

Richard III's Animalistic Criminal Body

GRETA OLSON

Distortum vultum sequitur distortio morum
—Thomas More *History of Richard III*

Contemporary criminal reporting often likens perpetrators to animals when their crimes are considered particularly reprehensible. Witness this recent headline from the *New York Daily News*: “One of the most savage entries in New York’s crime annals—the 1989 Central Park wilding attack on a female jogger—may have to be rewritten after DNA testing now clearly points to a new suspect, the *Daily News* has learned” (September 4, 2002). The adjectives “savage” and “wilding” to describe the crime stress its inhuman qualities and awaken the racial and class tensions that have marked this case. Such comparisons also reify divisions between the species: humans, they suggest, are morally superior to their amoral animal counterparts. Moreover, making the division between human and animal in terms of their capacity for crime serves a definitional purpose that includes a normative component: human beings are perforce that species that does not partake in “beastly” criminal acts. This conflation of the animalistic and the criminal is by no means the invention of current crime news.

Shakespeare’s was one period in which this motif was rampant. Pamphleteers characterized cozeners, those who commit fraud, and rogues, for example, by pointing out their proximity to animals. For instance, in 1566, Thomas Harman, a landowner and local officer from Kent, described a “wild rogue” by comparing him to a beast: “He is more subtle and more given by nature to all kind of knavery than the other [a regular rogue], as beastly begotten in barn or bushes, and from his infancy trade up in treachery; yea, and before ripeness of years doth permit, wallowing in lewd lechery—but that is counted amongst them no sin.”¹ Harman’s characterization implies that an animal-like birth is conducive to learning the sinfulness and lechery of criminal life, and then, like a pig, wallowing in this life

without compunction. This characterization may also serve to remind readers that the words “crime” and “criminals,” in the sense we now use them are inventions of the late nineteenth century when criminology first became established as a scientific discipline. During the Renaissance, citizens worried about the “sin of all sorts” rather than crime and, instead of criminals, those “evildoers [that] go on with all licence and impunity” as another Kent magistrate put it in 1582.² Many sixteenth-century statements about the dangers presented by those who commit acts of “lechery” and “sin” may be likened to current preoccupations with the perceived threat of violent crime.

In this essay I wish to trace associations of the criminal with the animal into the past by examining the characterization of Shakespeare’s Richard York, Duke of Gloucester, who later became Richard III. Specifically, I will analyze the repeated associations of this character’s criminal behavior, or sins, and his physical abnormalities with animals. Rather than focusing on Richard’s deformity as an indication of his monstrosity, a subject that has been well documented,³ I intend to show how Richard’s extraordinary physicality is connected both with his crimes and with specific animal images. My argument is prefaced by an overview of how Shakespeare repeatedly foregrounds the Duke of Gloucester’s anomalous body as a central aspect of his characterization. I then explain the audience’s response to this fascinating and repulsive body by revisiting Lady Anne’s reluctant sexual attraction to Richard as evidenced in the wooing scene. Concentrating on the cursing scene (act 1, scene 3), I trace in the third part of this essay the individual lines of animal imagery associated with Richard, including those related to dogs, boars, toads, and spiders. An analysis of specific types of animal imagery will demonstrate, on the one hand, that Richard’s individual crimes are conflated with his supposedly beast-like physical characteristics; on the other hand, note will be taken of those less numerous allusions to Richard’s animalistic characteristics that underscore his cleverness and strength. By documenting Shakespeare’s specific use of animal imagery, I wish to show how the playwright uniquely blends images of exaggerated physicality with specific animals and crimes to create a character whose criminality is scripted onto his body. In the last section of this essay I relate the depiction of Richard III to the history of nineteenth-century criminal anthropology to argue that Shakespeare’s characterization of Richard contributed to the scientific discovery of innate inborn criminality.

1

Like hardly another character in Shakespearean drama, Richard III commands the audience's attention to his body. Opening the action of *Richard III*, Richard famously blames his having been born "Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time" (1.1.20)⁴ for the necessity of his acting a villain who is in every way different from his ladies-man brother Edward IV. Audiences familiar with the tetralogy will recall that even Richard's birth had been marked by signs of his physical alterity. As related in *Henry VI*, Part 3, it caused his mother inordinate pain (5.6.49) and was either premature—"Like to a chaos, or unlick'd bear whelp" (3.2.161)⁵—or belated: he was born with teeth. Note that the comparisons of the Duke to a bear cub and to chaos stress his non-human qualities, which will be borne out in his inhuman crimes. Dramatic means further stress Richard's corporality. As Marie Plasse has pointed out, Richard begins the play in contradistinction to any other major Shakespeare character with a direct address to the audience.⁶ With appearances in 15 of the play's 25 scenes, the role of Richard III presents a physical challenge to any actor: he must assume the guise of disability and move through a series of scenarios in which his body must appear in rapid turns threatening, pleading, and pious. Since the actor playing Richard probably will not have the limp, shortened arm, and hunched back, his depiction will draw attention to the double nature of the staged body (actor's body and enacted character's body). Performing the Duke of Gloucester's embodiment becomes then a trope for dramatic enactment itself. Accordingly, Samuel Johnson described the quintessential actor as "a fellow who claps a hump on his back, and a lump on his leg, and cries, 'I am Richard the Third.'"⁷

Rendering Richard extraordinarily ugly serves the play's partisan ends and helps to legitimate the power of Shakespeare's sovereign, the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth I. Yet before Shakespeare wrote the play about him, Richard York's body had already been fashioned into that of a severely disabled person. A contemporary portrait shows nothing unusual in Richard's form, another one features him with uneven shoulders. Closer examination of this second portrait reveals that the original was painted over so as to make its subject appear deformed.⁸ Thomas More's *History of Richard III* (written 1513-1518) and the various Tudor histories that use More's text as a source, such as Edward Hall's and Raphael Holinshed's, describe Richard as hunchbacked and having odd features. Furthermore, they associate Richard's

strange looks with his being mean-tempered from birth, because, as Thomas More tells it, the rule of physiognomy insists that ugliness of form denotes ugliness of character.⁹

What is called the Tudor myth—the official historiography of the Tudor period—represented the usurpation of the English throne by Henry IV, the wars in France, as well as the civil wars that followed as a series of devastating national crises. Since history is written by the victor's historians, this period of chaos officially ended when Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond and later Henry VII, defeated Richard III in the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, and the Tudors ascended the throne.¹⁰ The historical Richard had to be depicted as ugly so as to stress the attractiveness of Tudor rule.

