Timeline for Textual Evidence

Richard III (1984), dir. Bill Alexander, at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre (Stratford-upon-Avon, England).

Antony Sher, *Year of the King: An Actor's Diary and Sketchbook* (London: Methuen, 1985).

Richard III (2000), dir. Jakub Špalek, by the Divadelní Spolek Kašpar company, at the Divadlo v Celetné (Prague, Czech Republic).

Richard III (2003), dir. Barry Kyle, at the Globe (London, England).

Richard III (2004), dir. Peter DuBois, at the Public Theatre (New York, NY).

Richard III (2005), dir. Heidi Lauren Duke, at the Spoon Theatre (New York, NY).

Richard III (2008), dir. Ian Leson, at the Kitchen Dog Theatre (Dallas, TX).

Richard III (2015), dir. Sally Wood, at the Portland Stage Company (Portland, ME).

Richard III (2016), dir. Christopher Brauer, at the Trappist Monestary Provincial Heritage Park (Winnipeg, Canada).

Richard III (2016), dir. Jessica Thebus, at the Garage Theatre at Steppenwolf (Chicago, IL).

Richard III (2017), dir. Barrie Rutter, at the Hull Truck Theatre (Hull, UK).

Timeline for Shakespearean Historical Evidence (#1: Shakespeare's Age)

Desiderius Erasmus, *The Manuell of the Christen Knyght* (1503), trans. William Tyndale (London: Wynkyn de Worde for Iohan Byddell, 1533):

> Thinke & surely byleue that thing{is} inuysible whiche thou seest not are so excellent / so pure / so perfyt / that thinges whiche be sene in comparyson of them are scarse very shadowes representyng to the eyes a small & a thynne simylytude of them. Therfore in this outwarde corporall thing{is} what so euer thy sensyble wyttes eyther desyre or abhorre / it shalbe a gret deale meter yt the spyrit loue or hate thesame thynge in inwarde & incorporall thyng{is}. The goodly beautye of thy body pleaseth thyne eyes / thinke than how honest a thing is the beauty of ye soule. A deformed vysage semeth an vnplesaunt thing. remembre howe odyous a thing is a mynde defyled with vyces: and of all other thyndo likewyse. For as ye soule hath certayne beauty wherwith one whyle she pleaseth god / & a defourmyte wherwith an other whyle she pleaseth ye dyuell / as lyke vnto lyke: so hath she also her youthe / her age / sicknes / helth / dethe / lyfe / pouerty / riches / ioye / sorowe / werre / peace / colde / heate / thurst / drinke / hunger / meate. To conclude shortly what soeuer is fythy in the body / that same is to be vnderstande in the soule. ("The fyfth rule. capi .xiij")

Bartolommeo della Rocca (called Cocles), *The Rebirth of Chiromancy and Physiognomy* (1504), trans. Thomas Hill, as *The Whole Art of Phisiognomie* (London: Iohn Waylande, 1556)

> The necke croked after the latytude of the bodye, fro the ryghte or leafte syde, argueth hym to be deceatfull, a wary talker, and vnfaythfull: as Arystotle affyrmeth, eschewe vtterlye hys company, whiche is wrye necked downe to the Joyning of the shoulder pointes, for such be vngraci|ous, dissemblers & deceateful, as Cocles noted the same in melancholicke parsones. ("Of the sygnyfycacions of the necke. The. xxx. Chapter")
>
> The shoulder poyntes crokyng inwarde: declare that man to be wary, slouthfull, secrete, ingeniouse, and a surmiser.... The shoulder poyntes vnequall, as the one greater then the other, declare that man to be slouthful, of a dul vnderstandig· of a grosse wit & feadyng· sipie, of a dul capacitie, faithful, bold, a niggard or one hard to be moued, and somtymes an vtterer of secretes, false, and not crediteyng one. ("Of the shoulder poyntes")
>
> The crokednes of the backe, declareth the maliciousnesse of condicious, and ouerthwartnesse in maners. ("Of the belly, backe, greate guttes, and haunches, with the legges to the fet. The. xxxv. Chapter.")
>
> The legges croked, and hollow or bending in the nether part of the legges: declare those men, to be euil. ("A conclusion or briefe rehearsall")

Thomas More, *Vtopia* (1516), trans. Raphe Robynson (London: S. Mierdman for Abraham Vele, 1551):

> To mocke a man for hys deformitie, or for that he lacketh anye parte or lymme of hys bodye, is counted greate dishonestie and reproche not to hym that is mocked, but to hym that mocketh. ("Of Bondemen, sicke persons, wedlocke, and dyuers other matters")

Lodovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso* (1516-32), trans. John Harrington (London: Richard Field for John Norton and Simon Waterson, 1607):

> Eu'n so Rogero plainly now deseride,
> Alcynas foule disgraces and enormitie,
> Because of this his ring she could not hide,
> By all her paintings any one deformitie:
> He saw most plainly that in her did bide,
> Vnto her former beauties no conformitie,
> But lookes so vgly, that from East to West,
> Was not a fouler old misshapen beast.
>
> Her face was wan, a leane and writheld skin,
> Her stature scant three horseloaues did exceed:
> Her haire was gray of hue, and very thin,
> Her teeth were gone, her gums seru'd in their steed,
> No space was there between her nose and chin,
> Her noisome breath contagion would breed,
> In fine, of her it might haue well bene said,
> In Nestors youth she was a pretie maid. (7.61-62)

Johannes Indagine, *Briefe Introductions, both Naturall, Pleasaunte, and also Delectable vnto the Art of Chiromancy, or Manuel Diuination, and Physiognomy* (1522), trans. Fabian Withers (London: Iohannis Day for Richarde Iugge, 1558):

> A croked backe is token of a nigarde, and couetous persone.

