戲 劇 研 究　　第 17 期
Journal of Theater Studies
2016 年 1 月　　頁129-148
DOI: 10.6257/JOTS.2016.17129

Constructing Deformity in *Richard III* and *The Changeling*[*]

Elyssa Y. CHENG
Associate Professor, Department of Western Languages and Literature,
National University of Kaohsiung

In early modern England, physical deformity was not merely conceptualized in physical, biological terms; it was regarded as "the scourge of God"—as immanent warning of divine judgment and sign of political disaster (Charnes 22-23; Moulton 262-263; Thomas 89-96). The deformed were viewed as "objects of God's wrath" and were intentionally avoided by peasants and villagers (Charnes 24). Based on the belief that there is a correspondence between the body and the soul, Renaissance philosophers such as Francis Bacon and Michel de Montaigne, approached deformity in socially biased terms. For example, in his essay, "Of Deformity," Francis Bacon attributes a whole negative personality profile to the deformed on account of their physical differences:

> Deformed persons are commonly even with nature; for as nature hath done ill by them, so do they by nature; being for the most part, as the Scripture saith, "Void of natural affection," and so they have their revenge of nature. Certain there is a consent between the body and the mind, and where nature erreth in the one, she ventureth in the other….Whosoever has anything fixed in his person that doth induce contempt, hath also a perpetual spur in himself, to rescue and deliver himself from scorn; therefore all deformed persons are extreme bold…. Also it stireth in them industry, … to watch and observe the weakness of others that they may have somewhat to repay.
>
> Again, in their superiors it quencheth jealousy and it layeth their competitors and emulators asleep; as never believing they should be in possibility of advancement, till they see them in possession. So that, upon the matter, in a great wit deformity is an advantage to rising…. they will, if they be of spirit, seek to free themselves from scorn, which must be either by virtue or malice.
>
> (99-100)

臺灣大學學術典藏庫

[*] I am deeply grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments and criticism. I also want to dedicate my greatest thanks to Professor Barbara Bono (Department of English, SUNY at Buffalo), who read and commented on this essay before its submission.

In this quote, Bacon notices that the deformed are usually "void of natural affection" (99). According to Bacon, the deformed consider that nature has done wrong with them by making their bodies malformed, so they have every reason to seek revenge for divine injustices. Believing that a maligned body will house a malign soul, Bacon considers the souls of the deformed distorted and argues that due to their physical abnormality the deformed will become especially bold and audacious. Moreover, he also observes that the deformed will use their misshapen bodies as camouflage to disarm their competitors and climb the social ladder.

Also believing in the correspondence between the body and the soul, Michel de Montaigne in his essay, "Of Physiognomy," starts his discussion by considering the contradiction of Socrates's ugly appearances:

> About Socrates, who was a perfect model in all great qualities, it vexes me that he hit on a body and face so ugly as they say he had, and so incongruous with the beauty of his soul, he who was so madly in love with beauty. Nature did him an injustice. There is nothing more likely than the conformity and relation of the body to the spirit. (809)

In this passage, Montaigne admits that it is hard to apply the principles of physiognomy to Socrates because his beautiful soul does not correspond to his physical ugliness. To cover up this contradiction, Montaigne attempts to focus on what ugliness connotes and argues that there are differences between minor unattractiveness and significant disfigurement:

> This superficial ugliness, which is very imperious for all that, is less prejudicial to the state of the spirit and not very certain in its effect on men's opinion. The other, which is more properly called deformity, is more substantial and more apt to strike home inwardly. (810)

From this argument, we find Montaigne intends to assert that superficial ugliness does not affect the person greatly because it incurs less criticism from others; however, more substantial deformity has impact upon and will affect the soul. Moreover, we can also find that although Montaigne is skeptical of the physiognomical belief of the correspondence of body and soul, he cannot completely drop this supposition. Montaigne's paradoxical inferences suggest that even Montaigne himself does not know how to overleap the theory of physiognomy to fully justify Socrates's beautiful soul within his ugly appearances. Under such contradiction, Montaigne cannot even decide whether we should judge a person by his/her appearances or not. Although Montaigne has some reservation regarding physiognomy, he tries to endorse it by using his real life incident in this essay. By stressing the fact that his gentle appearances can help him escape crisis, he wishes to show that there is still some accuracy in the principles of physiognomy (812-814). All his efforts suggest that even Montaigne has doubt regarding whether we should judge a person by his/her appearances; however, he still considers deformity via the Renaissance communal bias.

In Renaissance drama, such bias toward deformity is reflected most stereotypically in William Shakespeare's dramatization of Richard Gloucester in

Richard III (1592) and his younger colleagues Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's construction of Deflores in *The Changeling* (1622). In a short commentary note on *Richard III* and *The Changeling*, Mark Hutchings observes that there are obvious similarities in "character, plot, and thematic parallels" in these two plays (229). Hutchings claims that Shakespeare and Middleton worked for the same theater company; as colleagues, it is not a surprise for Middleton to borrow Shakespeare's original idea to produce a play of similar plot (230). Although Hutchings's commentary note clearly points out the similarities between both plays, it is too short for him to explore more deeply the social significances of such construction of deformity. In this essay, I attempt to further Hutchings's argument and consider the broader social, political and cultural contexts of Elizabethan and Jacobean England to argue that the staging of deformity perpetuates and helps internalize the oppression of the normalcy toward the deformed and the socially vulnerable. I will first launch my exploration via a close examination of *Richard III* and *The Changeling* and see how the character, plot and thematic parallels between the two plays insinuate the dramatists' representations of the Renaissance communal bias on deformity.

