

Spring 2017

Books, bodies, and the "great labor" of Helkiah Crooke's Mikrokosmographia

Jillian Faith Linster
University of Iowa

Copyright © 2017 Jillian Faith Linster

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/5551>

Recommended Citation

Linster, Jillian Faith. "Books, bodies, and the "great labor" of Helkiah Crooke's Mikrokosmographia." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2017.
<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.nllpqmps>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>

Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

BOOKS, BODIES, AND THE “GREAT LABOR” OF
HELKIAH CROOKE’S *MIKROKOSMOGRAPHIA*

by

Jillian Faith Linster

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy
degree in English in the
Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2017

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Adam G. Hooks

Copyright by
JILLIAN FAITH LINSTER
2017
All Rights Reserved

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Jillian Faith Linster

has been approved by the Examining Committee for
the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree
in English at the May 2017 graduation.

Thesis Committee:

Adam G. Hooks, Thesis Supervisor

Blaine Greteman

Alvin Snider

Matthew P. Brown

Elizabeth Yale

To the memory of Gene Kenneth Crawford,
who asked “Why Crooke?” until I could answer

First therefore, for the nakednesse of his soule, he hath Reason, which is
an art before all arts, and in recompence of the nakednesse of his body,
hee hath the Hand, an organe before all organes.

Helkiah Crooke
Mikrokosmographia

I have unclasped to thee the book even of my secret soul.

William Shakespeare
Twelfth Night

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply appreciative of the extensive network of support I had in the years it took to research, write, and revise this dissertation. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my committee: to Blaine, who taught me to write well and, more importantly, to get the writing done; to Alvin, whom I strove to impress and who thereby kept me from ever doing less than my best; to Matt, who sparked vital ideas with thoughtful conversation early in the process; and to Beth, whose presence showed me so much I had not realized had been absent, and whose unassailable example I confidently follow. Most of all, I am eternally grateful to Adam. Without his rigor, humor, accessibility, flexibility, positivity, and insightful suggestions, I would never have reached this point. He gets it, thank god.

I also owe thanks to a large community of scholars and colleagues who supported me in manifold ways throughout this lengthy process. Thank you to those who came before and showed me how, especially Tom Blake, Sonja Mayrhofer, Benjamin Miele, and Jen Shook. A great big thank you to Tyler Fyotek for patiently tutoring me in Latin. Thank you also to the faculty I have encountered at different stages of my graduate school career whose scholarly fields may be far from my own but whose examples I will long draw strength from: Tim Barrett, Jen Buckley, Harry Freeman, Emily Haddad, Rob Ketterer, Kathy Lavezzo, Jon Wilcox, and Susan Wolfe. A special thank you to Miriam Gilbert for indispensable support and guidance in my nascence as an early modern scholar.

Enormous thanks goes to the family members whose tangible care came in the form of much-needed childcare, housecleaning, and constant cheerleading: Kris Erickson, Erin Erickson, Amanda Erickson, Diane Linster, and Katie Linster. I will do the dishes for the next five years.

Special thanks are due to Darlene Farabee. She led me to Crooke and, more importantly, led me to myself. I could not ask for a more brilliant personal and professional model or a dearer friend.

Most of all, thank you to Matthew and Isabella, who always seemed to know when to keep me working and when to keep me from working. Thank you, Matt, for the resilience of your belief and for the million unspoken ways you care for me. Izzy, if I finished this project for anyone other than myself, it was for you, to show you how extraordinary an ordinary person can be.

ABSTRACT

Helkiah Crooke (1576-1648) was a London physician who wrote the first comprehensive anatomy manual in the English vernacular, *Mikrokosmographia* (1615). This dissertation demonstrates the significance of Crooke's example for several lines of inquiry. His story shows the essential role of humanistic study in the development of an effective early modern physician. It also demonstrates how reading an anatomy manual as a literary work illuminates the paradigms underpinning the relationships between books and bodies in the early modern era. Furthermore, examining the performative aspects of the physician's profession alongside dramatic literary characters elucidates the relationship between the professional sphere and the public stage and, consequently, the ramifications of that relationship for Crooke's historical characterization. Ultimately, the project shows how and why Crooke and *Mikrokosmographia* are perfectly positioned to lend insight on a large number of medical practices and experiences in the early modern period.

While scholars frequently cite the book as a reference on early modern thinking about bodies, almost all of this use has consisted of material excerpted without systematic analysis of the way the text is put together or close examination of the cultural conditions of the book's production. Furthermore, several of the extant accounts of Crooke's life contradict one another, neglect crucial evidence, or make unsupported claims, leaving confusing questions regarding the education and career of the man who authored this important text. This dissertation rectifies several misconceptions regarding Crooke and his book, providing new interpretation of the creation of *Mikrokosmographia* and Crooke's memory in the history of medicine. The project explores the anatomy manual's

cultural currency and the relationship of the book and its author to contemporary writing more readily recognized today as literary works. It also questions existing categorizations of early medical texts as it works to demonstrate the role of such writing in shaping authors' identities and careers as well as affecting the lives and health of the public, recovering the fullest picture of Crooke's life story and the most extensive bibliography of his writing to date.

PUBLIC ABSTRACT

English physician Helkiah Crooke (1576-1648) wrote the first comprehensive vernacular anatomy manual, *Mikrokosmographia* (1615). Although scholars in many disciplines have drawn heavily on the text of the anatomy manual as a source for their research, the book and its author have not yet been properly examined and contextualized. This dissertation explores the life, education, and career of Crooke as well as the multiple editions of his book and the various people who contributed to its production and used it.

Crooke led a fascinating life. The son of a puritan preacher and one of nine children, he studied at the Universities of Leiden and Cambridge before settling in London to practice medicine as a member of the College of Physicians. Early in his career, Crooke frequently clashed with his professional institution, and they disapproved of his anatomy manual. The College objected that the book described the female body, particularly the reproductive system, in the common tongue, rather than being written in Latin like most medical books of its day. Crooke managed to obtain the support of King James I and published his book anyway.

Mikrokosmographia was printed in three editions as well as in “epitome” form. Because the original book was large and expensive, the publisher also produced a more affordable and portable version to sell to a wider audience. Copies of both books survive today in libraries around the world and provide rich insights on the medical culture of early modern England and its treatment of female bodies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: An Introduction to Crooke’s “Great Labor”	1
Chapter 2: The Ambitious Physician.....	18
Chapter 3: The Anatomy Manual	43
Chapter 4: The Censored Body	74
Chapter 5: Book, Body, and Soul.....	102
Chapter 6: Dangerous Doctors	125
Chapter 7: Bedlam and Beyond.....	150
Chapter 8: Conclusions Regarding Use and Influence.....	175
Bibliography	183

Chapter 1: An Introduction to Crooke's "Great Labor"

I acknowledge that which I have promised to be a great labor
and more then any man whom I have yet seene hath accomplished.

– Crooke, "The Preface to the Chyrurgeons"
in *Mikrokosmographia*

I. Setting the Banquet

The preface addressed "To The Worshipfull Company of the Barber-Chyrurgeons" at the start of Helkiah Crooke's anatomy manual *Mikrokosmographia* (1615) begins with a cannibalistic metaphor:

My Maisters and Worshipfull Friends. As from the first I intended this Labor unto your behoofe; so now having by Gods assistance brought it to an end, I offer it unto you as a token of my Love: Not that I doubt but there are some among you who as themselves stand in no neede of my helpe, so they are also able to have set out this Banquet with greater variety and to have Cooked it fitter for you as being better acquainted with your diet and appetites. (¶1)¹

Crooke figures his book on the human body as a "Banquet" that has been "Cooked" to suit the barber-surgeons' "diet and appetites." In other words, he presents the work as a feast of human flesh to be consumed by his readers. Crooke had other options, of course; he might have invoked the anatomy theater by making a reference akin to Thomas Nashe's description of Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* (1591) as "a paper stage,"

1. Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia* (London: William Jaggard, 1615). In quoting Crooke throughout this dissertation I have silently modernized the i, j, u, v, long s, and any ligatures; spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and italic type have not been normalized and remain consistent with the 1615 source text (unless otherwise noted). Parenthetical references to signatures are provided in-text, as the book's pagination is not reliably accurate.

setting up his book as a presentation space in which a theoretical dissection takes place. Or he might have illustrated his book's creation by relating it to the process of human reproduction as did John Donne, writing that "this child of mine, this book, comes into the world, from me, and with me" in the dedication to his *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624).² Instead, Crooke decided to invoke the image of a dining table set with body parts.³

Crooke's chosen metaphor is highly appropriate to his audience. The barber-surgeons dissected bodies in their Company's kitchen and carefully prepared and arranged the anatomized body parts for presentation to their guests. Upon the barber-surgeons' incorporation in 1540, Henry VIII granted them the right to the bodies of four executed criminals each year for the purpose of public dissection, but it was not until 1636 that construction began on a separate purpose-built anatomy theater for the Company.⁴ Before then, including at the time Crooke was writing his anatomy manual, the barber-surgeons carried out the actual cutting of corpses in their kitchen facilities and then transported the cleaned and covered parts to the common hall of the company, where a physician revealed and discussed the body parts for the benefit of the audience seated

2. Thomas Nashe, "Somewhat to read for them that list," in *Astrophel and Stella* by Philip Sidney (London: Thomas Newman, 1591), A3^r; John Donne, *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions, Together with Death's Duel* (Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 2003), 3.