Like the Tudor historians, Shakespeare vividly contrasts the beauty of the Tudors' leading man with the ugliness of the Yorkists' leader in *Richard III*. This difference in looks and personality traits associated with them is underlined by the personifications of war and peace linked to Richard and Henry. In the opening soliloquy Richard describes himself not only as deformed but also as having a face unsuited to peace. Whereas with the defeat of Henry VI and Edward's ascension, "[g]rim-visaged war hath smoothed his wrinkled front" (1.1.9), Richard has not been made any less wrinkled. He remains poorly disposed "to court an amorous looking-glass" (1.1.15). By contrast, Henry Tudor closes the play by associating himself with "smooth-faced peace." Newly crowned as Henry VII, he intones a blessing on England that echoes the imagery in the play's first scene: "Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace, / With smiling plenty, and fair, prosperous days" (5.7.33-34). In both Sir Laurence Olivier's 1955 and Richard Loncraine's 1995 films of *Richard III*, Henry is depicted by young, muscular actors, who fulfill conventional expectations of masculine attractiveness. His statement that "[a]ll this divided York and Lancaster, / Deformèd in their dire division" recalls the physical anomalies that Richard cited in the opening soliloquy as a motivation for his villainy (5.7.27-28). Following More's statement that a distorted form inevitably marks a twisted character, Henry suggests that the deformed Richard has caused the deformation of England's politics.¹¹ That Henry has just received the widowed Elizabeth's blessing to marry and mate with her daughter, whom Richard had also wanted to wed, further confirms his role as a lover and bearer of peace and plenty, versus Richard, the barren, wrinkled and deformed purveyor of war and derision. By equating Richard's bad looks with his political crimes and by constantly drawing attention to his appearance, Shake-

speare anticipates criminologists who were to look for the source of crime in the criminal's body. Moreover, he adds force to a tradition of coupling the villain's evil deeds with his extraordinary physicality.

2

Yet if Richard is so horrid-looking and making him so is so central to the political ends of the play about him, how and why does he succeed in winning Lady Anne? In the first scene Richard asserts his unsuitability for lovemaking. Unlike his brother he cannot "prove a lover" (1.1.28) or "caper nimbly in a lady's chamber" (1.1.12). Richard's attestation of his lack of attractiveness recalls a scene from *Henry VI*, Part 3, in which he complains that the only kingdom open for him is the dynastic one, since "heaven in a lady's lap" (3.2.148) is barred to him due to his "deformity."

Nonetheless, in act 1, scene 2, Richard successfully talks a woman into marrying him at record speed, in a less than two-hundred line dialogue. Moreover, the object of his declared affections is a woman whose husband and father-in-law he has recently murdered, and the situation in which he chooses to seduce her in could not be less conducive to courting, namely during the funeral procession of Henry VI. Richard's person, his chosen object, and the setting all conspire to make this seduction appear inconceivable. Yet within the course of their short verbal exchange, Anne moves from cursing Richard as a "fiend" and likening him to the devil to agreeing to wear his ring and move to his London home. What is more, she changes her form of address to him from the initially insulting "thee" and "thou" to the formal and polite "you" form (1.2.224). She abandons the body of her father-in-law and the funeral procession that provided her motivation for appearing on the scene originally. Thus Anne anticipates Gertrude in failing to let a first husband's funeral meats cool down before beginning to imbibe of the next wedding feast.

Why place this impossible scene so near the beginning of the play? Why have it follow Richard's profession that he is so entirely unsuited for courting? Why locate a woman's seduction over the murdered body of her father-in-law? As though himself in want of an answer to these questions, Richard steps out of the action to marvel at the enormous improbability of his speedy betrothal, offering the audience this ironic commentary on what has just passed: "Was ever woman in this humour wooed? / Was ever woman in this humour won?" (1.2.213-14).

Interpreters of the wooing scene have explained its unlikelihood in a number of ways. One traditional and, I would argue, overtly sexist reading of the scene blames Anne's weakness of character and her supposedly inherent feminine frailty and vanity for her acquiescing to marry her enemy. According to such interpretations, the wooing scene can then be seen as an analogue of the temptation of Eve by the serpent.¹² Other commentators focus on the verbal fireworks in the scene, the rapid-fire stichomythic dialogue between Anne and Richard to conclude that Richard's superior rhetorical skills enable him to win the day. Within this context the scene's tongue imagery is interpreted as a symbol of Richard's Machiavellian verbal skills.¹³ Alternately, the scene is viewed as a power contest in which Richard bullies Anne into accepting him, or she is even symbolically raped by him.¹⁴ More recent readings have stressed the corporality of the wooing scene as well as its challenge to traditional gender roles.¹⁵ To my mind the scene has to be interpreted with reference to its overt physicality.

In both Olivier's and Loncraine's film interpretations the wooing scene is depicted with great sexual suggestiveness. Even in the now dated-looking Olivier film, Richard accompanies his words: "Look how this ring encompasseth thy finger, / Even so thy breast encloseth my poor heart" (1.2.189-90) with erotic physical play. During this speech Olivier as Richard cups Anne's breast while holding her closely from behind. Loncraine's *Richard III* renders the erotic quality of the scene far more explicitly. Richard removes the ring from his hand with his mouth, holds it on his tongue, and uses his mouth to slide it on to Anne's finger. These actions underscore the audience's awareness of what Anne's agreeing to wear Richard's ring implies: she will soon be having sex with him. Responding to the startling quality of the widow's being seduced over the corpse of her father-in-law, one student commented in a class I taught on *Richard III* that the wooing scene was "gross," and a traditionally-minded reviewer has described the same scene as "revolting" and "repulsive."¹⁶

Both the student and the reviewer react to the wooing scene's vivid and psychologically disturbing corporality. Richard, we recall, first overpowers the grieving Anne by making the pallbearers put down the coffin with Henry's body in it. Anne calls Richard a devil, wishes him gone, complains that her father-in-law's wounds bleed afresh in the presence of his murderer, and curses Richard for murdering her beloved husband Edward. Richard responds by slyly suggesting that Prince Edward was better suited for heaven than Anne's bedroom;

he, Richard, would make a far better occupant there. Anne spits in disgust at this speech, wishing her spit were poison. Richard then appears to relinquish the dominance that made the pallbearer's respond to his command. He goes down on his knees, bares his breast, and offers Anne a choice. She should either stab him with his own sword or agree to marry and bed with him.

