

CHRISTOPHER FREY AND LEANORE LIEBLEIN

'My breasts sear'd': The Self-Starved Female Body and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*

And blessed Mary said to [Alpaïs]: 'Because, dear sister, you bore long starvation in humility and patience, in hunger and thirst, without any murmuring, I grant you now to be fattened with an angelic and spiritual food. And as long as you are in this little body, corporeal food and drink will not be necessary for the sustaining of your body, nor will you hunger for bread or any other food ... because after you have once tasted the celestial bread and drunk of the living fountain you will remain fattened for eternity.'

Life of Alpaïs of Cudot (d. 1211)

There is diuers opinions why they were called *Amazones*. ... Others take the *Etymologie* of this vowel A. priuatiue, and of *Maza*, that signifieth bread, for that they liue not with bread ... as those that haue bene norished w[th]out womans milke.

THE NEW found vvorlde (1568)

She evacuates nothing by urine, or stool, she spits not that I can hear of, but her lips are often dry, ... her belly flap'd to her back-bone, so that it may be felt through her Intestines.

A Discourse upon Prodigious ABSTINENCE (1669)¹

'Enter ANNE in her bed' (17.38).² So reads the stage direction introducing what is surely one of the theatrical high points of Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603). The language of the scene insists upon the physical consequences of Anne Frankford's decision to starve herself after her husband has discovered her in bed with his best friend. It emphasizes her thinness, her weakness, her faintness, and her paleness. She asks for some air, needs assistance to be raised a little higher in her bed, and is, in the words of the servant Jenkin, 'as lean as a lath' (17.36). No matter how the actor playing Anne may have been costumed or made up, for an Elizabethan audience, as for us, the idea of

a starving body would have evoked a powerful and concrete mental image that insists upon Anne's fasting as a physical act with physiological consequences.

Starvation has always been with us. John Reynolds in *A Discourse upon Prodigious ABSTINENCE* writes that 'Divines, Medicks, Historians, yea, Poets and Legenders have presented the Learned World with a great variety of wonderful Abstinents'. Among those he cites are Moses, Elijah, Jesus, and Saint Augustine. Female fasting, however, became an important phenomenon in the later Middle Ages. Both Rudolph Bell and Caroline Walker Bynum focus on food as 'an obsessive and overpowering concern in the lives and writings of religious women between the twelfth and the fifteenth century'.³ As the example of Alpaïs cited above suggests, for the medieval woman saint, asceticism was associated with holiness. Appetite and sexual desire were considered urges needing to be tamed, and abstinence from food, or at least food other than the Eucharist, was a preferred means of demonstrating one's spirituality. The medieval belief in starvation as a means to higher spiritual and moral calling remained current in Heywood's time. Bartholomew Batty, for example, bases his argument in favour of fasting on the belief that 'the Soule and minde is heavenly: but the Bodie wee haue common with Beastes'.⁴ Batty advises that because the body is fed corporeally, and the soul is nourished by the word of truth, rejection of substantial food assists one's consumption and digestion of truth. Women, in particular, he argues, should fast as part of their general education in preparation for being good wives and mothers.

By the end of the seventeenth century, however, fasting had become a medical and scientific rather than a purely spiritual phenomenon. In 1689 in Latin, and in 1694 in English, Richard Morton's *PHTHISIOLOGIA: OR, A TREATISE OF Consumptions* tells the story of a Mr. Duke's daughter who, in 1684 at the age of 18, due to 'a multitude of Cares and Passions of her Mind', experienced 'a total suppression of her Monthly Courses', bringing about a loss of appetite and consequent loss of weight, which left her 'like a Skeleton only clad with skin'. Though she initially responded to medical treatment, 'being quickly tired with Medicines, she beg'd that the whole Affair might be committed again to Nature, whereupon consuming every day more and more, she was after three Months taken with a Fainting Fit, and dyed'.⁵ Mr. Duke's self-starved daughter is not, in the terms of Batty, an ideal wife or mother-to-be; rather, her body has become an object of the clinical gaze of scientific and medical scrutiny. For late seventeenth-century observers of female starvation, the woman in question is no longer of interest for speculation about the relationship between her body and soul and mind; instead, her body is an object of interest in and for itself. Although by the end of the seventeenth century

the starved female body was perceived not as saintly, but sickly, the act of fasting, even to death, continued to carry with it the potential for active female subjectivity since, as in the case of Mr. Duke's daughter, it was the result of a woman's choice.

Between accounts of the lives of medieval women saints and clinical descriptions of what came to be known in the nineteenth century as fasting girls falls *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. Anne Frankford stands at the intersection of these various, ultimately contradictory, views of voluntary female fasting. Her self-starvation is simultaneously illuminated by the spiritual transcendence of the medieval female saint, the self-sacrifice of the Renaissance ideal mother, and the clinical pathology attributed to fasting young women in later seventeenth-century medical and scientific reinterpretations of female starvation as illness. Heywood's representation of Anne contains elements of all of these views. It is also informed by his admiration of female autonomy, an admiration that emerges in his depiction of the pseudo-historical mythological figures known as Amazons. Like the Amazons Heywood describes, who were known for their monomastectomy and removal of male children from their society,⁶ Anne chooses to harm her own body and withdraw her power to nourish as an act of resistance. Her decision to starve herself, a response to a patriarchal society in which food and eating are forms of control, succeeds in compelling her husband's assent to a redefined marital relationship.

Criticism of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* has tended to overlook the corporeality of Anne's body. Critics of the 'domestic tragedy' school, initiated by the pioneering work of Henry Hitch Adams, have concentrated instead on the homiletic dimension of Anne's adultery. Anne, according to Adams, follows a trajectory of sin, discovery, repentance, punishment, and expectation of divine mercy. Peter Ure also focuses on Anne as a sinner, contrasting her easy capitulation with the resistance of Susan in the subplot, and interpreting her self-starvation as payment of a debt imposed by Frankford's 'kindness'.⁷ Such a reading ignores the independence of Anne's action and the corporeal form it takes. Anne is simply a negative exemplum, and her choice to self-starve is an act of acquiescence in the judgment and punishment her husband has imposed upon her.