3. Although the book-as-feast/reading-as-dining metaphor sounds disconcerting in the context of an anatomy manual, it was a common trope for early modern authors. Consider, for instance, Bacon's familiar example: "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested"; Francis Bacon, "Of Studies," in *The Essays*, ed. John Pitcher (New York: Penguin, 1985), 209.

4. Kate Cregan, "Blood and Circuses," in *Images of the Corpse: From the Renaissance to Cyberspace*, ed. Elizabeth Klaver (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2004), 42-43.

on scaffolding erected solely for the purpose of the lecture.⁵ The Company's Annals dictated that "no persone or persones shall beholde the desections or incysyns of the body, but that all maye be made cleane and covered wth fayer clothes untyll the Docter shall com and take his place to reade and declare upon the partes deseected."⁶ As the popularity of anatomical dissection increased, the existing system became unwieldy. In 1631 the Annals observe that "hitherto those bodies have beene a greate annoyance to the tables dresser boardes and utensills in o^r upper Kitchen by reason of the blood filth and entrailes of those Anathomyes," and so the Company planned construction of new facilities "for the better accomodateing of those anatomicall affaires and preserving the Kitchin to its own proper use."⁷

The descriptions of the anatomy procedure recorded in the barber-surgeons' Annals demonstrate the close relationship between the cooking and dissection processes in this context. The act of anatomical dissection was not like a kitchen production; it *was* a kitchen production. The same ritual that served to insulate the audience from the gruesome sight of a flayed and dismembered human body at the same time aligned it with the domestic rite of food preparation in the service of formal hospitality. When Crooke, then, refers to this striking juxtaposition he makes a deliberate and calculated appeal to his target audience, demonstrating that he understands the conditions of their professional

5. Sidney Young, *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1890), 315, 334; see also Louise Noble, *Medical Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave, 2011), 54.

6. Young, 315.

7. *Ibid.*, 334. The barber-surgeons' purpose-built anatomy theater, designed by Inigo Jones, finally opened for use in 1638; see Cregan, 43.

practices and situating his book in a prime position to become a part of those practices.⁸ Crooke speaks to the barber-surgeons in their own language: literally, by writing the first comprehensive anatomy manual in vernacular English, and metaphorically, in describing his book on human dissection as a “Banquet” he has “Cooked.”⁹ This example shows how sustained inquiry into *Mikrokosmographia*—its rhetoric, its illustrations, its publication history, its audience, its legacy—and examination of its author—his religion, his education, his personal and professional associations, his career—can provide a wealth of insights into early modern literature and culture. To borrow from the extraordinary subtitle of *Never Pure*, Steven Shapin’s 2010 book on the history and sociology of science, my study recognizes that Crooke’s anatomy manual “Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority.”¹⁰ I have sought to identify the people and explore the culture that produced *Mikrokosmographia* to better understand how Crooke navigated the early

8. On May 27, 1616, the Worshipful Company of Barber-Surgeons gave Crooke five pounds “for that he did dedicate a booke unto this Companie & gave one of them unto this howse”; Young, 332. There are two first-edition copies of *Mikrokosmographia* in the library of the Royal College of Surgeons; one is known to have entered the collection only recently, and if the other is Crooke’s presentation copy, there are no marks or records to identify it as such. (The presentation copy of the second edition *Mikrokosmographia* at the Royal College of Physicians is clearly labeled such on its period binding.)

9. There are three English anatomy books that precede Crooke’s—in the sentence following the banquet metaphor Crooke himself mentions the work of “*Banister* (that good old man)” (¶1)—but the others avoid detailed description of the female body and reproductive system, which Crooke provides. He is also the first licensed physician to author an anatomy manual in English.

10. Steven Shapin, *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as if It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010).

modern world he helped to shape. In other words, I have pursued what Robert Darnton calls the “whole human comedy behind the books.”¹¹

As my invocation of Shapin and Darnton suggests, the project is deeply interdisciplinary. The single term that best describes its organizing principle is Narrative Historicism, which “inverts the standard critical structure” to embed arguments in a story “rather than embedding stories in an argument.”¹² Instead of taking a central critical approach and applying it to a variety of case studies, I have chosen to attend to one central case study and apply multiple critical approaches: bibliography, book history, performance studies, body theory, the history of medicine, cultural studies. The resulting effect is a sort of microhistory, a sustained and focused study that lends insight to big-picture questions by providing rigorous attention to the details of just one limited narrative.¹³ But this is a microhistory deeply invested in literary analysis, not only in using familiar tools such as close reading and recognizable theoretical approaches like historicism but also for the nature of its subject, a book referenced frequently by literary scholars and with deep connections to its contemporary literary works—in addition to its own literary features, which have been given less attention but are nonetheless significant to the study of early modern culture. Part of the rationale for my approach is

Mikrokosmographia’s widespread use as an interpretive tool; when a book is used as a

11. Robert Darnton, “‘What is the History of Books?’ Revisited,” *Modern Intellectual History* 4.3 (2007): 496.

12. Kevin Birmingham, “‘The Great Shame of Our Profession’: How the Humanities Survive on Exploitation,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 12, 2017, accessed February 19, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Great-Shame-of-Our/239148>.

13. On microhistory, see Carlo Ginzburg, “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It,” *Critical Inquiry* 20.1 (1993): 10-35.

lens through which to view other works, the scholars using it need to know the precise dimensions of that lens. My dissertation aims to provide those dimensions, in the service of responsible and rigorous inquiry as well as the broader historical, literary, and cultural questions they address.

II. Critical Reception

Crooke has not yet received sustained scholarly attention for the same reason I believe he warrants such consideration; namely, his profound mediocrity. Crooke may not have made any scientific discoveries or medical breakthroughs in *Mikrokosmographia* or any of his other work, but that is the very reason why he merits study. As a middling sort of professional in a middling sort of profession, Crooke provides a prime example of what it was like to be an ordinary physician in early modern London. Admittedly, however, Crooke is an exceptional average. Because he studied medicine abroad and in England, fought with the College of Physicians as well as held office in their organization, wrote a book that saw multiple editions over several decades, served in a public office to both his credit and his disgrace, and experienced recognized success as well as dejection and poverty, Crooke is able to serve as a representative cross-section of a sizeable portion of medical practices and experiences in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. While the relatively undistinguished nature of Crooke's life and career has long been considered a negative aspect of his legacy, it is in fact one of the strongest positives in favor of telling (and examining) his story.

Scholars have approached Crooke with varying levels of bias and engagement. Generally speaking, two groups have paid him attention: Historians of medicine and literary scholars. The former are most interested in Crooke as a cultural figure. His

earliest appearance in a work of historical scholarship occurs in *The Story of Bethlehem Hospital from its Foundation in 1247* (1914) by Edward Geoffrey O'Donoghue, a former chaplain at the psychiatric hospital who writes briefly about Crooke's service as keeper of the hospital near the end of the physician's professional career. While O'Donoghue had unparalleled access to the institution's records and archives, much of the evidence he offers is highly circumstantial, and his book contains blatant errors as well as abundant unsupported claims.¹⁴ Crooke next appears in Sir George Clark's *History of the Royal College of Physicians of London* (1964), which provides a great deal of useful information on the College's structure and practices but mentions Crooke only in passing and merely as a troublesome example.¹⁵ The representation of Crooke as an unruly and unrepentant rebel became a persistent one, codified by C. D. O'Malley's 1968 Fielding H. Garrison lecture that categorized the early modern physician rather romantically as a "medical buccaneer."¹⁶ O'Malley's lecture is in many ways the most thorough accounting of Crooke's career before the one at hand, but its bias is deeply slanted. While O'Malley provides the first extensive research on Crooke and corrects many factual errors made by previous scholars, he also makes qualifications about Crooke's character that are wholly interpretive and subjective, calling him "ruthlessly ambitious," dismissing Crooke's

14. Among other fallacious things, O'Donoghue writes that Crooke "was appointed in 1604 physician to James I. In the next year he wrote a book on anatomy ('Mikrokosmograpia'); *The Story of Bethlehem Hospital from its Foundation in 1247* (London: Unwin, 1914), 157.

15. Sir George Clark, *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London* (London: Oxford UP, 1964), 1:204-05, 251, 258.

16. C. D. O'Malley, "The Fielding H. Garrison Lecture: Helkiah Crooke, M.D., F.R.C.P., 1576-1648," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 42.1 (1968): 18.

original writing in *Mikrokosmographia* as “words ... of no great consequence,” and labeling the physician’s professional decisions as “Crookian effrontery.”¹⁷

While the literary scholars are generally kinder to Crooke’s memory, their use of his work has its own attendant problems. The vernacular language of *Mikrokosmographia* makes the volume infinitely more relevant to scholars of English (as well as more accessible for those not fluent in Latin, the language of most medical texts of its day), and so the book has been used extensively as an exemplar of anatomical knowledge in early modern England. However, almost all of this use has consisted of scholars excerpting material and passages without systematic analysis of the way the text is put together, close examination of the cultural conditions of the book’s production, or attention to the ways in which Crooke develops his arguments.¹⁸ In essence, no one has yet written the book on Crooke, a deficiency this project directly addresses. Through careful attention to both primary and secondary sources, with a sharp eye on unrealistic preconceptions, this dissertation recovers the fullest picture of Crooke’s life story to date. It rectifies several misconceptions and flat-out errors about Crooke and his book and provides a new interpretation of the preparation that went into creating *Mikrokosmographia* as well as some of the tensions present in Crooke’s early relationship with the College of Physicians, which has greatly colored his memory in the history of medicine. The project also explores the anatomy manual’s cultural currency and the relationship of the book

17. Ibid., 4, 11, 16. Crooke also features as an “irregular practitioner” running afoul of his governing professional body in Margaret Pelling’s prosopographical study, *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians, and Irregular Practitioners, 1550-1640*, with Frances White (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003).