I. Scrutinizing Richard's Deformity in History and Shakespeare *Richard III*

Richard III (1452-1485), the last king of the House of York and the Plantagenet dynasty, was killed by Henry Tudor (Queen Elizabeth's grandfather) at the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485. In Shakespeare's *Richard III*, the last Plantagenet king is portrayed as a physically deformed Machiavellian villain who commits numerous murders in order to pave his way to the throne. Previous literary critics, such as Linda Charnes, Marjorie Garber, and Peter Saccio, have endeavored to unveil Shakespeare's (as well as his contemporary historians') twisted depiction of Richard III. Linda Charnes finds that the real historical Richard III was not as severely handicapped as Shakespeare portrays; however, the playwright dramatizes a physically deformed and mentally sinister Richard to help justify the Tudor legitimacy of their rule. For Charnes, the augmentation of Richard's deformity is deliberately framed political propaganda to help legitimate the Tudor's usurpation of Richard's throne. Charnes also argues that Richard uses all means to obtain the throne in order to use the flawless political body of the monarch to replace his natural deformed body because he understands that his deformed body will be prejudiced (23). In doing so, Richard attempts to let people see what he wants to present himself, rather than what others see him (32).

Marjorie Garber argues that together with his contemporary historians, Shakespeare depicts Richard III as a self-evident villain and presents his misshapen body as a sign of evil and moral depravity (81). Garber points out that there are obvious differences as well as exaggerations and distortions in the adjectives used in

the Tudor historical accounts of Richard III's monstrous birth and physical deformity (such as his prolonged gestation, hunchback, monstrosity, and uneven shoulders). These facts show that Shakespeare's contemporary Tudor historians worked hard to make the last Plantagenet monarch unworthy of the throne. Garber argues, in order to legitimate their rule, the Tudor monarchs built the Tudor myth out of a notoriously evil and severely deformed Richard (86-87). For her, the deformity of Shakespeare's Richard III is presupposed, and this presupposition makes it easier for his audience to connect Richard's deformity with his evil personality traits and also makes it easier for his audience to believe the Tudor nation-building myth (87).

Charnes's and Garber's arguments have been further supported by a recent archeological discovery conducted by the University of Leicester, Leicester City Council, and the Richard III Society. In an essay entitled, "The King in the Car Park," archeological scholars in the University of Leicester claim that Richard III's remains were still interred at the lost site of the former Grey Friars Church, which was demolished during Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries and is currently a parking area for the City Council Social Services (Buckley *et al.* 520). Based on mitochondrial DNA evidence, soil analysis, dental tests, and the comparison of the skeleton with contemporary accounts of Richard's appearance, these archeologists are confirmed that the skeleton they discovered was Richard's. Their archeological discovery reassured that Richard III had adolescent-onset scoliosis (Buckley *et al.* 536). This disability may have lifted Richard's right shoulder higher than his left, but based on an anonymous report entitled, "What the Bones Can and Can't Tell Us," posted on the official website of the University of Leicester on 4 Feb. 2013, these archeologists discovered "there is no sign of a withered arm" on the skeleton. Also, according to another news release from the official website of the University of Dundee, England, Professor Caroline Wilkinson of the University of Dundee conducted a forensic facial reconstruction of Richard III based on the skeleton discovered by the Leicester scholars. Wilkinson's 3D mappings of Richard III's skull show that his face is "warm, young, earnest and rather serious"—"a more pleasant, younger and fuller appearance than period portraits reveals." Wilkinson's reconstruction of Richard's face reveals that the Tudor portrayals of Richard's contorted facial and bodily features were created for political purposes after his death.

In *Shakespeare's English Kings*, Peter Saccio documents that Shakespeare's Richard III is by no means the real historical Richard because he "owes far more to rumor and to the political bias" (158). According to Saccio, Shakespeare and his contemporary Tudor historians invented a twisted myth for Richard to make the last Plantagenet monarch as an incarnation of devil, a blood-thirty murderer whose death was not a further crime:

> The Tudor imagination revelled in Richard III, Archvillain and devil incarnate, he supposedly started his infamous career by lingering sullenly in the womb for two years, finally coming to term with teeth and shoulder-length hair. Having thus discommoded his mother, he murdered his way through the royal

> house, slaughtering his cousin the last Lancastrian king Henry VI, Henry's son Prince Edward, his own brother the duke of Clarence, his nephews the child-king Edward V and Richard duke of York, and finally his wife Anne. He was the bane of his brother Edward IV's wife Elizabeth Woodville and of her relatives; he contrived the judicial murder of Edward's loyal chamberlain Lord Hastings; and he spun his plots whilst seated in a privy. He was the final embodiment of the Plantagenets since Richard II's deposition in 1399. He was a criminal so appalling that his own death was not a further crime requiring still more retribution, but a purgation of all England. After his defeat at Bosworth, the kingdom could rest united and secure under the Tudor dynasty that had conquered him. (157-158)