For current scholars of Shakespeare the scene's spitting and sword business suggest some kinkiness; Harold Bloom, for example, uses the word "sodomasochism" to characterize Richard's behavior towards Anne.¹⁷ Bodily fluids are exchanged when Anne spits at Richard; and depending on the individual interpretation, the actor playing Richard may wipe Anne's spit away, lick it from his fingers, and/or return it to Anne's body with his touch. Richard offers Anne his sword so that she may penetrate his body, as he will later penetrate hers. Richard's kneeling before Anne, when he "humbly beg[s] the death upon [his] knee" (1.2.164), also presents a symbolic reversal of their real roles in terms of power and gender. The gender hierarchy is overturned when Anne initiates an aggressive verbal sparring match in lines 178-82: Her: "I would know thy heart" is answered by his "'Tis figured in my tongue." She demands to know his intrinsic motivations; he offers her literal knowledge of his tongue, suggesting more oral eroticism. Her next verbal serve: "I fear me both are false" (1.2.180) is followed by his stichomythic response: "Then never was man true." Given that Richard has just before this scene told the audience that he is not interested in marrying Anne for love but for his own secret reason (1.1.156-57), the irony of this speech strikes home. Anne's brief verbal incentive is overrun by Richard's "Say then my peace is made" (1.2.183). He initiates the next lines, and she answers with a strategy of first delaying an answer and then agreeing to his proposal.

How is Anne's change from palpable disgust to strong, if highly ambivalent, sexual attraction to be explained? Why does this noble woman violate the rules of "social decorum" to spit at her opponent?¹⁸ I would suggest that her spitting resembles the involuntary urge to vomit that one has in experiences of revulsion, a revulsion that is echoed in some audience members' responses to this scene. In his recent study of disgust Winfried Mennighaus follows Freud in suggesting that physical revulsion represents a repression of animalistic forms of sexuality that take pleasure in anal and oral activities: "Freud's theory of revulsion is an integral part of his 'narrative' about the emergence of upright posture and the civilizing force of making

anal desire and smelling genitals disgusting.”¹⁹ This emphasis on what is considered a threatening relapse into animalistic forms of sexuality in Freud and in Menninghaus’s reading of Freud makes sense in light of early modern concerns about humans becoming too much like animals in their sexual behavior or even worse, their actually coupling with animals. As studies on the subject show, bestiality was considered the anathema of the elevated state of being human, a crime so horrible that it barred even naming.²⁰

Given that Lady Anne repeatedly likens Richard to an animal, her initial curse on his future offspring to be of “ugly and unnatural aspect” (1.2.22) highlights the conviction, typical of the period, that the union of a human with an animal will result in the birth of monstrous progeny.²¹ That in accepting Richard’s marriage proposal, she destines herself to mate with a beast and potentially become the mother of this beast’s offspring may further explain her initially revolted response to his attempt to seduce her.

According to Freud the desires expressed in revulsion emerge in anal and oral fetishes. Hence Anne’s words of profound physical disgust for Richard, “Blush, blush, thou lump of foul deformity” (1.2.55), followed by her sudden agreement to marry him may represent an effort to repress her desire to be consumed by him sexually, to return so to speak to an animalistic, orally-centered form of sexual activity. Her speech to Richard from lines 48-65 suggests powerful images of orality. She stresses the physicality of Richard’s murder of Henry in terms of his open wounds as bleeding “mouths,” describes the earth as drinking Henry’s blood and gaping open to “eat” Richard as he has swallowed the “king’s blood.” Linda Charnes has suggested that Henry’s wounded body is metaphorically linked with Anne’s permeable and desirous—and, as female, also bleeding—one, so that Richard literally seduces Anne in proxy using Henry’s prone body.²² Anne’s demand that the earth consume Richard as he has consumed Henry represents her own as yet unstated desire to feed on and be devoured by Richard. Repressing as yet unconscious desires for a man she hates, she expresses her initial deep-felt disgust. Ultimately, however, the physical desire that is reflected in the scene’s stage directions as well as in its overtly oral imagery appears to overwhelm Anne’s scruples. How else can we explain how her repugnance—she calls Richard a “dreadful minister of hell” a “Foul devil” (1.2.48), a “hedgehog” (1.2.100) as well as a “foul . . . toad” (145)—is transformed into reluctant passion?

Marrying Anne does not help Richard to the throne. Hence the inclusion of this scene in the play has another motivation. To my mind the wooing scene highlights Richard's particular form of engaging embodiment. Although he is "unnatural" (1.2.58 and 59) and resembles a toad, he exerts an extraordinary psychological force over Anne that renders this political and emotional foe vulnerable to him. Like Anne, the audience is seduced by Richard in this scene and learns to marvel at how he uses his extraordinary physicality to achieve his goals. As Bloom puts it, the Duke of Gloucester "makes us all into the Lady Anne"²³ in his ability to cajole us into agreeing to witness and be entertained by his crimes. Even Richard has to gloat over his success and wonder at being found "a marv'lous proper man" (1.2.239). He jokes that his newly discovered beauty will keep him out of pocket. That the wooing scene occurs over King Henry VI's murdered body juxtaposes Richard's past crimes with his current powers to attract and dominate even his adversaries. Moreover, that Anne describes Henry's body as bleeding afresh in the presence of his murderer further illuminates the contrasting qualities of Richard's body. Indirectly, she compares the Christ-like qualities of her deceased father-in-law's form with the inhumanness of his murderer's deformity. Crime here is written on the body.

The wooing scene highlights the fascination as well as the instrumentalization of Richard's anomalous body. He uses his body and his sword to manipulate Lady Anne into asking him to arise from a debased position to resume his position of physical mastery. Mirroring his physical resumption of power, Richard begins the scene by addressing Anne with the polite you form and ends it by calling her "thee" and "thou," thus reversing her own verbal practice towards him. The scene exhibits how the simultaneously revolting and commanding qualities of Richard's body combine to make him a physically dynamic anti-hero, whose animal attractiveness and criminality are manifest in his visible difference. Sexualizing Richard's horrifying body provides the audience with a clue to his power to seduce and fascinate those who deal with him.

Anne's references to Richard's porcine and amphibian qualities pave the way for the conflation of Richard's exaggerated physicality with his crimes throughout the rest of the drama. His body will be associated with negatively-connotated animals such as a bloodthirsty dog, a rooting hog, a poisonous spider, and a hunchbacked toad. Each of these images of animals is used to illustrate the nature of

Richard's inherent criminality. In the following I explore the most frequently used animal imagery in greater detail.