JEFFREY R. WILSON
PHYSICAL DEFORMITY IN THE RENAISSANCE

Juan Luis Vives, *Introduction to Wisedome* (1524), trans. Richard Morison (London: Tho. Berthelet, 1550):

> There be in the bodie, as belongyng vnto it, beautie, helth, integritee of membres, strength, lightnes, delectacion, and their contraries as deformitee, sickenes, lacke of limmes, wekenes, sloth, sorowe, and other, as well commoditees of the body, as incommoditees of the mynde, as learnyng and vertue, & their contraries, rudenesse and vice. ("A diuision of suche thynges, as ar perteignyng vnto men")

Baldassarre Castiglione, *The Courtyer* (1528), trans. Thomas Hoby (London: Wyllyam Seres, 1561):

> The place therfore and (as it were) the hedspring that laughing matters arise of, con|sisteth in a certein deformitie or ill fauourednesse, bicause a man laugheth onlie at those matters that are disagree|ing in themselues, and (to a mans seeminge) are in yll plight, where it is not so in deede. ("Wherein laughing matters consist")
>
> Doeth ech man seeke to couer the defaultes of nature, aswell in the minde, as also in the bodie: the which is to be sene in the blinde, lame, crooked and other mayned and deformed creatures. For although these imperfections may be layed to nature, yet doeth it greeue ech man to haue them in him self: bicause it seemeth by the testimonie of the self same nature that a man hath that default or blemishe (as it were) for a patent and token of his ill inclination. ("Images in the honour of men")

Richard Roussat, *Of Physiognomie* (1542), in *The Most Excellent, Profitable, and Pleasant Booke of the Famous Doctour and Expert Astrologian Arcandam or Aleandrin* (London: Henry Denham for James Rowbothum, 1564):

> If the body of them that haue croked bodyes bee softe, it is not so euyll as yf it were in a thick & hard body.
>
> Euen as all lame men are wicked so all they which are in health haue not good maners. For it is more requisite, & there is more a doe to forme a mind without faulte, than a body. Wherfore the most wicked of al other, are ye croke backed men seing the faulte of them is neare vnto the hart whych is the prince of all ye body. Next are the blind and the squint eyed men, forasmuch as nature hath failed about ye braine. After them come the dome & the deffe. And then the halting men & after the~ are they yt haue their fingars fast ioyned together, or to farre a sounder the one from the other for nature hath failed in them, in mem+bers lesse necessarye. They that be ful of wartes haue the nexte and last place and the scarred bodies folow them.

Charles Estienne, "That it is better to be fowle than faire," in *The Defence of Contraries: Paradoxes Against Common Opinion* (1553), trans. Anthony Munday (London: Iohn Windet for Simon Waterson, 1593):

> Who knoweth not, how much the deformitie of body and hard fauoured face is to bee esteemed, principally in women (for in men it was neuer in so great request:) hath neuer considered, how ma|ny amorous sparks is dayly to be seen, vnder an il-fauoured countenance and badde composed body, choicely hid and couered: which in a faire face finely polished, giues often occasion of ceaselesse flames and cruell passions. (17)
>
> Note the good and profit ensuing by deformitie, when all they in generall, that of olde time haue beene, & yet at this day are studious in chastitie, doe openly confesse, as nothing hath like force in them, to tame and check the pricks of the flesh, neither long watchings, greeuous disciplines, or continuall fastinges; as one only looke vpon an il-fauoured and counterfeit per|son. Hence ensueth that, which is vsed as a common prouerbe, concerning a very fowle deformed wo|man: that shee serueth as a good receipt and soue|raigne remedy, against fleshly tentations. O sacred and pretious deformity, deerly loued of chastitie. (20)
>
> And if we shall compare and vnite together, the beawty of the mind with that of the body: shall we not finde a greater number of deformed people, to be more wise and ingenious then the faire and well fourmed? Let Socrates be our witnesse, whome the historians and auncient figures represent, to be so il|fauoured as might be: notwithstanding, by the Ora|cle of Apollo, he was acknowledged to be the wisest man of his time. Phrigian Aesope, the most excellent fabulist, was in forme of bodie so strange and misha|pen, as the verie ougliest in his time (in comparison of him) might rightly bee resembled to Narcissus or Ganimede: neuerthelesse, as each one may read, hee was most rich in vertues, and in spirit (beyond all o|ther) most excellent.
>
> Of great deformitie were the Philosophers, Zeno and Aristotle, Empedocles fowlie composed, and Galba a very ougly counterfeit: neuerthelesse, they al were of maruellous and sweet disposed spirit. Could any impeach the deformity of Philopoemen, who after hee was seene to be a good and hardie souldiour: came he not to the dignity of a most valiant captaine? and was hee not reuerenced among his people, for his high & excellent vertues? (18-19)

Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London: Richard Grafton, 1553):

> Oftentimes the deformitie of a mans bodye geueth mater enoughe to be ryght merye. (78)

Pierre Boaistuau, *Theatrum Mundi* (1558), trans. John Alday (London: H. Denham for Thomas Hacket, 1566):

> What anguishe and paine the poore mothers suffer in their childings, and what daunger they are in, it is manifest, somtimes there are children that come forth their arms first, & others their fete first, others their knées first, and others ouerthwart. But that which is more cruell, and that we cannot apprehend without horror, is, that sometimes it is force to cal Chirurgians, Mediciners and Barbars, in stede of wise Matrons and Midwiues, to dismember the children and pull them out by pieces, and sometime it behoueth to open the poore innocent mother aliue, and put yron tooles in hir bodie, yea to murther hir for to haue hir fruite: some children are borne so monster like and deformed, that they are not like men, but abhominable monsters: some are borne with .ij. heades, and foure legges, as one which was séene in the Citie of *Paris*, whilst this booke was a making, others cleping together, as hath bene séene in Fraunce, and in other places. Two women children were borne ioyned together by the shoulders, after the one had liued a certaine time, died and infected the other.... Some there are that are borne blinde, others deafe, others dumbe, and others there are born lame of their limmes, for whom their parents are sorowfull. In such sort that if we consider attentiuely all the misery of our natiuitie, we shall finde the olde Prouerbe true, which sayth, that we are conceyued in filth & vnclennesse, borne in sinne and care, and nourished wyth paine and labor. (C1)

Giovanni Battista Giraldi, *A Discourse of Ciuill Life* (1565), trans. Lodowick Bryskett (London: R. Field for Edward Blout, 1606):

> We are not in any wise to esteeme a person in body mis-shapen or deformed, lesse worthy to be nourished, or to be admitted to magistracie, if he be vertuous, then the other that is of gratefull presence. For though *Aristotle* thinke the deformitie of the body to be an impediment to the perfect felicitie of man, in respect of exteriour things; yet he determineth, that it is no hindrance to the course of vertue. To conclude therfore this point, though chil|dren be borne weake, crooked, mis-shapen, or deformed of body, they are not therefore to be exposed, but as wel to be brought vp and instructed as the other, that they may grow and increase in vertue, and become worthy of those dignities which are dispensed in their common-weales. And, me thinketh, *Socrates* that wise man spake very well to his scholers, and to this purpose, when he ad|uised them, that they should often behold themselues in looking-glasses: to the end (said he) that if you see your faces and bodies comely and beautifull, ye may endeuor to set forth and grace the gifts of nature the better, by ad|ioyning vertues thereunto: and if ye perceiue your selues to be deformed and il-fauoured, you may seeke to supply the defects of nature, with the ornaments of vertue, thereby making your selues no lesse grateful and amiable then they that haue beautiful bodies. For it is rather good to see a man of body imperfect and disproportioned en|dued with vertues, then a goodly body to be nought else but a gay vessell filled with vice and wickednes. Children are to be bred, such as nature giueth them vnto vs, and we are to haue patience to abide their proof, and to see what their actions will be: and if theirs that be of deformed body, do proue good and vertuous, they are so much the more to be commended, as they seemed lesse apt there|unto by their birth. (38-39)