Saccio discovers that the real historical Richard was far more stable and loyal to King Edward than Clarence, who "had already betrayed Edward once by joining Warwick's revolt" and who continued hatching plans of self-aggrandizement during Edward's reign (167). Instead of plotting Clarence's death at the Tower of London, Richard tried to prevent Clarence's execution in 1478, and when he failed, he held the queen's family relatives (the Woodvilles) responsible for Clarence's death and resented them since after (167). Saccio also finds that while Sir Thomas More and Shakespeare considered Richard's seizure of the crown to be his long-term ambition, Richard's acceptance to the throne rose chiefly out of consideration for his own personal safety (174). According to Saccio, although the Tudor myth propagandized that Richard had long dreamed of the crown, the actual events of April-May 1483 showed a "less masterful and far less wicked Richard" (172). Due to the threat of the Woodvilles, Richard decides that protectorate was not enough.

However, in Shakespeare's *Richard III*,[1] the last Plantagenet king is constructed as a physically deformed and mentally distorted social outcast whose anger is unceasingly aggravated as he sees his own deformity (his shadow under the sun):

> But I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks
> Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass,
> I that am rudely stamped and want love's majesty
> To strut before a wanton ambling nymph,
> I that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
> Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
> Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time
> Into this breathing world scarce half made up—
> And that so lamely and unfashionable
> That dogs bark at me as I halt by them—
> Why, I in this weak piping time of peace

[1] Subsequent citations of *Richard III* are from William Shakespeare, *The Norton Shakespeare*, eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York: Norton, 1997), pp. 507-600.

臺灣大學學術典藏

Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to spy my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity. (1.14-27)

In this famous opening, Shakespeare's theatrical Richard employs various negative adjectives, such as "rudely stamped," "curtailed," "unfinished," "scarce half made up," "lamely," and "unfashionable" to describe his own physical deformity. This symbolic exhibition of Richard's self-denial enhances the playwright's intention to portray the hunchbacked Plantagenet king as a deviant pervert whose congenital disabilities have greatly twisted his mentality and activated a perverse inferiority complex. This representative display of Richard's self-pity as well as self-alienation also establishes him as a social loner who configures himself as an outcast and who considers himself entitled to be a villain due to divine injustices and the discrimination that other social beings impose upon him.

In the play, Richard's unquenchable anger at his deformed body and his attempt to replace his misshapen body with the mystified, flawless monarch's political body is best shown by his wooing of Lady Anne. In this fictitious wooing scene, Richard successfully courts Lady Anne over her father-in-law's coffin. No solid historical evidence is available to explain why Lady Anne made such a choice; while very possibly, she reached this decision due to her political wisdom with regard to self-preservation. In the play, however, Richard goes into a dramatic rapture after Lady Anne accepts his marriage proposal:

Was ever woman in this humour wooed?
Was ever woman in this humour won?
I'll have her, but I will not keep her long.
What, I that killed her husband and his father,
To take her in her heart's extremest hate,
With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes,
The bleeding witness of my hatred by,
Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me,
And I no friends to back my suit withal
But the plain devil and dissembling looks. (1.2.215-224)

This self-intoxicating ecstatic moment helps highlight Richard's sexual perversity curtailed by his physical deformity. Understanding that he wins this widow at her most distressed moment, Shakespeare's villainous Richard does not show the slightest human empathy; instead, he is wildly excited about the fact that he is able to win her with "curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes" (1.2.220). Considering Richard's success in wooing Lady Anne from the perspectives of the medieval political theology of the King's Two Bodies,[2] Linda Charnes argues that Richard's success in wooing Lady

[2] Ernst H. Kantorowicz offers the most comprehensive study of the medieval political theology in his book, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, in which he argues that there is an inseparable correspondence between the king's human body with its eternal,

Anne allows him a chance to demonstrate "how rhetorical success reorganizes bodily subjectivity" (51). Richard's successful courtship shows that language can reconstruct his deformity to help him reassure his bodily agency (Charnes 51). Based on this argument, Charnes further claims that in doing so, Richard attempts to make others see him as he wants to see himself, rather than what his Renaissance contemporaries customarily saw him in his misshapen body (33). Charnes's argument helps us understand Richard's alienation from other social beings as well as his intention to boost his confidence via his reconstruction of his political identity as well as his forcible sexual oppression of a widow.

Aggravated at the fact that he is doomed to be physically inferior to the widow's former husband, Richard transfers and vents his frustration via his forcible sexual conquest of this poor innocent woman. For him, Lady Anne is not deemed as a marriage partner, but a political instrument to be manipulated, and she can be easily disposed of when she is no longer useful. Ian Frederick Moulton considers Richard's deformity an obstacle for him to enjoy the physical pleasure of amorous relationships and argues that Richard uses his ambition for social rising as a displacement for his unfulfilled erotic energy (262-265). Moulton's argument explains why in the wooing scene Richard is totally uninterested in consummating with Lady Anne, but is obsessed with his misshapen body and the potential his deformity can reach after he successfully woos her (1.2.242-250).