3

Several types of animal images are used in *Richard III* to characterize the protagonist: canine and porcine ones as well as those of small poisonous animals. As Wolfgang Clemen points out in his study of the dramatic function of Shakespearean imagery, these figures serve as leitmotifs for Richard's character; the recurrent symbolization of Richard as a dog, a boar, and a spider by those who describe his evil-doings and even by himself acts to meld the physically anomalous image of the actor playing Richard with a series of animals that are considered disgusting: "Without our becoming conscious of it, the repulsive figure of the hunch-backed Richard as we see it upon the stage is repeatedly transformed into animal bodies conforming to his nature, and thus his brutal, animal character is illuminated from this angle too."²⁴

All of these animal images are brought together in Queen Margaret's demand to her arch-enemy Richard that he must stay to hear her words during the memorable cursing scene, act 1, scene 3. This scene, which represents the historical impossibility of Margaret's appearance in the court after Edward IV's ascension in 1471, is considered artistically ill-conceived by some critics such as Bloom due to the one-sided nature of the former Queen's declamatory oaths against the Duke of Gloucester.²⁵ In my view Margaret's public listing of crimes and curses at their perpetrators interrupts the spirit of complicity between the audience and the protagonist that has been developed during the wooing scene, a complicity that has culminated in Richard's gloating over his successful wooing of Anne. By contrast, the cursing scene forces the audience to see Richard through the world's eyes again and to recall his crimes.

Offering her audience a psychological explanation for her damning those around her, Margaret recites all of the deaths that preceded the ones that will occur in *Richard III*. This recitation allows the audience to recall the divisiveness and bloodshed that were enacted in the preceding history plays, just as the presence of Henry VI's corpse in the wooing scene reminded us of how Richard stabbed him at the end of *King Henry VI*, Part 3. In her initial short addresses to the Duke Margaret refers to him as "devil" (118), "a murd'rous villain" (134), a "cacodemon" (144), and as a "gentle villain" (163), thus set-

ting the scene for the more extended ritualistic cursing that follows and in which animal insults feature prominently. Furthermore, her reference to all of the assembled characters as a pack of snarling dogs that were busy fighting each other before they turned on her is not only accurate but also serves to further anticipate her use of animal images to curse Richard and to describe his various types of villainy (1.3.185-87). She begins her curses by singling out the present Queen as well as Rivers, Dorset, and Hastings; but her real verbal venom is reserved for the person who will counter her initial imprecations by calling her a "hag." With her imperious command to "Stay, dog," Margaret brings her foe Richard to heel with the same harsh words some owners might use even today with their misbehaving canines. Her insulting form of address denotes an attitude of ownership towards her addressee:

... Stay, dog, for thou shalt hear me.
 If heaven have any grievous plague in store
 Exceeding those that I can wish upon thee,
 O let them keep it till thy sins be ripe,
 And then hurl down their indignation
 On thee, the troubler of the poor world's peace.

 No sleep close up that deadly eye of thine,
 Unless it be while some tormenting dream
 Affrights thee with a hell of ugly devils.
 Thou elvish-mark'd abortive, rooting hog,
 Thou that wast sealed in thy nativity. . . .
 (1.3.213-26)

The despised dog of line 213 is by line 225 a monster that elves have marked at birth and a hog. Each image refers to negative characteristics of Richard's behavior and person. The dog epithet emphasizes his bloodthirstiness as well as his, in Margaret's view, lowly social station. She addresses Richard with "thou" in order to further emphasize his inferior status. "Sins" refers to the totality of Richard's bloody crimes, and "troubler" of world peace to his tendency to purvey political dissension, a quality that will be repeatedly associated with his heraldic emblem, the white boar. This imagery is taken up in the "elvish-mark'd abortive, rooting hog" which makes specific reference to Richard's emblem, while emphasizing his hunch-backed form as well as the wild boar's uprooting behavior.

The most powerful and continuous line of animal imagery in the play refers to Richard as a dog, the insulting name Margaret gives to Richard when she begins to curse him. This line of imagery was al-

ready used to characterize Richard in the preceding history play, when King Henry VI told his murderer that he was born with teeth in order to “bite the world” (*Henry VI, Part 3*, 5.6.54), and Richard reflected that his premature teeth meant that he was destined to “snarl, and bite, and play the dog” (5.6.77). Such references to the appearance of Richard’s teeth at birth, including the one in *Richard III* (4.4.46) associate him with cannibalism. Long and/or extra teeth are associated with the pronounced desire to devour flesh. As symbolized by a rabid dog, Richard causes the deaths of many individuals but most venially those of the princes in the tower, his two young nephews Prince Edward and the Duke of York. Already king, he nonetheless “wish[es] the bastards dead” (4.2.17) and commands their murder. This act is most frequently condemned in speeches that associate Richard with a dog or a wolf. As the children’s mother Queen Elizabeth laments after their deaths: “Wilt thou, O God, fly from such gentle lambs, / And throw them in the entrails of the wolf” (4.4.17-18). Innocence here is coupled with the children whose death moved even their assassins Dighton and Forrest to pity. Moreover, the association of the boys with lambs creates a likeness between them and Jesus Christ, who is frequently symbolized by this creature. For instance in the first chapter of First Epistle of Peter, he is called “a lamb without blemish and without spot.”²⁶ The wolf of Elizabeth’s speech stands metonymically then for Richard, while God, the would-be shepherd, remains absent.

This Elizabethan attribution of bloodthirstiness to dogs was in part informed by images from popular sports such as bull- and bear-baiting as well as dog fighting. Such sports pitted mastiffs against fettered bears and bulls and ended in the animals’ deaths. The dogs continuously attacked their prey, and frequently they were mangled. Juliet Wightman interprets such spectacles of animal brutality as the fulfillment of a contemporary need to “experience” the unremitting violence of life without any overriding narrative of theological meaning in death.²⁷ In other words: watching dogs attack bears in packs and be killed by them was about being entertained by a spectacle of the bloodiness of the everyday.²⁸ Classical references added to the negative connotations of Richard’s figuration as a hound. The vicious three-headed dog Cerberus who stands at the gates of Hades in Greek mythology contributes to depictions of Richard as a dog. Moreover, Biblical imagery associates dogs with damnation. For instance, the speaker of Psalm 22:20 prays to God to “[d]eliver my soul from the

sword; my darling from the power of the dog.”²⁹ Such imagery is taken up in the frequent symbolizations of pagans as dogs during the medieval period, as Friedrich Ohly has shown.³⁰ Thus the association of Richard’s victims with Christ-like lambs and his person with a vicious dog has multiple, even over-determined religious and popular cultural meanings. It comes then as no great surprise that Christian prejudice associated Jews with ravenous canines which were thirsty for Christian blood. For instance, in *The Merchant of Venice* Shylock complains that Antonio has repeatedly called him a “cut-throat dog” (1.3.108), and he is often called a “cur” by the Christians. Shylock’s supposed bloodthirstiness becomes manifest when he desires to literally take a pound of Antonio’s flesh as interest for the money he has lent to him.³¹ The supposedly canine lust for blood and desire to bite the flesh of innocents that Margaret and others attribute to Richard coincide with contemporary prejudices about Jews and other non-Christians who were already stigmatized due to their religious otherness.

