a barber shaves him. Peele acknowledges how familiar this image of chastisement in a barbery setting is to him and his reader: 'a folly it was for [Peele] to aske what they meant by it', referring both to his understanding of the action and of the reason for it.²¹ In *Fancies Chaste and Noble* John Ford parodies the theme of a barber's authority in a shop and customers' restriction. The barber Secco means to punish Spadone for insinuating that his new wife has cuckolded him with Nitido. In the chair, Spadone gradually feels himself becoming trapped: 'set me at liberty as soone as thou canst', he demands.²²

²⁰ Cf. Richard Strier's reading of the servants' revolt in *King Lear* for a political account of the 'lower orders' in *Resistant Structures* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 189-199.

²¹ George Peele, *Merrie Conceited Jests* (1627), C3r-C3v.

²² John Ford, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (1638), K1r.

Gloucester's restrained position on stage also suggests a surgical context. To modern audiences who are familiar with images of sedated patients, physical restraint appears distinctly non-medical; but to a contemporary audience, tying down a subject, even 'hard hard' (III.vii.32), as Regan instructs, was a course of practical action which controlled a candidate for operation. There is no anaesthetic here.²³ Early modern medical tracts explain procedures. François Tolet illustrates his methodology in lithotomy which shows the necessary preparations of a surgeon and his assistants to ensure that a patient could not lash out. Of the position in which a patient finds himself restrained (for one of the most unpleasant and dangerous operations of the period), Tolet concludes: 'this posture is somewhat terrible to the Patient'.²⁴ Surgical processes were simpler if patients were tied into or supported by a piece of furniture. Tolet explains that ideally a patient 'is set upon the Chair' for an operation.²⁵ John Evelyn refers to a 'high Chaire' into which surgeons 'bound' patients' 'armes & thighs' for stone removal.²⁶ For resetting fractured bones, Florentine Horatius Morus parenthetically notes, 'the patient being set in a chaire'.²⁷ In the inventories taken of several surgeons of the later seventeenth century, furniture listed for the practitioners' workspace regularly includes a chair.²⁸

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

²³ On late medieval surgeons' attempts to alleviate pain and the common practice of restraining patients, see Esther Cohen, *The Modulated Scream* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 108-111.

²⁴ François Tolet, *A Treatise of Lithotomy*, trans. A. Lovell (1683), G5v.

²⁵ Tolet, G4r.

²⁶ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Guy De la Bédaryère (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995), p. 71.

²⁷ Horatius Morus, p. 28.

²⁸ See Richard Thorowgood, Southwark (1671), PROB 4/7382; Richard Gunning, Dorking (1677), PROB 4/6693.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 7: Woodcut, a man restrained in a chair for lithotomy, François Tolet, *A Treatise of Lithotomy* (1683), p. 70.

– This image has been removed for reasons of copyright –

Figure 8: Woodcut, ‘putting a Shoulder into Joynt’, Ambroise Paré, *The Workes* (1634), p. 609.

Chairs were essential equipment not just for lithotomy and fractures but also for any surgical work on or near eyes. Ambroise Paré, instructs that a candidate for cataract

removal 'shall be placed in a strait chaire'.²⁹ Dutch surgeon Paul Barbette similarly stipulates, 'set the Patient in a Chair' for cataract treatment.³⁰ Jacques Guillemieu directs, 'For the better perfecting of this woorke [on a weeping eye], let the diseased partie be set...in a chaire'.³¹ Guillemieu also suggests a slightly different positioning of surgeon and patient for tumour removal near the eye: 'The patient shall bee so placed, that he may laye his heade uppon the Chirurgians knees sitting in a chayre'.³² The horrific episode in III.vii, where eyes are the target, occurs in a chair. No stage direction specifies a chair, but unless lines are cut, the scene does not make sense without one. Cornwall demands, 'To this chair bind [Gloucester]' (III.vii.34) (the demonstrative pronoun indicates the physical reality of the chair) and later instructs, 'Fellows, hold the chair' (III.vii.66). The chair is vital. Like any individual, Gloucester (as victim-patient) needs to be stabilized so that the practitioner (Regan pulling hairs and Cornwall plucking eyes) can perform. In this way, Alan Dessen's reading of the dichotomy between fictional and theatrical signs is clarifying.³³ Editors, including Foakes, frequently note that Gloucester's 'I am tied to the stake' (III.vii.53) evokes bearbaiting scenes.³⁴ The stake is a fictional 'extra'; the chair (and therefore its accompanying context) is theatrical.

Sofer discusses the Prague School of Thought which underlines the self-consciousness of any object on stage, explaining, 'Simply by being placed on stage, a chair acquires an invisible set of quotation marks and becomes the sign "chair"...Any stage chair is thus doubly abstracted from a real chair: first, as representative of the class of

²⁹ Ambroise Paré, *The Workes*, trans. Th[omas] Johnson (1634), p. 653.

³⁰ Paul Barbette, *Thesaurus Chirurgiae*, trans. out of *Low-Dutch* into *English*, 3 vols (1687), I, p. 63.

³¹ Jacques Guillemieu, *A Worthy Treatise of the Eyes*, trans. into English (1587?), p. 22.

³² Guillemieu, p. 149.

³³ Alan C. Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), pp. 59-63.

³⁴ Cf. Andreas Höfele, *Stage, Stake, and Scaffold* (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 208-210.

chairs' (here, the type belonging to a barber or surgeon) 'and second, as a sign of the material chair's abstract connotations', as a place which denotes rest, confinement, sleep, power etc (here symbolising restriction).³⁵ In *Arcadia* the old man explains how Plexirhus 'threw [him] out of [his] seat, and put out [his] eies'.³⁶ Shakespeare inverts the image, making the metonymic 'seat' of the Prince of Paphlagonia a physical object: not a throne but a site of powerlessness. The chair in *King Lear* does not have to be physically differentiated from other chairs for its representativeness to be apparent, although this is possible. It is, however, certainly distinct from a bench.³⁷ Foakes is dismissive of props in *King Lear*, skipping over the chair as a 'commonplace' property and failing to register that theatre commonly makes unconventional 'common' objects.³⁸ The very commonness of the prop (a wardrobe staple) underlines the effect which I am exploring by which ordinary, familiar objects (or contexts) are endowed with nightmarish qualities by just a little tweaking. On stage the chair is never necessarily a humble or standardised piece of background furniture. In *Devil's Charter*, an extraordinary chair, referred to as a 'curious snare...never yet devis'd', is used by Lucretia on her husband.³⁹ Ronald McKerrow views the 'authorship of [Lucretia's] murder of Gismond' as the 'invention of the author of the play' and not from other sources, which fits with this chapter's interest in the theatrical

³⁵ Sofer, p. 7. Cf. The Wellcome Collection's *Medicine Man* (183, Euston Road, London) which includes a set of three chairs: a Chinese torture chair, a birthing chair and an adjustable dentist's chair. Their impact as a set is evident, and yet each chair retains its discreteness as each represents the situation (or predicament) of a single person. The display text notes that 'One of the recurring themes of the history of medicine is the gradual adaptation of existing objects into specialised medical tools'.

³⁶ Sidney, *Arcadia*, 144r.

³⁷ Andrew Gurr distinguishes 'chairs' from 'Benches and stools' (*The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), pp. 191-2).

³⁸ Foakes (ed.), *King Lear*, p. 5. Cf. Neil Carson, *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 53.

³⁹ Barnabe Barnes, *The Devils Charter* (1607), C1v.

possibility for the chair.⁴⁰ Restrained in this chair, which has the capacity to ‘graspe [a subject’s] armes’ (C1v) – ultimately, Lucretia has to ‘*unbindeth*’ (s.d. C3r) her victim – Gismond is forced to sign a paper which clears his wife’s name and then Lucretia stabs him to death. Although the chair has a stage history its specific role in a performance of *King Lear*, as in other plays, is particular.

In production, this chair is either brought on or is already present in the discovery-space. Andrew Gurr explains that ‘The relative frequency with which properties were discovered for display rather than brought on is hard to tell, because the stage directions are ambiguous’; he adds that chairs and tables ‘were revealed in the discovery-space...but were equally often carried on’.⁴¹ In *Devil’s Charter*, Lucretia enters ‘*bringing in a chaire, which she planteth upon the Stage*’ (s.d. C1r) and, at the end of the scene, ‘*con[v]aieth away the chaire*’ (s.d. C3r). If, on the other hand, the actors make use of a discovery space at this moment in *King Lear*, then Cornwall’s actions would replicate a practitioners’ relocation to a ‘more private chamber’ (II.iii.16) such as we find in the subplot in *Quiet Life*: rough surgical practice is conducted in an obscure workspace. ‘Shakespeare’s open platform stage has no technical means to distinguish between vast outdoor spaces and crammed interiors, but that does not mean the play is not able to suggest this crucial opposition’, argues Andreas Höfele (although he somewhat contradicts his reading of Gloucester’s punishment, which, he underlines, is an indoor incident), ‘profit[ing] from the raw savagery of baiting’, which is an open event.⁴² If the chair is disclosed, it makes sense

⁴⁰ See ‘Introduction’ in Barnabe Barnes, *The Devil’s Charter*, ed. Ronald Brunless McKerrow (London: David Nutt; Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1904), VIII.

⁴¹ Gurr, *Shakespearean Stage*, p. 191.

⁴² Höfele, pp. 204, 208.

of Cornwall's elusive comments in the scene's opening which suggest he has a course of action in mind and equipment set up: the chair is in readiness.

In Edward Bond's *Lear* (1971), Lear's (rather than Warrington's) eyes are removed. The end of II.vi *Lear* is a modern narrative of III.vii *King Lear*.⁴³ Lear is in 'a strait-jacket', he is 'seated on a chair', and 'His legs are strapped to the chair legs'. The central prop for Bond as it was for Shakespeare is a single chair. Fourth Prisoner (the coordinator of the operation) 'produces a tool', explaining, 'Understand, this isn't an instrument of torture but a scientific device...Note how the eye passes into the lower chamber and is received into a soothing solution of formaldehyde crystals'. Bond extracts from *King Lear* and makes explicit a clinical, instrument-based process of eye-extraction. Audiences' horror at this eye removal is not based on loathing of torture but on disgust at the eerie sense of discipline in a disturbingly unchecked scientific procedure. In the prompt book of Barry Kyle's 1982-3 RSC production of *Lear*, the instrument used to extract Lear's eyes is termed a 'syringe'.⁴⁴ Moreover, while the chair is referred to in the 'Props Setting List' as 'torture chair', Kyle evidently did not want the chair to appear a primitive object, but instead as a sanitized and specialist piece of furniture. Stage hands are instructed to clean the chair before performances.⁴⁵ The audience of Kyle's production responded squeamishly to the effects and in over 100 performances at least 25 people fainted at the moment of the eye extraction. On Wednesday 11th May 1983 on its 51st performance, the Stage Manager notes, 'A young man fainted during the eye extraction scene, which caused a hiatus...He came round rather noisily, and did not return after the

⁴³ Quotations are taken from Edward Bond, *Lear* (London: Methuen, 1983).

⁴⁴ Shakespeare Centre, *Lear*, dir. Barry Kyle (1982), *The First Prompt Book*, RSC/SM/1/1982/LEA1.

⁴⁵ Shakespeare Centre, 'Props Setting List', *Production Records*, RSC/SM/2/1982/73.

interval'.⁴⁶ In *Lear* and *King Lear*, the surgical procedure is an appropriated act, appalling to audiences because of misplaced medical activity. The Stage Manager's parenthetical detail in another report following a *Lear* performance is revealing: 'Two gentlemen fainted – one at the end of Act 1 scene 4, and the second, (...the doctor who had attended the first) at the end of the blinding scene' (Thursday 19th May 1983 on its 54th performance).

Several stage directions in early modern drama mention a chair which authorizes a medical context. Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson note that 'the portable *chair* carried by the arms or on poles is the most widely used signal that a figure is sick/wounded/dying', creating a sub-category of 'chair': 'sick' chair.⁴⁷ (*Lear*'s entry in a sick chair in IV.vii (Folio only) is discussed later in this section.) Benivemus calls for 'A chaire' for Strozza who has an arrow in his side in George Chapman's *Gentleman Usher*; Strozza worries that the Doctor will perform on him a live anatomization in this chair.⁴⁸ In IV.iii of Philip Massinger's *Emperor of the East* 'Paulinus [is] brought in a chaire' with 'Chirurgian'. This surgeon has already practised his 'art' on Paulinus 'to stoppe / The violent course of [his] fit'.⁴⁹ Maimed Cassio, re-enters 'in a chair' (*Othello*, s.d. V.ii.279). Earlier in *Othello*, when Cassio is first injured, Iago calls four times for a/the 'chair' (V.i.82, 96, 97) which will transport Cassio to 'the general's surgeon' (V.i.99).⁵⁰ Wife enters in Middleton's *A Yorkshire Tragedy* 'brought in a chair' (s.d. 8:4) having been attended to

⁴⁶ See Shakespeare Centre, *Stage Manager's Report*, RSC/SM/2/1982/72. Cf. Staines on audiences' reactions to this scene (pp. 75-80).

⁴⁷ Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), p. 46. Cf. Dessen, 'Sick Chairs and Sick Thrones' in *Recovering*, pp. 109-126. In his catalogue of household stuff in the unpublished part of his *Armory*, Randle Holme lists different types of chairs, including a kind 'called Twigges chaires...These are principally used by sick and infirm people, and such women as have bine lately brought to bed; from whence they are generally termed, Growneing chaires, or Child-bed chaires' ('The Manuscript of the Third Book of *The Academy of Armory*' in *Academy of Armory*, ed. I. H. Jeaynes, Vol II (London: Roxburghe Club, 1905), p. 14).

⁴⁸ George Chapman, *The Gentleman Usher* (1606), F1r.

⁴⁹ Philip Massinger, *The Emperour of the East* (1632), 11r.

⁵⁰ Editor E. A. J. Honigsmann retains Johnson's s.d., '[A chair is brought in.]' (s.d. V.i.97).

by a surgeon. In a Cambridge entertainment, *Aristippus*, Aristippus is treated by Medico.⁵¹ Medico instructs Simplicius, ‘bring [Aristippus] out in his Chaire’ so that he can treat him; later in stage directions ‘three Schollers’ enter ‘bringing fourth Aristippus in his Chayre’.⁵² Early moderns recognised a chair as a method of transport to the surgeon (their stretcher equivalent), a location for treatment itself, and also a seat for recovery.⁵³ Gloucester’s situation in a chair cues, to contemporary audiences, particular associative contexts.

The chair is also a definitive sign of barberry: authors reference the barber’s chair abundantly in early modern literature. Unlike a chair that is associated with surgery, a ‘barber’s chair’ is an exclusively modified noun. (Sometimes it is called ‘a trimme chayre’, as in Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pithias* (1571), Fiiiir.) This chair is quintessential to the barber’s trade and is emblematic of barbers’ shops. Johann Comenius’s annotated barber’s shop focalizes the client in his chair (see *Figure 2*), as does sixteenth-century Swiss artist Jost Amman’s woodcut of *The Barber* (undated), and in seventeenth-century paintings by Dutch and Flemish artists who took up the barber-shop subject the barber’s chair is ubiquitous; more recently, Norman Rockwell’s ‘Shuffleton’s Barbershop’ (1950) and the cover photograph for *Barbershops* (2005) show frayed, but imposing barbers’ chairs.⁵⁴ Charles Whyte, a barber in the sixteenth century, and also Warden to The

⁵¹ Medico is a satirical characterisation of Richard Lichfield, the Barber-Surgeon figure who pamphleteered against Thomas Nashe (see chapter five).

⁵² Thomas Randolph, *Aristippus* (1630), D1v-D2r.

⁵³ Cf. t.p. of Thomas Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, 2nd edn (Goricom [Gorinchem, i.e. London]: 1624) which illustrates Count Gondomar’s chair of ease for his fistula. Taylor concludes in *Collected Works* that ‘Gondomar’s actual litter and special chair were brought on stage’ in Middleton’s *A Game at Chess* (p. 1775). In Jonson’s *The Staple of News*, the barber, Tom, reports on Gondomar’s fistula and the fact that he is ‘condemn’d to his chair’ (*Staple*, ed. Devra Rowland Kifer (London: Edward Arnold, 1976), III.ii.212). Also see Foakes, *Illustrations of the English Stage, 1580-1642* (London: Scolar Press, 1985), pp. 124-125, and a report by John Holles on a performance of *Game at Chess* quoted by Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare’s London*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), pp. 134-5.

⁵⁴ Tally Abecassis and Claudine Sauvé, *Barbershops* (Black Dog Publishing, 2005). The collection of photographs captures the modern barber shop as a celebrated feature of our urban heritage.

Company, lists in his will ‘three barbour’s chayres’.⁵⁵ As I discussed in chapter two, the chair was also the butt of bawdy jokes: in *All’s Well That Ends Well*, the clown refers to the ‘Barbers chaire that fits all buttocks’ (II.ii.16). Morose hopes that the customers’ ‘chairs’ will ‘be always empty’ (III.v.79) for Cutbeard in *Epicoene*.⁵⁶ ‘The Rimers New Trimming’ makes three references to the chair in the barber’s shop, around which the ballad’s tale of pranks occur.⁵⁷ The author establishes a metaphorical barbery context for his satirical pamphlet, *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (1597), specifically referring to ‘The Barbers Chaire’ which, in the figurative context of the pamphlet, is a verbal and later textual site where he imagines he will trim back Nashe’s verborosities.⁵⁸ In the opening dialogue of the pamphlet, Richard Lichfield pretends to welcome Nashe into his shop: ‘Come, sit downe’, he writes, ‘Ile trim you my selfe. How now? what makes you sit downe so tenderly?’, implying that sitting in the barber’s chair is not the same as sitting in any ordinary chair.⁵⁹ In *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596) – to which Lichfield is responding – Nashe characterises the barber’s chair with these inflated remarks about clients: ‘they are...elevated & erected...on thy barbed steed, *alias*, thy triumphant barbers Chaire’, reminding us of the hobbyhorse in *Hoffman*.⁶⁰ In *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, the Host’s description of the fierce giant barber, Barbaroso includes a reference to his

⁵⁵ Charles Whyte, City of London (14th February, 1545), PROB 11/30.

⁵⁶ Ben Jonson, *Epicoene*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

⁵⁷ Anon, ‘The Rimers New Trimming’ (c.1614), stanzas 7, 8 and 15. Here, ‘chaire’/‘chayre’ is named three times, whilst matters relating to the chair (‘rising’, ‘became empty’, ‘turne taking’, ‘under’, ‘up rose’) number five. The chair also functions as a boundary-setting object in the ballad. Cf. Anon, ‘West-Country Tom Tormented’ (1664-1703), in which Tom runs out of the barber’s shop distressed at being pressed for news by the barber. In the shop, he is ‘plac’d and set in the Chair’ (stanza 8, line 2).

⁵⁸ Richard Lichfield[?], *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (1597), B4r.

⁵⁹ Lichfield[?], B1r.

⁶⁰ Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), B1v.

‘enchanted chair’ (III.243), entertaining the folkloric potential of the barber’s chair. The barber in *Quiet Life* refers to his ‘chair of maintenance’ (V.ii.338-9).⁶¹

On stage, a chair is an essential prop for barber characters. One of the Barbers sent to poison Bernardo and Philipppo in *Devil’s Charter* invites, ‘Wilt please your Lordship sit on this low chaire’ (I2v). John Day pillages material from *Quiet Life* for a scenario in *Knave in Grain* in which the Barber thinks that the Mercer’s Man needs treatment for a delicate problem (the Mercer’s Man actually attends on financial business): inviting the Mercer’s Man into his ‘withdrawing Room’, the Barber instructs, ‘pray rest you in that chaire’.⁶² A barber’s chair is called for in *Fancies*: ‘A Chaire, a Chaire, quick, quick’, commands Secco, while his boy, Nitido, confirms, ‘Here’s a chaire, a chaire politique’ (I4r). Secco’s frantic call for a chair parodies alarm calls in emergency situations when a person needs a chair and surgical attention, as in *Othello*. The situation of the subject in a chair was instantly recognizable on stage, in the context of theatre semiotics, as a sign of barbery.

That Gloucester is tied up in a chair for questioning suggests that Shakespeare avoids common theatrical reification of trial scenes, a context we might be tempted to link with III.vii. Dessen explains,

Certainly, the staging of court and trial scenes may have varied somewhat from theatre to theatre..., but the basic configuration probably remained roughly the same: a bar; a table; some distinctive seats and a placement for the judges; and...distinctive costumes.⁶³

⁶¹ Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

⁶² John Day, *The Knave in Grain* (1640), I2v,

⁶³ Dessen, ‘Recovering Elizabethan Staging’ in *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare*, pp. 44-65 (p. 49).

According to the evidence (the scene's language and limited stage directions) only one piece of furniture is needed in III.vii, and moreover, this is the wrong one for the character on trial who usually stood at the bar surrounded by seated judges. Even in the mock trial of the preceding scene in quarto, which, as Höfele argues, 'proves remarkably resilient' as a trial scene, delusional judge Lear orchestrates the court-like configuration that Dessen observes is typical: 'Come, sit thou here, most learned justice; / Thou sapient sir, sit here' (III.vi.21-22, quarto only), 'thou, his yoke-fellow of equity, / Bench by his side. You are o'the commission; / Sit you too' (III.vi.37-39, quarto only).⁶⁴ At the beginning of III.vii Cornwall suggests that we should expect another trial with the words, 'the traitor Gloucester' (III.vii.22), 'bring him before us' (III.vii.23) and 'the form of justice' (III.vii.25), but that 'form' never takes shape. In being removed from a court-like context – which III.vii is directly set against in quarto – the scenario of Gloucester's interrogation and blinding forces us to think of it in terms of another.⁶⁵

Once he is seated, Gloucester's beard is plucked. Again, we infer deeds from the dialogue; later editions tend to highlight in stage direction. Barbers not only shaved and trimmed hair with razors and scissors, they also plucked hair with pincers or tweezers:

⁶⁴ Höfele, p. 199 (see pp. 194-228). Seeing the animal imagery as another sign of the trial context, Höfele argues against Gary Taylor and Michael Warren's reading of III.vi which, they suggest, 'never settles into the clearly fixed shape of a trial' (p. 198).

⁶⁵ See Dorothy C. Hockey, 'The Trial Pattern in *King Lear*', *SQ* 10:3 (1959), 389-395. Hockey senses the perversion of a trial motif in III.vii, but does not explore how that perversion is characterized (see p. 393). Another context worth exploring in conjunction with my reading of Gloucester's blinding, and later Lear's recovery, is exorcism, and its malpractice. Critics have long regarded Samuel Harsnett's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (1604) as a source for *King Lear* (see Foakes (ed.), *King Lear*, pp. 102-104, Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), pp. 94-128; Stuart Gillespie, *Shakespeare's Books* (London: Athlone Press, 2001), pp. 228-235). The chair features heavily in Harsnett's text: the process of exorcism is referred to as 'chaire-work' (pp. 27, 40, 218), the chair is characterised as an 'Engine' (p. 30), into it persons are bound or tied 'with towells' (p. 39 [pagination in error numbers this page 30]), and pins or needles are sometimes thrust into the exorcism subject's shoulders or legs while they are seated. The subjects of exorcism, however, tend to be female in *Impostures*, and while the victims suffer trauma, they are rarely permanently maimed.

‘Tweezers’, ‘Twitchers’ and ‘Mullets’ were all standard barbery equipment.⁶⁶ Randle Holme explains that barbers ‘take away stragling hairs’ when they tidy up a customer’s beard.⁶⁷ In John Jones’s *Adrasta*, the ‘Devill Barber’ enters ‘pulling forth Damasippus by the Beard’.⁶⁸ Shakespeare ensures that beard plucking is significant because it interrupts Cornwall’s sentence: ‘Villain, thou shalt find –’ (III.vii.34). Contrary to editors’ stage directions, Cornwall could also pluck Gloucester’s beard, causing aposiopesis by his own action: Gloucester’s rebuke, ‘’tis most ignobly done / To pluck me by the beard’ (III.vii.35-6) does not name a subject. Regan, who must pluck Gloucester’s hairs before he calls her a ‘Naughty lady’ (III.vii.37), could simply follow suit. If so, it suggests a master-apprentice relationship between Cornwall and Regan. Regan sustains the focus on the beard by commenting on the hairs’ colour: ‘So white, and such a traitor?’ (III.vii.37). Like a barber, Regan conducts her actions and maintains her focus ‘exactly to a Hayre’.⁶⁹ Höfele dismisses her action as ‘childish cruelty’, ‘hardly an appropriate penalty’ and mere ‘silliness’, although he does acknowledge its suggestion of ‘domestic violence’.⁷⁰ But Shakespeare makes beards and hair a focal point of III.vii; they are integrated into a system of chastisement whereby the barber’s association with the ‘reformation’ of appearances transposes to his ability to reform conduct and morality. In an epigram by Samuel Rowlands the themes of castigation and hair removal are aligned: ‘nittie Locks must suffer reformation’.⁷¹ Greene/Lodge refer to barbers’ encountering ‘rebellious

⁶⁶ Holme, *Academy of Armory* (Chester: [1688]), p. 127; John Woodall, *The Surgions Mate* (1617), A4r.

⁶⁷ Holme (1688), p. 128

⁶⁸ John Jones, *Adrasta* (1635), s.d. 11r.

⁶⁹ See Henry Hutton, *Follie’s Anatomie* (1619), C6v (Epi. 32).

⁷⁰ Höfele, p. 207.

⁷¹ Samuel Rowlands, *The Letting of Humors Blood in the Head-Vaine* (1611), A7v (Epi. 13). In Middleton’s *Hengist* the barber is ‘A corrector of enormities in hair’ (III.iii.46-7).

haire'.⁷² Although these descriptions seem merely humorous, methods of control in early modernity were enacted through beard regulations (see chapter five). The servant channels his notion of retribution through the beard trope, threatening Regan, 'If you did wear a beard upon your chin, / I'd shake it on this quarrel' (III.vii.75-6): *his* impassioned threat cannot be read as 'silliness'. And earlier, Kent disputes with Oswald, 'Spare me my grey beard, you wagtail?' (II.ii.65), aligning manners of attack with the beard rather than any other part of the body. Before that, Kent calls Oswald a 'cullionly barber-monger' (II.ii.32). In *Comedy of Errors* Shakespeare parodies the barbery context for a depiction of punishment. A Messenger describes how Antipholus and Dromio of Ephesus have attacked Dr Pinch; the Messenger says that they have

bound the doctor
Whose beard they have singed off with brands of fire;
And ever, as it blazed, they threw on him
Great pails of puddled mire to quench the hair:
My master preaches patience to him and the while
His man with scissors nicks him like a fool (V.i.171-176)

(The muddy waste reminds us of Grimme's barbery experience in *Damon and Pithias*.)

Referring to Regan's beard plucking, Thomas Berger explains, 'With that act the scene grows small and personal'.⁷³ Berger does not investigate the semiotic potential of the action, but invites his readers to see that Regan's attention to Gloucester permits levels of acute intimacy. In 'New Trimming', the barber declares to his client, 'I must be familiar' (stanza 14, line 4). Similarly in Dekker's *The Gull's Horn-Book*: 'let the drawers be as familiar with you as your Barber'.⁷⁴ But Gloucester finds Regan's actions too familiar and

⁷² Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge, *A Looking Glasse, for London* (1598), B2v.

⁷³ Berger, p. 202.

⁷⁴ Dekker, *Guls Horne-Booke* (1609), F2r.

dangerously exposing; he deems her a 'Naughty lady' (III.vii.37) conjecturing that hairs have been 'ravish[ed] from [his] chin' (III.vii.38), and drawing on the lascivious association of the barber's chair. The barbery act is more threatening than a tidy-up of whiskers. Shakespeare construes as irregular and rough Regan's hair-plucking practice (we assume she pulls on Gloucester's beard with bare hands and not with tools). Moreover, Gloucester's allusion to 'ruffle' (III.vii.41) makes the beard metonymic of Gloucester's whole body, which is entirely shaken by this stage. His defence relies on a homophonic pun: 'These hairs.../ Will quicken and accuse thee' (III.vii.38-9). Early moderns regarded beards as signs of the masculine generative faculty.⁷⁵ In John Lyly's *Midas*, Motto refers to 'the breeding of a beard' (III.ii.70), Middleton describes 'Young beards...pullulate[ing] and multiply[ing] like a willow' (*Owl's Almanac*, 2044-2045), and in *Troilus and Cressida*, Helen jokes about Troilus's beard by asking which one of the sons (represented by the hairs of the beard) is Paris (see I.ii.134-162).⁷⁶ Gloucester imagines that his 'heirs' will revenge him. Tellingly, in his description, Berger uses oxymoronic 'grows small'. This seems apt: the scene swells in implication, but its focus tightens as it represents a concentrated, personal, body-focused relationship between practitioner and subject.

The twenty-five lines that follow Gloucester's barbering are an interrogation by Cornwall and Regan. They want confirmation of information: 'what letters had you late from France?' (II.vii.42), 'Where has thou sent the King?' (III.vii.49), 'Wherefore to Dover?' (III.vii.51, 52, 54 (Folio)). Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern discuss how 'physical

⁷⁵ See Will Fisher, 'Staging the Beard' in *Staged Properties*, pp. 230-257 (pp. 234-5); Johnston, 'Bearded Women in Early Modern England', *SEL* 47:1 (2007), 1-28 (pp. 3, 5, 8); and my discussions in chapter five.

⁷⁶ John Lyly, *Midas* in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David M. Bevington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

torture is matched by verbal torture' in this scene.⁷⁷ In the context of the scene, Regan and Cornwall demand a confession through cross-examination; in the context of the barber-surgery semiotic, demonic barbering comes with a ravenous appetite for news.

Violent surgery on Gloucester is added to inappropriate barbering: Shakespeare shrouds the actions of uncomfortable hair-plucking in the scene with crude, forced amputation. Gloucester's confession causes Cornwall to wrench out one of the old man's eyes, and the other ten lines later. This practitioner also gets personal, departing from his use of the royal "we" and establishing his private agency with 'I'll set my foot' (III.vii.67). Cornwall does not need surgical tools for the surgical context to resonate, although a director's decision to give him implements is possible given the textual substance. Dessen describes a production of *King Lear* at the Stratford Festival Canada (1972): 'the blinding scene was drawn out interminably while Cornwall stripped down to a leather tunic and then chose his gouging tool from a large rack of gleaming instruments that had been wheeled onto the stage'.⁷⁸ In IV.i *King John* Hubert prepares 'hot irons' (IV.i.1, 39, 59) with which to gouge out Arthur's eyes. Although Arthur persuades Hubert to release him, this scene has several connections with III.vii *King Lear* and shows Shakespeare's early dramaturgical conception of the scenario. Describing blindness later in the play, Edmund refers to 'our impressed lances in our eyes' (V.iii.51): his suggestion of eye-assault involves an implement and potentially reflects on the method by which Cornwall extracts Gloucester's eyes.⁷⁹ Directors and actors today debate how Cornwall removes Gloucester's

⁷⁷ Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), p. 245 (see pp. 240-265, esp. pp. 244-6).

⁷⁸ Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), p. 121.

⁷⁹ Although 'lances' refers to soldiers' weapons, it has phonemic correspondence with 'lancets'. See Patricia Parker, 'Cutting Both Ways' in *Alternative Shakespeares* 3, ed. Diana E. Henderson (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 95-118.

eyes. For instance, does Cornwall actually ‘set [his] foot’ on Gloucester? Bill Alexander explains how they interpreted Cornwall’s lines and actions in an RSC production.⁸⁰

Initially we wondered whether the line ‘put the eye beneath my foot’ might mean that Cornwall was going to put out Gloucester’s eyes with his heels, but that would have been extremely difficult. The thumb is the obvious thing: he’s gauging [*sic*] out the eye with his thumb and then stamping on it.⁸¹

Alexander’s solution is practical, but the idea that a person should set their foot on a subject in order to remove organs is not obscure, nor out of a medical context. Surgery was (and is still) physically demanding on practitioners’ bodies. Middleton/Webster parody this effect in *Quiet Life* when the barber imagines how he will punish Young Franklin for his tricks, evoking a surgical ‘pinning down’ only to turn the process into something ridiculous: ‘Now, Fleshhook, use thy talon – set upon his right shoulder – thy sergeant Counterbuff at the left, grasp in his *jugulars* and then let me alone tickle his *diaphtagma*’ (III.ii.1-4). Surgical tracts explain how surgeons should use their bodies in procedures: the surgeon ‘shall hold the patients legges betweene his knees’, writes Paré of eye surgery, ‘for by a little stirring’, he continues, the patient ‘may lose his sight for ever’.⁸² Ironically, Cornwall demands that his servants stabilise the chair and sets his foot for the purpose of expunging Gloucester’s sight.

To gruesome-surgeon Cornwall, Gloucester’s eyes are malignant, tumour-like lumps on his body that have rendered Gloucester’s senses and body diseased, and have precipitated treacherous activity. Lisa Silverman explores the relationship between the surgeon and the judge whose ‘healing work must be done mercilessly’: ‘The criminal is an

⁸⁰ *King Lear*, dir. Bill Alexander (Theatre Royal: RSC, 2004).

⁸¹ Bill Alexander, ‘The Director’, RSC (2004) <www.rsc.org.uk/lear/current/director.html> [accessed 13 January 2010] (para. 14 of 15).

⁸² Paré, p. 653.

infection of the social body. Mercy for a decayed limb can only imperil the whole', hence in *King Lear* Cornwall makes a judgement, 'Lest it see more [mischief], prevent it. Out, vile jelly' (III.vii.82).⁸³ When the Governor of Cyprus in Chapman's *Widow's Tears* imagines that he will 'cut of all perisht members' of the city (meaning all that is corrupt), Tharsalius quips, 'Thats the Surgeons office'.⁸⁴ Höfele suggests that Cornwall's actions are the realization of what Lear hopes to conduct on Regan: an exploratory anatomization or vivisection.⁸⁵ But Cornwall's attack is not exploratory. Gloucester's corrupt parts have been identified: his eyes are both 'vile jell[ies]' (III.vii.81), not naturally anatomical, but sarcomic. Perversely, in early modern surgery, 'gellyes' were usually 'nourishing medicines'.⁸⁶ Moreover, of the 'five things [that] are proper to the dutie of a Chirurgian' according to Paré, the first is 'To take away that which is superfluous'. Paré's examples of this include matter around or in the eye, such as 'haire of the eye-lid', 'the web, possessing all the *Adnata* and part of the *Cornea*', 'parts of the *uvula* or haire that grow on the eye-lids' and 'Cataracts'. Ironically, of the surgeon's duties in resetting body parts (that are out of their natural place), one of four basic examples is, 'the eye hanging out of its circle, or proper place'.⁸⁷ Cornwall's surgical acts and statements are perverted because he reverses customary medical procedure. In Dekker/Rowley's *Noble Soldier* Carle tries to warn the King of Spain against his rash decision, explaining that, 'like a bad Surgeon, / Labouring to plucke out from your eye a moate, / You thrust the eye cleane out'.⁸⁸

⁸³ Lisa Silverman, *Tortured Subjects* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 59.

⁸⁴ George Chapman, *The Widdowes Teares* (1612), L1v.

⁸⁵ Höfele, p. 203.

⁸⁶ Paré, p. 1111.

⁸⁷ Paré, p. 4.

⁸⁸ Thomas Dekker [S. R. initials on t. p., quarto], *The Noble Souldier* (1634), C4v.

The damage Cornwall commits on Gloucester is not only an indication of surgical aberration, but is another piece of the barbering sign system. In a barber's shop, a customer's eyes are a point of vulnerability because the soaps which barbers lather on their clients' faces sting. Barber figures in comedies/satires are able to play tricks because of a customer's need to close their eyes. In 'New Trimming', the barber secretly varnishes the rhymster's face, having instructed, 'keepe close your eyes / For this Ball will prove somewhat tart / and twill disquiet you much to feele them smart' (stanza 12, lines 2-4). When barbering Spadone in *Fancies Secco* warns that the 'composition of this ball...will search and smart shrewdly, if you keep not the shop-windowes of your head close' (I4v). The Host refers to barbering practice in *Burning Pestle* which 'makes [clients] wink' (III.246) and indeed in stage directions one of the knights leaving Barbaroso's dreadful cave' (III.361) does so 'winking' (s.d. III.366). The narrator in Barnabe Rich's *Greenes Newes* (1593) describes how an Officer tries to arrest Velvet breeches in a barber's shop: realising that the officer is waiting to apprehend him, Velvet Breeches, 'suddaynelie...threwe all the water so directly in [the officer's] face, that the Sope getting into [his] eyes, did so smart...that [he] was not able to holde them open...[and] stoode starke blinde for the tyme, wpying and rubbing...[his] eyes'.⁸⁹ In Marston's *Dutch Courtesan*, Mulligrub, whose face is left lathered on stage calls out, 'Why, Andrew, I shall be blind with winking' (II.iii.81).⁹⁰ Earlier, Cocledemoy tells Mulligrub, 'Shut your eyes close; wink! Sure, sir, this ball will make you smart' (II.iii.67-68), puts a coxcomb on his head and steals his purse. Similarly in V.v *I Promos and Cassandra*, Rosko the barber instructs old Grimball the barber 'your eyes harde you must close' as he rinses his face

⁸⁹ Barnabe Rich, *Greenes Newes Both From Heaven and Hell* (1593), H2r.

⁹⁰ John Marston, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997).

with perfumed water, repeating, 'Winke hard *Grimball*'; meanwhile stage directions dictate that Roske's partner in crime, Rowke, '*cuttes Grimbals purse*'.⁹¹ Later in *King Lear*, Lear comments to Gloucester, 'No eyes in your head, nor no money in your purse?' (IV.vi.141-2), aligning Gloucester's maltreatment with loss of money.⁹² In the fifth chapter I investigate how receptacles (basins and purses) associated with the barber's shop have an economic, spatial and dialogic relationship. Margreta de Grazia highlights that 'From the first to the last, the play stigmatizes [Gloucester] as the indiscriminate dispenser of both economic and sexual purses, coin and seed'.⁹³ Most depictions of barber economics rely on jokes about emptying customers' purses, aligning barbers' work with acts of cozenage. In *Like Will to Like*, Cutbert (which, as I suggested in the Introduction, gave the name 'Cutbeard') Cutpurse carries a '*whetstone*' and declares, 'I cut away his purse clenly': his tools and dexterity can double up with those of the barber.⁹⁴ In *King Lear* that act of cozenage is the pulling out of eyes rather than the pulling away of a purse. Blinding Gloucester in III.vii is the ultimate authentication of the more mundane risk a customer faces when he is seated in the barber's chair: a client's eyes might be stung by the suds, their purse might be pinched while they have their eyes shut. In *King Lear*, these petty offences are doubled-up and transformed into a heinous crime.

An alternative reading of the semiotics of Gloucester's blinding still brings us back 'full circle' to the subject of this thesis. de Grazia argues that 'Edgar retroactively makes the loss of his father's eyes the price of his adultery (and not, as Cornwall charges, of his

⁹¹ George Whetstone, *Promos and Cassandra* (1578), Fiiiv.

⁹² Lichfield[?] stresses that 'None but Barbers meddle with the head' and in the main text that 'a mans face (the principall part of him) is committed onely to Barbers' (B4v).

⁹³ Margreta de Grazia, 'The Ideology of Superfluous Things' in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), pp. 17-42 (p. 28).

⁹⁴ Ulpian Fulwell, *Like Will to Like* (1587), Ciiiv.

treason)', drawing on Edgar's observation that 'The dark and vicious place where [Edmund] he got / Cost him his eyes' (V.iii.170-1). Lear's rambling diatribe against brothels and indiscreet sexual activity, and, more generally, the cultural connection between lust and eyes sets a context. Staines explains that in 'Shakespeare's England, blinding had some legendary associations with punishments for adultery and other sexual crimes'.⁹⁵ For de Grazia, the removal of Gloucester's eyes is a sign of castration: "'jelly" [is] a synonym for sperm'.⁹⁶ Much of the surgical activity in which barbers persisted throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was treatment for venereal disease, especially the removal of the external marks from the pox and damaged members, as in *Burning Pestle* and *Quiet Life*. Summoned into the barber's backroom, Ralph is asked to take out his 'yard' (*Quiet Life*, II.iv.40) – to Ralph, his tailor's measuring stick, to everyone else, his penis.⁹⁷ The barber is led to believe that Ralph's penis is 'endangered' (II.iv.15) or 'gangrened' (II.iv.17), and he observes, 'Better a member cut off than endanger the whole microcosm' (II.iv.32-3), encouraging Ralph to let him amputate.⁹⁸ Middleton parodies familiar lessons on adultery from the Sermon on the Mount:

...Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whatsoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast [it] from thee: for it is profitable for thee that

⁹⁵ Staines, p. 86.

⁹⁶ de Grazia, p. 29.

⁹⁷ Characters 'Shortyard' and 'Shortrod' (a jealous husband) are in Middleton plays (*Michaelmas Term/A Mad World My Masters*).

⁹⁸ See Gary Taylor, *Castration* (New York; London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 56-7. Dympna Callaghan investigates the practice of castration in early modernity but conflates advanced surgical procedures in the period with rough barber-surgeon work (*Shakespeare Without Women* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 53-58, 62-64). Sigmund Freud discusses the long association between the fear of going blind and the fear of castration (*The Uncanny*, ed. David McLinktock and Hugh Haughton (New York; London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 139-140). Cf. 'there's a pittifull head, it had need to bee looked after, for it will infect the whole body else' (Thomas Tomkis, *Preist the Barbar, Sweetball his Man* in *Collections*, ed. Suzanne Gossett and Thomas L. Berger. (Oxford: Malone Society, 1988), XIV, lines 14-15.

one of thy members should perish, and not [that] thy whole body should be cast from hell.
(*King James Bible*, Matthew 5.27-29)

Middleton makes equivalent eyes and sexual organs; Whetstone makes equivalent purses and penises (*1 Promos and Cassandra*, Fiiv). If Edgar does change our understanding of Gloucester's punishment from the result of treachery to the result of sexual deviance, he does not do so at the expense of the context of barber-surgery that the scene evokes: indeed, he endorses it.

I have not yet emphasized much variation between quarto and Folio texts: my analysis of props, stipulated stage activities, and inferred theatrical direction in III.vii is relevant to both editions. However, the final nine lines of quarto, which are cut from Folio, provide additional evidence of the medical register conceived of in the scene. As unwilling apprentice figures, the servants' complicity (forced or otherwise) in the undertakings of their gory pedagogue causes them to revolt. After Cornwall and Regan exit, the servants also offer the scene, or more specifically, Gloucester's wound, some hope of healing. 2 Servant says, 'I'll fetch some flax and whites of eggs / To apply to [Gloucester's] bleeding face' (III.vii.105-6). Countless surgeons', physicians' and domestic works from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries stipulate egg whites in prescriptions for treating wounds, sores or broken skin: it was a medicinal staple. David Hargreaves, who took the role of Gloucester, describes what an audience would see in Alexander's production:

...we're going to have a piece of sacking (Hessian or flax) covered in something that looks like egg whites and congealed blood, which will give an almost clownish appearance of spectacles. There'll be blood from capsules running down into the beard too.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ David Hargreaves, 'The Actors', *RSC* (2004) <www.rsc.org.uk/lear/current/actors.html> [accessed 13 January 2010] (para. 5 of 7).

Not only does this design for Gloucester's eye-mask draw together themes of physical violence and remedy, of sight and blindness, but, in that it is a production team's conscious decision to make the beard part of the fabric of Gloucester's wounded face, it also encourages audiences to see the connection between a bedraggled, bloody beard and systems of abuse in the play. In a parodic episode in *Adrasta*, a 'Devill Barber' threatens to 'dissect' (I1r-I2r) Damasippus's beard.¹⁰⁰

In Folio, the conversation between the servants is cut, which gives a different tone to the end of the scene: with no remedial assistance for Gloucester, hazardous barber-surgery is not superseded by cure. This is part of a consistent tone in the Folio which more acutely than quarto depicts a world without compassion or succour.¹⁰¹ The horrific barber-surgery context lingers rather than is soothed, and this textual amputation from quarto heightens the pain Edgar suffers during his reunion with his mangled father in the following scene.

The barber-surgery reading of III.vii elucidates the impact of a later scene in the play. Only one other reference to a chair occurs in *King Lear* (Folio only): "*Enter Lear, in a chair carried by servants*" (s.d. IV.vii.20).¹⁰² ('When Sapless age and weak unable limbs / Should bring thy father to his drooping chair' (*Henry VI Part I*, IV.v.4-5).) Perhaps this chair doubles up with III.vii's prop in performance. Sofer asserts, 'By definition, a prop is an object that goes on a journey; hence props trace spatial trajectories and create temporal

¹⁰⁰ See chapter five for a discussion of the beard's unstable relationship to corporeality.

¹⁰¹ See Staines, p. 90; Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichiwaka, *Staging Shakespeare's Theatres* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), pp.115-117; Michael Warren, 'Quarto and Folio *King Lear* and the Interpretation of Albany and Edgar' in *Shakespeare's Tragedies*, ed. Emma Smith (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), pp. 289-302 (pp. 298-300); Foakes, *Hamlet Versus Lear* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), pp. 59, 63-5, 71.

¹⁰² The absence of this stage direction in quarto does not contradict my reading of IV.vii. Common sense tells us that Lear must enter carried, because he is 'In the heaviness of sleep' (IV.vii.21); the most likely prop available in early modern theatre was the *sick chair*, discussed earlier. Folio direction suggests what was typical in production at the time.

narrative as they track through a given performance'.¹⁰³ But they can also track through an aesthetic narrative. If this is the same chair, or, at least, if the chair is reminiscent of Gloucester's, the effects are striking as Shakespeare recycles in IV.vii the metaphors, allusions, contexts and kinetic patterns with which this chapter is concerned.¹⁰⁴ The practitioner figures (Cordelia, Kent and Gentleman¹⁰⁵) and Lear in this later scene, as in III.vii, are emblematic, rather than literal. Here, Shakespeare reconfigures the sense of barber-surgery as nonhazardous but Lear's reaction to his predicament retrospectively instructs us how to read and understand the signs of III.vii: he implicitly reads the potential threat of a scenario in which, in a chair, the subject is unable much to move.

In IV.vii, Lear's chair is supposed to be a therapeutic site: themes of 'restoration' (IV.vii.26) and 'Repair' (IV.vii.28) replace the brutality previously associated with it. Cordelia tries to administer 'medicine' (IV.vii.27) – her kiss – which will mend 'those violent harms' (IV.vii.28) made on her father. In the previous scene, at the height of his distress, Lear exclaims, 'Let me have surgeons, / I am cut to the brains' (IV.vi.188-9), suggesting that Cordelia's later attendance on his wounded head follows in a necessary surgical vein. As in III.vii, the subject of the medical context is discussed (and diagnosed) in advance of his entry, which supports Lear's condition as patient. Lear's disorientation in the space is plain: 'I am mainly ignorant / What place this is' (IV.vii.65-6), reminding us of Gloucester's disorientation in the abusive arena of III.vii. For a moment, Cordelia focuses on Lear's bearded face by pointing to 'these white flakes' (IV.vii.30). Although he

¹⁰³ Sofer, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Jean Howard's exploration of the fluid structures in *King Lear* that produce meaningful visual continuity and (orchestrated) design in the play, reinforced by dialogue (*Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 119-132).

¹⁰⁵ In quarto, Cordelia and Gentleman are accompanied by a Doctor. In Folio, this character is cut and Gentleman speaks the lines. Perhaps, as in the cut from the end of III.vii discussed earlier, the Folio text stripped obvious allusion to medical cure.

is not physically tied down by servants, Lear believes he is 'bound' (IV.vii.46). In the text, this sense of being bound is metaphorical: Lear thinks that he is 'Upon a wheel of fire' (IV.vii.47). However, in Alexander's production (2004), Corin Redgrave as Lear was in a strait jacket at this moment. Lear's reference to a 'pinprick' (IV.vii.56) is an allusion to pierced flesh that senses acutely all abuse upon it. Foakes notes that 'let's see – / I feel this pinprick' (IV.vii.55-6) indicates 'stage business' which requires a prop; that Lear chooses to lance his skin with an implement fits in the barber-surgery frame. Pleading, 'Do not abuse me' (IV.vii.77), and echoing Cordelia's allusion to 'his abused nature' (IV.vii.15), Lear senses his predicament. His entry in the chair retells a narrative. Whereas in III.vii characters enucleated Gloucester, IV.vii makes Lear's eye-opening part of the activity: 'He wakes' (IV.vii.42). Shakespeare presents the audience of IV.vii *King Lear* with a recapitulation of III.vii: a chair, a beard, physical inertia, practitioners and assistants, vulnerable eyes, and a pricked body. The scene throbs with the barber-surgery semiotics and we, like Lear, remain unsettled. The chair implicitly becomes a site of trauma, inviting us to conceive the wounds of the mind (Lear's psychological torture) fusing with physical injury (Gloucester's bodily hurt), realised in Bond's *Lear*.¹⁰⁶ Staines explains that 'the tragedies of the character of Lear...and of the whole play of *Lear* are inseparable from the representation and experience of physical pain'.¹⁰⁷ By evoking the barber-surgery context through the chair, Lear enacts Gloucester's trauma and within that memory implants his own, doubling the males' impotency.

**

¹⁰⁶ On the 'doubleness of traumatic narratives' and how that relates to the theatre, see the Introduction to *Staging Pain* by Martin and Allard, pp. 1-14 (pp. 6-8).

¹⁰⁷ Staines, p. 78.

John Ford's works have alerted scholars to his Shakespearean influence, particularly the influence of *Romeo and Juliet* on *'Tis Pity She's A Whore*. Whether Ford is rewriting, pastiching, parodying, or producing an early form of literary criticism is unclear as is the scale of Shakespeare's influence. But how Ford evidently digests scenes from Shakespeare's *King Lear* underpins this chapter's reading of the chair. In *Lover's Melancholy*, Ford echoes the scenario between an ailing father and nurse-like daughter of IV.vii *King Lear*.¹⁰⁸ Meleander is sick in mind after he has been stripped of his nobility for protecting his daughter, Eroclea, from the advances of the ruler of Cyprus. His other daughter, Cleophila, 'discover[s]' him 'in a chaire sleeping.' But unlike the *King Lear* scenes, in which I inferred a barber-surgery semiotic, in Ford's scene, both practices are named specifically and the chair is contextualised directly. Trollio offers, 'Lady Mistris, shall I fetch a Barbour to steale away [Meleander's] rough beard, whiles he sleepes in's naps? He never lookes in a glasse, and tis high time on conscience for him to bee trimd, has not been under the Shavers hand almost these foure yeeres'. And later, Meleander refers to 'the Surgeon' who may 'Have not been very skilfull to let all [blood] out.' Stirring, the old father complains, 'I know yee both. 'las, why d'ee use me thus!', interpreting his predicament in a chair intertextually as well as contextually, and he asks whether he is 'starke mad'. Moreover, Trollio twice directs attention to Meleander's eyes, which he notes, are 'open' and 'rowle'. Ford gives the official contextual demarcations by naming barbers and surgeons in this sequence and, in doing so, authorizes this chapter's reading of the signs in Shakespeare.

¹⁰⁸ Quotations in this paragraph are taken from John Ford, *The Lovers Melancholy* (1629), E4r-E4v.

The Basin and Bloodletting in *Titus Andronicus*

Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* is about signs: about making, reading and seeing them. Audiences and readers of the play as well as the characters within it are interpreters of tokens, gestures, symbols and, in quarto versions, 'scrowle[s]'.¹⁰⁹ In the following paragraphs I unravel one sign system in which Shakespeare contextualises some of the horrific events of the play. I work backwards through *Titus* and show how later props, actions, utterances and tableaux relate and are in direct response to the language and events of earlier scenes.

In III.vii *King Lear* a chair enables barbering and surgery contexts to combine; in *Titus* it is a basin, which Lavinia carries on stage in V.ii. The semiotics of barbering and surgery in *Titus* are dispersed throughout the play, and the dramaturgy of the barber-surgery framework relies on cumulative allusion to and representation of amputation, trimming, washing, cutting, phlebotomy and medicinal cannibalism. If we examine V.ii in isolation, the basin aligns itself with surgery semiotics; if we examine V.ii in relation to V.i and II.ii, the basin completes a barbering sign-system in the play. Because their actions are highly abusive, the practitioner figures in the play labour both within and against the barber-surgery framework. The scenes I examine in *Titus* reflect the disastrous side of barber-surgery activities. Lavinia is victim both of physical abuse and satirical sport, of brutal barbering and sick surgery: Demetrius and Chiron trim and chop her. Titus's retribution for his daughter's persecution mirrors, *quid pro quo*, crimes committed against her; the barber-surgery frame holds in V.ii with Titus as surgeon and Lavinia as

¹⁰⁹ Shakespeare, *The Most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (1594), E2r. Quartos of 1600 and 1611 are consistent with the text of 1594, although their page signatures are out by one. Future quotations from this play are from *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate (London: Routledge, 1995) unless otherwise indicated. Cf. Mary Laughlin Fawcett, 'Arms/Words/Tears', *ELH* 50:2 (1983), 261-277; Gillian Murray Kendall, "'Lend me thy hand'", *SQ* 40:3 (1989), 299-316.

apprentice. I begin my *Titus* section, as I did the case study of *King Lear*, by discussing the practicalities and effects of tying up characters on stage.