18. For example, *Mikrokosmographia* has often been cited as a highly popular volume because the first edition was reprinted in 1616 and 1618; however, the 1616 and 1618 copies are actually issues of the same 1615 print run.

and its author to contemporary writing more readily recognized today as literary works. The dissertation as a whole takes on the question of how to categorize the writing of early modern medical texts and works to demonstrate the role of such books in shaping their authors' identities and careers as well as affecting the lives and health of the culture at large.

Printed books such as *Mikrokosmographia* played an important role in early modern health. The bulk of English medical training consisted largely of reading and a rather limited amount of observation, and so books were a crucial educational technology.¹⁹ At the time Crooke was studying medicine and writing his anatomy manual, the printed book was of the utmost importance to university-educated physicians as “the primary medium by which they learned about their subject and the opinions of the ancients, and . . . the means by which they expressed their views about their subject and commented on classical authors,” which Crooke does throughout *Mikrokosmographia*.²⁰ The College of Physicians recognized that a book such as Crooke's that printed knowledge about medicine in the vernacular was positioned to have significant impact on the broader medical marketplace. Despite the College's objections to the dissemination of their specialized knowledge, broader understanding of basic anatomy was profoundly needed. In early seventeenth-century England, desperate people in desperate situations

19. See Daniela Prögler, *English Students at Leiden University, 1575-1650* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013), 13-26; Ole Peter Grell, “The Attraction of Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590-1642,” in *Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England* (Aldershot: Routledge, 1996), 231-35; A. H. T. Robb-Smith, “Cambridge Medicine,” in *Medicine in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. Allen G. Debus (Berkeley: U of California P, 1974), 327-30.

20. Sachiko Kusukawa, *Picturing the Book of Nature: Image, Text, and Argument in Sixteenth-Century Human Anatomy and Medical Botany* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2012), 27.

sought whatever kind of help they could obtain, and the marketplace for alternative sources of medical attention thrived. Unwitting and even abusive self-proclaimed practitioners regularly did a great deal of harm to vulnerable patients. One of Crooke's contemporary physicians warned, "So many and so infinitely do the numbers of barbarous and unlearned counsellours of health at this time overspread all corners of this kingdome, that their confused swarmes do not onely every where cover and eclipse the Sun-shine of all true learning & understanding but generally darken and extinguish the very light of common sense and reason."²¹ The accessibility of the vernacular language and the illustrations in *Mikrokosmographia* meant it was positioned to provide a common vocabulary through which patients could better communicate with their practitioners regarding their symptoms and could better understand a practitioner's recommendations regarding treatment and care.

Some scholars, particularly historians of medicine, have been eager to dismiss the value and quality of early modern English physicians' service as medical practitioners on the basis that their training was theoretical and humanistic rather than practical and scientific. However, in the following chapters I show how Crooke's example proves two things: Humanistic education did not take place to the total exclusion of practical training, and, furthermore, humanistic education was essential to the personal and professional development of an effective early modern physician. Nowhere is the close connection between "art and science" more evident than in Crooke's *Mikrokosmographia*. As Crooke writes, "Under the name of *Nature*, I comprehend many

21. John Cotta, *Unobserved Dangers of Severall Sorts of Ignorant and Unconsiderate Practisers of Physicke in England* (London: William Jones and Richard Boyle, 1612), A3^r.

things” (D2^r). This dissertation explains and explores Crooke’s varied interests as an author and physician, thereby demonstrating the value of such a project to the field of literary studies and commenting on currently relevant questions regarding the divide between the sciences and the humanities in twenty-first century academia.

III. Delivery

In addition to the disconcerting banquet imagery Crooke uses in the opening paragraph of his anatomy manual, he employs another more persistent metaphor to define his book. The second metaphor appears repeatedly in “The Preface to the Chyrurgeons” as well as throughout the rest of the text, including Crooke’s concluding paragraph at the very end of the book and William Jaggard’s letter “From the Printer to the Reader,” which appears on the volume’s final printed page. It is also the term used in this project’s title. Crooke figures his book as a “great labor” (¶1^v), specifically an “Anatomicall labour” (¶1^v) as well as “my paines” (¶2^v) and, in his closing lines, “a long and painfull labour” (4Q3^r).²² As with the banquet metaphor, Crooke is not original in describing the creation of his book as labor, but once again his choice of language is apt. Crooke knows he has to defend his heavy reliance on sources other than his own experience; the book’s own title page announces the text is “Collected and Translated our of all the Best Authors of Anatomy,” and Crooke explains in his conclusion, “I have pressed the footsteps of the best and most approved Authors” (4Q3^r). By fashioning his book as a “great labor,” Crooke emphasizes the tangible work he did in reading, choosing, translating, organizing, and supplementing his source texts. The anatomy manual is not the outcome of Crooke’s labor, his progeny akin to Donne’s “child of mine, this book.” As it takes its reader

22. For the printer Jaggard, the book is an “excellent labour” (4Q4^r).

through the activity of human dissection, *Mikrokosmographia* itself represents a process of labor, an experience of pain. Once more Crooke's choice of metaphor deeply embeds his book in the procedure it is meant to guide. He asks his reader to work with him and "labour to make manifest to the world, those divine Oracles [his sources], which hitherto we have rather admired then understood" (C5^r).²³

In this dissertation I, too, labor to make manifest one of the "divine Oracles" supplicated for insights on early modern literature: Crooke himself, whom many have long admired rather than fully understood. Chapter 2 begins the work with historical investigation into Crooke's personal identity, education, and early career. Prior to my study, extant biography on Crooke was limited and scattered. The overview provided by William Birken in his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Crooke provides a basic framework but is by no means exhaustive (and of course is not meant to be, as a dictionary entry).²⁴ I explored crucial foundational information provided by the archives that contain textual traces of Crooke's life, including those of the Royal Society of Medicine, which keeps the only manuscript copy of the thesis Crooke wrote while

23. It is difficult, if not impossible, to engage in close reading of the word "labor" without invoking images of the childbirthing process. However, no instance of Crooke's use of the metaphor includes such a connotation. As the above reading shows, Crooke implements the term for its meaning of physical and mental exertion rather than the distinctly female labor of childbirth (unlike, for instance, Sidney's "eyes...great in labor with their tears" in *Arcadia*, 1586). For detailed discussion of how Crooke handles the subject of parturition, see Eve Keller, *Generating Bodies and Gendered Selves: The Rhetoric of Reproduction in Early Modern England* (Seattle: U of Washington P, 2007).

24. William Birken, "Helkiah Crooke (1576-1648)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

studying at the University of Leiden, and those of the Royal College of Physicians, of which Crooke was a fellow and in whose *Annals* he appears many times.²⁵

Chapter 3 undertakes the crucial work of cataloging and describing the various editions, issues, and other iterations of *Mikrokosmographia* and its constituent parts. My bibliographic research on Crooke's anatomy manual has taken me to dozens of libraries in the US and the UK where I have seen, to date, 43 distinct copies of the book, in addition to many other volumes closely related to it, including 15 copies of its portable companion volume, the epitome *Somatographia Anthropine*.²⁶ This chapter establishes that the copies of *Mikrokosmographia* dated 1616 and 1618 are not distinct editions (as frequently identified) but rather subsequent issues of the 1615 first edition. It also explains the addition to the second edition of a translated tract on surgical instruments originally written by Ambrose Paré and untangles some bibliographic confusion regarding Crooke, Paré, Jaggard, and the Cotes brothers, the printers of the third edition of *Mikrokosmographia*. Chapter 3 explores the differences among the book's three editions as well as the relationship between the full-sized anatomy manual and the epitome mentioned above. This chapter also gives attention to Jaggard's personal involvement in and motivations for printing *Mikrokosmographia* as well as his responsibility for *Somatographia Anthropine*, subjects additionally explored in chapter 4.

25. The Royal Society of Medicine document commonly referred to as Crooke's Leiden "thesis" (singular) comprises a series of thirteen short but separate anatomical "theses" (plural). Crooke would have presented the set of theses to his professor, Pieter Pauw, and defended them either publicly or privately (the latter is more likely, as Crooke did not take a degree).

26. There are fewer extant copies of the smaller book, likely because it saw greater use and was less revered than the larger, more imposing *Mikrokosmographia*.

Chapter 4 builds on an original observation I first made in early 2014 regarding a woodcut used in the printing of *Mikrokosmographia*. The woodcut initially appears in the book's first edition, but for all subsequent editions of the anatomy manual and all printings of *Somatographia Anthropine* (which repurposes the larger book's illustrations), the woodcut has been altered in an apparent act of censorship. The image in question represents a partially anatomized female torso; after its first printing, the genitals are carved out of the woodcut so that all that remains is blank space between the woman's legs. This chapter suggests the physical rendering of female genitalia into nothing in the *Mikrokosmographia* woodcut as an actual manifestation of the bawdy early modern pun on "nothing/no-thing" used by Shakespeare and other authors in reference to female genitals (in apposition to the male "thing").