Brian Scobie summarizes challenges to the homiletic tradition, many of which emphasize as we do Frankford's moral ambiguity and like us recognize that Anne's actions at the end of the play are a manifestation of her agency and resistance.⁸ Thus a number of critics see the play as a criticism, not an endorsement, of Frankford's behaviour and the system of marriage and domesticity it presupposes.⁹ Increasingly, critics also connect the vulnerability of

the marriage relationship to the changing nature of the domestic economy of the household,¹⁰ and some have also seen in Anne's decision to starve herself an act of taking responsibility for her actions.¹¹

In general, however, few critics address the corporeal dimension of punishment by self-starvation that Anne imposes upon herself. There are two important exceptions. One of these is Margaret Bryan, who points out that eating in the play represents erotic love or lust and thus Anne's renunciation of food can be interpreted as the renunciation of the symbol of her affair with Wendoll (9, 14). More recently, proposing that fasting in the play is a paradigm of puritan resistance, Gutierrez argues that Heywood's play participates in the puritan discourses concerning women and marriage, and possession and exorcism, where the relationship between a woman and her seducer is configured as the relationship between a possessed Christian and her demon. In this case, Anne's self-starvation is a means of exorcising Wendoll, her demonic lover, and by substituting the punishment dictated by her conscience for that imposed by her husband, associates the practice of fasting and prayer with resistance against episcopal authority.¹² Hence Gutierrez considers Anne's self-starvation as resistance and recognizes fasting as a means for women to control their sexuality. While Bryan and Gutierrez recognize the importance of food, and Gutierrez sees in the refusal to eat an act of resistance, for both critics Anne's fasting is a response to her seduction by Wendoll. In contrast, we argue that Anne's self-starvation is addressed to her husband and the role of food in the patriarchal society he embodies.

From Sainly to Sickly

For medieval women and men, fasting offered a front-line assault against the threat of the unruly body by denying the flesh its most basic need. Feeding the body was a precarious first step toward becoming too much a 'friend' of this world and a potential enemy of God and the truth. Through fasting one could mortify the body and free the soul from the body's superfluity and susceptibility to human pride. James of Vitry, for example, reports of women abstinent in the early thirteenth century, '*The cheeks of one were seen to waste away, while her soul was liquified with the greatness of her love*'. The belief that effacing the body allows one to renovate and regenerate the soul, as described by Vitry, also underscores Alpaïs of Cudot's early thirteenth century report that the Blessed Mary told her, '*as long as you are in this little body, corporeal food and drink will not be necessary for the sustaining of your body . . . because after you have once tasted*

the celestial bread and drunk of the living fountain you will remain fattened for eternity'.¹³

Medieval women who starved voluntarily were often considered subject to pride at best, or diabolical possession at worst. As Rudolph Bell has written, whether or not their fasting was of God or the devil would depend on 'Christendom's patriarchy, not the girl herself'.¹⁴ The imposition of a male-determined verdict on a woman's decision to self-starve suggests that starvation could be a contentious issue between the female subject and ruling authorities. Female self-starvation as such could thus provide an opportunity for a woman to challenge a sceptical male clerical hierarchy on terms most clearly within the jurisdiction of her own agency. Nobody, short of being violent, could actually force a woman to eat.

The physical body was not unconditionally regarded as negative by medieval commentators. Some theologians claimed that the body is in integral union with the soul, and that one accesses the divine by starting with contemplation of the body.¹⁵ Aquinas theorizes this integral relationship between body and soul: 'Since the human soul's act of intelligence needs powers, namely imagination and sense which operate through corporeal organs, this by itself shows that the soul is naturally united to the body in order to complete the human species'.¹⁶ According to Aquinas and others, the Resurrection demonstrates and ultimately celebrates an integral union between body and soul. Voluntary self-starving re-enacts this celebration by drawing attention to the body's instrumentality in the process of spiritual renewal. In one popular metaphor, the body's contribution to spirituality resembles the lute's relation to song, a metaphor that appears in Heywood's play. When Anne's lute follows her into exile, she recognizes it as an extension of her body: 'I know the lute. Oft have I sung to thee; / We both are out of tune, both out of time. ... My lute shall groan; / It cannot weep, but shall lament my moan (16.18–31). She will 'play' her body through starvation as she plays and then destroys the lute.

In spite of Reformation and humanist hostility to excessive asceticism, some early modern commentators considered fasting to be a way of purifying the soul.¹⁷ William Struther speaks of fasting generally as God's requirement 'that our bodies bee defrauded, not onelie of their superfluous and vnlawfull desires, but also of their due and lawfull necessities in nourishment'. Juan Luis Vives observes, 'moche fastynge shall be good' to 'quenche the heate of youthe'. Phillip [*sic*] Stubbes cites fasting as a sign of spiritual purity and describes its practice by his ideal woman, his own wife Katherine, who died in childbirth: 'Neither was she given to pamper her body with delicate meats, wine or strong drink, but rather refrain them altogether'. Batty as well advises mothers to

‘forbeare ... from intemperauncie in eating and drinking’.¹⁸ It is in their emphasis on the moral and the domestic that such early modern views of women fasting differ from those of the Middle Ages. Unlike the fasting attributed to medieval female saints, the fasting promoted by Struther, Vives, Stubbes and Batty perpetuates the belief that women are weaker creatures of infirm nature, and seems designed to produce a good wife and mother by purging the female flesh to eliminate personal or subjective desire.

Early modern accounts also suggest that women might choose to fast as a protest against patriarchal norms. Elizabeth Cary, for example, chooses to endure starvation as a matter of strategy and principle. Destitute after her separation from her husband in 1627, she sends her servants and children to eat at other tables while she refuses to eat pending the outcome of her petition for support to King Charles.¹⁹ Female fasting may become political, as in the context of puritan resistance whereby ‘overt political resistance becomes identified with the practice of fasting and prayer’.²⁰ And the heroine of *The Broken Heart* (1633) by Heywood’s contemporary, John Ford, uses fasting to enforce a personal choice. When Penthea, whose name invokes that of the famous Amazonian warrior Penthisilea, is forced by her brother to marry a tyrant instead of the man she loves, she resolves: ‘But since [my] blood was seasoned by the forfeit / Of noble shame with mixtures of pollution, / [My] blood—’tis just—be henceforth never heightened / With taste of sustenance. Starve’.²¹