When Tamora believes that her tricks of disguise have worked on Titus in V.ii, and that the time is ripe for more jests, she leaves her sons, Chiron and Demetrius, in Andronicus's household. Within a few lines Publius, Caius and Valentine are busy binding the brothers. Ten lines are concerned with this event. Chiron and Demetrius's mouths are stopped for a practical reason, thematic homogeny, and theatrical effect: Titus makes his retributive speech without interruption, the play is riddled with motifs of tongue-stopping, and audiences sense the anxiety of persons on stage who are prohibited from expressing themselves through utterance.¹¹⁰ Despite the lineal focus on binding, we know little about the way in which the brothers are restrained in contemporary performance. With what are they bound? Are they tied to each other? Are they bound to a chair like Gloucester, or to another piece of furniture?¹¹¹ These questions prompt us to reconsider scholars' speculation about the presence of a moveable object in the scene: Tamora's chariot.¹¹² If, as Eugene Waith suggests, Tamora enters V.ii as Revenge in a chariot, another piece of furniture is available to the Andronici, and they could tie the Goth brothers into or on it.¹¹³ The effect suits the play's interest in oscillating fortunes and upper hands: the chariot remains a seat of revenge, but the control over it shifts. Waith assumes that additional,

¹¹⁰ James Calderwood refers to the play as a 'rape of language' (p. 29) and identifies the instances of tongue-truncation (pp. 30-31) in *Shakespearean Metadrama* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

¹¹¹ The actions on the stage appear to take place in a hall of the Andronicus house outside Titus's '*studie doore*', specified in quarto ((1594), I3r) and Folio stage directions. This space might logically yield chairs, tables, stools. Cf. Dessen, *Recovering*, pp. 160-4. Bate highlights the quality of the stage directions in quarto and Folio versions of *Titus*, pp. 105-8, 111.

¹¹² Titus refers to 'thy chariot wheels' (V.ii.47), 'thy vengeful waggon' (V.ii.51), 'thy car' (V.ii.53), and 'thy wagon wheel' (V.ii.54). Chariots were evidently popular on stage at this time at the Rose, used in Christopher Marlowe, *The Second Part of Tamburlaine* (1590), J3r, and George Peele, *The Battle of Alcazar* (1594), B1r. For additional examples, see Dessen and Thomson, pp. 47-8. Ernest L. Rhodes tracks movements of stage properties (including chariots) in the references from plays performed at the Rose, *Henslowe's Rose* (Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1979), pp. 121, 224-5.

¹¹³ Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Eugene M. Waith (Oxford: OUP, 1984), FN to V.ii.0.1-3.

mute characters draw Tamora's chariot on and off, but this seems uneconomic. Instead, Chiron and Demetrius, Tamora's 'ministers' (V.ii.60), could pull a chariot on and Tamora could leave on foot.¹¹⁴ My suggestion challenges Jonathan Bate's and Frederick Kiefer's conclusion that because Chiron and Demetrius cannot drag a chariot off, they do not drag one on.¹¹⁵ My point, too, is practical: as well as providing the Andronici with something solid on/in which to restrain the brothers, a chariot would allow characters to cart out the dead Goths at the end of V.ii. Moreover, this makes sense of Titus's earlier fantasy to 'be [the] waggoner' (V.ii.48) with a 'car [that] is loaden with [the] heads' (V.ii.53) of Rape and Murder. We know that felons' bodies in Shakespearean London were transported in a coach and dissected at Barber-Surgeons Hall.¹¹⁶ Moreover, the image of Tamora's chariot packed with her sons anticipates how her own belly will be packed with their flesh: the chariot is a doubly symbolic cavity, like the pit.

One fact governs how Chiron and Demetrius are positioned on stage, and suggests why an object to steady the characters would be helpful: the brothers are bound for fatal phlebotomy. Father and daughter's props dictate events. '*Enter Titus Andronicus with a knife, and Lavinia with a basin*' (s.d. V.ii.165).¹¹⁷ Titus will slit the brothers' throats and Lavinia will hold a blood-collecting basin beneath their necks. Access to the boys' throats is important because the handless Lavinia is unlikely to be agile with her prop. Lavinia is apprentice-like: her prop suggests her subordination to Titus. If we characterise their equipment, a knife actively works upon something but a basin is passive. However, the

¹¹⁴ Tamora is hardly careful with her disguises, and it is difficult to argue that she would not have left her chariot for the sake of her camouflage.

¹¹⁵ Bate, FN to V.ii.47; Frederick Kiefer, *Shakespeare's Visual Theatre* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), p. 44.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage* (Ann Arbor: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 128-9. Mullaney likens the theatre stage to the public scaffold when discussing the effect of Macbeth's severed head.

¹¹⁷ Stage directions stipulating '*bason*' are consistent in quarto ((1594), K1r) and Folio texts. Titus also refers to the 'basin' (V.ii.83) in dialogue.

generic '*knife*' in this stage direction is not as important as the basin in the stage semiotics available because it does not in itself endow Titus with the habit of a specific practitioner; instead, Lavinia's basin, carried 'tween her stumps' (V.ii.182), determines the knife's signifying potential and denies the possibility that Titus is simply a murderer. Although Katherine Rowe does not discuss Lavinia's basin, she argues that Lavinia's powerful deployment of manual icons means that she is not simply Titus's passive opposite.¹¹⁸ The basin is for blood (Titus explains it 'receives...guilty blood' (V.ii.183)); the knife, therefore, is for bloodletting. (The editors of Middleton's *Phoenix* infer that a basin should be present on stage when Quieto phlebotomises Tangle, who is bound: '[*Opens Tangle's vein over a basin*]' (s.d. 15:308), '[*Holds up basin to Phoenix*]' (s.d. 15:314).) If Titus were simply to slit the boys' throats, the event would represent butchery or uncomplicated execution. Collecting blood from a bleeding body was not about stage practicality or logic. Early modern playwrights frequently staged bloodbaths for gory effects (Julius Caesar's murder, for example in III.ii).¹¹⁹ By *Titus* V.ii, blood has already spouted and splattered freely on stage.¹²⁰ Shakespeare resists this repetition, producing a different atmosphere.

Simon Harward, a clergyman who was interested in the competence of surgeons, refers to 'the little basins' in which they compare the blood of their patients.¹²¹ According

¹¹⁸ Katherine Rowe, *Dead Hands* (Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1999), pp. 73-80.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Dessen and Thomson for a list of 'bloody' and 'bleeding' stage directions (pp. 32-3); analyses of bloody stage incidents in Leo Kirschbaum, 'Shakespeare's Stage Blood and its Critical Significance', *MLA* 64:3 (1949), 517-529; Richard Sugg, *Murder After Death* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2007), p. 17; Gurr and Ichikawa, pp. 61-2; Margaret Ellen Owens, 'Dismemberment and Decapitation on the English Renaissance Stage' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 1994), pp. 64-83.

¹²⁰ Martius and Quintus fall into a 'blood-drinking pit' (II.ii.224) and are dragged from it covered in blood, Marcus comments on 'all this loss of [Lavinia's] blood' which 'spouts' (II.iii.29, 30), and Aaron '*cuts off Titus' hand*' (s.d. III.i.192).

¹²¹ Simon Harward, *Harwards Phlebotomy* (1601), 17v.

to a proverb in the period, ‘There is no difference of bloods in a basin’.¹²² Of ‘the Brasse Bason’, John Woodall stipulates that a surgeon should have ‘at least...one if not two’.¹²³ However, Woodall explains that there is a difference between the types of utensils used to collect blood, suggesting that Harward’s reference to ‘little basins’ shows his lack of the surgeon’s technical language, which relates to the arguments I made in chapter one. The ‘little basins’ are porringers:

German Surgeons doe ever let blood into a Bason, which I hold not good for the Surgeons Mate to imitate..., except he be of good judgement indeed to judge of the quantity: the blood porringers which are made for that purpose being full, hold just three ounces.¹²⁴

Holme describes various seventeenth-century vessels for phlebotomy – including a ‘*Blood Porrenger*’ to measure out specific quantities of blood.¹²⁵ In London, receptacles for bloodletting decorated shops to advertise the practice, although there were edicts for hygiene. The Company’s Ordinances of 1566 stipulate,

no p[er]sonne of the said mysterye exercysinge fleabothomye or bloudlettinge at any time hereafter shall sett his measures or vesselles w[i]th bloude out or within his shoppe windowe but to hange or set his measures or vesselles cleane one the out syde of the shoppe windowe.¹²⁶

Lavinia’s basin is emblematic of all blood-collecting vessels.¹²⁷ But the size of Lavinia’s basin could also regulate the audience’s perception of Titus’s bloodletting: a large basin implicitly suggests a lot of blood-letting, appropriate to this scene. The ‘*basin*’ in stage

¹²² Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs* (Michigan: University of Michigan, 1950), p. 157 (D335).

¹²³ Woodall, F1v.

¹²⁴ Woodall, F2r.

¹²⁵ Holme (1688), p. 438.

¹²⁶ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 4v.

¹²⁷ Dessen notes that early modern dramatists used vials, urinals and basins to represent characters’ sickness on stage (*Recovering*, p. 112).

directions not only suggests that Shakespeare, like Harward, opts for the convenience of a general description (possibly for the simplicity of stage business), but that his stipulation of a basin was also the stipulation of the non-specialist's blood-letting receptacle. Size, as I implied in the previous chapter, matters. Comparable to the basin prop is the saucer in the opening dumb show of *Devil's Charter* in which a devil-surgeon, equipped with 'a box of Lancets' and a 'saucer', extracts blood from Alexander's arm, whose sleeve is 'strippeth[ed] up' (s.d. A2v). For the contract, the devil-surgeon only needs to let a little of Alexander's blood: the saucer's size reflects the peculiar intricacy of the bloodletting which will not, in itself, kill Alexander.

Lavinia is not a capable assistant and Titus is hardly a suitable practitioner: they have one hand between them.¹²⁸ Lavinia's apprentice role is an element of the dark satire in the play. Deformity was rife in London.¹²⁹ An additional clause in The Company's Ordinances of 1605-6 (revised from 1566) indicates that physical disabilities of apprentices were a problem in London at the end of the sixteenth century:

Item it is ordeyned that no p[er]son beinge a barbor or Surgeon by profession or Admitted to practise Surgery according to the statute w[i]thin the Lymitte before specified shall take any p[er]son to serve him as his Apprentice whoe is decrepit deformed or haveinge any uncleane or noisome disease Or beinge not sownde of his body.¹³⁰

A decrepit or deformed apprentice could disturb, or be the cause of injury to a patient or client. Lavinia's deformation ensures that Titus's surgical operation is part of a wholly perverted medical system which will frighten, damage or kill subjects. Moreover, Titus is a subject of the early modern proverbial joke that 'The best surgeon is he that has been well

¹²⁸ Bate comments on the tragedy's 'relentless play on the word "hands"' (p. 11-12).

¹²⁹ See Margaret Pelling, 'Appearance and Reality' in *London 1500-1700*, ed. A. L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986), pp. 82-112 (p. 89); Young, p. 119.

¹³⁰ Barbers' Archive, *The Charter, Act and Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 28v.

hacked (slashed) himself".¹³¹ In reality, it was required of surgeons to have a 'stedfast hand, voyde of trimblyng' and that he hath the use of the lefte hande, as well as of the ryghte'.¹³²

While knives were a standard instrument for a surgeon (Woodall begins his list of 'The particulars of the Surgeon's Chest' with 'Incision knives' and 'Dismembering knives'¹³³), they were not appropriate for phlebotomy, which 'belongs to Surgery'.¹³⁴ The correct instrument was a lancet. Nicholas Gyer warns,

There is newe kinde of instruments to let blood withall nowe a daies: as the Rapier, Sword, and long Dagger; which bring the blood letters sometime to the Gallowes, because they strike too deepe. These instruments are the Ruffians weapons...veyne[s] must be opened with a fine Launcet.¹³⁵

Titus's knife is a 'Ruffians weapon', unspecific to the task, and his role as a blood-letter is coarse. Titus goes for the boys' throats. Phlebotomists commonly slit veins in the neck, but it was vital that in this procedure they used a fine lancet 'a launcer *cum pilo*, that is to saye, that hath a pyn over-thwart about the ende of the lau[n]cer, to kepe it for goying to depe in the [necke] veyne'.¹³⁶ Gail Kern Paster explains that phlebotomy 'was, at least in theory, a *controlled* opening and closing of the bodily container, a deliberate invitation to that body to bleed where, when, and for how long the phlebotomist and his patient chose'; she

¹³¹ Tilley, p. 643 (S1012).

¹³² Thomas Gale, *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), 8r. Peter Lowe similarly explains the need for ambidextrous surgeons (*The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* (1597), B3v). Memnon warns against his surgeon's 'hand shak[ing]' in Fletcher's *Mad Lover* (C2r).

¹³³ Woodall, A1r.

¹³⁴ Primerose, *Popular Errours*, p. 37.

¹³⁵ Nicholas Gyer, *The English Phlebotomy* (1592), O5r. Woodall (1617) warns of the dangers of phlebotomy insisting on the specificity of the lancet. He remarks, 'it is not amisse to advise [the apprentice surgeon] that he cary...at least sixe of the best sort [of lancet], besides sixe more common ones' (E2v). Cf. J. S. [John Shirley] M. D., *A Short Compendium of Chirurgery* (1678), 17r-v; Parker's examination of official practices of early modern bloodletting ('Cutting Both Ways', pp. 95-104).

¹³⁶ Thomas Geminus, 'A Table Instructive' (1546), para. 2, left-hand column.

concludes, 'We cannot be surprised that phlebotomies often went disastrously wrong' and surgeons easily gain the reputation of being bloodthirsty.¹³⁷ In *Saffron-Walden*, Nashe satirises and makes vulgar the Barber-Surgeon's legitimate training in blood-letting. Of Richard Lichfield's patients, Nashe orders, 'Phlebothomize them, sting them, tutch them Dick, tutch them, play the valiant man at *Armes* and let them bloud and spare not; the Lawe allowes thee to doe it'.¹³⁸ By repeating his instruction to 'tutch', Nashe debases the medical man's professional relationship with the body.¹³⁹ While the effect of Lavinia's blood-collecting represents, in Gail Paster's terms, 'in theory' a controlled process, the lack of discipline in Titus's bloodletting characterises the event. Titus falls into Harward's category of 'unskilfull Surgeons':

There are many unskilfull Surgeons which doe thinke...that for the quantity of bloud, how much may be spared, they neede no other observation, but to let the bloud to runne...so long as they see it to be grosse and corrupt...If they take this course...they may utterly overthrow the strength of their patient.¹⁴⁰

The Company's Court Minutes record dismissals of practitioners who did not conform to regulations. On 20th June, 1609, Mathias Jenkinson was discharged from Surgery for his 'evell & unskilfull practise'.¹⁴¹ Thomas Gale warns how 'easily [a chirurgion] shall fall into intollorable errours, especialye in phlebotomye'.¹⁴² And in the later-seventeenth century, Richard Brome satirises anxieties around bloodletting in *Sparagus Garden*. In II.iii, Mony-lacks, Brittleware and Springe dupe Timothy Hoydens into spending huge sums of money on becoming a gentleman which, they claim, involves removing his 'foule

¹³⁷ Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1993), p. 83.

¹³⁸ Nashe, *Saffron-Walden*, B1v. In the margin, Nashe refers to 'a la[n]ce an instrume[n]t to let bloud with'.

¹³⁹ Cf. 'the spider shall intercept something of you again. He shall be phlebotomist to the fly if she come in his net' (Middleton, *Owl's Almanac*, 2033-5). The spider was the symbol of touch.

¹⁴⁰ Harward, H7v.

¹⁴¹ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/4, p. 54.

¹⁴² Gale, 6v.

ranke blood of Bacon and Pease-porridge...to the last dram'. Timothy worries that he will 'bleed to death', but the confederates reassure him that an 'excellent Chyrurgeon' will be his charge, his 'blood shalbe taken out by degrees', and his 'Mother vaine shall not be prick't'.¹⁴³

To Titus, Chiron and Demetrius's blood is 'guilty' (V.ii.183): the brothers are suitable candidates for phlebotomy because their blood is corrupt and corrupting. In this instance, phlebotomy serves physiological and ideological effect: for cure (bloodletting was the default treatment for imbalanced humours in the body, such as a flux of rheum) and, ironically, death, and for redemption.¹⁴⁴ Bate questions whether the bloodletting is 'a dark parody of the language of the holy eucharist' (FN to V.ii.197). In *Troilus and Cressida*, Paris explains that 'hot blood begets hot thoughts, and hot thoughts beget hot deeds, and hot deeds is love' (III.i.124-5). Demetrius refers to 'heat' (I.i.634) that overwhelms him and when the audience must imagine that Chiron and Demetrius are raping Lavinia offstage, Tamora refers to her 'spleenful sons' (II.ii.191). One of several reasons for opening 'these veines of the necke or throat', Gyer explains, was for 'griefs of the Splene' as well as for 'hot blood'.¹⁴⁵ Titus draws from his patients the life-blood that gave them vigour to enact their heinous deeds: a choleric disposition in humoral terms is the result of excessive yellow bile produced by the spleen. As well as a punitive action, bloodletting here is also strangely curative. At his own (theatrical) execution Thomas More underplays his sentence: 'I come hither only to be let blood...My doctor here tells me it is good for the headache' (17.86-88).

¹⁴³ Richard Brome, *The Sparagus Garden* (1640), D3v-D4r.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Catherine Belling, 'Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge' in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, ed. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 113-132.

¹⁴⁵ Gyer, Q7v.

This curative process in *Titus* is two-fold. First, the Goth brothers are purged. Second, Titus reveals that there is remedial potential of the boys' blood. Mythological Chiron – a satyr, but also the teacher of Asclepius – was, of course, known for using his own blood as a salve. Titus's supposition is based on a kind of surgical knowledge: he transforms blood into a salutary substance which he prescribes to cure Tamora's savage appetite. In order to do this, Titus becomes the dissector who prises apart cadavers. In V.ii, Tamora is the anticipatory patient and Titus concocts a recipe. He might 'play the cook' (V.ii.204), but Titus is a dreadful surgeon dabbling in clinical gastronomy when he declares,

I will grind your bones to dust,
And with your blood and it I'll make a paste,
...
And make two pasties of your shameful heads,
And bid that strumpet, your unhallowed dam,
Like to the earth swallow her own increase. (V.ii.186-187, 189-191)

Repeating,

and when that they are dead
Let me go grind their bones to powder small,
And with this hateful liquor temper it,
And in that paste let their vile heads be baked. (V.ii.197-200)

Surgeon and cook allusions mingle. The polysyndeton in Titus's speech is the cumulative effect of concocting recipes, but in this context also indicates a receipt. Louise Noble examines early modern commerce in pharmacopoeia, and finds clues about the practice of processing body parts (methods of 'curative cannibalism') in the annals of The

Company.¹⁴⁶ Richard Sugg emphasizes that ‘corpse medicine’ was not a marginal enterprise in the early modern period, aligning it with Paracelsian influence on spiritual healing and demonstrating that educated support for medical cannibalism continued throughout the Restoration.¹⁴⁷ The Company regulated uses of mummia and bodily remnants from the dissection table.¹⁴⁸ Medical cannibalistic allusions to bodies and bellies are not uncommon in the period. In *Widow’s Tears*, the Governor imagines how he will deal with corruption in Cyprus: ‘If they bee poore they shall bee burnt to make sope ashes, or given to Surgeons Hall, to bee stamp’t to salve for the French mesells’ (L2r).¹⁴⁹ Culinary and medical themes combine linguistically in Titus’s lines: in its technical sense, ‘temper’ means ‘to moisten (a substance, usually medicinal or culinary ingredients in a comminuted state) so as to form a paste’.¹⁵⁰ In Webster’s *Duchess of Malfi*, Bosolo characterises the aging body of the Duchess as ‘but a salvatory of green mummy’, continuing, ‘what’s this flesh? A little crudded milk, fantastical puff-paste’ (IV.ii.124-26). Carnal appetites are easily replaced with strange, gustatory ones.

In *Sea Voyage*, shipwrecked sailors become cannibalistic. The play satirises a sea surgeon’s gory hunger, knowledge of dissection, and central role in cannibalistic activities, making cannibalism a medical matter, although its relationship to medical cure is questionable, even by early modern standards (see chapter one). Franville asks the Surgeon

¹⁴⁶ Louise Christine Noble, “And Make Two Pasties of Your Shameful Heads”, *ELH* 70:3 (2003), 677-708.

¹⁴⁷ Sugg, “Good Physic but Bad Food”, *Social History of Medicine* 19:2 (2006), 225-240. Sugg also investigates the attitudes towards a variety of forms (and degrees) of Renaissance medicinal cannibalism in *Murder After Death* (pp. 40-49). Cf. David Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 66-79. Hillman reflects on the figurative and rhetorical construction of ‘biting appetites’, and argues that *Troilus and Cressida* is a ‘bulimic play’ in which Thersites in particular brings to an audience’s attention diverse forms of appetite.

¹⁴⁸ See Noble, pp. 684-5. Cf. Sugg, *Murder After Death*, pp. 40-2. Sugg also explores the trade in *mummia* and its lucrative counterfeits (pp. 47-9).

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Old Carter’s reference to supper and anatomies in Barber-Surgeon’s Hall in Dekker, Ford, W. Rowley, *The Witch of Edmonton* (1658), B4v.

¹⁵⁰ *OED*, ‘temper’, v, 11. a. Cf. Wendy Wall, ‘Blood in the Kitchen’ in *Staging Domesticity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 189-220 (esp. p. 196).

whether he has kept ‘the great Wen / [He] cutst from *Hugh* the saylers shoulder’ (Aaaaa4v). He wants to eat the wart. Although he is referring to growths on horses, Gervase Markham characterises the quality of a wen in the second book of his treatise which ‘belongeth to Chirurgerie’:

A Wenne is a certaine bunch or kinnell upon the skinne, like a tumor or swelling; the inside whereof is sometimes hard like a gristell, and spongiuous like a skinne full of soft warts; and sometimes yellow like unto rusted bacon, with some white graines among¹⁵¹

Markham’s analogy of wens to ‘rusted bacon’ puts warts in the category of ‘foodstuffs’; ‘graines’ are associated with cereals. When Aminta faints before the men, the Surgeon says, ‘I think shee may be made good meat. / But look we shall want Salt’ (Bbbbb1r). Starving Morillat encourages, ‘Wake her Surgeon, and cut her throate, / And then divide her, every man his share’ (Bbbbb1r). So that ‘shee’l eat the sweeter’, the Surgeon explains, Aminta must have her ‘humorous parts’ ‘suck[ed] out’ (Bbbbb1r). Morillat and the Surgeon recognise that draining blood from a living, conscious body results in culinary excellence. The surgeon in *Sea Voyage* admits, ‘I confesse an appetite’ and the sequence echoes the way in which Titus deals with his subjects. In addition, Aminta is not simply good food that can alleviate the threat of famine, she is also a ‘restoring meate’ and her body represents a type of treatment as well as a banquet. Descriptions of food, cure and dissection synthesise in *Duchess of Malfi* when Duke Ferdinand threatens his Doctor who has been unable to cure the Duke’s incestuous infatuation. Ferdinand says he will ‘stamp’ the Doctor ‘into a cullis’ (V.ii.75-6), and orders, ‘flay off his skin, to cover one of the / anatomies, this rogue hath set i’t’h’ cold yonder, in / Barber-Chirurgeons’ Hall’ (V.ii.76-8).

¹⁵¹ Gervase Markham, ‘The Second Booke’ in *Markhams Maister-Peece* (1610), p. 270.

A cullis is a broth used to nourish the sick.¹⁵² Ferdinand imagines that the Doctor's dead body – rather than his (lack of) existing skills – would best serve as a cure and as a preservative.

At the heart of these allusions, the imagined or anticipated venue for dealing with gourmet bodies, is Barber-Surgeons' Hall, where dissections and lectures in anatomy took place. Here, belly-feeding activities are also blurred.¹⁵³ Before the dissection theatre was commissioned for the Company in 1636, cadavers were chopped up in the kitchen of the Hall. The Court Minutes take notice on 20th October, 1631,

...of the lack of a private dissection Roome for anatomicall imployemente and that hitherto those bodies have beene agreate annoyance to the tables dresser boards and utensils in o[u]r upper kitchin by reason of the blood filth and entrails of those Anathomyes.¹⁵⁴

This kitchen was evidently well used: in early modern London, the Barber-Surgeons' Hall was a place of anatomical and surgical learning, but also a social centre; the Company held annual feasts and let out the Hall for functions.¹⁵⁵ The observation made in the minutes in 1631 was driven by the Company's collective anxiety that the anatomies they dissected might end up on their dinner plates.

But the corpse medicine is not the only cannibalistic impulse in *Titus*: the context of this cannibalism is also, of course, revenge. In Sugg's terms, this is also a form 'exocannibalism': 'extreme aggression against one's enemy'.¹⁵⁶ Noble uses the term

¹⁵² *OED*, 'cullis', n.¹.

¹⁵³ Cf. Pelling, 'Compromised by Gender' in *The Task of Healing*, ed. Hilary Marland and Margaret Pelling (Rotterdam: Erasmus, 1996), pp. 101-133, where she examines physicians' connection – from the classical period – with cooks, demonstrating that in early modernity, "cookery" and "cooks" became terms of abuse with both status and gender implications' (p. 104).

¹⁵⁴ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 200.

¹⁵⁵ See Young, pp. 443-467. For details about the regulated use of the company hall, see the seventh clause of the 1566 ordinances in *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 2r.

¹⁵⁶ Sugg, *Murder After Death*, p. 37. I say a 'form of' because Titus does not actually eat the bodies.

‘surgical barbarity’ to explain irregular medical practice.¹⁵⁷ I now want to explore how barbery themes in *Titus* align themselves with surgical aberration. This context is more complex than a suggested doubling-up of poor surgical phlebotomy and illegal barbery bloodletting, although that link too is important.¹⁵⁸ Middleton’s satiric comment in *Owl’s Almanac* that without surgeons, ‘letting of blood will be common’ (2032-2033) amuses a readership that knows it is already common. (Attacks on the practice of bloodletting (and an increasingly vehement rejection of Galenic physiology and theory) occurred later in the seventeenth century.¹⁵⁹ William Harvey’s discovery of blood circulation had little immediate effect on bloodletting practices based on Galenic theory, which were well established in the period.) But those barbers discovered practising surgery in early modern London were warned, fined or dismissed by the Company. On 3rd July 1599, one ‘Watson confessed before the Maisters that he used Flebotomey beinge not Surgeon’, but, by implication, being a barber. And on 29th July 1600, the Court Minutes note that ‘This daye \it is/ ordered that John Mowle shalbe warned to be before the M[aster]s the next Court for usinge surgery beinge but a barbor’.¹⁶⁰

In *Titus*, the barbery context is composite, not centred on a particular scene or any one action. However, it is emblemised on stage by a single prop: Lavinia’s basin. The basin is part of bloodletting equipment, but here it is also Lavinia’s response to the barbery context which characterises her victimisation. The basin is also a shaving bowl. In the light of these barbery signs Titus’s aim for Chiron and Demetrius’s necks is telling: in the same way that I highlighted Gloucester’s eyes as a vulnerable organ in the barber(-surgeon)’s

¹⁵⁷ Noble, p. 698.

¹⁵⁸ Barbers continued to let blood despite warnings. In barber Stafford Tyndall’s inventory ‘a fleame for letting blood’ is included (Stafford Tyndall, Lambeth (1665), PROB 4/7218).

¹⁵⁹ See George Thompson, *Aimatiasis* (1670).

¹⁶⁰ *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, pp. 23, 65.

chair, so here I highlight the neck. The perennial fear of the barber's client is that his throat might be slit. In *Damon and Pithias* and *Herod and Antipater*, the kings fear that a barber can 'lay [a] Razor to [their] throat' (*Herod and Antipater* (1622), G4r). The barber's boy refers in *Midas* to shaving when the barber 'hath the throat at command' (III.ii.85). In the Lichfield pamphlet, the author gives the example of '*Dionisius...that feared no peeres stooode alwaies in feare of Barbers, and rather would have his hayre burnt off, than happen in to the Barbers handes*'; and he concludes, 'All trades adorne the life of man, but none (except Barbers) have the life of man in their power, and to them they hold up their throats readie'.¹⁶¹

The barber's basin, like the barber's chair, was essential to the trade. Whenever barbers' shops closed in the period, people described the procedure in terms of taking down basins: on 30th April, 1605, barber Stephen Abraham was ordered to 'take downe his basons and geve over his shop'.¹⁶² Indeed, as I discussed in chapter two, in terms of denoting the barber's shop in the early part of the seventeenth century, the basin superseded the barber's pole. Ordinances of 1566 specify, 'yt is Ordayned that no p[er]son using Barbory...hange upp, set, or put out any Bason or Basons...uppon his poule Racke shoppe windowes'.¹⁶³ The barber's pole was simply one part (the supporting structure, in fact) of the definitive sign of barberry. In William Rowley's short tract, *A Search For Money* (1609), the author describes a barber leaving his shop with his 'banner of basons swinging in the ayre'.¹⁶⁴ Ralph in *Quiet Life* says to the Barber, 'I will break thy head with every basin under the pole' (II.iv.65-6). Perhaps Ralph's comment is an indication as to

¹⁶¹ Lichfield[?], B4r-v.

¹⁶² *Court Minutes*, B/1/3, p. 238.

¹⁶³ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 4r.

¹⁶⁴ William Rowley, *A Search for Money* (1609), B2v-B3r.

why the basin was removed from the pole and replaced – eventually – with the decorative knob with which we are familiar today. Thirty years after Abraham’s case, the pole starts to be prioritized: on 1st December 1635, John Robinson was ordered to ‘take in his barbors pole & basons, & to forbear keeping that shop any longer’.¹⁶⁵ And in *Fancies*, Secco refers to his ‘Pole’ within simultaneous mention of the basin (I1r). Basins were defining objects for the outside of a barber’s shop because they were fundamental to the barbery activities within. A barber used the basin for cleaning and shaving although the shape doubled up with the design of phlebotomy vessels. Holme defines the ‘*Barbers Washing Bason, or Trimming Bason*’ which, he explains, ‘generally have rounds cut in the rim or edge thereof, to compass about a Mans Throat’.¹⁶⁶ The basin is a point of orientation in the shop. Holme lists specific barbery terms such as ‘*Handle the Bason*’ and ‘*Dry the Bason*’ suggesting the centrality of this object in barbery procedures.¹⁶⁷ John Eliot provides the French for ‘*Hold up this bason*’ (‘*Haulssez ce bassin*’).¹⁶⁸ In Greene’s *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, Cloth Breeches’s comments on barbery procedures include the phrase ‘[the barber] comes to the bason’.¹⁶⁹

The barber’s basin is referenced and stipulated as barbers’ standard appurtenance in several early modern plays: Cocledemoy borrows a ‘basin’ as part of his barber disguise (*Dutch Courtesan*, II.i.186); Secco’s equipment includes a ‘*Bason*’ (*Fancies*, s.d. I4r); one of Barbaroso’s prisoners emerges from a cave ‘*with a basin under his chin*’ (*Burning Pestle*, s.d. III.366) and the object outside Barbaroso’s dwelling, which likely merits a

¹⁶⁵ *Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 200.

¹⁶⁶ Holme (1688), p. 438. John Webster (a seventeenth century medical figure, not the playwright), describes the pan in which miners sift for gold in a text dedicated to the knowledge and science of minerals and metals: ‘being round and hollow in the middle, like unto a Barbers Basin’ (*Metallographia* (1671), p. 160).

¹⁶⁷ Holme (1688), p. 128.

¹⁶⁸ John Eliot, *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), I1r.

¹⁶⁹ Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), C3v.

prop, is a ‘basin’ (III.239); Preist calls out in mock alarm, ‘what are you [Sweetball] gone from the Bason?’ (*Preist the Barber*, lines 50-51); and Licio refers to ‘the barber’s basin’ metonymically (*Midas*, III.ii.63, see chapter five). To a contemporary audience, the basin on stage is a stereotype of the barber package. However, accompanied by the knife and not the razor (nor apron, towel, comb, nor scissors), the basin in *Titus* is far from a secure signifier: it will collect blood shed by the practitioner of surgery, but it looks like barbering furniture. Its name, ‘basin’, is a term used more in barbering than in surgery language, as indicated earlier by my references to porringers and saucers. The portable basin that is a familiar comic prop is not in *Titus* re-imagined as in *Burning Pestle* and *Damon and Pithias* to be something amusingly other than it is, but smacks sinisterly of authenticity, which, nevertheless, takes us in two directions.

The audience’s perception of the basin is shaped by barbering metaphor earlier in the play which underlines this prop’s thematic importance. When Lucius confronts Aaron about Chiron and Demetrius’s abominable acts, Aaron jeers at Lavinia’s rape and dismemberment. Literal and figurative meanings clash uncomfortably in his description and the lively punning is manifold.

AARON	They cut thy sister’s tongue and ravished her And cut her hands and trimmed her as thou sawest.
LUCIUS	O detestable villain, call’st thou that trimming?
AARON	Why, she was washed and cut and trimmed, and ’twas Trim sport for them which had the doing of it. (V.i.92-96)

Aaron’s asteismus depicting horrific deeds on Lavinia using the language of barbering – of common matters and hygiene routines – disgusts Lucius. One of Rowlands’s epigrams refers to ‘common Sope’, ‘ordinarie Bals’ and ‘common trimming’; ‘commonness’, of

course, doubles with notions of promiscuity (the ‘common Whore’) as well as banality.¹⁷⁰ Aaron implies that Chiron and Demetrius’s behaviour is humdrum, not extraordinary, and in doing so he undercuts any sense that he is applying elaborate metaphor: his representation has uncomfortable tangibility, not obscurity. Add to this the sense that barbers’ language is usually bawdy language and we understand the depth of Lucius’s repulsion. Puns on ‘trim’ typify barbering humour with their potential for *double entendre* and suggestions of dishonesty. In one of Dekker’s jests, a barber’s apprentice impregnates a girl, and the tale concludes: ‘your man has done no more then what he is bound to by indenture, which is to follow his trade, and thats to trimme folkes’.¹⁷¹ A seventeenth-century ballad, ‘Merry Tom of All Trades’, describes Tom’s barber role with the lines, ‘And I can trim a woman / as well as any man’ (and the stanza refers pointedly to his ‘Razor and ‘Washing-balls’).¹⁷² The notion of the ‘trimmed’ female body also holds linguistic doubleness. Whereas in *Titus* trimmed Lavinia is a dismembered rape victim, Juliet’s supposed trimness in *Romeo and Juliet* is testament to her adorned, virginal body. Juliet’s nurse is instructed by Capulet to make her ‘trim’ (IV.iv.24) before her wedding night with Paris. References to women’s treatment in barbering terms shift between suggesting their sexual availability and sexual vulnerability. ‘Trim’ (in its various forms) is ubiquitous in barbering language – both in its official terminology and in literary representation of official terminology – and is a verbal signal of the trade. In Holme (1688), most uses of ‘trim’ and ‘trimming’ are in barbers’ turns of phrase. (The second most prevalent use is in nautical language, and the third in haberdashery terms.) Two

¹⁷⁰ Rowlands, A8v (Epi. 13).

¹⁷¹ Dekker, *Jests to Make You Merie* (1607), C2r (jest 35).

¹⁷² Anon, ‘Merry Tom of all Trades’ (1681-84), stanza 10, lines 3-6.

contemporary works' titles, already cited in this study, use 'trimming' to establish directly a barbery context: *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* and 'New Trimming'.

Lucius responds to Aaron's description: 'O barbarous, beastly villains, like thyself!' (V.i.97). Q1's spelling is 'barberous' (*Titus* (1594), I1v). But graphemic variations do not alter the effect of this word in performance: whether spelt with an 'a' or an 'e', when uttered – especially in this context – 'barbarous' to an audience puns on 'barber'. Patricia Parker explores the semantic nexus of 'Barbary', 'barbarousness' and 'barber', explaining the self-consciousness of the wordplay available: 'conflations of sound and interchangeable spellings were joined by the polyglot influence of languages in which different parts of the network were semantically or etymologically connected'.¹⁷³ Thinking back to the sequence discussed in *Sea Voyage* earlier in this chapter, it is little wonder that Aminta apostrophises the surgeon-led group of sailors who nearly mutilate and eat her with the words, 'Hear me ye barbarous men', to be echoed by Albert a number of lines later, 'O barbarous men!' (Bbbbb1r). (See also Truewit's reference to the barber as 'a barbarian' (II.vi.6) in *Epicoene*; Quintiliano's question to Cutbeard in Chapman's *May-Day*, 'What newes out of Barbary?' ((1611), E2r); Dekker's description of 'every base barbarous Barber' (*Horn-Book*, C3v); Spadone's reference to barber Secco as an 'aproved Barbarian' (*Fancies*, B1r), and Secco's wife Morosa telling him he is 'Barbarous minded' (*Fancies*, G4r).) For a barber to be 'barbarous' is for him to be aligned with barber-surgery. There are seven uses of 'barbarous' in *Titus* which are significant oral signifiers in the play's barbery sign system – Calderwood notes that 'the word "barbarous" appears more often in *Titus* than in any other of Shakespeare's plays', but fails to register the

¹⁷³ Parker, 'Barbers and Barbary', *RD* 33 (2004), 201-244 (p. 201).

barber association.¹⁷⁴ In I.i alone there are three, accompanied by allusions to ‘razors’ (I.i.319) and ‘raze’ (I.i.456): barbering puns hang in the air from early on in the play. In his study on puns and wordplay in early modern drama, Jeremy Lopez explains that ‘Constant, unsubtle, even strained puns keep the [theatrical] surface very active’, concluding that ‘When the surface is active, the audience responds’. However, Lopez primarily explores puns that are separated from what is actually occurring on stage: jokes that are ‘clearly a product of convenience more than design’.¹⁷⁵ Simon Palfrey, by comparison, argues that Shakespearean puns are often ‘more than an immediate verbal “hit”’, and suggests that ‘precisely in the wordplay...Shakespeare is plotting a particular play’s working architecture, the connecting points “beneath” the various characters and crises’.¹⁷⁶ In my example from *Titus*, the puns and wordplays do not ‘remove an audience to a level where the artificiality of language is self-contained and self-sufficient’; instead, they offer the audience a sign-system through which to envisage and see methods of abuse and consequential methods of retribution in the play.¹⁷⁷ Lucius’s response, which is to call the Goths ‘barberous’, ensures (ironically, through punning) that an audience grasps the barbering puns which matter in the play’s semiotics.

Lavinia is barbered in a surgical manner: she is disastrously mis-fashioned. Like the verb ‘trim’, ‘cut’ holds linguistic doubleness. Usually in the lexical context of a ‘wash, cut and trim’, ‘cut’ refers alone to hair; here, however, the semantics shift because of earlier allusion to ‘cut [her] tongue’ and ‘cut her hands’, actions of limb severance. The

¹⁷⁴ Calderwood, p. 29. The *Titus* references are: ‘barbarous Goths’ (I.i.28), ‘Was never Scythia half so barbarous!’ (I.i.134), ‘be not barbarous’ (I.i.383), ‘barbarous Moor’ (II.ii.78), ‘barbarous Tamora’ (II.ii.118), ‘barbarous, beastly villains’ (V.i.97) and again ‘barbarous Moor’ (V.iii.4).

¹⁷⁵ See Jeremy Lopez, *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), pp. 35-55 (pp. 37-8, 44).

¹⁷⁶ Simon Palfrey, *Doing Shakespeare* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005), pp. 134-167 (p. 159).

¹⁷⁷ Lopez, p. 48.

proximity of verb usages enables linguistic and phonetic connectivity, and underlines the mixed tropes of barbering and surgery. Moreover, as a verb, 'cut' also means to 'help oneself sexually', and as a noun, 'cut' was synonymous with vagina.¹⁷⁸ Lavinia's rape is linked to surgical acts of violation on the body and sexually-orientated barbering. Bate interprets Aaron's punning as butchery metaphor, explaining that a 'washed and cut and trimmed' Lavinia is treated 'like dead meat'.¹⁷⁹ However, Lavinia is trimmed alive. In contrast, Antony calls Caesars' assassins 'butchers' (*Julius Caesar*, III.i.258). None of the butchers' trade terms in Holme involve any form of the word 'trim', and the notion of trimming meat (and therefore trimmings of meat) enters the language in the nineteenth century.¹⁸⁰ The triadic activity and figure of speech of washing, cutting and trimming is characteristic of barbering, not butchery. The opening of a dialogue between neighbours Balthasar the barber and Bennion the button-maker has a similar turn of phrase: Balthasar says he has 'bin washing, shaving, and trimming'.¹⁸¹ On the subject of 'trimming' in Fleet Street, Dekker asks, 'how hast thou bene trimd, washed, Shaven and Polde by these deere and damnable Barbers?'.¹⁸² The boys' barbaric washing of Lavinia's body is a licentious lathering and flushing out, not a sanitizing butchery activity: washing Lavinia is dirtying her through perverted barbering.¹⁸³ Sugg similarly notes that a choice of word or context

¹⁷⁸ Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols (London; Atlantic Highlands NJ: Athlone, 1994), I, pp. 357-9.

¹⁷⁹ Bate, FN to V.i.95. Bate retains this footnote for his later edition of *Titus* in *The RSC Shakespeare*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2007).

¹⁸⁰ See Holme (1688), pp. 87-88; *OED*, 'trimming, *vbl. n.*', 1.c. *pl.*

¹⁸¹ Anon, *Temporis Filia Veritas* ([S.I.: s.n.]: 1589), Aijr.

¹⁸² Dekker, *Lanthorne and Candle-Light* (1609), B3v.

¹⁸³ Cf. Grimball's bawdy dialogue – on the subject of washing – with Dalia, a prostitute (*Promos and Cassandra*, Eiiiv [sig. Eiiii is missing from the text]).

other than butchery (in his example ‘anatomy’ is favoured over ‘butchery’) can make the semiotic ‘a stronger form of socially degrading taboo’.¹⁸⁴

Four other references in *Titus* – to payment, hair, a pillow and a pattern – although extraneous in themselves, add texture to the barbery frame in the play’s early stages. First, Tamora regards Lavinia’s body as her ‘sweet sons[’]...fee’ (II.ii.179). The monetary term transforms Lavinia and sex into commodity value. Perhaps Lavinia gains a whore-status, but in this fiscal exchange, the boys receive a ‘fee’ for trimming Lavinia, and not *vice versa*: Chiron and Demetrius (not yet Lavinia) are at work. That ‘barber’ could be synonymous with ‘prostitute’ suggests that the whore-status is turned on the two boys.¹⁸⁵ Phillip Stubbes satirises a barber’s objective: ‘what tricking, and triming, what rubbing what scratching, what combing and clawing...and al to tawe out mony you may be sure’.¹⁸⁶ Costs mount for the person *who is trimmed*. Second, if we think of barbers, we think of hair. When Quintus describes the pit into which the Goth brothers throw Bassianus, he is also describing Lavinia’s vagina.¹⁸⁷ The pit’s ‘mouth is covered with rude-growing briars’ (II.ii.199): Chiron and Demetrius encounter Lavinia’s hair as part of their trimming procedure. In the period, trimmed female pubic hair was called a ‘cony barber’ and was associated with assault.¹⁸⁸ Third, the rapists draw attention to the seat on which Lavinia will be trimmed. This is not a chair, but the body of Lavinia’s dead husband, Bassianus. Chiron anticipates ‘mak[ing] his dead trunk pillow to our lust’ (II.ii.130).

¹⁸⁴ Sugg, *Murder After Death*, p. 56.

¹⁸⁵ Williams, I, pp. 69-70.

¹⁸⁶ Phillip Stubbes, *The Second Pat of the Anatomie of Abuses Conteining the Display of Corruptions* (1583), G8v.

¹⁸⁷ See Bate (ed.), *Titus*, p. 8-9; Laurie Maguire, *Helen of Troy* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 83-4..

¹⁸⁸ Williams, I, pp. 300-301. See the anonymous ballad ‘A Pleasant New Song Called The Cony Barber’ (1680-85 [1683]) which tells of a girl whose pubic hair is trimmed while she sleeps. Lopez gives examples of ‘coney’ puns (p. 43). Cf. barber Secco’s description of being cuckolded in *Fancies*: ‘this sucking Ferret hath been wrigling in my old Coney borough’ (G4v).

Pillows stuffed with excrements from a barber's shop were a familiar joke in the period (see chapter five). Rowlands's barber epigram refers to the 'Cushion [that] entertaines [the] slopp' of a barber's client.¹⁸⁹ Finally, the mise-en-scene of demoniacal barbering in *Titus* emulates the common attire of a barber. Tamora characterizes the wood where Lavinia is violated as patterned: 'The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind / And make a *chequered* shadow on the ground' [italics mine] (II.ii.14-15). Today we associate barbers with stripes (on the barber's pole), but in the seventeenth century, a barber is 'always known by his *Cheque parti-coloured Apron*' which 'needs not mentioning'.¹⁹⁰ In *Midas*, Motto glorifies 'chequered-apron men' (III.ii.161) and the barber is called a 'Checkerman' in *Adrasta* (I1r). The atmospheric 'chequered shadow' camouflages unimaginable actions of II.ii in the guise, in this instance, linguistic – of common barbering.¹⁹¹

After their heinous deeds, the brothers taunt Lavinia for being unclean. Chiron says, 'Go home, call for sweet water, wash thy hands' (II.iii.6). Having been savagely trimmed, Lavinia needs her own basin, soap and water and more traditional barbering attentions, which were hygiene-focused.¹⁹² The boys' joke in *Titus* however, is that in the same way that cosmetics cannot erase a person's sexual history, so the perfumed waters

¹⁸⁹ Rowlands, A7v (Epi. 13). In *The Humorous Courtier* (1640) by James Shirley, Crispino (the ex-barber) remarks on his short-lived run as a judge: 'Eare I've made my cushion warme!' (K1v).

¹⁹⁰ Holme, p. 127.

¹⁹¹ Gurr and Ichikawa conclude that 'With very few exceptions...scenes were fixed by word-painting rather than scene-painting' (p. 62), and Stern argues the important absence of realistic stage scenery on the Shakespearean stage with reference to *Tempest*, explaining that 'when a place is envisioned only verbally, the depiction given is not always supposed to be understood in a straightforward fashion' (*Making Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 92-93 (p. 92)).

¹⁹² On barbers and sweet waters, see Stubbes, G8v, and *Horne-Book*, F2v.

Compare this with the dumb show in the anonymously written, *A Warning for Faire Women* (1599?) in which Tragedie 'Enter[s] with a bowle of bloud in her hand', referring to the 'deadly banquet' and 'bloudy feast' at hand which includes 'wine...[in] dead mens sculles' (C4v-D1r). The bowl appears then to be taken from Tragedie by Murther (although nothing is cued in the script) and 'Murther settes downe her blood and rubbes [Brown's, Roger and Drury's and Anne's] hands', preparing the path for terrible crimes (D1v-D2r). Lady Macbeth knows the futility of trying to wash away a crime.

cannot make Lavinia sweet. They align her with the female who William Averell portrays at the beginning of *A Dyall for Dainty Darlings* (1584) to illustrate the futile methods of ‘washing in sweet waters...anointing with sweet odours...to make the body sweete, when...pride and whordome...make...soules to stincke’.¹⁹³ On one occasion, Sweetball in *Quiet Life* curses his misfortunes saying, ‘My sweetballs stink’ (II.iv.70), playing to a dirty pun. In Jonson’s *Staple of News*, the bodies of Pecunia’s women seem available as they joke about their ‘legs [being] / Turn’d in or writh’d about’ (IV.iii.55-56), much to Pennyboy Senior’s dismay as he refers to them as ‘you whores, / My bawds, my instruments!’ (IV.iii.58-60). Two jeerers respond:

MADRIGAL

Barbers are at hand.

They all threaten.

ALMANAC Washing and shaving will ensue. (IV.iii.68-69)

The stage direction, ‘*They all threaten*’, is given in the margin of the 1631 collection, and it is not clear which line merits the action, what this action specifically involves, nor who makes it on stage.¹⁹⁴ Unfortunately, unlike a prop, a theatrical gesture is not so easily recorded. But it is clear that a vulgar gesture existed which denoted barbering, perhaps relating to the barber’s third ‘tongue between two of his fingers’ (see chapter one). The analogy between a sexualised threat conceived through ‘washing’ on the female body and barbering activities is clear in the dialogue. Washing is associated with ritual, rites and routine and in *Titus* it is used as an aesthetic means to connect perverted activities. Shakespeare aligns images of washing not with biblical baptismal metaphor but with barbering, and these external processes of cleaning the body correspond to phlebotomy

¹⁹³ William Averell, *A Dyall for Dainty Darlings* (1584), Biiiir.

¹⁹⁴ See *The Staple of Newes* in *Bartholmew Fayre / The Divell is an Asse / The Staple of Newes* (1631), H1r.

procedure by which the inner body is purged. Barber-surgery in *Titus* scours bodies inside and out, and Lavinia's name, from the Latin, *lavare* (to wash), encodes this reading.¹⁹⁵

Although he does not make the barber/surgery link either within or between *Titus* and *King Lear*, Bate senses a connection which supports my explorations in this chapter: 'There is also an anticipation of *Lear* [in the sick comedy of hand washing in *Titus*], where Cornwall accompanies the gouging of Gloucester's eyes with some grimly witty word-play'.¹⁹⁶ The witty word-play in II.iv *Titus* conjures the image of Lavinia with a basin and imparts significance to the later materialization of this object. Sofer explains, 'The stage property offers a way to rescue the material object from the ocean of signs limned by theatre semiotics, and indeed, to distinguish the prop from other material objects on stage'.¹⁹⁷ The basin gives material weight to V.ii and concretizes visually contexts hitherto only linguistically present.¹⁹⁸ The basin is a sign of reversed (mis)fortunes and apposite reprisal; as a stage property it has a practical function (in that it collects blood), medical value, and simultaneously it has symbolic effect in that it is referential to previous barber contexts constructed in the play. E. A. M. Colman states that 'it is no simple matter to determine precisely where, or why, the sexuality [in *Titus*] turns bawdy'.¹⁹⁹ My barber-surgery reading enables us to see how the sick interplay is envisaged.

¹⁹⁵ See Belling (p. 126) who registers the onomastic implication but does not elucidate its implication.

¹⁹⁶ Bate (ed.), *Titus*, p. 10.

¹⁹⁷ Sofer, p. 11.

¹⁹⁸ See the woodcut of the *Titus* story which accompanies seventeenth- and eighteenth-century broadside ballads, 'The Lamentable and Tragical History of Titus Andronicus' (for example 1658-64 [1661] (Wing L252A) and 1674-79 [1677] (Wing L252)) and which centralises and makes its kinetic focus the bloodletting sequence showing Lavinia with her basin. A ballad does not need a prop, but the receptacle is visually and linguistically referenced (as a 'pan' in the lyrics, for metrical logic) suggesting its indebtedness to the play's striking motif. On the ballad as a source see Bate (ed.), *Titus*, pp. 83-85; Stern, pp. 101-102; Richard Levin, 'The Longleat Manuscript and Titus Andronicus', *SQ* 55:3 (2002), 323-340 (esp. pp. 334-337); M. Mincoff, 'The Source of "Titus Andronicus"', *N&Q* 18:4 (1971), 131-4; Ralph M. Sargent, 'The Source of *Titus Andronicus*', *SP* 46:2 (1949), 167-183.

¹⁹⁹ E. A. M. Colman, *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare* (London: Longman, 1974), p. 60.

**

Shakespeare recognises the theatrical potential that the combination of barbering and surgical practices holds, and he makes symbolic on stage what is familiar in contemporary life by exploiting barbering and surgery signs' ability to communicate without direct reference. The semiotics I explore in these plays are, in part, surface-level, visible, tangible, and simple; at the same time they are linguistically complex, and thematically composite. The barbering and surgery signs have contextual referent points that in modern production can be lost or misinterpreted. By uncovering these contexts (historical, theatrical and literary) we appreciate the richness of the barber-surgery allusion and its dramaturgical effect, the symbolic use of particular props on the early modern stage, and the linguistic intelligence of these Shakespearean passages. The semiotics of irregular barber-surgery in *King Lear* and *Titus Andronicus* enable Shakespeare to explore and stage uncivilizing processes of past eras that resonate through contemporary unease: this is Shakespeare's lurking civic and medical satire.

Chapter 4

‘And pleasant harmonie shall sound in your eares’: Ballads, Music and Groans, Snip-snaps, Fiddlesticks, Ear-picks and Wax

‘That cursed barber!’

Two comments about Jonson’s *Epicoene* are my springboard to this chapter. William Kerwin explains that ‘Cutbeard [the barber] is remarkable to the characters [of *Epicoene*] for his relation to sound...in a profession known for its garrulousness, he is able both to find a woman quiet enough...and to comport himself noiselessly enough’.¹ Writing on the noisy soundscapes of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, Emily Cockayne discusses the play’s ‘sonic theme’ in relation to contemporary advice about seeking out ‘aural ease’.² Kerwin only highlights the barber’s relationship to talkativeness (leaving unexplored ‘sound’ and ‘noise’ as non-verbal concepts in this context), and Cockayne only focuses on the play’s exploration of ambient city and domestic noise.³ (Despite Michael Flachmann’s assertion that ‘*The Silent Woman*, is anything but a silent play’, he interprets its noise as analogical to hell and purgatory, and sidelines its civic logic.⁴) Throughout *Epicoene*, Cutbeard has an impact upon Morose’s, and therefore the audience’s, aural experience and we should interpret Kerwin’s and Cockayne’s responses to the play simultaneously: the barber is the linchpin in the play’s satirical exploration of loquaciousness *and* sonority in

¹ William Kerwin, *Beyond the Body* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), pp. 126-7.