Richard's obsession with his misshapen body is not only revealed in his distorted mentality but also in his fierce attack on his political enemies as well as his radical responses to the boy Duke of York's mindless taunting jokes. Enraged at the misrepresentation of him by the queen's relatives, Richard presents himself as a simple, plain man wronged by the insinuations of sly flatterers because flattery is not part of his nature. Although the original purpose of this argument serves to prove himself as a righteous man, his obsession with the courtesies that his deformed body fails to perform brings the audience back to his fixation on deformity and self-inferiority:

> They do me wrong, and I will not endure it.
> Who are they that complain unto the King
> That I forsooth am stern and love them not?
> By holy Paul, they love his grace but lightly
> That fill his ears with such dissentious rumours.
> Because I cannot flatter and look fair,
> Smile in men's faces, smooth, deceive, and cog
> Duck with French nods and apish courtesy,
> I must be held a rancorous enemy. (1.3.42-50)

Here, Richard couples his inability to flatter with his physical ugliness and blames his political enemies for incriminating him simply because his handicapped body cannot

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

unimpeachable, and divine royal body.

perform French nods and apish courtesy as beautifully as they do. And the boy Duke of York's joke in 3.1, also, aggravates Richard's inferiority complex, propelling Richard to interpret the boy's mischievousness much more seriously and metaphorically than he should. Noting that his younger brother's pranks may have offended their uncle, Prince Edward tries to soften the situation: "My lord of York will still be cross in talk.— / Uncle, your grace knows how to bear with him" (3.1.126-127). Still unaware of his offense, the child Duke of York stretches his joke even further: "You mean to bear me, not to bear with me.— / Uncle, my brother mocks both you and me. / Because that I am little like an ape. / He thinks that you should bear me on your shoulders" (3.1.128-131). For Richard, the boy's playful use of "bear," "bear with," and "ape" insinuates that his deformity (especially his hunchback and uneven shoulders) make him look like a working camel, and he suspects that the joke may result from an instruction by the boy's queen mother for the boy to act out. Unable to tolerate the boy Duke of York's mindless joke, Richard immediately sends him and his brother, Prince Edward, to the Tower of London.

As Marjorie Garber observes, Shakespeare followed his contemporary Tudor historians' distortion of history to fashion Richard York's twisted myth (82). Following his contemporary John Rous's *Historia Regium Angliae*,[3] Shakespeare touches upon the story of Richard's prolonged gestation, his premature teeth and his monstrous deformity in the aged Queen Margaret's curses in 1.3 and the young Duke of York's playful joke in 2.4. Historically, this Lancastrian Queen died in 1482, so it is virtually impossible for her to survive and live with the Yorks. However, Shakespeare casts her as a prophetic chorus figure, standing apart but listening attentively to the wrangling of her enemies and interjecting comments on the words of the loyalties. Interrupting Richard's argument with King Edward's wife, Queen Elizabeth, Queen Margaret offers her most scathing comments on Richard's monstrous birth:

> Thou elvish-marked, abortive, rooting hag,
> Thou that wast sealed in thy nativity
> The slave of nature and the son of hell,
> Thou slander of thy heavy mother's womb,
> Thou loathed issue of thy father's loins,
> Thou rag of honour, thou detested— (1.3.225-230)

The aged queen's curses refer to Richard's unnatural birth, especially his birth defects and the rumor that he was born with teeth in his mouth. Her curses suggest that Richard's monstrous birth (especially his birth defects) signals God's warning to the

[3] In *Historia Regium Angliae*, John Rous offered the story of Richard's prolonged gestation, "held for two years in his mother's womb, emerging with teeth, and with hair down to his shoulders," and of his deformity, "small of stature, having a short figure, uneven shoulders, the right being higher than the left." For this quote of Rous's description, see Geoffrey Bullough ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1996), vol. 3, p. 223.

political disasters that he will bring to England. Later in a more domestic scene, the young Duke of York uses Richard's unnatural birth as the source of his family joke with his grandma:

> YORK. Now by my troth, if I had been remembered,
> I could have given my uncle's grace a flout
> To touch his growth, nearer than he touched mine.
> DUCHESS OF YORK.
> How, my young York? I pray thee, let me hear it.
> YORK. Marry, they say my uncle grew so fast
> That he could gnaw a crust at two hours old.
> 'Twas full two years ere I could get a tooth.
> Grannam, this would have been a biting jest. (2.4.23-30)

The boy Duke of York's taunting joke about Richard's legendary prolonged gestation refers to the Renaissance belief that getting teeth early was a sign for villainous disposition and definitely helps enhance Shakespeare's construction of Richard's physical monstrosity.

For Shakespeare's contemporary audiences, Richard III was not yet a distant memory; and, no doubt, dramatizing such a recent historical figure posed some technical difficulties for the playwright. As a dramatist, he had to make Richard monstrously evil in order to justify Henry VII's usurpation of Richard's throne; however, he could not totally negate the admirable traits of King Richard that were still-fresh in his audiences' minds. Shakespeare resolved this dilemma by giving Richard some admirable traits but channeling them into monstrous actions. Richard's dauntless courage and persistence in combating his enemies to the last moment establishes him as a despicable, yet admirable, tragic hero on the Shakespearean stage.