As the significance of female fasting changes from the medieval to the early modern period, so does the view of corporeality generally. In the seventeenth century, the body of a starving woman becomes less a sign of conflict or harmony between body and soul and more a site for physical illness and medical inquiry. The title of John Reynolds’ presentation to the Royal Society indicates the shift in interest from holy and spiritual to scientific and clinical matters: *A Discourse upon Prodigious ABSTINENCE: OCCASIONED By the Twelve Moneths FASTING OF MARTHA TAYLOR The Famed Derbyshire Damosell: Proving That without any Miracle, the Texture of Humane Bodies may be so altered, that Life may be long Continued without the supplies of MEAT & DRINK. With an Account of the Heart, and how far it is in-teressed in the Business of Fermentation*. Reynolds is at pains to prove that the ‘prodigious abstinence’ he describes is neither a miracle nor a fake, but accountable in scientific, diagnostic terms: ‘She evacuates nothing by urine, or stool,’ he reports to the Society and continues, ‘she spits not that I can hear of, but her lips are often dry, ... her belly flap’d to her back-bone, so that it may be felt through her Intestines’ (33–4). Richard Morton similarly emphasizes the scientific in his *PHTHISIOLOGIA: OR, A TREATISE OF Consumptions*, cited above, as does Christian

Joachim Lossau in his *Actual and detailed description of an unusual and noteworthy incident of starvation from the year 1728 involving the daughter of a gardener from Steinbeck in Holstein near Hamburg named Maria Fehnfels*.²² Unlike the male observers of the Middle Ages who assess the behaviour of fasting female saints from the point of view of their potential salvation, Reynolds, Morton and Lossau observe Mary Taylor, Mr. Duke's daughter, and Maria Fehnfels for their contribution to an understanding of anatomy and physiology.²³

Accounts of fasting girls in the early modern period, however, like the accounts of medieval saints, remain suffused with anxieties about the authenticity of the girls' behaviour and their ability to wrest control of the progress of the disease from the authority of the observing medical man. Like such fasting women, Heywood represents Anne as an active female subject who wrests control over her punishment from her husband by choosing to starve to death rather than live in indeterminate exile. But along with its indebtedness to medieval female saints and early modern fasting girls, Heywood's presentation of Anne also draws on another example of active female subjectivity familiar to the early moderns, the Amazon warrior.

Anne as Amazon

The tradition of the female warrior in Amazonian culture was well known to early moderns by way of classical and medieval sources, among them Herodotus and Chaucer. In his *GUNAIKEION* and *Exemplary Lives* Heywood reveals his fascination with these women who reject conventional feminine roles by choosing alarming self-disfigurement. What Heywood and others identify as central to Amazonian culture is male infanticide and breast removal, unique expressions of female power to not-nourish which Anne's self-starvation arguably enacts. Anne, like an Amazon, removes herself from the economy of the gendered body, but whereas the Amazon practices monomastectomy, Anne punishes her body and the beauty that has made her desirable by refusing to ingest food. Though she begs her husband not to disfigure her and hence brand her as a whore, she like an Amazon marks her own flesh with wasting away.

Early modern England's preoccupation with Amazons has been related to its having to accommodate a female 'king' within a patriarchally-based monarchy and society.²⁴ Gail Kern Paster and Skiles Howard account for the anxiety Amazonian culture caused the early moderns:

The customs of the Amazons inverted all the traditions of patriarchal society: Amazons usurped masculine martial and administrative functions, lived apart from men but used them for procreation, cherished and educated their daughters and disposed of their sons, and (in an emblematic rejection of both maternity and sexual allure) burned off a breast in the interests of martial efficiency. Contemporary anxieties over threats to the social order and the dangers of the new world were displaced onto the Amazons, formerly denizens of India, Asia, and Africa and recently discovered in the Americas (194–6).²⁵

Different interpretations of Amazonian culture coexist in the early modern period. Christine de Pizan, for example, stresses that the decision of Amazonian women to rule was not a deliberate act of aggression against men, but was necessitated by the loss of their men in battle. Sir Walter Raleigh also plays down female aggression by presenting the Amazons as welcoming new world explorers. Queen Elizabeth associates herself with Amazonian warrior qualities of skill, courage, and independence in her address to her troops at Tilbury. John Knox, on the other hand, sees the Amazons as aggressive and considers them close cousins to those Catholic female monarchs on the continent who threatened Protestant England. And Edmund Spenser presents both positive and negative aspects of Amazonian culture in his allegorical characters Britomart and Radigund.²⁶

Heywood's own presentation of Amazons, in comparison to other early modern accounts, is balanced.²⁷ He says in 'Of Amasons and warlike Women', 'my purpose is not too farre to effeminate men, nor too much to embolden women: since the most valiant man that is, is timorous ynough, and the modestest woman that is may bee made sufficiently bold'.²⁸ Heywood reminds us that Amazonian culture originally included men as well as women, that they performed 'braue and remarkeable deedes of armes', and that despite being 'barbarians' in the classical sense of being 'outsiders', Amazons had 'much true morall humanitie as the wise men of Greece' (219).

Like Pizan, Heywood also identifies the Amazonian decision to establish an all-female society as primarily a response to necessity rather than a deliberately deviant act:

Hauing for many yeares made spoyle of the neighbour nations ... [Amazonian men] were betraide and slaine. Their wiues, by reason of their exile halfe in despaire, boldly tooke armes, and first retyring themselves and making their owne confines defensible, after grew to the resolution to iuuade [*sic*] others. Besides they disdained to marry with their neighbours, calling it rather a seruitude than Wedlock. A singular example to all ages. (220)

As Heywood describes them, Amazonian women make choices according to circumstance. It is the circumstances that lead them to reject men on the battlefield, in the nursery, and at the site of the breast.²⁹

Heywood's representation of Amazons resonates with his depiction of Anne Frankford. Anne's decision to self-starve and thus make her separation from her children final is also presented as a choice made in response to the situation created by Frankford's punishment. The theme of adultery, which is central to *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, is part of Heywood's construction of Amazonian culture too. Heywood in *GUNAIKEION* describes an offshoot tribe who 'immitate these Amazons', the women voluntarily killing themselves for committing adultery, as Anne does, because 'they supposing their husbands ... to haue beene defeated and lost ... married themselves to their slaves ... knowing themselves guiltie ... of adulterie to their beds ... all in conclusion brauely and resolutely with selfe hands finished their owne liues' (223). Like the women in Heywood's description, Anne punishes her adultery by taking her own life.