² Emily Cockayne, *Hubbub* (New Haven; London: Yale UP, 2007), pp. 106-130 (pp. 109-10).

³ Morose’s objection to noise is far more encompassing than an objection to people talking in his presence: sounds other than the human voice offend him, including bearward’s dogs, a fencer’s drum, bells, snoring and creaking shoes. Some tradesmen are particularly irksome to him because of the equipment they use as well as their street cries: ‘chimney-sweepers’, ‘broom-men’, ‘any hammerman’, ‘brazier[s]’, and ‘pewterer[s]’s prentice[s]’ use tools that beat, bang, scrape and crash (Ben Jonson, *Epicoene*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black, 2005), I.i.146-153). Bruce R. Smith reminds us that plays were often full ‘not just of human voices, but of sound effects’ (*The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. 218) making us wonder how noisy *Epicoene*’s soundscape may have originally been.

⁴ Michael Flachmann, ‘*Epicoene*: A Comic Hell for a Comic Sinner’, *MaRDiE* 1 (1984), 131-142 (p. 131).

the city, the impact of both verbal and non-verbal sound. This chapter investigates why a barber is related to the latter, reflecting on the raw physical effects of hearing, while my final chapter examines barbery's association with gossip mongering and verborities in the light of another of Jonson's plays, *Staple of News*. Jonson's choice of a barber character in *Epicoene* is a prudent, dramaturgical one, although critics have, for the most part, avoided commenting on this figure.⁵ In a play that satirises aural experiences and the noisy soundscapes of early modern London, as well as caricatures those persons affected by noise, barbery and the barber are contextual and contextualising constructs. Kerwin's dramaturgical point is that 'by making [Cutbeard] a barber, Jonson places him at the center of London's culture of appearances'.⁶ But by making Cutbeard a barber, Jonson also places him at the centre of London's culture of sound.

In his first appearance on stage, Morose is impatient for Cutbeard to arrive. Indeed he is the first person about whom Morose enquires: 'And you [Mute] have been with Cutbeard, the barber, to have him come to me? – Good. And, he will come presently? ...How long will it be ere Cutbeard come?' (II.i.15-21). Morose is not waiting to have his beard trimmed. He is instead contemplating how to defend and distract himself from 'the labour of speech' (II.i.2), 'the discord of sounds' (II.i.3) and 'noise' (II.i.12). (The irony of 'Cutbeard' is that he is never connected to cutting beards in the play.) Morose is, instead, impatient for the arrival of the barber who is his sound control. The first time that an audience witnesses Morose responding to noise in performance is when a horn is blown offstage to herald a 'post from court' (II.i.42): Morose cries, 'Oh! oh! What villain, what prodigy of mankind is that? ...Oh! cut his throat, cut his throat!' (II.i.38-40), applying a murderous barbery threat which analogises how to exterminate offensive sound. Throats in

⁵ On Jonson's 'utilitarian approach' to character in *Epicoene* see Kate D. Levin, 'Unmasquing *Epicoene*' in *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson*, ed. James Hirsh (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson UP; London: Associated University Presses, 1997), pp. 128-153 (p. 130).

⁶ Kerwin, p. 126. Cf. Farah Karim-Cooper, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama* (Edinburgh UP, 2006), pp. 111-126, although she does not discuss the presence of a barber in *Epicoene*.

Epicoene, associated with barbery, are not portrayed as places of hair-growth, but of noise-making: alone with the barber in the next scene, Morose complains of Truewit, ‘Oh, Cutbeard, Cutbeard, Cutbeard! here has been a cutthroat with me’ (II.ii.147-148); later, Truewit refers to Cutbeard saying, ‘may he cut a collier’s throat with his razor’ (III.v.110); and finally, Morose complains of the wedding guests that ‘They have rent my roof, walls, and all my windows asunder, with their brazen throats’ (IV.ii.116-117).

Cutbeard is associated with the misogynistic default that females talk too much, in particular supplied by Truewit: ‘Why, you oppress me with wonder! A woman, and a barber, and love no noise!’ (I.ii.34-35).⁷ The barbery context can transpose the female voice into a musical instrument, with Morose declaring, ‘I have married [the barber’s] cittern, that’s common to all men’ (III.v.60): Morose blames Cutbeard for being the sole provider of his chatty wife.⁸ When Epicoene begins to ‘speak out’, Morose calls, ‘Oh immodesty! A manifest woman! What, Cutbeard!’ (III.iv.39) and a few lines later explodes with, ‘That cursed barber!’ (III.v.58). But Cutbeard controls more than speaking voices in the play. When he needs swiftly to remove the Parson from Morose’s presence, he instructs, ‘Cough again’ (III.iv.19), and coughing causes Morose to expel the Parson. Referring to the racket he has endured at his antimasque-like wedding (as Truewit describes, a cacophony of ‘spitting’, ‘coughing’, ‘laugh[ing]’ ‘neezing’, ‘farting’, and ‘noise of the music’ (IV.i.7-8), as well as chatty, ‘loud and commanding’ (IV.i.9) females), Morose despairs, ‘That I should be seduced by so foolish a devil as a barber will make!’ (IV.iv.3-4). Accused of unleashing a variety of noises, Cutbeard is also associated with controlling and generating sounds. He is a slippery agent: disguised for a substantial period

⁷ Cf. ‘Fame, who hath...many tongues...hearing of the honourable defeature...could not choose (because shee is a woman), but pratle of it, in all places, and to all persons...*Barbers* had never such utterance of a newes’ (Thomas Dekker, *A Strange Horse-Race* (1613), D2r).

⁸ See Laurie Maguire, ‘Cultural Control in *The Taming of the Shrew*’, *RD* 26 (1995), 83-104 (pp. 92-3) for her discussion of the association between barbery and cittern-playing. This analogy also highlights another misogynistic conception that noisy women are available women, and that they could be played upon.

of the play, switching alliances, and with his own abstruse agenda. Like intrusive sound, he interferes with the acoustic medium, causing discomfort but cannot, himself, be pinned down.

In this exploratory chapter, which takes its theme from *Epicoene*, I ask why barbers, in particular, are affiliated with sounds and hearing in early modern England by investigating how ears were treated, entertained and abused in barbery settings; I reconstruct the literary trope of the noisy barber shop and examine the stereotype of barbery's music-making and sound-marking. In my endeavour to contrast barbery with surgery I also question how surgical contexts are inflected by their relationship to musical sounds and instruments, and I explore the phonic absence of surgeons (logically the product of their frequent stage absence) and how sounds displace or replace surgery. The competition between Pan and Apollo staged in John Lyly's *Midas* provides us with a blueprint: medicine's harmonic notes (represented by Apollo) supposedly produce one acoustic effect which is 'pleasant' and associated with the God of healing; 'barbarous noise' (IV.i.178) from the 'barbarous mouth of Pan!' (IV.i.20) produces another and is set against the play's barbery subplot in which the first song of the play is performed.⁹ Pan plays on his pipes, referring in his song to 'The bagpipe's drone' (IV.i.123). Cockayne notes that in the seventeenth century 'especial hatred was reserved for bagpipes', which produce, in Samuel Pepys's words, "'mighty barbarous music'".¹⁰ A Latin song translated by John Bold begins, 'In former time 't hath been upbrayded thus, / That Barbers Musick was most Barbarous'.¹¹ The quotation from Phillip Stubbes's *Display of Corruptions* in the title of this chapter is ironic: 'pleasant harmonies' in the barber-shop are, in Stubbes's satire, these 'barbarous notes'. In past chapters I have explored how (abusive or irregular)

⁹ John Lyly, *Midas* in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David M. Bevington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

¹⁰ Cockayne, 'Cacophony, or Vile Scrapers on Vile Instruments', *Urban History* 29:1 (2002), 35-47 (pp. 38-9).

¹¹ Henry Bold, *Latine Songs With their English* (1685), M4v.

barbery and surgery makes vulnerable throats, teeth, noses and eyes; in this chapter, I add ears to the list.

Despite contextualising this chapter in Jonson's play, my explorations are more historical in their outlook than the previous ones. I discuss early modern sounds, music, hearing, and aural cleanliness, both literally and figuratively in terms of their association with ablutionary and medical practice, sociability, and ideology (including theology). Although much of the material with which I am concerned is not directly translatable to the stage, thinking about sound is an essential part of thinking about the reception of performance and fits with my thesis's wider methodological concerns. Smith argues that 'listening is an intensely *situated* experience', drawing comparison with the site specificity of theatre.¹² Stephen Gosson's unusual and allusive reference that in the theatre there is 'Such masking in [the audience's] eares, I knowe not what', raises questions significant to my discussion: did, as the *OED* states, early modern people have a means to regulate or deaden sounds in the theatre using materials or a substance; what were the attitudes towards, what we now term, selective hearing; how were ears represented as a site of competing agency; and how, for the anti-theatricalist, is sound frivolous?¹³

This chapter's interest in sounds and spaces corresponds to critical discussions about theatre's architecture (as a sound-making instrument) which creates a particular listening/hearing acoustic space: the 'wooden o', and indoor theatres' acoustic environment.¹⁴ Moreover, my explorations are in dialogue with the growing body of criticism that investigates the ways in which sounds (soundmarks, noise, music and pre- and non-verbal sound)¹⁵ can help us to think about identity, both individual and

¹² Smith, p. 31.

¹³ Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579), C1v. See *OED*, 'masking, n.², †1'.

¹⁴ See Smith, pp. 206-17.

¹⁵ The term soundmark is 'derived from *landmark* to refer to a community sound which is unique or possesses qualities which make it specially regarded'. Noise has a number of meanings included 'unwanted sound', 'unmusical sound', 'any loud sound' or disturbance'. These definitions are taken from R. Murray

communal. Soundscape theorists such as R. Schafer and Barry Truax have provided a technical language for sonic studies, and have questioned how we view the relationship between man and the sounds of his environment, mainly through anthropological lines of enquiry.¹⁶ Smith, Emily Cockayne, David Garrioch, Wes Folkerth, and Bruce Johnson have drawn on soundscape theorists' studies and the language of acoustemology in their attempts to reconstruct the sound maps of the early modern past: urban and rural acoustic landscapes, bell ringing, rough music, and the anatomy of the ear are the subject of some of their investigations.¹⁷ I draw on the theory and historicity of these studies defining my own civically-, socially- and medically-situated acoustic field.

'those that will preserve their hearing...picke not their eares'

Mrs Corlyon's household book (1606), in the Wellcome Institute, describes several methods which tackle ear complaints, including a steam cure for 'those that are deafe and to recover perfect hearinge' made from 'a pinte of Malmesye' (a strong sweet Greek wine) and an 'ownze of Clooves'; an extraction for earwigs from the ear using warm apples; and three cures for 'the singinge in the eares' using 'Barley flower' and 'Nutmegges', 'Sacke' and 'a greate Onyon', 'Sallett Oyle' and 'Aquavite'.¹⁸ The author also describes a lancing procedure for treating impostumes in the ear for which she explains how to prepare a sterile agent composed of vinegar-soaked, toasted leavened bread.¹⁹ Her book advises strongly against one technique of ear treatment: 'lett those that will preserve their hearing

Schafer's glossary in *The Soundscape* (Rochester, Vermont: Destiny Books, 1994), pp. 271-5. For further discussions on early modern attitudes to 'noise' see Cockayne, *Hubbub*, pp. 106-130. Cockayne explains that 'Noisy sounds irritate the hearer because they were irregular, intrusive, disturbing, distracting, inexplicable or shocking' (pp. 112-3).

¹⁶ See Barry Truax, *Acoustic Communication* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2001).

¹⁷ See Cockayne, 'Cacophony', and *Hubbub*; David Garrioch, 'Sounds of the City', *Urban History* 30:1 (2003), 5-25; Wes Folkerth, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002); Bruce Johnson, 'Hamlet: Voice, Music, Sound', *Popular Music* 24:2 (2005), 257-267.

¹⁸ London, Wellcome MS 213, fo. 33-5. Cf. Cockayne, 'Experiences of the Deaf in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal* 46:3 (2003), 493-510 (esp. p. 498).

¹⁹ Publications for surgeons also list domestic cures – often herbal remedies – for the hard of hearing, although surgical procedures in the ear could also be complex, making use of instruments.

that speciall care that they picke not their eares'.²⁰ Despite the fact that Mrs Corlyon's address is of universal counsel, her warning seems only a small voice in the period.²¹ The 'gilde box' described in Henslowe's domestic accounts includes '3 eare pickers' which were common ablutionary items.²² But the practitioners responsible for daily cleaning and therefore opening, in helping to prevent deafness, the ears of London's populace were the barbers, and inventories and fictional sources reveal that the ear-pick/picker was one of the basic tools of the trade which professionalised domestic tools. Indeed, the practice was as routinely conducted as shaving and beard trimming, and the excrement that accumulated in the barber's shop included earwax as well as hair shavings and rotten teeth. In conceptual terms, therefore, the barber is symbolic in enabling the *earwitness* ('one who...can testify to what he...has heard').²³ Schafer describes his vision for tackling noise pollution: 'I...suggested that multitudes of citizens...needed to be exposed to ear cleaning exercises in order to improve the sonological competence of total societies'.²⁴ The timing of Stubbes's reference to 'pleasant harmonie' in the barber's shop, which 'tickle [ears with] vaine delight', is important in the context of the ritual-orientated order of events described: 'pleasant harmonie[s]' are heard *after* the client's ears have been picked.

²⁰ Wellcome, MS 213, fo. 33-4.

²¹ The historical background to the manuscript indicates that the book came into possession of Alatheia [née Talbot], Countess of Arundel and Surrey [-1654] whose portrait is on the frontispiece of a 1655 book of 'receipts' thought to be based on the Corlyon manuscript: the fact that the Countess's name is written above the title of Mrs Corlyon's book in the hand responsible for the rest of the manuscript suggests that the receipts recorded were intended to be in circulation (Wellcome, MS 213, 'Record Details').

²² Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), p. 146.

²³ Schafer, p. 272.

²⁴ Schafer, p. 181. Although Schafer's ideas about ear cleaning (discussed pp. 208-211) are to do with exercising rather than physically attending to the ear, his implication is relevant to this discussion and corresponds to the literary tropes derived from barbering.



Figure 9: Artefacts from the wreck of the Mary Rose.

In the museum at the Mary Rose Trust, one of the display items for the Barber-Surgeon is of bone earscoops ‘found behind the [medicine] chest’ with barbery objects such as some razor handles.²⁵ The Trust’s term ‘earscoop’ is modern and anachronistic.²⁶ The *OED*’s first reference to ‘Ear Scoop’ is from 1895 (*ear*, n.¹, III.16). In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the gouge used to scrape wax from the ears was only called an ear-pick or picker.²⁷ We are used to cotton-covered materials with which to probe our ears, but early modern ears were not subjected to the same delicate treatment: the inflexible objects seem alarmingly large for the ear canal. In John Woodall’s *Surgions Mate*, the ‘Earepicker’ is listed fifth on the page devoted to an inventory of the ‘Barbers Case’.²⁸ The ‘Instruments of the Barber’ in Randle Holme’s *Armory* include ‘A pair of Tweesers, or Twitchers: with an Ear pick at the other end of it’.²⁹ In John Eliot’s French handbook, the vocabulary deemed useful for conversation in a barber’s shop includes ‘An eare-picker,

²⁵ The three items named ‘ear-scoop’ are numbers 80 A 1577, 81 A 1276, and 80 A 1524. See Julie Gardiner, Michael J. Allen, and Mary Anne Alburger (eds.), *Before the Mast* (Portsmouth: Mary Rose Trust, 2005), p. 196. Cf. image of an Italian ‘ear cleaner’ in Sandra Cavallo, ‘Health, Beauty and Hygiene’ in *At Home in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis (London: V & A Publications, 2006), pp. 174-187 (p. 180).

²⁶ Presumably ‘scoop’ was chosen to convey the shape of the instrument, which gives familiarity and makes sense of the object to the modern eye.

²⁷ See entries for ‘Ear[e][–]pick[e]’ in dictionaries by Richard Huloet (1572), Piv, and Charles Hoole, *An Easie Entrance to the Latine Tongue* (1649), p. 244, who agree that an *Auriscalpium* is the Latin for an ear-pick, and do not make any reference to a scoop-like object.

²⁸ John Woodall, *The Surgions Mate* (1617), A4r.

²⁹ Randle Holme, *Academy of Armory* (Chester: [1688]), p. 127.

and a tooth-picker': 'Une cure-dent & une cure-oreille'.³⁰ Describing the instrument in more detail, Holme emphasises that the ear-pick often had a dual function: 'The use of this Instrument is to cleanse the eares from waxe, which often causeth a Deafness in the party: the other end is used to cleanse the teeth'.³¹ Eliot and Woodall do not state that the 'Earpicker' is attached to tweezers or gravers, which were used in basic dentistry. But Eliot describes the instruments in the same single phrase, and mullets and gravers are listed respectively sixth and seventh in Woodall's list, suggesting that these tools are taxonomically if not physically linked. Instruments, as well as professions, have dual functions. Unlike the barber's ear-pick which claims – despite, and even in spite of its doubled function – its discrete place on inventories, the surgeons' ear-picks are simply part of, in Woodall's terms, a '*Bundle of small Instruments...conteyning divers kindes, as Mulletts, Forceps, Hamules or Hookes, Ear-pickers, Sikes, Small spatulas, &c.*' numbering 'at the least 20' of such 'strange formes' – a miscellany.³² Ear-picks take on greater definition in the barber's practice, which corresponds to Kopytoff's argument about the 'singularizing values...held by...professional and occupational groups which subscribe to a common cultural code' produced by material objects.³³ Authors often give detail to their descriptions of or allusion to barbering or a barber by including an ear-pick reference. In *Midas*, Motto protests by his 'earpick' (V.ii.178).

Mrs Corlyon's advice reminds us of similar warnings we receive today against careless use of cotton swabs. Inserting objects – cotton tipped or otherwise – into the ear has never been regarded as a risk-free matter. Over-exuberant digging in the ear can puncture the delicate eardrum and some instruments can, if used inappropriately, drive earwax further down the delicate ear canal. In a metaphor in *Sir Thomas More*, 'Nor does

³⁰ John Eliot, *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), 11r. Eliot's translation of ear/tooth is the wrong way around but his earlier references to 'les dents' suggest that this is a small oversight.

³¹ Holme, p. 427.

³² Woodall, D1r-v.

³³ Kopytoff, pp. 77-78.

the wanton tongue here screw itself / Into the ear, that like a vice drinks up / The iron instrument' (13.20-22), the instrument inserted into the ear, which conceptualises the flatterer and his patron, easily takes on the qualities of a torture weapon. In barbery terms the ear-pick is a trivial version of the more intimidating razor: an unskilled barber might be a threat to customers' ears. Mocking the activities in a barber's shop, Stubbes's interlocutor Amphilogus declares, 'next the eares must be picked, and closed together againe artificially forsooth', hinting at the potential perversions, or the perceived perversion, of barbery activities.³⁴ Stubbes suggests that barbers pick their customers' ears so vigorously that they actually pick them apart. Pick can mean 'to probe and penetrate...with a pointed instrument as to remove extraneous matter', but it can also mean 'To pierce, indent, or dig...as to break up...with a pick or similar instrument'.³⁵ Stubbes's reference to an artificial procedure suggests that the ear incurs some damage and is not as it was before the barber sets to work upon it.

Responding to the scripted '*Lowde Musicke*' in the late Elizabethan play, *Blurt Master-Constable*, the courtesan Imperia complains to the musicians, 'Oh, fie, fie, fie, forbear, thou art like a punie-Barber (new come to the trade) thou pick'st our eares too deepe'.³⁶ The courtesan objects as an audience member. This '*Lowde Musicke*' could have alarmed audiences.³⁷ In a play full of images of vulnerable ears Hamlet knows that the groundlings ears can be 'split' (III.ii.10), and William Prynne's *Histrion-Mastix* (1633), a lengthy anti-theatrical tract, is full of references to theatre's 'uncleanesses', many of which are aural.³⁸ Imperia's response to the blast of notes is to raise her voice above it (initially

³⁴ Phillip Stubbes, *The Second Part of the Anatomie of Abuses Containing the Display of Corruptions* (1583), H1r.

³⁵ *OED*, 'pick, v.¹', I.2.a, I.1.c.

³⁶ Dekker, *Blurt Master-Constable* (1602), G3r.

³⁷ Cf. Lucy Munro, 'Music and Sound' in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*, ed. Richard Dutton (Oxford: OUP, 2009), pp. 543-559 (esp. pp. 543-4).

³⁸ William Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix* (1633). Cf. Philippa Berry, 'Hamlet's Ear' in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 50: Shakespeare and Language*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), pp. 57-64.

by using more pre-verbal than verbal sounds), and to tell the musicians to be quiet. Her analogy has a reflexive effect: audiences might, at this moment, become more aware of what is demanded of their own ears in the theatre. Smith argues of London's early South Bank theatres, 'What they contained, most obviously, was spectacle...What [they] contained, less obviously, was sound'.³⁹ Barbers were agents in this listening world.

The effects of some sounds, as Imperia suggests, are equivalent to bad ear-picking practice. Focusing on the experiential nature of science, Francis Bacon describes in *Sylva Sylvarum* (1627) the physical effect loud sounds have on the ear:

A very great *Sound*, neare hand, hath stricken many *Deafe*; And at the Instant they have found, as it were, the breaking of a Skin or Parchment in theire Eare: And my Selfe standing neare one that *Lured* loud, and shrill, had suddenly an Offence, as if somewhat had broken, or beene dislocated in my *Eare*'.⁴⁰

Intrusions on the aural faculties, as Bacon argues, can be more intense than visual experiences.

In *Visibles*, there are not sound Objects so odious and ingrate to the *Sense*, as in *Audibles*. For foule *Sights* doe rather displease, in that they excite the Memory of foule *Things*, than in the immediate Objects...But in *Audibles*, the Grating of a Saw, when it is sharpened, doth...[set] the Teeth on Edge'.⁴¹

Bacon's memory argument for sight helps to explain the impact of the barber-surgeon's chair. But it is harder to encounter the hearing experiences of early modernity, as Smith demonstrates, because they heard within an utterly different sonic environment.⁴² Although we might be desensitised to some sounds that would have disturbed early moderns, we still know the effectiveness of certain noises and how sensitive our ears can be, particularly in the theatre when our faculties are especially alert. In one production of

³⁹ Smith, p. 206.

⁴⁰ Francis Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum* (1627), G1r (128).

⁴¹ *Sylva Sylvarum*, K3r (275).

⁴² See Smith, pp. 49-52.

Titus (RSC, 1955) Peter Brook unlocked a greater potential to unnerve the audience. 'During the run, the Express reported: "Extra St John Ambulance volunteers have been called in. At least three people pass out nightly. Twenty fainted at one performance." A spokesman for the theatre pinpointed the "nice scrunch of bone off-stage when Titus cuts off his hand" as the crucial moment.'⁴³ While the early modern barber's responsibility with ears is not a controversial practice (and often takes comic paths), their association with them can be provocative.

Because of the probing action during ear picking, the activity unsurprisingly relates to the sexually-charged climate of the barber shop; Imperia's objection to an uncomfortable picking sound occurs during some heavy petting. The barber Tryphon apostrophises his ear-pick in *Herod and Antipater*:

TRYPHON Tooth-pick, deare Tooth-pick; Eare-pick, both of you
 Have beene her sweet Companions; with the one
 I've seene her picke her white Teeth; with the other
 Wriggle so finely worme-like in her Eare;
 That I have wisht, with envy, (pardon me)
 I had beene made of your condition.⁴⁴

In this play, the ear-pick is likely to be a stage property. Moreover, in view of Holme's depiction of the ear-pick and tooth-pick as a double-ended instrument (as well as double entendre), we know that Tryphon is unlikely to hold up two separate instruments in this instance (although this is what happened in the recent 'Read Not Dead' production of the play at the Globe, July 2011): he balances his exposition of the tool, 'with the one...with the other', which could be linguistically representative of its physical attribute, its double-sidedness. When Tryphon says that he wishes to be made of their 'condition' he wishes for

⁴³ Quotations are from Samantha Ellis writing for the Guardian, 25 June 2003 on the production of *Titus Andronicus*, dir. Peter Brook for the RSC (Shakespeare Memorial Theatre: 1955): 'according to the Evening Standard, [a young Brook] "clashed experimentally with pots and warming pans, played with pencils on Venetian glass phials, turned wire baskets into harps", and even resorted to a plastic trumpet to compose a suitable score.'

⁴⁴ Gervase Markham and William Sampson, *Herod and Antipater* (1622), G2r.

the single instrument's double capacity to penetrate. The passage is amusing because the common object with its basic ablutionary imperative is converted by Tryphon into something strangely sensual: another double effect.

But some years before Tryphon stepped onto the early modern stage with his precious delving ear-pick, another image of the erotic ear and a probing instrument is captured: Elizabeth's Rainbow Portrait (c1600), tenuously attributed to Isaac Oliver, is enigmatic in its depiction of the monarch's rich attire covered in detached eyes, noses and ears. Joel Fineman expresses surprise at 'the way the painting places an exceptionally large pornographic ear over Queen Elizabeth's genitals, in the crease formed where the two folds of her dress fold over on each other, at the wrinkled conclusion of the arc projected by the dildolike rainbow clasped so imperially by the virgin queen'. This ear, explains Fineman, is 'vulvalike'.⁴⁵ Barbers' activities which related to females could suggest their sexual ambiguity – as I have already argued. But barbery activities which especially encoded this were those which acted upon ears, corresponding, therefore, to the problematic virgin queen: hence, the prostitute in *Blurt Master-Constable*, Salumith cradling desire for her nephew, and ambivalent Epicoene. Suggested through this ambivalence are also sodomitic and transsexual inclinations and effeminacy, commonly associated with barbers but not in the early-seventeenth century playing out with anything like the force which we find in the later-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Earwax: 'not unprofitable'

While the orifice of the ear might be sexually suggestive and easily feminized (and, as I shall examine, easily abused) earwax is not often part of the sexual fantasy. Truewit makes this clear in *Epicoene* when he wishes that the barber may have to 'Eat ear-wax' (III.v.87)

⁴⁵ Joel Fineman, 'Shakespeare's Ear', *Representations* 28 (1989), 6-13 (pp. 10-11). Further, Syriac poetry favoured the image of the ear as the agent of Mary's conception of Christ which was celebrated on Lady Day in England (25 March). See Miri Rubin, *Mother of God* (London: Penguin, 2010), pp. 34-40.

in order to stay alive after calamity has – in Truewit's imagination – struck the barber shop. His suggestion makes a neat lesson for the barber, given the plot. Cutbeard exposes Morose to unwelcome sounds by arranging his marriage: he has, metaphorically speaking – although with a literal consequence – unblocked and therefore successfully picked Morose's ears. If we regard Epicoene as Cutbeard's figurative earpick, we find the play's gender politics are further interlaced: sodomitic notions of Epicoene as a penetrative object are suggestive before Epicoene is revealed to be male.

Morose's extreme hatred of noise, and his general gloom, is characterised as a humoural imbalance that needs treatment. Michael Flachmann discusses Morose's 'humourous ailment' although not with specific reference to his ears. Taking his cue from Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), he diagnoses Morose with melancholy verging on madness which 'can force a person into silence and seclusion'.⁴⁶ But Morose himself is not silent and he continues to seek out company (so long as it is mute) making Flachmann's melancholia reading questionable. Hudson Hallahan emphasizes that it is difficult for an audience to be particularly sympathetic to Morose because of his hypocrisy in speaking at length himself.⁴⁷ Earlier in the play, the Boy suggests that if Morose's ears were not exercised on occasion, 'He would grow *resty*...in his *ease*' (I.i.165-166) [italics mine]. Holdsworth glosses 'resty' with 'sluggish' (with reference to horses that refuse to go forward), but given the proceeding sentence's reference to 'rust' and Jonson's appetite for gritty depictions of urban and human filth, 'resty' in this context refers to rancidity.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Flachmann, see pp. 132-4 (p. 132).

⁴⁷ Hudson D. Hallahan, 'Silence, Eloquence, and Chatter in Jonson's *Epicoene*', *HLQ* 40:2 (1977), 117-127 (pp. 120-1).

⁴⁸ Richard Dutton makes the same comment in his earlier edition of the play (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003), FN to I.i.170-171. See *OED*, † resty, adj.¹. A variant of 'resty' is 'reasty', which also is etymologically linked to 'reasy' and 'rusty'.

Looking collectively at the critical works of Gail Kern Paster, Patricia Fumerton and Bruce Thomas Boehrer, Julian Koslow summarises that Jonson was 'constantly pushing the physical, the bodily, the grotesque to the fore, requiring us to confront embodied experience as an inescapable resource of social and literary significance' ('Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *ELH* 73:1 (2006), 119-159 (p. 121)). Cf. Anne Lake Prescott, 'Jonson's Rabelais' in *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson*, pp. 35-54; Andrew McRae,

The boy is commenting on Morose's physical complexion as well as his demeanour. The adjective is especially linked to bacon and fat (*OED* examples include grease, oil and butter) which turn thick, sour, sometimes crusty, and distinctly yellowy, like wax.⁴⁹ Morose's ear canal is the subject of the Boy's attention, which is particularly foregrounded by the phonic similarity between 'ease' (in the text) and 'ears' (implied in the context). The homophone for the phrase is 'greasy in his ears'. In George Peele's *Old Wive's Tale*, 'Huanebango is deaf and cannot heare'.⁵⁰ A flustered Zantippa (who breaks her pitcher over his head) exclaims, 'Foe, what greasie groome have wee here?' (E1r). Additionally in *Epicoene*, the Boy's description of the 'street...so narrow' (I.i.161) in which Morose lives, corresponds architecturally to the anatomy of intricate aural passages.⁵¹ Dekker describes the inner ear with 'all the walles...plaistred with yellow wax round about them' by making a direct comparison with the structure of 'Powles [St Pauls] steeple' which both function as 'Musique roomes into which as well good sounds as bad' enter; in the same paragraph he refers to 'every base barbarous Barber'.⁵² Cutbeard is employed as picker and emulsifier of the excessive lipid-like substances in Morose's festering ears. Later, therefore, Truewit imagines, for Morose's satisfaction, that Cutbeard should be punished in physical terms and that his punishment must fit his crime: the

"On the Famous Voyage" in *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 181-203, in which McRae explores Jonson's 'filthiest poem' with its mock-heroic journey through London's back alleys and waterways which, in the poem, are as a means of 'spatial cognition' for the author and reader in conceptualising the city as a squalid bodily system.

⁴⁹ When wax is not kept warm and moist, its consistency changes, described in *Staple* when Band says that Wax has been left out in the cold: Statute responds, 'she was stiff as any frost, and crumbl'd / Away to dust and almost lost her form' (Jonson, *The Staple of News*, ed. Devra Rowland Kifer (London: Edward Arnold, 1976), IV.iii.47-48).

⁵⁰ George Peele, *The Old Wives Tale* (1595), s.d. E1r.

⁵¹ Cf. Smith's examination of London's 'relatively reverberant environment' which is characterized in terms of interplay between surface and depth (pp. 58-60).

⁵² Dekker, *Guls Horne-Booke* (1609), C3v-C4r.

excrements of the metaphorically conceived cleared orifice of Morose's ear must sicken Cutbeard also.⁵³

Descriptions of earwax hardly sound appetising. Indeed, writers often characterise the excrement of the ear by its unpleasant taste. Helkiah Crooke refers to it as 'bitter waxe'.⁵⁴ Walter Charleton, a seventeenth-century physician and natural philosopher, defines '*Ear-wax* [a]s a bilious excrement, thick, yellow, and bitter'.⁵⁵ Early moderns generally explain earwax in terms of it being waste matter; its beneficial properties, which I discuss in the next paragraph (and which are implied through the example from *Epicoene*), are usually portrayed by writers as secondary to the wax's execratory quality. A French historiographer, Scipion Dupleix, poses the question, 'What is the cause of the bitterness of our eare waxe?', responding with, 'It comes from a putrified and corrupt humour, which gathered together, thickens and heats there within, and being such, can bee no other then bitter; as are all things overcocted and rotten'.⁵⁶ Dupleix takes the gastronomic description of earwax further with his culinary analogy of how bitter tastes are the product and the consistency of over-cooked matter. The humour, according to Dupleix and others, is the product of corruption in the body; it is like a secondary type of bile. For another French writer whose interests among other things were scientific, earwax is a 'superfluitie & excrement purged from the braine'.⁵⁷

Moderated removal of wax is deemed a necessary procedure by most medically-sound commentators. Filthy ears, states Pierre de La Primaudaye, 'must be oftentimes looked unto and cleansed'.⁵⁸ But writers do not always portray wax-free ears as a healthy

⁵³ To punish the barber who cannot keep his word and respect Midas's ears, Petulus also is specific in his target: he '*pulls...[Motto] by the ears*' (s.d. V.ii.166).

⁵⁴ Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia* (1615), p. 576.

⁵⁵ Walter Charleton, *Natural History of Nutrition, Life, and Voluntary Motion* (1659), p. 97.

⁵⁶ Scipion Dupleix, *The Resolver* (1635), P2v.

⁵⁷ Pierre de La Primaudaye, *The French Academie* (1618) p. 127. See the entry on Primaudaye in Gillespie, p. 277.

⁵⁸ Primaudaye, *The Second Part of the French Academie* (1594), p. 127.

condition. Variouslly spelled – with obvious innuendo – Cockadillio, Cockadilio, Cockadillia (and ‘Cock’ in speech prefixes) is the barber courtier in *Noble Soldier* and a typical lackey in Baltazar’s eyes.⁵⁹ In the following extract, the noble soldier, Baltazar, quickly detects corruption in court.

BALTAZAR	Signeor is the King at leisure?	
COCKADILLIO	To doe what?	
BALTAZAR	To heare a Souldier speake.	
COCKADILLIO	I am no ear-picker	
	To sound his hearing that way.	
BALTAZAR	Are you of Court, Sir?	
COCKADILLIO	Yes, the Kings Barber	
BALTAZAR	That’s his eare-picker: your name, I pray.	
COCKADILLIO	Don <i>Cockadilio</i> :	
	If, Souldier, thou hast suits to begge at Court,	
	I shall descend so low as to betray	
	Thy paper to the hand Royall.	
BALTAZAR	I begge, you whorson muscod! my petition	
	Is written on my bosome in red wounds.	
COCKADILLIO	I am no Barbar-Surgeon.	<i>Exit</i>
BALTAZAR	You yellow hammer, why shaver:	
	...	
	These excrements of Silke-wormes! oh that such flies	
	Doe buzze about the beames of Majesty!	
	Like earwigs, tickling a Kings yeelding eare	
	With that Court-Organ (Flattery) (C2r)	

Baltazar characterises Cockadillio as ‘all ear-picker’: ‘To sound’ means to probe and pierce. The King’s bodily and political health is threatened. If the King is exposed to constant picking, no wax is left to protect his ears from, in physical terms, flies, and, in conceptual terms, flattery. Suggestively, Baltazar’s outburst associates the barber with one colour in particular: ‘yellow’ (in ‘yellow hammer’, a potential pun on a tool), the colour of wax.

Of the flatterer (or ‘willing slave[s] to another mans eare’) Grey Chandos explains, ‘his art is nothing but delightfull cosenage...In short he is the mouth of liberall mens

⁵⁹ *The Noble Souldier* was authored, according to the Stationers Register by Thomas Dekker, but with the initials S. R [Samuel Rowley] on the title page of the quarto, 1634.

coates, the earewig of the mightie'.⁶⁰ In a sermon on slander and flattery, Jeremy Taylor preaches that dangerous and smooth tongues, whisperers, tale-bearers and sycophants, are 'like the earwig creeps in at the ear, and makes a diseased noyse, and scandalous murmur'.⁶¹ Troublesome voices are characterized as non-verbal disturbances in the ear. Writers concede, therefore, that wax is not without benefit to the body. Pierre de La Primaudaye explains that the 'yellow humour purged by the eares...defendeth them against fleas, little flies and other small wormes and beastes, that might otherwise enter within them'.⁶² Scipion Dupleix clarifies that,

[earwax] is not unprofitable within the eares, but being thickened, fleas, and other little flyes which many insinuate within the eares, may trouble us, are there taken by this conglutinate humour⁶³

Ambroise Paré describes the ear's ability to prevent 'little creeping things and other extraneous bodys as fleas & the like' from penetrating beyond the 'winding and turnings of the waies' of the outer ear by 'the *glutinous* thicknes of the cholerick excrement or *eare-waxe*'.⁶⁴ Evidently from these tracts and from Mrs Corlyon's receipts book in which she describes a cure for ear-wigs, insect infestations could be a problem in early modern ears. Balthasar suggests that the King's ears have been picked so much that the royal ear now harbours 'wormes', 'flies' and 'earwigs'. In Richard Brome's *Love-Sick Court*, Tersules, once a tailor and – like the play's barber, Varillus – embracing the role of courtier, accuses the barber: 'Your instruments are sharp as mine...you can pick more out of your Lords ears / Then I take from his Garments with my sheers'.⁶⁵ Careless, overly-probing barbering activities leaves the King's ear in *Noble Soldier* defenceless and vulnerable to infection.

⁶⁰ Grey Brydges Chandos, *A Discourse Against Flatterie* (1611), C2r-v.

⁶¹ Jeremy Taylor, *XXV Sermons Preached at Golden-Grover* (1653), p. 312 (Sermon XXIV, Part III).

⁶² Primaudaye (1618), p. 399.

⁶³ Dupleix, p. 316.

⁶⁴ Ambroise Paré, *The Workes*, trans. Th[omas] Johnson (1634), p. 190.

⁶⁵ Richard Brome, *The Love-Sick Court in Five New Playes* (1659), 16r.

This King only asks to be read reports he wants to hear, saying that his ear ‘Must have his musicke’ (C2v). Royal ears are in danger of being open only to gratification (Baltazar recognises the sodomitic undertones); ultimately this King faces civil war, the penalty for not keeping attentive to his subjects’ dirges as well as his courtiers’ music. Poor barber practice, satirised here, is set against references to better barber treatment: the King characterises Baltazar as ‘The Barber that drawes out a Lions tooth [who] Curseth his Trade’ (C3v). The removal of a rotten tooth can be medically beneficial, if temporarily aggravating, but picking out all earwax is not healthy.

In *Fancies Chaste and Noble* by Ford, Spadone uses the trope of wax-free ears to portray not only vulnerability to flattery, but also sexual access. Naming Nitido an ‘eare-wig’, Spadone says that he ‘will wriggle into a *starting hole* so cleanly’, that is that he will have free access to Secco’s wife, Morosa.⁶⁶ Later, Secco refers to Nitido as ‘that hole-creeping Page’ (F1v). If ears were not waxy enough to prevent assault, wax could always be added. In *Staple*, one of Pecunia’s ladies is called [Rose] Wax, often modified to ‘soft Wax’. Pennyboy Senior exclaims of ‘little Blushet-Wax’ (II.iv.119), ‘I’ll stop mine ears with her against the sirens’ (II.iv.120), referring to the jeerers of the play who appear predatory, and drawing on Book XII of *The Odyssey* when Circe instructs Ulysses to ‘stop [his] comrades’ ears with ‘sweet wax kneaded soft, that none of the rest may hear’ the siren’s enticing voices.⁶⁷ Some lines later in *Staple*, Pennyboy Senior complains again of the jeerers, ‘Are not these flies gone yet?’ (II.iv.165), suggesting that a little wax would have prevented the infestation, and demystifying mythology.

In *Timon of Athens*, Apemantus despairs, ‘O, that men’s ears should be / To counsel deaf, but not to flattery’ ([Middleton] I.ii.256-57). Later, in a scene of mixed authorship,

⁶⁶ John Ford, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (1638), D3r. Spadone again calls Nitido ‘eare-wig’ in a later scene (G3v).

⁶⁷ Homer, *The Odyssey*, ed. Robert Squillace, trans. George Herbert Palmer (New York: Barnes and Noble, 2003), Book XII, p. 148. Cf. p. 151.

but where the opening lines are thought to be Shakespeare's, this image appears. In physical terms, ears can seem under attack.

SECOND SERVANT	So his [Timon's] familiars to his buried fortunes Slink away, leaving their false vows with him Like empty purses picked (IV.ii.10-12) ⁶⁸
----------------	--

The term 'picked' invites an audience to think of the barber's tool. Our comprehension of the passage relies on our perception of 'vows', which, throughout the play, perform as aural gestures. Shakespeare(?) depicts Timon's ear as an overly-picked organ because false vows, received by the ear, have done nothing but gouge away any protective layer that Timon might have had in his reception of and response to flattery. Vows have a distinct material quality in this respect: false vows have negative value. Timon's loss is portrayed in fiscal terms, but it is also envisioned as a loss of wax in the ear which is figuratively conceived of as the empty purse. Here, the customer's (Timon's) purse is a bodily as well as a textile entity: the ear as well as the pouch. This conceit is suitable because satire of barbering often remarks on the elaborate performances that surround the barber's client all in order 'to tawe out mony', as Stubbes quips in *Display of Corruptions* (hence empty eye-sockets in *King Lear*).⁶⁹ In this example, the playwright provocatively draws on the imagery of barbering without naming the occupation, reinforcing the opinion that these are Shakespeare's words.

Morose makes steps to protect his ears in *Epicoene*. Truewit says that he has 'a huge turban of nightcaps on his head, buckled over his ears' (I.i.139-40). But such interference with ears is contrary practice to that circulated by Protestant sermons. If 'faith

⁶⁸ On the authorship, see Shakespeare and Middleton, *Timon of Athens*, ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton (London: Cengage Learning, 2008), pp. 402, 407.

⁶⁹ Stubbes, G8v.

cometh by hearing', God wanted discerning hearers.⁷⁰ The image of the blocked ear in early modernity is a troubled one because truth is also barred from it. Gina Bloom highlights that the presiding lesson for women as well as good Christians was to be wary of the blurry line between 'constructive defense' and 'destructive deafness'.⁷¹ Thomas Adams, a clergyman, despairs 'that the eare which should be open to complaint, is...stopped up with the eare-waxe of partiality. Alas poore truth, that shee must now bee put to the charges of a golden eare-picke, or shee cannot be heard'.⁷² Barbary is, once again, in danger of being a competing image of worship; but good barbary (iconographically represented by a rare ear pick), ultimately, is good religious practice. The barber's need to strike a balance in ear picking was the physical realisation of the ideological balance that the everyday listener was expected to achieve.

One of Thersites's typically corporeal insults in *Troilus and Cressida* is that Agamemnon has 'not so much brain as ear-wax' (V.i.51-2), which corresponds to Primaudye's description that earwax is a cerebrum superfluity. Thersites suggests that Agamemnon not only has little reason, but also has little humoral balance and is literally – according to Thersites's diagnosis – a bit soft in the head (over-cooked or 'resty'). Thersites's aspersion is bursting with irony, as we would expect from him.⁷³ Earlier in the play, Agamemnon emphasises that his ears are open and, by implication, healthy. When Aeneas comes with a message from Hector he tries to confide in Agamemnon, 'Sir, pardon, 'tis for Agamemnon's ears' (I.iii.248) to which Agamemnon responds, 'He hears naught privately that comes from Troy' (I.iii.249): his ear is public, literally and

⁷⁰ On this subject see Cockayne ('Experiences of the Deaf') who observes that the reduced involvement of the senses through reduced ritualised religious ceremonies post-Reformation resulted in greater emphasis on the faculty of hearing (pp. 495-497); Folkerth, who regards the doctrine on the 'proper use of the Christian ears' as the 'most salient discourse on hearing and the role of sound in early modern English culture' (pp. 44-51 (pp. 44-45)).

⁷¹ Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 111-159.

⁷² Thomas Adams, *The Happiness of the Church* (1619), p. 266. Cf. Thomas Taylor, *Peter his Repentance Shewing* (1653), 12r; Robert Wilkinson, *A Jewell for the Eare* (1610); William Harrison, *The Difference of Hearers* (1614); Stephen Egerton, *The Boring of the Eare* (1623).

⁷³ Cf. Thersites's description of Ajax's 'evasions have ears thus long' (II.i.67).

figuratively open.⁷⁴ By comparison, Thersites is the play's model of selective hearing: in his first appearance he, seemingly on purpose, given his aural attentiveness throughout much of the play's action, repeatedly fails to hear the addresses of those around him. When Ajax has trouble getting Thersites's attention he barks, 'Thou bitch-wolf's son, canst thou not hear?' (II.i.10). Indeed, Thersites seems to function on what we might now term 'a different wavelength', our modern figure of speech which suggests that human comprehension is still a matter of interacting on a perceived sonic level.⁷⁵ Robert Weimann describes how in V.ii, 'Thersites can overhear and respond to the utterances of both parties, his own speech – inaudible to other characters – is not heard within the play world proper. Remaining aloof, spatially as well as acoustically'.⁷⁶ Thersites develops his own particularly corrosive acoustic space in performance which prompts Patroclus at one moment to plead, 'No more words, Thersites. Peace!' (II.i.110). Because he digs deeply into his listeners' ears, it is little surprise that Thersites fixes on an image of earwax. Consumed with images of rotting, diseased bodies, Thersites's interests are those of the barber-surgeon figure, akin to Cocledemoy's in Marston's *Dutch Courtesan*, and, much like Cocledemoy, Thersites is aware of self-presentation.⁷⁷ One of Thersites's first announcements is that Agamemnon has 'a botchy core' (II.i.6). Later in the play he lists 'rotten diseases of the south': 'guts-gripping, ruptures, catarrhs, loads o' gravel i'th' back, lethargies, cold palsies, raw eyes, dirt-rotten livers, wheezing lungs, bladders full of imposthume, sciaticas, limekilns i'th' palm, incurable bone-ache' (V.i.17-22). The

⁷⁴ This works as an inflection of 'the public ear', discussed by Folkerth with reference to *Anthony and Cleopatra* (pp. 35-44). Agamemnon's ear becomes a public organ; Folkerth explores the significance of the public ear as representative of many ears. In Agamemnon's case, one (pair of) ear's hearing is opened out to many; in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, many ears' hearing is condensed into the one organ. The effect might be the same, the framing of it is different.

⁷⁵ Cf. Folkerth, p. 32.

⁷⁶ Robert Weimann, 'The Actor-Character in "Secretly Open" Action' in *Shakespeare and Character*, ed. Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 177-193 (p. 180).

⁷⁷ Kerwin notes that *Troilus and Cressida* is 'Shakespeare's pox play', and he discusses Shakespeare's version of the story as a meditation on the dichotomy of glamorous exteriors and corrupt interiors (pp. 113-123).

unsanitary effect of his cumulative descriptions places him firmly in the ‘irregular’ practitioner category. He is obsessed with grimy bodies and sexual diseases: linguistically and metaphorically he is the play’s embodiment and projection of distasteful barber-surgery. (When Patroclus asks, ‘Who keeps the tent now?’ (V.i.10), Thersites replies, ‘The surgeon’s box, or the patient’s wound’ (V.i.11) asserting his association with and fixation of surgical matters.) Placed linguistically within a filthy barber-surgery context, Thersites projects himself on a particular sonic level in the play which can offend ears and, like Cutbeard in *Epicoene*, he draws attention to and manipulates hearing. For Thersites to conclude that Agamemnon has plenty of earwax puts him at an advantage: his ears, ‘constructively defen[ded]’ are potentially blocked to Thersites’s abuse.

‘knock, squire, upon this basin’

The barber’s shop is a nodal image of a sound-making site. A story from Plutarch, writing about the ingenuity of animals, conceptualises the barber’s shop as the place to be surrounded by, introduced to and encouraged to make, rehearse and imitate sounds of all description. In the space a magpie hones its polyphonic skills:

There was a barber within the city of *Rome*, who kept a shoppe...and there nourished a pie, which would so talke, prate, and chatte...counting the speech of men..., the voice of beasts, and sound of musicall instruments...now it hapned that there were solemnized great funerals...and the corps was carried forth...with the sound of many trumpets...in which solemnitie, for that the maner was that the pompe and whole company should stand still and rest a time in that verie place...the morrow after this, the pie became mute...[and they] marvelled now much more at her silence...most men guessed that it was the violent sound of the trumpets which had made her deafe, and that together with the sense of hearing, her voice also was utterly extinct: but it was neither...for the trueth was...she was in deepe studie, and through meditation retired within herselfe, whiles her minde was busie and did prepare her voice like an instrument of musicke, for imitation; for at length her voice came againe and wakened (as it were) all on a sudden...onley the sound of trumpets she resembled.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, trans. Philemon Holland (1603), pp. 966-967.

The barber's shop invariably contextualises the location of sound-learning and aural attentiveness.

The early modern pulpit and the stage, as Bryan Crockett asserts, are comparable theatrical performing spaces which encourage aural alertness.⁷⁹ Of church-going, Robert Wilkinson observes, 'Some come not have their lives reformed, but to have their eares tickled even as at a play'.⁸⁰ Smith writes of the South Bank Theatres, 'they were built...to contain...[They were]...instruments for producing, shaping, and propagating sound'.⁸¹ The barber's shop is a similar acoustic site. A shop, of course, is architecturally enclosed and, to some degree, separated from the polyphony of street cries and urban noises that intermingle outdoors: for Plutarch's magpie, the barber's shop is a place to filter and interpret mixed sounds.⁸² In *Sylva Sylvarum*, Bacon discusses the spatial effects of sound-making and describes 'Enclosures', which 'doe not onely preserve *Sound*, but also Encrease and Sharpen it'.⁸³ As the critics of sound studies make clear, our perception of sound is intrinsically linked to spatiality and also to materiality.

The barber's shop not only contains sound but reverberates with it. In chapter one I discussed Rafe's entry into Barbarossa's lair in *Knight of the Burning Pestle* which is delineated by a particular noise: 'Knock, squire, upon this basin till it break / With the shrill strokes, or till the giant speak. [Tim *knocks*]' (III.320-321, including Hunter/Bevington's s.d.).⁸⁴ Earlier in the scene, the Host describes 'Without [Barbarosa's] door...hang[s] / A copper basin.../ At which no sooner gentle knights can knock / But the shrill sound fierce Barbaroso hears' (III. 238-241). Celebrating the play's 'happy reconcilements' (V.ii.386), the barber declares in *Anything for a Quiet Life*, 'My basins

⁷⁹ See Bryan Crockett, *The Play of Paradox* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

⁸⁰ Wilkinson, p. 34.

⁸¹ Smith, p. 206.

⁸² See Smith, pp. 63-70.

⁸³ *Sylva Sylvarum*, G2r (138).

⁸⁴ Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

shall all ring for joy' (V.ii.383), indicating also theatrical finality. The basin's signifying function is acoustic as well as visual; it is both door bell and church bell announcing the subject of barbery both inwards and outwards. Unlike a soundmark that refers simply to a 'community sound', these threshold sounds are, in Schafer's term, 'sound signals', 'sounds to which the attention is particularly directed' and which 'constitute acoustic warning devices'.⁸⁵ Indeed, the chiming barber's basin was acoustically tagged to denote something other than barbery practice: it was code for prostitution, the acoustic equivalent of a red light. In *Epicoene* Morose declares, 'Let there be no bawd carted that year to employ a basin of [Cutbeard's]' (III.v.83-4). When Rafe knocks on Barbaroso's basins, he signals to the audience the subject of sexual indiscretion but he himself does not understand the social meaning of the sound he creates and misreads his purpose in the barber's lair. The ringing of the barber's basins at the end of *Quiet Life* reminds audiences that women in the play have been figured within a male, economic market in which both sexes are open to exploitation.

Music-making is also a nodal image of activity in the barber's shop for which instruments, especially the citterns, gitterns, lutes and virginals, were part of the furniture.⁸⁶ Characters perform songs in barbery settings in *I Promos and Cassandra*, *Damon and Pithias* and *Midas*.⁸⁷ According to *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, barbers have a 'great facilitie attaine to happiness': 'if idle, they passe that time in life-delighting musique'.⁸⁸ Of Octavio, Troylo says in *Fancies*, 'His Barber is the master to instruct / The lasses both in Song and Dance' (D1v). The Latin song which Bold translates, '*On a*

⁸⁵ Schafer, pp. 10, 275.

⁸⁶ See Maguire, 'Cultural Control', pp. 88-93.

⁸⁷ Music in Lyly's plays has been the subject of debate since the early twentieth century. The quartos of his dramatic works include s.d.'s for singing but song lyrics are absent. These were not published until Edward Blount's edition of Lyly's plays, *Six Court Comedies* (1632). For discussions on the 1632 songs' authorship see W. W. Greg, 'The Authorship of the Songs in Lyly's Plays', *MLR* 1:1 (1905), 43-52; John Robert Moore, 'The Songs in Lyly's Plays', *PMLA* 42:3 (1927), 623-640; R. Warwick Bond, 'Lyly's Songs', *RES* 6:23 (1930), 295-299; Bond, 'Addendum on Lyly's Songs', *RES* 7:28 (1931), 442-447; and, more recently, Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), pp. 138-139.

⁸⁸ Richard Lichfield[?], *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (1597), B4v.

Barber who became a great Master of Musick’ envisages that barbers will form a music society.⁸⁹ Unlike the image of the man or woman singing while they work (the proverb goes that ‘The singing man keepes his shop in his throate’), the barber’s musical space was public (even a place for rough pedagogy).⁹⁰ Intending ‘to tickle with...vaine delight’, as Stubbes makes clear, barbers claim an audience.⁹¹ My argument that the barber’s shop was intelligible visually to early moderns corresponds to this chapter’s argument that it possessed a culturally-stable aural identity.