On the eve of Richard's last battle, the Battle of Bosworth Field, Richard seems to have some ill feeling about the impeding war. After the tents are pitched, he first chides Surrey for looking sad, but the earl assures him that his heart is light (5.3.2-3). Then, Richard states philosophically: "Here will I lie tonight. / But where tomorrow? Well, all's one for that" (5.3.7-8). This philosophical statement resembles what Hamlet says to Horatio as he reinstates his determination to accept the duel:

> Not a whit. We defy augury. There's a special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come. If it be not to come, it will be now. If it be not now, yet it will come. The readiness is all. Since no man has aught of what he leaves, what is't to leave betimes? (*Hamlet*, 5.2.157-161)[4]

Same as Hamlet, Richard seems to feel that his death is inevitable. Shakespeare lets his ill feeling lightly cast upon his refusal to have supper and his request for some wine to boost his alacrity in spirit (5.5.1-3, 5.5.25-27). However, Richard's doomsday feeling haunts him in his nightmare in which his narcissistic, self-pitying fantasies alternate

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

[4] This citation of *Hamlet* is also taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*, 1st ed.

with his sentiment of self-denial and self-alienation:

KING RICHARD.
The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
What do I fear? Myself? There's none else by.
Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am.
Then fly! What, from myself? Great reason. Why?
Lest I revenge. Myself upon myself?
Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? For any good
That I myself have done unto myself?
O no, alas, I rather hate myself
For hateful deeds committed by myself.
I am a villain. Yet I lie: I am not.
……
I shall despair. There is no creature loves me,
And if die no soul will pity me.
Nay, wherefore should they?—Since that I myself
Find in myself no pity to myself.

(5.5.134-45; 5.5.154-57)

Three times in this soliloquy he laments not being loved by anybody—"Richard loves Richard," "no creatures loves me," and "All if I die no soul will pity me." The audiences see a villain who is "determined to be a villain" all his life and who uses his deformity as a pretense to justify all his wrong-doings. Even upon facing the accusations and curses of his victims' ghosts, he still insists that he became so villainous due to divine injustices and social oppression. Yet, all his self-justification fails to account for his wrong-doings. Tragically and pathetically, as the congenital deformity he saddles with alone, Shakespeare's Richard also faces his death on the battlefield by himself, crying the most classical line in the play: "A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse" (5.7.7).

II. Transforming Physical Deformity to Social Monstrosity in *The Changeling*

In *The Changeling*, Middleton and Rowley not only incorporate the crooked hunchback, withered arm, uneven shoulders, and even the limp gait of Shakespeare's Richard into the construction of their deformed servant, but they also add rough skin and a hairy, pimply bad face.[5] Different from Richard, Middleton and Rowley's

[5] Robert Jordan notes that the frequent and striking references to rough skin and gross animal

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

hunchbacked servant, Deflores, is the supreme luxury edition of a deformed sexual pervert. Deflores is "so foul one would scarce touch him with a sword he loved" (5.2.15-16) and "so most deadly venomous" that "he would go near to poison any weapon that should draw blood on him" (5.2.17-19).[6] Unlike Shakespeare's Richard, who is despicable and admirable at the same time, Middleton and Rowley inscribe notorious monstrosity as well as Satanic nature into their representation of Deflores. His name, Deflores, suggests that he is a monstrous rapist to deflower a beauty, an embodiment of Satan to destroy the felicity of Eden.[7] Beatrice Joanna considers the very sight of him "a deadly poison" (1.1.107), and wants to avoid him as much as possible. However, despite her bitter scorn, Deflores finds methods to "force errands, frame ways and excuses" "some twenty times a day" in order to see her (2.1.30-31).[8] Unlike Shakespeare's Richard, though evil, yet still carrying majestic and admirable personality traits, Middleton and Rowley's deformed servant is monstrously hideous, demonized, and dreams to transgress his designated social status by sexually possessing his master's daughter.[9] Right from the beginning of the play, Middleton and Rowley endow an enigmatic sexual perversity on Deflores:

> Wilt never mend this scorn,
> One side nor other? Must I be enjoined
> To follow still whilst she flies from me? Well,
> Fates do you worst, I'll please my self with sight
> Of her, at all opportunities,
> If but to spit her anger. I know she had
> Rather see me dead than living, and yet
> She knows no cause for't but a peevish will. (1.1.95-102)

Here, Middleton and Rowley present Deflores as a sexual pervert who will potentially force sex to his master's daughter despite her resistance. However, this impulse to rape

images, such as serpents, toads, and dogs, insinuate Deflores's hideousness (159).

[6] Subsequent citations of the play are taken from *The Changeling* (1653), ed. Michael Neill (New York: Norton, 2006).

[7] Douglas Duncan regards Deflores as a Satanic figure who slithers into Eden to "tempt" Beatrice Joanna to sin (29). Duncan claims that the demonic images Beatrice Joanna applies to Deflores as well as her animosity against him, "show her subconscious dread of him as the polluter of her (sexual) innocence, the destroyer of her (virginal) paradise" (31). J. L. Simmons argues that Beatrice Joanna lost her Eden due to her copulation with the serpent (Deflores) that deflowers her (148).

[8] Mohammad Kowsar notices that Deflores's physical deformity is closely associated with his sexual perversity—the more severely Beatrice Joanna humiliates him, the most sexually arousal he finds (149).