The corporeal connection between Amazons and Anne is established at the site of the female breast. 'Again and again in the medical, social, and more explicitly fictional narratives of the English Renaissance,' writes Kathryn Schwarz, 'representations of the female breast reify the logic that puts women in their place' (147).³⁰ Schwarz argues that the female breast's capacity to nourish leads to the association of women with inferior matter, as opposed to the association of men with superior reason or soul. The female is thus seen as a passive domestic helpmeet while the male is characterized as an active agent outside of the home. Batty, for example, who considers women generally as 'weak' and 'infirm', emphasizes the breast's power to nourish: 'It is most necessarie and best agreeing to the nature of the childe, that mothers nourish and giue sucke to their owne children, with their owne dugges and breastes'.³¹ Thomas Vicary, another early modern commentator on the female body, also sees women, contrary to men, as having passive qualities because, as he says, their "sparme is thinner, colder, and feebler" (55).³² Amazonians and their practice of breast removal radically challenged conceptions of good wifery and motherhood based on the concept of the nourishing breast.

Early modern accounts of the Amazons' self-mutilating practice of removing one breast always explain it as a means to facilitate more efficient use of the bow and arrow, lance, and dart.³³ Midwives' manuals of the period, however, express the anxiety that losing a breast is akin to losing a womb.³⁴ In light of this anxiety that conflates the specific act of nourishing with the more general concept of generation, the significance of the Amazons' deliberate

monomastic choice becomes clear. To remove a breast is literally as well as symbolically to sacrifice not only one half of one's potential to nourish, but also one's capacity to procreate. This sacrifice is re-enacted at a larger societal level when Amazons eliminate half of their population by killing all their male children.

The relationship between female voluntary self-starvation – the withholding of nourishment both from oneself and by extension from one's offspring – and Amazonian practices of male infanticide and breast removal becomes apparent from the etymology of 'Amazon', as debated by early moderns. Heywood, in *GUNAIKEION*, offers the standard reading: 'they tooke the name of Amasons, as much as to say *Vnimamma*, or *Vrimamma*, [that is], those with one breast, or with a burnt breast' (221). The connection between breast, nourishment, and generation is made explicit by Thevet's observation, 'Others take the *Etymologie* of this vowell A. priuative, and of *Maza*, that signifieth bread, for that they liue not with bread ... as those that haue been nourished w[th]out womans milke'.³⁵ Amazons demonstrate symbolically a willingness to starve themselves, even to extinction, since their removal of breasts and men puts them on a precarious progenitive threshold.

Like the Amazons who resist in intensely corporeal terms, Anne Frankford responds to her husband's punishment by modifying her body's appearance through self-starvation. The language she uses to describe punishment is deeply corporeal. She speaks of having her 'hand cut off' and her 'breasts seared' (18.135). In deciding to starve, Anne uses her body to resist confinements imposed on her by Frankford's patriarchal worldview and its normative social expectations based on eating. In the context of the play's society, her refusal to eat, understood in relation to its medieval saintly and early modern sickly forms as well as in relation to the received idea of Amazons, makes her more than a passive template for fallen virtue.

The Intact Social Body and the Mutilated Passional Body

Anne's adultery and decision to starve occur in the context of the household where her husband implements principles of property and hospitality that represent the play's normative social order. Food and eating, which he uses to impede individual agency, are the main means by which he controls the patriarchal economy of his household to keep its social body intact.³⁶ But 'supping' can work in reverse. By inviting rivalry and resistance in the forms of Wendoll's adultery and Anne's fasting, it can create a fissure in the early modern household that eludes the control Frankford would impose.

Normative early modern domesticity, as personified by Frankford and represented by his household, turns on the notion that over-consumption is a manifestation of wealth. Viviana Comensoli points out that the specific material details of Frankford's domestic display, including candlesticks, carpets, tablecloths and napkins, salters and trenchers, are visible signs of prosperity and hospitality (70–2). Lena Cowen Orlin also richly describes the material texture of Frankford's house, but sees in its abundance and complexity a reflection of 'concerns for the uncertain ownership of property and property's extension, accumulated domestic goods, as well as for their anxious symbolization in the trade in and title to women' (137).³⁷ For both Comensoli and Orlin the early modern household participates in a move toward a developing notion of privacy, including sexual privacy, as 'an indicator of status and privilege' (75).³⁸ But Wendy Wall observes that the household might well contain not only the married couple at its centre, but also a broad array of diverse individuals contributing various forms of household work, including companions, male and female servants, wet-nurses, children, apprentices, and others. Such social complexity, Wall contends, raises the possibility of multiple economic and erotic relations that problematize patriarchal authority.³⁹

The play's opening scene, the marriage of Anne and Frankford, articulates the basic patriarchal features of the Renaissance social order and the early modern household. The seemingly stable social classes of aristocracy, gentry, and peasantry, and the presumed 'natural' gender relations of heteroeroticism, are upheld by the 'perfection' of the central characters. The scene consists of an all-male gathering, and opens with verbal sparring on the subject of male domination in sexual relations with women: 'Yes, would she dance "The Shaking of the Sheets": / But that's the dance her husband means to lead her' (2–3); "'In a good time that man both wins and woos / That takes his wife down in her wedding shoes'" (47–8). The only female on stage is Anne, who speaks fewer than 10 of the scene's 115 lines. Thus she is largely a creation of the men's highly idealized descriptions: 'Master Frankford, ... / you have a wife / ... / She's beauty and perfection's eldest daughter' (12–23); 'A perfect wife already, meek and patient' (37). The play's opening scene leaves little doubt that a male-dominated perspective determines the play's governing reality and the world in which Anne will live. Anne offers little resistance in scene 1 to being over-determined by the male group. In fact her sparing speech contributes to her effacement in both verbal and physical terms: 'I would your praise could find a fitter theme / Than my imperfect beauty to speak on' (29–30). She surrenders her identity entirely to Frankford by calling his face the measure of her being: 'His sweet content is like a flattering glass, / To make

my face seem fairer to mine eye: / But the least wrinkle from his stormy brow / Will blast the roses in my cheeks' (33–6). Anne begins the play, then, virtually silenced and with no significant corporeal presence in her own mind.