Wawrzyniec Goslicki, *The Counsellor* (1568), anonymous trans. (London: Richard Bradocke, 1598):

> We also commonly take heede of those whom nature hath marked by defect of any member, as they that are lame of one legge, squint eyde, or deformed in person: for such men are accounted craftie and subtill. Neuerthelesse, if any such personage be knowen for good, and by the excellency of vertue hath ouercome the imperfection of nature; then shall he deseruingly be admitted to the dignitie of Counsellors.... *Philopaemen* a notable Captaine of the Achaeans, was an euill fauored man, and being taken prisoner, was forced to cut wood. Afterwards he became knowen, and saide; that he suffered the punishment due to his deformitie. We therfore commend a graue & pleasant face in our Counsellor: and allow most of such eies as are sweet & not cruell; for that countenance is fittest for men of such qualitie. Yet is not the coniecture we haue by the features of bodie so certaine, as thereby we may exactly iudge the vertue of mind: for many there are, whose persons be not beautifull, yet in mind are vertu|ous men, that is to say, iust, prudent, & temperate. The mind is not blemished by deformitie of bodie, but by beauty of mind the bodie is beautified. Vertue is not bound eyther to a beautifull or deformed body, but is of it selfe comely, and doth grace all bodies with beautie therof. And therfore it behoueth vs in knowing of men, to vse not onely eyes, but also iudgement (137)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
PHYSICAL DEFORMITY IN THE RENAISSANCE

Pierre de la Primaudaye, "Of Uice," in *The French Academie* (1577), trans. Thomas Bowes (London: Edmund Bollifant for G. Bishop and Ralph Newbery, 1586):

> Now hauing by our last speech declared sufficiently, that vertue is the onely true good of the soule, it is out of question, that vice, which is altogither contrarie vnto it, is the onely euill thereof, and the fountaine of al the miseries of man, as wel earthly as eternall. Which, that we may more surely auoid, and marke better the excellencie and beautie of vertue, by the lothsomnes and deformitie of vice (bicause contraries set one by another, as blacke neare to white, shew themselues a great deale better). (63)

Philippe de Mornay, seigneur du Plessis-Marly, *The Trewnesse of the Christian Religion* (1581), trans. Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding (London: John Charlewood and George Robinson for Thomas Cadman, 1587):

> How can matter be without forme, seeing that euen deformitie it selfe is a kynd of forme? (157)

Giambattista della Porta, *On Human Physiognomy* (1586), trans. Zakiya Hanafi, in *The Monster in the Machine* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000):

> Everyone knows that amongst the Philosophers it is a commonplace that the monster in the body is a monster in the soul, and being a monster in the soul, what can be expected of such a person, what should become of him, if not evils and misfortune. (100)

Jacques Guillemeau, *Child-birth or, The Happy Deliuerie of Women* (1609), anonymous trans. (London: A. Hatfield, 1612):

> A woman with child must be pleasant and merrie, shunning all melancholike and troublesome things that may vexe or molest her mind... so that discreet women, and such as desire to haue children, will not giue eare vnto lamentable and fearefull tales or storyes, nor cast their eyes vpon pictures or persons which are vglie or deformed, least the imagination imprint on the child the similitude of the said person or picture, which doing, women shall be sure to be well and happily deliuered, and that (With the help of God) they shall beare their burthen to the full terme, which shall be sent into the world without much paine, promising them a happie and speedie deliuerie. To conclude, they must leaue off their Busks as soone as they perceiue themselues with child, not lacing themselues too straight, or crush|ing themselues together, for feare least the child be mishapen and crooked, or haue not his naturall growth: and their garments must be rather light and thin, then heauie and cumbersome. (26)

Timeline for Shakespearean Historical Evidence (#2: Shakespeare's Text)

William Shakespeare, *2 Henry VI* (1590-91):

Clif. Heap of wrath, foul indigested lump,
As crooked in thy manners as thy shape! (5.1.157-58)

William Shakespeare, *3 Henry VI* (1590-91):

[*Glou.*] Why, love forswore me in my mother's womb;
And for I should not deal in her soft laws,
She did corrupt frail nature with some bribe,
To shrink mine arm up like a wither'd shrub,
To make an envious mountain on my back,
Where sits deformity to mock my body;
To shape my legs of an unequal size,
To disproportion me in every part,
Like to a chaos, or an unlick'd bear-whelp
That carries no impression like the dam.
And am I then a man to be belov'd?
O monstrous fault, to harbor such a thought!
Then since this earth affords no joy to me
But to command, to check, to o'erbear such
As are of better person than myself,
I'll make my heaven to dream upon the crown,
And whiles I live, t' account this world but hell,
Until my misshap'd trunk that bears this head
Be round impaled with a glorious crown. (3.2.153-71)

K. Hen. Hadst thou been kill'd when first thou didst presume
Thou hadst not liv'd to kill a son of mine....
The owl shriek'd at thy birth, an evil sign;
The night-crow cried, aboding luckless time;
Dogs howl'd, and hideous tempest shook down trees;
The raven rook'd her on the chimney's top,
And chattering magpies in dismal discord sung;
Thy mother left more than a mother's pain,
And yet brought forth less than a mother's hope,
To wit, an indigested and deformed lump,
Not like the fruit of such a goodly tree
Teeth hadst thou in thy head when thou wast born,
To signify thou cams't to bite the world.
And, if the rest be true which I have heard,
Thou camest –
Glou. Die, prophet, in thy speech: *Stabs him.*
For this, amongst the rest, was I ordain'd....
Indeed, 'tis true that Henry told me of;
For I have often heard my mother say
I came into the world with my legs forward:
Had I not reason, think ye, to make haste,
And seek their ruin that usurp'd our right?
The midwife wonder'd and the women cried
'O, Jesus bless us, he is born with teeth!'
And so I was; which plainly signified
That I should snarl and bite and play the dog.
Then, since the heavens have shaped my body so,
Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it. (5.6.35-79)

William Shakespeare, *Richard III* (1592-93):

[*Glou.*] But I, that am not shaped for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass;
I, that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;
I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
Deform'd, unfinish'd, sent before my time
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,
And that so lamely and unfashionable
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them;
Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to spy my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity.
And therefore, since I cannot prove a lover,
To entertain these fair well-spoken days,
I am determined to prove a villain
And hate the idle pleasures of these days. (1.1.12-31)