[9] Swapan Chakravorty points out that Middleton and Rowley's representation of Deflores makes his deformity the source of his deviant behavior and his motivation for his sexual and class revenge (151).

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

is best shown in the glove-trying scene where Deflores fantasizes sexual transgression via trying and wearing the glove Beatrice Joanna drops:

> Here's a flavour come—with a mischief! Now I know
> She had rather wear my pelt tanned in a pair
> Of dancing pumps than I should thrust my fingers
> Into her sockets here. [Tries to pull the glove onto his hand]
> I know she hates me,
> Yet cannot choose but love her.
> No matter: if but to vex her, I'll haunt her still,
> Though I get nothing else, I'll have my will. (1.1.224-230)

Like Shakespeare's Richard, Deflores understands that his physical deformity mars amorous courtship; and like Shakespeare's Richard, Deflores transfers his frustration and vents his anger to conquering women, the weaker sex. However, as Mark Thornton Burnett notes, the glove-trying scene does not only insinuate sexual penetration,[10] but also class transgression. Burnett considers Deflores's glove-trying a "metaphorical act of cross-dressing" and encodes "both social and sexual meanings" (299). In his analysis, this symbolic trial implies that the master's daughter and the servant have the potential to exchange clothes with each other, and thus connoting Deflores's destructive potential of class transgression (299-300). I argue that by fashioning their deformed protagonist as ugly, evil, and monstrous, Middleton and Rowley intend to suggest that both Deflores's sexual perversity and social monstrosity originate from his physical deformity.

In the play, as Deflores's sexual desire for Beatrice Joanna grows stronger and stronger, he cannot help but develop into a compulsive stalker. Despite his physical ugliness, he justifies himself as a qualified suitor based on his misfortunate past and social degeneration, "[t]hough my hard fate has thrust me out to servitude, / I tumbled into th'world a gentleman" (2.1.48-49). Although he presents himself as a displaced gentleman forced to servitude due to misfortunes (very possibly by orphanage or disinheritance), he is serving Beatrice Joanna's family, and his desire to court and sexually possess her marks the subversive potential of the servant class to the established social hierarchy. For the audiences, Deflores is not only an avenger of divine and social injustices; he also threatens social stability. In the play, the hidden anxiety for the deformed and the servant class can be clearly marked by the instinctive fear of Beatrice Joanna and the constant suspicion of Alsemero.

Unlike Shakespeare's Richard, who blames his failed courtship on his misshapen body and social discrimination, Deflores recognizes his deformity and physical ugliness but considers his congenital defects on a more comparative grounds,

[10] Antony B. Dawson considers Deflores's symbolic retrieval and trial of Beatrice Joanna's gloves as a sign of his desire to penetrate into her body (99), but Burnett furthers Dawson's point and argues that what Deflores desires is not simply to rape his mistress, but also to seek class revenge (299-300).

thinking that those who are fouler than he is still have chances to approach and be dotted by beautiful women: "I'll despair the less / Because there's daily precedents of bad faces / Beloved beyond all reason; these foul chops / May come into favour one day 'mongst his fellows" (2.1.82-85). However, it is not merely his deformity and foul face that keeps Beatrice Joanna away, but also his inherent evilness. In the play, due to her intuitive fear, Beatrice Joanna constantly orders Deflores to keep out of her sight (2.1.59; 2.1.73-74). This instinctive fear is most obvious before she hires him as her agent to murder her fiancé, Alonzo:

> I never see this fellow, but I think
> Of some harm towards me, danger's in my mind still,
> I scarce leave trembling of an hour after.
> The next good mood I find my father in,
> I'll get him quite discarded. (2.1.89-93)

Her initial avoidance intensifies the unknown fear she has for Deflores, and such intuitive fear is also shared by Alsemero, a new comer to the household, who clearly expresses his hard feeling and constant suspicion to Deflores.

In the play, although Alsemero has never hurled any insults at Deflores, nor displayed any disgust at Deflores's physical deformity, he instinctively feels that this servant is "out of his place" (1.1.135)—an ambiguous phrase pointing to Deflores's disorderliness and potential subversion. Despite the unknown fear buried in the minds of the upper-class characters, Deflores's subversive potential turns into a reality when Beatrice Joanna hires him to be an agent for murder. As she decides to murder her fiancé, Alanzo, in order to marry Alsemero, she takes Deflore's physical deformity and his fondness of her as an instrument to be exploited: "Blood-guiltiness becomes a fouler visage, / And now I think on one…The ugliest creature / Creation framed for some use" (2.2.40-44). For Beatrice Joanna, Deflores's innate deformity is not to be sympathized but to be abused. However, she is shocked by the deformed servant's refusal to take monetary reward. To her astonishment, Deflores does not want money but opts for the pleasure of depriving her virginity and enjoying her body, but this twist definitely highlights Deflores's sexual perversity and subversive potential. Stunned to learn what Deflores covets is not money but her body, Beatrice Joanna realizes that now it is too late to escape the danger. The foul servant explicitly tells her that since both of them are equally dipped in blood, it is not fit that "two, engaged so jointly, should part and live asunder" (3.3.88-89). Mark Thornton Burnett notices that there is another social meaning behind Deflores's refusal to accept monetary award. Not wanting to be labeled a "journeyman in murder" (3.3.69), Deflores asks Beatrice Joanna, "Do you place me in the rank of verminous fellows, / To destroy thing for wages?" (3.3.64-65). These two lines reveal Deflores's firm conviction that he should not be treated as a mere instrument for murder, as a cheap "thing" for demeaning cash transaction; rather, he should be deemed as a "fully fledged 'master' in murder" (302). Deflores's resistance to be called a "journeyman" and his refusal to be an instrument for murder demonstrate that he does not simply want to have sex with his master's

daughter; furthermore, his sexual possession of her illustrates his ambition to transgress his designated social class and subvert the established social hierarchy.