Chapter 4 also provides background on earlier representations of the female body in various anatomy and midwifery books both on the continent and in England. It takes up the related censorship of *Mikrokosmographia* as a whole that was threatened by the College of Physicians and the Bishop of London upon its initial publication yet not carried out, providing new evidence on and interpretation of a previously largely inexplicable situation. Furthermore, the chapter supplies a careful and thorough reading of the rhetoric of Crooke's writing in the anatomy manual regarding his justification for including graphic depictions and vernacular description of the taboo female body. It also considers the printer Jaggard's role in the production of both *Mikrokosmographia*, whose uncensored publication he fully supported, and *Somatographia Anthropine*, the volume for which it appears Jaggard orchestrated the woodcut's alteration. Finally, the chapter assesses the use of Crooke's anatomy manual by female authors such as the poet Anne

Bradstreet and the midwife Jane Sharp, as well as several intriguing instances of readers' marks in copies of later editions of *Mikrokosmographia* that respond directly to the illustration's erasure.

Chapter 5 undertakes the most overtly literary reading of Crooke's text, explicating the epistemological role of the human soul in the relationship between book and body as understood in the early seventeenth century. The foundations for this work lie in the Jonathan Sawday's influential book, *The Body Emblazoned*, which heralded an abundance of "body" scholarship in English literary studies during the past two decades.²⁷ The chapter endeavors to demonstrate how reading an ostensibly "scientific" book such as an anatomy manual as a literary work illuminates the paradigms underpinning the relationships between books and bodies in the early modern era. Rather than using *Mikrokosmographia* as a tool for reading other literary works, which has already been done extensively, I draw on the work of Henry Turner to point out the elision of "literary" categories that existed in Crooke's day and apply the tools of literary analysis to reading the anatomy manual.²⁸ Elizabeth D. Harvey has illuminated the relationship between *Mikrokosmographia* and the work of one canonical author in her reading of Crooke's use of Spenser's "Castle of Alma" allegory from *The Faerie Queene*.²⁹ Chapter 5 builds on her example to explore the relationship between the structure of the body Crooke writes about and the structure of his anatomy book, as well

27. Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London: Routledge, 1995).

28. Henry Turner, "Lessons from Literature for the Historian of Science (and Vice Versa): Reflections on Form," *ISIS* 101 (2010): 578-89.

29. Elizabeth D. Harvey, "Sensational Bodies, Consenting Organs: Helkiah Crooke's Incorporation of Spenser," *Spenser Studies* 18 (2003): 295-314.

as the way he uses the soul to support both structures, drawing meaningful connections to the writing of other early modern authors including Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton.

Chapter 6 compares Crooke to one of his contemporary medical practitioners, an infamous charlatan named John Lambe. The story of “Doctor” Lambe (as he styled himself) and the mistreatment and manipulation of clients that eventually led to his death by public beating provides a useful juxtaposition to Crooke’s professional career. The two men were contemporaries, both practicing medicine in London at the same time, both called before the College of Physicians for remonstrance. Crooke had the favor of King James I; Lambe had the patronage of James’s beloved Duke of Buckingham. Both practitioners are remembered by many historians in negative terms and painted with undesirable characteristics. However, examining the two men’s careers side by side reveals that while Crooke may have had ideological clashes with various individuals and made some questionable decisions, Lambe was the truly dangerous doctor. The chapter also explores Lambe’s depiction in a ballad commemorating his death and the explicit connection of a woodcut used in the ballad to Christopher Marlowe’s play *Doctor Faustus*. This work builds on Patricia Fumerton’s concept of “secular subjectivity” as well as her ballad investigations with Anita Guerrini, Margaret Pelling’s study of marginal physicians in the early modern medical marketplace, respective historical work completed on Lambe by Alastair Bellany and Malcolm Gaskill, and insights on medicine and magic from Owen Davies.³⁰

30. Patricia Fumerton, *Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006); Patricia Fumerton and Anita Guerrini, *Ballads and Broadsides in Britain, 1500-1800* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010); Alastair Bellany, “The Murder of John Lambe,” *Past and Present* 200 (2008): 37-76;

Chapter 7 returns to the latter portion of Crooke's career and life. In 1619, around the same time Crooke finally made peace with the College of Physicians and settled into the role of a respectable and acquiescent college fellow, he also took on another professional charge outside of the College: the keepership of Bethlem Hospital. Achieved in large part through the king's favor, Crooke's tenure as keeper would rapidly prove tendentious. As it was a more public position than his place in the College and his private medical practice, perhaps it is not surprising that the controversy generated by his keepership inspired at least two characters on the London stage, the unnamed madhouse master in John Fletcher's *The Pilgrim* (1621) and the madhouse keeper Alibius in Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling* (1622). By illuminating the highly performative aspects of the physician's professional role alongside the obviously performative aspects of the fictional dramatic characters, this chapter explores the relationship between the professional sphere and the public stage and its ramifications for Crooke's historical characterization. It finishes with an account of the end of Crooke's life and leads into chapter 8, which provides concluding thoughts and directions for future study.

“And so,” as Crooke writes, “wee proceede to our businesse” (206^v).

Malcolm Gaskill, “Witchcraft, Politics, and Memory in Seventeenth-Century England,” *Historical Journal* 50.2 (2007): 289-308; Owen Davies, *Cunning-Folk: Popular Magic in English History* (New York: Hambledon & London, 2003).

Chapter 2: The Ambitious Physician

Nought needed Adam, but we first must cut,
Next know, last teach, how every member's put.

– Ambrose Fisher, prefatory poem
to *Mikrokosmographia*

I. The Start of a Career

Helkiah Croke was born in 1576.¹ His father, Thomas Croke, was the puritan rector of Great Waldingfield in Suffolk at the time, but in early 1582 the rector moved his family to London so he could serve as preacher to Gray's Inn and lecturer at St. Mary Woolchurch. Helkiah had three older siblings. The eldest, his sister Sara, married Stephen Egerton, parish lecturer at St. Ann Blackfriars, in 1585.² Helkiah also had two older brothers, Thomas and Samuel; Thomas studied law and later established a puritan colony at Baltimore in County Cork, Ireland, while Samuel, who had the unusual distinction of being named after his mother, became a clergyman like his father and brother-in-law.³ Helkiah also had five younger siblings: two brothers, John and Richard, and three sisters, Rachel, Anne, and Elizabeth. Although Thomas Croke, Sr., is remembered as “a

1. Variant spellings include Hilkiah, Hilkias, Helkiach, Elkhiah, Elias; Crook, Croke, Cruyck, and Crocus.

2. “Ordained priest at Peterborough on 11 May 1581, [Egerton] seems to have settled in the London liberty of St Ann Blackfriars in late 1583 or early 1584. On 4 May 1585, resigning his fellowship, he was married there to Sara (*d.* 1624), daughter of Thomas Croke, and by 1586 was officially described as parish lecturer”; Brett Usher, “Stephen Egerton (c.1555-1622),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

3. Brett Usher, “Sir Thomas Croke, first baronet (c.1574-1630),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004). Thomas Croke's will, written in 1595, clearly names his wife “Samuell”; Brett Usher, “Appendix: Will of Thomas Croke,” *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, ed. Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell, 2006), 111. See also Vivienne Larminie, “Samuel Croke (1575-1649),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

privileged member of the godly élite,” his family was large, and according to his will there was not much left for his children to inherit by the time he died in 1598.⁴ But the family’s rich tradition of puritan devotion had a formative influence on the future physician, who would embrace the humanistic aspects of medical education and practice and make them an essential part of his professional identity.⁵ Helkiah began his university education at Cambridge in 1591 at approximately fifteen years of age. He studied at St. John’s College with John Bois, a fellow native of Suffolk. It may have been Bois who first sparked or encouraged the young Helkiah’s interest in a medical career. Bois, although a Greek scholar, had originally “thought of studying medicine but, imagining he had every disease of which he read, gave it up” for a career lecturing in Greek and, later, a life in the church.⁶ Crooke graduated BA from Cambridge in 1596 and later that same year traveled to the United Provinces (now known as the Netherlands) to study medicine at the University of Leiden.

It was not unusual for an English student in the late sixteenth century to travel abroad for part of his studies, and those who did formed small but meaningful

4. Brett Usher, “Thomas Crooke (c.1545–1598),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004). Thomas Crooke’s cash legacies amounted to a total sum of £146 1s. 8d; the five younger children were all still minors at the time of their father’s death (Usher, “Will,” 110).

5. William Birken writes, “Crooke’s concurrent involvement with theology [and medicine] perfectly illustrated the close relationship that medicine and divinity enjoyed, particularly among Puritans. There was no incompatibility between the two, but rather a harmony ... which cannot be emphasized too strongly”; Birken, “The Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of London, 1603-1643: A Social Study” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1977), 89.

6. David Norton, “John Bois (1561–1644),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

communities at the institutions they attended.⁷ The 21,045 matriculations recorded at the University of Leiden between 1575 and 1650 include 811 individual English students.⁸ In the brief time Crooke was in Leiden, during the years 1596 and 1597, there were approximately fifteen English students at the University; half of those were medical students.⁹ As Daniela Prögler explains, “The attraction of Leiden University for English students resulted partly from the intense relationship between England and the United Provinces,” a relationship dependent on four central factors: geographic proximity, religious (i.e., Calvinist) sympathy, religiously and economically active and successful expat communities in both countries, and “an intensive economic and cultural exchange [that] introduced novelties of all kinds to England.”¹⁰

The reasons for an Englishman to study medicine at Leiden in the 1590s were manifold and especially pertinent to Crooke’s career, as the things he saw and did while studying abroad shaped his attitude toward medical study and practice and prepared him to write his anatomy manual. Although Oxford or Cambridge seems a more obvious choice for an English medical student, *Mikrokosmographia* would have been an entirely

7. Prögler, 27.

8. Ibid., 32, 129; the number of matriculations does not equal the number of students, as students could matriculate multiple times (and were in fact expected to do so if they were away from the university for six months or longer). Prögler explains that during those years there were 919 English student matriculations, but 71 English students matriculated more than once, anywhere from two to four times (129).