Glou. I pray you all, tell me what they deserve
That do conspire my death with devilish plots
Of damned witchcraft, and that have prevail'd
Upon my body with their hellish charms?
Hast. The tender love I bear your Grace, my lord,
Makes me most forward in this princely presence
To doom th' offenders, whosoe'r they be:
I say, my lord, they have deserved death.
Glou. Then be your eyes the witness of their evil.
Look how I am bewitch'd; behold mine arm
Is like a blasted sapling, wither'd up;
And this is Edward's wife, that monstrous witch,
Consorted with that harlot, strumpet Shore,
That by their witchcraft thus have marked me.
Hast. If they have done this deed, my noble lord –
Glou. If? Thou protector of this damned strumpet,
Talk'st thou to me of 'ifs'? Thou art a traitor.
Off with his head! (3.4.59-76)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
PHYSICAL DEFORMITY IN SHAKESPEARE

William Shakespeare, *Venus and Adonis* (1592-93):

Were I hard-favor'd, foul, or wrinkled old,
Ill-nurtur'd, crooked, churlish, harsh in voice,
O'erworn, despised, rheumatic, and cold,
Thick-sighted, barren, lean, and lacking juice,
Then mightst thou pause, for then I were not for thee,
But having no defects, why dost abhor me? (133-38)

William Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors* (1592-94):

[*S. Ant.*] They say this town is full of cozenage,
As, nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind,
Soul-killing witches that deform the body,
Disguised cheaters, prating mountebanks,
And many such-like liberties of sin. (1.2.97-102)

[*Adr.*] He is deformed, crooked, old, and sere,
Ill-fac'd, worse bodied, shapeless everywhere;
Vicious, ungentle, foolish, blunt, unkind;
Stigmatical in making, worse in mind. (4.2.19-22)

William Shakespeare, *The Rape of Lucrece* (1593-94):

Then, for thy husband and thy children's sake,
Tender my suit: bequeath not to their lot
The shame that from them no device can take,
The blemish that will never be forgot;
Worse than a slavish wipe or birth-hour's blot:
For marks descried in men's nativity
Are nature's faults, not their own infamy. (533-39)

William Shakespeare, *King John* (1594-96):

Const. If thou, that bid'st me be content, wert grim,
Ugly and slanderous to thy mother's womb,
Full of unpleasing blots and sightless stains,
Lame, foolish, crooked, swart, prodigious,
Patch'd with foul moles and eye-offending marks,
I would not care, I then would be content,
For then I should not love thee, no, nor thou
Become thy great birth nor deserve a crown.
But thou art fair, and at thy birth, dear boy,
Nature and Fortune join'd to make thee great. (3.1.43-52)

[*K. John.*] Hadst not thou been by,
A fellow by the hand of nature mark'd,
Quoted and sign'd to do a deed of shame,
This murder had not come into my mind:
But taking note of thy abhorr'd aspect,
Finding thee fit for bloody villany,
Apt, liable to be employ'd in danger,
I faintly broke with thee of Arthur's death. (4.2.220-27)

William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-96):

Obe. Now, until the break of day,
Through this house each fairy stray.
To the best bride-bed we,
Which by us shall blessed be;
And the issue, there create,
Ever shall be fortunate.
So shall all the couples three
Ever true in loving be;
And the blots of Nature's hand
Shall not in their issue stand;
Never mole, hare lip, nor scar,
Nor mark prodigious, such as are
Despised in nativity,
Shall upon their children be. (5.1.401-14)

William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* (1596-97):

Launcelot Gobbo, a clown, servant to Shylock. (dramatis personae)

William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598-99):

Con. Yes, the fashion is the fashion.
Bora. Tush! I may as well say the fool's the fool. But seest thou not what a deformed thief this fashion is?
2. Watch. [*Aside*] I know that Deformed; a' has been a vile thief this seven year; a' goes up and down like a gentleman: I remember his name....
Bora. Seest thou not, I say, what a deformed thief this fashion is? how giddily a' turns about all the hot bloods between fourteen and five-and-thirty? sometimes fashioning them like Pharaoh's soldiers in the reeky painting, sometime like god Bel's priests in the old church-window, sometime like the shaven Hercules in the smirched worm-eaten tapestry, where his codpiece seems as massy as his club?...
2. Watch. We charge you, in the prince's name, stand!
1. Watch. Call up the right master constable. We have here recovered the most dangerous piece of lechery that ever was known in the commonwealth.
2. Watch. And one Deformed is one of them: I know him; a' wears a lock.
Con. Masters, masters –
2. Watch. You'll be made bring Deformed forth, I warrant you. (3.3.122-73)

[*Dog.*] The watch heard them talk of one Deformed; they say he wears a key in his ear and a lock hanging by it, and borrows money in God's name, the which he hath used so long, and never paid, that now men grow hard-hearted and will lend nothing for God's sake. (5.1.308-12)

William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* (1600-01):

[*Ham.*] Oft it chances in particular men
That for some vicious mole of nature in them,
As in their birth, wherein they are not guilty
(Since nature cannot choose his origin),
By the o'ergrowth of some complexion,
Oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason,
Or by some habit that too much o'erleavens
The form of plausive manners – that these men,
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
Being nature's livery, or fortune's star,
Their virtues else (be they as pure as grace,
As infinite as man may undergo)
Shall in the general censure take corruption
From that particular fault. The dram of ev'l
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt
To his own scandal. (1.4.23-38)

William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night* (1601-02):

[*Ant.*] Thou hast, Sebastian, done good feature shame.
In nature there's no blemish but the mind;
None can be call'd deform'd but the unkind:
Virtue is beauty, but the beauteous evil
Are empty trunks o'erflourish'd by the devil. (3.4.366-70)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
PHYSICAL DEFORMITY IN SHAKESPEARE

William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida* (1601-03):

Ther. The plague of Greece upon thee, thou mongrel beef-witted lord!
Ajax. Speak then, thou vinewedst leaven, speak: I will beat thee into handsomeness. (2.1.12-15)

Enter Thersites.
Achil. How now thou core of envy? Thou crusty batch of nature, what's the news?
Ther. Why, thou picture of what thou seemest, and idol of idiot-worshippers, here's a letter for thee.
Achil. From whence, fragment?...
Patr. Why thou damnable box of envy, thou, what mean you to curse thus?
Ther. Do I curse thee?
Patr. Why, no, you ruinous butt, you whoreson indistinguishable cur, no....
Patr. Out, gall!
Ther. Finch-egg! (5.1.4-36)

William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* (1611):

Caliban, a salvage and deformed slave. (dramatis personae)

Mir. Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! (1.2.351-53).