Deflores's sexual perversity and class transgression is shown in the way he fantasizes the pleasure Beatrice Joanna will have when having sex with him: "O my blood! / Methinks I feel her in mine arms already, / Her wanton fingers combing out this bread, / And being pleased, praising this bad face" (2.2.146-149). Unlike Shakespeare's Richard, who courts Lady Anne with rhetorical and diplomatic skills, Middleton and Rowley's Deflores uses rape to force Beatrice Joanne to accept his body—a way to enforce her to accept his ugliness and physical deformity at the same time. However, different from Shakespeare's clear boundary between the deformed and the normalcy, in *The Changeling*, Middleton and Rowley intend to liquidate the boundary between beauty and ugliness, and Beatrice Joanna's flesh trade for the murder of Alanzo artistically serves this twist. Suspicious of his wife's supposed adultery, Alsemero angrily calls Beatrice Joanna "a whore" (5.3.32). Upon hearing the word "whore," Beatrice Joanna immediately understands that her doomsday has arrived: "What a horrid sound it hath! / It blasts a beauty to deformity; / Upon what face soever that breath falls, / It strikes it ugly" (5.3.32-35). She knows that once she loses her virginity, her moral degeneration will mar and cancel her physical beauty, and she will surely lose her newly-wed husband. Unable to sustain Beatrice Joanna's adultery and moral corruption, Alsemero sees her ugliness and deformity through her face, and he condemns both Deflores and his wife—"Oh, thou art all deform'd"! (5.3.78).

Alsemero's severe condemnation on the moral deformity of Beatrice Joanna and Deflores announces the final suicidal attempt of the adulterer and the adulteress. Out of the fear that they are going to be tortured, Deflores stabs himself and Beatrice Joanna to death. For the audience, Alsemero's final comment to the adultery: "Here's beauty changed to ugly whoredom" implies that Beatrice Joanna's moral degeneration propels her to transform from the beautiful into the ugly and eventually into the deformed that were communally disdained in the Renaissance (5.3.97-98). Rather than ending *The Changeling* with a conventional union between the beautiful and the handsome, Middleton and Rowley devise to have the beautiful dying together with the deformed, letting Deflores stab himself and Beatrice Joanne to death in a closet. However, this innovatively tragic ending also connotes a contemporary consensus that an aristocratic beauty should not marry a deformed servant.[11]

In accounting for the amplification of Richard's deformity by Shakespeare as well as his contemporary Tudor historians, Marjorie Garber argues that all history writing is essentially propagandistic because history is always in favor of those who "authorized" writing (33). Yet, the Renaissance communal bias toward the deformed

[11] In arguing so, I actually respond to Simmons's reading of the play. Simmons argues that although the play may seem to be based on the myth of beauty and the beast, but its ending appears to be a bitter reversal. Instead of revealing the beast as a prince, the princess is in fact a beast (165).

臺灣大學學術典藏

was not merely restricted to the defamation of a historical figure such as Richard III. Living in a turbulent time when peasant revolts, apprentices' riots and food riots shook every part of England,[12] Middleton and Rowley inscribed their anxiety toward popular protest as the social monstrosity of a deformed domestic servant. Deflores's physical deformity is decoded as the disorderly social energy of the servant class that threatens to subvert the domination of the employing class. By amplifying and distorting the Renaissance communal bias toward the malformed, these playwrights perpetuate and help internalize the hegemonic power of the normalcy to stigmatize the physical differences of the deformed. Their construction and staging of deformity transfers their anxiety over social disruptions at the cost of displacing social monstrosity on the deformed and marginalizing them into the periphery.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

[12] For socio-historical conditions of peasant revolts, apprentices' riots and food riots in early modern England, see Archer, Manning, Suzuki, Underdown, and Walter and Wrightson.

《理查三世》和《替身》中之殘障建構

鄭月婷

國立高雄大學西洋語文學系副教授

在前現代時期的英國，人們不僅只是用形體和生物學的詞彙來構想肢體的殘障；相反地，殘障被視爲是「上天的懲罰」，是神譴的警告，也是政治災禍的預警。在莎士比亞的《理查三世》（1592）中對於駝背暴君理查三世的描寫和米德頓及羅利合著的《替身》（1622）中對長得像蟾蜍一樣的僕人迪佛洛斯的刻畫，均能夠反映當時的英國人對殘障的典型歧視。莎士比亞筆下內心邪惡、嚴重肢體殘障的理查三世，不僅爲亨利都鐸對理查三世的竄位正名，也成爲都鐸王朝建國神話的政治宣傳。米德頓及羅利戲劇中殘障的僕人迪佛洛斯，正如他的名字所影射的，*僭越了傳統的社會階級，強暴了他主人的女兒；他大膽的性侵和階級僭越展現了十七世紀中葉僕役階級的巨大社會顛覆潛力。這些劇作家企圖用殘障角色的建構和消費來達到娛樂觀眾的效果，但是劇中殘障角色的建構和上演卻使得當時英國社會對殘障和社會弱勢的歧視更加深化和永存。