Musical performances are not solely the barber’s. The opening of the ballad, ‘The Rimers New Trimming’ (c.1614), ‘A rimer of late in a Barbors shop’, acoustically situates the tale and identifies a performer. In the second verse the balladeer adopts a new persona (rhymer) who embarks on his own, six-verse song (which accounts for almost a third of the entire ballad). The rhymer’s voice must, according to context, resound within the walls of the shop, and so the listening body is reconfigured also within that soundscape. During a balladic performance, according to Smith, ‘the body projects itself into space and claims that space as its own.’⁹² The irony in ‘New Trimming’ is that the rhymer rather than the barber causes aural offence; as such, the actions described at the end of the ballad ensure that the rhymer is removed from the shop, a space in which custom and routine has been flouted because of his initial performance. Window and door act as acoustic *limena* which enforce the effect of the rhymer’s exclusion (his body is flung from the shop): ‘fourth of doores’, ‘gon out’, ‘went backe againe’, ‘the door was shut’, ‘at the Window a Glasse’ (see stanzas 15-17).⁹³ Significantly, the rhymer does not converse or sing in the space outside

⁸⁹ Bold, M4v-N1r.

⁹⁰ George Herbert, *Outlandish Proverbs* (1640), D8r (entry 918). This in turn corresponds to anatomical conceptions of the thorax or chest: ‘the shop wherein the voice is framed; and for this cause it is called...a Citterne or Crowd, because of the sound of it maketh Musick’ (Crooke, p. 347).

⁹¹ Stubbes, H1r.

⁹² Smith, p. 180.

⁹³ The opening of *Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, ‘Sir, here is a gentleman at the doore would speake with you. Let him come in. M. Nashe!’, suggests the shop’s threshold (B4r).

the shop, where he loses verbal expression and musicality: outside, he can only ‘swear and rave’ (stanza 18, line 1). (When Tom evacuates the barber’s shop in ‘West-Country Tom Tormented’ (Anon, 1664-1703), he also ‘Rave[s]’ (stanza 8, line 7).) The barber then redefines the rhymers’ earlier ‘bold’ singing as ‘scalding, and scraping’ (stanza 19, line 2). In ‘New Trimming’ and in *Midas*, music associated with barbering rarely seems to be conventionally musical and this contributes to the perception that the barber’s shop is somewhere where ears are under attack. In the same way that writers convert the smells of barbering into something repulsive, so they are liable to adjust the perception of its associated sounds and music. One of the main lessons of *Midas* might be listen carefully (to advice as well as to playing), but its subplot tests and ridicules this maxim: centred on the barber, it concentrates on sounds which, in non-theatrical settings, we might wish to filter out. Cries of pain, rattling, knocking, out of tune instruments, verbosity, slander and protests make a noisy soundscape. The given ‘tune of “My Teeth Do Ache!”’ (III.ii.148, in quarto as well as the 1632 edition) for the barber’s song plays into the scene’s parody of dentistry but it also ridicules the nature of the barber’s shop music: the tune is not tuneful.

‘The Barber goes snip snap’

The 21 stanzas of ‘A Merry New Catch of All Trades’ (c.1620), a ballad, list over fifty different characters and tradesmen, from courtiers to whores, from bakers to beggars. Its composition is a series of mnemonics which distinguish the occupational identities: some of these mnemonics are soundmarks. The effect of the ballad as a compilation of trade habits, sounds, instruments and qualities is twofold. In one respect, the ballad creates a sense of separation between the characters it records: there is division in titles (‘trades’/‘arts’/‘occupations’), variety of representation, and a pointed concluding aphorism, ‘all arrive by contraries’. Simultaneously, the ballad brings together the

occupational mix. There is line sharing and internal rhyme which unites the mnemonics of the different trades, and the ballad's performance register, which is determined by the manner of a catch, ensures that lines resonate concurrently. Trades' soundmarks are especially performative in 'Merry New Catch', as they are in Dekker's animated satire, *Seven Deadly Sins*, in which the street scene is noisy and unsuitable for Sloth's idleness: 'hammers are beating in one place, Tube hooping in another, Pots clinking in a third, water-tankards running at tilt in a fourth...Tradesmen (as if they were dau[n]cing Galliards (are lusty) at Legges and never stand still'.⁹⁴ 'Merry New Catch' is riddled with onomatopoeias which add richness to the acoustics in performance. These 'inner' ballad sounds, which are externalised by balladeers, constitute a lively balladic soundscape which corresponds to a civic one: 'tinke a tanke tanke', 'ranta tan tan' (twice), 'thumps', 'mumps', 'snip snap[s]', 'prickes', 'nickes', 'whips', 'nock[s]', 'rubs' and 'scrubs'. Smith reflects,

The soundscape of early modern London was made up of a number of overlapping, shifting acoustic communities, centered on different soundmarks: parish bells, the speech of different nationalities, the sounds of trades, open-air markets, the noises of public gathering places. Moving among these soundmarks – indeed, *making* these soundmarks in the process – Londoners in their daily lives followed their own discursive logic.⁹⁵

But if trades are 'soundmarked', and thereby have specificity in this acoustic form of representation, how do these identification tags function autonomously?

The apothecary's soundmark, 'ranta tan tan' (stanza 3, line 4), is of interest. Proverbially, the apothecary produced a distinctive din: 'The apothecary's mortar spoils the luter's music' (see *Figure 3*).⁹⁶ In the proverb, sounds are not just simultaneous, they are competitive, and the apothecary's noise is dominant. Bacon writes in *Sylva Sylvarum*,

⁹⁴ Dekker, *The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London* (1606), E1v.

⁹⁵ Smith, p. 56.

⁹⁶ Tilley, p. 16 (A281). Cf. 'the Musick of the Pestil and Mortar will sound pleasanter than the Passing Bell' on the subject of practicing Apothecaries, Christopher Merret, *The Accomplisht Physician* (1670), p. 95.

‘*Sounds* doe disturbe and alter the one the other: Sometimes the one drowning the other, and making it not heard; Sometimes the one jarring and discarding with the other, and making a Confusion’.⁹⁷ The proverb draws attention more generally to the cacophonies associated with mixed performances (artisan and musical) in a tradesman’s shop, which are readily transportable to the barbery context. Moreover, the proverb suggests that itinerant sounds made by the tradesman spoil what might otherwise be ‘pleasant harmonie[s]’.

The other phrase of particular acoustic interest – for the purposes of this thesis – in ‘Merry New Catch’ is ‘The Barber goes snip snap’ (stanza 5, line 2). This soundmark is not the creative device of a single balladeer. In the period this barbery soundmark echoes across different literary media (pamphlets, treatises, ballads, plays) in a range of contexts, making it culturally stable. ‘Snip snap’, ‘snap’, ‘snip’, ‘snipsnap’, ‘snip-snap’, ‘snipping’, and ‘snapping’ as well as associative ‘knacking’ sounds are commonplace. Bacon notes that the letter ‘P’ is ‘not expressed, but with the *Contracting*, or *Shutting* of the *Mouth*’.⁹⁸ In order to shape and vocalize ‘snip snap’ (a mixture of sibilance, barbed consonants and plosives) in our mouths and larynx, we must emulate physically as well as vocally (percussively) the activity it describes. In ‘Merry New Catch’ the mention of the barber is characterised by sound alone. Because nothing in the ballad qualifies this sound, the ‘snip snap’ in this instance encompasses a variety of effects. ‘Snip-snap’ and ‘knack’ hover between various acoustic contexts and their flexibility as soundmarks correspond to the linguistic slipperiness of the language generally attributed to barbers.

Barbery instruments (mainly scissors and razors) inherently produce sounds: the trade cannot be silent. In referring to the routines of barbery in ‘New Trimming’, the balladeer also reproduces the itinerant sounds of the barber at work, or characterizes

⁹⁷ *Sylva Sylvarum*, I2v (227).

⁹⁸ *Sylva Sylvarum*, H3r (198).

barbery through onomatopoeia: ‘rub’, ‘brush’, ‘bob’, ‘slap’, ‘clip’ and ‘frizz’. In the catalogue of barber’s equipment recovered from the wreck of the Mary Rose, archaeologists list the variety of razors found: ‘In four instances a copper-allow ‘arm’ was attached to [the split end] of the blade...it is possible that any razor without [provision of arms] was opened simply by *shaking the blade free*’ [italics mine].⁹⁹ Although this implied action would not specifically constitute a ‘snap snap’, it suggests the noise made by metal scraping against metal. In his examination of ancient barbery tools, George Boon cites Plutarch who comments on the barber’s need frequently to ‘strop the razor’ and a customer’s desire to have something to ‘soften [his] stubble’, writing, in addition, on Juvenal who ‘recalls a young man’s stiff growth “sounding” under the blade’.¹⁰⁰ Barbery work is characterized as a finicky business. In Charles Hoole’s Latin dictionary a section on barbery defines the practitioner as ‘one that snaps with the scissors’.¹⁰¹ Drawing on Truax’s description of soundscapes, Smith explains: ‘the impinging of non-human sounds, all contribute to a given community’s sense of self-identity. To some degree, nonhuman sounds are the product of human activities.’¹⁰²

For the most part, however, writers do not suggest that these are solely incidental sounds from barbery work, but make clear that they are the result of barbers’ affectations and rehearsed mannerisms. In *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, Greene implies that verbal communication can be matched with non-verbal sounds in the barber’s shop, and that scissor sounds endorse faux penal gestures and Rhetoric. He describes a barber lavishly waiting on Velvet Breeches: ‘begins he to take his sissars in his hand and his combe, and so to snap with them as if he meant to give a warning to all the lice in his nittie lockes’

⁹⁹ *Before the Mast*, p. 217.

¹⁰⁰ George C. Boon, ‘*Tonsor Humanus*’, *Britannia* 22 (1991), 21-32 (p. 27).

¹⁰¹ Hoole, p. 299.

¹⁰² Smith, p. 47.

(more infestations).¹⁰³ Excessive sound (even if these are not loud notes) associated with the practice of barbering appears frivolous and performance-driven. Motto reminds Dello in *Midas*, ‘Thou knowest I have taught thee the knacking of the hands, the tickling on a man’s hair, like the tuning of a cittern’ (III.ii.36-8): apprenticeship training is a matter of acquiring an affectation. Often when sounds trouble us we characterize them as wholly unnecessary. In recent studies on early modern soundscapes, critics focus on the loud, iconoclastic sounds that characterize and organize the ‘noisy’ city, its bells and its street cries, for example. But intrusive sounds are not only the loud ones: the nature and the context of the sound affects people’s reaction to it. Cockayne notes that ‘the honourable Roger North explained that some sounds, such as the “clapping of a door”, annoyed the hearer because, in contrast to musical sounds that have “equal time pulses”, they have “unequal movements” and “uncertain periods”’.¹⁰⁴ If barbering sounds are like the ‘tuning of a cittern’ then they are not the predictable notes of a tune.

When people name sounds that put them on edge today they commonly mention ones that are localised. Nails on a blackboard, for example, may not be a sound we encounter often, but it codifies unpleasant noise and a physical reaction to it, and can therefore be idiomatic. Sounds can function beyond their immediate sonic impact. This effect can be rhetorical, decorative (or stylistic), punitive and onomastic. Morose’s satisfaction that his barber ‘has not the knack with his shears or his fingers’ (I.ii.36-37) is not as peculiar or particular as it initially sounds. Jonson’s irascible protagonist might be associated with fanaticism, but he also highlights for the audience the sounds which are familiarly bothersome in varying degrees, and parodies common human intolerances. On the subject of Morose’s affliction as a supposed torment of boundaries Edward Partridge

¹⁰³ Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), C3v. Cf. Sweetball’s exclaim in *Quiet Life*: incensed by Franklin’s pranks, the barber declares, ‘To him boldly; I will spend all the scissors in my shop, but I’ll have him snapped’ (III.ii.15-16). Sweetball alludes to trapping Franklin, but ‘snapped’ is performative: Sweetball is also alluding a way to make Franklin’s body crack.

¹⁰⁴ Cockayne, *Hubbub*, p. 36.

points out that ‘No healthy, rational man – the terms overlapped for Jonson – should be so sensitive to noise as Morose’; but he goes on to say that Jonson’s sense of cure is applied to ‘social rather than physical troubles’.¹⁰⁵ It is more likely that Jonson applies this sense to both epistemes. Cockayne insists that ‘Morose’s pathological aversion to noise is manifested in his taking umbrage at the sounds of...hair-trimming’, but Morose is not the only character for whom barbering pursuits are associated with noise.¹⁰⁶ These are sounds are hardly deafening; compared to other sounds in ‘Merry New Catch’ ‘snip snap’ ranks below ‘beates his pan’, ‘thumps’, ‘cries’/‘cryes’, ‘nock[s]’ and the mortar’s ‘ranta tan tan’. However, if not the volume, then the nature of the sound, its sonic consistency, nettles the nerves. Moreover, objections to the noise are often explained by the proximity of its source to the ears of the client (as we found in Bacon): barbers’ work, even when they are not ear picking, focuses on the head area. Of the giant barber, Barbaroso, in *Burning Pestle*, the Host proclaims: ‘with his fingers and an instrument / With which he snaps his hair off, he doth fill / The wretch’s ears with a most hideous noise’ (III.249-51). This ‘hideous noise’ could be an allusion to the persistent chattiness of barbers, but given the references to ‘fingers’, ‘instruments’ and ‘snaps’, it is most likely to be a disturbance caused by non-verbal sounds. The sound produced by the barber is his vulgar, laboured proof that he is at work. Stubbes criticises elaborate show in a barber’s shop, emphasising, ‘what snipping & snapping of the sycers is there’, which, in part, justifies the barber’s fee.¹⁰⁷

Barbers’ hands are also a source of acoustic – as well as gesticular (kinetic) – performance. When Nashe refers to the ‘*knacke* of [the barber’s] occupation’ in *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, he includes an addendum in the margin: ‘*Barbers knocking their*

¹⁰⁵ Edward Partridge, ‘The Allusiveness of *Epicoene*’, *ELH* 22:2 (1955), 93-107 (p. 102).

¹⁰⁶ Cockayne, *Hubbub*, p. 109.

¹⁰⁷ Stubbes, G8v. Cf. ‘And how you will laugh at your Clients when you sit in a Tavern...and whip up a Cause, as a Barber trims his Customers on a Christmass Eve, a snip, a wipe, and away’ (Webster, *A Cure for a Cuckold* (1661), E4v).

fingers'.¹⁰⁸ In doing so, Nashe combines his reference to an occupational skill-set (albeit ironically in the context) and a soundmark. 'Knack' the skill is undermined by 'knack' the irritating noise, and the sounds play off each other on the page. In *Greene's Tu Quoque* by Cooke, Bubble says that the barber 'can snacke his fingers with dexteritie'.¹⁰⁹ Given the context, it is likely that 'snacke' is a printer's or scribe's error and should read 'knacke'. Cursive 's' and 'k' graphemes can look similar, particularly when they are followed by another letter. This is a singular use of 'snacke' in this context, whereas 'knack[e]' and 'knacking' are in frequent use. In *Fancies*, Spadone makes 'knacke' (B1r) a noun (epithet), in renaming Secco the barber. Like Nashe, Cooke highlights the pun and the word-play on 'knacke' is ironic. The literal mirroring of sounds in the barber's shop between instruments and fingers corresponds to the linguistic mirroring (puns and homophones) in the word.

Today we would call 'knacking' "clicking the fingers", the action of which John Bulwer describes: 'knacking', is 'to compresse the middle-finger with the thumbe by their complosion producing a sound so casting out our hand'.¹¹⁰ The preparation made for this gesture, Bulwer asserts, is the 'prepar[ation] to create a sound'.¹¹¹ In another entry that describes knocking, Bulwer says that the 'collision produc[es] a flurting sound'.¹¹² But 'flurting' is an unusual word choice to describe an acoustic effect, and it is difficult to see how the word captures any of the sonic quality of 'knacking', unless Bulwer is associating it with 'flurry' and noises that agitate the air. Bulwer later makes 'knacking' analogous with 'percussion', which seems more suitable.¹¹³ In his entry on 'knacking' which constitutes a 'Contemno Gestus', he also refers to dancing in a 'Barbarian fashion' which

¹⁰⁸ Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), A3v; Lichfield[?] quotes directly from Nashe ('I espied barbers knocking of their fingers' (B3v)).

¹⁰⁹ Jo. Cooke, *Greenes Tu Quoque* (1614), D3r.

¹¹⁰ John Bulwer, *Chirologia* (1644), M8v.

¹¹¹ Bulwer, N1r.

¹¹² Bulwer, G1r.

¹¹³ Bulwer H3r. Bulwer's difficulty in finding words to describe particular sounds, reminds us of the curator's difficulty in describing the smells of the contents of bottles found on the wreck of the Mary Rose, discussed in the first chapter of the thesis.

he identifies as ‘knacking...with...fingers’ performed over the dancer’s head.¹¹⁴ Although Bulwer never specifically mentions barbers in *Chirologia*, the homophone in ‘Barbarian’ in this sentence is suggestive reminding us of ‘barbarous’ Pan.

Bulwer concludes that knocking ‘expresse[s] the vanitie of things’.¹¹⁵ Attending to the vanity of customers by fixing their complexions is part of the barber’s professional activity, and so the trade’s soundmark sonically encapsulates this pursuit. This doubling-up is suggested in the tailor’s comparison between garments and ears in *Love-Sick Court* and the ‘vaine delight’ that music carries, according to Stubbes, in the barber’s shop, both discussed earlier. In *Taming of the Shrew*, Petruchio observes of the sleeve the tailor has made for Katherine, ‘Heers snip, and nip, and cut, and slish and slash, / Like to a Censor in a barbers shoppe’ ((1623, Folio). Laurie Maguire has demonstrated that the original reading of ‘Censor’ (changed by many editors to ‘censer’ and by editors of *Complete Works* to ‘scissor’) was ‘*cittern* (or a variant spelling of that noun)’.¹¹⁶ The itinerant sounds of barbery (which double-up with some soundmarks of the tailor, who also wields scissors), the implied musical instrument and the context of Petruchio’s dissatisfaction at the fussiness of the garment, which is like an over-elaborate cittern-neck’s engraving, here conflate. Although the context is sartorial, Petruchio’s criticism plays out across onomatopoeias – barbery soundmarks (in that the tailor’s scissor action is defined in terms of another context) – which provide an acoustic effect of excess. The point of the scene is that excess does not lie with the item (the sleeve) but with Petruchio’s reaction to it: his argument based on acoustics supplants one based on vision. I began this chapter by separating the concepts of the culture of appearance and the culture of sound in *Epicoene*, but they are related.

¹¹⁴ Bulwer, N1r.

¹¹⁵ Bulwer, part two, G1r.

¹¹⁶ Maguire, ‘Petruccio and the Barber’s Shop’, *Studies in Bibliography* 51 (1998), 117-126 (esp. pp. 117-118). The Arden 3 edition of *Shrew*, ed. Barbara Hodgdon (London: A & C Black, 2010) adopts Maguire’s emendation.

In some references, the barber's finger movements signal the conclusion of the trimming process which constitutes a separate acoustic sign-posting: barbering is bounded by – as well as articulated through – soundmarks, which are structural. In *Damon and Pithias*, Snap is the porter at whose gates Wyll and Jacke 'be come...trimme Barbers'.¹¹⁷ Snap's two entries around this scene encapsulate the trimming process (Fir, Giv). Finales are not described as a knocking-noise but as a single snap. In 'New Trimming', the rhymer refers to 'the snap of [the barber's] Finger [that] then followes after' (stanza 6, line 4) the trimming routine: it is its rather pathetic flourish. Similarly, Stubbes describes how a barber concludes his services: 'Then snap go the fingers, ful bravely god wot. Thus this tragedy ended'.¹¹⁸ Given the mundane subject, Stubbes's criticism of the excessive performances in barbers' shops easily emerges through his portrayal of an overly-emphasized and trifling gesture as something heroic ('bravely') and within a grandiose context (a 'tragedy'). Both knocking and snapping are aggravating and intrusive but, most significantly, they are not robust sounds: in their very nature they are incongruent with sounds we associate with grand matters (in performance contexts), such as alarums, thunder, drums, trumpets and bell chiming. Through the barber, therefore, we have a parody of sound, also exemplified earlier in this chapter by the effect of chiming basins. Stubbes constructs his parody by playing with notions of volume or scale which make a sound seem ridiculous; in the example of the ringing basin, parody is a matter of re-contextualization.

More generally, the noises associated with barbers are associated with coarse forms of expression. In Bulwer's *Chirologia*, 'certain Prevarications against the Rule of Rhetoricall Decorum' state that 'To use any Grammaticall gestures of compact, or any

¹¹⁷ Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pithias* (1571), Fiiiv.

¹¹⁸ Stubbes, G8v.

snapping of the *Fingers*...is very unsuitable to the gravity of an Oratour'.¹¹⁹ Elsewhere, *Cautio XXVIII* instructs, 'Avoyd knackings, and superflitious flextures of the *Fingers*, which the Ancients have not given in precept'.¹²⁰ The sound by which barbers are characterised informs the regular joke that barbers are terrific gossip-mongerers, but not necessarily great orators.¹²¹ Coarse, non-verbal sounds epitomize rough rhetoric (captured by Greene's description of a barber who 'at every word a [made a] snap with...[his] sissors'), and so this soundmark critiques oral expression.¹²² Having noted that ex-barber Crispino is not thought of to have many manners, Volterre declares that Crispino's 'fingers speake his profession' in James Shirley's *Humorous Courtier*.¹²³ In *Quiet Life*, Sweetball the barber cries, 'hark you, snipsnap' (II.iv.3) to encourage his boy to be speedy in his task. The soundmark is reductive, the barbery equivalent of 'be quick about it!' or 'hurry up!' Earlier I quoted from Smith on the soundmarks of trades who produce a discursive logic in a cityscape. More specifically, barbery's soundmark has a discursive logic in that it corresponds to barbers' oral habits and characterises utterance, discussed in the next chapter. The performative non-verbal sounds critically respond to verbal ones.

At the end of *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* in which Lichfield uses barbery language and metaphor to suggest how he might cut back Nashe's lengthy, and often insulting discourse, he instructs, 'if heere I have been too prodigall in *snip snaps*, tell me of it, limit me with a Falt, and in short time you shall see me reformed'.¹²⁴ Lichfield suggests that his own writing might have snip snapped immoderately wherein reproving '*snip snaps*' replace rhetorical attacks.¹²⁵ But the italics also highlight its intertextuality and parodic function: Lichfield adopts his reference to performing 'snip snaps' from the

¹¹⁹ Bulwer, part two, H1r.

¹²⁰ Bulwer, part two, K8r.

¹²¹ Bulwer, part two, H1r.

¹²² *Upstart Courtier*, C4r.

¹²³ James Shirley, *The Humorous Courtier* (1640), I3r.

¹²⁴ Lichfield[?], G4v.

¹²⁵ Italicisation of '*snip snaps*' in the printed text highlight its performative role.

pamphlet to which he is responding. In his mock dedication to Lichfield, Nashe suggests that Lichfield should ‘deal...*Snip Snap* snapishly’ with the Proctor of Saffron-Walden, indicating that if barbery and therefore barbers are characterized in terms of rhetorical prowess, the result is a rather feeble clicking of scissors and fingers which lacks efficacy.¹²⁶ ‘*Snip Snap* snappishly’ is childish and over-alliterated. William Rowley characterises a barber with ‘a snapping wit’.¹²⁷ Jonson’s barber (Tom) in *Staple* is described by Penny Boy Junior as

A pretty Scholler and a Master of Arts,
 ...
 At the Universities;...one Christmas,
 He got into a masque at court, by his wit,
 And the good means of his cittern, holding up thus
 For one o’the music. He’s a nimble fellow
 And alike skill’d in every liberal science,
 As having certain snaps of all (I.v.125-132)

The play, in particular, draws on the association between barbery and gossip-mongering and the jack-of-all-trades image with which the barber can be endowed. He is the early modern’s form of our taxi-driver stereotype: someone who seems to have some knowledge in many fields. Jonson terms Tom’s diverse knowledge as ‘snaps’, a collection of ‘scraps’, which also puns on the soundmark of his barbery practice.

The soundmark (‘snip snap’) is also supplied for onomastic purposes in literature. Disguised Young Franklin speaks in French (in his ludicrously poor disguise) and refers to Sweetball as ‘*ce poulain Snip-snap*’ (*Quiet Life*, III.ii.136-137), meaning the young colt snip-snap, thereby replacing the barber’s official name with an epithetical sound bite.¹²⁸ If audience members do not understand all of Young Franklin’s French, the ‘Snip-snap’ in

¹²⁶ Nashe, *Saffron-Walden*, B2r.

¹²⁷ William Rowley, *A Search for Money*, B3r.

¹²⁸ Leslie Thomson’s editorial decision to put ‘Snip-snap’ with hyphenation does not match the typography in the 1662 quarto (‘*ce Poullens Snip snap*’ (E2r)), but it does emphatically yolk the soundmark to create a name.

his speech nevertheless stands out for comic effect: it does not need translation. In *Fancies*, Spadone refers to the barber as ‘a snipper-snapper’ (B1r), transforming Secco into a minimizing onomatopoeia.¹²⁹ An epithetical use of ‘snip’ is also applied by the balladeer of ‘The Northern Ladd’. The song tells of a female who is wooed by a number of different tradesmen, all of whom she refuses in favour of a ploughman. One of the maid’s suitors is a mischievous barber:

But I repell’d his rude address,
and told him ’twas my greatest-cares,
If wa’d a lowsie A-Snip, alas,
when he’s incens’d should keep my ears.¹³⁰

As it did in *Quiet Life*, so ‘Snip’ (‘A-Snip’) in this quatrain can function as an antonomasia for the barber (i.e. ‘Alas, if he was a only a lousy barber’).¹³¹ However, it can also be an epithet for ‘rude address’, whereby the ‘Snip’ is a cutting or exposing remark (i.e. ‘if his address was a rotten insult or intrusion’).¹³² By adding ‘A’ before ‘Snip’, the balladeer improves the line’s lilt which then includes three ‘a’ phonemes in ‘a lowsie’, ‘A-Snip’ and ‘alas’ [*italics mine*]: these supply phonemic as well as rhythmic cohesion. In both senses the soundmark ‘snip’ is derogatory. The final line of the stanza suggests that the female’s ears are under threat from the barber: ‘should keep my ears’ means ‘should cover my ears’. The line means that when the barber becomes vulgar, or – to use Nashe and Lichfield’s phrase – too ‘prodigal in snip-snaps’, the maid must plug her ears. Once again, the ears, figured here through the fraught status of the female ear which Bloom explores, are considered a vulnerable organ in the presence of the barber. The performing ‘Snip’ in line

¹²⁹ Cf. ‘a pack of doting wretches...disturbers of the Common wealth, and yet are awed by...Barbers, and every *Snip-Snap Jack* which can tell the King a faire tale in his eare’ (Thomas Audley, *Mercurius Britannicus*, 27 (1644), p. 211).

¹³⁰ Anon, ‘The Northern Ladd’ (1670-1696), stanza 10.

¹³¹ Perhaps the capitalisation of the ‘A’ suggests the proper noun.

¹³² In this instance that remark is bawdy with its innuendo, ‘he would prick my master-Vein’ (stanza 8, line 4).

three and reference to ears in line four of the stanza makes the connection in the ballad between barbery, sound-making and offence to the ear.

‘What groane is that?...Convay him to a Surgeons’

Slicing off ears, like gouging out eyes, is the profound realization of a minor barbery threat and takes us into the field of barber-surgery. When Martius declares, ‘Were I Midas, I would cut these ears off close from my head than stand whimpering’ (V.iii.15-17), Midas responds, ‘Though art barbarous, not valiant’ (V.iii.18). Playing on his potential to be irregular, the Barber-Surgeon Richard Lichfield in *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* is interested in his subject’s ears, which, he deems, are ‘dull to heare’ and therefore ‘deserve their punishment’. His reprimand is enacted through the conversational style of the text: ‘Then to bee short, to have thine [ears] cropt is thy punishment: What *Tom*, are thine eares gone?’ Accompanying these lines is an acoustic cue in the margin: ‘Ha ha ha.’¹³³ Lichfield embeds his non-verbal reaction in the text, but Nashe’s presumed primal cry is bypassed: ‘I am sure tis a horrible paine to be troubled with the moving of the eares’. Lichfield then teases his imagined victim, shifting from the image of the barber-surgeon – who cuts unadvisedly – to the surgeon who cures, and asserting his professional status (a matter of regularizing himself) in the process: ‘What wilt thou give me if I (I am a Chirurgion) make a new paire of eares to grow out of thy head’. Lichfield has ‘wax & al things ready’ but he decides that Nashe ‘long a goe...deserved this disgrace to be eareless’.¹³⁴ The ear’s anatomical complexities were perplexing surgeons in early modernity and this passage’s interest in ear reconstruction is timely; only the ear wax is a familiar element. Helkiah Crooke remarks on the aural passage, the ‘outward Eares’: ‘so many & so smal are the

¹³³ *Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, F4v. Cf. Quentin Tarantino’s *Reservoir Dogs* (Artisan, 1992) when Mr Blonde cuts off Marvin’s ear using a straight razor. The choreography of the scene, which centrally depicts a chair, strikingly resembles Gloucester’s enucleation in *King Lear*.

¹³⁴ *Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, G1r.

particles there-of, and couched so close in narrow distances or nookes between the bones'.¹³⁵ Otology was only in its early phase, although it was a fast developing episteme.¹³⁶ Lichfield's vague reference to 'things' being ready to make or fix an ear fits the pattern I discussed in chapter one; whereas the barbers possess one iconic tool for ear treatments, for the surgeons the same cannot be said. Surgical equipment can be described as 'like unto an ear picker', where the definite instrument is a reference-point but not a discriminating object.¹³⁷ The 'ear Syringe, called *Otenechya*' is a derivative of the generic syringe which has dozens of variations depending on the specific use.¹³⁸ Holme reveals again that there are a variety of names for essentially the one instrument (as far as the lay-person can perceive): 'a *Syringe*, or *Clyster Syringe*; a *Mouth* or *Ear Syringe*; so called, because used chiefly about those parts...It hath several names, as *Syphon*, *Syringa*, and *Enterenchyta*', and more, 'The *Enchyta*, is an Instrument wherewith Liquids are instilled into the Eyes, Nostrils or Ears, called also *Otenchyta* and *Oegin*.'¹³⁹ Bacon writes, 'I have heard there is in *Spaine*, an *Instrument* in use to be set to the *Eare*, that *helpeth* somewhat those that are Thicke of Hearing.'¹⁴⁰ The information is hearsay. Once again, this pattern tells us something about the way in which a medical narrative plays out on stage. Todd Pettigrew writes that 'the surgeon does not provide enough narrative resource' for the stage.¹⁴¹ More specifically, the narrative resource for surgery is abundant, but can lack definition.

¹³⁵ Crooke, p. 573.

¹³⁶ Figureheads such as Paré (1510-1590), Vesalius (1514-1564), Bartolomeus Eustachius (1520-1574), Volcher Coiter (1534-1600) and Crooke (1576-1648) diagrammatised and referenced auditory systems throughout the period.

¹³⁷ Jacques Guillemeau, *The Frenche Chirurgerye* (1598), Fiiv.

¹³⁸ Scultetus, p. 33. Scultetus explains that this syringe is effective 'whereby liquors are injected into the organs of hearing, to cleanse and heal ulcers there'.

¹³⁹ Holme, p. 427.

¹⁴⁰ *Sylva Sylvarum*, K4r (285).

¹⁴¹ Todd H. J. Pettigrew, *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), p. 135.

If no specific surgical instrument is associated with ear treatments, I now want to look at whether the profession is given a specific soundmark. The sounds with which surgeons are most associated in theatre, as well as outside, are the screaming, groaning, crying and moaning injured or sick, which Lichfield converts to an unsympathetic chortle in his pamphlet. The Master of the College calls ‘Surgeons, surgeons’ in *A Yorkshire Tragedy* on cue from the injured Wife’s ‘O, O!’ (5:60), which, at first, is her only means of expression. In Marston’s *Malcontent*, Ferneze’s takes some time to revive after Mendoza ‘*Thrusts his rapier*’ into him.¹⁴² The young courtier’s first utterance upon stirring is ‘O!’, followed a line later by ‘O a Surgeon’, and finally ‘O helpe, help, conceale and save mee’ (E1v). Cassio cries in *Othello*: ‘O, help ho! light! a surgeon’ (V.i.30) and plenty of ‘O’-embellishments litter that scene when other characters panic. ‘O’ represents not just the victim’s alarm, but also that (feigned or otherwise) of those around them. ‘Even in the tongue of a man’, Crooke observes, ‘sometimes it expresseth onelie those things that fall under the Sense, as when wee crie for pain, or for Foode and succour’.¹⁴³ In Fletcher’s *Sea Voyage*, hungry sailors appealing to the surgeon have six scripted ‘O[h]!’ sounds over thirty lines (Aaaaa4v). Smith analyses [o:] as an act of communication questioning how the body projects itself through the primal cry and identifies itself through sound in a process of “‘Autopoiesis’”, or “‘self-making’”.¹⁴⁴ However, Elaine Scarry’s argument about the ‘unmaking’ power of pain is, among other things, an unmaking power of language: ‘Physical pain does not simply resist language but actively destroys it, bringing about an immediate reversion to a state anterior to language, to the sounds and cries a

¹⁴² Marston, *The Malcontent* (1604), s.d., D3v.

¹⁴³ Crooke, p. 629. On Oedipus, David B. Morris: ‘When [blind] Oedipus finally speaks, what we hear is not words but only a single, repeated cry of agony: speech rolled back into mere sound and torment. This is the stark revelation toward which every act and speech of the entire drama have been relentlessly aiming: a frozen moment of pain that contains nothing except the mutilated human body and its wordless suffering’ (*Culture of Pain* (Berkeley; Oxford: University of California Press, 1991), p. 248).

¹⁴⁴ Smith, pp. 13-22 (p. 15).

human being makes before language is learned'.¹⁴⁵ The 'O' of the injured party on stage, which is the effect of language failing, at once acoustically identifies its mangled subject and identifies its need: it is not a primal cry for food, but a reactive cry for a surgeon. In *Macbeth* the bleeding Captain's logic is, 'My gashes cry for help' (I.ii.42) which prompts Duncan to command, 'Go get him surgeons' (I.ii.44). Erving Goffman discusses pain as a warning cry (for a patient in the dentist's chair, for example), which mixes an intentional and non-intentional response, holding meaning, therefore, beyond the primal reaction.¹⁴⁶ Smith's and Scarry's readings can be combined. The cry makes and unmakes a subject: a surgeon and a patient. Surgeons in *Yorkshire Tragedy*, *Othello*, and *Malcontent* do not appear and therefore are without phonic presence (save that their generic name is called out). Nevertheless they are acoustically cued by the screaming and whimpering character. Nashe writes in *Terrors of the Night* (1594) that 'Dreaming is no other than groaning, while sleepe our surgeon hath us in cure' (Ciiijr). 'Groaning' is the realisation of that which is barred from sight. We cannot see what the dreaming man sees, but we can hear him; we cannot see the surgeon, but we can sense him. Toures describes surgeons who attempted 'To dig, to delve, to find her paine' in her song in *Two Maids of More-Clacke*. Their efforts ('*in vaine*') to locate her problem (and thus their presence as medical subjects) are displaced by the song's imperative to disclose pain in giving it expression.¹⁴⁷

Characterizing the 'O' or finding some standardization in it as a cry is not possible. Culpeper and Kytö examine patterns in the 'pragmatic noises' recorded in early modern drama, making suggestions about historically changing sound patterns, but they are forced to concede 'that frequent pragmatic noise items are striking for their *lack* of text-type

¹⁴⁵ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain* (New York; Oxford: OUP, 1985), p. 4.

¹⁴⁶ Erving Goffman, 'Response Cries', *Language* 54:4 (1978), 787-815 (see p. 804).

¹⁴⁷ Robert Armin, *The History of Two Maids of More-Clacke* (1609), C4v.

variation'.¹⁴⁸ Moreover the authors cannot access sounds made in performance because they look at interaction in writing. In production, the sound is, of course, at the discretion of the actor. There is likely to be some improvisation in the right scenario: the instinct of an actor to convey instinctive sound. In Marston's *Insatiate Countess*, injured 'Mend[osa] grones' before being conveyed to the surgeon's.¹⁴⁹ This stage direction, which resists scripted expression, is even less descriptive in its denotation of utterance than 'O'. Tragedie's commentary in *A Warning for Faire Women* refers to the sounds associated with agony that fill a theatre and affect the hearer. Following Historie's line, 'Oh we shall have some doughtie stuffe to day' in the Induction, Tragedie complains,

What yet more Cats guts? O this filthie sound
 Stifles mine eares:
 More cartwheelles craking yet?
 A plague upont, Ile cut your Addle strings,
 If you stand scraping thus to anger me.¹⁵⁰

Comedie describes 'a filthie whining ghost, / ...[that] Comes skreaming like a pigge halfe stickt, / And cries' (A2v). And later, Tragedie imagines 'The ugly Schreechowle, and the night Raven, / With...hideous craking noise' (C4v). By comparison, Petulus's 'O teeth, O torments! O torments, O teeth!' (*Midas*, III.ii.74) mocks stilted, overly-defined oral expositions of pain through the trite reversed diction. And Iago's 'O for a chair' (V.i.83) parodies the panic-stricken cries about him. Martin and Allard note that 'For Horace and Dryden, there is something about pain that exceeds representation and troubles the smooth symmetry of the Aristotelian mimetic relationship; the failure to recognize this asymmetry produces not tragic pleasure but either laughter or disgust.'¹⁵¹ The danger of representing

¹⁴⁸ Jonathan Culpeper and Merja Kytö, *Early Modern English Dialogues* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), pp. 199-305 (p. 283).

¹⁴⁹ Marston, *The Insatiate Countesse* (1613), s.d. E1v.

¹⁵⁰ Anon [Thomas Heywood?], *A Warning for Faire Women* (1599), A2r.

¹⁵¹ Mathew R. Martin and James Robert Allard (eds.), *Staging Pain, 1580-1800* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 3.

pain is that, like a staged surgeon, it can seem too strikingly counterfeit and threatens to 'unmake' the theatrical moment.

Scarry argues throughout her work that the very unrepresentability of pain nevertheless encourages writers to attempt its appropriation. Other characters help to characterise cries. Malevole responds to Ferneze's 'O', 'Proclamations, more proclamations' (E1v) in *Malcontent*. Williams provides a soundscape for the battlefield in *Henry V*: 'some swearing, some crying for a surgeon' (IV.i.137). When Lodovico and Gratiano hear the cries of Cassio and Roderigo, Lodovico remarks, 'Two or three groan' (V.i.42) and he refers to his hesitation 'to come in to the cry' (V.i.44). The primal cries are made a subject of their speech: 'the voice is very direful', 'Whose noise is this that cries', 'Did you not hear a cry?' 'What are you here that cry so grievously?' (V.i.37-53). Cries demand to be heard. The Captain's response to Mendosa's 'groanes' in *Insatiate Countess* transform stage directions (and therefore Mendosa's expression) into words: 'What groane is that?...Convay him to a Surgeons' (E1v). The refrain of Toures's song is the cry of a maiden in agony: 'O stone, stone ne ra, stone ne ne ra, stone' (C4v). The term of the problem from which she believes she suffers is encased between non-verbal sounds (performed, presumably, as notes) and, in the song, her pain (and her expression of it) is variously described in advance of the refrain: 'she cri'd out in her despaire', 'And with an open throat she cries' and 'Still she cri'd out with paine and wo' (C4v). The wails of the refrain are appropriated by both language and music. The illusion that words can substitute the primal cry is matched by the illusion of the surgeon's presence through the primal cry. Substitutions in these examples create a distancing factor that helps to dispel the anxiety surrounding the counterfeit.

'O' and its various alternatives in the examples discussed here is not a soundmark but is a sound signal. The point about the expression of pain is that it is wholly individual

and cannot become a community sound; hence the surgeon is abstractly imagined. Moreover, the sound does not necessarily derive from the activities of surgery, but often resounds in advance of it, as we have found in the examples from early modern drama. It does not ‘mark’ the surgeon (who cannot be ‘marked’ because of his absence), but variously ‘signals’ him. The sounds of characters in agony (in performance) are highly audible and effecting but they resist interpretation.¹⁵² In *Modulated Scream* Esther Cohen uses a musical analogy to conceptualise expressions of pain in late medieval culture when, she claims, the surgeons’ ‘battle [with] pain on a daily basis’ (because of the ‘extreme suffering of surgery’).¹⁵³ Cries of pain, she states, are ‘polyphonic’. However, there is a difference to be drawn: ‘Unlike good polyphonic music’, she argues, ‘sounds of pain...do not harmonize’.¹⁵⁴

‘Come Surgeon, out with your Glister-pipe, / And stricke a Galliard’

In *Before the Mast* Jeremy Montagu describes a copper-alloy whistle that was recovered from the Barber-Surgeon’s chest which held surgical instruments:

It is 96mm long and very narrow in bore, with an internal diameter of 7mm...The purpose of the whistle is unclear. It looks as though it could have been a piston whistle, like a modern swanee whistle...Such instruments were used for teaching caged birds...*If the piston was calibrated, it might, just possibly have been used to measure the range of hearing; if such techniques were within a contemporary practice* [italics mine].¹⁵⁵

The author suggests that the object could have been a sign of early otology. If the whistle was not an otological instrument, then a birdsong training instrument seemed an odd

¹⁵² Lisa Silverman explains that pain (and a patient’s expression of pain) was essential to surgeons for diagnostic purposes (*Tortured Subjects* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. 133-151 (esp. p. 143)).

¹⁵³ Esther Cohen, *The Modulated Scream* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 98-9.

¹⁵⁴ Cohen, p. 257.

¹⁵⁵ *Before the Mast*, p. 214.

addition to the Surgeon's case.¹⁵⁶ In *Sylva Sylvarum*, Bacon describes experiments in which he uses a whistle-like object to determine the transmission and reception of different 'Magnitude[s]...of Sounds':

Take a *Truncke*, and let one whistle at the one End, and hold your Eare at the other, and you shall finde the *Sound* strike so sharpe, as you can scarce endure it. The *Cause* is, for that *Sound* diffuseth it selfe in round; And so spendeth it Selfe; But if the *Sound*, which would scatter in *Open Aire*, be made to goe all into a Canale.¹⁵⁷

Crooke describes similar experiments to Bacon, although neither writer stipulates a formal measuring process that might involve a calibrated instrument. In his investigations of the inner ear (the *cochlea*), Crooke makes observations by using 'a circled instrument...For', he explains, 'if a man lay his eares to the holes of such an instrument, hee shall here a wonderfull whistling and hissing noyse and murmure: where if a man blow into it with his mouth it will sound like a Trumpet'.¹⁵⁸ It seems that Montagu was onto something.

However, a visit to the Mary Rose Collections revealed that the whistle had been misidentified. Embarrassingly, the curator informed me, the archaeologists had got the instrument 'the wrong way round'. The cylinder was not meant for blowing notes. It was for cleansing the bowels: the supposed 'whistle' was actually a glister-pipe. The curators at the Mary Rose Trust are not the first to acknowledge that a surgical instrument (and specifically a glister-pipe) can look uncannily like a musical instrument. François Tolet describes an Arabian's attempt to extract stones from the urethra using 'Pipes of different sizes, much of the shape of Flutes, or Pipes which are musical Instruments'. The practice even involved 'blow[ing] in' the inserted instrument to 'dilate...the passage'. Not

¹⁵⁶ No bird cage was discovered on the wreck. For a discussion about instruments in early modern England that mimicked birdsongs, see Philip Butterworth's 'Magic Through Sound' in *Magic on the Early English Stage* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), pp. 98-112 (esp. pp. 110-1).

¹⁵⁷ *Sylva Sylvarum*, G2r (138).

¹⁵⁸ Crooke, p. 605.

surprisingly, Tolet does not claim that this procedure was particularly successful.¹⁵⁹ In surgery a glister is historically associated with oral application. Paré writes, ‘Galen hath attributed to Storke the invention of Glysters, which with their bils, having drunke Sea water, which from saltenesse hath a purging quality...whereby they use to bring away the excrements of their meates...a Glyster is fitly taken after this maner.’¹⁶⁰ Watching Cassio with Desdemona, Iago observes, ‘Yet again, your fingers to your lips? Would they were clyster-pipes for your sake’ (II.i.178-179); the image is sexual, but foully so.

At the beginning of *Sea Voyage* the stranded sailors hope that the surgeon can brighten their spirits. Tibalt jests, ‘For my own part, Ile Dance till I’m dry; / Come Surgeon, out with your Glister-pipe, / And stricke a Galliard’ (Aaaaa2r). Nothing in the script suggests that any stage activity results from these lines (particularly as the surgeon is supposed to be without his instruments), but Tibalt draws attention not only to the correspondence of the instruments’ (glister-pipe and musical pipe) shape (and their reverse bodily application), but also more generally to the fact that in theatre, references to or the performance of lively, merry music makes a mockery of sober surgical practice; Galliards, according to *Deadly Sins*, are associated with fidgety tradesmen. (The ‘syringe’ (s.d. III.452) onstage in *Burning Pestle* could become a visual joke if gestures to the ear, mouth and bottom are made by the actors.) Crooke suggests that surgical learning can be of two kinds which he gives in musical terms, but with only one kind should surgeons associate themselves: ‘attend the plaine-song rather then the division or descant, which doth oftentimes corrupt the Musick if the auditors care be not careful to distinguish them’.¹⁶¹ The learning of a good medical practitioner included ‘musicke’ as well as grammar, logic, astronomy, arithmetic and geometry and philosophie.¹⁶² ‘Division’ or ‘Descant’ is

¹⁵⁹ François Tolet, *A Treatise of Lithotomy*, trans. A. Lovell (1683), F5v.

¹⁶⁰ Paré, p. 1053.

¹⁶¹ Crooke, ‘The Preface to the Chyrurgeons’.

¹⁶² Securis, A6v.

frivolous, distracting sound which – in Crooke’s conceit – renders sober practice difficult. William Bullein’s *Government of Health* (1595) provides pneumonics for remembering the ‘four complections’ (humours) in song format. Humfrey, in conversation with John, advises him to listen to his ‘simple harmonie’ and ‘many plaine verses’; ‘take that chaire and sit downe, and I...will teach thee my song’, he says.¹⁶³ Certain types of music can emphasise the irregularity or inoperativeness of the surgeon figure and others, like the ‘plain-song’, with its reverential undertones, can denote the atmosphere of the learned professional. ‘He that hath always a laughing contenance, & is geven to too much jesture and mirthe’, states John Securis of men of physic, ‘is taken for a lewde person’.¹⁶⁴ Crooke also claims that ‘where there is so great a consent of learned and wise men joyned with the authority of all antiquity, I am not easily drawne to dance after the novell musicke of a wanton wit, which shall varie there from’.¹⁶⁵ Crooke’s analogy is also his own defence against criticism from the College of Physicians, with whom he had, at times, a testing relationship because of his active involvement in anatomization, his publications of anatomy in English, and, ultimately his association with barbers. He demonstrates that he has not, despite his interest in modern anatomical learning, turned his back on classical medical teachings. Good, contemporary surgery, he suggests, is not ‘novell musicke’. Otolaryngologist, Charles Limb, who has clinical interests in music perception, acoustic neuroma and hearing restoration, introduces himself as follows:

I am a surgeon who studies creativity, and I have never had a patient tell me that “I really want you to be creative during surgery”...I will say though that...it’s somewhat similar to playing a musical instrument. And for me, this sort of deep and enduring fascination with sound is what led me to both be a surgeon and also to study the science of sound, particularly music.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ William Bullein *The Government of Health* (1595), 6v.

¹⁶⁴ John Securis, *A Detection and Querimonie of the Daily Enormities and Abuses Committed in Physick* (1566), A4v

¹⁶⁵ Crooke, p. 180.

¹⁶⁶ ‘Charles Limb: Your Brain on Improv’, TEDx Mid Atlantic Presentation (November, 2010).

Limb recognises that despite surgery's on-going need for improvisation and creativity, for the observer (and particularly the patient), the practice must at least seem like a well-known tune.

Later in the same scene of *Sea Voyage* when Tibalt again makes the surgeon a figure for ridicule, he says that the surgeon has 'lost his Fiddlestick' (Aaaaa2r). In the context of the earlier reference to a galliard, this sounds like a musical word-play on 'fiddle', although other readings are simultaneously possible (see chapter one). Mercutio jokes about his rapier being a 'fiddlestick...that shall make [Tybalt] dance' (III.i.47-48). Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* contains a scene in which a musical context (a bawdy sung quatrain) combines corporeal and fiddlestick references.¹⁶⁷ Balurdo 'Enter[s]...with a base Vyole' and tries to distract Maria who is distressed on the eve of her marriage to Piero.¹⁶⁸ Prefacing his music-making by drawing attention to his instrument ('I have the most respective fiddle. Did you ever smell a more sweet sounde'), Bulurdo begins:

*My mistresse eye doth oyle my joynts
And makes my fingers nimble:
O love, come on, untrusse your points,
My fiddlestick wants Rozzen* (F4r)

Balurdo's song is about probing (the naked female body), and is given a surgical, as well as sexual, context through its reference to 'joynts', 'nimble fingers' (Bullein instructs that the surgeon 'must be...nimble handed')¹⁶⁹ and a lubricated instrument (the 'fiddlestick' – for music- and love-making). Balurdo adopts the role of a mischievous medic as well as a musical entertainer. In *Monsieur Thomas*, Thomas directs, 'proceed to incision Fidler' in advance of a song, and *Noble Soldier* pastiches Bulurdo's song when Cornego asks of Baltazar, in the middle of bawdy conversation about 'pricke-song[s]' (F3r), 'have I tickled

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Maguire's discussion of the bawdy association between fingering and fiddling ('Cultural Control', pp. 91-92).

¹⁶⁸ Marston, *Antonios Revenge* (1602), s.d. F3v.

¹⁶⁹ Bullein, 'Dialogue' in *Bulleins Bulwarke* (1579), 7v.

my Ladies Fiddle well?', to which Baltazar responds, 'Oh but your sticke wants Rozen to make the strings sound clearely' (F3v).¹⁷⁰ Tibalt's reference to the surgeon's missing instrument is similarly compound in its allusion: his immediate mention afterwards of a 'Box of Bores grease' (Aaaaa2r) could be a reference to exotic remedial matter, but it is also, more basically in this context, his fiddlestick's resin. *Sea Voyage* surgeon's inability to perform surgically is characterised by his inability to perform sexually and musically: there is an implied triple pun on 'instrument'. Vulgar surgical performance is signalled by reference to a musical one.

Towards the end of *Sea Voyage*, the sailors repeat their request for music that will, they believe, revive them. The Master exclaims to the women, 'We cannot be merry without a Fidler. / Pray strike up your Tabors, Ladies' (Bbbbb4r). Tibalt confirms that their hunger can be appeased (and their bodies, therefore, restored) by the women by using a musical analogy: 'we that have grosse bodies, must be carefull. / Have ye no *piercing ayre* to stir our stomacks?' (Bbbbb4r) [*italics mine*]. Feasting on music is not feasting on pleasant melodies, but on penetrating ('piercing') sounds which hold both sexual and (medical-) cannibalistic meaning in *Sea Voyage*. By this stage the surgeon seems to have disappeared having been unsuccessful in his gruesome task in Act 3. The surgeon's failure to feed or restore the men is again transposed into a lack of restorative music. Finally, the women's attempt at another cannibalistic ritual at the end of the play mirrors the earlier one with the surgeon: just before Rossillia cuts the throats of Aminta, Albert and Raymond, Sebastian and Nicusa enter to restore civility and happiness on the island. At this moment the 'instruments of death' are 'la[id] by' (Ccccc2r). But these 'instruments' are both for flesh and for music-making: throughout the scene, 'Infernall Musick, / Fit for a bloody Feast' (or '*horrid Musicke*' as in stage directions (Ccccc1v)) provides a

¹⁷⁰ John Fletcher, *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), H1r.

soundscape for ritual cannibalism. Inappropriate music, gruesome feasting and tasteless surgery form a nexus of meaning in *Sea Voyage*: where surgery fails, the focus shifts to coarse music and even coarser rituals concerning bodies.

‘For to that warlike tune I will be open’d’

Examining the dual aesthetics of exposure and concealment in *Epicoene* and *Troilus*, Kerwin misquotes one of Thersites’s allegations of Cressida, saying that she performs “‘a juggling trick – to be *silently open*” (V.ii.24)’ [italics mine]. For Kerwin, this quotation summarises the doubleness he explores: the ‘charge of hypocrisy that both these plays make about some of the pieties of the surgical culture’, which, in particular, relate to themes of (female) deception.¹⁷¹ However, Folio and quarto editions of the play read ‘secretly open’ (V.ii.26). The misquotation does not undermine Kerwin’s argument about the hypocrisies he underlines about surgery’s attempts simultaneously to cut open the body but keep this act private, to treat the body, acknowledging its defaults, but disguise its true form. Nevertheless, he leaves open to question the relationship between an episteme of openness (with regard to surgical procedure) and its sonic characteristic.¹⁷² The open body was not necessarily identified with silence: to be ‘open’ and ‘silent’ could indeed be a ‘juggling trick’.