But despite the apparently seamless stability of the Frankfords' marital relationship and domestic world, the patriarchal social fabric is vulnerable. Even the marriage of John and Anne, praised as a model of decorum and propriety, crosses class lines: Frankford, a gentleman, marries into the aristocracy, matching his wealth to Anne's birth. And patriarchal society has the potential to cause tragedy, as in the play's subplot, where two of Acton's men are killed. The intact social body fissures when violence defeats sportsmanship, enmity replaces friendship, penury overtakes wealth, and new money overwhelms landed title.

The institution of marriage itself is potentially fissured. Anne, as a wife, is her husband's property: 'By your leave, sister—by your husband's leave / I should have said' (1.6–7). But the potential for her insubordination is present in the very images the wedding guests use to define her relationship to her husband:

She doth become you like a well-made suit
In which the tailor hath us'd all his art,
Not like a thick coat of unseason'd frieze,
Forc'd on your back in summer; she's no chain
To tie your neck and curb you to the yoke,
But she's a chain of gold to adorn your neck.
You both adorn each other, and your hands
Methinks are matches. (1.59–66.)

Though this passage concludes with an emphasis on mutuality, the language reveals the inequality of a relationship based on possession of material goods where a woman, compared to a 'well-made suit' and 'chain of gold',⁴⁰ can suffocate and bind as well as adorn.

The body is largely sublimated or ignored in the wedding world's language of ornaments and abstract accomplishments. But the subversive potential of the restrained or repressed body erupts in the text beneath the formal surfaces of social play – in the names of popular dances that suggest sexual relations, for example, and in the names of card games that re-enact seduction and adultery. The physical body is also implicated in the activity of eating, from which the guests, having presumably ingested the wedding meal that is the emblem of Frankford's hospitality, retire in order to dance.⁴¹

A Woman Killed with Kindness represents its social relations through the activity of 'supping' and the hospitality offered by Frankford's table. Food and money define the complicity between men represented in the play by the friendship between Frankford and Wendoll. As Frankford tells Wendoll, 'I know you, sir, to be a gentleman / ... / Please you to use my table and my purse— / They are yours' (4.63–6); and he continues, 'I will allow you, sir, / Your man, your gelding, and your table, all / At my own charge' (70–2). Frankford's benevolence, or 'kindness', regarding food makes regular appearances as the drama unfolds. All the major characters comment on food and eating at some point in the play. Anne, for example, points out to Wendoll, that 'his table / Doth freely serve you' (6.117–18), and she tells the servants, 'Go bid them spread the cloth and serve in supper' (11.11). Frankford's servant, Jenkin, reports, 'My master and the guests have supp'd already; all's taken away. Here, now spread for the servingmen in the hall' (8.1–3); and the servant Nicholas is ordered to invite a visitor into the cellar and 'make him drink' (11.49). Stage directions as well highlight aspects of dining: '*Enter 3 or 4 Servingmen ... one with a voider and a wooden knife to take away all, another the salt and bread, another the tablecloth and napkins*' (8.1); or, '*Enter FRANKFORD as it were brushing the crumbs from his clothes with a napkin, and newly risen from supper*' (8.21).

In Frankford's patriarchal world alimentary generosity and satiety are signs of prosperity and sufficiency. Frankford's authority in the household is thus associated with his ability to dispense culinary largesse. In consuming Frankford's proffered hospitality, Wendoll participates in the economy of the Frankford household and his subordination within it. But the boundary between satiety and gluttony is permeable. The play's conflation of eating and adultery is explicit in what turns out to be Anne and Wendoll's final rendezvous. Wendoll combines the pleasures of the bedroom with the pleasures of dining when, having seen Frankford leave the house on an errand, he says to Anne, 'Come ... let us sup within' (11.102).⁴²

It is Nicholas, known to critics as Frankford's 'good' servant or conscience, who monitors the play's unravelling of the ethic of eating. As he witnesses the adultery between Wendoll and Anne develop, Nicholas not only refuses to serve Wendoll, but speaks of eating in terms of abstinence or even cannibalism. Seeing Anne and Wendoll kiss for the first time, Nicholas swears that before his master will suffer such wrong, 'I'll eat my fingers first' (6.171), and having watched the liaison develop at the supper table, he declares: 'I cannot eat, but had I Wendoll's heart / I would eat that' (8.16–17). Only after reporting the relationship to his master does Nicholas return to eating: 'Now that I have

eas'd my stomach,' he tells Frankford, 'I will go fill my stomach' (8.92–3). Nicholas's return to eating heartily after serving his master well by reporting Wendoll's and Anne's adultery represents the servant's complicity with patriarchy's symbolic order.⁴³

Unlike Nicholas who, though a loyal servant, decides for himself under what circumstances to 'fill [his] stomach' (8.93), Wendoll's consumption of food is constrained by the terms of his ties to Frankford. When Wendoll expresses in soliloquy his desire for Anne, it is his relationship to his host's stomach that hinders him: 'He cannot eat without me, / ... I am to his body / As necessary as his digestion, / And equally do make him whole or sick' (6. 40–3). Their friendship literalizes the consumption at the centre of the Frankford household, but it makes him an extension of his benefactor and consumes him as well. Wendoll's consumption of his friend's hospitality deprives him of autonomy. For Wendoll to assert individual agency is to undo the social fabric of the household represented by his friend's body. In seducing Anne he consumes Frankford's hospitality not only by eating at his table but also by metaphorically devouring his wife. The adultery reifies the logic of overconsumption.

Heywood addresses excessive consumption of food in *GUNAIKEION*. In a section entitled 'Of Women addicted to Gluttonie, and Drunkenesse,' he presents over-eating and drinking as standard features of male society; as he says, 'Of men for their incredible voracitie, there are presidents infinite' (346). The possibility that social dining will tip over into excess and gluttony suggests the unruliness of the physical body beneath. In addition, according to Wendy Wall, for all its association with hospitality and sustenance, the preparation and consumption of food in the early modern period had the potential to be a profoundly alienated and alienating activity. Wall emphasizes that food preparation combined preservation with destruction and consumption (3–4 and *passim*). It was resonant not only of nourishment and nature, but also of slaughter, dissection and cannibalism.