Pros. A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains,
Humanely taken, all, all, lost, quite lostl
And as with age his body uglier grows,
So his mind cankers. (4.1.191-92).

Pros. This misshapen knave –
His mother was a witch, and one so strong
That could control the moon, make flows and ebs,
And deal in her command without her power,
These three have robb'd me, and this demi-devil
(For he's a bastard one) had plotted with them
To take my life. Two of these fellows you
Must know and own, this thing of darkness I
Acknowledge mine. (5.1.268-76)

Alon. This is as strange a thing as e'er I look'd on.
Pros. He is as disproportion'd in his manners,
As in his shape. (5.1.290-91)

John Heming and Henry Condell, "To the Great Variety of Readers" (1623):

Where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them: euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued them. (95)

Timeline for Historical Citations (Helping me interpret some of my historical evidence)

David T. Mitchell and Sharon L. Snyder, "Performing Deformity: The Making and Unmaking of Richard III," in *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000):

> Shakespeare's 'crookback'd king' embodies the chaos of a moment in England's history, while his physical differences underline his own metaphysical unfitness to govern. (95)
>
> In Shakespeare's play, with the significance of Richard's deformities unmoored from a fixed meaning – after all, the play enfolds a late Renaissance perspective upon medieval habits of court and 'superstitions' about disability – Richard is liberated to 'refashion' a performance. Richard's character fashions disability, then, as a full-blown narrative device that accrues force for his oewn machinations. He sets to work performing deformity. (103)
>
> This is not just a matter of *overcoming* liability, but of *employing* apparent liabilities as weaponry in the rhetorical dispute over his intentions and ambitions. (104)
>
> Among the contradictory significations of disabled corporeality that Richard's figure is made to mobilize, we would include these: social burden; metaphysical sign of divine disfavor; evidence of the workings of a divine plan in England's monarchy; the retribution a disabled child bears for parental wrongdoing; a disabled subject's binding to a determinate life; Richard's bearing an entrenched identity (pathetic or vengeful); his serving as literal evidence of the Fall; his personifying the fiendish specter of war; his being singular and exceptional rather than common or ordinary, most interior to a social order and most 'human' in his suffering, most exiled from society and lacking in natural human affections. Finally, a scapegoat patterning to the play reiterates exile as a culturally sanctioned historical solution to the social disruption that disabled people are perceived to present to an otherwise harmonious social order. (104-05)

Ato Quayson, *Aesthetic Nervousness* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007)

> disability is placed at the foreground of the action from the beginning and brings together various threads that serve to focalize the question of whether Richard's deformity is an insignia of or indeed the cause of his villainy. (27)

Katherine Schaap Williams, "Enabling Richard: The Rhetoric Of Disability In *Richard III*," *Disability Studies Quarterly* 29.4 (2009):

> While this language draws attention to Richard's bodily difference, the play ultimately remains ambiguous about his physical form, staging instead a frenzy of interpretive fervor about what Richard's body really means.
>
> In Richard III, Richard's ascent to power depends upon the manipulation of the body he marks, along with other characters in the play and critics alike, as insufficient, lacking, and deformed.
>
> The conflation of deformity and disability also obscures the complexity of Richard's bodily signification by assuming a unified discourse of deformity that maps onto physical disability.
>
> Although Richard's body appears singularly deficient among the other characters in the play, he relies upon the multiple significations of his deformities as a technology of performance to aid his bid for power, not impede it.

Abigail Elizabeth Comber, "A Medieval King 'Disabled' by an Early Modern Construct: A Contextual Examination of *Richard III*," in *Disability in the Middle Ages: Reconsiderations and Reverberations*, ed. Joshua Eyler (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010):

> Implicit within Shakespeare's play is an inherited medieval past and Shakespeare was applying medieval notions of disability to the historical Richard III in his construction of Richard, the character. (183)
>
> The field of disability studies shows us that people are never *just* physically impaired; they are always affected by and disabled by their societies and all the constructs which those societies crate to prescribe meaning to difference. *Richard III* illustrates the extent to which a figure can be disabled by an amalgamation of the religious, political, social and dramatic constructs and prejudices of society. (184)
>
> Shakespeare's original audience would have viewed Richard's impairment as a marker of his evil because that is what lingering medieval perceptions of disability had trained them to do. (192)

Robert McRuer, "Richard III: Fuck the Disabled: The Prequel," in *Shakesqueer: A Queer Companion to the Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Madhavi Menon (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011):

> Fuck Richard III, scholars and activists have essentially told us. Fuck the disabled figures we have inherited from an ableist literary tradition.... The crip processes of refusal most famously figured by Richard III, determined to prove a villain and hate the idle pleasures of dull, straight days, are inevitably at work in a range of queer performances that do not simply counter conservative ideas about disability or humanize those most affected by them (as important as those well-established critical projects might be), but that instead sneer at or piss on the unnatural (and always doomed) union of heterosexuality and able-bodiedness. (301)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
DISABILITY STUDIES ON RICHARD'S HUMP

Katherine Schaap Williams, "Performing Disability and Theorizing Deformity," *English Studies* 94.7 (2013): 757-72.

> Reading the "mutability" of Richard's character begins to approach the contemporary "social" model of disability, which separates impairment from disability. In this framework, disability happens through the interaction between an impaired body and the social and cultural environments that disable that body. A reading of Richard that emphasizes the disabling effects of negative social attitudes allows disability critics to posit a continuum between bodies of the past and the contemporary moment.... As part of a lineage of disabled identity, Richard's distinctive body—especially the hunchback formation—might be recognizably "disabled" in contemporary terms.
>
> Richard's double-facing presence in the narrative of disability theory reproduces the uniqueness inscribed within the role itself. While the actor's performance calls attention to Richard's deformity, however conceived, the character's distinctive body calls attention to the physical ability of the actor. (769)

David Houston Wood, "'Some tardy cripple': Timing Disability in *Richard III*," in *Richard III: A Critical Reader*, ed. Annaliese Connolly (London: Bloomsbury, 2013):

> Richard's deformities in *Richard III* might serve transhistorically as a narrative prosthetic within a play that resolves to eradicate him as a sign of deviancy. (131-32)
>
> This view of Richard ultimately refutes those which suggest Richard serves merely as a narrative symbol or as a political symptom, a narrative prosthetic within his cultural moment whose function is simply to be eradicated. What we can learn from Richard about early modern disability narratives is that time and emotion – the link between time, temperature, and the humours – can play a foundational role in representing crucial aspects of subjective identity, including the way in which corporeal difference, as inwardly and outwardly constituted, combine with social perception of such difference to produce stigma. (149)
>
> Richard comes to serve as *both* a 'spiritually pathological' image of the demonic *and* simultaneously medically explicable. (152)