Anatomisations were conducted regularly in Barber-Surgeon’s Hall. Of surgeons who failed to attend anatomy lectures given at Barber-Surgeon’s Hall, William Clowes gives a musical analogy:

¹⁷¹ Kerwin, p. 129.

¹⁷² Its implication of secrecy in relation to surgical procedures, however, relates to the subject of my first chapter in which I discuss the concealment of the surgery’s materiality.

It hath bene peradventure objected publicquely, [that] the negligence of some Chirurgo[n]s frequenting not of his Lectures, doth bewray the[m] to be rather wilfully bent to shrowde themselves under the dark wings of ignorance, than desirous of learning and knowledge...And therefore what awayleth it to play excellent Musicke to those that cannot, or will not heare.¹⁷³

‘Excellent Musicke’ is equivalent with the company’s anatomical lectures, when a cadaver is opened up. Whereas in barbery, the trade would analogise a teaching environment for music (making music is the focus of activities), here, music analogises the learning environment which demanded discerning listeners. No music actually plays during an anatomy, only afterwards at the banquets held. (Florike Egmond supposes that ‘the plan to enliven dissections with flute music’ in Leiden was never carried out because of ‘differences of opinion about the costs’, but equally there could have been differences of opinions about the suitability of music given the occasion.¹⁷⁴) According to Clowes, secrecy and obscurity (‘the dark wings of ignorance’) within the profession are characterized by surgeons’ inability to hear. Importantly, not ‘any old tune’ suffices for the metaphor. The premodifier – ‘excellent’ – endorses what Crooke later distinguishes as the difference between plain-song and novel music. In performance, the nature of the music characterizes the nature of the surgery represented (and the process of being opened up on stage) and determines acoustically whether it is learned and responsible or not.

Fletcher’s *Chances* uncovers the hidden secrets of the people in Bellonia. Petruchio thinks that he is ruined because disgrace has befallen his sister, Constantia: ‘I know as certaine, / As day must come againe; as clear as truth. / And open as beliefe can lay it to me, / That I am basely wrong’d’ (Aaa1v). Later, Constantia believes that when her secret is found out – that she has married clandestinely and had a baby – her brother ‘will cut [her] peece-meale’ (Bbb1r). Resolving wrongs and disclosing truths is a matter of prising

¹⁷³ William Clowes, *A Prooved Practise* (1588), I3v.

¹⁷⁴ Florike Egmond, ‘Execution, Dissection, Pain and Infamy’ in *Bodily Extremities*, ed. Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 92-127 (p. 119)

open bodies in the play. Petruchio's ally, Antonio, is the feisty one. He wants to gouge open the Duke (whom he believes has wronged his friend), and to this end involves himself in a brawl. Antonio hurls out various commands: 'Cut [the Duke's] winde-pipe', 'knock his brains out', 'If you do thrust, be sure it be to th'hilts, / A Surgeon may see through him' (Aaa1r-Aaa1v), and later, 'I say cut his Wezand, spoile his peeping' (Aaa3v). The gentlemen in ear-shot of Antonio comment, 'You are too violent', 'Too open, undiscreet' (Aaa1v). Predictably, the Duke is not injured in the fight, but Antonio is. His bloodthirsty 'openness' and his desire to see bodies opened-up is made manifest, and he is transported to the Surgeon's which is realised in some degree on stage.

In III.ii (see Bbb2r-Bbb2v), Antonio is about to be opened up: 'Wilt please ye / To let your friends see ye open'd?', asks Surgeon. The surgical subject's openness is also public, which doubles the effect of being turned inside out on stage. Antonio complains in advance that the surgeon 'Has almost scour'd [his] guts out' and in response to the surgeon's question, retorts, 'Will it please you sir / To let me have a wench: I feele my body / Open enough for that yet?' His bawdy demand makes little sense. He gets the context of his medical treatment wrong, speaking out in a manner more usual in a barbery setting. Urging, 'Leave these things, / And let him open ye', Antonio's friends indicate that they trust this surgeon who appears to them (and the audience) composed and dignified: he advises against drinking wine before the operation (and prescribes only 'temper'd' wine afterwards), confirms that he has 'giv'n [Antonio] that [which is] fittest for [Antonio's] state', listens to the requests of his patient ('Will these things please thee?'), and gives comfort ('Feare not').

One of Antonio's requests is to have music playing while he undergoes the operation:

ANTONIO De'ye heare Surgeon?

Send for the Musick
 ...
 1 GENT Let him have Musick.
 SURGEON 'Tis ith'house, and ready
 *Musick*

Anticipating that music will comfort and aid his patient, Surgeon is prepared for this request. Ideas about the healing power of music and music as a comforting distraction from pain have long circulated.¹⁷⁵ Peregrine Horden recognises that we can better think about medicine historically through a synoptic view of therapy which takes into account environments as well as practitioners.¹⁷⁶ Cordelia instinctively calls in quarto, 'louder the music there' (IV.vii.25) when her father begins to awaken after he has been 'cut to th'brains' (IV.vi.189). It is not clear what kind of music plays at these moments in *Chances* and *King Lear* but it was probably comparable. Foakes suggests that cutting the musical reference in Folio *King Lear* (and presumably therefore, the musical playing in performance) was consistent with cutting the role of the medical figure from 'Doctor' to 'Gentleman'.

However, restorative (perhaps restful) music in *Chances* is displaced by a different kind of entertainment. Antonio has a specific request:

ANTONIO let 'em sing
John Dorrie
 2 GENT 'Tis too long.
 ANTONIO Ile have *John Dorrie*,
 For to that warlike tune I will be open'd.
 ...
 And now, advance your plaisters *Song of Joh. Dorry.*
 Give'em ten shillings friends: how doe ye find me?

¹⁷⁵ Sheila Barker explores the ancient notion of artistic creation (including music as well as art) as a means of restoring the balance of the humours in 'Poussin, Plague, and Early Modern Medicine', *The Art Bulletin* 86:4 (2004), 659-689. Jeanice Brooks examines the synthesizing effect music has on medicine, alchemy, the occult, and romance, particularly under the figure of Apollo ('Music as Erotic Magic', *RQ* 60:4 (2007), 1207-1256). Smith discusses restful music but not healing music (p. 219). Crooke explores why when children 'heare musicke [they] doe first ceasse their crying and after fall asleepe' and relates Platonist arguments about music's powerful capacity to soothe (p. 699).

¹⁷⁶ Peregrine Horden, 'Medieval Medicine' in *The Oxford Handbook of The History of Medicine*, ed. Mark Jackson (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 40-59 (pp. 54-5).

Writing on the music in Fletcher's plays, Edwin Lindsey explains that John Dorrie, a popular ballad in the period which was recorded in a number of publications, and hence does not need writing out in the script, 'is a simple, a rollicking jig-like affair' but not a warlike piece of music (even though it tells of the capture of a pirate).¹⁷⁷ In the satiric context of faux-romance in *Burning Pestle*, Humphrey dreams that he 'had gone to Paris with John Dory' (II.241). The tune is 'lively' and 'fast', according to Lindsey, because of its 6/8 time, duple rhythm.¹⁷⁸ These are the frivolous notes which displace sober surgery, and against which Clowes and Crooke warn. Gosson writes, 'Homer with his Musicke cured the sick Souldiers in the *Grecians* campe, and purged every mans Tent of the Plague. Thinke you that those miracles coulde be wrought with playing of Daunces...Galiardes...Fancies, or new streynes?'¹⁷⁹ Whereas the earlier '*Musick*' in the scene from *Chances* comes from within the surgeon's house (probably from behind the musicians' curtained gallery in Blackfriars) the popular, vigorous piece is not background entertainment and usurps performance space, demanding the attention of audiences' eyes as well as their ears.¹⁸⁰ It might be that Antonio's friends dance to this jig. In his discussion of 'certaine wonderfull and extravagant wayes of Curing diseases', Paré begins by listing a variety of ailments which are cured, according to the ancients, by music. These include tarantula bites which relates to the tarantella in Italy ('they fetch Fidlers and Pipers of divers kinds, who by playing and piping may make Musicke, at the hearing whereof, he which was fallen downe by reason of the venemous bite, rises cheerfully and dances'), people who have become 'Franticke', and gout sufferers.¹⁸¹ This type of music is not

¹⁷⁷ Edwin S. Lindsey, 'The Music of the Songs of Fletcher's Plays', *SP* 21:2 (1924), 325-355 (p. 347).

¹⁷⁸ Lindsey, p. 346.

¹⁷⁹ Gosson, A8r.

¹⁸⁰ Later in *Chances* s.d.'s call for 'A noise within like horses' (Bbb4v). Cf. Stern's examination of music from under the stage (*Making Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 25)

¹⁸¹ Paré, p. 49.

suitable for operations and Paré emphasises the novelty and anachronism of these cures. The song in *Chances* marks the duration of a surgical event but it might also completely eclipse it. The Gentleman's original objection, "'Tis too long' suggests that a song must be selected that will fulfil a performance slot. The scene stages a battle of representations of surgery which play out acoustically. Moreover, the nature of this music for an indoor theatre was not, according to Tiffany Stern, usual: 'Music in general was a private-theatre staple, and it took a very different form from the basic, brash music that belonged to public theatres such as the Globe'.¹⁸² The *John Dorrie* is at odds with the typical atmospheric music effects achieved in the indoor theatres; therefore the controversy in representing a surgical context in *Chances* is underlined by the song selection which is unexpected, usurping surgery and the stage.¹⁸³ The hypocrisy, to which Kerwin refers, of a surgical context is not, therefore, achieved in this instance by Antonio being 'silently open[ed]'.

Antonio begs his surgeon to allow him to drink wine because he is horrified at the thought of being 'drest to the tune of Ale onely'. Alcohol possesses, according to Antonio, an inherent musical quality and one which suits his lively demands. But his surgeon warns that wine is 'death' when the body is being operated upon. Clowes instructs surgeons, 'You shall forbid Wyne to all wounded persons, chiefly if he have a Fever'.¹⁸⁴ Thomas Randolph's university drama, *Aristippus*, performed at Trinity College, Cambridge, is a celebration of canary wine rather than of the Socratic Greek sage. But the play's association with both the colloquially named drink and the ancient quick-witted philosopher make it a setting for mirth, satire, pranks and singing.¹⁸⁵ Young Simplicius is in search of philosophical training, instead of which he gets a drinking lesson from the

¹⁸² Stern, *Making Shakespeare*, p. 32. Cf. Smith who explores the different acoustic spaces of indoor and outdoor theatres (pp. 206-17).

¹⁸³ See Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), p. 186.

¹⁸⁴ Clowes, O2r.

¹⁸⁵ See Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives, Opinions, and Remarkable Sayings of the Most Famous Ancient Philosophers* (1688), pp. 142-169.

university men, Aristippus and his two scholars: their doctrine is ‘Sacke and red Noses’.¹⁸⁶ Aristippus’s head is cracked in a brawl with a Wilde-man, and so Medico enters first to brag about his miraculous talents and then fix the patient. Martin Walsh argues that *Aristippus* is a revival of the mumming play.¹⁸⁷ He identifies the duel (between Aristippus and his Scholars and the Wild-man and his Brewers), the boastful quack doctor (Medico), and his miraculous cure (some powder) for a broken cranium – resulting in the ‘resurrection’ of the title character – as key structural elements in the drama which support its air of revelry and folkloric characteristics. Walsh regards Medico as the generic ‘quack’.¹⁸⁸ But he is not an all-purpose medical figure. Medico is a satirical figure of both the barber-surgeon and, more specifically, of Richard Lichfield, Barber-Surgeon to Trinity College in the late sixteenth-century. Randolph takes the name Medico from the title page of Lichfield’s *Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (*Saffron-Walden* is addressed to ‘Don Richardo Barbarossa’ and ‘olde Dicke of Lichfield’).¹⁸⁹ Benjamin Griffin explains that in *Aristippus*, ‘Lichfield’s Nashe connection...is not stressed [but] the barber-surgeon had evidently remained a Cambridge character in his own right’.¹⁹⁰ His Barber-Surgeon status is made into a joke in *Aristippus* as it was in *Saffron-Walden*. Randolph’s Medico introduces himself as ‘a Surgeon’ but within a few lines, the Wild-man refers to ‘Razor[s] in [his] shop’ and Medico calls for a ‘Barbers provision’ in order to attend on Aristippus: a ‘Chayre’, ‘Bason’, ‘Napkins’ and ‘Boxes’ appear on stage (see D1r-D3r). Like other dramatists, Randolph makes a mockery of the professional who introduces himself as simply ‘Surgeon’ (with implied medical clout), but who nevertheless is affiliated with less medically-specialised practitioners. Ultimately, he is identified by barbery (its material

¹⁸⁶ Thomas Randolph, *Aristippus* (1630), B1v.

¹⁸⁷ Martin W. Walsh, ‘Thomas Randolph’s *Aristippus* and the English Mummers’ Play’, *Folklore* 84:2 (1973) 157-159.

¹⁸⁸ Walsh, p. 158.

¹⁸⁹ Nashe, *Saffron-Walden*, A2r, A2v.

¹⁹⁰ Griffin, p. 48. See chapter five.

signs) rather than his medical title, which sets the tone for Medico's ridiculous medical boasts and also for the music with which the play concludes.

Once Medico has performed his impossible cure, Aristippus's scholars hail his civic reputation and then the characters burst into song. Their subject is 'health', which completes Aristippus's recovery: 'Now noble Signior *Medico de Campo*, if you will walkein, let's be very joviall and merry' (D4r). With the refrain, '*Conferring our notes together*' (D4r), the song produces, through music, an effect which Simplicius has been trying to understand: '*compossibilitatis*' (A3r) (composition). This parodic matching together of pieces is, in turn, emblematised anatomically by the bringing together of Aristippus's fractured cranium. Medico observes that 'the Meninx of [Aristippus's] eare is like a cut Drum, and the hammer lost' (D3v): when he is fixed, music and sound will resume. However, the irregular and unrealizable context of Medico's practice is characterised by disorderliness ('*impossibilitatis*'): drunkenness and music displace sober, quiet recovery and the mending of the ear is made ridiculous by the play's noisy conclusion.¹⁹¹ In the same way that Lichfield is amused by the idea that he could fashion a prosthetic ear for dismembered Nashe, so here the response to unimaginable anatomical reconstruction is 'Ha ha ha' (a response which jovial music makes acceptable). Crooke applies a musical (rather than an architectural) analogy to conceptualise the composition of the body, which argues against Galen whose idea of the 'beauty of the part' was in its equality: 'but wee place the beauty of the whole body, in the *inequality* of the parts; that is, in their unlike and different quality and magnitude; but yet such a difference as whereby the parts do answer one another in as apt and neate correspondencie of proportion, even as musique is made of different sounds, but yet all agreeing in a harmonious concert'.¹⁹² The songs in *Chances* and *Aristippus* are not an attempt at 'harmonious concert'; they

¹⁹¹ Cockayne associates drunkenness and ill health with bad playing in the period ('Cacophony', p. 43).

¹⁹² Crooke, p. 29.

instead remind us of the scene in *Midas*, when a dentistry act is replaced by a song about sore teeth.¹⁹³ Surgery on stage can be marked acoustically with the semiotics of barbering.

**

The correspondence between barbering and surgery and aural/acoustic matters differs, but nevertheless has an interwoven association. Clients' ears are another point of focus for the barber and this translates to a variety of figurative depictions of blocked and unblocked, cleaned and over-picked ears in early modern idiom. Moreover, barbers are associated with a particularly irritating soundscape which feeds into the recurring concept examined in this thesis that a variety of abuses are made on clients when they are in the barber's chair. Bodies' relationship to barbering seems always to be threatened by its more intrusive 'other half', surgery, which, in turn, is made problematical – in terms of its professionalism – because of its association with barbering. Barbering's connection to aural/acoustic matters is easily explicated: the tangibility of the ear-pick, earwax as excrement, the routine ear-picking practice, the recurrent soundmark, the acoustically-defined spatiality of the barber's shop, and the stereotypical musical instruments associated with the barbering collectively inscribe the trade with aural/acoustic signifiers. By comparison, surgery is often disguised or usurped in performance through pre-verbal and musical sound. The sounds of howling victims seem to signal that surgical attention is required but is not necessarily going to be represented on stage. The soundscape associated with surgery is another way to disguise the practice; in barbering, the soundscape is a part of its exposition.

¹⁹³ This follows an extended conceit that teeth are like musical instruments. Various from *Midas*: 'All my nether teeth are loose and wag like the keys of a pair of virginals' (III.ii.92-3), 'your mouth [is] the instrument' (III.ii.94-5), 'Thou bitest. I cannot tune these virginal keys' (III.ii.97-8).

Chapter 5

‘An unnecessary flood of words’?

This final chapter explores the rhetorical characteristics of barbering and surgery. William Kerwin refers to the ‘polyphony of surgical voices’ in considering a spectrum of utterance from ‘academic surgeons to barbers’ in the period.¹ I isolate the voices of this ‘polyphony’, suggesting that barbers’ and surgeons’ practical work on bodies corresponds to the way language is conceptualised by writers in their contexts. The intersections between the oral and the literate in early modernity, the fruitful subject for Adam Fox, are relevant to my discussions on barber-surgeons and indeed are dramatised through the respective rhetorical situations of barbers and surgeons.²

I am interested in how barbering metaphor informs a type of popular oral criticism in early modernity, generating its own informal idiom. It is only when the Countess remarks, ‘that’s a bountiful answer that fits all questions’ (II.ii.125) in *All’s Well* that her Clown, Lavatch, responds with the aphorism, ‘It is like a barber’s chair that fits all buttocks’ (II.ii.16); the simile draws attention to the recyclability of language in a spoken context, which is also a familiar, bawdy, barbering one. The oral culture with which barbers are associated regards language as highly generative but also essentially disposable. Thomas Nashe reminds his readers, ‘hair the more it is cut the more it comes’.³ One of Walter Ong’s psychodynamics of orality is that it tends to be redundant or copious.⁴ Most valuable here are notions of *Copia* and *elecutio*, most significantly set down by Erasmus, which were famously open to exploitation. Ideas about stylistic elaboration had their

¹ William Kerwin, *Beyond the Body* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005), pp. 98-9.

² Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

³ Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), A4r.

⁴ Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), see pp. 39-41.

pitfalls.⁵ I explore the isomorphic connection between language and hair, or more generally, language and the waste matter that accumulates in a barber's shop. In John Lyly's *Midas*, for example, a chopped-up tongue is imagined as 'shavings' (II.v.103).⁶ The barbery trade can embody, in Mote's phrase, a 'great feast of language' (*Love's Labour's Lost*, V.i.36-37) because in the trade's setting 'one word...“beget[s]” another, always in transformation, never remaining still, never fixed'.⁷ Mote's reference to the 'feast' also describes the 'scraps' (V.i.37) and Costard responds with a reference to 'the alms-basket of words' (V.i.38-39). Both language and hair also encode ways of thinking about value, and I discuss how barbers' language-use (or language-use within a barbery context) is related to economic matters – a 'trimming market'. The context of the marketplace in this chapter corresponds to notions of abundance and austerity, and, in particular, to the dual semantics of the verb 'trim', which means both to cut back and to adorn. To think about language is to think about frivolity, waste and potential; in a barbery context language is an extravagance, a pile of trimmings, and a basin of words.

But if literary writers want to represent surgery in the period they can face a problem. I have suggested, with reference to tool sets, that surgical language is likely to be too technical for the typical writer. In addition, the voice of a regular surgeon should resound in plain terms, without embellishment. On a practical level, the role of the upright surgeon automatically carries little dialogue because private exchanges during treatment are not fit for a public stage. Moreover, a surgeon regards bodies as text to be read and interpreted – exemplified in public anatomisations – and aligns himself within the

⁵ See Neil Rhodes, *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992), pp. 41-50.

⁶ John Lyly, *Midas* in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David M. Bevington (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

⁷ William C. Carroll, *The Great Feast of Language in Love's Labour's Lost* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976), p. 63.

humanist tradition and a medical intellectual movement.⁸ Whereas the barber's language appears transient, public and transportable, the surgeon's is moving towards being fixed (and private) in alignment with the attitude that there was a correct way of speaking, writing and thinking, and it was working *against* the barber's image.⁹ This was emphasised by the shift in anatomy from reading the body as a sign of selfhood towards 'a Cartesian or purely mechanistic understanding of the relation of self to standardised body'.¹⁰ But surgeons' decision to publish in the vernacular put them linguistically between two traditions: an oral barbery one, and a classical, Latin, printed medical one. These historical tendencies help us to think about the figures as literary constructions. This thesis concludes, therefore, by arguing that conceptions of barbers and surgeons and their irregular counterparts were complicated by their linguistic distinctions, and highlighting contemporary rifts and crossovers between oral, popular cultures and printed, professional ones.

'Tully *de Oratore*, the very art of trimming'

In the first chapter I examined one aspect of the barber subplot in *Midas*, arguing that the play's absent beard was underlined by the striking absence of the material properties of barbery on stage. I return to this play to investigate another characteristic of Lyly's portrayal of the barbery trade, and to offer a reading of the text that relates to linguistic rather than to material elements in the drama, reflecting the player boys' training in

⁸ Later generations of English humanists were increasingly writing in English. See Mary Thomas Crane, 'Early Tudor Humanism' in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 13-26 (pp. 16, 25). On 'textualizing the body' as a political motif in dealing with rebellion and subversion, see William W. E. Slights, 'Bodies of Text and Textualised Bodies in *Sejanus* and *Coriolanus*', *MaRDiE* 5 (1991), 181-193.

⁹ Ong writes, 'Though words are grounded in oral speech, writing tyrannically locks them into a visual field forever' (p. 12). Cf. Thomas Rütten, 'Early Modern Medicine' in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Medicine*, ed. Mark Jackson (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 60-81 (pp. 61-2).

¹⁰ David Hillman, *Shakespeare's Entrails* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 34.

elocution and Lyly's artistic interests.¹¹ Speech is an additional (faux) skill-set in the barber's shop.

The point of the barber's role in the Midas story from Ovid is that the barber cannot keep silent about Midas's ass's ears: he must whisper the news into a hole in the ground, whereupon reeds sprout from the place and tell this news to the wind. An Ovid-aware audience expects the barber to be fundamental to the miraculous spilling of this news. The barber initially appears to have distinct verbal control in Lyly's *Midas*. In the end, however, he loses it and conforms to stereotype, although he never conforms to his role in *Metamorphoses*. Nothing fantastical occurs in relation to the barber in Lyly's version, although Lyly does not neglect the reed story element and its mythological dynamic in the drama. The shepherds in IV.ii know they have to be careful around the reeds which 'may have ears and hear us' (IV.ii.20), but the barber is kept separate.¹² The barber's voice in *Midas* holds no mystique because it is aligned with gossiping courtiers. Lyly's critique of the barber's verbal traits makes a larger point about the relationship between the barbery trade and its reputations in financial dealings, befitting a play that reviews attitudes towards material worth. The barber's voice is crucial to his barbery economy, and the hullabaloo in the subplot is as centred on the characters' ability to harbour silver tongues as it is on their squabbling over a golden beard.¹³

Motto and Dello, seem to have the verbal upper hand in their first appearance on stage and their rivals, Licio and Petulus, are the blabberers. Motto boasts of the rhetorical

¹¹ See Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), pp. 159-160.

¹² The reeds speak (IV.iv.64 and V.i.23).

¹³ On the tongue as an ambivalent member in early modernity, see Carla Mazzio, 'Sins of the Tongue' in *The Body in Parts*, ed. David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York; London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 53-79; and on the voice and its history, as a material site of agency, of production, ownership and exchange, see Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). For discussions of theatrical representations of credit relations, debt and capitalism in the period (and theatre's own participation in the early modern economy), see Theodore B. Leinwand, *Theatre, Finance and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999).

lessons he has given Dello which are comparable in importance to the artisanal skills required of apprentices of barberry:

MOTTO I instructed thee in the phrases of our eloquent occupation, as “How, sir, will you be trimmed?” “Will you have a beard like a spade or a bodkin?” “A Penthouse on your upper lip, or an alley on your chin?” “A low curl on your head like a bull, or dangled lock like a spaniel?” “Your moustaches sharp at the ends like shoe-makers’ awls, or hanging down to your mouth like goats’ flakes?” “Your lovelocks wreathed with a silken twist, or shaggy to fall on your shoulders?” (III.ii.40-48)

This mixture of animalistic, weaponry and courtly metaphor ridicules the diversity of cuts available to a client in the barber’s shop, and mocks not only the barber’s trade as a frivolous enterprise, but also highlights the supposed gullibility of barbers’ customers. Motto gives the list of phrases that Dello must master and handle as well as his barberry instruments, and from which a customer can make a selection. In Jonson’s *Epicoene*, when Cutbeard makes a statement ‘upon [his] dexterity’ (II.vi.22), he is referring to his use of clever words rather than fiddly instruments.¹⁴ The barbering economy – like other commercial ventures – is built upon a practitioner’s ability to generate and market a variety of products, and on a customer’s powers of selection. The various cuts on offer are for the barber a linguistic inventory.¹⁵ The barber cannot literally show the product until the client’s face has been shaped and so his description serves as a display of goods: words represent hairs. Motto’s list highlights that the styles of beard constituted an early modern fashion industry. In the seventeenth-century ‘Ballad of the Beard’, beards are celebrated in a variety of shapes and lengths (stiletto, needle, soldiers’, judges’, bishops’, and

¹⁴ Ben Jonson, *Epicoene*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

¹⁵ Cf. Carol Clark’s explorations of commoditised speech associated with mountebanks who competed orally for customers and were described as faux-Ciceronians (“‘The Onely Languag’d-Men of all the World’”, *MLR* 74: 3 (1979), 538-552).

clowns').¹⁶ The opening stanza defends the ballad's verbal attention on the beard by highlighting its proximity to the organ of speech, the tongue:

The beard, thick or thin, on the lip or chin,
Doth dwell so near the tongue,
That her silence in the beard's defence
May do her neighbour wrong.

Selling the beard is part of the barber's tongue's responsibility to his trade which is invariably perceived as an ability to con, a theme in the subplot of *Midas* which mirrors the main plot's concern with the dangers of poor counsel.

A barber's work can place a value on a client's face. In *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* Ilford tries to make a judgement on a group of strangers by asking Drawer whether they have 'Gentleman-like-beards or broker-like-beards'.¹⁷ Drawer avoids answering Ilford by claiming that he is not acquainted in the 'Art of Facemending' (D4v). Barbers' work, suggests Drawer, involves shaping faces to give the impression of monetary standing. But Drawer cannot judge the group because he does not know the tricks of the trade. Barbers and surgeons are often satirised and attacked for covering-up the true complexion of an ugly, diseased, or pock-marked face.¹⁸ Here, however, Drawer and Ilford suggest that barbers not only mask complexions for aesthetic and medical purposes, but also for social ones: the barber has a part in shaping a monetary as well as medical (often sexual) history on their clients' faces.

Dello responds to Motto's list with, 'I confess you have taught me Tully *de Oratore*, the very art of trimming' (III.ii.49-50). Here, 'trimming' holds multiple puns:

¹⁶ *Satirical Songs and Poems on Costume*, ed. F. W. Fairholt, vol 27 of *Early English Poetry, Ballads and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages*, ed. for the Percy Society, 30 vols (London: Percy Society by C. Richard, 1849), pp. 121-124. Cf. 'The very quaik of fashions, the very *hee* that / Weares a *Stelletto* on his chinne' (John Ford, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (1638), E1v).

¹⁷ George Wilkins, *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage* (1607), D4v.

¹⁸ See Kerwin, pp. 97-129 and Margaret Pelling, 'Appearance and Reality' in *London 1500-1700*, ed. A. L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986), pp. 82-112.

Dello suggests that Motto's list is a set of saleable haircuts, a collection of rhetorical phrases, and also a linguistic and, ultimately, tangible means by which to trick customers of monies. In his first few examples, Motto refers simply to beards that are 'spade[s]' and 'bodkin[s]', the weaponry images of which carry a semantic of clean cutting.¹⁹ But also 'trimming' refers to the decorative aspect of the barber's work: they adorn their client with 'curls[s]', 'flakes' and 'silken twist[s]'.

'The art of trimming', in Dello's line, correspondingly refers to the balancing of oral arguments and to an orator's selection of language. Dello's comment refers directly to *Art of Rhetoric* (55 BC) in which Cicero portrays the ideal orator. The intertextual reference amuses an audience who only see barbers as models for one kind of interlocutor. But Dello suggests that the art of barbering is a marketing strategy in that barbers must sell their goods using slogans, or mottos. Bruce Smith draws our attention to the 'voice-based cultures' that informed early modern media.²⁰ By reducing rhetoric to mere representation (of the trade), the barbers' oral prowess has its limit. In the barber's shop, where hair and beard cuts (differentiated from wigs) cannot literally be in stock, the barber exercises his sales pitch. Hunter and Bevington suggest the onomastic significance of the *dramatis personae* in *Midas*. For 'Motto' they cite etymologies in the Greek *motos* ('lint') and Latin *motus* ('motion').²¹ Neither is problematic. Motto's association with dentistry make sense of his name's etymological connection with lint, a fabric needed to dress wounds, and he is central in the subplot's tracking of an absent golden beard which is a faux fiscal ebb and flow (or motion). However, 'motto' also means a witty or succinct maxim: a sententia.

¹⁹ Cf. Petulus: 'I will have [my beard] so sharp pointed that it shall stab Motto like a poinado' (*Midas*, V.ii.9-10). In *The Owl's Almanac*, Middleton refers to 'The picke-devant...and a pair of muchatoes that will fence for the face' (2047-2049). The author characterises the barber's trade in Richard Lichfield[?], *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* (1597) as a process which 'shap[es]...faces to more austeritie', meaning that the barber gives them given a stern, sharp complexion (B4v). [Hereafter, *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe* is abbreviated to *TTN*.]

²⁰ Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. 29.

²¹ See Hunter and Bevington, 'Characters in Order of Appearance', p. 150.

Lyly ridicules his character – the barber and economic forms of speech rarely go together in literature. In the same way that ‘trim’ holds a double implication in relation to hair fashions, so it does in relation to rhetoric. The ‘art of trimming’ for the good rhetorician can mean to present terse (i.e. trimmed down) arguments, but the rhetorician also knows when to adorn his language. Cicero is Motto’s rhetorical guru because he is not as anti-ornamental as Plato or Quintilian.²² John Barton writes in *The Art of Rhetorick* (1634) that rhetoric involves embellishing language, ‘That is to say, It is the Art of trimming, decking, garnishing the Oration, with fine, wittie, pithie, moving, pleasing words, classes, and sentences in the passages and style of speech’.²³

Finally, ‘trimming’, as I have discussed before (particularly in relation to Marston’s *Dutch Courtesan* and Richard Edwards’s *Damon and Pithias*), also means to fleece someone. Dello recognises – on behalf of his audience – that Motto’s list of products becomes increasingly overdone and makes seem highly specialised and exotic what is in fact a standard list of beard styles/cuts.²⁴ Unwitting customers can be seduced by barbers’ bombastic language which is an elaborate façade: they pay more for something that sounds appealing. And this is the barber’s confidence trick. The customer will be fleeced as well as furnished in being trimmed.²⁵ Verbal, stylistic and economic interpretations of ‘trimming’ collide in Dello’s response to his master. At the end of the first barbery scene in *Midas* the characters sing a song which, in Blount’s edition of 1632, concludes with

²² See Peter G. Platt, ‘Shakespeare and Rhetorical Culture’ in *A Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. David Scott Kastan (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 277-296 (p. 292).

²³ John Barton, *The Art of Rhetorick* (1634), A8r. On ornament and rhetoric – ‘To adorn or not to adorn’ – see Platt, pp. 291-294 (p. 291). Cf. Carroll on the ending of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* which is not simply a forswearing of ‘taffeta phrases’ and ‘silken terms’: ‘we should recall the impressive range of possible attitudes towards language, no one of which is wholly sufficient in itself’ (p. 62); and Mazzio *The Inarticulate Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), pp. 162-171.

²⁴ Cf. Dekker, *The Seven Deadly Sinnes* (1606), F1r-F2v, in which he describes the prevalence of ‘shaving’ in the vice-world of early modern London. While Dekker suggests the universality of shaving (which characterises any trickster behaviour), his opening of the section on the ‘Sixt days Triumph’ initially addresses barbers with whom the semantic of ‘shaving’ is firmly associated.

²⁵ Dekker imagines a time ‘when none but the golden age went current upon the earth, it was high treason to clip haire, then to clip a money...he was disfranchized for ever, that but put on a Barbers apron’ (*The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609), D1r).

‘There is no trade but shaves, / For barbers are trim knaves. / Some are in shaving so profound / By tricks they shave a kingdom round’ (III.ii.162-165).

Philip Stubbes’s *Amphilogus* announces in *Display of Corruptions* that ‘in the fulness of their overflowing knowledge...[Barbers] have invented such strange fashions and monstrous maners of cuttings, trimmings, shavings, and washings’.²⁶ Stubbes’s ironic reference to barbers’ inventiveness mocks the way that they portray themselves as creative practitioners. *Amphilogus* emphasises copiousness (hyperbolic uses of ‘overflowing’ and ‘full’) in the trade (also suggested by Motto’s lengthy, florid list), which is, of course, not to suggest quality. Moreover, *Amphilogus* suggests that customers pay for the method of barbering and not simply the end product of a trim: ‘when they come to the cutting of the haire, what snipping & snapping of the sycers is there, what trickling, and trimming, what rubbing what scratching, what combing and clawing, what trickling & toying, and *al to tawe out mony you may be sure*’ [italics mine].²⁷ A customer’s cut is not a finished result, but a process, made performative in the text through dynamic, rhythmic, alliterative and onomatopoeic expression, which mount up as a cost factor. Significantly, the passage from Stubbes is reminiscent of part of Stephen Gosson’s criticism of fidgetiness in the theatre: ‘Such ticking, such toying, such smiling, such winking’.²⁸

In *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, it is obvious that the barber can draw more money out of velvet-breeches than of cloth-breeches. The latter observes,

[the barber] gets more by one time dressinge of [velvet-breeches], than by ten times dressing of me...velvett breeches he sittes downe in the chaire wrapt in fine cloathes...then comes he out with his fustian elequence...saith, Sir will you have your...haire cut after the Italian maner, shorte and round, and then frounst with the curling yrons...or like a spanyard long at the eares, and curled...or will you bee Frenchefied with a love locke downe to your

²⁶ Phillip Stubbes, *The Second Part of the Anatomie of Abuses Containing the Display of Corruptions* (1583), G8r.

²⁷ Stubbes, G8v.

²⁸ Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579), C1v.

shoulders...my sissars are ready to execute your worships wil...then being curiously washt with no weorse then a camphire bal.²⁹

Cloth-breeches's modified references to '*fine* cloathes', hair '*curiously* washt', and suds produced from '*no weorse then* a camphire bal' [italics mine] are ironic: velvet-breeches is getting the same treatment as everyone else in the chair who is washed with cloths and soap balls. But the barber alters his language for velvet-breeches: 'These quaint tearmes...g[r]ee[t] maister velvet breeches withall'.³⁰ Oral performances in the barber's shop relate to a monetary factor. According to Charles Nicholl, Cambridge barbers were renowned for their verbal performances which they commercialised.³¹ A barber's efforts to 'cut back' in the shop are matched by options for them to 'add on' services, which are usually represented by a flourish of language – 'fustian elequence' and 'quaint tearmes'.

Lyly also satirises barbers' use of Latin. Although barbers were not expected to have Latin, The Company decreed that Barber-Surgeons who were surgeons should be proficient in the language.

MOTTO	I did but rub his gums and presently the rheum evaporated.
LICIO	<i>Deus bone</i> , is that word come into the barber's basin?
DELLO	Ay, sir, and why not? My master is a barber and a surgeon. (III.ii.61-65)

The passage incorporates two comic paths (in addition to the onomastic one I discussed in my Introduction). First, Licio makes Motto appear like an irregular barber whose use of 'rheum' is supposedly inappropriate given that he should not display any specific medical knowledge. In *Anything for a Quiet Life*, the barber liberally uses Latinate medical language, which is not thought appropriate by Ralph, who asks, 'What's this you talk on,

²⁹ Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), C3v. Cloth-breeches then lists an assortment of cuts offered by the barber for velvet-breeches's beard, akin to Motto's list in *Midas*.

³⁰ *Upstart Courtier*, C4r.

³¹ Charles Nicholl, *A Cup Of News* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 234-5.

sir?' (II.iv.16), and again 'What a pox does this barber talk on?' (II.iv.19) when faced with the barber's textbook Latin.³² When Ralph appeals first to the practitioner (his fellow stage character) and then to the audience, he shares the joke that barbers attempt language for which they are unschooled both on and off stage. In *Seven Deadly Sins*, Dekker refers to barbers' 'learned Latin Basons'.³³ Dekker's phrase also incorporates a pun for his reader, perhaps not so obvious to us today. 'Latyn' or 'Latten' was a type of metal alloy thinly hammered from which basins were typically made.³⁴ Language here is associated with having material quality, and this too is underlined by the full impact of the line which describes barbers 'throwing all their Suddes out of their learned Latin Basons'. In *Fancies Chaste and Noble*, Spadone refers to barber Secco as a 'copper basnd-suds-monger' (B1r). Language envisaged in the barber's basin can be disposable, throw-away speech (the suds) which suits the image of non-specialist who nevertheless tries to make verbal impact. The second comic path in the *Midas* passage is that Motto appears like a deficient surgeon whose use of 'rheum' is not especially technical (as Hunter and Bevington note, 'rheum' is 'a perfectly good Elizabethan word', meaning that it was common).³⁵ Licio's implication that Motto has advanced medical knowledge is absurd.

Present in *Midas* and *Deadly Sins* is a suggestion of a conceptual linguistic space in the barber's shop, more specifically, in the 'barber's basin'. This rhetorical space can be perceived as regular or irregular: the language circulating within this iconic object can be playful chatter, incorrectly-used diction, and also the language of the sick and of graver

³² Truewit makes the 'gravest lawyer' (IV.vii.39) out of the barber in *Epicoene*: 'The barber smatters Latin, I remember' (IV.vii.48-9) Truewit understates. Earlier in the play, Clerimont observes of Cutbeard's language, 'How the slave doth Latin it!' (II.vi.25)

³³ *Deadly Sinnes*, F1r. Cf. Peter J. Smith's analysis of the form and content of Milton's reference to Jonson's 'learned sock' ('Tales of the City' in *Companion to English Renaissance Literature*, pp. 513-524 (p. 521)).

³⁴ The other material was pewter. See reference to 'six barbour's basons of latyn' in the will of Barber-Surgeon Warden, Charles Whyte, City of London (14th February, 1545), PROB 11/30.

³⁵ See Licio's and Petulus's response to Motto: 'Melancholy? Marry gup, is "melancholy" a word for a barber's mouth?...Belike if thou shouldst spit often, thou wouldst call it the rheum' (V.ii.107-108, 114-115).

matters.³⁶ The image of the basin as a spatial metaphor for where language collects (as well as where soapy water and blood accumulate) informs the whole cultural stereotype that the barber is a gatherer of words, phrases and news as well as corporeal waste. Moreover, the basin, like the barber's tongue has its own agenda in advertising the profession. If basins displayed in shop windows were filled with blood, the practice was deemed irregular.

Some years after Lyly's *Midas*, another playwright makes tangible on stage a basin as a space into which unwanted language is collected. Jonson's *Poetaster* is one of the later exchange plays in the *Poetomachia* or War of the Theatres (1599-1601). In the final scene Horace (the figure of Jonson in the play) supplies a cure for Crispinus (the figure of John Marston) who is on trial for using 'wordes...able to bastinado a mans Eares' and for trying to slander Horace.³⁷

HORACE Please it great Caesar, I have Pils about mee
 ...
 Would give him a light vomite; that should purge
 His Braine, and Stomack of those tumorous heates (M2r)

Soon Crispinus admits that he is sick, and Horace calls for 'A Bason, a Bason, quickly; our Physicke works' (M3r). Over the next one hundred lines, Crispinus vomits up his florid, bombastic vocabulary (both Latinate and vernacular) into the receptacle.³⁸ After each of Crispinus's heavings, Horace is able to examine the regurgitated language and repeat it: in the basin, language can be read and interpreted. Jonson does not draw from barber-surgery semiotics in this passage, but the scene is significant to our interpretation of the few lines

³⁶ Cf. Caroline Bicks's study of the sloppy speech of the 'gossip's bowl' used collectively by women at the bedside of a labouring woman (*Midwiving Subjects in Shakespeare's England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 22-59). Fleir quips to Felecia in Edward Sharpham's *The Fleire* (1607) that he will be as secret 'As your Midwife, or Barber Surgeon' (D1r). [NB the quarto in error attributes this and one other subsequent line on the page to Florida rather than Fleir.]

³⁷ Jonson, *Poetaster* (1602), M1v-M2r.

³⁸ Bicks discusses the image of 'incontinent mouths' in relation to the gossip's bowl (p. 31).

from Lyly and Dekker. While in Jonson's example the filling of the bowl with rejected language is a 'vomit', in *Dutch Courtesan* it is excrement: Cocledemoy insists that if his 'wit', his verbalisation of his barber's role, fails he will 'go cack in [his] pewter' (II.i.203-4).³⁹ Julian Koslow speculates that 'nowhere in Jonson's writings is there a scene which better dramatizes how complex and peculiar was the relation Jonson imagined between words and bodies'.⁴⁰ The barber's basin is a space for collecting that which is trimmed, shaved or extracted from the body. Words in the barber's shop are like bodily remnants – in theory the unwanted bits, but in practise the 'scraps' that are of interest.

Finally, while the basin performs metaphorically in these examples, it is possible that early moderns were familiar with the sight of a speech-impaired subject who used a receptacle – which could be slung around his/her neck – to permit speech. This figure could be one from folklore but Ambroise Paré writes authoritatively:

A certain man...had a great piece of his tongue cut off, by which occasion hee remained dumbe some three years. It happened on a time that as he was...drinking in a wooden dish...suddenly [he] broke out into articulate and intelligible words. He...put the same dish to his mouth...and then he spake so plainly and articulately, that he might be understood...Wherefore a long time following he alwaies carried this dish in his bosome to utter his mind.⁴¹

Further, Paré illustrates the cup-like instrument fashioned from this chance event, underlining its practical rather than fanciful use. Language in this object is not refuse; but we can see from where the literary imagery of a basin of words may derive.

The basin is not the only conceptual space in *Midas* with which the barber is associated. At the end of IV.iii, Licio remembers that he and Petulus still have business with Motto. Licio appeals to Minutius, the huntsman with whom they are bantering, 'help us to cozen the barber' (IV.iii.85), and Minutius responds, 'The barber shall know every

³⁹ John Marston, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997).

⁴⁰ Julian Koslow, 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *ELH* 73:1 (2006), 119-159 (p. 120).

⁴¹ Ambroise Paré, *The Workes*, trans. Th[omas] Johnson (1634), pp. 873-874.

hair of my chin to be as good as a choke-pear for his purse' (IV.iii.86-87). Mixed within Minutius's response, which is the final line of the scene, are a collection of images that associate the barber with hairs, controlled language use, and money. Hunter and Bevington's conclusion that 'Minutius intends to use every means at his disposal to pry open Motto's purse' makes one sense of the line, but does not give us the full implication of the metaphor at work. A choke-pear is an intrusive gag which prevents a torture victim from being able to make any noise. In Webster's *White Devil*, Monticelso threatens to silence Vittoria who rails against his lack of an 'honest tongue' (III.ii.229): 'I'll give you a choke-pear' (III.ii.233). The instrument does not 'pry open' in order to extract sound from the victim. In Dekker/Rowley's *Noble Soldier* Baltazar explains that he is careful to escape political censorship at court and he characterises this censorship as 'some choake-peare of State-policy' that would 'stop [his] throat, and spoyle [his] drinking-pipe'.⁴² Therefore a choke-pear for a purse does not necessarily extract money from the material space, but stops it from being filled with it.⁴³ I noted in chapter one that Robert Balthropp's will barely acknowledges specific surgical instruments, and yet one stands out: 'a chochbarr of silver for the uvula'.⁴⁴ The uvula is the projection of tissue from the soft palate, responsible for voice-making in the mouth.⁴⁵ Minutius's torture instrument possibly parodies a type of dentistry instrument, presumably used by practitioners when undertaking fiddly work, although I have not come across other references to a 'chochbar'.

⁴² Dekker [S. R. initials on t. p., quarto], *The Noble Souldier* (1634), F1v.

⁴³ A choke-pear is also a type of unpalatable fruit. Although this reading of the noun is less successful in the passage, it nevertheless reinforces the point that a choke-pear prevents materials or matter (in this example, voice and therefore money) from filling a space. The choke-pear fruit cannot be swallowed. Cf. *Owl's Almanac*, 2024-2026.

⁴⁴ Robert Balthropp, Saint Bartholomew the Less (16th December, 1591), PROB 11/78.

⁴⁵ Randle Holme describes the uvula as 'a peece of flesh in the Roofe of the Mouth...It is called also...the *Plectrum*; the *Gargareon*, and *Gargulio*: the two last taken from the gargleing or washing of the Mouth', glossing the plectrum as 'the Quill of the voice' (*Academy of Armory* (Chester: [1688]), p. 381) Cf. 'The *Uvula Spoon*...is applied to the Uvula that is fallen...this Spoon being filled with Pouders...and put under the Uvula relaxed, the Surgion takes the lower end of the Pipe in his mouth, and by blowing, scatters the powder all about upon the Uvula, and the Palate' (Holme, pp. 426-27)

Minutius's quip is that because he has no hair on his chin, like Hal of whom Falstaff remarks 'for a barber shall never earn sixpence of [his chin]' (2 *Henry IV*, I.ii.25), the barber's purse will be blocked from filling with coins, rather than being emptied of them: Minutius cannot be shaved/trimmed – in both senses – by the barber.⁴⁶ Mouths and purses double up. According to his brag, in which oral and fiscal images conflate, Minutius is able to stop the barber's mouth and therefore stop his custom. In the subplot, the absence of the golden beard, discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, makes a mockery of the on-going quarrel between the barbers and Petulus and Licio. Here, Minutius's physical lack of a beard is converted into a joke about a barber's inability to sell his trade to Minutius (to pour forth the 'phrases of [barbery's] eloquent occupation') and thus to generate income from him. The embodiment of value, linguistic and material, is called into question.

Minutius never appears with Licio and Petulus to confront the barber, but the duo later realise the importance of getting the upper hand of Motto linguistically – as Motto has done with the fake inventory – in order to gain the upper hand of him monetarily:

LICIO	Let us not seem to be angry about the inventory, and you shall see my wit to be the hangman for [Motto's] tongue.
PETULUS	... We'll make him have a tongue, that his teeth that look like a comb shall be the scissors to cut it off. (V.ii.96-100)

They will transform Motto's mouth into a physical (barbery) instrument which will ultimately silence him. Carla Mazzio discusses the paradoxical representations of the tongue 'as a literal prison-house of language', highlighting that in early modern texts 'the mouth is positioned as a war zone, with tongue and teeth locked in perennial combat'.⁴⁷ (Later, Dello says that Motto 'made [his] lips scissors' (V.ii.160).) In *TTN*, Richard

⁴⁶ Cf. '*I aske nothing else always: but health and a purseful of monie*', in John Eliot's entry on barbers in *Ortho-epia* (1593), H4v.

⁴⁷ Mazzio, 'Sins of the Tongue', p. 108.

Lichfield recognises that ‘nature hath set before [the tongue] a double bull-woorke of teeth to keepe in the vagrant wordes which straying abroade and beeing surprised may betray the whole cittie’.⁴⁸ To the author’s mind, moreover, Nashe’s ‘talking makes [him] bee accounted as a purse that cannot bee shutte’ who empties himself of worth (‘all silver’).⁴⁹ For Mazzio, ‘Nature...has encoded mechanisms for censorship into the anatomical structure of man’.⁵⁰ Licio’s imagining of Motto’s biting off of his own tongue is associated with the failure of ‘pre-performance’ censorship. In this way, censorship in *Midas* is ‘post-performance’, and corresponds to theatrical censorship which occurred after the performance event (as well as before).⁵¹ The mouth is figured as a penal zone for the tongue after it has strayed. Licio and Petulus force Motto into proclaiming that ‘the King’s are ass’s ears’ (V.ii.157), a treasonable utterance. The envisioned bitten-off tongue is the image of execution for the traitor, rather than of the prudent editing of language.⁵² As the set-up takes hold, Dello warns, ‘Master, take heed; you will blab all anon. These wags are crafty’ (V.ii.149-150). Motto disregards his apprentice’s advice, blabs, and has to promise to return the golden beard to Licio and Petulus in order to avoid punishment. As I have discussed, Motto’s default vow is to make an oath on the tools of his trade. In the first chapter I argued that where material props had never materialised, the material inventory was a worthless list on which to make a vow. Now we can see that where barbery language is represented as a slippery substance, oaths rather than actions highlight the irregular linguistic economies of the barbery trade.

Because Lyly adapts a famous story for theatre, he plays with audience expectations in ways other than the direction of the main plot, which is already decided.

⁴⁸ *TTN*, C1v. In the margin, the author instructs, ‘Mark this secret allegorie’, indicating the theme of censorship in the text.

⁴⁹ *TTN*, C1r.

⁵⁰ Mazzio, ‘Sins of the Tongue’, p. 67.

⁵¹ See Janet Clare ‘*Art Made Tongue-tied by Authority*’ (Manchester; New York: Manchester UP, 1990). Cf. Richard Dutton, ‘Licensing and Censorship’ in *Companion to Shakespeare*, pp. 377-391.

⁵² Cf. ‘A Womans tongue I see, some time or other / Will prove her Traytor’ (*Fancies*, G2r).

The barbery antics begin with Motto fighting against stereotype and agreeing with Dello, ‘thou shouldst be no blab, because a barber. Therefore be secret’ (III.ii.55-56); but he will conform to stereotype just as Midas will make the wrong decisions.⁵³ The subplot is not only a quarrel over an absent golden beard (and therefore wealth), but is also about the control and loss of control of language. Language gains commodity value in the barbery setting in that it can add and subtract value which is imaged in the golden beard, comparable to Pecunia’s allegorical role in *Staple of News*, below. According to Richard Hart, Pecunia is ‘not merely a passive embodiment of wealth as was the heap of gold which Volpone worshipped each morning when he arose from bed. She is kept under tyrannical watch’.⁵⁴ Similarly, the golden beard is not static, but is perpetually reforming as a symbol of wealth. Moreover, in the same way that Pennyboy Junior is engaged in ‘aimless and dissipated wanderings with Pecunia’, so are the characters of the subplot in *Midas* captivated in a fruitless enterprise.⁵⁵ Representations of barbers often encode a crisis of language, and in *Midas* this crisis has a faux-economic impact, raising questions about the substance and value of (oral) exchange.

Hair Extensions

When Motto promises to hand over the golden beard as bribe to stop Petulus and Licio from spreading the news that he has spoken treason, he is offering payment for the right of censorship by the court servants. Licio and Petulus gain the rights over the barber’s language which they have isolated – trimmed – from Motto’s speech. Dello suggests that he will increase the value of this bribe by offering to give the court servants huge cushions

⁵³ Dello shares a joke with the audience in the line before saying, ‘you know I am a barber and cannot tittle-tattle’ (III.ii.53).

⁵⁴ Richard Hart, ‘Jonson’s Late Plays’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, ed. Richard Harp and Stanley Stewart (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), pp. 90-102 (p. 91).

⁵⁵ Hart, p. 93. Ben Jonson ridicules the notion of ‘legitimate gossip’ in *Staple of News* where the output of information for the buying customer corresponds to fiscal themes in the play, embodied in the character of Pecunia and her women.

stuffed with hair made by the barber. He matches the court servants' inclination to capture value from the barber's speech to the barber's ability to generate value from hairy excrements in the shop, drawing attention to the fact that that which we believed to be throw-away might carry more weight than anticipated. This relates the medical cannibal arguments of previous chapters. Blood, for example, can either be put to remedial effect or poured away. In Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Carlo Buffone uses the conceit that barbers retain (as well as collect) blood in the basin: 'I, and preserv'd [the secretions] in Porrengers, as a Barber does his Blood when he pricks a veine'.⁵⁶ Barbers, moreover, used urine for lotium. Midas's wish itself appears like a wasted utterance in the play – he could have wished for anything – and yet its impact is made literally and literarily weighty.

It is not clear whether historical practice in the period included barbers making wares from hair (cushions, tennis balls), but literary references to it are abundant.⁵⁷ In his mock prognostication of 1591, the author, Foulweather, predicts certain events following the sun's eclipse: 'Item...some shall have so sore a sweating that they may sell their haire by the pound to stuffe Tennice balles'.⁵⁸ Puffe threatens Sir Oliver in *Ram-Alley*, 'If you come there, / Thy beard shall serve to stuffe, those balls by which / I get me heat at Tenice'.⁵⁹ Writing on parsimonious characters, Dekker observes of Covetousness: 'Hee kept not so much as a Barber, but shaved his owne head and beard himselfe, and when it came to wey a pound, hee sold it to a *Frenchman* to stuffe tennis balles'.⁶⁰ When Trollio suggests shaving Meleander's lengthy beard, he quips that 'there's haire enough to stuffe all the great Codpieces in Switzerland'.⁶¹ In *Much Ado*, Benedick's shaven cheek can 'stuff...tennis balls' (III.ii.43). In *Staple*, the jeerers ridicule Pennyboy Senior for being 'A

⁵⁶ Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humor* (1600), M1r.