In Frankford's world, corporeality is repeatedly expressed in terms of physical violence against the body. Social and emotional ties between friends, siblings, and spouses are part of a closed and stable economy, and their violation is expressed as laceration, incision, penetration, and evisceration. Even the play's language figures the cost of repressing corporeality. Because of his adulterous passion Wendoll's 'soul / Lies drench'd and drowned in red tears of blood' (6.6–7). He tries to forget Anne by 'hal[ing] these balls until [his] eyestrings crack / From being pull'd and drawn to look that way' (6.15–16). His unfulfilled passions do violence to his own body, but because seduction is

also theft, Wendoll imagines that succumbing to passion (claiming what belongs to another) will violate the body of his friend: 'Hast thou the power straight with thy gory hands / To rip thy image from his bleeding heart? / To scratch thy name from out the holy book / Of his remembrance ...?' (6.45–8). Frankford's reaction to his wife's adultery confirms Wendoll's fears. At the moment of Nicholas's revelation of Anne's infidelity, Frankford tells his dutiful servant: 'Thou hast kill'd me with a weapon whose sharp'ned point / Hath prick'd quite through and through my shivering heart' (8.56–7). Susan Mountford experiences her brother's plan to use her to pay off his debt similarly: 'Will Charles / Have me cut off my hands and send them Acton? / Rip up my breast, and with my bleeding heart / Present him as a token?' (14. 56–9). Thus while the patriarchal social body is closed, adorned, displayed, and gendered male, the passionate body is open, incised, penetrated, mutilated and gendered female. The two come together, as Comensoli points out, when Frankford's entry into his house as he returns to discover the lovers *in flagrante delicto* parallels Wendoll's penetration of Anne's body.

When Anne's adultery is discovered, it is violence against her body that she anticipates as punishment and that she fears: 'When do you spurn me like a dog? When tread me / Under your feet? When drag me by the hair?' (13.92–3). 'Mark not my face / Nor hack me with your sword, but let me go / Perfect and undeformed to my tomb' (98–100). Guilt inscribes the body: 'My fault, I fear, will in my brow be writ' (6.155), says Anne. 'Print in my face / The most stigmatic title of a villain' (vi.85–6), says Wendoll. Sorrow similarly leaves its mark: 'And yet to live one week / Without my brother Charles, through every cheek / My streaming tears would downwards run so rank / Till they could set on either side a bank, / And in the midst a channel; so my face / For two salt water brooks shall still find place' (3.82–7). For such passive inscriptions of her guilt upon her body, Anne substitutes the active choice to mutilate her own body. Her decision to starve is a refusal of the appropriation and control of her body by the social order represented by Frankford's hospitality with its overwhelming focus on the consumption of food.

The Passion of Anne Frankford

Anne's decision to take into her own hands the punishment for her adultery is illuminated by the history of female self-starvation and self-mutilation. On the one hand, her decision to fast reintroduces the spirituality of the holy anorexic for whom, from the twelfth to fifteenth century, fasting was associated with penance, humility, and spirituality.⁴⁴ Anne refuses to eat in part 'out of

[her] zeal to Heaven' (17.82), and mortifies her body in order to free her soul: 'I never will nor eat, nor drink, nor taste / ... / But when my tears have wash'd my black soul white, / Sweet Saviour, to Thy hands I yield my sprite' (16.102–6). Her fasting also draws attention to the positive role of the body in saintly life emphasized by some medieval mystics and theologians. On the other hand, what Anne's self-starvation achieves is less a union with God than a re-union with her husband. Frankford has preferred to kill Anne with 'kindness', to exclude her unruly female body from her community (to efface rather than deface her) and to punish her bodily transgression by denying that she has a body to punish. Anne, however, insists that her body bear the weight of punishment in full corporeal detail.

As a result, her suffering body becomes visible. Like the fasting girls who were to become objects of the clinical gaze in the later seventeenth century, Anne's starving body is displayed as a publicly acknowledged spectacle. Those assembled, largely men who in the opening scene had commented on her birth, beauty, education, and musical and linguistic abilities, the abstract 'ornaments / Both of the mind and body' (1.15–6), now detail her symptoms. Jenkin describes Anne as 'lean as a lath', and Sir Charles observes, 'Sickness hath not left you / Blood in your face enough to make you blush' (17.36, 58–9). Their focus on the observable physical consequences of Anne's abstaining from food looks forward to medical discourses about female self-starvation.

Finally, the passion of Anne Frankford reflects the spirit of the Amazon warrior. Her self-mutilation in the form of self-starvation shares with the Amazons' acts of male infanticide and breast removal a direct attack on patriarchal authority. If eating in Frankford's world is an instrument of patriarchy that masks the culture's distrust of the passionate body, Anne's self-starvation is a refusal to ingest the food that has been an instrument of social control. Anne evokes the Amazons when she associates the loss of her children with the loss of her breasts:

O me, base strumpet,
That having such a husband, such sweet children,
Must enjoy neither. O to redeem my honour
I would have this hand cut off, these my breasts sear'd. (13.132–5)

Frankford's decision to not punish Anne physically but rather 'torment [her] soul' (13.155) by removing her children and placing her in exile is an attempt to deny the significance of her corporeality. By self-starving, Anne enacts the withdrawal of her power to nourish and reverses the effect of her husband's punishment by compelling him to acknowledge her corporeal presence.

In the final scene, Anne's achievement of control through her deliberate decision to starve herself supercedes the opening scene's presentation of her passive physical effacement. Anne draws attention to her body's fleshly presence. It will no longer be her husband's but her own countenance that will report her being: 'Can you not read my fault writ in my cheek?' (17.56). She specifically asks John to touch her: 'Will you vouchsafe / ... / To take a spotted strumpet by the hand?' (76–8). He does, and his response emphasizes the corporeal energy of the act: 'That hand once held my heart in faster bonds / Than now 'tis gripp'd by me' (79–80). Her starvation brings about Frankford's submission to her when he renews his wedding vow in terms of Anne's starved corporeality rather than patriarchy's idealized and effacing vision. He acknowledges Anne's physical role as the nourisher of their children: 'My wife, the mother to my pretty babes, / Both those lost names I do restore thee back' (115–16). Finally he submits completely to her body with a corporeal kiss: 'And with this kiss I wed thee once again' (117). Anne's last line completes their newly recognized corporeal bond: 'Once more thy wife, dies thus embracing thee' (122). Even after her death Frankford alludes to their conjugal coupling: 'A cold grave must be our nuptial bed' (124). By voluntarily self-starving, Anne violates the body perceived as property, and resists and successfully eludes the male-determined symbolic order that engulfs her in the opening wedding scene and that her husband maintains throughout the play by way of his table. Self-starving allows Anne to regain personal agency at Frankford's and patriarchy's expense by reclaiming her own body.