9. Ibid., Plates 2 and 14. Crooke may also have been in Leiden in 1598; although it is possible to date his matriculation at the University of Leiden (November 6, 1596) and the defense of his theses (April 16, 1597), there are no other records to further indicate when he returned to England, although it was likely before the end of 1598, the date of *Paramythion* (see below), and certainly before 1599, when he took his MB at Cambridge (Birken, *ODNB*). Even if Crooke contributed to *Paramythion* from abroad, his father’s death in 1598 would likely have brought Helkiah home.

10. Prögler, 79-80.

different book had Crooke only studied at home. Before 1640 the English schools were far behind those of the continent in terms of medical facilities, faculty, and training. The Italian universities at Bologna and Padua were the most advanced medical schools in Europe and had long been popular with English students, but by 1590 they “had begun to feel the effects of the Counter-Reformation, making it difficult for them to retain and recruit the best teachers, while Protestant medical students from northern Europe found it an increasingly dangerous business to matriculate there.”¹¹ The University of Leiden, although young (founded as a Protestant university in 1575), was firmly grounded in “truly humanist and tolerant ideals.”¹² Furthermore, with the arrival of Pieter Pauw in 1589, the medical training at Leiden took an enormous leap forward. Pauw had learned and taught medicine in Germany and France and spent two years studying anatomy at Padua before returning to his native United Provinces.¹³ As professor of anatomy and botany with a particular interest in osteology (the study of bones), Pauw orchestrated three key contributions to the medical facilities: a botanic garden, an anatomy theater, and a collection of teaching aids and artifacts, all of which Crooke would have had access to.

Planning for a botanic garden at the University of Leiden had begun in 1587; Pauw was made supervisor in 1592, and the garden officially opened in 1594.¹⁴ There medical students could observe and learn to identify plants described by classical authors

11. Grell, 222.

12. Ibid.

13. Prögler, 185.

14. Ibid., 107; Grell, 228.

such as Discorides, Theophrastus, Pliny the Elder, and Galen.¹⁵ By 1595 the garden already included more than a thousand kinds of plants, approximately a third of which were medical, and in 1601 Pauw published a garden catalog that would be updated and expanded through three further editions. By 1685, the Leiden botanic garden held a total of approximately 3,000 kinds of domestic, exotic, and rare plant species, along with a growing collection “of stuffed animals and minerals in the adjoining gallery,” including “a crocodile, a globefish, an Indian bat, and a large tortoise” as well as “more wondrous” objects such as “the feather of a phoenix, the skin of a mermaid, and the claw of a griffin.”¹⁶ The rich offerings of the Leiden garden stood in stark contrast to those of England. Although the College of Physicians in London started a physic garden in 1587, Oxford did not establish one until 1621, and Cambridge not until 1762.¹⁷ Yet this was only one of the teaching advantages Leiden held over England in terms of medical education.

Like the botanic garden, anatomical dissections existed at Leiden prior to Pauw’s arrival, but they were conducted only privately. Along with his expansions to the garden, Pauw oversaw the construction of a new anatomy theater, one of the first in Europe, which opened in 1593 with room for about two hundred spectators. An anatomy theater was a luxury neither Oxford nor Cambridge attained before the eighteenth century, and although Cambridge required its MD candidates to observe two anatomies before

15. Prögler, 107.

16. Ibid., 110. Such exotic items were a hallmark of the early modern medical professions; they also appeared in apothecary shops, as in *Romeo and Juliet*: “...in his needy shop a tortoise hung, / An alligator stuffed, and other skins / Of ill-shaped fishes” (5.1.42-44); William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. David Bevington (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2003).

17. Prögler, 110.

graduating, dissections at both schools were rather few and far between.¹⁸ In the impressive space of the Leiden theater Pauw conducted dissections (and vivisections of animals) not only for medical students but also for members of the public, who paid an entrance fee. Between 1589 and 1615 Pauw undertook more than 60 anatomies, dissecting between two and four corpses each year. Dissections were held in the winter, when cold weather helped preserve the corpse, as the anatomy process occurred over several days. During the summer, Pauw stocked the spacious theater with skeletons, human and animal body parts, prints, antiquities, and medical books for use by students and viewing by visitors.¹⁹ Through the garden and the theater, then, theoretical study was paired with practical skills in anatomy and botany, and physic was taught by multiple means rather than solely through the theoretical teachings of Hippocrates and Galen that had prevailed at Leiden before Pauw.²⁰ By the time Crooke arrived, the teaching of anatomy had reached an advanced level and was considered integral to the medical discipline.²¹ Although no explicit record of Crooke's activities at Leiden exists, he did study with Pauw himself and undoubtedly would have directly benefitted from the professor's improvements to the school's medical curriculum.²²

The matriculation records at the University of Leiden show Crooke's entry as a medical student on November 6, 1596. While Crooke's interest in humanistic study

18. Robb-Smith, 336; Prögler, 114, 189. Furthermore, Oxford did not have a chair in anatomy until 1624, and Cambridge almost a hundred years after that; Grell, 232.

19. Prögler, 113.

20. Grell, 228.

21. Prögler, 112-13.

22. Although Crooke did not take a degree at Leiden, he defended his thirteen anatomical theses to Pauw; Helkiah Crooke, *Theses Anatomice*, 16 April 1597, TR.D.2(13), Royal Society of Medicine, London.

seems to have been enduring—in his 1595 will Thomas Crooke bequeaths his son Helkiah “all my humanitie bookes”²³—studying at Leiden gave him exposure to non-traditional teaching and attitudes that incorporated classic texts with cutting-edge methods. Faculty posed and addressed concrete questions, and scholars across the University of Leiden focused on gathering together collections of ideas during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, observing quantifiable value “in ordering arguments and pieces of knowledge.”²⁴ Although Galen and Aristotle retained their “outstanding reputations,” by the 1590s the medical faculty at Leiden also demonstrated a pronounced interest in the ideas of Paracelsus. Medicine was “intertwined” with natural philosophy, and Leiden scholars studied enormous catalogs, encyclopedias, and compendia that attempted to “collect and present all knowledge.”²⁵ It is easy to see inspiration for and influence on Crooke’s later anatomy manual in books by influential continental scholars such as Conrad Gesner’s *Bibliotheca Universalis* (1545), Theodor Zwinger’s *Theatrum Vitae Humanae* (1565), and Gerardus Mercator’s *Atlas* (1583). Although Gesner, Zwinger, and Mercator were not themselves Leiden scholars (most of their work predates the university), the studies they conducted served as models for the kind of scholarship championed by the university where Crooke learned anatomy.²⁶

None of the records of Crooke’s time at Leiden indicate that Crooke took a degree from the university, which is not at all unusual.²⁷ In fact, only a small number of the

23. Usher, “Will,” 110.

24. Prögler, 101.

25. Ibid., 94-95.

26. Ibid.

27. Some scholars have mistakenly recorded that Crooke graduated from Leiden, an error apparently generated by an 1883 book by Edward Peacock. Although the volume

English-speaking students who studied medicine at Leiden took a degree there.²⁸ For one, a degree was expensive to obtain, as the student was required to not only pay a fee to the university but also host a feast for his professors and fellow students.²⁹ Furthermore, foreign degrees were not widely respected back in England. Any physician who held only a doctorate from a foreign institution was made to pay triple the fees to gain a license from the College of Physicians. From the English viewpoint, in the late sixteenth century the University of Leiden was “doing well ... its library and garden were exemplary, but it did grant the title of doctor easily, and the Leiden graduates who were fellows [of the College] had reason to be concerned for the reputation of their own degrees.”³⁰ There were even more particular rules that may have prevented Crooke from obtaining a degree at Leiden; in 1587 the university officially decreed that a student had to be at least twenty-four years old to obtain a medical license and twenty-eight years old to be eligible for a doctorate degree, and Crooke was only 20 or, at the most, 21 years of age when he studied there.³¹ Whether age restrictions, cost concerns, or the irrelevance of a degree in

transcribes the University of Leiden matriculation record, it is misleadingly titled *Index to English Speaking Students who have Graduated at Leyden University*.

28. According to one historian, “Only a minority of the English-speaking students of medicine...graduated at Leiden”; R. W. Innes Smith, *English-Speaking Students of Medicine at the University of Leyden* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1932), xiii. Prögler puts the medical student graduation quota at approximately twenty-five percent, but notes that this “was by far the highest among English students at Leiden” across all fields of study; she also points out that about the same number went on to graduate MD from another university attended after Leiden (192-93).

29. Prögler, 105; Innes Smith, xii-xiii. This practice apparently became somewhat problematic later in the seventeenth century, when someone with enough money could supposedly buy a degree, but this does not seem to have been an issue in Crooke’s day (see Robb-Smith, 365-66, and Prögler, 193).

30. Clark, 1:134-35.

31. Prögler, 105.

light of his future career plans, it is not at all surprising that Crooke, despite completing his theses, chose not to officially graduate from the University of Leiden.