⁵⁷ I do not discuss the art of periwig making because the production of wigs was not remarked upon in literary representations of barbery before the early-seventeenth century (see chapter two).

⁵⁸ Adam Foulweather, *A Wonderful, Strange and Miraculous Astrological Prognostication* (1591), B1v.

⁵⁹ Lording Barry, *Ram-Alley* (1611), D4v.

⁶⁰ *Deadly Sinnes*, D3v.

⁶¹ John Ford, *The Lovers Melancholy* (1629), E4r.

slave and an idolator to Pecunia' (II.iv.181). Fitton jokes that Pennyboy Senior 'preserve[d] / Each hair falls from him to stop balls withal' (II.iv.179-80).⁶² Menenius Agrippa berates Sicinius and Brutus, the 'herdsmen of the beastly plebeians' (II.i.93) in *Coriolanus*: 'When you speak best unto the purpose it is not worth the wagging of your beards, and your beards deserve not so honourable a grave as to stuff a botcher's cushion, or to be entombed in an ass's pack-saddle' (II.i.84-87). In this last example, Menenius associates the subject of (what he regards as) the tribunes' poor language with the image of their beards and their beards' fates. Indeed he exploits the notion that hairs and language can have worth beyond their initial growth or utterance to indicate that these men's words and hair do *not* have extended value, even for an ass's pack-saddle. Gosson writes of frivolous, effeminate poets who deal in bowels, dunghills, and wantonness, filling their words with 'ornamentes': 'Rippe up the golden Ball, that *Nero* consecrated to *Jupiter Capitollinus*, you shall have it stuffed with shavings of his Beard'.⁶³

Hairs' ambivalent relationship to the human body correspond to oral discourse's unstable relationship to the written word: both are branches of more permanent-seeming entities. Helkiah Crooke begins his description of 'the Haires of the whole body' by drawing on Greek definitions meaning to 'mowe or poule', or 'cut' which suggest their inherent temporary status.⁶⁴ Indeed, Crooke explains the lack of coordination in humans between hair and skin colour in terms of hairs' lack of longevity: 'the skinne cannot...reteyne the excrement driven to it so long as to give it his owne colour'.⁶⁵ When asked '*which are the members called excrementous*', Peter Lowe replies, 'The nayles and the hayre'.⁶⁶ But it appears from other anatomical tracts that hairs are not simply

⁶² Unless otherwise indicated, quotations are taken from Jonson, *The Staple of News*, ed. Devra Rowland Kifer (London: Edward Arnold, 1976). The editor notes that 'balls' refer to 'tennis balls'.

⁶³ Gosson, A2r-A2v.

⁶⁴ Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia* (1615), p. 66 (on hairs, see pp. 66-70).

⁶⁵ Crooke, p. 69.

⁶⁶ Peter Lowe, *The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* (1597), D1v.

excrements, but are matter produced *from* waste. They are not classified as unwanted bodily discharge because they have diverse uses such as cover, defence, ornament, and the removal of other bodily excrements.⁶⁷ According to Ambroise Paré, ‘The benefit of [hair] is [that it] consum[es] the grosse and fuliginous or sooty excrements of the braine’.⁶⁸ Crooke is in accord: ‘Haires are bodyes engendred out of a superfluous excrement...corried by the narturall heate’.⁶⁹ Moreover, Will Fisher asserts that early modern physiognomers ‘figured [beard growth] as a kind of seminal excrement’, identifying it in terms of production rather than waste or residue.⁷⁰ This makes sense of the references to ‘sweating’, ‘heat’, ‘*Frenchman*’, ‘Codpieces’ (and the inevitable ‘balls’) in the examples I gave in the previous paragraph; playing tennis could mean having sex, but in *Staple* it could also encode a jeering contest (see IV.i.20-25). If the reuse of human hair is a literary fantasy for a sexualised effect of extra-generativeness then it is an externalised view of the inner processes of production from waste in the body which revolve around hair: the writer’s perception of natural patterns of waste. If the reuse of human hair is social practice, then it contributes to a picture of early modern resourcefulness. Thomas Boehrer, for example, discusses processes of excremental (sewage) circulation in early modernity, using the ‘waste-is-treasure equation’ and historical records of turd repositories, and relating it to the rhetorical character of Ben Jonson’s poetry: ‘Like the waste it represents, Jonson’s excremental verse refuses to be disposed of once and for all; it keeps coming back in different shapes that cannot be entirely ignored or dismissed’.⁷¹ Boehrer suggests the recyclability of linguistic formulae associated with bodily excrement

⁶⁷ See Crooke, p. 70.

⁶⁸ Paré, p. 160.

⁶⁹ Crooke, p. 66.

⁷⁰ Will Fisher, ‘Staging the Beard’ in *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 230-257 (p. 234).

⁷¹ Bruce Thomas Boehrer, ‘The Ordure of Things’ in *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson*, ed. James Hirsh (Madison N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson UP; London: Associated University Presses, 1997), pp. 174-196 (pp. 177, 191).

which is relevant to this discussion. Dekker's joke in *The Gull's Horn-Book* that men should grow shaggy long beards is based on the gull's misunderstanding of hair's ability to regenerate – a physiological confusion also about the male's ability to reproduce: a 'cruelty...it is, to stuffe breeches and tennis balles with that, which...once lost, all the hare-hunters in the world may sweat their hearts out and yet hardly catch it againe'.⁷²

I now want to look at how contemporary playwrights extended their output by inserting material on the subject of the barber, using the example of *Sir Thomas More*, which suggests that stereotype has an implicit inexhaustibility. Put crudely, playmakers use barber material to stuff their works, filling subplots and creating interludes. Tiffany Stern has characterised the fluid nature of playmaking and the unstable text by drawing on playwrights' epithet, 'playpatchers', and discussing the evidence that writers recycled their material, and inserted, deleted and revised collaboratively and individually before and after the play made it to performance.⁷³ Because the language associated with barber material is not a stable economy, it is a staple commodity for writers who utilize its puns, tropes, layers of meaning and faux rhetorical turns: it was a good subject with which to pad out a play. Addition IV in Hand C (the scribe and coordinator of the manuscript) of *Thomas More* is one such example. Images of filled spaces pattern the scene and its sense of being packed-in is embedded: the Sheriff accuses Falconer of causing the street to be 'choked up with carts' (8.62) and Erasmus notes that 'merry humour is best physic /..., for...melancholy chokes the passages / Of blood and breath' (8.191-194). Of Addition IV, John Jowett writes that it 'might be motivated by practical considerations of staging...The need to buy time might have become more and more apparent as the play moved towards

⁷² *Horne-Booke*, C4v.

⁷³ Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 34-61.

performance'.⁷⁴ The writers needed extra dialogue for what was a rejected and failing manuscript.⁷⁵

The Falconer episode of Addition IV is recycled from a description of incidents involving Cromwell, not More, in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1583).⁷⁶ Common early modern puns on hair/heir implicitly endow the subject of hair with a sense of generativeness, captured in More's and Falconer's reference to hairs at birth (see 8.100, 240-241). The scene is a late insert in the play in terms of its chronology, and Dekker's extension at the end of the scene – which continues the discourse on hair – contributes to the effect of further padding.⁷⁷ Following More's soliloquy (Addition III, again in Hand C), Addition IV accounts for most of scene 8 (271 of its 291 lines) as it stands in modern editions. Addition IV is really two episodes: More's trick in letting his man Randall pretend to be Lord Chancellor and the dispute between Falconer, a long-haired ruffian, and the Sheriff and secondly More. Despite its two strands, scene 8 centres on a few themes: outward appearances, hair and wit, disguise, penalties and tricks – a typical subplot combination, and a typical barber's one, which relates to the play's interest in the historical anecdote that More would have his head cut off for holding his tongue, but not his beard, and its internal reflexive demand for Wit to be found a beard.⁷⁸ Scene 8 juxtaposes the playwrights' need to create dialogue with More's message that 'Who prates not much seems wise, his wit few scan, / While the tongue blabs tales of the imperfect man' (8.38-39) and warning to Randall that he 'talk not overmuch' (8.37). In turn, its focus on Falconer's overly-lengthy hair conceptualises this; 'less hair upon' your shoulders means 'more wit' (8.248). More's interest in Falconer's need to amend his image is drawn out:

⁷⁴ Anthony Munday and others, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. John Jowett, The Arden Shakespeare (London: A & C Black, 2011), p. 392.

⁷⁵ Critics hypothesise that the play never made it to stage (see Stern, p. 36).

⁷⁶ Jowett, pp. 61-63.

⁷⁷ See Jowett, p. 393.

⁷⁸ See Charles Clay Doyle, 'The Hair and Beard of Thomas More', *Moreana XVIII*, 71-72 (1981), 5-14.

‘How long have you worn this hair?’ (8.99), ‘how long / Hath this shag fleece hung dangling on thy head?’ (8.101-102), ‘When were you last at barber’s? How long time / Have you upon your head worn this shag hair?’ (8.107-108), ‘it is an odious sight / To see a man thus hairy’ (8.121-122), ‘Cut off this fleece’ (8.125). More classifies Falconer’s case as a ‘trivial noise’ (8.74), and yet much is made of it: ‘let’s talk with [Falconer]’ (8.231), More says at the next opportunity. Towards the end of Addition IV, Morris remarks, ‘I’ll hear no words, sir, fare you well’ (8.273) indicating that the padding is complete. The words on hair have done their bit. Whereas More pontificates on the familiar virtues of trimmed-down speech, shaved Falconer complains that the barber has taken value – rather than waste – from his head and has made him look like a sufferer from the pox who turns bald. Falconer makes his ‘locks’ (8.249/250) synonymous with safe-keeping, says he is ‘deposed’ because his ‘crown is taken from [him]’ (8.260-261), claims that he is the victim of a ‘poache[r]’ (8.282), and hopes that his new hair will be spun like ‘fine thread’ (8.288-289).

Although the character of a barber does not appear in the scene, the term ‘barber’ is used five times and is important to its conception. We must envisage a barber at work off-stage during Addition IV because Falconer re-enters trimmed. Moreover, in the scene’s other episode, More calls Randall a ‘painted barbarism’ (8.180) for deluding Erasmus, a jest which More orchestrates. More’s notion of disguise is filtered through a pun on ‘barber’ and his criticism of language-use is contextualised by that figure. Ultimately, Falconer dismisses the idea of being ‘a hairmonger’, but this term, in the penultimate line of the scene, characterises the activity with which the playmakers have engaged in constructing Addition IV: in trying to add value to their manuscript, the authors of *Thomas More* further question the value of language through various analogies to hair. Jowett glosses ‘hairmonger’ with a description of ‘a barber’s client whose hair is sold to make

wigs'.⁷⁹ But this is out of place, despite the fact that the actor playing Falconer had to wear a wig in his first entrance in order to appear shaved in his second. The play never makes use of the term 'wig', and periwig-making did not begin in earnest for social, rather than royal or theatrical, use until later in the seventeenth century: in the period of this study, barbers and wig-making do not go together in popular representations of the trade, or in The Company's records about barbery practice. Like a prosthetic beard, Falconer's head of hair was detachable and recyclable. The notion that barbers deal in hair was not restricted to the single commercial avenue of wig-manufacturing. Hair's potential as a material object, concept, or literary subject – especially in a barbery context – means that it is readily-available filling-matter.

'I'll go see / This Office...and be trimm'd afterwards'

In *Staple* Jonson satirises the social institution of printing houses, journalistic partiality, mass circulation of news sheets, contemporary publisher figures like Nathaniel Butter, and contemporary attitudes towards wealth and Jonson's own literary corpus.⁸⁰ But within the play, he also satirises the social and literary aspects of the broadcaster role played by barbers, and in doing so, he develops a theatrical frame in the play which assists his exploration of the correspondence between the Staple office and the theatre.

In the previous chapter I examined why in *Epicoene*, written nearly two decades before *Staple*, Jonson gives the barber, Cutbeard, a fundamental role in controlling the non-verbal soundscape around Morose, and I argued that we should think about the barber as an iconic ear-picker in the period. Jonson also illustrated the role the barber played in managing voices, dialogue, gossip and news. Hart notes that both news and money demand by their nature to be current; barbery fits into the fashions of the now-conscious

⁷⁹ Jowett, FN to 8.290.

⁸⁰ See S. A. Baron, 'Butter, Nathaniel (*bap.* 1583, *d.* 1664)', *DNB* (OUP, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4224>, accessed 28 March 2011]).

worlds.⁸¹ Jonson makes directly correspondent a barber's ability to generate news and a barber's ability to make money. Cutbeard controls speech, as well as sound, in *Epicoene*. But, more significantly, Jonson makes a barber, Tom, a vital structural unit in the news office in *Staple*. Pennyboy Junior remarks on Tom's suitability for this role because of his 'Quick vein in forging news' (I.v.133) – the gossipy barber stereotype is in his blood. Indeed, Expectation says of Pennyboy Junior that he 'makes much of the barber' (First Intermean, 4). And so too does Jonson. In his introduction to the play, Anthony Parr highlights the complexities embedded in every feature of it.⁸² Here, I explore the barber as a dramatic, thematic and structural feature in the play who is crucial to Jonson's presentation of the *Staple*.⁸³ Tom the barber becomes a member of the office, but more than this, he is fundamental in its linguistic and also physical conception on stage. He is the first character to tell us about the office and the one who reports its destruction. The *Staple* is the barber's news.

The barber's shop as a place for exchange, gossip and news-gathering has been long established in literature and in popular social consciousness. William Andrews describes the perennial barber figure: 'he retailed the current news, and usually managed to scent the latest scandal, which was not slow to make known'.⁸⁴ In *TTN* 'The Barbers Chaire is the verie Royall-Exchange of newes'.⁸⁵ Mulligrub asks barber-disguised

⁸¹ Hart, p. 93.

⁸² See Jonson, *The Staple of News*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988), Introduction, pp. 11-60.

⁸³ Critics regularly cite Jonson's masque, *News from the New World* (1620), as the dramatic precursor to *Staple*, but it does not contain a barber (see Parr, p. 9; D. F. McKenzie, 'The *Staple of News* and the Late Plays' in *A Celebration of Ben Jonson*, ed. William Blissett, Julian Patrick and R. W. Van Fossen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 83-128 (p. 95); and Martin Butler, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 247-252). Tom's barbery role in *Staple* adds another dimension to the play's satire. For a discussion of Jonson's engagement with the development of news media throughout his theatrical career, see Mark Z. Muggli, 'Ben Jonson and the Business of News', *SEL* 32:2 (1992), 323-340.

⁸⁴ William Andrews, *At the Sign of the Barber's Pole* (Cottingham: 1904), p. 8.

⁸⁵ *TTN*, B4v. Cf. William Shand's depiction of Henry VIII's royal barbers who were members of staff of the Privy Chamber and therefore, at least in theory, had access to privileged information ('Edmund Harman' in *Notable Barber Surgeons*, ed. Ian Burn (London: Farrand Press in association with The Worshipful Company of Barbers, 2008), pp. 31-57).

Cocledemoy four times ‘what[’s the] news?’ (*Dutch Courtesan*, II.iii.30, 32, 36), Spadone turns to Secco for the ‘tattle oth’ towne’ (*Fancies*, I4v) and declares of news: ‘that’s part of your trade’ (I4v). In John Ford’s *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore*, Bergetto and Poggio are excited by foolish talk from the barber about sandbag-fuelled mills: ‘my barber told me’, ‘(my barber says)’, and ‘So the barber swore, forsooth’ (I.iii.34-42) pepper their talk.⁸⁶ Bergetto’s immersion in gossip with the barber characterises his hopelessness as suitor to Annabella. His ‘rare speech’ is ‘gross’ and, according to his uncle, Donado, ‘intolerable’ (I.iii.56, 64, 69). The barber’s shop or the barber himself is a centre of information which emanates verbally: at best it represents distraction; at worst it signals corruption. In *Quaternio* (1633), Jurisperitus tells the Rustic of the punishments to which Heathens subjected those who told lies. His example is of a barber who circulates ‘intelligence’ of ‘some strange Occurrence which happened in *Sicilia*’ which he learns from a customer in his shop. The barber’s information proves false and causes uproar in the town, and he is tortured on ‘the wheele’ for being ‘a disturber of the peace of the Citie’. Nashe supplies the epithet ‘*rumor-rayser*’ for this barber.⁸⁷ In this compound, rumour is at once seen as generated (raised up, or amassed), and also seen as an item of the barbery process that can as easily be cropped (razored) as cultivated, reminding us of the double implications of ‘trim’. Rumour is envisioned as something material, harvestable and ultimately saleable, although it characterises false commodities. In ‘West-Country Tom Tormented’ (a ballad surviving from the late-seventeenth century), the eponym refuses to ‘prattle and prate’, ‘*meddle [and] make*’, and is irked by the news mongering in London at the cobbler’s stall, in a tavern and at the Royal Exchange.⁸⁸ The balladeer withholds the setting of the barber’s shop as a centre for chatter until the final stanza and the barber’s demand for news is the final provocation for Country Tom, who runs from the shop half-shaved and interrupts the

⁸⁶ John Ford, *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore in Three Plays*, ed. Keith Sturges (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985).

⁸⁷ Nashe, *Quaternio* (1633), Gg2r-v.

⁸⁸ Anon, ‘West-Country Tom Tormented’ (1664-1703), stanza 1, lines 4 and refrain.

barbery process by rejecting an element of its routine. In being deprived of gathering news from a customer, the barber (in this example) is also deprived of his fare for barbering. The Staple, which doubles as a barber's shop in Jonson's play, is the point of consolidation for the urban centres ('The Court...Paul's, Exchange, and Westminster Hall' (I.ii.60)) of artificial (social and political) intelligence.

Staple is a typical product of Jonson's interest in framing devices: the play is divisively layered.⁸⁹ A sense of a distinct venue is as important to the Staple as it is to a barber's shop, and in Tom's first scene, Jonson connects the practical considerations of setting-up a barber shop with the notion of setting-up the Staple. Tom initially arrives on stage with his barber's furniture, greeted by Pennyboy Junior's instruction, 'Set thy things upon the board / And spread thy cloths. Lay all forth *in procinctu* / And tell's what news' (I.ii.20-22). The news is, of course, a description of the Staple. And at the end of the scene, Pennyboy Junior decides, 'I'll go see / This Office, Tom, and be trimm'd afterwards' (I.ii.140-141). Tom 'lay[s] forth' his barbery gear not to set up his barber's shop in which to shave his client, but to establish a space in which to set forth the Staple in words rather than 'things'. He rhetorically constructs the venue which is 'Newly erected / Here in the house' (I.ii.31-32) and has been 'set up' by Cymbal (the Master of the Office) with 'desks and classes, tables, and his shelves' (I.ii.44-45) in advance of its realisation on stage. Put another way, an audience sees a barbery setting (with props/furniture) as a place for news to be disseminated before they see the Staple's office space. Pennyboy Junior says upon entering the Staple, 'I bought this place for [Tom] and gave it him' (III.ii.8). Later, Customer 1 refers to the staple as a 'profane shop' (III.ii.123). The office space ultimately displaces the functional barbery space and Pennyboy Junior is 'trimm'd afterwards' of monies for news-purchasing rather than for hair-removal.

⁸⁹ Cf. McKenzie's discussion of Jonson's 'calculatedly complex nest of successive audience-actor creations' (p. 97).

Later in I.iv, the structural space of the Office is configured on stage. (Catherine Rockwood argues that the play has ‘no central *locus*’ in terms of its structural and thematic configuration; yet I find that a strong sense of physical space is ingrained at some instances in this drama.⁹⁰) Register is coordinating the Office: ‘What, are those desks fit now? Set forth the table, / The carpet, and *the chair*’ ([italics mine] I.iv.1-2).⁹¹ Having a single chair is significant in view of the iconic status a chair gains in a barber’s shop. Dekker mocks ‘Or if you itch, to step into the Barbers, a whole Dictionary cannot afford more words to set downe notes what Dialogues you are to maintaine whilest you are Doctor of the Chaire there’.⁹² When Pennyboy Junior and friends enter the Office, they take note of the ‘dainty rooms’ and the ‘place’ (I.v.1) itself. Cymbal explains the set up: ‘This is the outer room, where my clerks sit / And keep their sides; the Register i’t h midst, / The Examiner, he sits private there, within’ (I.v.2-4).⁹³ It is significant that the office is separated into outer and inner (private) spaces, like the space of a barber’s shop which is divided if additional surgical services are provided. The shop and office are not entirely open to scrutiny, and the space for news-mongering is inherently corrupt. Jonson lays before his audience the sites in which the slow-witted are exploited: the playful news office which doubles as barber’s shop is comparable to the fair. D. F. McKenzie sees the unusual amount of attention given to the office as a physical space as ‘an open invitation to a stage designer’: it is a ‘place’ (I.v.67), as Pennyboy Junior says, in which things are well ‘fitted’ (I.v.68); it has ‘shape’ (I.v.73) Fitton boasts, and is ‘A most polite neat thing! With all the limbs / As sense can taste!’ (I.v.74-75) according to Pennyboy Junior; the Staple is, Cymbal concludes, a ‘well-begotten...business’ (I.v.76); it has form as something that has been

⁹⁰ Catherine Rockwood, “‘Know Thy Side’”, *ELH* 75:1 (2008), 135-149 (p. 135).

⁹¹ Cf. Parr’s discussion of the practicalities of staging the office (pp. 50-2).

⁹² *Horne-Booke*, F4r.

⁹³ Rockwood argues that Jonson objects on stylistic grounds to Middleton’s *Game of Chess* in which sides are black and white and she highlights his ‘mockery of journalistic impartiality’: ‘each of the Clerks...has been assigned a particular set of sources’ (p. 140) and the knowledge that they regurgitate is far from speculative.

mechanically ordered has form.⁹⁴ But the office clerks fuss. After Jonson's fractious years composing masques with Inigo Jones at court it is little surprise that instances when interior design becomes a subject on Jonson's stage appear ridiculous. McKenzie claims that 'even in its further perspectives of outer and inner rooms, the Staple is a competing image of the theatre', but it is also a competing image of a masque.⁹⁵ In 'An Expostulation with Inigo Jones', Jonson addresses 'wise Surveyo^r' Jones with affected zeal: 'are you fitted yet? / Will any of these express yo^r place?', he asks, and refers to Jones's 'omnipotent Design!'⁹⁶ In addition, the emphasis on the physical construction of the office as a bodily subject (with 'limbs') appears doubly parodic: first with regard to Jones and his classical, Raphaelesque training in human anatomy, second with regard to a divided space, overseen by a barber, in which bodies are reconstructed.⁹⁷

Ultimately, Jonson undermines the characters' sense of the office's physical manifestation making their fussing seem absurd. When Expectation refers to the office after it has been set up on stage, he emphasises its elusiveness and lack of delineation: 'a new Office, i'the air, I know not where' (I.Intermean, 5-6) and later complains that 'They have talk'd on't, but we see't not open yet' (II.Intermean, 49-50) even though the office space has been set forth in I.v. The office now resists definition in physical terms. The illusion, which is based on 'this tempting language' (III.ii.236) successfully dupes Pennyboy Junior, Lickfinger and the various Customers. The most gullible in the play is Pennyboy Junior, to whom the barber first speaks of the office and conceives of its elusive material space. McKenzie observes that 'The true language of the play [is] in its

⁹⁴ McKenzie, p. 104.

⁹⁵ McKenzie, p. 97. McKenzie examines the 'antimasque' elements of the jeerers (pp. 98-101).

⁹⁶ Jonson, 'An Expostulation with Inigo Jones' in *Ben Jonson: The Poems; The Prose Works*, ed. Charles Harold Hertford, Percy Simpson and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925-52 [1947]), VIII, pp. 402-406), lines 85, 17-18, 96.

⁹⁷ See Jeremy Wood, 'Inigo Jones, Italian Art, and the Practice of Drawing', *The Art Bulletin* 74:2 (1992), 247-270; John Peacock, 'Inigo Jones as a Figurative Artist' in *Renaissance Bodies*, ed. Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 154-179.

powerfully coordinated structural statement, not in the odd speech'.⁹⁸ The Staple's ephemerality underlines the type of manufacturing industry with which the barber is associated: the industry in which the trade goods (hair and language) are quickly regenerated and disposed of (raised or razored). Significantly, it is Tom who gives the news about the fate of the office, as he did about its erection: 'Our Staple is all to pieces, quite dissolv'd' (V.i.39) he says, mixing images of material disintegration and disappearance (things becoming immaterial).⁹⁹ It has 'Shiver'd' and 'crack[ed]' in being 'blown up!', but the clerks have 'flew[n] into vapor' or 'Into a subtler air' (V.i.40-47); the office has broken up (i.e. it is a ruin and has remains), but simultaneously has 'vanish'd' without trace (V.i.50). The Staple struggles with the divisions between selling spoken, written and printed language, between words that are heard, read and owned, and in the play it is the barber, finding himself unable to trade effectively in printed language, who is left to suffer at the loss of the office: he mourns, 'I am clear undone' (V.i.37) and 'broke, broke, wretchedly broke' (V.i.38).

Ultimately, the conjuring of language that is satirised in the Staple mirrors the playwright's duty, and the office that was essentially 'i'th air' is correspondent to the play that exists 'in our skies' (Prologue, 10). In *Staple's* 'Prologue for the Stage', the audience is asked to 'come to hear, not see, a play' (line 2) for the writer would have an audience 'wise / Much rather by [their] ears than by [their] eyes' (lines 5-6). Writing on *Staple's* satire of 'commodification as a disease of the urban populace', and evaluating Jonson's repeated discovery 'that the distinction between high and low cultural effects is a problematic one', Don Wayne concludes: 'In contesting...[the] criteria of distinction, the playwright is unable to disguise the fact that he takes the productive labor and the material

⁹⁸ McKenzie, p. 103.

⁹⁹ Muggli terms it 'an alchemical dissolution' (p. 336).

culture of everyday London life and turns it into aesthetic capital'.¹⁰⁰ McKenzie specifies that 'the play itself is properly larger than the Staple, for it is Jonson's own Staple of news. It is not synonymous with the city news office but is offered in serious public competition with it...the Staple is a competing image of the theatre'.¹⁰¹ Muggli argues that Jonson 'succinctly dramatizes the frightening transformation of individual consumers into a mass audience seeking the same trivial...news'.¹⁰² The office members, and the barber's commitment to language is also Jonson's: all three rely on language, which becomes a social and commercial enterprise, to earn their keep.¹⁰³ At the time of writing *Staple* Jonson's popularity had slumped considerably and his literary output was being ill-received. In encouraging his audience to take pleasure in the language games in the play, Jonson was encouraging audiences to take pleasure in his linguistic conjuring, whilst simultaneously critiquing himself. The office in *Staple* is therefore a tri-partite construction in that it interweaves criticism and the reputations of a news-house, a barber's shop, and a playwright's poetic mind.¹⁰⁴ Jonson intermingles his commentary on the social mechanisms of early modern London with his more politically ideological critiques. McKenzie's reductive summary of the barber's function in the play – he allows the Staple to 'cope with the arts' – only hints at the connectivity between the perception of the barber's shop and creative, linguistic venues.

The Trimming of Thomas Nashe

¹⁰⁰ Don E. Wayne, "Pox on Your Distinction!" in *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, ed. Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 67-91 (pp. 69, 71, 86).

¹⁰¹ McKenzie, pp. 94, 97.

¹⁰² Muggli, p. 332.

¹⁰³ 'In no other [play] does Jonson offer to relate in such a penetrating and cohesive way economics and language as forces for binding or disrupting community....Only in *The Staple*...are the social uses of language fully explored' (McKenzie, p. 105).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. McKenzie, pp. 97, 102-104. McKenzie concludes that 'The dramatic poet, as rhetor in the truest sense, has lost his vocation to a journalist' (p. 126).

In this section I examine how writers employ an ideological sense of trimming as punishment. The Company exercise very specific measures to discipline an unruly apprentice brought before the court by his master on 9th August 1647. The minutes take note:

Mr Heydon complayning to this Court of his Apprentice how present in Court For his evill and stubborne Behaviour towards him and frequent absentes out of his service...The said Apprentice being in Court to answer to the same did rudely and most irreverently behave himselfe towards his said M[aste]r...in Savory language and behaviour using severall Oathes protesting that he will not serve his M[aste]r Whatever shall come of it¹⁰⁵

The clerk registers not only the apprentice's absence from duties, but also the language he uses before his superiors, which is unregulated and unruly. His words are rude and savoury but his speech is also too lengthy: he makes 'severall Oathes' implying that the nature of his protestation in this context, his defence, is overly long or exaggerated (like Motto's oaths). The minutes note one course of action only: 'This Court did therefore cause the haire of the said Apprentice (being undecently long) to be cut shorter'.¹⁰⁶ The court tackles the indecency of the apprentice's verbal expression by tackling the indecency of his overly-hairy physical expression.¹⁰⁷ Verbal expression can be interrupted but it cannot literally be cropped once it is generated. Hair cutting in this instance codifies that impossible (penal) response to language use (hence in *Midas* the court servants trim Motto of his golden beard). In *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), Thomas Nashe imagines that the barber has the capacity to 'shorten...all his enemies' who employ strong language against him.¹⁰⁸ Mercutio objects to being stopped in full flow in *Romeo and Juliet*: 'Thou desirest me to stop in my tale against the hair' (II.iii.87-88), he says. Benvolio responds,

¹⁰⁵ Barbers' Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 404.

¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately the Company records cannot tell us Mr Heydon's occupation.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 'prentis not to were [*sic*] a bearde past xv days growing' the clerk writes of an order on 27th April 1556. Minutes pre-1557 were written retrospectively, and most, including this one, were crossed out. If beard growth was never made into a fixed rule, The Company could treat unruly apprentices to the same treatment as Mr Heydon's apprentice as occasion required.

¹⁰⁸ *Saffron-Walden*, A2r.

‘Thou wouldst else have made thy tale large’ (II.iii.89) to which Mercutio’s riposte is ‘I would have made it short, for I was come to the whole depth of my tale, and meant indeed to occupy the argument no longer’ (90-92). Mercutio equates hair length with length of speech and later tells Benvolio ‘thou wilt quarrel with a man that hath a hair more or a hair less in his beard than thou hast’ (III.i.17-18) suggesting that hairs beget arguments.

In John Jones’s *Adrasta*, Damasippus is a lecturing as well as ‘lecherous’ stoic, adapted from the philosopher Damasippus in the second of Horace’s *Sermones*. Damasippus’s crime in the play is not just that he nearly cuckolds Master Frailware and is unfaithful to his wife Mistress Abigail, but that he is a hypocrite in delivering his ‘moral lecture’ against the sins of the flesh.¹⁰⁹ Frailware and his page punish Damasippus by arranging for a barber (disguised, perhaps like Nick in *Burning Pestle*, as ‘a Devill Barber’ (s.d. IIr)) to shave him. In part, this is an act of castration, envisaged by Page: ‘Let his offensive member be now lopt off’ (IIr). But the analogy that dominates the scene is that Damasippus’s long beard is his long speeches; his is a ‘morall Beard’ (IIv), comparable to the ‘moral lecture’, of which Damasippus protests, ‘it is an Ornament and speciall gravity belonging to our Sect’ (IIv), meaning a group of vocal stoics. The barber teases, ‘what can you say to save it?’ and then denounces, ‘Impossible that hair should argue wit’ (IIv). Moreover, language that has proved false is comparable to a messy beard: Damasippus has a ‘Dung-mix of haire’ (IIv).

Licio traps the barber by regarding Motto’s mouth as a barbery instrument which will, metaphorically, cut off his tongue in *Midas*. Barbers’ tools and barbery’s language of cutting and trimming contribute to a semiotic that regards language use as something that needs maintenance and penalties. Beards and hair that get out of control or become too

¹⁰⁹ John Jones, *Adrasta* (1635), B3v.

lengthy are associated with the look of a ruffian (as the Falconer scene in *Thomas More* makes clear) or (for males) are too womanish.¹¹⁰ Amphilogus explains in *Corruptions* that

barbers are verie necessarie, for otherwise men should grow very ougglishom and deformed, and their haire would in processe of time overgrowse their faces, rather like monsters...I cannot but marvell at the beastlinesse of some ruffians...that will have their haire to growe over their faces...hanging downe over their shoulders, as womens haire doth¹¹¹

In the same way that a person's hair tells the observer something about their social standing and often determines their gender (and age), so too does their language-use. In *King Lear* the fact that Gloucester's crime, according to Edgar and Cornwall, is indiscreet talking makes Regan's interest in his beard appropriate: his beard prompts her to think of him as 'traitor' (III.vii.37). Gloucester, in turn, imagines that his beard will become the accuser, extending the trope that speaking out and feats of justice can centre on the figurative associations of a beard. Responding to talkative Falconer, whose head is newly barbered, More remarks, 'Why, now thy face is like an honest man's' (*Thomas More*, 8.237). In *Adrasta* Damasippus is a 'reformed man' (I2r) after the barber takes his razer to 'these haire that never yet were cut' (I1v). More generally, unwanted language is treated like superfluous hairs – like excrement. When Polonius bemoans in *Hamlet* that the 1st Player's speech 'is too long' (II.ii.494), Hamlet jibes, 'It shall to th' barber's with your beard' (II.ii.495).¹¹² In *Hengist*, the eponym tackles a dispute occurring between two townsmen, declaring, 'Call in the Barber; if the tale [the history of the dispute] be long, / He'll cut it short, I trust, that's all the hope on't' (III.iii.43-4). Of the vicar that Cutbeard selects for Morose's marriage in *Epicoene*, the barber acknowledges that he is 'an

¹¹⁰ On the beard as an 'Ensigne of Manhood', see Will Fisher, 'Staging the Beard', esp. 233-234. On the length of women's hair and its ornamentation, see Will Fisher, *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), pp. 129-158.

¹¹¹ Stubbes, H1v.

¹¹² Lines are from Folio (1623) text. The exchange is almost identical between Corambis and Hamlet in the First Quarto, 7.360-361, also from this edition.

excellent barber of prayers' (III.ii.41-42). In Quintiliano's dispute with the barber in Chapman's *May-Day*, memories of promised 'crownes', which Cutbeard says have 'hung long enough a conscience', should, according to Quintiliano, be 'Cut...downe' – which 'belongs to [the barber's] profession if they hang too long'.¹¹³ Stories, tales, speeches, prayers, memories and news, predominantly considered in their spoken forms, can be embellished by a barber, but they can also conceptually be chopped. Nashe characterises the barber's need 'Without further circumstance to make *short*, (which to speake troth is onely proper to [the] Trade)' in his dedicatory epistle to Trinity College Cambridge Barber-Surgeon in his pamphlet *Saffron-Walden*.¹¹⁴ Nashe's address to the Barber-Surgeon (and his cocksure use of barbery stereotype) sparks the final pamphlet of those recognised as part of his controversy with Gabriel Harvey in the 1590s: *TTN* literally cuts things off.¹¹⁵

Although *TTN* is officially anonymous, critics have long since discarded the idea that Harvey was author, and some have confidently identified it as the work of the Barber-Surgeon of Trinity College Cambridge, Richard Lichfield. Nashe's epistle is addressed to 'Don Richardo Barbarossa de Caesario', and on the title page of *TTN*, the name 'Don Richardo de Medico Campo' (medico/leech, and campo/field, thus Leechfield) is included.¹¹⁶ There are pros and cons in this authorship attributive.¹¹⁷ However, the author of *TTN* certainly relies on this persona for his satirical impact and he is characterised as an authorial voice even if he is not the author.

¹¹³ George Chapman, *May-Day* (1611), E2r. Cf. Petulus's observation in reference to hunting techniques, 'Remember all? Nay, then had we good memories, for there be more phrases than thou hast hairs' (*Midas*, IV.iii.59-60), indicating the number of oral expressions as a measurement of hairs.

¹¹⁴ *Saffron-Walden* A2v.

¹¹⁵ After his initial address of Nashe in the opening of *TTN*, the author acknowledges his own aposiopesis: 'but to leave these parergasticall speeches and come to your trimming' (B3v).

¹¹⁶ *Saffron-Walden*, A2r.

¹¹⁷ See Benjamin Griffin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees', *N&Q* 44:1 (1997), 47-9; Nicholl, pp. 233-36.

After Nashe appeals to the Barber-Surgeon to ‘come and joyne with [him] to give [Harvey] the terrible cut’, Lichfield turns on Nashe.¹¹⁸ Nashe’s appeal to him in *Saffron-Walden* is hardly delicate: despite his call for collusive action, the satirist does not resist humiliating the Barber-Surgeon figure. His aggressive use of ‘Dick’ in abbreviating ‘Richardo’ and his derogatory barbery tropes are provocative. Twice in *TTN*, the author parenthesises a reminder, ‘([as] I am [a] C[h]irurgion)’, he writes, indicating that Nashe’s appeal to Lichfield’s barber identity only fails to acknowledge his true professional one.¹¹⁹ Here I examine how the author of *TTN* applies barbery metaphor to imagine silencing Nashe, whereby Nashe gets the barbery treatment for which he has set himself up in *Saffron-Walden*. Ultimately Lichfield’s surgeon identity oversees the enactment of a ‘perfect cut’ on Nashe’s works rather than his spoken discourse. In *TTN*, barbers’ ability to cut back customers’ excretory matter is the author’s trope for his attack on Nashe’s ‘infectious excrements’, his language. Nashe supplies this trope in *Saffron-Walden* in which he appeals to the barber as a ‘Corrector of staring haires’ and ‘vagrant moustachios’, a ‘scavenger of chins’, and a ‘supervisor of all excrementall superfluties’ (similar epithets to the ones Middleton assigns to the barber in *Hengist*).¹²⁰ In *TTN*, the author develops the conceit of the barber as the iconic waste-remover, and makes more explicit the language of barbers’ ability to target the verbal. Nashe’s voice is welcomed into the barber’s shop: his ‘ill corrupted speeches’ and ‘infected speech’ which spill from his ‘cankered convicious tongue’ are his overly lengthy excrements.¹²¹ Lichfield attacks Nashe’s ‘talking’ and

¹¹⁸ The suggestion of castration here also befits the barber-surgeon setting, as I explored in relation to *Lear*, *Quiet Life*, *Knave in Graine* and *Ordinary*.

¹¹⁹ *TTN*, C2r, G1r.

¹²⁰ *Saffron-Walden*, A2r. Nashe originally calls on the barber to ‘correct’ and ‘supervise’ the language of his Harvey rivals (Gabriel’s brother, Richard, was also involved in the controversy).

¹²¹ *TTN*, C1r-C1v. ‘Convicious’ is not recorded in the *OED* but perhaps is a compound, neologised by the author, of ‘convincing’ and ‘vicious’, suggesting that despite its rottenness, Nashe’s tongue has the ability to persuade.

‘confused bibble babble’.¹²² *TTN* engages in a printed pamphleteering battle, but the context of barbery shifts the focus firmly onto oral rather than printed matters. However, the author has to focus on Nashe’s mouth and ‘stinking breath’ rather than on his beard because Nashe is without much facial hair: his ‘want of a beard taketh away halfe of the subject of our disputation’.¹²³ Given that the ‘disputation’ is theorized in the hair/language analogy of the barber’s shop, Nashe’s lack of facial hair is – although a laughing point – a frustration for Lichfield who has to shift its focus. The very title of the pamphlet is put under threat. The effect, however, is apt: language replaces hair.

Unlike in the vomiting scene in *Poetaster*, the barber-surgery context of *TTN* is emphatic when the author conceives that ‘out of [Nashe’s] mouth proceedeth nothing but noysome and ill-savered vomittes of railinges’.¹²⁴ Lichfield diagnoses Nashe and whereas in *Poetaster* Crispinus’s vomiting is the translation of his bombast speech into sickness, in *TTN* sickness characterises Nashe’s speech. Well before Jonson, the author of *TTN* uses the image of spewed language to represent corruption of verbal expression, although he does this without reference to a basin. Where language fails to develop effectively in the mouth, sickness follows. Lavinia is left without a tongue in *Titus Andronicus*, with Aaron characterising her dismemberment in barbery terms (she is ‘washed and cut and trimmed’ (V.i.94)). Having no tongue to express herself, Lavinia at first can only weep, and normal oral communication paths are violently disrupted. Titus says that he cannot internalise her sorrow, but is obliged to cough it up (as a ‘vomit’) in an expression (and purging) of uncontrollable passion.

For why my bowels cannot hide her woes,
But like a drunkard must I vomit them.

¹²² *TTN*, D1r. See Rhodes on Nashe’s simulation of oral techniques: ‘Orality, Print and Popular Culture’ in *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Matthew Dimmock and Andrew Hadfield (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 29-44 (esp. pp. 31-37).

¹²³ *TTN*, C1v, D4r.

¹²⁴ *TTN*, C1r.

Then give me leave, for losers will have leave
To ease their stomachs with their bitter tongues. (III.i.231-234)

Tongues that are ‘bitter’, suggests Titus, cannot formulate neat, trim speeches, and language pours from the mouth like waste matter, like the railings of a drunkard. In *TTN*, the author’s suggestion that he should ‘picke [Nashe’s] teeth and make a cleane mouth’ is followed by a greater threat: ‘Ile picke out tounge and all’.¹²⁵ The barbery contexts linger in these examples: in the direct naming thereof in *TTN*; in the barbery semantics associated with missing tongues in *Titus*; and in the object associated with the activity (the basin) in *Poetaster*, where mouths (and tongues) and therefore language are perceived to be unkempt.

As well as attacking Nashe’s speech within a barbery frame in *TTN*, the author also attacks Nashe’s body, and introduces a surgical element to the concept of trimming. (At the beginning of the pamphlet the author notes in the margin that his trimming involves attacking ‘all [Nashe’s] parts’.¹²⁶) When this happens, the subject of language is not perceived as that produced by Nashe’s mouth, but that recorded in his works: his printed materials. The notion of Lichfield’s ‘perfect cut’ in *TTN* aims at something more permanent compared to the ‘margent cut’ which characterised trimming back Nashe’s speech/voice – a temporary measure. Dekker refers to more drastic shaving in *Deadly Sins* when he describes the more damaging vice of the metropolis as ‘a shaving that takes not only away the rebellious haire, but brings the flesh with it too: and if that cannot suffice, the very bones must follow’.¹²⁷ Marie Claire Randolph highlights the trope that links surgical and satiric writing: ‘the satirist himself is a whipper, a scourge, a barber-surgeon’ and ‘the satirist’s pen is often a searing, cauterizing scapel which probes deep and cuts

¹²⁵ *TTN*, C2r. Cf. Mazzio for a discussion on the ‘relations between the tongue and the penis’ (‘Sins of the Tongue’, p. 59 (see pp. 59-60)).

¹²⁶ *TTN*, B3v.

¹²⁷ *Deadly Sinnes*, F1r.

away dead or gangrenous flesh, leaving a clean wound to heal'.¹²⁸ The site in which Lichfield envisages tackling Nashe as a linguistic subject shifts from the barber's shop (in the opening) to Barber-Surgeon's Hall, specifically its anatomy theatre: 'but when thou shalt be opened, that is, when [the anatomist] shall see but some *worke* of thine, he shall finde in thee naught but rascallitie and meere delusions' [italics mine].¹²⁹ And the author foresees that 'with [his] brethren the Barber-Chirurgions of London' he will 'anatomize [Nashe] and keep his bones as a chronicle to shew many ages heereafter that sometime lived such a man'.¹³⁰ Chopped up Nashe as a body is dismembered Nashe as a text. The figure of the surgeon steps in to perform a permanent, textual attack, and the remaining fragments chronicle in literary form what has been broken up. Lichfield's contextual use of barber/surgeon binaries in creating this division might purposefully have been employed to rile Nashe who harboured an anti-Ramist stance against binary division of the arts envisioned by the Ramean Tree. Nashe's use of print as, in Neil Rhodes's use of Walter Ong, 'a form of secondary orality' is simplified by Lichfield's attack on its two manifestations, as oral and as print, rather than its wholeness.¹³¹

Twice at the end of *TTN* the author portrays this 'trimming' as a record 'in red letters', and reminds us of an exchange between Baltazar and Cockadillio in *Noble Soldier*: Cockadillio names himself the king's barber and Baltazar asks him to appeal to the King on his behalf (see chapter four). Cockadillio shows little interest in the matter, and in Baltazar's frustration he declares, 'I begge, you whorson muscod! my petition / Is written on my bosome in red wounds' (G2r), to emphasize the gravity of his appeal. Cockadillio

¹²⁸ Marie Claire Randolph, 'The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory', *SP* 38:2 (1941), 125-157 (pp. 125, 145).

¹²⁹ *TTN*, C4v. For discussion on 'reading' the anatomized body as text (primarily for religious and intellectual ritual) in early modernity, see Katherine Park, 'The Criminal and the Saintly Body', *RQ* 47:1 (1994), 1-33, and Andrea Carlino, *Books of the Body*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), pp. 187-225.

¹³⁰ *TTN*, G4r.

¹³¹ Rhodes, 'Popular Culture', pp. 41-44 (p. 44).

immediately gives his excuse: 'I am no Barber-Surgeon' (G2r), he says.¹³² Because Baltazar embodies his petition as a text, the barber, because he is not a surgeon, assumes he has no business with it (i.e. with Baltazar's body). In *Macbeth*, Duncan remarks to his injured Captain, 'So well thy words become thee as thy wounds' (I.ii.43) before sending him to the surgeon. Words in this analogy are transcribed. In a dedication to his brother-in-law, the writer Thomas Randolph, Richard West observes that 'Although his wit was sharp as other, yet / It never wounded; thus a Razor set / In a wise Barbers hand tickles the skin, / And leaves a smooth not carbonated chin...His quickening pen did Balsam drop not Inke'.¹³³ The wise barber avoids cutting 'red wounds'. I now want to examine surgery's association with oral and written language in the period to further highlight the divisions I have identified.

'an unnecessary flood of words'

In the previous chapter I explored how sounds associated with surgery could put a label on the practitioner: plain music suited the figure of the temperate, scholarly surgeon while frivolous tunes deprived a surgical context of sobriety and learnedness. Medical tracts frequently instruct surgeons in decorum of speech: unnecessary words are like unnecessary notes. In Ordinances of 1606, The Company's court decrees against the 'multiplyinge of idoll and unnecessary speeches'.¹³⁴ According to advice, surgeons should be economical speakers, they should prioritise the voice of the patient rather than their own, they should prove themselves in deeds rather than in words, and they should not circulate information on case histories or patients as common news. This was a backlash against the medical

¹³² Cf. in the same work, the Poet: 'He that writes / Such Libels (as you call'em) must lanch wide / The fores of men corruptions, and even search / To'th quicke for dead flesh, or for rotten cores: / A Poets Inke can better cure some sores / Than Surgeons Balsum' (D4r).

¹³³ Richard West, 'To the pious Memory of my deare Brother-in-Law Mr Thomas Randolph' in Thomas Randolph, *Poems with Muses Looking-Glasse* (Oxford: 1638), ***3r.

¹³⁴ Barbers' Archive, *Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 33r.

rhetoric of medieval times which, Peregrine Horden argues, gained physicians a reputation of saying more than they did; Horden characterises the ‘success’ of medicine in this period as a ‘placebo effect’ orchestrated through ‘verbal and gestural performance’.¹³⁵ The patient’s voice in the seventeenth century, Françoise Tolet suggests, should be given priority over the practitioner’s: ‘The Chirurgion ought to be Informed from the Patients own mouth, and by those that wait on him, of the secret matters and distempers to which he is subject’.¹³⁶ While an operation for lithotomy (one of the most dangerous and painful of the period) is being prepared, ‘it is fit’, writes Tolet, ‘that the Chirurgion should speak to the Patient, but in few words...because one must be very reserved, to oblige those that are present to be silent and with respect to be attentive’.¹³⁷ Talking can mask the expression of a sick patient and interfere with a surgeon’s ability to diagnose.

Moreover, ‘plain speech’, according to Bicks, ‘was traditionally revered as a virile, effective style’.¹³⁸ Pelling examines the difficulties faced by Physicians in being associated with female communities of healing in a ‘menial, domestic world behind closed doors’ for which, as Kate Giglio explains in her examination of Spenser’s *Mother Hubberds Tale*, story-telling is part of the process in restoring health.¹³⁹ Surgeons’ and Physicians’ relationship to orality is equivocal. Yet throughout the instructions given to the surgeons is also this unspoken message: in order to distance themselves from their counterpart barbers, surgeons should be mindful of the way they talk. This also tied into surgeons’ (and physicians’) need to distance themselves from charlatans and quacksalvers – the phonies of their professions – whose names, as Rhodes explains, derive from words associated with

¹³⁵ Peregrine Horden, ‘Medieval Medicine’ in *History of Medicine*, pp. 40-59 (pp. 42-5).

¹³⁶ Françoise Tolet, *A Treatise of Lithotomy*, trans. A. Lovell (1683), D3r.

¹³⁷ Tolet, G6r.

¹³⁸ Bicks, p. 49.

¹³⁹ Pelling, ‘Compromised by Gender’ in *The Task of Healing*, ed. Hilary Marland and Margaret Pelling (Rotterdam: Erasmus, 1996), pp. 101-133 (p. 109); Kate Giglio, ‘Female Orality and the Healing Arts in Spenser’s *Mother Hubberds Tale*’ in *Oral Traditions and Gender in Early Modern Literary Texts*, ed. Mary Ellen Lamb and Karen Bamford (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 13-24.

oral performance: from ‘ciarlere’, the Italian meaning to chatter or spin a line, and ‘quacken’, the Dutch meaning to prattle.¹⁴⁰ (The term ‘quacksalver’, the yoking of a notion of oral performance with ‘salve’ (ointment), is comparable to the name ‘Motto’, discussed earlier.) William Bullein characterises ‘ignorant, counterfet Chirurgy’ ‘Wyth flattring words, and trim tales, glosinges’ and insists that ‘playne true tales, oughte to bee amonge Men of knowledge, without curious Cyrcumstau[n]ce or Rhetoricall coloures’.¹⁴¹ William Clowes warns of the dangers of surgeons using ‘flattring speeches and sweet words’ to coax patients into risky operations.¹⁴² Tolet insists that ‘[the surgeon] ought to make his prudence appear by making his prognostick, and distinguishing between those things that are ineffectual and perilous, and those things, wherein according to the Rules of his Art he may succeed, without exaggerating the least circumstances...by *an unnecessary flood of words*’ [italics mine].¹⁴³ ‘For if ye be a surgeon, ye know it must be your dedes and not your wordis, that must help hym’, writes Thomas Elyot in his pasquinade on flattery in Henry VIII’s court.¹⁴⁴ The surgeon is set in direct contrast to the figure of the sycophant, associated with barbery.

Insistent upon his surgeon identity and yet exploiting the barbery one with which Nashe has pigeonholed him, the author of *TTN* explains, ‘Now I give not every word their litterall sence, and by that you may see how I presume of your good wit, to see if by my allusions you can picke out the true meaning, but I use a more plaine demonstration’.¹⁴⁵ Lichfield does not become particularly plain in his demonstration, but preserves the allusive, convoluted language that befits a barber persona and his retaliation to Nashe. ‘Plain demonstration’ is his potential to cut up Nashe’s body/text in the formal setting of

¹⁴⁰ Rhodes, ‘Popular Culture’, p. 34.

¹⁴¹ William Bullein, *Bulleins Bulwarke* (1579), 6v, 2v.

¹⁴² William Clowes, *A Prooved Practise* (1588), D1r.

¹⁴³ Tolet, D2v.

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Elyot, *Pasquil the Playne* (1533), D2r.

¹⁴⁵ *TTN*, D3v.

the Barber-Surgeon's hall. Although sometimes incorporating elements of performance (as critics such as Hillary Nunn have argued), this kind of 'Plain demonstration', as I have shown, rarely suits the demands of theatre.¹⁴⁶ William Carroll argues that the characters of *Love's Labour's Lost* learn a principle of decorum in the way to use words, and yet the play's very construction relies on the fact that this decorum is flouted throughout, making it Shakespeare's most Lyly-like play. For a playwright to represent a surgeon who does not flout this decorum, the creative options for language are reduced. And so in *Massacre at Paris*, King Henry's surgeon, told to 'flatter not' (xxii:1222), only has two lines.¹⁴⁷ The surgeon's lack of language *is* his narrative.

In Middleton's *A Fair Quarrel* the surgeon saves the Colonel, who is injured in a duel, and asserts his position as a regular practitioner by declaring that if the Colonel is not fully recovered he may 'be excluded quite out of Surgeon's Hall else' (V.i.394). His reference to 'Surgeon's Hall', rather than to 'Barber-Surgeon's Hall' is interesting given that the name that The Company members hit upon (due to abbreviation – see Introduction) was the latter. By eliminating any barber reference with regard to his professional identity, the surgeon hopes to appear fully fledged in a medical rather than trading capacity. However, this surgeon's efforts to seem regular are undermined by the onslaught of language he uses in IV.ii to explain to the Colonel's sister his chosen remedies. He declares, 'I made [the Colonel] a quadrangular plumption, where I used sanguis draconis...with powders incarnative, which I tempered with oil of hypercon, and other liquors mundificative' (IV.ii.17-20), and he also boasts that he will 'make another experiment on next dressing with a sarcotrick medicament, made of iris of Florence. Thus, mastic, calaphena, opopanax, sacrocolla –' (IV.ii.22-25). Using excessive and inaccessible language in order to seem expert to his listener, the surgeon seems like a bragging barber

¹⁴⁶ See Hillary M. Nunn, *Staging Anatomies* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 195-209.

¹⁴⁷ Marlowe, *The Massacre at Paris* in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1981), I.