Allison P. Hobgood, "Teeth Before Eyes: Impairment and Invisibility in Shakespeare's *Richard III*," in *Disability, Health, and Happiness in the Shakespearean Body*, ed. Sujata Iyengar (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015):

> Long after his death and even now in his resurrection, King Richard's body – and the various processes used to diagnose that body – always take center stage. (23)
>
> Shakespeare's intense pathologizing of Richard's physical health through scientific discourse does much to transmit and shape our understanding of the last Yorkist king.... Shakespeare engages throughout *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third* a medical model of disability rapidly developing in the early modern period.... The play illustrates a quite complex construction of disability in the Renaissance as it verifies how disability would have signified in definite material terms, not just metaphorical ones. The play's original performance, which the Norton, Cambridge, and Folger Shakespeare editions concur most likely took place in 1592 or 1593, was situated at a unique historical juncture wherein Richard's lack of 'fair proportion' (1.1.18) would have been interpreted via latent medieval beliefs in the marvelous and widespread curiosity about monsters, but also via burgeoning trends towards scientific rationalism that aimed to diagnose atypicality so as to cure individuals of supposed impairments and restore them to normative, able-bodies health. (24)
>
> In a vein strikingly resonant with a contemporary medical model of disability, the young duke employs existing early modern medical discourse around teething to highlight how Richard's physiology fundamentally differs from his own. (29)

JEFFREY R. WILSON

DISABILITY STUDIES ON RICHARD'S HUMP

> The more Richard and his embodiment get read throughout the drama, the less visible they actually become. The more the play's characters, for instance, try to pin down – and most often stigmatize – his body, the more his body disappears. As the play progresses, his habitus comes to contain so many possibilities for meaning that it actually fades from view; the precise, disabled body that prompts such intense attention from spectators, in the end, gets erased by over-signification. (31)

Geoffrey A. Johns, "A 'Grievous Burthern': *Richard III* and the Legacy of Monstrous Birth," in *Disability, Health, and Happiness in the Shakespearean Body*, ed. Sujata Iyengar (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015):

Katherine Schaap Williams, "Richard III and the Staging of Disability," in the *Discovering Literature: Shakespeare* section of the British Library website (2016), http://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/richard-iii-and-the-staging-of-disability

Gemma Almond, "To what Extent has the Concept of 'Deformity' Affected Richard III's Image and Character?," *Gorffennol* 1 (2015): 88-101.

Timeline for Shakespearean Historical Evidence (#3: Shakespeare's Reception)

JEFFREY R. WILSON

MODERN PERFORMANCE STUDIES ON RICHARD'S HUMP

Alice Ida Perry Wood, *The Stage History of Shakespeare's King Richard the Third* (New York, NY: AMS Press, 1909);

Chris R. Hassel, Jr., *Songs of Death: Performance, Interpretation, and the Text of Richard III* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987);

Scott Colley, *Richard's Himself Again: A Stage History of Richard III* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992):

Barbara Hodgdon, "Replicating Richard: Body Doubles, Body Politics," *Theatre Journal* 50.2 (1998):

Mathew Wagner, "A King(dom) for a Stage: The War Body in and as Performance," *The War Body on Screen*, ed. Karen Randell and Sean Redmond

Jim Casey, "'Richard's Himself again': The Body of Richard III on Stage and Screen," in *Shakespeare and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Performance and Adaptation of the Plays with Medieval Sources Or Settings*, ed. Martha W. Driver, et al. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009): 27-48.

Timeline for Cultural Historical Evidence

JEFFREY R. WILSON
DISABILITY STUDIES

Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation, *Policy Statement* (1974), at www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/UPIAS/UPIAS.pdf:

> In our view, it is society which disabled physically impaired people. Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society. Disabled people are therefore an oppressed group in society. To understand this, it is necessary to grasp the distinction between the physical impairment and the social situation, called 'disability', of people with such impairment. Thus we define impairment as lacking part of or all of a limb, or having a defective limb, organ or mechanism of the body; and disability as the disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organisation which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities. Physical disability is therefore a particular form of social oppression. (4)
>
> The Union aims to have all segregated facilities for physically impaired people replaced by arrangements for us to participate fully in society. These arrangements must include the necessary financial, medical, technical, educational and other help required from the State to enable us to gain the maximum possible independence in daily living activities, to achieve mobility, to undertake productive work, and to live where and how we choose with full control over our lives. (Aims)

Henri-Jacques Stiker, Introduction to *A History of Disability* (1982), trans. William Sayers (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1999):

> A society reveals itself by the way in which it treats certain significant phenomena. The problem of disability is one such phenomenon. To speak at all pertinently of disabled people discloses a society's depths. (14)
>
> What are societies doing when they exclude in one way or another and when they integrate in this fashion or that? What do they say about themselves in so doing? The study of everything that we could call the marginalized allows us to bring out previously ignored or neglected dimensions of that society. (16–17)

Mike Oliver (1983):

> The social model of disability acknowledges impairment as being a cause of individual limitation, but disability is imposed on top of this.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, at http://www.ada.gov/archive/adastat91.htm:

> The Congress finds that (1) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;... (7) individuals with disabilities are a discrete and insular minority who have been faced with restrictions and limitations, subjected to a history of purposeful unequal treatment, and relegated to a position of political powerlessness in our society, based on characteristics that are beyond the control of such individuals and resulting from stereotypic assumptions not truly indicative of the individual ability of such individuals to participate in, and contribute to, society; (8) the Nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals. (42.126.§12101.a)
>
> It is the purpose of this chapter (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;... (3) to ensure that the Federal Government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this chapter on behalf of individuals with disabilities. (42.126.§12101.b)

The ADA Amendments Act of 2008, at http://www.ada.gov/pubs/adastatute08mark.htm:

> Congress finds that... (3) while Congress expected that the definition of disability under the ADA would be interpreted consistently with how courts had applied the definition of a handicapped individual under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, that expectation has not been fulfilled;... (6) as a result of these Supreme Court cases, lower courts have incorrectly found in individual cases that people with a range of substantially limiting impairments are not people with disabilities.

Tom Shakespeare:

> The social model's benefits as a slogan and political ideology are its drawbacks as an academic account of disability.
>
> The social model so strongly disowns individual and medical approaches, that it risks implying that impairment is not a problem.

Lennard J. Davis, "Constructing Normalcy," in *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness, and the Body* (London: Verso, 1995):

Timeline for Historical Citations (helping me interpret some of my cultural historical evidence).