On April 16, 1597, Crooke defended his thesis, a series of thirteen brief arguments and assertions about the human body and its parts, under the guidance of his teacher Pauw. This was a pedagogical exercise rather than a graduation requirement, as Crooke was not taking his degree. Two copies of the thesis are known today. R. W. Innes Smith mentions both in his 1932 compendium *English-Speaking Students of Medicine at the University of Leyden*, which alphabetically catalogs all students “who were engaged in medical study” at the university between 1575 and 1875.³²

At Leyden there is a “Dissertatio exercitii gratia” entitled “Theses Anatomicæ de corpore Humano” and dated Leyden, April 16, 1597. On the title-page he is “Helkiah Crocus, Suffolciensis Anglus.” *It is dedicated to his father Thomas Crooke, D.D.; Stephen Egerton; William Bend; and Mr Robert Dexter.* At the end of the Thesis is a Carmen in Greek signed S. Canæus. There is a MS. copy of this Thesis at the R.S. of M. [Royal Society of Medicine]. The thesis is not *pro gradu*, and he did not graduate at Leyden.³³

As Innes Smith suggests, the copy of Crooke’s theses in the archives at Leiden is a printed copy.³⁴ However, the only other extant copy of the thesis, held at the Royal Society of Medicine, is in manuscript, although the 26 additional theses and few other

32. Innes Smith, vii.

33. *Ibid.*, 58; italics in the original.

34. Verified via email correspondence with Joke Pronk, Special Collection Services, Leiden University Libraries, September 5, 2016.

documents with which it is bound are all printed works.³⁵ The thirteen theses themselves are written in Latin and not particularly remarkable.

While Crooke would pursue further medical training back in England, the education offered by Cambridge and Oxford, though not regressive, remained staunchly traditional, “and hence, ambitious physicians were likely to be interested in going to the continent to broaden their knowledge.”³⁶ In pursuing even a brief period of study at Leiden, Crooke was clearly one such “ambitious physician.” When he arrived in 1596, the botanic garden, anatomy theater, and teaching collections were all in use by the excellent medical teaching faculty led by Pauw, and Crooke would have had full access to all of those resources. Most importantly, Crooke’s training at Leiden included a distinct and robust anatomy component, unlike the medical training he received in England. Although Crooke’s later MB (*Medicinae Baccalaureus*, or Bachelor of Medicine) and MD degrees from Cambridge were essential to his future career in London, it was the training he gained in Leiden that qualified him for the work of writing *Mikrokosmographia* both in terms of the book’s anatomy instruction and for the efforts the book made to influence public health. Crooke’s time in Leiden contributed not only to his apparent interest in anatomy but also to his ability to write as an authority on it. Furthermore, Crooke saw first-hand on the continent a very different way to learn and practice medicine than he returned to back in England, making it unsurprising that he

35. The other print documents in the sammelbande include a treatise on the plague, two sets of Hippocratic aphorisms, and a tract on arthritis. There are notes scattered throughout the leaves of the book that appear to be in the same hand as the MS thesis. The existence of two copies, one manuscript and one print, raises a whole host of (likely unanswerable) questions too speculative to be addressed here.

36. Prögler, 26.

should undertake a tangible effort (in the form of a print book) toward improving the professional training of both physicians and barber-surgeons, and thereby the welfare of patients, in his home country.

II. Tending Bodies and Souls

Exactly when Crooke left Leiden to return to England is somewhat difficult to date, particularly because of the lack of a recorded degree, which would clearly mark the end of his studies abroad. Instead, Crooke's last recorded activity is the disputation of his thesis in April 1597, a mere five months after his matriculation. But those five months were winter months, which means the main focus of his studies would have been anatomy. Crooke would have had the chance to see at least two and as many as four anatomical dissections performed by his teacher Pauw in the anatomy theater during the time he developed his thirteen theses on the human body. While Crooke would shortly return to Cambridge to undertake further study, it does not appear to have been those studies that immediately took him back home. First, Crooke apparently returned to London, where he completed a decidedly un-medical project: an edition of the works of Richard Greenham, a recently deceased clergyman beloved by many English puritans, including Crooke's family.

Not only was Helkiah's father, Thomas Crooke, a distinguished puritan rector, but Thomas's first child, his daughter Sara, married another prominent Church of England clergyman, Stephen Egerton. Helkiah seems to have greatly respected and admired both his father and brother-in-law, as his Leiden thesis is dedicated to Thomas Crooke, Stephen Egerton, and two other men, William Bend and Robert Dexter. Dexter was a London bookseller and a close associate of both Thomas Crooke and Reverend

Greenham; he served as an executor of Thomas's will and published the second and third editions of Greenham's collected works edited by Henry Holland (1599 and 1601, respectively).³⁷ Dexter also published an earlier volume of selections of Greenham's writing, printed in 1598, for which Helkiah Croke appears to have written a dedication, a preface, and a prefatory poem. There is some confusion about who, specifically, is responsible for this early book of Greenham's works. Obviously, it was not Greenham himself, as he died in 1594. Birken records Stephen Egerton and Robert Dexter as the editors of the volume, but Egerton's name is nowhere to be found in the book itself, although the title page does mention Dexter as bookseller: "Imprinted at *London* by *Richard Bradocke*, for *Robert Dexter*, and are to be solde at the signe of the Brasen Serpent in *Paules Churchyard*, 1598."³⁸ Other scholars have noted Egerton primarily as a later editor of Greenham's works, producing a fifth and final edition published in 1612.³⁹

The 1598 prefatory materials are only signed "H.C.", but Henry Holland, in the preface to his expanded 1599 edition of Greenham's works, clarifies that "M.D. Croke,

37. Usher, "Will," 112, 112n; for more on Dexter, see R. B. McKerrow, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books, 1557-1640* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1910), 91-92; and Henry R. Plomer, *Abstracts from the Wills of English Printers and Stationers, from 1492-1630* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1903), 37-38. In his 1603 will Dexter bequeaths to "Mr. Samuel Croke. Mr. Thomas Croke and Helkiah a ring each" and appoints Egerton an executor (Plomer, 38).

38. Birken, *ODNB*; Richard Greenham, *Paramythion: Two Treatises of the Comforting of an Afflicted Conscience* (London: Richard Bradocke, 1598).

39. Kenneth L. Parker and Erik J. Carlson, *Practical Divinity: The Life and Works of Revd Richard Greenham* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 1998), 32. Historians Parker and Carlson seem to attribute the 1598 volume *Paramythion* to the "Master John Hopkins" noted in the book's table of contents as the person who collected the "great number of grave and wise counsels and answers" that together comprise one chapter of seventeen in the volume, or 16 of 207 pages (33n). They do credit Helkiah's father, Thomas Croke, and Stephen Egerton with beginning work on the *Complete Works* that would ultimately be finished by Henry Holland (32).

(a reverend man for his learning and labour in the Church well deserving of Gods people) for the great love he bare him [i.e., Greenham], and desiring the good of many, perused and corrected some part of these workes, intending to review the whole.”⁴⁰ Holland’s designation “M.D.” coupled with the four clear instances of the initials “H.C.” in the 1598 edition most likely points to Helkiah Crooke as the author of the prefatory materials. Although Crooke had not yet completed his MD, Holland might easily be excused for thinking he had, given Crooke’s recent time studying at Leiden. The abbreviation “M.D.” clearly indicates a medical degree, not a doctor of divinity. However, Holland complicates things a bit when he goes on to say, “Now the Lord hath taken him [i.e., the aforementioned “M.D. Crooke”] also from us, and given him rest”; Helkiah, of course, is still very much alive and well in 1599, but his father Thomas, Doctor of Divinity, had died sometime in 1598. Holland thus conflates father and son to a confusing degree. While Holland’s mix-up may indicate that Thomas was involved in editing the 1598 edition, either instead of or in addition to Egerton, even with the mistaken death lament the note seems to point to Helkiah as the “H.C.” of the 1598 prefatory materials, and his poem “An Epigramme to the Reader” is reprinted in the 1599 and several other subsequent editions of Greenham’s works with the continued attribution “H.C.”

Although Crooke’s departure date from Leiden is unclear, it must have been some time in 1597 or very early in 1598 (and that only if the book was printed late in the year) to allow for his involvement in the 1598 edition of Greenham’s works, titled

40. Henry Holland, “The Preface to the Reader,” in *The Works of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham*, ed. Holland (London: Felix Kingston, 1599), A6^r.

Paramythion.⁴¹ Although someone else—at least Dexter, if not Egerton and/or Thomas Croke—was likely involved in producing the volume, Helkiah may have contributed to writing the prefatory materials.⁴² At the start of the volume, in an epistle dedicating the book “To the right worshipfull S. Drue Drurie Knight,” the author of the preface, likely Croke, mentions a previous collection of Greenham’s writing, presumably one of the “brief treatises and collections of miscellaneous sayings” printed in 1595 and 1597.⁴³

The same now being brought unto me to be prepared for the second impression; the common good of those, who from these holy labours might raise unto them selves a soverayne comfort for their oppressed consciences; as also the reverent regard I had unto the blessed memory of the deceased Author, encouraged, or rather inforced me to looke more carefully unto it, and finding the former edition very defective, to indeavour the correction of it, which is thus as you see obtained, & the volume thus far increased by such written coppies of the like argument, as were ministred unto me.⁴⁴

In addition to indicating involvement beyond composing prefaces, this passage conveys a clear sense of compassion on Croke’s behalf for the volume’s target audience, those suffering “an afflicted conscience” and seeking the “comfort” promised by the Greek

41. The Greek title is incorrectly transliterated as “*Paramthion*” in the *ODNB* entry for Helkiah Croke.

42. Birken is wholly convinced that the “H.C.” attribution of *Paramythion*’s prefatory materials rightfully belongs to Helkiah Croke; see “Fellows of the Royal College,” 86-88.