Anne's choice of death and the form that it takes in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* challenges a social order in which food has been both a method of control and a site of vulnerability. The spiritual, mythical, domestic, and clinical perspectives illuminate the complexity of her resistance.

Notes

-
- 1 *Life of Alpaïs of Cudot*, qtd in Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987), 73; Andrewe Thevet, *THE NEW found vvorlde, or Antarctike* (London, 1568; STC: 23950), 101v; John Reynolds, *A Discourse upon Prodigious ABSTINENCE* (London, 1669; STC: 10543; Wing: R1315), 33–4 [E4r–E4v].
 - 2 Thomas Heywood, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, R. W. Van Fossen (ed) (London, 1970), 17.38. Heywood's play is divided into scenes, not acts, and

subsequent quotations will be cited by scene and line numbers in parentheses in the text. In the case of stage directions, the practice followed is that of Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580–1642* (Cambridge, 1999), in which the line number cited precedes the quoted direction.

- 3 Reynolds, *A Discourse upon Prodigious ABSTINENCE*, 1 [A4]; Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 93; Rudolph M. Bell, *Holy Anorexia* (Chicago, 1985).
- 4 Bartholomew Batty, *The Christian mans Closet*, William Lowth (trans) (London, 1580; STC: 1591), 23r [F3r].
- 5 Richard Morton, *PHTHISIOLOGIA: OR, A TREATISE OF Consumptions* (London, 1694; STC: 32124; Wing: M2830), 8–9. We are grateful to the staff of McGill University's Osler Library of the History of Medicine for their assistance in finding early texts on female starvation.
- 6 Thomas Heywood, *GUNAIKEION: or, NINE BOOKES of Various History. Concerning Women; Inscribed by ye names of ye Nine Muses* (London, 1624; STC: 13326); *THE EXEMPLARY LIVES AND MEMORABLE ACTS OF NINE THE MOST WORTHY WOMEN OF THE WORLD* (London, 1640; STC: 13316).
- 7 Henry Hitch Adams, *English Domestic Or, Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642* (New York, 1943), 7, 144–59 and *passim*; Peter Ure, 'Marriage and the Domestic Drama in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *Shakespeare's Contemporaries* (2nd ed), Max Bluestone and Norman Rabkin (eds) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970), 194–203. See Andrew Clark, *Domestic Drama: A Survey of the Origins, Antecedents and Nature of the Domestic Play in England, 1500–1640* (2 vols) (Salzburg, 1975), 1:12–24 and *passim*, for an overview of the impact of Adams on subsequent discussions of domestic drama.
- 8 Brian Scobie, 'Introduction', *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (London, 1985), xxii–xxvii.
- 9 To take some recent examples, Nancy A. Gutierrez, 'Exorcism by Fasting in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*: A Paradigm of Puritan Resistance?', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 33 (1994), 43–62, suggests that the things that make Anne in the eyes of her husband and his friends a 'perfect wife' also make her vulnerable to Wendoll's solicitations (48). Her recent book, *'Shall She Famish Then?': Female Food Refusal in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2003), elaborates upon the material in the two articles we cite. Jennifer Panek, 'Punishing Adultery in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 34 (1994), 357–78, reads the play in the context of contemporary marriage manuals as 'an exemplum of how *not* to treat a repentant adulteress' (363); Paula McQuade, "'A Labyrinth of Sin': Marriage

- and Moral Capacity in Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *Modern Philology* 98 (2000), 231–50, in the context of a study of what she calls the 'casuistical moral analysis' of the period, concludes that 'The play illustrates the disastrous consequences of female subordination and male domination on both husband and wife' (233, 249); and Thomas Moisan, 'Framing with Kindness: The Transgressive Theatre of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *Essays on Transgressive Readings*, Georgia Johnston (ed) (Lewiston, 1997), 171–84, suggests that Frankford is 'the architect of ... his own cuckolding' (182). Viviana Comensoli, in *'Household Business': Domestic Plays of Early Modern England* (Toronto, 1996), 179 (n. 62), offers another comprehensive overview of critical perspectives on Frankford's complicity in Anne's adultery.
- 10 According to Ann Christensen, 'Business, Pleasure, and the Domestic Economy in Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *Exemplaria* 9 (1997), 315–40, Frankford is undermined by the tension between 'business', which began to draw the early modern householder away from the home, and his responsibilities of household management. Lena Cowen Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), 137–51, similarly argues that *A Woman Killed with Kindness* presents a new domestic ethic of responsibility for keeping, protecting and governing the persons and material possessions of the household sphere accompanied by the anxiety of uncertain ownership and possession, including the possession of one's wife. Comensoli, *'Household Business'*, argues as well for the relationship between Anne and property and also discusses the play in terms of the dynamics of private and public space in the early modern household, but clearly sees Anne as the transgressor (69–79). See also Cynthia Lewis, 'Heywood's *Gunaikeion* and Woman-kind in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *English Language Notes* 32 (1994), 24–37.
- 11 Scobie, 'Introduction,' xxi, sees Anne's action as a consequence of Frankford's kindness. In contrast, Lewis, 'Heywood's *Gunaikeion*', finds that Anne's decision to starve herself brings about her husband's moral awakening. Moisan, 'Framing with Kindness', more emphatically stresses that Anne shapes the terms of her restoration to spiritual grace and her reconciliation with her husband, while Comensoli, *'Household Business'*, cites Batty's *Christian mans Closet* to suggest that Anne's fasting would have been interpreted by an early modern audience as a sign of spirituality and purification of the soul. Unlike Moisan, Comensoli therefore finds that Anne's self-starvation is a suppression of her autonomy and power of self-assertion (82).
- 12 Margaret B. Bryan, 'Food Symbolism in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*', *Renaissance Papers* 1974 (Durham, 1975), 9–17; Gutierrez, 'Exorcism', 44–54.