JEFFREY R. WILSON
DISABILITY STUDIES

> To understand the disabled body, one must return to the concept of the norm, the normal body. (23)
>
> The concept of a norm, unlike that of an ideal, implies that the majority of the polulation must or should somehow be part of the norm.... When we think of bodies, in a society where the concept of the norm is operative, then people with disabilities will be thought of as deviants. This ... is in contrast to societies with the concept of an ideal, in which all people have a non-ideal status. (29)
>
> The social process of disabling arrived with industrialization and with the set of practices and discourses that are linked to late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century notions of nationality, race, gender, criminality, sexual orientation, and so on. (24)

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, "Disability, Identity, and Representation," in *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1997):

> The discursive construct of the disabled figure, informed more by received attitudes than by people's actual experience of disability, circulates in culture and finds a home within the conventions and codes of literary representation. (9)
>
> Whether one lives with a disability or encounters someone who has one, the actual experience of disability is more complex and more dynamic than representation usually suggests.... Yet representation frequently obscures these complexities in favor of the rhetorical or symbolic potential of the prototypical disabled figure. (15)

Simi Linton, "Reassigning Meaning," in *Claiming Disability: Knowledge and Identity* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1998): 8-17.

> The present examination of disability has no need for the medical language of symptoms and diagnostic categories. Disability studies looks to different kinds of signifiers and the identification of different kinds of syndromes for its material. The elements of interest here are the linguistic conventions that structure the meanings assigned to disability and the patterns of response to disability that emanate from, or are attendant upon, those meanings. (8)
>
> The *disabled* or the *handicapped* was replaced in the mid-70s by *people with disabilities* to maintain disability as a characteristic of the individual, as opposed to the defining variable. At the time, some people would purposefully say *women and men with disabilities* to provide an extra dimension to the people being described and to deneuter the way the *disabled* were traditionally described. Beginning in the early 90s *disabled people* has been increasingly used in disability studies and disability rights circles when referring to the constituency group. Rather than maintaining disability as a secondary characteristic, disabled has become a marker of the identity that the individual and group wish to highlight and call attention to. (13)

James I. Charlton, "Nothing About Us Without Us," in *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998):

> 'Nothing About Us Without Us' resonates with the philosophy and history of the disability rights movement (DRM), a movement that has embarked on a belated mission parallel to other liberation movements. (3)

David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder, "Narrative Prosthesis and the Materiality of Metaphor," in *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000):

> Our thesis centers not simply upon the fact that people with disabilities have been the object of representational treatments, but rather that their function in literary discourse is primarily twofold: disability pervades literary narrative, first, as a stock feature of characterization and, second, as an opportunistic metaphorical device. We term this perpetual discursive dependency upon disability *narrative prosthesis*. Disability lends a distinctive idiosyncratisy to any character that differentiates the character from the anonymous background of the 'norm.... Disability also serves as a metaphorical signifier of social and individual collapse. Physical and cognitive anomalies promise to lend a 'tangible' body to textual abstractions; we term this metaphorical use of disability the *materiality of metaphor*.... While stories rely upon the potency of disability as a symbolic figure, they rarely take up disability as an experience of social or political dimension. (47-48)

Catherine J. Kudlick, "Disability History: Why We Need Another 'Other'," *The American Historical Review* 108.3 (June, 2003):

> Over the past two decades, our cousins in anthropology and literature have produced essays and monographs dealing with disability as a historical subject. The fields that blazed the trail for studying race, gender, and sexuality while introducing postmodernism and the linguistic turn have provided valuable analytic and theoretical tools for exploring this new Other. (par 1)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
DISABILITY STUDIES

Ato Quayson, "Aesthetic Nervousness," in *Aesthetic Nervousness: Disability and the Crisis of Representation* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2007): 1-31.

> Aesthetic nervousness is seen when the dominant protocols of representation within the literary text are shortcircuited in relation to disability. The primary level in which it may be discerned is in the interaction between a disabled and nondisabled character, where a variety of tensions may be identified. However, in most texts aesthetic nervousness is hardly ever limited to this primary level, but is augmented by tensions refracted across other levels of the text such as the disposition of symbols and motifs, the overall narrative or dramatic perspective, the constitution and reversals of plot structure, and so on. The final dimension of aesthetic nervousness is that between the reader and the text. (15)

Tobin Siebers, "Body Theory: From Social Construction to the New Realism of the Body," in *Disability Theory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008):

> Disability offers insight into the fact that all bodies are socially constructed – that social attitudes and institutions determine, far greater than biological fact, the representation of the body's reality. (53-54)
>
> The greatest stake in disability studies at the present moment is to find ways to represent pain and to resist models of the body that blunt the political effectiveness of these representations. I stress the importance of pain not because pain and disability are synonymous but to offer a challenge to current body theory and to expose to what extent its dependence on social constructionism collaborates with the misrepresentation of the disabled body in the political sphere. (61)
>
> The challenge is to function. I use this word advisedly and am prepared to find another if it offends. People with disabilities want to be able to function: to live with their disability, to come to know their body, to accept what it can do, and to keep doing what they can for as long as they can. (68-69)

Timeline for theoretical Citations

Graeae, "Our Artistic Vision," at http://graeae.org/about/our-artistic-vision/

> Graeae is a force for change in world-class theatre, boldly placing D/deaf and disabled actors centre stage and challenging preconceptions.

The Alliance for Inclusion in the Arts, "Mission," at http://inclusionin thearts.org/about/mission/

> The Alliance for Inclusion in the Arts is the nation's leading advocate for full diversity as a key to the vitality and dynamism of American theatre, film, and television.

Kenny Fries, *Staring Back: The Experience of Disability from the Inside Out* (Plume, 1997)

Petra Kuppers, "Deconstructing Images: Performing Disability," *Contemporary Theatre Review* 11.3-4 (2001): 25-40.