Having finished her imprecations to Richard, Margaret offers Buckingham a warning: “O Buckingham, beware of yonder dog. / Look when he fawns, he bites; and when he bites, / His venom tooth will rankle to the death” (1.3.289-91).³² Here she directly contradicts Richard’s falsifying description of himself at the beginning of the scene when he stated that “I cannot flatter and speak fair” (1.3.47). Her warning to Buckingham has good warrant: Richard, will first behave as Buckingham’s friend and even offer him lessons on how to perform convincingly (act 3, scene 5), and then eventually have him executed in the fourth act. His use and subsequent abuse of Buckingham has a parallel in his treatment of Anne, whom he seduces in quick order, only to then report immediately to the audience that he “will not keep her long” (1.2.215).

Anthropomorphizing canine behavior, Margaret curiously attributes to dogs the ability to perform: “when he fawns, he bites.” Whereas before Richard’s dog-like excess of teeth was cited as a proof of his desire to drink the blood of innocents, his canine fawning is now mentioned in order to illustrate his dangerous ability to con his enemies into a blindness about his real intentions. Margaret’s attribution presumably refers to dogs’ alleged tendency to flatter human beings. This is portrayed, for example, in Sir Philip Sidney’s reworking of a beast fable in *The Old Arcadia* (1593). Here every kind of animal gives its leading characteristics to newly created human beings; and

dogs donate flattery to man.³³ Reviewing the images of Richard as bloodthirsty and dissembling, it would seem that each act of fawning by Richard to win over his foes to his own ends is followed by his viciously devouring them with his oversized teeth.

Margaret's use of dog imagery to portray her nemesis comes to a highpoint in the fourth act. There she completes her imprecation against him as dog in the powerful meter of a rhymed couplet:

Earth gapes, hell burns, fiends roar, saints pray,
To have him suddenly conveyed away.
Cancel his bond of life, dear God, I plead,
That I may live to say, "The dog is dead."

(4.4.70-73)

Although Margaret does not get to witness the fulfillment of her curses in person, the play does conclude with Richard's destruction. Even in death, he is represented as a bloodthirsty canine: Henry acting as an avenger for all the dead and their mourning mothers declares after his successful battle against Richard that "God and your arms be praised, victorious friends, / The day is ours; the bloody dog is dead" (5.7.1-2). Having initiated the line of comparison between Richard and a vicious dog, Margaret indirectly brings this imagery to a close when Henry repeats the words of her curse in his victory speech. The rabid dog Richard—dangerous both due to his teeth and his ability to hide them—has after much cursing finally been brought to stay in death.

Returning to the cursing scene we remember that Margaret has called Richard an "abortive rooting hog" (1.3.225) and likened his actions to a despoiling wild boar, which upsets the world's peace. Such references to Richard as porcine represent the second most important type of derogatory animal metaphors used to underline his inherent criminality. Most obviously, these references remind the audience of Richard's badge, the white boar.³⁴ A powerful and merciless warrior, Richard's burnt-earth policy of eliminating his enemies resembles a boar's violent uprooting of the earth in its search for nourishment (3.2.11, 3.2.26-32, 3.2.72-73, 4.5.2, 5.4.130). Hence Ian Moulton, for instance, reads the boar references as signals of Richard's exaggerated masculinity.³⁵ The implicit association of the boar with the movement of uprooting the earth or despoiling it overlaps with speeches in which England is likened to a body which Richard rapes or defecates on. Again, fears of uncontrolled, animalistic sexuality inform such comparisons. Playing upon this imagery, Henry Tu-

dor, who is portrayed in every way as being visibly and temperamentally different from the animalistic Richard, motivates his men before battle by referring to their enemy as a destructive, wild boar:

The wretched, bloody, and usurping boar,
That spoils your summer fields and fruitful vines,
Swills your warm blood like wash, and makes his trough
In your inbowelled bosoms, this foul swine
Lies now even in the center of this isle,
Near to the town of Leicester, as we learn.

(5.2.7-12)

This porcine imagery reiterates Richard's role as a usurper, one who divides the kingdom rather than unites it: he digs up fields and eats from the impaled bosoms of the English, rather than caring for them. According to this speech, the wild boar king not only defiles the body of England with his brutal actions, but he revels in doing so, as the verbs "swills" and "lies" suggest. This language reminds the reader of the pamphlet by Thomas Harman that was quoted at the beginning of this essay. Harman's use of the word "wallowing" to describe the wild rogue's pleasure in his criminal life resonates with the imagery in Henry's speech: criminals like wild boars or pigs, as humans picture them in these texts, take physical pleasure in their filthy acts and filthy living conditions. The conflation of filth with the porcine and with criminality suggests that a number of associative fields become overlapped in these metaphorical descriptions of criminals; these outlaws, such metaphors imply, are sexually perverse and sinful as well as criminal.³⁶ Moreover, the curious attribution of bloodthirstiness to the "usurping boar" in this speech aligns negative portrayals of Richard as a boar with those of him as a gnashing, bloodthirsty dog. Since when, one may ask, did pigs bathe in blood or eat human bodies? Henry's speech may allude to another resonant image of the wild boar as an agent of destruction. Pope Leo X's administration described Martin Luther as a despoiler of the Lord's vineyard in a text concerning the errors of his teachings from 1520: "A wild boar from the forest is raging to destroy the vineyard, and an outrageous, unprecedented animal is devouring it."³⁷ This metaphorical description can be traced to Psalm 80:13, where the speaker laments that "[t]he Boar out of the wood doth waste it [the vineyard], and the wild beast of the field doth devour it." Religious analogies featuring wild boars and the destruction of God's creation show that the boar was figured as a wild outsider and an element of annihilation.