- 13 Qtd in Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 13 and 73.
- 14 Bell, *Holy Anorexia*, 21.
- 15 Caroline Walker Bynum, 'The Female Body and Religious Practice in the Later Middle Ages', *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, Michel Feher (ed), part 1 (New York, 1989), 161–219.
- 16 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, English Dominican Fathers (trans), vol 2 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1923), 174.
- 17 Nancy A. Gutierrez, 'Double Standard in the Flesh: Gender, Fasting, and Power in English Renaissance Drama', *Disorderly Eaters: Texts in Self-Empowerment*, Lilian R. Furst and Peter Graham (eds) (University Park, 1992), 79–93.
- 18 William Struther, *SCOTLANDS WARNING, Or a Treatise of Fasting* (Edinburgh, 1628; STC: 23370), 60; Juan Luis Vives, *The Instructio[n] of a Christen Woma[n]*, Richarde Hyrd (trans) (London, 1529; STC: 24856), H1r; Phillip [sic] Stubbes, [*A Christal Glasse for Christian WWomen*] (London, 1591; STC: 23381), A3r. Batty, *The Christian mans Closet*, 51v–53r [N4v–O1r].
- 19 Elizabeth Cary, *The Tragedy of Mariam the Fair Queen of Jewry; With, The Lady Falkland: Her Life by One of Her Daughters*, Barry Weller and Margaret W. Ferguson (eds) (Berkeley, 1994), 11, 206–7.
- 20 Gutierrez, 'Exorcism', 51.
- 21 John Ford, *The Broken Heart*, T.J.B. Spencer (ed) (Manchester, 1980), 4.2. 149–52.
- 22 Christian Joachim Lossau, *Wahrhafftige und ausführliche Beschreibung Eines besondern und merckwürdigen CASUS INEDIAE* (Hamburg, 1729). Sarah Westphal and Christina Oltmann provided this translation of Lossau's title page, which continues as follows: 'wherein you will find not only a chronological account of how this person was reduced to such a condition that she lived for a long time without eating, drinking, or speaking; what happened to her at the plague hospice in Hamburg, and what sorts of experiments were carried out; how she finally took food again, spoke again, and then died; but you will also find a medical opinion, based on the anatomical account of her body, concerning the causes of her sickness and her death. Appended to this is a full report of the ancient and modern writers who have described, either in other contexts or in independent tracts, similar incidents of people who lived for many months and years without food and drink'. The long title indicates an intense interest in the body's corporeal rather than spiritual dimension in relation to female self-starvation.
- 23 Gutierrez, 'Double Standard in the Flesh', 83 and 92, also points to a number of pamphlets published in England between 1589 and 1635 that represent

- 'fasting girls'. Her examples emphasize how women's survival of starvation is a miracle that demonstrates the power and goodness of God.
- 24 Peter Stallybrass, 'Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed', *Rewriting the Renaissance*, Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (eds) (Chicago, 1986), 123–42. Andrew Belsey and Catherine Belsey, 'Icons of Divinity: Portraits of Elizabeth I', *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540–1660*, Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (eds) (London, 1990), 11–35.
 - 25 Gail Kern Paster and Skiles Howard (eds), 'Amazons', *Midsummer Night's Dream: Texts and Contexts* (Boston, 1999), 194–216.
 - 26 Paster and Howard, 'Amazons', *passim*.
 - 27 Marilyn L. Johnson, *Images of Women in the Works of Thomas Heywood*, (Salzburg, 1974), 27–54.
 - 28 Thomas Heywood, 'Of the Amazons', *GUNAIKEION*, 225. Subsequent references to this edition are documented by page numbers in parentheses in the text.
 - 29 Heywood's positive view of the Amazons is also indicated by his inclusion of Penthisilea in *THE EXEMPLARY LIVES*. An Amazon queen who assists Priam during the Trojan War, she is 'The first brave Championesse observed in field, / Arm'd with a Polleax and a Mooved [*sic*] shield', 94 [N3v]. Like Penthisilea, whose corpse becomes an object of Achilles' devotion once he has murdered her, Anne finds her starved-to-death body the object of Frankford's devotion.
 - 30 Kathryn Schwarz, 'Missing the Breast: Desire, Disease, and the Singular Effect of Amazons', *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe*, David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (eds) (New York: 1997), 147–69.
 - 31 Batty, *The Christian mans Closet*, 53r [O1r].
 - 32 Thomas Vicary, *Anatomie of the Bodie of Man* (London, 1586; STC: 24707), 55.
 - 33 Thevet, *THE NEW found vvorlde*, 101v [D5v]; Heywood, *GUNAIKEION*, 221; John Bulwer, *A VIEVV OF THE PEOPLE OF THE VVHOLE VVORLD* (London, 1654; Wing: B5470), 321–3 [Uu2r–Uu3r].
 - 34 Schwarz, 'Missing the Breast', 156.
 - 35 Thevet, *THE NEW found vvorlde*, 101v [D5v].
 - 36 The discussion in this section draws upon the distinction between the 'classical' and the 'grotesque' body developed by Mikhail Bakhtin. See introduction to *Rabelais and His World*, Helen Iswolsky (trans) (Cambridge, 1968, 18–30.
 - 37 As Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance* (Urbana, 1984), 268, points out, 'The connection between women and property was ... deeply engrained in Renaissance thought'.

- 38 Comensoli, 'Household Business', 74–7; Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture*, 143–8.
- 39 Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge, 2002), 7–8, 201–7 and *passim*.
- 40 As pointed out by Karen Newman of the marriage sermon published in 1623 by Protestant preacher Thomas Gataker, the woman has no existence on her own; rather, she is 'a series of prosthetic parts and the "bodie whereunto it is fastned" is the husband'. *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago, 1991), 9.
- 41 David Cressy, in *Birth, Marriage & Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997), 350–61, describes the role of eating and drinking in wedding celebrations in the early modern period. Food is also suggested by such names as Sisly Milk-pail.
- 42 In contrast to Wendoll and Anne, Sir Charles Mountford and his sister Susan in their penury 'feed sparing' (7.44).
- 43 Wall, *Staging Domesticity*, 201–4, discusses Nicholas in terms of competition between different classes of servants (broadly defined) within Frankford's household, and reads his antipathy to Wendoll as hostility to the disruption of established lines of dependency and authority.
- 44 The word 'passion' as used here has both physical and spiritual resonances. The view of Scobie (xvii) and others that Frankford can be associated with Christ, and its implications for Anne's suffering, is not addressed.