43. Parker and Carlson, 32n; the historians place *Paramythion* in this category.

44. H[elkiah] C[rooke], “To the right worshipfull S. *Drue Drurie Knight*,” in *Paramythion* by Richard Greenham (London: Richard Bradocke, 1598), A2^v.

title. Although “conscience” is commonly associated with a sense of morality, since as far back as the fourteenth century the word has also been used without a moral dimension, as “inward knowledge or consciousness of something within or relating to oneself; internal conviction, personal awareness,” which is the sense in which it appears in *Paramythion*.⁴⁵ Similarly, despite the book’s religious context, the “afflictions” referred to do not necessarily or exclusively mean sin or guilt, but rather all nature of “trouble” and “dismay” from which the sufferer “cannot tell how to be delivered” (B1^v). Such comfort was a specialty of Greenham’s, who was known for “the nature of his ministry to afflicted persons” and “his charity to bodies and souls” and was remembered as “that excellent Physitian of the Soule” by his contemporaries.⁴⁶

Whatever his exact level of involvement, Croke did not initiate the project to publish *Paramythion*. The author of the preface describes how someone “brought” the volume to him “to be prepared” and additional materials “were ministred unto” him, so if Croke did write the prefatory materials someone other than the young medical student thought him an apt candidate for the work and enlisted his services, whether his father or brother-in-law Egerton or some other person. Undoubtedly, the six years of university education Croke had already acquired were one recommendation of his abilities. His dedication to caring for others, attested by his chosen profession and the rhetoric of his prefaces, was surely another reason. Birken notes that the project gave the future physician early exposure to “the problems of mental illness,” in response to which

45. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “conscience, n.,” def. II.7.a.

46. Parker and Carlson, 6; Eric Josef Carlson, “Richard Greenham (early 1540s-1594),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

Crooke “showed a genuine compassion for the afflicted.”⁴⁷ In his epistle “To the Reader,” Crooke demonstrates his sympathy by using biblical references to paint a vivid picture of how difficult the human experience can be. He calls life “a warfare” fraught with “adversaries” such as “an olde wily Serpent, and a fierce ravenous Lion” and imagines “many snares . . . laide to intrapre the soule of man” and “hearts scorched with the venomous heat of the firie serpent.” Even in the face of such challenges, he assures his “gentle Reader” that the book is “copious” enough to “cure all” thanks to Greenham’s “carefull” effort to “leave a remembrance of himselfe in some profitable instructions for those that should come after.”⁴⁸

Crooke’s prefatory verses are similarly sympathetic and encouraging. Although still only a medical student, Crooke shows a physician’s predilection for diagnosis, prescription, and treatment in the three stanzas of his poem. First, he carefully and accurately assesses the suffering of his readers, describing a “thirstie” and “hunger-bit” soul, a “weariet” and “oppressed” heart, and a “minde enthralled.” He demonstrates a keen understanding of the need for action when he warns that “smothered flames a greater fire will breede.” In his second stanza, Crooke describes the antidotes necessary to address the symptoms of the afflicted conscience: “silver streames” to “quench the boyling heat, / And hony dewes thy hungrie stomacke fill,” along with “sweete Repose . . . Thy wounded breast to cure.” In the third and final stanza, he explains the successful treatment, which provides “Rest and Comfort,” “pure light,” and “æternall joys” for the

47. Birken, *ODNB*. Usher credits Crooke as “a pioneer in the study of mental illness,” but that may be taking things a bit far; “Will,” 110n.

48. H[elkiah] C[rooke], “To the Reader,” in *Paramythion* by Richard Greenham (London: Richard Bradocke, 1598), A3^{r-v}.

“ransom’d soule.” Finally, Crooke assures his reader/patient that “timelye death shall blessed life begin.”⁴⁹

The idea that death was a blessing and the beginning of a more desirable eternal life in heaven was a common one at the time, and rather a platitude as an ending to Crooke’s verses. Crooke engages the concept further in later writings, but the idea carries particular weight for an early modern physician, especially one with a deep interest in anatomy. Accepting death as a blessing not only made it easier to face one’s own ever-present mortality in a time fraught with physical perils, but it also made it easier for a physician to fail at his job, when the core imperative of medical practice was keeping people alive. It also helped to endorse the practice of human dissection, which although permitted was not quite as readily accepted in England as it was in other Western countries such as Italy and the United Provinces. The idea that the deceased was better off in that condition made it easier to take the next step and accept that the gruesome act of anatomizing his or her body allowed the dead person to contribute to the good of those still living. After all, becoming an anatomy subject could also be an act of redemption through punishment, as the bodies sanctioned for dissection were most usually those of executed criminals.

Scholars have found it odd or inconsequential that a physician such as Crooke wrote prefatory material for a book of sermons and religious/philosophical treatises, but recognizing and acknowledging his involvement in this early book reveals that writing was central to his professional formation and development, even before he completed his

49. H[elkiah] C[rooke], “An Epigramme to the Reader,” in *Paramythion* by Richard Greenham (London: Richard Bradocke, 1598), A4^v.

degree and began formal medical practice. First Crooke authored his thirteen anatomical theses at Leiden, which identifies and grounds him as medical student. But even if those theses were debated publicly (which they do not appear to have been), the audience for that writing was limited. Through his involvement in Greenham's *Paramythion*, Crooke finds a much wider audience. It seems unlikely that he would have been asked to participate in such a venture unless those responsible for it fully believed he was qualified for the task, and Crooke rises to the occasion, approaching his prefatory materials in full seriousness and with careful attention to the cause and purpose of the text. Crooke thereby offers a prime example of how humanistic education was essential to the development of an effective physician, demonstrating the value and quality of the early modern English physicians' role in society as medical practitioners because their training was theoretical and humanistic as well as practical and scientific.

III. The College of Physicians

Crooke next returned to Cambridge, where he graduated MB in 1599 and MD in 1604.⁵⁰ For the next six or seven years, he falls out of the official records, but he was probably gaining practical experience by practicing medicine in a rural area; Suffolk is a strong possibility as both the county of his birth and a likely location for Cambridge medical graduates.⁵¹ Crooke returns to the record in London, appearing in the Annals of

50. The Cambridge grace book records that Crooke studied medicine the seven years required for his Bachelor of Medicine degree (Birken, *ODNB*); they apparently credited him for his previous BA study with Bois, and possibly his time at Leiden.

51. Robb-Smith, 368.

the College of Physicians beginning in 1611.⁵² Although he was by default licensed to practice in London thanks to his Cambridge medical degree, he had to apply and pass an examination to gain candidacy in the College, the first step to becoming a fellow, which additionally required the completion of four years' practice.⁵³ Crooke was examined "for the first time" on March 1, 1611.⁵⁴ Although the Annals note his examination, the record makes no observation of his performance, merely stating his "replies are shown in the Book of Examinations for this day," a reference to a volume that has unfortunately been lost to history. The College's statutes, however, having last been revised in 1601, provide a fairly clear idea of what such an examination would have entailed.

The candidacy exam involved tests on three subjects: 1) physiology and the science and knowledge of medicine, 2) pathology, or the symptoms and cause of diseases, and 3) the use and exercise of medicine, including methods of treatment.⁵⁵ The applicant was given a designated list of books by Galen in Latin to study for each of the three subject areas. The sheer quantity of reading was "formidable," including seventeen distinct Galenic treatises, and the College appears to have expected "genuine knowledge

52. The institution's name was the College of Physicians of London when chartered by Henry VIII in 1518; the prefix "royal" was not added until the 1680s (Pelling 1; Clark, 1:337).

53. Clarke, 1:101. There were three levels of membership (and corresponding fees) within the College of Physician: licentiate, a term "used only for those who were allowed to practice by virtue of some qualification lower than a doctor's degree" within a seven-mile radius of London (Clark, 1:176); candidate, which gave a physician voting rights in the College; and fellow, from which status one might be appointed lecturer or officer (Prögler, 190; see also Pelling, *Medical Conflicts*).

54. Royal College of Physicians (hereafter RCP), RCP Annals Transcription and Translation MS (hereafter Annals Translation MS), vol. III, 29. The original entry uses Old Style dating and records the entry as "1610 March 1"; RCP, Annals of the College of Physicians MS (hereafter Annals MS), vol. III, fol. 8^v.