One other meaning of the porcine metaphors used to describe Richard and his behavior remains to be mentioned. In the wooing scene Anne insults Richard by calling him a “hedgehog” (1.2.100). Here the animal image refers to Richard’s physical deformity rather than his criminal activities: both hogs and hedgehogs have humped backs, and their mention here serves as an insulting reminder of one of Richard’s physical handicaps. Furthermore, the prefix “hedge” could be used in early modern English to denote “a common or inferior creature,” thus making it a class slur.³⁸ In terms of the overarching argument of this essay, it is important to remark how Anne’s insult strikes a chord that will be heard again and again in depictions of Richard. Invariably, attention is drawn to Richard’s body, which is compared to that of a negatively-connoted animal. Often, as in Henry’s speech to his men above, this animal’s evil actions—as they are described by humans—are cited to illustrate the nature of Richard’s crimes. Yet the mention of Richard’s animal-like ugliness is frequently followed by a demonstration or a mention of his ability to enlist others in his brutally ambitious crimes. Note the examples of Lady Anne and the Duke of Buckingham.

The third and final form of animal imagery used to portray Richard and his activities is amphibian or arachnid in nature and refers to these animals as poisonous creatures. I take the liberty of combining the discussion of spiders and toads, because Shakespeare appears to think of these animal types as belonging to one group: for instance, at the beginning of the wooing scene Anne curses her soon to be seducer by wishing him a fate even worse than that for which she would wish for “. . . adders, spiders, toads / Or any creeping venom’d thing that lives” (1.2.18-19). This comparison suggests that Richard is worse kind of being than the animals he will be repeatedly associated with and hence introduces some ambiguity in the overwhelmingly negative characterizations of animals in this play.

Again, we can turn to the verbally powerful Margaret in the cursing scene to see how she uses this third type of animal metaphor to illustrate her enemy’s inherent criminality. When she chastises the current queen for misguidedly believing that she can outwit Richard, Margaret uses poisonous animal figures to refer to him:

Why strewst thou sugar on that bottled spider
Whose deadly web ensareth thee about?
Fool, fool, thou whet’st a knife to kill thyself.
The time will come that thou wilt wish for me
To help thee curse that poisonous bunch-backed toad.
(1.3.242-246)

Like all of Margaret's prophecies this one comes true. Elizabeth will indeed adopt the same animal imagery that Margaret used here to curse Richard after she has seen almost all of her family members destroyed by him (4.4.76). She repeats the "bottled spider" and "foul [rather than poisonous] bunch-backed toad" almost verbatim to designate Richard. Margaret's speech and Elizabeth's after hers make obvious reference to Richard's fantastic shape as "bottled" and "bunch-backed." As in the hedgehog insult, Richard's reported likeness to an animal signifies his evilness. This visible similarity is mentioned before stating how the given animal's behavior, as seen by humans, illustrates the nature of one of Richard's crimes. Thus the Duke of Gloucester's resemblance to a playacting ("bottled") spider is first established. Then the spider's characteristic weaving of webs to capture its prey is mentioned so as to illustrate Richard's talents as a plot maker. This imagery compares to that used by the fairies in their lullaby for Titania in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where "Weaving spiders" are told to keep away from the sleeping queen (2.2.20).

Richard's ability to plot against his enemies coupled with his poisonous tongue make him a highly successful Machiavellian schemer. Like Anne, other characters will grow "captive to his honey words" (4.1.75) and eventually be poisoned by them. Richard's web includes making Edward appear to be responsible for Clarence's death, positing Anne's beauty as the cause for his murdering the men she loved, and putting Elizabeth to blame for virtually all of the country's woes, including even Richard's deformed arm. Richard's aim to poison his enemies sweetly, like a bottled spider, is reiterated in the designation of him as a venomous toad. The deadly toxin Margaret refers to is the weapon Richard uses to infect and eliminate all who stand in his way.

Richard's characterization as poisonous resulted in part from the contemporary conception of the body as full of fluids and in a constant state of flux.³⁹ Humoral physiologists understood the body to be much more porous and unstable entity than the discrete and measurable entity that was created in the eighteenth century with the advent of what Michel Foucault has called "bio-power."⁴⁰ The poison Richard is said to have in his fangs expresses the idea that he not only infects the body politic but also the bodies of those who surround him. Anne has called him a "diffused infection of a man" (1.2.76) and insisted that he "infects" her eyes with his presence (1.2.146) during the wooing scene. This line of imagery is picked up again when

Henry refers to Richard as though he were a blight on the figurative crops of the country in the speech quoted from above. The healthy body of England has been infected by the disease called Richard. Similarly, the play's citizens equate the political instability of their country to a body that has become diseased when they comment on "This sickly land . . ." (2.3.32). Hence representations of Richard as a disease contribute to the figuration of England as a vulnerable body that may be made ill by the derisive politics of its rulers.

The discussion of particular strands of animal imagery makes evident that the mention of Richard's canine, porcine, amphibian and arachnid qualities often occurs within the context of some demonstration or attestation of his ability to manipulate others. Anne calls him a hedgehog and a toad before agreeing to marry him; Buckingham is warned of his dog-like teeth but nonetheless allows Richard figuratively to fawn over and then to bite him; despite the warnings from Margaret, Queen Elizabeth is indeed drawn into Richard's web-like design. Seemingly, the playwright is at pains to juxtapose the perceived beastliness of his protagonist with his considerable success in getting what he wants. What is the motivation for this jarring juxtaposition other than its contributing to an interesting dramatic character?

It would be easy to regard Richard's associations with animals as straightforward instances of stigmatization. Likening individuals' looks and actions to animals removes them from the realm of normative humanity. The traditional exploitation of animals led to a discursive tradition of insulting those perceived as being socially inferior by comparing them to beasts. As Erika Fudge describes this process, "If you abuse something or someone you need a language through which to represent it as legitimate treatment rather than abuse, and at its most potent the language of brutalisation is internalized by the social groups who are labelled as animal."⁴¹

While dehumanizing Richard's appearance and actions works primarily to highlight his inherent villainy, references to him as a boar also serve another function: they highlight his strength and ability to fight; those to him as a spider underline his talents as a Machiavelian strategist. Furthermore, several references to animals in the play subvert the dualistic hierarchy of man over animal. Richard states in his opening description of his own ugliness: "That dogs bark at me, as I halt by them" (1.1.23). Apparently, he is so odd-looking that even his supposed kin eschew his company. In the wooing scene Anne states that Richard is more pitiless than any wild animal: "Villian,

thou know'st no law of God nor man. / No beast so fierce but knows some touch of pity" (1.2.68-69). Accordingly, Richard's immorality exceeds any cruelty that humans may imagine animals to be capable of. Unlike the humans whom Anne refers to in the first line of the quotation, Richard acts outside of all legal and religious systems; unlike the beasts she refers to in the second line, he is incapable of mercy. Fashioning him into a kind of terrorist then, Anne suggests that Richard is entirely lawless in his failure to observe even the norms of his own kind, beasts.⁴² As a boar, spider, toad, dog, and hog, Richard elsewhere displays behavior deemed less than human and is 'othered' from humans as a vicious animal. Yet in these two passages, animal rhetoric serves another function. It figuratively places Richard below the level of an animal in the natural order. Thus images of Richard as less merciful than a beast and too ugly for even the companionship of dogs work to deconstruct the boundary between animal and human.⁴³