關鍵字：殘障　《理查三世》　《替身》　都鐸建國神話　階級僭越

* 迪佛洛斯的英文名字，Deflores，相似於英文動詞「破處」（deflower）的念法和拼音，有奪取處女貞操之蘊含。

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Constructing Deformity in *Richard III* and *The Changeling*

Elyssa Y. CHENG
Associate Professor, Department of Western Languages and Literature,
National University of Kaohsiung

In early modern England, physical deformity was not merely conceptualized in physical, biological terms; rather, it was regarded as "the scourge of God"—as immanent warning of divine judgment and sign of political disaster. Such stereotypical bias about physical deformity is reflected most clearly in William Shakespeare's dramatization of the hunchbacked tyrant, Richard Gloucester, in *Richard III* (1592), and Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's construction of the toad-like servant, Deflores, in *The Changeling* (1622). Shakespeare's portrayal of the severely handicapped and mentally sinister Richard III not only helped legitimate Henry Tudor's usurpation of Richard III but also served as political propaganda to consolidate the Tudor nation-building myth. Middleton and Rowley's deformed servant, Deflores, transgresses traditional class boundaries by, true to his name, "deflowering" his master's daughter; his audacious rape and class transgression demonstrate a formidably subversive potential in the mid-seventeenth-century servant class. All these playwrights aimed to entertain the audience via the construction and consumption of deformed figures; however, such staging of deformity perpetuated and helped internalize the oppression of the deformed and the socially vulnerable by figures of normalcy.

Keywords: deformity *Richard III* *The Changeling*
the Tudor nation-building myth class transgression

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Works Cited

Anon. “CAHID and DJCAD Experts Reconstruct Face of Richard III 528 Years after His Death.” *University of Dundee*. 1 Feb. 2013. http://cahid.dundee.ac.uk/news/cahid-and-djcad-experts-reconstruct-face-richard-iii-528-years-after-his-death [accessed 12 January 2016]

_____. “What the Bones Can and Can’t Tell Us.” *University of Leicester*. n. d. http://www.le.ac.uk/richardiii/science/whattheonesdontsay.html . [accessed 7 July 2014]

Archer, Ian W. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Bacon, Francis. “Of Deformity.” *The Essay or Counsels: Civil and Moral*. Ed. and intro. Brian Vickers. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Buckley, Richard, Mathew Morris, Jo Appleby, Turi King, Deirdre O’Sullivan, and Lin Foxhall. “‘The King in the Car Park’: New Light on the Death and Burial of Richard III in the Grey Friars Church, Leicester, in 1485.” *Antiquity* 87 (2013): 355-370.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. *The Changeling* and Masters and Servants.” *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*. Eds. Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., Patrick Cheney, and Andrew Hadfield. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 3. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Chakravorty, Swapan. *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Charnes, Linda. “Belaboring the Obvious: Reading the Monstrous Body in *Richard III*.” *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Dawson, Anthony B. “Giving the Finger: Puns and Transgression in *The Changeling*.” *The Elizabethan Theatre* 12 (1993): 93-112.

Duncan, Douglas. “Virginity in *The Changeling*.” *English Studies in Canada* 9 (1983): 25-52.

Garber, Marjorie. “Descanting on Deformity: *Richard III* and the Shape of History.” *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture.* Ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1988.

Hutchings, Mark. “*Richard III* and *The Changeling*.” *Notes and Queries* 52.2 (2005): 229-230.

Jordan, Robert. “Myth and Psychology in *The Changeling*.” *Renaissance Drama* 3 (1970): 157-165.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kowsar, Mohammad. “Middleton and Rowley’s *The Changeling*: The Besieged Temple.” *Criticism* 28. 2 (1986): 145-164.

Manning, Roger B. *Village Revolt: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

Middleton, Thomas and William Rowley. *The Changeling*. Ed. Michael Neill. New York: Norton, 2006.

Montaigne, Michel de. "Of Physiognomy." *Complete Works of Montaigne: Essays, Travel Journal, Letters*. Trans. Donald M. Frame. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. "'A Monster Great Deformed': The Unruly Masculinities of *Richard III*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47.3 (1996): 251-268.

Saccio, Peter. "Richard III: The Last Plantagenet." *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Richard the Third*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus. 1st ed. New York: Norton, 1997.

Simmons, J. L. "Diabolical Realism in Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling*." *Renaissance Drama* 11 (1980): 135-170.

Suzuki, Mihoko. "The London Apprentice Riots of the 1590s and the Fiction of Thomas Deloney." *Criticism* 38. 2 (1996): 181-217.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Scribners, 1971.

Underdown, David. *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Walter, John and Keith Wrightson. "Dearth and the Social Order in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 71 (1976): 22-42.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

臺灣大學學術
期刊資料庫