(such as Lyly or Stubbes portrays); the Colonel's sister finds puns ('figatives'/'Sacro-halter!' (IV.ii.21/26)) in his speech, undermining his vocabulary. Thomas Randolph uses a similar scenario in *Aristippus* – just as jovial music supplants a serious surgical tone in the play, so too does Medico's unnecessary chatter and boasting. Asking after her brother, the Colonel's sister is disconcerted: 'I'm ne're the better for this answer' (IV.ii.14) she says. Her 'Sacro-halter' (IV.ii.26) interruption insinuates that the surgeon should be bridled, a comparable image to that of the choke pear. The verbally performative surgeon is instantly less surgeon-like and to a contemporary audience appears like a barber.¹⁴⁸ If, as Susan Gossett supposes, the surgeon's 'not thus much' is accompanied with '[*snapping his fingers*]' (IV.i.7) an additional acoustic signifier marks the surgeon's performance. The Colonel's sister asks for the surgeon to speak in 'plain terms' (IV.ii.27) and despairs when he cannot:

What thankless pains does the tongue often take
To make the whole man most ridiculous.
I come to him for comfort, and he tires me
Worse than my sorrow. What a precious good
May be delivered sweetly in few words,
And what a mount of nothing has he cast forth. (IV.ii.36-41)

The Colonel prepares his will seeing little hope. The 'plain' fact he deduces is that he is on his deathbed, and he asks for his sister to 'hear [his will] plain' (IV.ii.71). After the surgeon's muddling words, brother and sister determine to be straight with each other, and the Colonel turns to text (his will), staking his control over his announcement and the material trajectories of his belongings. But the Colonel is not going to die. The surgeon's 'glosinges' have given the wrong impression. Offstage and in silence, the Colonel recovers in the surgeon's care.

¹⁴⁸ The surgeon is not the only medical character in the play to be satirically represented. The Physician abuses his responsibility to protect his patient by making inappropriate advances on Jane and proclaiming her, against the discretion he promised, a whore.

‘abusing confession’

Non-disclosure forms and guarantees of confidentiality are embedded in our contemporary society and inform an entire legal system. In the past, the church offered the population one of the most private forums for self-expression in the form of the confessional box. But the medical world, with its emphasis on the Hippocratic Oath which included a clause about keeping secrets, was also supposed to offer a similar pledge on trust. Today, protection over medical histories is a contested and controversial field, explored, in relation to oral testimonies, by Kate Fisher.¹⁴⁹ The reluctance today of many ethics committees to enable research is, although frustrating for historians, deeply-rooted. For Elyot, some four-hundred years before, the surgeon’s office is ‘The same...office of a good confessour’.¹⁵⁰ Giving advice to physicians, surgeons and apothecaries in the mid-sixteenth century, John Securis displays an acute sense of responsibility: ‘And whatsoever I shal see or heare among my cures (yea although I be not sought nor called to any) whatsoever I shall know amo[n]g the people, if it be not lawful to be uttered, I shal kepe close, and kepe it as a secrete unto my selfe’.¹⁵¹ One type of medical irregularity John Cotta identifies is embodied by the female voice which becomes the centre of his grievances against their involvement in medicine. ‘We may justly here taxe their dangerous whisperings about the sicke’, he writes, and refers to the ‘waving of [their] idle tongues’, their ‘indiscreete words’ and ‘Common & vulgar mouthes’; he warns of the dangers of their ‘Oft and much babling inculcation in the weake braines of the sicke’ and asserts that their ‘faire and pleasing’ comments are often simply ‘dangerous flattery’.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ Kate Fisher, ‘Oral Testimony and the History of Medicine’ in *History of Medicine*, pp. 598-616 (esp. p. 606).

¹⁵⁰ Elyot, D2r.

¹⁵¹ John Securis, *A Detection and Querimonie of the Daily Enormities and Abuses Committed in Physick* (1566), Aiiiiir.

¹⁵² John Cotta, *A Short Discoverie* (1612), E1r-E4r.

Barbers, of course, did not hold the same office as surgeons. In *Epicoene*, Truewit questions Morose, ‘Why, did you ever hope, sir, committing the secrecy of it to a barber, that less than the whole town should know it?’ (III.v.21-22). William Cartwright’s *Ordinary* includes a scene similar to the ones in *Quiet Life* and *Knave in Grain* in which a barber is made to believe that a client needs a special operation (on his genitals) when in fact the client attends on business. Cartwright names the barber character a ‘Chirurgion’. This Chirurgion promises secrecy: ‘D’y’think / I would undo me self by twitting? ’twere / To bring the Gallants all about mine Ears, / And make me mine own Patient. I’m faithfull, / And secret, though a Barber’.¹⁵³ Because the character aligns himself with undependable barber promises of secrecy, his ability to promise discretion under his surgical title is undermined. The stereotype of the garrulous females aligns itself with that of the chatty barber, rendering them both, according to some, unsuitable medical practitioners.

In *The Company*, surgeons specifically were instructed to avoid entering into rumour matches: ‘it is ordayned That no manne of the saide Fellowshippe shall...by slanderous words or other evil device shall disable any of the said Fellowshippe touchinge his Science or connynge...except that his patient himself or his Friendes be agreed [sic] or doe mislyke his Surgeon’.¹⁵⁴ As well as civic business (which members were obliged to keep private), the court might also discuss certain medical cases because surgeons were obliged to alert the Master and Governors of patients who presented severe, life-threatening conditions on whom an operation was required.¹⁵⁵ On 5th August 1600, a case is recorded of a member who breaks the Secrets Act, ‘Where Raphe Pyat was charged by

¹⁵³ William Cartwright, *The Ordinary in Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With Other Poems* (1651), E4v.

¹⁵⁴ Barbers’ Archive, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 3v.

¹⁵⁵ ‘it is ordayned that no...person of the said mysterye shall take any Sicke or hurte p[er]son...to his cure w[hi]ch is in p[er]jill of maym or Dethe But that he shall shoue and present the same sick or hurte p[er]son within three dayes...unto the M[aste]r of the companye...and the said M[aste]r w[ith] his governores shall then go in their owne p[er]sonages or appoynte suche p[er]sons as at their discrecions shall seeme moste conveyent & experte in the said faculty of Surgerye to go with them’ (rules of 1566, *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 5r). It is uncertain how this decree could have been carried out, but evidently the Hall, as a place of learning for the surgeons, was also a centre in which specific patients were discussed. On revealers of secrets, see *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 67v.

John Newsam concerninge the utteringe of some speeches spoken and passed in the election house...which ought not to have byn revealed'.¹⁵⁶ Ironically, while tangled reports about who said what to whom are recorded on this day, no further entry is made on the matter in the minutes and Raphe Pyat either is not charged or the charge is not recorded: the minutes are silent on the matter.

Webster's *Devil's Law-Case* paints a bleak picture of human interaction: secrets, ill-timed disclosures, false counsel, rumour, withheld information, and involuntary truth-telling in the play spin a messy web of unethical conduct. The surgeon characters are central to Webster's conception of sickness in society.¹⁵⁷ Because surgeons are associated with keeping secrets, Webster demonstrates that if they break their moral codes and disclose information they should keep or if they keep secret information that they should share, they can function as unequivocal signs of social deterioration. This differs from barbers' gossiping pastimes which generally provide a variable sense of social mobility and interaction rather than an impression of failed rites. The surgeons are not attentive to their patient, Contarino, and are persuaded – because they expect monetary reward – to let Romelio 'have all privacy' (III.ii.68) with him: Contarino's privacy is a saleable product for them. And their reward from Romelio lies in another form of interference with patient privacy and appropriate lines of communication: they promise to help Romelio amend Contarino's will. Moreover they witness what happens after Romelio stabs Contarino which they have a responsibility to report. But Romelio can, ironically, buy their secrecy – 'purchase the[ir] silence' (III.ii.123) – on the matter: 'Here's your earnest / In a bag of double ducats' (III.ii.125-6), Romelio says. 'You will be secret?', Romelio checks, to which First Surgeon confirms, 'As your soul' (III.ii.132). Their silence, usually a

¹⁵⁶ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 71r.

¹⁵⁷ Kerwin refers to surgery's affiliation with 'broader conflicts of authority within early modern culture' (p. 99). Cf. Lee Bliss, 'Destructive Will and Social Chaos in "The Devil's Law-Case"', *MLR* 72:3 (1977), 513-525: 'Around the central family whirls an assortment of...tainted relationships. In the widest sphere, the comically inverted health-giving functions of medicine and law reflect a deep-seated social malaise' (p. 517).

favourable quality, is in this case unorthodox, particularly as it draws on the connotation of the surgeon as a religious figure with privileged access to the spiritual as well as bodily condition of patients. In III.iii Romelio unwittingly tells Jolenta the truth that their mother was in love with Contarino. But he has no grounds on which to make this claim. Sensing his device, Jolenta demands, 'How came you by this wretched knowledge?' (III.iii.128) to which Romelio, with his corrupt interactions with the surgeons fresh in his mind, answers, 'His surgeon overheard it, / As he did sigh it out to his confessor' (III.iii.129-30). Jolenta's criticism is swift to follow: 'I would have the surgeon hang'd / For abusing confession' (III.iii.132-133), aligning the surgeon's sacred responsibility with that of church members.

Readily adopting their roles in a bribe relationship, the surgeons think of additional ways to ensure a stream of payments from Romelio which will enable them, laughably, to 'grow...lazy surgeon[s]' (III.ii.139). Indeed, Romelio shows he has little faith in the surgeons keeping quiet. He therefore determines that they 'Be wag'd up the East Indies' where, he says, they can 'prate...beyond the line' (III.iii.203-204). The surgeons discover that Contarino is not dead and have a duty to let it be known he lives, but it is at this point that they decide, on their own terms, to 'be secret' (III.ii.158) and 'not blab' (III.ii.162), preaching perversely by their professional code: 'We are tied to't' (III.ii.159) says First Surgeon. Finally, it makes little sense for Contarino to remain disguised once Ercole has revealed himself in IV.ii. But his reserve in this instance is prompted by First Surgeon who advises him to 'Stay' and 'keep in [his] shell / A little longer' (IV.ii.536-537). The final punishment given by Aristo at the conclusion of the play is for the surgeons, 'For concealing Contarino's recovery' (V.v.87).

Plain Dealing for a Fee and Thrift in Being Mute

While scholars have presented arguments for a variety of texts as sources of Philip Massinger's *Emperor of the East*, they agree that the scene between Paulinus, his surgeon, and an empiric in Act 4 is originally contrived and inserted by Massinger; there is, it seems to them, little need to linger on it.¹⁵⁸ Peter Phialas concludes that 'the scene with the empiric and that of the confessions [in the final act] are stage conventions introduced by Massinger for the purposes of producing certain required effects'.¹⁵⁹ However, where others have sidelined IV.III as a stage 'convention', I want to use it to explore Massinger's original treatment of medical satire. His representation of the surgeon is unusual and is in dialogue with the historical advice to surgeons I outline above. Indeed, Massinger's surgeon is a unique example of the representation of a sober, trusted surgeon on the early modern stage who actively separates himself from the world of empirics and takes, during his scene, a central role.¹⁶⁰ Todd Pettigrew argues that 'In the case of the empirics...the vociferous attacks on their practice create a strong narrative conception of the illicit practitioner...Surgeons, unlike most other practitioners, were not subject to the same intensity of attack and, when they were attacked, could defend themselves in print'.¹⁶¹ But this view is simplistic. Surgeons were attacked in popular culture, they could not always defend themselves in print, particularly, as I discuss later, because they published in the vernacular; an empiric only appears in *Emperor* and in one other play of the period, Middleton's *Widow* (see IV.i and IV.ii).

In *Emperor*, the surgeon admits that Paulinus's gout is beyond his cure and that he can do only so much to relieve his patient's discomfort. Soon after, an empiric enters professing that he has cured a host of noble patients and claiming inordinate fees for his

¹⁵⁸ See A. K. McIlwraith, 'Did Massinger Revise *The Emperour of the East*?', *RES* 5:17 (1929), 36-42; Peter G. Phialas, 'The Sources of Massinger's *Emperour of the East*', *PMLA* 65:4 (1950), 473-482; J. E. Gray, 'The Source of *The Emperour of the East*', *RES* 1:2 (1950), 126-135.

¹⁵⁹ Phialas, p. 474.

¹⁶⁰ John Cotta aligns the 'unlearned Surgeon' with empirics (G1v).

¹⁶¹ Todd H. J. Pettigrew, *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), p. 133.

medical services which he says will restore Paulinus to health. After listening to the empiric's lengthy avowal, the surgeon explains to Paulinus that the imposter's proposed (and elaborately expressed) solutions are unsuitable for gout. This scene is not simply a comic interlude – indeed, Phialas suggests that it fails as one. Unlike in *Fair Quarrel*, *Aristippus* and *Corruptions* where the surgeon figures are represented by the authors as boastful, money-driven and prone to using impenetrable language (capable of disarming their patients), and unlike in *Law-Case*, where surgeons appear to be inadequate or in *Mad Lover* where the surgeon is set up to fail (in an impossible task), Massinger makes the surgeon in *Emperor* a respected figure who uses plain terms and resists money-laundering. The playwright achieves this at one level because he stages alongside the surgeon an imposter of the medical world. But more than this, Massinger makes thematic in the scene a notion of verbal decorum, upheld by Chirurgion.

First, the audience learns that Chirurgion has successfully alleviated some of Paulinus's discomfort, despite not being able to cure him: 'I Have done as much as art can doe, to stoppe / The violent course of your fit', he says, and Paulinus confirms that he is now 'At some ease'.¹⁶² That the surgeon has not been able to cure Paulinus is not isolated as a failure: surgical tracts from the period are larded with practitioners' suggestions for relieving gout, but like many of the pharmaceutical methods discussed in the period, the medical practitioners are not equipped with certified ways to help sufferers. Second, Chirurgion is refreshingly realistic in signalling to Paulinus that his 'many bounties' could easily be wasted by continuing to attempt to find a cure. He tells Paulinus, 'If I could cure, / The gout my Lord, without the Philosophers stone / I should soone purchase [it]', indicating that finding a solution (within the limits of his profession) is unlikely and would also be costly. The surgeon prepares Paulinus 'for a certaine truth'; to 'flatter [Paulinus]',

¹⁶² Philip Massinger, *The Emperour of the East* (1632), IIr. All quotations in this paragraph from this play are taken from this sig.

he acknowledges, 'were dishonest', and he will not, as Paulinus observes, 'ling[er] out what is remediesse'. In line with all medical surgical advice, Chirurgion does not employ inaccessible language in conversation with Paulinus, he does not talk at length, and he does not gloss over the medical truths. Paulinus is impressed: 'Your plain dealing / Deserves a fee', he says.

I have argued that for a writer to depict the esteemed surgeon could be a verbal dead-end or simply dull, which it would be here were Massinger not to introduce an empiric against which he depicts the surgeon. Chirurgion is given a position of authority: 'Heare him, my Lord', he says to Paulinus, 'for your mirth; I will take order, / they shall not wrong you' (I1v). The surgeon opens a verbal path in the scene, and becomes a judge of medical language. His self-controlled silence is transposed into a dramaturgically effective strategy, a strategy employed more complexly by Shakespeare, for example, in IV.iii *Love's Labour's Lost*. While the empiric makes a fool of himself with florid speeches (which he says demonstrate his 'plainest language'), Massinger's Chirurgion is not passive: 'Why doe you smile?' asks Paulinus when the empiric is in full flow, and Chirurgion responds, 'When hee hath done I will resolve you' (I2r). His expressions, indicates the script, punctuate the scene's humour in the same way that Biron's, King's and Longueville's asides do in Shakespeare. In reserving judgement, the surgeon's silence allows the empiric to continue talking, and by avoiding aposiopesis, the surgeon does not enter into an oral battle which might compromise his professional status. Chirurgion in this way critiques what would be familiar to an audience as the satirised version of himself. Without forcing a historical point, Massinger's Caroline play bucks a trend and perhaps pays tribute to the fact that surgery was becoming more accepted as a professional discipline, estranged from its barbery roots, later in the seventeenth century. Chirurgion

has the final word on the matter. Of the empiric, he observes, 'Such slaves as this / Render our art contemptible' (I2v).

IV.iii of *Emperor of the East* anticipates the later confessional scene when Theodosius disguises himself as a friar to hear Athenais's (his wife's) confession and determine whether or not she has been unfaithful. The surgeon insisted that to interrupt the empiric were to spoil the potential for 'mirth' in the scene. Indeed, by making Paulinus 'smile' the empiric is 'free[d] from punishment' (I2v). Theodosius, must allow Athenais to complete her speeches so that she also can be freed from punishment. Like the surgeon and the priest, he must pass remarks after the patient/confessor has spoken. The decorum set by the surgeon underpins the opportunity for other characters to entertain (the empiric) and to be heard (Athenais), thus marrying channels of performance in both interlude and central elements of the drama. Phialas is right to acknowledge the connection between these two scenes, but is hasty in his dismissal it.

In Marston's *Wonder of Women*, Gisco is sent by Carthalon from Carthage to poison Massinissa (under Astrubal's supervision). However, unlike Massinger's surgeon whose ability to hold his tongue is a favourable quality, Marston's 'impoisner' (given the title of 'surgeon') is crafty and non-professional seeming in his silence.¹⁶³ First Surgeon in *Law-Case* tells us that the surgeons' silence is not necessarily a mark of their honesty: 'They give us so much for the cure, and twice as much / That we do not blab on't' (III.ii.161-162). The desired characteristic of a surgeon figure is readily transformed into something menacing by making the characteristic either corrupt or extreme. Gisco is not plain speaking, 'his thrift is to be mute' (C1v). A totally silent surgeon-figure (a devil in disguise) appears in the opening dumb show of *Devil's Charter*, using lancets to phlebotomize Alexander's arm in preparation for signing his diabolic contract. While an

¹⁶³ John Marston, *The Wonder of Women* (1606), B4v, C3v. In Marston's list of 'Interlocutores', Gisco is listed as 'A Surgeon of Carthage' (A2v).

extremely chatty barber figure might correspond to tricksters and vagabonds, a fully silent surgeon might embody a threat of a sinister nature. Gisco is not trained to cure, but to kill. Warned by letter of the threat Gisco poses Massinissa advises the surgeon (who is on the verge of dressing, in silence, Massinissa's arm), 'to leave off murder, thy faint breath. / Scarce heaves thy ribs, thy gummy blood-shut eyes / Are sunke a great way in thee, thy lanke skinne / Slides from thy fleshesh veines' (E4v). These silent, 'faint breath[ed]' surgeons are unnatural, 'base...creature[s]' (II.ii.54) whose practices are not explained to the patient-figure. The threat embodied by surgical figures, in *Wonder of Women* made into a visual sign on Gisco's person, is that they could act upon a body unquestioned. Their non-disclosure policy can be protective but it can also be intimidating. Elyot highlights that the surgeon should not be a silent figure simply iconised with his 'playsters and instruments', but that 'somtyme he speketh also' underlining the fact that speech is not necessarily 'unprofitable'.¹⁶⁴

Finding a (Written) Voice

Curators at the Mary Rose Trust recognise the distinction between common barber and eminent surgeon as a matter of the grain of the voice. In the Museum at the Trust in Portsmouth, their reconstruction of the Barber-Surgeon's cabin includes a voice-over, representing the serving Company member. In the first recording, members of the Trust instructed the actor to adopt a swarthy, heavily-accented, fustian voice; the voice, they thought, that would represent an all-purpose tradesman, viewing the name 'Barber-Surgeon' as the label of a mixed professional rather than a civic title. Upon further consideration, the curators rerecorded the exhibition piece. The coarse voice did not reflect the stature of the Barber-Surgeon on board, who was probably an eminent surgeon of the

¹⁶⁴ Elyot, D2r.

period because of his appointment upon Henry VIII's favourite ship.¹⁶⁵ The new voice of the Barber-Surgeon is refined and claims, in its very grain, the authority of a professional, learned practitioner, rather than a tradesman.¹⁶⁶ Sounding right mattered and surgeons had a balancing act to perform in their use of language because of their predominantly unwanted affiliation with barbering and their aspiration to possess similar scholarly credentials to physicians.

Unlike barbers in The Company, all surgeon apprentices were obliged to be able to 'write and read'.¹⁶⁷ Stubbes's criticism that 'Yea, you shall have some [surgeons] that know not a letter of the booke (so farre are they from being learned, or skilful in the toongs, as they ought to be, that shoulde practise these misteries)' distinguishes the unskilled practitioners.¹⁶⁸ Some surgeons in The Company published. But they were not obliged to go to university. One of the places where some surgeons found their voices was in the Anatomy Hall, but even here their expression through verbal discourse could be restricted. Examinations in surgery, like university examinations, would be conducted orally, but this channel of communication was highly-controlled and smacked of the formality of the written word. Lectures in surgery were text-based and in early 1568 court minutes took note of standard practice: a 'doctor [Physician] shall com and take his place to reade and declare upon the parts desected'.¹⁶⁹ In Fletcher's *Monsieur Thomas*, sick Franck says that 'Physitians...meane to reade upon me'.¹⁷⁰ Anatomisations were traditionally not exploratory but 'didactic experience[s]', ritual dominated, and studies of

¹⁶⁵ His identity, despite efforts, has never been found.

¹⁶⁶ With thanks to the curator, Simon Ware, who supplied me with this information.

¹⁶⁷ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 3v. On examinations see clauses in *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 2v, and *Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 30v-31r. NB. Barbers are not mentioned in these orders.

¹⁶⁸ Stubbes, H3r. Cf. Cotta: 'our common and unlearned Surgeons, hav[e] neither letters nor humanity, nor ever [are] acquainted with the dialect and language of the learned' (F2v).

¹⁶⁹ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 24v. The Ordinances of 1606 declare that 'Everie Surgeon [was] to be at Everie Lecture of Surgery' (*Ordinance Book*, A/6/1, 31r). In December 1627, an order declares that no one is to 'interrupt' or 'question the reader' until the end of lecture, preventing any attempt to go off text (*Court Minutes*, B/1/5, p. 70).

¹⁷⁰ Fletcher, *Monsieur Thomas* (1639), F4v.

bodies were most likely to be done in the absence of the public platform and recorded textually.¹⁷¹ In these scenarios, the body becomes a text. Jealous Corvino barks at Celia, ‘I will make thee an anatomy, / Dissect thee mine own self, and read a lecture / Upon thee’ (*Volpone*, II.v.70-72).¹⁷²

The ‘public’ anatomisation was not the practitioner working on the body in any kind of improvisational fashion that he might undertake during operations or private study. Paré tells surgeons that they ‘shalt fare more easily...attaine to the knowledge of [surgical operations] by long use and much exercise, than by much reading of Bookes, or daily hearing of Teachers. For speech how perspicuous...soever it be, cannot vively expresse any thing as that which is subjected to the faithfull eyes and hands.’¹⁷³ The surgeon on display professionally was not like the barber, off-text and freely-expostulating in his shop. And yet the two are comparable in their propensity to recycle information: barbers notoriously spread the news (a regurgitation) and surgeons lectured on the body according to a script (repetition).¹⁷⁴ The trajectories of voices in these two places, however, are different. Whereas in the barber’s shop the practitioner receives, assembles and divests news from outside his walls, surgeons’ Anatomy Hall was a nucleus for information which emanated from within. Indeed, in 1566, the Company funded Thomas Hall, a freeman of surgery in the Mystery, ‘towards his study in Maudlin College in Oxford...for Surgery annexynge physycke there unto And thereby here after to proffett his other brethren beyng of this sayd mystery...by Readyng lectures unto them in [th]e Comon Hall’.¹⁷⁵ Even from an early stage, The Company sought an ‘in house’ representative. The reputations of the practitioners position them very differently in terms of early modern systems of discourse.

¹⁷¹ Carlino, p. 94.

¹⁷² Jonson, *Volpone*, ed. Robert N. Watson, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2003).

¹⁷³ Paré, p. 4.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Horden’s commentary on medical history which ‘has sometimes been diagnosed as liable to ...swallowing and regurgitating its own narrow, self-imposed agenda’ (p. 53).

¹⁷⁵ *Court Minutes*, B/1/2, 14r. Cf. Young p. 187.

Barbers' voices carry across town and are involved in popular social networks, and beards and hair are incorporated into figurative conceptions of speech. Surgeons' voices are tightly controlled, often subverted, often privileged, and do not enter into public pathways of communication. Indeed, the fact that the surgeons barely have a voice on the commercial stage might have reflected the profession's ability to position itself away from a public platform. The 'public' anatomisation – which was probably not as 'public' (certainly not in London) as has previously been made out – might tell its audience something about anatomy, but it did not disclose the practice of surgery, which was not available to the public ear or (as I discussed in the first chapter) eye.¹⁷⁶ Pepys is invited to a public anatomy as a special guest, and nowhere is it suggested that part two of a morbid display at Tyburn was the gathering of the public at Barber-Surgeon's Hall. The surgeon who anatomised corpses performed differently from the surgeon who attended to the living patient.

The identity of the learned, medical practitioner is also a chirographic matter. In *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), John Eliot provides phrases for use in an Apothecary's shop: 'Who prescribed you this receipt?', 'Tis Maister Doctor.' 'What Doctor?' 'Will you know? Know you not the hand?' ('Ne cognoissez vous pas la main?')¹⁷⁷ Securis writes on the importance of the physician's writing:

some...wil rather scribble the[n] write a recept, and will make such dashes and strange abbreviations in theyre billes, that theyre writing semeth rather to be arabicke...I fear me that they that write so, are ashamed of their owne occupation, and feare leaste that if they should write playne, their errorrs and faults shoulde be espied. He that is a playne man will deale playnelye, will speake splaynely, and write playnely.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ See Florike Egmond, 'Execution, Dissection, Pain and Infamy' in *Bodily Extremities*, ed. Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 92-93. Egmond finds evidence that the lay person might have had a view to anatomisations in other European countries than England. The 'publicity' argument which is the cornerstone in her article works for Tyburn-like crowds but is forced upon her discussion of dissections.

¹⁷⁷ Eliot, L2v-L3r.

¹⁷⁸ Securis, C6v.

He warns against adding ‘dashes’ to and abridging documents: trimming in both senses is not advised. Paré gives examples of writing medical reports ‘in imitation whereof the young Chirurgion may frame others’. The ‘presidents’ Paré provides encourage surgeons to engage critically with his text and also remind the surgeon of their own documents ‘In wittenesse whereof [to] have signed’, or to ‘have put [his] hand and seale’, and to affirm the ‘report with [his] owne hand’.¹⁷⁹ Giving a diagnosis, explains Paré, is a delicate matter, needing ‘considerat[ion]’, ‘ingenious[ness]’, ‘wis[dom]’ and ‘judgement’, and writing suits its measured expression. But this expression is not simply formulaic. Paré’s reference to ‘making or framing’ suggests to the surgeon that writing is another craft.¹⁸⁰ Unlike in *Securis*’s limiting instruction, Paré hints at a creative streak which incorporates notions of composition, such as those I examined in reference to *TTN*. When in *Epicoene* La Foole says of Daw’s writing set (his ‘pen and ink’ (V.i.9)) that ‘he has his box of instruments’ (V.i.14), Clerimont responds, ‘Like a surgeon!’ (V.i.15). Clerimont’s quip not only uses the surgeon’s instrument-rich tool kit to conceptualise a box of items, but also underlines the fact that writing instruments and surgical tools have the potential to inscribe and create (Mavis wants to ‘write out a riddle’ (V.i.10)). The opening dumb show in *Devil’s Charter* also makes visible the connection between surgical tools (lancets) and Alexander’s ability to sign a contract. Indeed, the *OED* cites from the mid-sixteenth century the use of the verb, to lance, as ‘to make a dash or stroke with a pen’.¹⁸¹ In *Return From Parnassus*, Ingenioso remarks upon Juvenall’s writing, analogising surgical lancing and satirical inscription:

...thy jerking hand is good,
 Not gently laying on, but fetching blood;
 So, surgeon-like, thou dost with cutting heale,
 Where nought but lanching can the wound avayle.

¹⁷⁹ Paré, pp. 1129-1130.

¹⁸⁰ Paré, p. 1121.

¹⁸¹ *OED*, I†5.intr.

O suffer me, among so many men,
To tread aright the traces of thy pen (I.i.86-91).¹⁸²

By comparison, John Davies characterises poor writing in *A Scourge for Paper-Persecutors* (1625) as verbal incontinence by referring to a different surgical instrument which, as I argued in the first chapter, is usually associated with oral application: ‘making a Glister-pipe of his rare pen’.¹⁸³ This pen threatens to act as a conduit for waste.

Despite this, printing was not necessarily straightforward for surgeons: a limitation on surgical narratives existed beyond the stage. Cornelius Schilander, whose surgical tracts were published in the 1570s and 1590s admits at the beginning of his *Chirurgerie* (1596) that the work ‘was not meant at first, to be published unto the view of the world, but only for [his] owne private practise’.¹⁸⁴ In the same way that the instruments of surgery were fashioned by the individual practitioner in private, so the writings of the surgeons could be concealed and were not collectively manifest. While surgeons and physicians shared similar anxieties about their oral reputations, they were distanced in their reputations as writers. For surgeons, such as Thomas Gale who was a forward thinker at the end of the sixteenth century, even finding a printed voice in the period – to sound against the sceptics of surgery – was not always easy. He writes of his inclination to ‘holde back [his] penne in farther commendynge Chirurgerie’ to his patron, Robert Dudley.¹⁸⁵ In his dedication to Gale at the beginning of Gale’s *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), W. Cunyngham, doctor of physic, asks the author, ‘what kepeth backe the publishing of your iiij books...Doth feare of sycophants and detracting tongues atoyne you? Or the mistrust of severe judgement at the learned, kepe back your honest attempt?’ He advises of surgical

¹⁸² Anon, *The Return from Parnassus* in *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. J. B. Leishman (London: Nicholson & Watson, 1949).

¹⁸³ John Davies, *A Scourge for Paper-Persecutors* (1625), A3v.

¹⁸⁴ Cornelius Schilander, *Cornelius Shilander his Chirurgerie*, trans. by S. Hobbes (1596), A2r.

¹⁸⁵ Thomas Gale, *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (1563), Aiiiv.

works generally, ‘kepe these bookes no lenger in darknes, but let them taste of lyght’.¹⁸⁶ Gale left many manuscripts and half-finished treatises which suggests his on-going struggle with committing his works to print, and the contemporary difficulty for many surgeons to put English surgery on the literary as well as medical map.¹⁸⁷

For surgeons, this meant writing in the vernacular, although this was seen as unlearned in elite circles or at least to have had an unsteady relationship with medical scholasticism which could be, and was, grasped beyond the academies.¹⁸⁸ Despite the fact that a surgeon’s education was officially grounded in Latin, many capable practitioners, it seems, were not fluent. Crooke begins *Mikrokosmographia* with a lengthy address in Latin but concedes in his Preface that crucial tracts in physic have had to be ‘translated’ for surgeons. He goes on to defend himself: ‘Many objections are made against me. First, that being a professed Scholler I should have written in Latine...but it had bin most ydle, my purpose being to better them wo do not so wel understand that language’. Finally, the struggle surgeons faced as writers was not helped by critics such as James Primerose who dismissed their published works:

Hence it is, that whosoever have written any thing of Surgery worthy of praise, from *Hippocaretes*...unto this our age, have been always physicians, except a few late writers, who have presented nothing to us, but what wee had before.¹⁸⁹

Primerose accuses surgeons, the ‘late writers’, of presenting merely recycled knowledge, aligning them with phoney tradesmen who offer little more than a glossy version of something fundamental and, crucially, not original.

¹⁸⁶ Gale, Aiiiir.

¹⁸⁷ Max Satchell, ‘Gale, Thomas (c.1507–1567)’, *DNB*, OUP, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10297>, accessed 21 March 2011].

¹⁸⁸ See Horden, pp. 44–45.

¹⁸⁹ Primerose, *Popular Errours* (1651), p. 39.

**

Critics have established that there is ‘not a simple, hierarchical relationship between orality and literacy’ in early modernity, or in other periods.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, there is no simple divide between speaking and writing, particularly when we think about the production, performance and publication of drama: rather, in Mazzio’s words, there is a ‘crossroads of oral and textual cultures’.¹⁹¹ Early moderns’ representations and critiques of language drew on their attitudes to hair and the body, and, by implication in this thesis, to barbers and surgeons, who were also at a crossroads. In this way they conceptualised the ambiguous relationship between words spoken and written. Barbers’ and surgeons’ relationship to these cultures is markedly different, but it is not a clear-cut case of one only being associated with one culture. As this thesis has demonstrated, compounded and problematic notions of barbering and surgery are pervasive. That said, barbers’ and surgeons’ association with artistic (as well as medical) cultures are, at least idealistically, at odds, enabling writers such as Lichfield to play on the divisions between orality and literacy implicit in the ‘barber-surgeon’.

¹⁹⁰ Rhodes, ‘Popular Culture’, p. 40.

¹⁹¹ Mazzio, *Inarticulate*, p. 167. Also see Stern (pp. 137-158) who traces the stages of theatrical production and discusses the issues of stage and page.

Epilogue: A Necessary Flood of Words

‘Performing Barbers, Surgeons and Barber-Surgeons’ has invited its reader to see double and to see the effects of doubleness as diversely-constructed. Binaries are an implicit part of literary and dramaturgical mechanisms which have shaped countless critical responses to text, and here I have examined a range: the onomastic (the hyphenation of ‘barber-surgeon’), spatial (interconnecting public and private work spaces), material (props such as the basin and chair which signal ambiguous contexts), sonic (the dual phonic and rhetorical effects of the onomatopoeiac ‘snip snap’), theatrical (absence and presence on stage and the differences between structure and content), linguistic (slippery terms such as ‘trim’), theological (rival, secular images of the church), social (medical and civic), and cultural (oral and written domains). The barber-surgeon is a trope in early modern literature because he has a tangible social impact and historical meaning derived from his barbery and surgery roots; but the figure of the barber-surgeon can also be *our* trope in investigating how representation works. He therefore performs in this thesis within and beyond his era.

If, as Robert Weimann argues, ‘the early dramatic figuration of an actor-character thrived on a doubleness in (im)personation’, and that ‘this doubleness...possessed a specific impetus, an impelling force which remarkably vitalized and impinged on the contract between the two roles of any dramatic performance’, then the barber-surgeon adds a further dimension: a character can have an inner opposition, a competing stereotype or convention which also forms a contract and relates to extra-literary conceptions.¹⁹² Weimann asserts that ‘One reason why the personator as compared to the personated looms so large is the former’s own duplicity’, but here we have found the reverse to be

¹⁹² Robert Weimann, ‘The Actor-Character in “Secretly Open” Action’ in *Shakespeare and Character* ed. Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 177-193 (pp. 178-9).

true as well.¹⁹³ The barber-surgeon looms in performance, not only because he embodies a social anxiety, but also because he poses a problem to the writer who draws the character(s)'s duplicity from two cultural banks.

¹⁹³ Weimann, p. 185.

Bibliography

Manuscripts from the archives of the Worshipful Company of Barbers, London

An Act Concerning Barbers and Surgeons to be of One Company (1540), 32 HENRY VIII, A/6/1.

An Act for Making the Surgeons of London and the Barbers of London Two Separate and Distinct Corporations (1745), 18 GEO II, A/6/3.

Charter (1605), 2 JAC I, A/6/1.

Charter (1629), 1 CAR I, A/3/2.

Charter, Act and Ordinance Book (1604-), A/6/1.

Minutes of the Court of Assistants (1551-86), B/1/1.

Minutes of the Court of Assistants (1566-1603), B/1/2.

Minutes of the Court of Assistants (1598-1607), B/1/3.

Minutes of the Court of Assistants (1607-1621), B/1/4.

Minutes of the Court of Assistants (1621-1650/1), B/1/5.

Wardens' Great Accompt Book (1603-1659), D/2/1.

Manuscripts from the Oxford Barbers records, Bodleian: Western Manuscripts Collections

Charter (1675), MSS. Oxford Barbers 1 (31110).

Orders for the Governement of the Company of Barbors of the University of Oxon (1675), MSS. Oxford Barbers 2 (31111).

The Old Order Book (1675-1839), MSS. Oxford Barbers 3 (31112).

The New Order Book, 1777 (1741-1839), MSS. Oxford Barbers 4 (31113).

The Quarterage Book (1680-1747), MSS. Oxford Barbers 8 (31117).

The Book of Accompts (1675-1788), MSS. Oxford Barbers 11 (31120).

The Inroling of Apprentices and Memorandum Book of Exceptional Occurrences (1670-1826), MSS. Oxford Barbers 12 (31121).

Wills from the National Archives, Kew, London

Balthropp, Robert, Saint Bartholomew the Less, City of London (16th December, 1591), PROB 11/78.

Cornish, Richard, Barber Chirurgeon of London and Chirurgeon on the Good Frigate Kent (3rd June, 1667), PROB 11/324.

Dod, William, Freeman of the Company of Barber Surgeon of London (21st June, 1592), PROB 11/80.

Eaton, Henry, Barber Surgeon of London (9th September, 1605), PROB 11/106.

Francke, David, Barber Surgeon of London (18th December, 1589), PROB 11/74.

Gunning, Richard, Dorking, Surrey (21st May, 1677), PROB 11/354.

Kent, James, Barber Surgeon of London (20th June, 1626), PROB 11/149.

Laye, George, New Windsor, Berkshire (7th May, 1684), PROB 11/376.

Lloide, Richarde, Barber Surgeon of London (26th February, 1579), PROB 11/61.

Lombard, Thomas, Barber Surgeon of London (12th November, 1618), PROB 11/132.

Peryn, George, Barber Surgeon of London (20th September, 1633), PROB 11/164.

Piper, Edward, Chirurgeon of Dorking, Surrey (4th November, 1662), PROB 11/309.

Thorowgood, Richard, Chirurgeon of Saint Olave, Southwark, Surrey (16th January, 1671), PROB 11/335.

Vigures, John, Barber Chirurgeon of Saint Margaret Westminster, Middlesex (6th June, 1699), PROB 11/451.

Whitton, George, London (21st July, 1597), PROB 11/90.

Whyte, Charles, City of London (14th February, 1545), PROB 11/30.

Worland, William, Chirurgeon of Dorking, Surrey (20th December, 1690), PROB 11/401.

Inventories from the National Archives, Kew, London

Gunning, Richard, Dorking, Surrey (1677), PROB 4/6693.

Piper, Edward, Dorking, Surrey (1662), PROB 4/3176.

Thorowgood, Richard, Southwark, Surrey (1671), PROB 4/7382.

Tyndall, Stafford, Lambeth, Surrey (1665), PROB 4/7218.

Vigures, John, Westminster, Middlesex (1699), PROB 4/13107.

Worland, William, Dorking, Surrey (1690), PROB 4/2817.

Sources from The Wellcome Collection, London

‘A barber pretending to be David Garrick’ (1788), Record no. 29532i.

‘A barber-surgeon operating on a man’s head; representing the sense of touch’ (16--), Record no. 27127i.

Mrs Corlyon (1606), MS 213.

Jane Baber (c. 1625), MS 108.

Sources from The British Museum, London

‘La Belle Barbierre’ (Cornelis Danckerts II, 1680-1717), Registration No. 1,7.191.

‘A Man Being Shaved’ (Dominico Fetti?, 1604-1624), Registration No. 1116.6

‘Tragedy Burlesqued, or The Barber Turned Actor’ (1785-1790), Satires 7473.

Artifacts from the archives at The Mary Rose Trust, Portsmouth

Clyster Pipe (MR 80 A 1586)

Coifs (MR 80 A 1856 [velvet and silk], MR 80 A 4706 [silk])

Barber-Surgeon’s Chest (MR 80 A 1530 (beech; elm; walnut))

Bleeding Bowl (MR 80 A 1625 [pewter])

Brass/Bronze Syringes (MR 80 A 1560, MR 80 A 1741)

Ear-Scoops (MR, 80 A 1577, 81 A 127, 80 A 1524 [all bone/ivory]).

Elkerton, Andrew (undated), ‘Descriptive Analysis of Samples Related to Barber/Surgeon Chest’ (A1530).

Fleam Wallet (MR 80 A 1564 [leather])

Mortar (MR 80 A 1672 [bronze/tin])

Needle (MR 80 A 1733)

Personal Hygiene [collection of combs, razors and whetstones]

Razor-Case (MR 80 A 1523 [wooden])

Shaving Bowl (MR 80 A 1618 [brass])

Shawm and Case (MR 80 A 0545)

Tabor Pipes (MR 81 A 5846, MR 81 A 3901 [cherry wood])

Production Records from the Shakespeare Centre Library, Stratford-upon-Avon

The Knight of the Burning Pestle, dir. Michael Bogdanov (1981), *Costume Design: Barber's Assistants*, RSC/DE/1/1/1981/KNI1/31.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle, dir. Michael Bogdanov (1981), *Production Prints*, RSC/PR/3/1/1981KNI1.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle, dir. Michael Bogdanov (1981), *First Prompt Book*, RSC/SM/1/1981KN1.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle, dir. Michael Bogdanov (1981), *Rehearsal Prints*, RSC/PR/3/1/1981KNI2.

Lear, dir. Barry Kyle (1983), *Archive Video*, RSC/TS/2/2/1983/LEA1.

Lear, dir. Barry Kyle (1982), *Production Prints*, RSC/PR/3/1/1983/LEA1.

Lear, dir. Barry Kyle (1982), *The First Prompt Book*, RSC/SM/1/1982/LEA1.

Lear, dir. Barry Kyle (1982), *Stage Manager's Reports*, RSC/SM/2/1982/72.

Lear, dir. Barry Kyle (1982), *Production Records*, RSC/SM/2/1982/73.

Online Resources

Cox, Nancy and Karin Dannehl, *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550-1820*, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=739>> (Sponsored by the University of Wolverhampton, 2007).

Limb, Charles, 'Charles Limb: Your Brain on Improv', TEDx Mid Atlantic Presentation (November, 2010).

Primary Materials:

Anon, *A Closet for Ladies and Gentlewomen* (London: 1608), STC 5434.

Anon, 'The Fanaticks Barber or, A New Cut For Non-Conformists' (London: 1655), Wing F401.

Anon, *The True Chronicle History of King Leir, and his Three Daughters* (London: 1605), STC 15343.

Anon, *The Ladies Cabinet Opened* (London: 1639), STC 15119.

Anon, 'The Lamentable and Tragical History of Titus Andronicus' (London: 1658-64 [1661]), Wing L252A.

Anon, 'The Lamentable and Tragical History of *Titus Andronicus*' (London: 1674-1679 [1677]), Wing L252.

Anon, 'A Merry New Catch of all [T]rades' (London: c.1620), STC 4793.

Anon, 'Merry Tom of all Trades' (London: 1681-84), Wing M1874.

Anon, 'The North Countrey-Taylor Caught in a Trap' ([London]: 1641-74), Wing N1290C.

Anon, 'The Northern Ladd: or, The Fair Maids Choice' ([London]: 1670-1696), Wing N1295.

Anon, 'A Pleasant New Song Called The Cony Barber, Or, A Young Ladies Delight' (London: 1680-85 [1683]), Wing P2558.

Anon, 'Poor Tom the Taylor His Lamentation' (London: 1685), Wing P2894.

Anon, *The Returne from Pernassus: or The Scourge of Simony* (London: 1606), STC 19309.

Anon, 'The Rimers New Trimming' (London: [c.1614]), STC 21056.8.

Anon, 'The St. James's Frolick; or, The Barbers Merry Meeting with the Poulterers Buxome Young Wife' (1683-1703[?]), Wing S320A.

Anon, *Temporis Filia Veritas...The Troublsome Travell of Tyme* ([S.I.: s.n]: 1589), STC 23875.

Anon, *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. by J. B. Leishman (London: Nicholson & Watson, 1949).

Anon, *Two Most Unnaturall and Bloodie Murthers* (London: 1605), STC 18288.

Anon, [Thomas Heywood?], *A Warning for Faire Women* (London: 1599), STC 25089.

Anon, 'West-Country Tom Tormented' (London: 1664-1703), Wing W1407A.

Anon, *Mr William Prynne his Defence of Stage-Plays, or A Retractation of a Former Book of his Called Histrio-mastix* (London: 1649), Wing M2278.

Anon, *The Wisdome of Doctor Dodypoll* (London: 1600), STC 6991.

Armin, Robert, *The History of Two Maids of More-Clacke* (London: 1609), STC 773.

Audley, Thomas, *Mercurius Britannicus*, 27 (London: 1644).

Averell, William, *A Dyall for Dainty Darlings* (London: 1584), STC 978.

Awdelay, John, *The Fraternitie of Vacabondes* (London: 1603), STC 994.5.

Bacon, Francis, *Baconiana, or, Certain Genuine Remains of Sr. Francis Bacon* (London: 1679), Wing B269.

Bacon, Francis, *Sylva Sylvarum: or A Naturall Historie* (London: 1627), STC 1168.

Banister, John, *A Needefull, New, and Necessary Treatise of Chirurgerie* (London: 1575), STC 1360.

Barbette, Paul, *Thesaurus Chirurgiae*, trans. out of *Low-Dutch* into *English*, 3 vols (London: 1687), Wing B701.

Barnes [?], *The Treatyse Answeringe the Boke of Berdes* (London: 1541), STC 1465.

Barnes, Barnabe, *The Devil's Charter*, ed. Ronald Brunless McKerrow (London: David Nutt; Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1904).

Barnes, Barnabe, *The Divils Charter* (London: 1607), STC 1466.

Barton, John, *The Art of Rhetorick* (London: 1634), STC 1540.

Beaumont, Francis, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

Beaumont, Francis, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (London: 1613), STC 1674.

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London: 1647), Wing B1581.

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 10 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966-96).

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. George Darley, 2 vols (London: Routledge, 1840).

Blount, Thomas, *Glossographia* (London: 1661), Wing B3335.

Bold, Henry, *Latine Songs With their English* (London: 1685), Wing B3471.

Bond, Edward, *Lear* (London: Methuen, 1983).

Bonham, Thomas, *The Chyrurgians Closet* (London: 1630), STC 3279.

Brome, Richard, *Five New Playes* (London: 1659), Wing B4872.

Brome, Richard, *The Sparagus Garden* (London: 1640), STC 3820.

Bullein, William, *Bulleins Bulwarke of Defence Against All Sicknesse, Soarenesse, and Woundes* (London: 1579), STC 4034.

Bullein, William, *The Government of Health* (London: 1595), STC 4042.

Bulwer, John, *Chirologia: or the Naturall Language of the Hand Whereunto is Added Chironomia: Or, the Art of Manuall Rhetoricke* (London: 1644), Wing B5462A.

Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Holbrook Jackson and William H. Grass (New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001).

Cartwright, William, *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With Other Poems* (London: 1651), Wing C709.

Case, John, *The Praise of Musicke* (Oxford: 1586), STC 20184.

Chandos, Grey Brydges, *A Discourse Against Flatterie* (London: 1611), STC 6906.

Chappell, William, *Popular Music of the Olden Time; a Collection of Ancient Songs, Ballads and Dance Tunes*, 2 vols (London: Cramer, Beale & Chappell, [1859]).

Chapman, George, *Al Fooles* (London: 1605), STC 4963.

Chapman, George, *Eastward Hoe* (London: 1605), STC 4971.

Chapman, George, *The Gentleman Usher* (London: 1606), STC 4978.

Chapman, George, *May-Day* (London: 1611), STC 4980.

Chapman, George, *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman*, ed. Thomas Marc Parrott, 2 vols (London: Routledge; New York: Dutton, 1910-14).

Chapman, George, *The Widdowes Teares* (London: 1612), STC 4994.

Charleton, Walter, *Natural History of Nutrition, Life, and Voluntary Motion* (London: 1659), Wing C3684.

Chettle, Henry, *The Tragedy of Hoffman* (London: 1631), STC 5125.

Chettle, Henry, *The Tragedy of Hoffman*, ed. John Jowett (Nottingham: Nottingham Drama Texts, 1983).

Clowes, William, *A Profitable and Necessary Booke of Observations* (London: 1596), STC 5445.5.

Clowes, William, *A Prooved Practise for All Young Chirurgians* (London: 1588), STC 5444.

Comenius, Johann Amos, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, trans. Charles Hoole (London: 1659), Wing C5523.

A Compendious and Most Marveilous History of the Latter Tymes of the Jewes, trans. Peter Morwen (London: 1558), STC 14795.

Cooke, Jo., *Greenes Tu Quoque, or, The Cittie Gallant* (London: 1614), STC 5673.

Cotta, John, *A Short Discoverie of the Unobserved Dangers of Severall Sorts of Ignorant and Unconsiderate Practisers of Physicke* (London: 1612), STC 5833.

Courtily de Sandras, Gatien, *The Memoirs of the Count de Rochefort* (London: 1696), Wing C6600.

Cox, Robert, *Acteon and Diana...Followed by Several Conceited Humours* (London: 1655), Wing C6711.

Crooke, Helkiah, *Mikrokosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* (London: 1615), STC 6062.

Daborne, Robert, *A Christian Turn'd Turke* (London: 1612), STC 6184.

Davies, John A *Scourge for Paper-Persecutors* (London: 1625), STC 6340.

Davies, William, *A True Relation of the Travailes and Most Miserable Captivitie of William Davies, Barber-Surgion of London* (London: 1614), STC 6365.

Day, John *The Knave in Graine* (London: 1640), STC 6174.

Dekker, Thomas, *Blurt Master-Constable. Or, The Spaniards Night-Walke* (London: 1602), STC 17876.

Dekker, Thomas, *The Guls Horne-Booke* (London: 1609), STC 6500.

- Dekker, Thomas, *Jests to Make You Merie* (London: 1607), STC 6541.
- Dekker, Thomas, *A Knights Conjuring Done in Earnest* (London: 1607), STC 6508.
- Dekker, Thomas, *Lanthorne and Candle-Light* (London: 1609), STC 6486.
- Dekker, Thomas, *A Tragi-Comedy: Called, Match Mee in London* (London: 1631), STC 6529.
- Dekker, Thomas [S. R. initials on t. p., quarto], *The Noble Souldier* (London: 1634), STC 21416.
- Dekker, Thomas, *The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London* (London: 1606), STC 6522.
- Dekker, Thomas, *The Shoemakers Holiday* (London: 1600), STC 6523.
- Dekker, Thomas, *A Strange Horse-Race* (London: 1613), STC 6528.
- Dekker, Thomas, John Ford, William Rowley, *The Witch of Edmonton* (London: 1658), Wing 2097.
- Dionis, Pierre, *A Course of Chirurgical Operations* (London: 1710).
- Donne, John, *John Donne: The Complete English Poems*, ed. by A. J. Smith (London: Penguin, 1996).
- Drayton, Michael, *Poly-Olbion* (London: 1612), STC 7226
- Dupleix, Scipion, *The Resolver; or Curiosities of Nature* (London: 1635), STC 7362.
- Earle, John, *Micro-cosmographie* (London: 1628), STC 7440.2.
- Edwards, Richard, *The Excellent Comedie of the Two Moste Faithfullest Freendes, Damon and Pithias* (London: 1571), STC 7514.
- Egerton, Stephen, *The Boring of the Eare* (London: 1623), STC 7527.5
- Eliot, John, *Ortho-epia Gallica Eliots Fruits for the French* (London: 1593), STC 7574.
- Elyot, Thomas, *Bibliotheca Eliotae* (London: 1542), STC 7659.5.
- Elyot, Thomas, *Pasquil the Playne* (London: 1533), STC 7672.5.
- Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Guy De la Bédaryère (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995).
- Fabricius Hildanus, Wilhelm, *Experiments in Chyrurgerie*, trans. John Steer (London: 1642), Wing F72.
- Field, Nathaniel, *A Woman is a Weather-Cocke* (London: 1612), STC 10854.

Fletcher, John, *Monsieur Thomas* (London: 1639), STC 11071.

Fletcher, Phineas, *The Purple Island, or, The Isle of Man Together* (Cambridge: 1633), STC 11082.5.

Ford, John, *The Fancies, Chast and Noble* (London: 1638), STC 11159.

Ford, John, *The Lovers Melancholy* (London: 1629), STC 11163.

Ford, John, *John Ford: Five Plays*, ed. Havelock Ellis (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957).

Ford, John, *Three Plays: 'Tis Pity She's a Whore / The Broken Heart / Perkin Warbeck*, ed. Keith Sturges (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985).

Ford, John, *The Works of John Ford*, ed. William Gifford, 3 vols (London: James Toovey, 1869).

Foulweather, Adam, *A Wonderful, Strange and Miraculous Astrological Prognostication for This Yeere 1591* (London: 1591), STC 11210.

Fulwell, Ulpian, *Like Will to Like* (London: 1587), STC 11474.

Fulwood, William, *The Enimie of Idlenesse* (London: 1568), STC 11476.

G, T. [Robert Greene and Thomas Goffe?], *The Tragedy of Selimus Emperour of the Turkes* (London: 1638), STC 12310b.

Gale, Thomas, *Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie* (London: 1563), STC 11529.

Geminus, Thomas, 'A Table Instructive Whan and How a Man May Co[n]nyngly Let Bloude' (London: 1546), STC 11718.9.

Gosson, Stephen, *The Schoole of Abuse* (London: 1579), STC 12097.5.

Greene, Robert, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier: or, A Quaint Dispute Between Velvet Breeches and Cloth-Breeches* (London: 1592), STC 12301a.3.

Greene, Robert and Thomas Lodge, *A Looking Glasse, for London and Englande* (London: 1598), STC 16680.