4

In this essay I have traced a number of contradictions in the manner in which Richard York's intriguing and horrifying animalistic body is depicted. I argued first for the centrality of his body to Richard's characterization and then showed the political investment that was involved in rendering this body ugly. The analysis of the particular kinds of animal imagery—used most vocally by Margaret to curse Richard—has shown that these references are used foremost as reminders of the protagonist's inherent and varied criminal tendencies. Each type of animal he is compared with represents one of the types of crimes he commits: the dog kills, the boar uproots, and the spider spins webs of intrigue, while the toad poisons. Most frequently, these images are introduced in a three-step process: first Richard's visual likeness to the negatively-connoted animal is remarked upon. Then, that animal and its brutal behavior stand in as metonyms for Richard and his crimes. Finally, the derogatory reference is coupled with some demonstration of the Duke's power to achieve his goals. Some fewer associations of Richard with animals do, however, highlight his forcefulness and cleverness or destabilize the binary opposition between man and animal that is presupposed in the play.

Shakespeare was not the first author to illustrate an outlaw's alterity by attributing physical oddities to him. Arguably, the identification of criminality with bodily anomalies reaches back into antiquity. Aristot-

tle wrote about character deviation and physiognomy, as did Homer: with his hunched back, lame foot, and bowed legs making him something of a physical forerunner to the Duke of Gloucester, in the *Iliad* Thersites discovers painfully that his physical non-conformity renders him the object of derision and physical blows. Moreover, interest in physiognomy, that is the interpretation of behavioral traits based on facial characteristics, was large during the Renaissance, when Giambattista Della Porta published his *De humana phsyiognominia* (1586), a work that highlights similarities between humans and animals.

Yet the specificity of the conflation of bestial qualities with inherent brutality in Richard's characterization also anticipates biological theories of crime that gained particular credence during the latter part of the nineteenth century. In the wake of the gradual acceptance of Darwinian theories of evolution and natural selection, explanations of crime that purported to identify recognizable signs of animal otherness in deviants became influential. Arguably the animal metaphors that Shakespeare drew on to depict Richard combined with the reactions of revulsion characters display towards him influenced the inception of criminal anthropology. The Italian physician Cesare Lombroso initiated this empirical science of crime perpetrators with the publication of his *L'uomo delinquente* in 1876, and his positive criminology went on to have an enormous effect on the treatment of convicts in Italy and the United States. According to this science, an individual's criminality was, like Richard's villainy, visible and measurable; it could be proven on the basis of the criminal's having certain beast-like physical anomalies, which were called stigmata. Acknowledging the influence of literary and visual examples of the criminal type on his theory of innate criminality, Lombroso writes: "The assassins, executioners, and devils painted by Mantegna, Titian, and Ribera the Spagnoletto embody with marvelous exactitude the characteristics of the born criminal; and the descriptions of great writers, Dante, Shakespeare, Dostoyevsky, and Ibsen, are equally faithful representations, physically and psychically, of this morbid type."⁴⁴ In this description Lombroso may well have been thinking of Shakespeare's physically and psychically marked 'born criminal' Richard III.

Like Richard III, Lombroso's atavistic criminal shared physical characteristics with dogs and other animals. For instance, the existence of large teeth, resembling those of a canine, was seen as an indication of inherent moral viciousness.⁴⁵ Moreover, Lombroso insisted on the naturalness of a sense of disgust normal individuals feel when faced with innate, born criminals. Hence the perception of physical

anomaly was used to justify negative judgments about the criminal's inherently bad character.

Although Lombroso's work was discredited when it was proven that the so-called normal population had just as many stigmata as the criminal one, the fascination with the criminal's body and the search to find an origin of crime within this body persisted in any number of biocriminological theories.⁴⁶ Arguably, this search continues in practices such as racial profiling today. A preoccupation with those whose behavior troubles and offends us or threatens the stability of the world as we know it occupies much of news reporting today. Western culture remains deeply invested in the naming and attempting to understand that which is considered inhuman or criminal in others. One of the ways we continue to stigmatize criminals is to liken them to animals which we understand as being morally inferior to humans. Shakespeare's Richard with his combination of exaggerated physicality, animal qualities, and inherent criminality continues to tell us much about our fascination with and need to stigmatize those we call criminal beasts today.

Freiburg University

NOTES

- 1 Thomas, Harman, *A Caveat for Common Cursitors*, 78, in *The Elizabethan Underworld*, ed. A. V. Judges (1566; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1930), 61-118.
- 2 J. S. Cockburn quotes from C. Read, ed. *William Lambarde and Local Government: His 'Ephemeris' and Twenty-nine Charges to Juries and Commissions* (Cornell U. Press, 1962), 68, in "The Nature and Incidence of Crime in England 1559-1625: A Preliminary Survey," *Crime in England 1550-1800*, ed. J. S. Cockburn (London: Methuen, 1977), 49-71.
- 3 A number of interpretations of Richard III explore the conflation of physical deformity with monsters during the Renaissance. See Richard Marienstras for an analysis of contemporary texts on teratology and their relation to Richard's depiction as a monster, Antichrist, and Herod figure. Marienstras also provides specific readings of Richard's particular disabilities including his limp, hunched back, and withered arm: "Of a Monstrous Body" in *French Essays on Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: 'What Would France with Us?'* ed. Jean-Marie Maguin and Michèle Willems (Delaware U. Press, 1995), 153-74; Marjorie Garber locates the creation of Richard's deformity in historical accounts and Shakespeare's play as a rhetorical figure (36); in support of her thesis she cites, for instance, how Francis Bacon's essay "Of Deformity" (1625) attributes a whole negative personality profile to the deformed person on account of her or his unnaturalness. Paying particular attention to images of Richard as a spider and weaver of tales, she reads the play with