> The disabled performer is marginalised and invisible—relegated to borderlands, far outside the central area of cultural activity, into the discourses of medicine, therapy and victimhood. At the same time, people with physical impairments are also hypervisible, instantly defined in their physicality. The physically impaired performer has therefore to negotiate two areas of cultural meaning: invisibility as an active member in the public sphere, and hypervisibility and instant categorisation. (25)

Thomas Fahy, introduction to *Peering Behind the Curtain: Disability, Illness, and the Extraordinary Body in Contemporary Theater*, ed. Thomas Fahy and Kimball King (New York, NY: Routledge, 2002):

> When the disabled, suffering, or freakish body appears on stage, it raises certain questions (How did this happen? Is this condition permanent? Can this happen to me? Is the actor really disabled?) that challenge the audience's assumptions about and interpretations of this body. By not defining characters by their bodies, disability theater hopes to transcend these questions, fashioning narratives that individualize experience and move beyond the metaphoric. It ultimately challenges audiences to reevaluate preconceived notions about disability, and the stage becomes a space where social and political changes are possible. (x)

Petra Kuppers, *Disability and Contemporary Performance: Bodies on Edge* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004):

> Performers can perform disability, and this performance has currency, tradition and weight in the social sphere of popular culture: film actors playing disabled characters have carried off a number of Oscars, making it seem that acting disabiled is the highest achievement possible. There is plenty of scope for actors interested in taking on this challenge: both our popular and out high art heritage provide many instances of disabled characters, from Richard II to Quasimodo, from the X-Men to Captain Ahab. What we see much less is disabled people as artists and originators of artistic social texts and practices.... I want to move from non-disabled certainties about disability to disabled perspectives on these certainties. (12)

Bodies in Commotion: Disability & Performance, ed. Carrie Sandahl and Philip Auslander (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005),

> Bodies in Commotion is the ‹rst collection to explore disability as performance across a wide range of meanings—disability as a performance of everyday life, as a metaphor in dramatic literature, and as the work of dis- abled performing artists. It is important to address these myriad meanings in tandem because the depictions of disability embedded in dramatic liter- ature always frame the performance of everyday life, and because the sense that disability in daily life is already performance is reflected in the content and form of disabled artists' stage practices. (1)

JEFFREY R. WILSON
DISABILITY THEATER

Carrie Sandhal, "The Tyranny of the Neutral: Disability & Actor Training," in *Bodies in Commotion: Disability & Performance*, ed. Carrie Sandahl and Philip Auslander (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005),

> Because disability always signifies in representation, the trained disabled actor is rarely given the opportunity to play nondisabled characters. Disabled actors are told that their impairments would detract from the playwright's or director's intent for a nondisabled character. Disabled people who want to be actors learn this tenet early on and are dissuaded from pursuing training. Other barriers to training include inaccessible classroom and theater spaces and demeaning, stereotypical roles.

Terry Galloway, Donna Nudd, and Carrie Sandahl, "Actual Lives and the Ethic of Accommodation," in *Community Performance: A Reader*, ed. Petra Kuppers (New York: Routledge, 2007): 227-234.

> 1 At its core, an Ethic of Accommodation means that the majority does not rule. Instead, accommodation means including everyone wanting to participate, often necessitating that the majority make difficult changes in its practices and environment. These changes are not made begrudgingly, but with goodwill, creativity, and a strong dose of humor, elements that often find expression in the performances themselves.
> 2 The ethic includes the politics of listening as well as the politics of speaking. Whereas most minority groups maintain that they have been 'silenced' by the majority and thus place speaking at a premium, disability communities often place listening on the same plane. People with disabilities often feel they have not been listened to or even addressed. In this context, listening does not have to happen with the ears. Listening, here, means being taking into consideration, being attended to.
> 3 The Ethic of Accommodation means making room for difference possible, letting go of preconceived notions of perfectability, and negotiating complex sets of needs. Often these 'needs' compete with one another. Accommodating disability or other forms of difference often does not seem practical or marketable, since doing so often raises costs or necessitates work that seemingly benefits only a few. Marketability is not our concern.
> 4 The Ethic of Accommodation inspires creative aesthetic choices from casting, choreography and costuming, and also the use of space for the creation of new material. Practicing the ethic enhances theatrical practice. (229)

Carrie Sandhal, "Why Disability Identity Matters: From Dramaturgy to Casting in John Belluso's Pyretown," *Text and Performance Quarterly* 28.1-2 (2008),

> disability identity at work on two primary levels: the level of the play and the level of production
>
> When I refer to disability identity at work at the level of the play, I mean how disability functions dramaturgically in new disability plays. How is disability used to create meaning in the text beyond the fact of impairment? (227)
>
> The terms I have been using in this article to describe the interactions between the characters in the play and between the audience and the characters*terms such as "alliance," "identification," and "intersecting interpretive frameworks"*imply a sort of emotional and intellectual exchange between members of different groups. Unfortunately, historical power imbalances mean that resources have not been equally distributed across groups, so the real costs and benefits of this exchange are not equivalent among participants. The ways in which this inequality manifests itself become apparent at the level of production, particularly around issues of casting. (234-35)
>
> Disabled actors' demands to play disabled characters are based on economics, aesthetics, and politics. In terms of economics, disabled actors rarely make a living in their profession because so few roles are available to them; they are neither type-cast nor cast against type. Even professionally trained disabled actors have difficulty getting cast at all. They are routinely passed over for traditionally non-disabled roles because it is assumed that their impairments will confuse the audience if the impairment is not explained by

> the text. After all, audiences are trained by convention to read disability as a metaphor, or meaning-maker, in the play. If the disability cannot be explained by the script, then the actor's impairment will be a supposed distraction, or will create meanings unintended by the playwright or the director. Even when a character is written as disabled, non-disabled actors are still routinely chosen over disabled ones. The most commonly reason cited for this choice is that there are simply not enough professionally trained disabled actors in the casting pool. (236)
>
> In terms of aesthetics, disabled actors argue that non-disabled actors, no matter how good their technical skill at imitating the physicality of a disabled character (and most often verisimilitude is not achieved) or how good their research into the lives of disabled people, they lack the lived experience of disability necessary to bring these characters fully to life. Non-disabled people, even fine actors, understand the disability experience primarily through stereotypes available in mainstream media. These actors often focus on getting the outward shell of the characterization right (how a disabled person might move, speak, carry the body, etc.) but have little access to the lived experience of disability. Experiences such as being stared at, using personal assistants for activities of daily living, living with pain, dealing with access issues, and navigating social services and the medical establishment are unavailable to most non-disabled actors. Even if a disabled actor has not personally experienced all of these situations, it is likely that he or she has better access to them because of related disability experiences or ties to the disability community in general. (236)

Tobin Siebers, "In/Visible: Disability on the Stage," in *Body Aesthetics*, ed. Sherri Irvin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016):

> The disabled body, when it appears on the stage, stands out as a spectacle in and of itself, one that threatens to draw attention to itself and away from the other performances on the stage. (227)

Kirsty Johnston, *Disability Theatre and Modern Drama: Recasting Modernism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016)

> Undermining stereotypes and stigma on the one hand, and pressing the boundaries of aesthetic convention of the other, disability theatre is thus both activist and artistic in orientation. (15)
>
> Disabled people's place alongside other groups seeking equitable opportunities and participation in the arts. (39)
>
> Realist and naturalist aesthetics pose the strongest challenges for disabled actors who seek to embody non-disabled characters or for non-disabled actors who seek to portray disabled characters. (52)

Petra Kuppers, *Theatre and Disability* (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2017)