Guillemeau, Jacques, *Child-Birth or, The Happy Deliverie of Women*, trans anon. (London: 1612) STC 12496.

Guillemeau, Jacques, *The Frenche Chirurgerye, or All the Manual Operations of Chirurgerye*, trans. A. M. ([London]: 1598), STC 12498.

Guillemeau, Jacques, *A Worthy Treatise of the Eyes*, trans. into English ([London]: 1587?), STC 12499.

[Guy, Robert] 'A Warning for All Good Fellowes to Take Heede of Punckes Inticements' (London: 1615?), STC 12547.7.

Gyer, Nicholas, *The English Phlebotomy: or, Method and Way of Healing by Letting of Blood* (London: 1592), STC 12561.

Hall, John, *Select Observations on English Bodies*, trans. James Cook (London: 1679), Wing H357.

Harrison, William, *The Difference of Hearers* (London: 1614), STC 12870.

Harsnett, Samuel, *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (London: 1603), STC 12880.

Harvey, William, *An Anatomical Disputation Concerning the Movement of the Heart and Blood in Living Creatures*, trans. Gweneth Whitteridge (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1976).

Harward, Simon, *Harwards Phlebotomy: or, A Treatise of Letting of Bloud* (London, 1601), STC 12922.

Henslowe, Philip, *Henslowe Papers: Being the Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary*, ed. by Walter W. Greg (London: A. H. Bullen, 1907).

Henslowe, Philip, *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Herbert, George, *Outlandish Proverbs* (London: 1640), STC 13182.

Heywood, John, *A Dialogue Conteynyng the Number in Effect of all the Proverbes in the Englishe Tongue* (London: 1546), STC 13291.

Heywood, Thomas, *The Golden Age* (London: 1611), STC 13325.

Heywood, Thomas, *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV*, ed. Richard Rowland (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

Holme, Randle, *Academy of Armory, or, A Storehouse of Armory and Blazon* (Chester: [1688]), Wing H2513.

Holme, Randle, 'The Manuscript of the Third Book of *The Academy of Armory* as it was for the Printing: From Chapter 14 to the End', in *Academy of Armory or A Storehouse of Armory and Blazon*, ed. I. H. Jeaynes, Vol II (London: Roxburghe Club, 1905).

Homer, *The Odyssey*, ed. Robert Squillace, trans. George Herbert Palmer (New York: Barnes and Noble, 2003).

Hoole, Charles, *An Easie Entrance to the Latine Tongue* (London: 1649), Wing H2681.

Hoole, Charles, *Vocabularium Parvum Anglo-Latinum* (London: 1657), Wing H2695.

Huloet, Richard, *Huloets Dictionarie Newelye Corrected* (Oxford: 1572), STC 13941.

Hutton, Henry, *Follie's Anatomie* (London: 1619), STC 14028.

Johnson, Richard, *The Golden Garland* (London, 1620), STC 14674.

Jones, John, *Adrasta: or, The Womans Spleene and Loves Conquest a Tragi-comedie. Never Acted* (London: 1635), STC 14721.

Jonson, Ben, *Bartholmew Fayre / The Divell is an Asse / The Staple of Newes* (London: 1631), STC 14753.5.

Jonson, Ben, *Ben Jonson*, ed. Charles Harold Hertford, Percy E. Simpson and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52).

Jonson, Ben, *Epicoene, or The Silent Woman* (London: 1620), STC 14763.

Jonson, Ben, *Epicoene, or, The Silent Woman*, ed. Richard Dutton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Jonson, Ben, *Epicoene or The Silent Woman*, ed. Roger Holdsworth (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2002).

Jonson, Ben, *Epicoene, or The Silent Woman*, in *Volpone and Other Plays*, ed. Lorna Hutson and Richard Rowland (London; New York: Penguin, 1998).

Jonson, Ben, *Poetaster* (London: 1602), STC 14781.

Jonson, Ben, *The Staple of News*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Jonson, Ben, *The Staple of News*, ed. Devra Rowland Kifer (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).

Jonson, Ben, *Volpone*, ed. Robert N. Watson, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black; New York: WW Norton, 2003).

Jonson, Ben, *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. William Gifford (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Company; New York: J. C. Derby, 1855).

Jonson, Ben, *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson* (London: 1616), STC 14752.

Kirkman, Francis, *The Wits, or, Sport Upon Sport* (London: 1673) [Vol II], Wing W3220.

Kirkman, Francis and Henry Marsh, *The Wits, or Sport Upon Sport* (London: 1672) [Vol I], Wing W3219.

Kunstbüchlin, Jost Amman's, *293 Renaissance Woodcuts for Artists and Illustrators* (New York: Dover Publications, 1968).

Kyd, Thomas, *The Spanish Tragedie* (London: 1592), STC 15086.

Kyd, Thomas, *The Tragedye of Solyman and Perseda* (London: 1592), STC 22894.

Laertius, Diogenes, *The Lives, Opinions, and Remarkable Sayings of the Most Famous Ancient Philosophers* (London: 1688), Wing D1516.

Lichfield, Richard[?], *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe Gentleman* (London: 1597), STC 12906.

Lording, Barry, *Ram-Alley* (London: 1611), STC 1502.

Lowe, Peter, *The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* (London: 1597), STC 16869.5.

Lupton, Thomas, *Siuqila Too Good, To Be True* (London: 1580), STC 16951.5.

Lyly, John, *Midas*, in *Galatea / Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David M. Bevington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 111-259.

Lyly, John, *Midas* [with the songs from the 1632 edition inserted] (London: 1592), STC 17083.

Markham, Gervase, 'The Second Booke' in *Markhams Maister-Peece, or, What Doth a Horse-man Lacke* (London: 1610), STC 17376.5.

Markham, Gervase and William Sampson, *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater With the Death of Faire Marriam* (London: 1622), STC 17401.

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1981).

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Jew of Malta*, ed. James R. Siemon (London: Ernest Benn, 2001).

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Massacre at Paris* (London: 1594), STC 17423.

Marsh, Henry, *The Wits, or, Sport Upon Sport* (London: 1662), Wing 3218.

Marston, John, *Antonios Revenge* (London: 1602), STC 17474.

Marston, John, *Antonio's Revenge*, ed. G. K. Hunter (London: Edward Arnold, 1966).

Marston, John, *The Dutch Courtesan*, ed. David Crane (London: A & C Black; New York: W W Norton, 1997).

Marston, John, *The Dutch Courtezan* (London: 1605), STC 17475.

Marston, John, *The Insatiate Countesse* (London: 1613), STC 17476.

Marston, John, *The Malcontent* (London: 1604), STC 17481.

Marston, John, *The Wonder of Women or The Tragedie of Sophonisba* (London: 1606), STC 17488.

Marston, John, *The Workes of Mr. John Marston* (London: 1633), STC 17471.

Massinger, Philip, *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, ed. Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

Massinger, Philip, *The Emperour of the East* (London: 1632), STC 17636.

Merret, Christopher, *The Accomplisht Physician* (London: 1670), Wing M1835

Middleton, Thomas [and John Webster], *Any Thing for a Quiet Life* (London: 1662), Wing M1979.

Middleton, Thomas, *The Collected Works*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007).

Middleton, Thomas, *A Faire Quarrell* (London: 1617), STC 17911a.

Middleton, Thomas, *A Game at Chaess* (London: 1625), STC 17883.

Middleton, Thomas, *A Mad World, My Masters* (London: 1608), STC 17888.

Middleton, Thomas, *The Mayor of Quinborough* (London: 1661), Wing M1984.

Middleton, Thomas, *The Owles Almanacke* (London: 1618), STC 6515.5.

Middleton, Thomas, *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (London: 1608), STC 22340.

Middleton, Thomas and William Rowley, *A Fair Quarrel*, ed. R. V. Holdsworth, New Mermaid edn (London: Ernest Benn, 1974).

Morel, Pierre, *The Expert Doctors Dispensatory* (London: 1657), Wing M2719.

Morus, Horatius, *Tables of Surgerie*, trans. Richard Caldwell (London: 1585), STC 18204.

Morley, Thomas, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* (London: 1597), STC 18133.

Mulcaster, Richard, *The First Part of the Elementerie* (London: 1582), STC 18250.

Munday, Anthony and others, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. John Jowett, The Arden Shakespeare (London: A & C Black, 2011).

Munday, Anthony and others, *Sir Thomas More*, ed. Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1990).

- Nashe, Thomas, *Christs Teares Over Jerusalem* (1593), STC 18366.
- Nashe, Thomas, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* (London: 1596), STC 18369.
- Nashe, Thomas, *Quaternio or a Fourefold Way to a Happie Life* (London: 1633), STC 18382.
- Nashe, Thomas, *The Terrors of the Night or, A Discourse of Apparitions* (London: 1594), STC 18379.
- Nashe, Thomas, *The Unfortunate Traveller* (London: 1594), STC 18380.
- Norton, Thomas and Thomas Sackville, *The Tragedie of Ferrex and Porrex [Gorboduc]* (London: [1570]), STC 18685.
- Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, trans. Arthur Golding (London, 1567), STC 18956.
- Paré, Ambroise, *The Workes*, trans. Th[omas] Johnson (London: 1634), STC 19189.
- P., M. [Martin Parker], 'The Married-Womans Case' (London: c.1625), STC 19254.5.
- Peele, George, *The Famous Chronicle of Edward the First* (London: 1593), STC 19535.
- Peele, George, *The Old Wives Tale* (London: 1595), STC 19545.
- Peele, George, *Merrie Conceited Jests* (London: 1627), STC 19543.
- Planis Campy, David de., *Phlebotomiographia or, a Treatise of Phlebotomy*, trans. E. W., well-wisher to physick and chirurgery (London: 1658), Wing P2376A.
- Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, trans. Philemon Holland (London: 1603), STC 20063.
- Primerose, James, *Popular Errours. Or the Errours of the People in Physick*, trans. Robert Wittie (London: 1651), Wing P3476.
- P., L. [Laurence Prince], 'Strange and Wonderfull News of a Woman' (London: c.1630), STC 20322.3.
- Procter, Richard Wright, *The Barber's Shop* (Manchester: Thomas Dinham, 1856).
- Prynne, William, *Histrion-Mastix* (London: 1633), STC 20464a.
- Prynne, William, *The Unlovelinesse, of Love-Lockes* (London, 1628), STC 20477.
- Randolph, Thomas, *Aristippus, or, The Joviall Philosopher* (London: 1630), STC 20687.
- Randolph, Thomas, *Poems with Muses Looking-Glasse* (Oxford: 1638), STC 20694.
- Rich, Barnabe, *Greenes Newes Both From Heaven and Hell* (London: 1593), STC 12259.

Rowlands, Samuel, *Humors Looking Glasse* (London: 1608), STC 21386.

Rowlands, Samuel, *The Letting of Humors Blood in the Head-Vaine* (London: 1611), STC 21396.

Rowley, William, *A Search for Money* (London: 1609), STC 21424.

Rüff, Jakob, *The Expert Midwife* (London: 1637), STC 21442.

Fairholt, F. W. (ed.), *Satirical Songs and Poems on Costume*, vol 27 of *Early English Poetry, Ballads and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages*, ed. for the Percy Society, 30 vols (London: Percy Society by C. Richard, 1849).

Schilander, Cornelius, *Cornelius Shilander his Chirurgerie*, trans. S. Hobbes (London: 1596), STC 21817.

Scott, Thomas, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, 2nd edn (Goricom [Gorinchem, i.e. London]: 1624), STC 22103.7.

Scott, Thomas, *The Second Part of Vox Populi*, 2nd edn (Goricom [Gorinchem, i.e. London]: 1624), STC 22104.

Scultetus, Johannes, *The Chyrurgeons Store-House* (London: 1674), Wing S2166.

Securis, John, *A Detection and Querimonie of the Daily Enormities and Abuses Committed in Physick* (London, 1566), STC 22143.

Shakespeare, William, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet: The Texts of 1603 and 1623*, ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006).

Shakespeare, William, *The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster* (1594), STC 26099.

Shakespeare, William, *King Lear*, ed. R. A. Foakes, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Thomas Learning, 1997).

Shakespeare, William, *His True Chronicle Historie of the Life and Death of King Lear and His Three Daughters* (London: 1608), STC 22292.

Shakespeare, Willima, *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir, The Arden Shakespeare (London: A & C Black, 1951).

Shakespeare, William, *The Most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (London, 1594), STC 22328.

Shakespeare, William, *The Most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (London: 1600), STC 22329.

Shakespeare, William, *The Most Lamentable Tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (London: 1611), STC 22330.

Shakespeare, William, *Othello*, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Thomson Learning, 1997).

Shakespeare, William, *The RSC Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2007).

Shakespeare, William, *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. Barbara Hodgdon, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: A & C Black, 2010).

Shakespeare, William and Thomas Middleton, *Timon of Athens*, ed. Anthony B. Dawson and Gretchen E. Minton, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Cengage Learning, 2008).

Shakespeare, William, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Alan Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Shakespeare, William, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Eugene M. Waith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Shakespeare, William, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Routledge, 1995).

Shakespeare, William, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1998).

Shakespeare, William, *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (London: 1623), STC 22273.

Sharpham, Edward, *The Fleire* (London: 1607), STC 22384.

Sherry, Richard, *A Treatise of Schemes & Tropes* (London: 1550), STC 22428.

S., J. [Shirley, John], M. D., *A Short Compendium of Chirurgery* (London: 1678), Wing S3496.

Shirley, James, *The Humorous Courtier* (London: 1640), STC 22447.

Sidney, Philip, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (London: 1590), STC 22539.

Stow, John, *A Survey of London* (London: 1598), STC 23341.

Stow, John and Anthony Munday, *A Survey of London* (London: 1633)

Stubbes, Phillip, *The Anatomie of Abuses* (London: 1583), STC 23376

Stubbes, Phillip, *The Second Part of the Anatomie of Abuses Containing the Display of Corruptions* (London: 1583), STC 23380.

Swinburne, Henry, *A Briefe Treatise of Testaments and Last Willes* (London: 1591), STC 23547.

Taylor, John, *The Praise, of Cleane Linnen* (London, 1624), STC 23787.

Taylor, Thomas, *Peter his Repentance Shewing* (London: 1653), Wing T569.

Thompson, George, *Aimatiasis, or, The True Way of Preserving the Bloud* (London, 1670), Wing T1021.

Tolet, François, *A Treatise of Lithotomy*, trans. A. Lovell (London: 1683), Wing T1775.

Tomkis, Thomas, *Preist the Barbar, Sweetball his Man* in *Collections: Jacobean Academic Plays*, ed. Suzanne Gossett and Thomas L. Berger (Oxford: Malone Society, 1988), XIV.

Ussher, James, *The Annals of the World* (London: 1658), Wing U149.

Vicary, Thomas, *The Englishemens Treasure* (London: 1586), STC 24707.

Vicary, Thomas, *The Surgions Directorie* (London: 1651), Wing V335.

Webster, John, *A Cure for a Cuckold* (London: 1661), Wing W1220.

Webster, John, *The Devils Law-Case* (London: 1623), STC 25173.

Webster, John, *Three Plays: The White Devil; The Duchess of Malfi; The Devil's Law-Case*, ed. D. C. Gunby (London: Penguin, 1972).

Whetstone, George, *The Right Excellent and Famous Historye, of Promos and Cassandra* (London: 1578), STC 25347.

Whitlock, Richard, *Zootomia, or, Observations of the Present Manners of the English* (London: 1654), Wing W2030.

Whitney, Geffrey, *A Choice of Emblemes* (London: 1586), STC 25438.

Wilkins, George, *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage* (London: 1607), STC 25635.

Wilkinson, Robert, *A Jewell for the Eare* (London: 1610), STC 25654.

Woodall, John, *The Surgions Mate* (London: 1617), STC 25962.

Woodall, John, *The Surgeons Mate, or, Military & Domestique Surgery* (London: 1639), STC 25963.

Woodall, John, *The Surgeons Mate or Military & Domestique Surgery* (London: 1655), Wing W3421.

Woodall, John, *Woodalls Viaticum: the Path-way to the Surgions Chest* (London: 1628), STC 25964.

Wright, Thomas, *The Passions of the Minde* (London: 1601), STC 26039.

Secondary Materials

Abecassis, Tally and Claudine Sauvé, *Barbershops* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2005).

Ackroyd, Peter, *London: The Biography* (London: Vintage, 2001).

Ackroyd, Peter, *Shakespeare: The Biography* (London: Vintage, 2006).

Allard, James Robert and Mathew R. Martin (eds.), *Staging Pain, 1580-1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Amussen, Susan Dwyer, 'Punishment, Discipline, and Power: The Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England', *The Journal of British Studies*, 34: 1 (1995), 1-34.

Anderson, David K., 'The Tragedy of Good Friday: Sacrificial Violence in *King Lear*', *English Literary History*, 78: 2 (2011), 259-286.

Andrews, William, *At the Sign of the Barbers' Pole, Studies in Hirsute History* (Cottingham: 1904).

Appadurai, Arjun (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986).

Arab, Ronda A., 'Work, Bodies, and Gender in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 13 (2001), 182-212.

Archer, John Michael, 'Citizens and Aliens as Working Subjects in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*', in *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 37-52.

Ashenburg, Katherine, *Clean: An Unsanitised History of Washing* (London: Profile, 2008).

Backscheider, Paula R. and Timothy Dykstal (eds.), *The Intersections of the Public and Private Spheres in Early Modern England* (London; Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1996).

Bach, Susannah, 'The Barber-Surgeons' Anatomy Theatre: "This frame coagmented for the service of the Soule we have compared to the whole world or universe" (unpublished thesis for diploma in Architecture, Cambridge University, 1999).

Bakhtin, M. M., *Rabelais and his World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984).

Barker, Sheila, 'Poussin, Plague, and Early Modern Medicine', *The Art Bulletin* 86:4 (2004), 659-689.

Barnett, Richard, *Sick City: Two Thousand Years of Life and Death in London* (London: Strange Attractor Press, 2008).

Barrett, William Alexander, *English Glees and Part-Songs: An Inquiry into their Historical Development* (London: Longmans, Green, 1886).

Bate, Jonathan and Russell Jackson (eds.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Shakespeare on Stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Bate, Jonathan, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (London: Picador, 1997).

Beckerman, Bernard, *Dynamics of Drama: Theory and Method of Analysis* (New York: Knopf, 1970).

Beckerman, Bernard, *Shakespeare at the Globe: 1599-1609* (New York: Collier Books; London: Collier-Macmillan, 1962).

Beier, A. L. and Roger Finlay (eds.), *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis* (London: Longman, 1986).

Benbow, Mark, 'Dutton and Goffe versus Broughton: A Disputed Contract for Plays in the 1570s', *REED Newsletter* 6:2 (1981), 3-9.

Berek, Peter, 'The Jew as Renaissance Man', *Renaissance Quarterly* 51:1 (1998), 128-162.

Berger, Thomas L., 'The (Play) Text's the Thing: Teaching the Blinding of Gloucester in *King Lear*', in *Teaching Shakespeare through Performance*, ed. Milla Cozart Riggio (New York: Modern Language Association, 1999), pp. 196-219.

Berger, Thomas L., William C. Bradford, and Sidney L. Sondergard, *An Index of Characters in Early Modern English Drama: Printed Plays 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Berry, Philippa, 'Hamlet's Ear', in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 50: Shakespeare and Language*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 57-64.

Bicks, Caroline, *Midwiving Subjects in Shakespeare's England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Billing, Christian, 'Modelling the Anatomy Theatre and the Indoor Hall Theatre: Dissection on the Stages of Early Modern London', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13: Special Issue (2004), 1-17.

Biow, Douglas, 'Manly Matters: The Theatricality and Sociability of Beards in Giodarno Bruno's *Candelaio* and Sixteenth-Century Italy', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40:2 (2010), 325-346.

Bliss, Lee, 'Destructive Will and Social Chaos in "The Devil's Law-Case"', *The Modern Language Review* 72:3 (1977), 513-525.

Bliss, Lee, "'Plot me no Plots': The Life of Drama and the Drama of Life in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*", *Modern Language Quarterly* 45:1 (1984), 3-21.

Bloom, Gina, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

Bond, R. Warwick, 'Addendum on Lyly's Songs', *The Review of English Studies* 7:28 (1931), 442-447.

Bond, R. Warwick, 'Lyly's Songs', *The Review of English Studies* 6:23 (1930), 295-299.

Boon, George C., '*Tonsor Humanus*: Razor and Toilet-Knife in Antiquity', *Britannia* 22 (1991), 21-32.

Brewster, Paul G., 'Physician and Surgeon as Depicted in 16th and 17th Century English Literature', *Osiris* 14 (1962), 13-32.

Brockbank, W., 'Old Anatomical Theatres and What Took Place Therein', *Medical History* 12:4 (1968), 371-384.

Brody, Alan, *The English Mummings and Their Plays: Traces of Ancient Mystery* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971).

Brooks, Jeanice, 'Music as Erotic Magic in a Renaissance Romance', *Renaissance Quarterly* 60:4 (2007), 1207-1256.

Bruster, Douglas and Robert Weimann, *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama* (London; New York: Routledge, 2004).

Burke, Peter, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3rd edn (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Burn, Ian (ed.), *The Company of Barbers and Surgeons* (London: Farrand Press, 2000).

Burn, Ian (ed.), *Notable Barber Surgeons: Biographies of Barber Surgeons Who Have Distinguished Themselves Both in Medicine and in the Wider World* (London: Farrand Press in association with The Worshipful Company of Barbers, 2008).

Burnett, Mark Thornton, 'Calling "things by their right names": Troping Prostitution, Politics and *The Dutch Courtesan*', in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690*, ed. Gordon McMullan (Basingstoke; London: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 171-188.

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

Butler, Martin, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Butler, Martin, *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Butler, Samuel, *Characters and Passages from Note-Books*, ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908).

Butterworth, Philip, *Magic on the Early English Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Calbi, Maurizio, *Approximate Bodies: Gender and Power in Early Modern Drama and Anatomy* (London; New York: Routledge, 2005).

Calderwood, James, *Shakespearean Metadrama: the Argument of the Play in Titus Andronicus Love's Labour's Lost, Romeo and Juliet, A Midsummer Night's Dream, and Richard II* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

Callaghan, Dymrna, *Shakespeare Without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Calore, Michela, 'Enter Out: Perplexing Signals in Some Elizabethan Stage Directions', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 13 (2001), 117-135.

Capp, Bernard, 'The Double Standard Revisited: Plebeian Women and Male Sexual Reputation in Early Modern England', *Past & Present* 162 (1999), 70-100.

Capp, Bernard, *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Carlino, Andrea, *Books of the Body: Anatomical Ritual and Renaissance Learning*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi (London: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Carlino, Andrea, *Paper Bodies: A Catalogue of Anatomical Figurative Sheets 1538-1687* (London: Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1999).

Carlson, Marvin, *Performance: A Critical Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Carroll, William C., *The Great Feast of Language in Love's Labour's Lost* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

Carson, Neil, *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Cauthen, I. B., Jr, 'Gorboduc, Ferrex and Porrex: The First Two Quartos', *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962), 231-233.

Cavallo, Sandra, *Artisans of the Body in Early Modern Italy: Identities, Families and Masculinities* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2007).

Cavallo, Sandra, 'Health, Beauty and Hygiene', in *At Home in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis (London: V&A Publications, 2006), pp. 174-187.

de Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1984).

Chambers, E. K., *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923).

Chambers, E. K., 'The First Illustration to "Shakespeare"', *The Library*, 4th Ser., 5 (1925), 326-330.

Chillington Rutter, Carol (ed.), *Documents of the Rose Playhouse* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Chillington Rutter, Carol, *Enter the Body: Women and Representation on Shakespeare's Stage* (London; New York: Routledge, 2001).

Clare, Janet, 'Art Made Tongue-Tied By Authority': *Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1990).

Cockayne, Emily, 'Cacophony, or Vile Scrapers on Vile Instruments: Bad Music in Early Modern English Towns', *Urban History* 29:1 (2002), 35-47.

Cockayne, Emily, 'Experiences of the Deaf in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal* 46:3 (2003), 493-510.

Cockayne, Emily, *Hubbub: Filth, Noise & Stench in England, 1600-1770* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2007).

Cohen, Esther, *The Modulated Scream: Pain in Late Medieval Culture* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

Colman, E. A. M., *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare* (London: Longman, 1974).

Cox, John D. and David Scott Kastan (eds.), *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

Cox, Nancy and Karin Dannehl, *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Crockett, Bryan, *The Play of Paradox: Stage and Sermon in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

Crystal, David and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2002).

Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö, *Early Modern English Dialogues: Spoken Interaction as Writing* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Cunnington, Phillis and Catherine Lucas, *Occupational Costume in England: From the Eleventh Century to 1914* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1967).

Daileader, Celia R., *Eroticism on the Renaissance Stage: Transcendence, Desire, and the Limits of the Visible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Davis, Lloyd, *Guise and Disguise: Rhetoric and Characterization in the English Renaissance* (Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

Dent, R. W., *Shakespeare's Proverbial Language: An Index* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1981).

Derrida, Jacques, *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (London: Routledge, 2001).

Dessen, Alan C., *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Dessen, Alan C., *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Dessen, Alan C. and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Dillon, Janette, *The Cambridge Introduction to Early English Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Dillon, Janette, "“Is Not All the World Mile End, Mother?”: The Blackfriars Theater, the City of London and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*”, *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 9 (1997), 127-148.

Dimmock, Matthew, and Andrew Hadfield (eds.), *Literature and Popular Culture in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Dobson, Jessie and Robert Milnes-Walker (eds.), *Barbers and Barber Surgeons of London: A History of the Barbers and Barber-Surgeons' Companies* (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications for the Worshipful Company of Barbers, 1979).

Dooley, Brendan, ed., *The Dissemination of News and the Emergence of Contemporaneity in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Dutton, Richard, *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Dutton, Richard (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Eagleton, Terry, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic* (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

Egmond, Florike, and Robert Zwiijnenberg (eds.), *Bodily Extremities: Preoccupations with the Human Body in Early Modern European Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Evenden, D. A., 'Gender Differences in the Licensing and Practice of Female and Male Surgeons in Early Modern England', *Medical History* 42:2 (1998), 194-216.

Farr, Dorothy, M., *John Ford & the Caroline Theatre* (London: Macmillan, 1979).

Fawcett, Mary Laughlin, 'Arms/Words/Tears: Language and the Body in *Titus Andronicus*', *English Literary History* 50:2 (1983), 261-277.

Fineman, Joel, 'Shakespeare's Ear', *Representations* 28 (1989), 6-13.

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

Fisher, Will, 'The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54:1 (2001), 155-187.

Flachmann, Michael, 'Epicoene: A Comic Hell for a Comic Sinner', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984), 131-142.

Flather, Amanda, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society / Boydell Press, 2007).

Foakes, R. A., *Hamlet versus Lear: Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Foakes, R. A., *Illustrations of the English Stage, 1580-1642* (London: Scholar Press, 1985).

Foakes, R. A., *Shakespeare and Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Folkerth, Wes, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002).

Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin, 1977).

Foucault, Michael, 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics*, 16: 1 (1986), 22-27.

Fox, Adam, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

France, Peter, 'Public Theatre and Private Theatre in the Writings of Diderot', *The Modern Language Review* 64:3 (1969), 522-528.

Freeburg, Victor Oscar, *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama: A Study in Stage Tradition* ([New York]: Benjamin Blom, 1965).

Freud, Sigmund, *The Uncanny*, ed. David McLintock and Hugh Haughton (New York; London: Penguin, 2003).

Fumerton, Patricia, *Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

Fumerton, Patricia and Simon Hunt (eds.), *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).

Gardiner, Julie, Michael J. Allen, and Mary Anne Alburger (eds.), *Before the Mast: Life and Death Aboard the Mary Rose* (Portsmouth: Mary Rose Trust, 2005).

Gardiner, Michael, *The Dialogics of Critique: M. M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1992).

Garrioch, David, 'Sounds of the City: The Soundscape of Early Modern European Towns', *Urban History* 30:1 (2003), 5-25.

Gent, Lucy and Nigel Llewellyn (eds.), *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990).

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

Goffman, Erving, 'Response Cries', *Language* 54:4 (1978), 787-815.

Gordon, Andrew and Bernhard Klein (eds.), *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Gordon, D. J., 'Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949), 152-178.

Grantley, Darryll, *London in Early Modern English Drama: Representing the Built Environment* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Gray, J. E., 'The Source of *The Emperour of the East*', *The Review of English Studies* 1:2 (1950), 126-135.

de Grazia, Margreta, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (eds.), *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

de Grazia, Margreta and Stanley Wells (eds.), *The New Companion to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

Greg, W. W., 'The Authorship of the Songs in Lyly's Plays', *The Modern Language Review* 1:1 (1905), 43-52.

Greg, W. W., *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots: Actors' Parts: Prompt Books*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931).

Grell, Ole Peter (ed.), *Paracelsus: The Man and His Reputation, His Ideas and Their Transformation* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

Griffin, Benjamin, 'Nashe's Dedicatees: Beeston and Richard Lichfield', *Notes & Queries*, 44: 1 (1997), 47-9.

Gruber, William, *Offstage Space, Narrative, and the Theatre of the Imagination* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

Gurr, Andrew, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Gurr, Andrew, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Gurr, Andrew, *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company 1594-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Gurr, Andrew and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging Shakespeare's Theatres*, Oxford Shakespeare Topics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Hachmeister, Jorge, E., 'An Abbreviated History of the Ear: From Renaissance to Present', *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine* 76 (2003), 81-86.

Hallahan, Huston D., 'Silence, Eloquence, and Chatter in Jonson's *Epicoene*', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 40:2 (1977), 117-127.

Hall, Edith and Stephe Harrop (eds.), *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice* (London: Duckworth, 2010).

Hamilton, A. C. (ed.), *The Spenser Encyclopedia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: Routledge, 1990).

Hamilton, Carolyn et al, *Refiguring the Archive* (Cape Town, South Africa: David Philip; Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002).

Hamling, Tara and Catherine Richardson (eds.), *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Hansen, Julie V., 'Resurrecting Death: Anatomical Art in the Cabinet of Dr. Frederik Ruysch', *The Art Bulletin* 78:4 (1996), 663-679.

Hansen, Julie V. and Suzanne Porter, *The Physician's Art: Representations of Art and Medicine* (North Carolina: Duke University Medical Center Library and Duke University Museum of Art, 1999).

Hanson, Elizabeth, 'There's Meat and Money Too: Rich Widows and Allegories of Wealth in Jacobean City Comedy', *English Literary History* 72:1 (2005), 209-238.

Hard, Frederic, 'Notes on John Eliot and his *Ortho-epia Gallica*', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 1:2 (1938), 169-187.

Harkness, Deborah E., 'A View from the Streets: Women and Medical Work in Elizabethan London', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 81:1 (2008), 52-85.

Harp, Richard and Stanley Stewart (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).

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

Harris, Jonathan Gil and Natasha Korda (eds.), *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Hart, Gerald David, *Asclepius: The God of Medicine* (London: Royal Society of Medicine, 2000).

Harvey, Elizabeth D., 'Anatomies of Rapture: Clitoral Politics/Medical Blazons', *Signs* 27:2 (2002), 315-346.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. (ed.), *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

Hattaway, Michael (ed.), *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

Haynes, Jonathan, 'Festivity and the Dramatic Economy of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*', *English Literary History* 51:4 (1984), 645-668.

Hillman, David, *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

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

Hirsh, James (ed.), *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1997).

Hockey, Dorothy C., 'The Trial Pattern in *King Lear*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 10:3 (1959), 389-395.

Hoeniger, David F., *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1992).

Höfele, Andreas, *Stage, Stake, and Scaffold: Humans and Animals in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Holland, Peter and Stephen Orgel (eds.), *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Hope, Jonathan, *Shakespeare and Language: Reason, Eloquence and Artifice in the Renaissance* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010).

Hopkins, D. J., *City/Stage/Globe: Performance and Space in Shakespeare's London* (New York; Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).

Howard, Jean E., 'Crossdressing, The Theatre and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39:4 (1988), 418-440.

Howard, Jean E., 'Figures and Grounds: Shakespeare's Control of Audience Perception and Response', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 20:2 (1980), 185-199.

Howard, Jean E., *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984).

Howard, Jean E., *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994).

Howes, David (ed.), *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader* (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005).

Hubert, Judd D., *Metatheater: The Example of Shakespeare* (Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press, 1991).

Hunt, Tony, *The Medieval Surgery* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992).

Hunter, Lynette and Peter Lichtenfels (eds.), *Shakespeare, Language and the Stage: The Fifth Wall: Approaches to Shakespeare from Criticism, Performance and Theatre Studies* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005).

Jackson, Mark (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of The History of Medicine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Johnson, Bruce, 'Hamlet: Voice, Music, Sound', *Popular Music* 24:2 (2005), 257-267.

Johnston, Mark Albert, 'Bearded Women in Early Modern England', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 47:1 (2007), 1-28.

Johnston, Mark Albert, 'About Face: Performing the Beard in Renaissance Drama' (unpublished MA thesis, Queen's University, Canada, 1999).

Johnston, Mark Albert, 'Playing with the Beard: Courtly and Commercial Economies in Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pithias* and John Lyly's *Midas*', *English Literary History* 72:1 (2005), 79-103.

Johnston, Mark Albert, 'Prosthetic Absence in Ben Jonson's *Epicoene*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholmew Fair*', *English Literary Renaissance* 37:3 (2007), 401-428.

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

Jowitt, Claire, *Voyage Drama and Gender Politics, 1589-1642: Real and Imagined Wolds* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Kaplan, Donald, M., 'Theatre Architecture: A Derivation of the Primal Cavity', *The Drama Review* 12:3 (1968), 105-116.

Karim-Cooper, Farah, *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

Kastan, David Scott (ed.), *A Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

Kastan, David Scott and Peter Stallybrass (eds.), *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama* (New York and London: Routledge, 1991).

Kathman, David, 'Grocers, Goldsmiths, and Drapers: Freeman and Apprentices in the Elizabethan Theater', *Renaissance Quarterly* 55:1 (2004), 1-49.

Katritzky, M. A., *Women, Medicine and Theatre, 1550-1750: Literary Mountebanks and Performing Quacks* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Keller, Eve, *Generating Bodies and Gendered Selves: The Rhetoric of Reproduction in Early Modern England* (Seattle; London: University of Washington Press, 2007).

Kemp, Martin, 'A Drawing for the *Fabrica*; and Some Thoughts Upon the Vesalius Muscle-Men', *Medical History* 14:3 (1970), 277-288.

Kemp, Martin and Marina Wallace, *Spectacular Bodies: The Art and Science of the Human Body from Leonardo to Now* (London: Hayward Gallery; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000).

Kendall, Gillian Murray, "'Lend me thy hand": Metaphor and Mayhem in *Titus Andronicus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40:3 (1989), 299-316.

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

Kiefer, Frederick, *Shakespeare's Visual Theatre: Staging the Personified Characters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Kirschbaum, Leo, 'Shakespeare's Stage Blood and Its Critical Significance', *PMLA* 64:3 (1949), 517-529.

Kisby, Fiona (ed.), *Music and Musicians in Renaissance Cities and Towns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Knight, Katherine, *How Shakespeare Cleaned his Teeth and Cromwell Treated his Warts: Secrets of the 17th Century Medicine Cabinet* (Stroud: Tempus, 2006).

Kocher, Paul H., 'Francis Bacon and His Father', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 21:2 (1958), 133-158.

Kocher, Paul H., 'The Physician as Atheist in Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 10:3 (1947), 229-249.

Kolin, Philip C., *The Elizabethan Stage Doctor* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1975).

Korda, Natasha, 'Household Property/Stage Property: Henslowe as Pawnbroker', *Theatre Journal* 48:2 (1996), 185-195.

Korda, Natasha, *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

Korica, Maja and Eamonn Molloy, 'Making Sense of Professional Identities: Stories of Medical Professionals and New Technologies', *Human Relations* 63:12 (2010), 1879-1901.

Koslow, Julian, 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *English Literary History* 73:1 (2006), 119-159.

Kraye, Jill (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

Lamb, Mary Ellen, and Karen Bamford (eds.), *Oral Traditions and Gender in Early Modern Literary Texts* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

Lambert, George, 'The Barbers Company: A Paper Said Before The British Archeological Association (unpublished paper, Barber-Surgeons' Hall, London, given on Saturday 15th October 1881).

Lancashire, Anne, *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Lane, Joan, *John Hall and his Patients: The Medical Practices of Shakespeare's Son-in-Law* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthday Trust, 1996).

Lanham, Richard A., *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, 2nd edn (Berkeley; Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1991).

Laquer, Thomas, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1992).

Latham, Jacqueline E. M., 'Machiavelli, Policy, and *The Devil's Charter*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984), 97-108.

Leinwand, Theodore B., *Theatre, Finance and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Levin, Richard, 'The Longleat Manuscript and Titus Andronicus', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55:3 (2002), 323-340.

Lindsey, Edwin S., 'The Music of the Songs of Fletcher's Plays', *Studies in Philology* 21:2 (1924), 325-355.

Lopez, Jeremy, *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Lund, Mary Ann, *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading "The Anatomy of Melancholy"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

MacDonald, Helen, *Human Remains: Dissection and its Histories* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Magnusson, Lynne, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Maguire, Laurie, 'Cultural Control in *The Taming of the Shrew*', *Renaissance Drama* 26 (1995), 83-104.

Maguire, Laurie, *Helen of Troy: From Homer to Hollywood* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

Maguire, Laurie, 'Performing Anger: The Anatomy of Abuses in *Troilus and Cressida*', *Renaissance Drama* 31 (2002), 153-183.

Maguire, Laurie, 'Petruccio and the Barber's Shop', *Studies in Bibliography* 51 (1998), 117-126.

Maguire, Laurie, *Shakespeare's Names* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Maguire, Laurie, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The "Bad" Quartos and their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Mangan, Lucy, 'Why I love Japan: raw fish, kitten cafes and clean ears', *The Guardian Weekend Magazine*, 10 July 2010, p. 70.

Marshall, Cynthia, *The Shattering of the Self: Violence, Subjectivity, and Early Modern Texts* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

Marland, Hilary and Margaret Pelling (eds.), *The Task of Healing: Medicine, Religion and Gender in England and the Netherlands, 1450-1800* (Rotterdam: Erasmus, 1996).

Mazzio, Carla, *The Inarticulate Renaissance: Language Trouble in an Age of Eloquence* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

Mazzio, Carla, 'Sins of the Tongue in Early Modern England', *Modern Language Studies* 28:3/4 (1998), 93-124.

McIlwraith, A. K., 'Did Massinger Revise *The Emporour of the East*?', *The Review of English Studies* 5:17 (1929), 36-42.

McKenzie, D. F., 'The Staple of News and the Late Plays', in *A Celebration of Ben Jonson: Paper Presented at the University of Toronto in October 1972*, ed. William Blissett, Julian Patrick and R. W. Van Fossen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 83-128.

McMullan, Gordon (ed.), *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690* (London: Macmillan, 1998).

Miller, Ronald F., 'Dramatic Form and the Dramatic Imagination in Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*', *English Literary Renaissance* 8:1 (1978), 67-84.

Miller, Shannon, 'Consuming Mothers/Consuming Merchants: The Carnavalesque Economy of Jacobean City Comedy', *Modern Language Studies* 26:2/3 (1996), 73-97.

Mincoff, M., 'The Source of "Titus Andronicus"', *Notes & Queries* 18:4 (1971), 131-134.

Moore, John Robert, 'The Songs in Lyly's Plays', *PMLA* 42:3 (1927), 623-640.

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

Morris, David B., *The Culture of Pain* (Berkeley; Oxford: University of California Press, 1991).

Mountford, Roxanne, 'On Gender and Rhetorical Space', *Rhetorical Society Quarterly* 31:1 (2001), 41-71.

Muggli, Mark Z., 'Ben Jonson and the Business of News', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32:2 (1992), 323-340.

Mullaney, Steven, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Ann Arbor: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Nicholl, Charles, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).

Noble, Louise Christine, "And Make Two Pasties of Your Shameful Heads": Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus*, *English Literary History* 70:3 (2003), 677-708.

Nordenfalk, Carl, 'The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985), 1-22.

Northway, Kara, "[H]urt in that service": The Norwich Affray and Early Modern Reactions to Injuries during Dramatic Performances', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 26:4 (2008), 25-52.

Nunn, Hillary M., *Staging Anatomies: Dissection and Spectacle in Early Stuart Tragedy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

O'Malley, Michelle and Evelyn Welch (eds.), *The Material Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002).

Orgel, Stephen, *The Authentic Shakespeare and Other Problems of the Early Modern Stage* (New York; London: Routledge, 2002).

Orgel, Stephen, *Imagining Shakespeare: A History of Texts and Visions* (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

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

Owens, Margaret Ellen, 'Dismemberment and Decapitation on the English Renaissance Stage: Towards a Cultural Semiotics of Violent Spectacle' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 1994).

Palfrey, Simon, *Doing Shakespeare* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2005).

Palfrey, Simon and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Park, Katherine, 'The Criminal and the Saintly Body: Autopsy and Dissection in Renaissance Italy', *Renaissance Quarterly* 47:1 (1994), 1-33.

Park, Katherine, *Secrets of Women: Gender, Generation, and the Organs of Human Dissection* (New York: Zone Books, 2006).

Parker, Patricia, 'Barbers and Barbary: Early Modern Cultural Semantics', *Renaissance Drama* 33 (2005), 201-244.

Parker, Patricia, 'Cutting Both Ways: Bloodletting, Castration/Circumcision, and the "Lancelet" of *The Merchant of Venice*' in *Alternative Shakespeares 3*, ed. Diana E. Henderson (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 95-118.

Parker, Patricia, 'Gender Ideology, Gender Change: The Case of Marie Germain', *Critical Inquiry* 19:2 (1993), 337-364.

Parry, Graham, *Hollar's England: a Mid-Seventeenth Century View* (Salisbury: Russell, 1980).

Paster, Gail Kern, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Paster, Gail Kern, 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).

Pavis, Patrice, 'A Semiotic Approach to *Disparitions*', trans. Marguerite Oerlemans Bunn, in *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of the Theatre* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982), pp. 165-177.

Partridge, Edward B. 'The Allusiveness of *Epicoene*', *English Literary History* 22:2 (1955), 93-107.

Peacock, John, 'Inigo Jones's Stage Architecture and Its Sources', *The Art Bulletin* 64:2 (1982), 195-216.

Pechter, Edward (ed.), *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996).

Pelling, Margaret, 'Apprenticeship, Health and Social Cohesion in Early Modern London', *History Workshop* 37:1 (1994), 33-56.

Pelling, Margaret, *The Common Lot: Sickness, Medical Occupations and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England: Essays* (London: Longman, 1998).

Pelling, Margaret, 'Defensive Tactics: Networking by Female Medical Practitioners in Early Modern London', in *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric*, ed. Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 38-53.

Pelling, Margaret (with Frances White), *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians, and Irregular Practitioners 1550-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003).

Pelling, Margaret, 'Occupational Diversity: Barbersurgeons and the Trades of Norwich, 1550-1640', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 56 (1982), 482-511.

Pettigrew, Todd H. J., *Shakespeare and the Practice of Physic: Medical Narratives on the Early Modern English Stage* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007).

Pettitt, Thomas, 'Customary Drama: Social and Spatial Patterning in Traditional Encounters', *Folk Music Journal*, 7 (1995), 27-42.

Pettitt, Thomas, "'Worn by the friction of time": Oral Tradition and the Generation of the Balladic Narrative Mode', in *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: the European Tradition*, ed. Roy T. Eriksen (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994), pp. 341-372.

Phialas, Peter G., 'The Sources of Massinger's *Emperour of the East*', *PMLA* 65: 4 (1950), 473-482.

Porter, Joseph A., 'More Echoes from Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica*, in *King Lear* and *Henry V*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37:4 (1989), 486-488.

Porter, Roy, *Blood and Guts: A Short History of Medicine* (London: Penguin, 2003).

Porter, Roy (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medicine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Posen, Solomon, *The Doctor in Literature*, 2 vols (Oxford: Radcliffe, 2005).

Postlewait, Thomas and Bruce A. McConachie (eds.), *Interpreting the Theatrical Past: Essays in the Historiography of Performance* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989).

Prest, Wilfrid R. (ed.), *The Professions in Early Modern England* (London; New York: Croom Helm, 1987).

Prioreschi, Plinio, *A History of Medicine: Roman Medicine*, vol 3 (Omaha, NE: Horatius Press, 1998).

Randolph, Marie Claire, 'The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications', *Studies in Philology*, 38:2 (1941), 125-157.

Rey, Roselyne, *The History of Pain*, trans. Louise Elliott Wallace, J. A. Cadden and S. W. Cadden (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1993).

Rhodes, Ernest L., *Henslowe's Rose: The Stage & Staging* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1979).

Rhodes, Neil, *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992).

Richardson, Catherine, *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Early Modern England: The Material Life of the Household* (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2006).

Richardson, Catherine, *Shakespeare and Material Culture*, Oxford Shakespeare Topics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Richardson, Ruth, *Death, Dissection and the Destitute* (London: Routledge, 1987).

Rifkin, Benjamin A., Michael J. Ackerman and Judith Folkenberg, *Human Anatomy: Depicting the Body from Renaissance to Today* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2006).

Riss, Arthur, 'The Belly Politic: Coriolanus and the Revolt of Language', *English Literary History* 59:1 (1992), 53-75.

Roach, Joseph r., *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1993).

Rockwood, Catherine, "'Know Thy Side": Propaganda and Parody in Jonson's *Staple of News*', *English Literary History* 75:1 (2008), 135-149.

Rollins, Hyder E., 'An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London', *Studies in Philology* 21:1 (1924), 1-324.

Rollins, Hyder E., 'The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad', *PMLA* 34:2 (1919), 258-339.

Rowe, Katherine, *Dead Hands: Fictions of Agency, Renaissance to Modern* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999).

Rubin, Miri, *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary* (London: Penguin, 2010).

Rubright, Majorie, 'Going Dutch in London City Comedy: Economies of Sexual and Sacred Exchange in John Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan* (1605)', *English Literary Renaissance* 40:1 (2010), 88-112.

Santesso, Aaron, 'William Hogarth and the Tradition of Sexual Scissors', *Studies in English Literature* 39:3 (1999), 499-521.

Sargent, Ralph M., 'The Source of *Titus Andronicus*', *Studies in Philology* 46:2 (1949), 167-183.

Sawday, Jonathan, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Scarry, Elaine, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Schafer, R. Murray, *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World* (Rochester, Vermont: Destiny Books, 1994).

Schechner, Richard, *Performance Theory* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Schlueter, June, 'Rereading the Peacham Drawing', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50:2 (1999), 171-184.

Scragg, Leah, 'Speaking Pictures: Style and Spectacle in Lylian Comedy', *English Studies*, 86: 4 (2005), 298-311.

Serpieri, Alessandro, 'Reading the Signs: Towards a Semiotics of Shakespearean Drama', trans. Keir Elam, in *Alternative Shakespeare*, ed. John Drakakis, 2nd edn (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 121-146.

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

Sheen, Erica, *Shakespeare and the Institution of Theatre: 'The Best in this Kind'* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Shell, Alison, *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Schoenfeldt, Michael C., *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spencer, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Silverman, Lisa, *Tortured Subjects: Pain, Truth, and the Body in Early Modern France* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

Silvette, Herbert, *The Doctor on the Stage: Medicine and Medical Men in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Francelia Butler (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967).

Slights, William W. E., 'Bodies of Text and Textualized Bodies in *Sejanus* and *Coriolanus*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 5 (1991), 181-193.

Smith, Bruce R., *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Smith, Bruce R., 'Female Impersonation in Early Modern Ballads', in *Women Plays in England, 1500-1600: Beyond the All-Male Stage*, eds. Pamela Allen Brown and Peter Parolin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 284-301.

Smith, Bruce R., *Shakespeare and Masculinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Smith, Emma, and Garrett A. Sullivan Jr. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Smith, Emma (ed.), *Shakespeare's Tragedies* (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

Sofer, Andrew, 'Felt Absences: The Stage Properties of Othello's Handkerchief', *Comparative Drama* 31:3 (1997), 367-393.

Sofer, Andrew, *The Stage Life of Props* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2003).

Spicer, Andrew and Sarah Hamilton, eds., *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Steinberg, Glenn A., “‘You Know the Plot / We Both Agreed On?’: Plot, Self-Consciousness, and *The London Merchant* in Beaumont’s *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*’, *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 5 (1991), 211-224.

Stern, Tiffany, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Stern, Tiffany, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page* (London: Routledge, 2004).

Stern, Tiffany, ‘The Part for Greene’s *Orlando Furioso*: A Source for the “Mock Trial” in Shakespeare’s *Lear*?’, *Notes & Queries* 247 (2002), 229-231.

Stern, Tiffany, *Rehearsal From Shakespeare To Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Stern, Tiffany, “‘You That Walk i’th Galleries”: Standing and Walking in the Galleries of the Globe Theatre’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51:2 (2000), 211-216.

Sternfeld, F. W., ‘Music and Ballads’, *Shakespeare Survey Volume 17: Shakespeare in his Own Age*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 214-222.

Strier, Richard, *Resistant Structures: Particularity, Radicalism, and Renaissance Texts* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1995).

Sullivan, Garrett A., Jr, Patrick Cheney and Andrew Hadfield (eds.), *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Sturdy, Steve (ed.), *Medicine, Health and the Public Sphere in Britain, 1600-2000* (London; New York: Routledge, 2002).

Sugg, Richard, “‘Good Physic but Bad Food’: Early Modern Attitudes to Medicinal Cannibalism and its Suppliers’, *Social History of Medicine* 19:2 (2006), 225-240.

Sugg, Richard, *Murder After Death: Literature and Anatomy in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press; Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2007).

Swartz, Mark, ‘Smells like Prince Hamlet’, *Mississippi Review* 29:3 (2001), 180-183.

Tarlow, Sarah, *Ritual, Belief and the Dead in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Taylor, Gary, *Castration: An Abbreviated History of Western Manhood* (New York; London: Routledge, 2000).

Taylor, Gary, ‘Divine []sences’, in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 54: Shakespeare and Religions*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 13-30.

Taylor, Gary and John Lavanino, *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to The Collected Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007).

Teague, Frances N., *Shakespeare's Speaking Properties* (Lewisburg: Brucknell University Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1991).

Thomas, Duncan P., 'Texts and Documents: Thomas Vicary and the *Anatomie of Mans Body*', *Medical History* 50:2 (2006), 235-246.

Thomson, Leslie, "'As Proper a Woman as Any in Cheap": Women in Shops on the Early Modern Stage', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 16 (2003), 145-161.

Tilley, Morris Palmer, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Michigan: University of Michigan, 1950).

Tomalin, Claire, *Samuel Pepys: The Unequalled Self* (London: Penguin, 2002).

Tomlinson, Rowan Cerys, 'Thinking with Lists in French Vernacular Writing, 1548-1596' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2008).

Truax, Barry, *Acoustic Communication* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2001).

Turner, Victor, *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York: PAJ, 1988).

Turner, Victor, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London: Aldine Transaction, 2009).

Ungerer, Gustav, 'An Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance of *Titus Andronicus*', in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 14: Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (1961), pp. 102-109.

Unwin, George, *The Gilds & Companies of London* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938).

Vaught, Jennifer C. (ed.), *Rhetorics of Bodily Disease and Health in Medieval and Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Walker, Garthine, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Wall, Wendy, *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Walls, Kathryn, 'Absolon as Barber-Surgeon', *The Chaucer Review* 35:4 (2001), 391-398.

Walsh, Martin W., 'Thomas Randolph's *Aristippus* and the English Mummers' Play', *Folklore* 84:2 (1973) 157-159.

Weimann, Robert, 'Textual Authority and Performative Agency: The Uses of Disguise in Shakespeare's Theatre', *New Literary History* 25:4 (1994), 789-808.

Weiss, Allen S. (ed.), *Experimental Sound and Radio* (Cambridge, Mass; London: MIT Press, 2001).

West, Russell, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave, 2002).

West, William N., *Theatres and Encyclopedias in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Wilde, R. M., 'Professionalism and Power in the Surgical Practice of London During the Early Modern Period' (unpublished MA thesis, Open University, 2008).

Wiggins, Martin, *Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time*, Oxford Shakespeare Topics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Williams, Gordon, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols (London; Atlantic Highlands NJ: Athlone, 1994).

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

Williams, R. Grant, 'Disfiguring the Body of Knowledge: Anatomical Discourse and Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*', *English Literary History* 68:3 (2001), 593-613.

Wilson, Richard and Richard Dutton (eds.), *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama* (London; New York: Longman, 1992).

Wiseman, Susan, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Wood, Jeremy, 'Inigo Jones, Italian Art, and the Practice of Drawing', *The Art Bulletin* 74:2 (1992), 247-270.

Woolf, D. R., 'Speech, Text, and Time: The Sense of Hearing and the Sense of the Past in Renaissance England', *Albion* 18:2 (1986), 159-193.

Wyman, A. L., 'The Surgeoness: The Female Practitioner of Surgery, 1400-1800', *Medical History* 28:1 (1984), 22-41.

Yachnin, Paul, *Stage-Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and the Making of Theatrical Value* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997).

Yachnin, Paul and Jessica Slights (eds.), *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Yates, F., 'The Importance of John Eliot's *Ortho-Epia Gallica*', *The Review of English Studies* 7:28 (1931), 419-430.

Young, Sidney, *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, 1890).

Zimmerman, Susan, *The Early Modern Corpse and Shakespeare's Theatre* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).