- relation to how history is formed and deformed in its telling: *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Casualty* (New York: Methuen, 1987). Ian Frederick Moulton emphasizes images of Richard as deformed within the context of the Elizabethan conflation of errant eroticism and monstrosity to argue that Richard is "utterly barren" and hence becomes "monstrously destructive" (265): "'A Monster Great Deformed': The Unruly Masculinity of Richard III," *SQ* 47 (1996): 251-65.
- 4 *The Oxford Shakespeare. Richard III*, ed. John Jowett (Oxford U. Press, 2000).
 - 5 *The Arden Shakespeare: Henry VI, Part 3*, ed. Andrew S. Cairncross (London: Routledge, 1964).
 - 6 Marie A. Plasse, "Corporeality and the Opening of *Richard III*," *Entering the Maze: Shakespeare's Art of Beginnings*, ed. Robert F. Wilson (New York: Lang, 1995), 11-26.
 - 7 James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, vol. 2 (1791; London: Dent and Sons, 1906), 135; also cited by John Jowett in his introduction to *The Oxford Shakespeare: Richard III*, 34.
 - 8 Garber, 35.
 - 9 Thomas More, *History of Richard III*, 386, from Raphael Holingshed's *Chronicle*, 1587, "Appendix E" in *The Oxford Shakespeare: Richard III*, 386-396.
 - 10 See Jowett's introduction to the Oxford edition of the play I quote from here and Judy R. Weinsoft, "Strutting and Fretting His Hour Upon the Stage: An Analysis of the Characterization of Richard in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Daviot's *Dickon*," *Lecture at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival* (August, 27, 1993): 25 November 2004 <www.r3.org/struttxt.html>.
 - 11 John Jowett, Note 28, 356 in *The Oxford Shakespeare. Richard III*.
 - 12 See the *Shakespeare Variorum* for a variety of such readings, ed. Horace H. Furness Jr. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1908), 44-45. Continuing in this tradition is J. A. R. Marriot, who insists that many weak-natured women are inexplicably attracted to "misshapen men": *English History in Shakespeare* (1918; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1971), 218; in the same vein see also Robert B. Pierce, "Richard III," *Shakespeare's History Plays: The Family and the State* (Ohio State U. Press, 1971): 89-124.
 - 13 See David L. Frey, *The First Tetralogy: Shakespeare's Scrutiny of the Tudor Myth: A Dramatic Exploration of Divine Providence* (Paris: Mouton: 1976), 95-99; Tracy B. Strong, "Shakespeare: Elizabethan Statecraft and Machiavellianism," *The Artist and Political Vision*, ed. Benjamin Barber and Michael McGrath (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1982), 193-220; and Wolfgang G. Müller, "The Villain as Rhetorician in Shakespeare's *Richard III*," *Anglia* 102 (1984): 37-59.
 - 14 Robert Ornstein, *A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's Plays*. (Harvard U. Press, 1972), 75.

- 15 See Jowett, 41-43; Linda Charnes, *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare* (Harvard U. Press, 1993); and Phyllis Rackin, "Engendering the Tragic Audience: The Case of Richard III," *Studies in Literary Imagination* 26 (1993): 47-65.
- 16 Marriot, 214.
- 17 Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1998), 71.
- 18 Jowett, 42.
- 19 Winfried Menninghaus, Ekel. *Theorie und Geschichte einer starken Empfindung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999), 19; transl. Greta Olson.
- 20 Erica Fudge, *Perceiving Animals: Human and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 2000), 137; Bruce Boehrer. *Shakespeare Among the Animals: Nature and Society in Early Modern England* (New York and Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002), 48-53.
- 21 Fudge, 136.
- 22 Charnes, 33-51.
- 23 Bloom, 71.
- 24 Wolfgang Clemen, *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1977), 51.
- 25 Bloom, 68.
- 26 King James Version, 1 Peter 1:19. All Biblical references are to this version.
- 27 Juliet H. Wightman, "'All the world is but a bear-baiting'—Violence and Popular Culture in the Renaissance," 67-77, in *Sites of Discourse—Public and Private Spheres—Legal Culture: Papers from a Conference Held at the Technical University of Dresden*, ed. Uwe Böker and Julie Hibbard (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), 71.
- 28 Tantalizingly, Wightman also associates the figure of the bear with contemporaneous images of a suffering, bloody Jesus Christ (73-75). This association would further determine Richard's being symbolized as a dog with his qualities as an Antichrist, here as a torturer of the bear-Christ figure.
- 29 My thanks go to the editor for his having made me aware of this reference.
- 30 Friedrich Ohly, *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977), 9, 210.
- 31 *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice*, ed. Jay L. Halio (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

- 32 Interestingly, the image of the dog's poisonous tooth also ties in with those metaphors concerning venomous spiders and toads.
- 33 Sir Philip Sidney, *The Old Arcadia*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. The World's Classics (Oxford U. Press, 1985), 225.
- 34 Pierce, 102-103.
- 35 Moulton, 265.
- 36 For a general investigation of the association of crime and prisons with filth, smell, and darkness see Martha Grace Duncan, *Romantic Outlaws, Beloved Prisons: The Unconscious Meanings of Crime and Punishment* (New York U. Press, 1996).
- 37 "Exterminare nititur eam aper de silva, & singularis ferus depascitur eam" (Leo X 1049D), "Bulla apostolica Leonis papae X contra errores Martini Lutheri & sequacium" *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collection*, ed. Joannes Dominicus Mansi (1520; Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1961), vol. 32. My gratitude goes to Thomas Lederer for his bringing my attention to this reference as well as his translating it.
- 38 Jowett, Note 100, 164; see the OED, "hedgehog" 8d.
- 39 Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Cornell U. Press), 7-11.
- 40 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Vol. I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage/Random House, 1980), 143.
- 41 Fudge, 28.
- 42 Similarly, current observers characterize Islamist terrorists as lawless, out of control, primitive and bestial. Indeed, one could make an argument for reading Richard as a terrorist who has been styled by those who fear him into a kind of mercurial, unclassifiable Bin Laden figure.
- 43 For a playful deconstruction of the animal-human polarity, see Jacques Derrida, "The Animal that Therefore I Am (More to Follow)," *Critical Inquiry* 28, No. 2 (Winter 2002): 369-418. For a culturally and historically specific examination of the frailty of anthropocentric treatments of animals in early modern English culture, see Fudge and Boehrer.
- 44 Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso briefly summarised by his daughter Gina Lombroso-Ferrero with an Introduction by Cesare Lombroso*, 1911 (Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1972), 49.
- 45 Lombroso-Ferrero, 7.
- 46 See Greta Olson, "Criminalized Bodies in Literature and Biocriminology," *The Body as Interface: Dialogues Between the Disciplines*, ed. Sabine Stelke, Elisabeth Schäfer-Wünsche (Amsterdam: Rodopi, in print).