55. Clarke, 1:179.

of the original.”⁵⁶ An applicant with a sound Oxbridge medical degree, undoubtedly the ideal from the College’s perspective, would of course have studied many of these texts previously, but individual courses of study varied greatly, and the exam was not given within the context of a regularized university setting in which examiners and examinees knew each other, were familiar with a similar curriculum, and might provide allowances based on extenuating circumstances. Rather, in its original sixteenth-century form, the conduct of the College’s candidacy exam “was regulated minutely” and specified “no respect of persons.”⁵⁷ At least five fellows had to be present as the president selected three questions from different places in the assigned books. The applicant was shown the questions and allowed several hours with un-indexed copies of the Galenic texts to prepare his answer. He then stood before the College, identified the passages in question, and provided his own assertions in regard to an answer.⁵⁸ The severe course of the original exam was somewhat relaxed by the 1601 revisions to the statutes, which omitted the details governing the choice and form of questions, the ways in which candidates may prepare, and the range of acceptable answers “so that the examiners were now less strictly tied in their procedure and may in practice have interpreted their duties more indulgently, accepting as satisfactory a less literal knowledge of the texts, though still demanding an intelligent grasp of the subject-matter.”⁵⁹

While the Annals for March 1, 1611, record that Crooke was then examined for the first time, the outcome of his examination is not provided. The only further mention

56. Ibid., 1:99.

57. Ibid., 1:99, 100.

58. Ibid., 1:99.

59. Ibid., 1:179-80.

of his name in the entry occurs in regard to another physician who was appearing before the comitia at the same time, one Dr. Tenant, who, among other complaints, was charged “by Dr. Crooke with treating Mrs. White, living near St. Antholin’s church from whom he had received 271., and as yet he had not cured her quartan fever,” upon which note the entry ends.⁶⁰ Crooke next appears in the Annals nearly a full year later, on February 7, 1612.⁶¹ That entry reports, “Dr. Crooke was examined by them [the president and four censors] for the second time, and replied to the question suggested by himself as shown in the Book of Examinations for this day: at length he wished to know whether that would stand for a second or for no approval: they agreed with him as regards these last words, namely for no approval.” While many candidates went through two examinations, no records exist to give indication of why so much time elapsed between Crooke’s two attempts.⁶² The records in the Annals, however, provide evidence that Crooke, at least, seemed to think the second exam should have been well enough to qualify him. A brief while later, at the comitia held on the day after Palm Sunday, 1612, Crooke appeared once more, endeavoring “to obtain more consideration for himself,” but the College’s response remained unfavorable: “But in truth after actions at law and other charges against him and not a few instances of obtrusion on his part quoted by a number of

60. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 29. Typically brief, after listing the day’s examinees, the entry only mentions that Dr. Tenant had sought a license from the RCP, was denied, and was charged by both the President and Crooke with “bad practice.”

61. The entry in the Annals recorded in the Old Style as February 7, 1611; RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 10^r.

62. The College’s original statutes mandated re-examination occur no more than three months later, on the principle that “a man for whom three months were not sufficient would have no hope of passing after six” (Clark, 1:100); however, the set timing of exams is one of the things removed during the 1601 revisions (1:179).

people he was advised to behave himself with more regard to authority: and in the meantime the decisions recorded would remain unaltered.”⁶³

The College’s response to Crooke’s appeal is striking for its emphasis on submission to authority rather than demonstration of knowledge. None of these three entries includes a single indication that any of the College members found Crooke’s medical expertise lacking, and his ample education further suggests his competence as a practitioner.⁶⁴ That the College gave Crooke the opportunity to suggest his own question for the second examination indicates they trusted his basic capabilities as a learned physician. Rather, the College admittedly withheld Crooke’s election to candidacy on the basis of his failure to demonstrate their desired level of “regard to authority.” The College’s problem with Crooke was not his knowledge but his behavior. From the very start of his London career, the young physician seems to have irked the sensibilities of his superiors, as did so many of the other “irregular” practitioners chastised by the institution.⁶⁵

For many historians, the fault here lies with Crooke. Clark qualifies the Annals entries as records of “several scarcely creditable incidents.”⁶⁶ O’Malley labels Crooke “an ambitious man, even ruthlessly so” with a “brash personality and penchant for litigation” on the basis of the same entries and takes especial umbrage at Crooke’s

63. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 34.

64. The Annals do include plenty of examples of medical practitioners who were examined and whose knowledge was found lacking; see, for instance, the example of John Lambe, discussed in chapter 6.

65. See Pelling’s comprehensive prosopographical study of this group, *Medical Conflicts*.

66. Clark, 204.

accusation of Dr. Tenant at the March 1, 1611, comitia.⁶⁷ While O'Malley himself notes that Dr. Tenant was previously and subsequently brought before the College on similar charges, he still finds Crooke's accusation a "gambit" of "self-righteous indignation."⁶⁸ O'Malley fails to note that the Annals also record, in the same sentence, that the College president similarly charged Tenant "with bad practice against another man."⁶⁹ Crooke ought not be so harshly accused for offering supporting evidence in a case already before the College and being heard on a day he happened to also be present, nor is it surprising he would be willing to do so when he stood to directly benefit from courting the College's favor. Because O'Malley's historical narrative (which, until recently, was the predominant biographical source on Crooke) already reads so negatively into Crooke's behavior, when Crooke is rejected on his second attempt at the candidacy examination, O'Malley is already poised to take the College's side. It could very well be that the complaints listed by the College—"actions at law and other charges against him and not a few instances of obtrusion on his part quoted by a number of people"—were negative behaviors on Crooke's part, but there is no further detail to provide proof one way or the other. The only existing record of Crooke's conduct is the report that the College disliked the young physician's behavior, and that dislike in and of itself is not proof of a character defect in Crooke. It merely stands testament to his willingness to resist the authority of an administrative body that, by many other accounts, was deeply faulted in its governance of many of the matters within its purview.

67. O'Malley, 4.

68. Ibid.

69. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 29.

Finally, on May 7, 1613, Crooke was examined once more and, as the Annals note, approved for candidacy. (Coincidentally, Dr. Tenant appeared again before the College at the same time and “was condemned for ill practice and fined 20 l., and warned.”)⁷⁰ Again the record refers to the lost Book of Examinations for further details of the meeting, but it does mention that “the matter was put to a vote and by ten stones or peas he [i.e., Crooke] was declared a Candidate.”⁷¹ Since there were seventeen members of the College present to participate in the vote, O’Malley asserts Crooke’s ten votes represent “a rather grudging approval,” but such a biased interpretation of scant evidence neglects alternate possibilities.⁷² The number of votes does not testify to any of the members’ feelings toward the candidate; it only suggests that the comitia was divided in its conclusions regarding Crooke’s suitability for candidacy, which might be due to any number of reasons suggested by the limited record of Crooke’s preceding relationship with the College.

There is no doubt Crooke was a contentious figure in the College at this point of his career, but criticizing Crooke too harshly for that divisiveness fails to account for the potentially conflicting ambitions of the other College members and the sometimes misguided motivations and objectives of the College itself. The fact that the only extant account of Crooke’s behavior exists in the Annals of the College of Physicians means that the primary source on his conduct is inherently biased. While O’Donoghue and O’Malley seem content to read Crooke in the terms by which he is described in the official records, Pelling asserts the account provided in the College’s Annals cannot be

70. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 44.

71. *Ibid.*, 46.

72. O’Malley, 4.

taken literally, as those documents “insisted on how the actions that they recorded were to be viewed.... The Annals were—and are, for the historian—a carefully constructed set of texts.”⁷³ The Crooke who appears in the Annals of the College of Physicians is an intentionally fabricated character formed by the interests and aims of his governing professional body, as are the other practitioners depicted therein. Recognizing the deliberate fashioning that occurs in a text appearing on its surface to be an ideal historical document reveals the layers of complexity implicit in reading early modern primary sources. In order to reach a less prejudiced view of Crooke, the broader picture must be taken into account, as further demonstrated by the following two chapters, which discuss how Crooke figured his own professional identity in his anatomy manual and how he navigated the College’s attempts to censor his book, respectively.

73. Pelling, 5-6.

Chapter 3: The Anatomy Manual

Heere you have the worke perfected...

– Crooke, “The Preface to the Chyrurgeons”
in *Mikrokosmographia*

I. Overview and Chronology of Editions

Crooke is best remembered as the author of *Mikrokosmographia*, his often-maligned and yet much-referenced anatomy manual. The book has garnered criticism for an apparent lack of originality or scientific significance, and Crooke’s position as author has been called into question repeatedly since before the volume was even published. Yet the book saw two subsequent editions, was complemented by an epitome version, and is frequently cited by scholars of many kinds seeking insight on human embodiment, medicine, and identity in the early modern England. Bibliographers and historians have paid a fair amount of attention to Crooke for what he is, an average sort of physician who did not appear to make any significant scientific achievements. Crooke did not revolutionize the practice of anatomy in Europe, like Andreas Vesalius; he did not make an important physiological discovery, like William Harvey’s theory of blood circulation; he did not keep extensive records of patient care, like Simon Forman; nor did he write deeply insightful philosophical treatises on religion and death, like Sir Thomas Browne. Yet Crooke’s mediocrity in many ways makes him better suited for the job to which he is so often put, representing the medical culture of his day and the struggle of an average physician to make a successful living for himself amidst considerable political and social turmoil.¹ His anatomy book remains his greatest legacy, not for being a stunning

1. I use the term “mediocrity” for Crooke intentionally. The word did not always carry the negative connotation it tends to have now. It can also mean “the quality or condition

scientific breakthrough (because it absolutely is not), but because the story of its creation, evolution, and afterlives has so much to tell about early modern medicine, publishing, and self-fashioning through print. The book impacted English culture at the time of its printing because it made medical knowledge available in the vernacular, and the accessibility of its English language remains one of its most significant features for scholars today.

Mikrokosmographia was first published in 1615. In addition to the original first edition version, there are three variant title pages. The most significant variant, which constitutes the addition of the claim that Crooke was physician and professor to King James I, seems to indicate that the king may have intervened on Crooke's behalf when the book's release came under threat from the College of Physicians. The other two variants involve only the date; copies of the first edition were issued in 1616 and again in 1618 with the respective year reflected on the title page. An epitome volume, *Somatographia Anthropine*, was published in 1616. A second edition of *Mikrokosmographia*, "corrected and enlarged," with two new title pages and the addition of a Paré tract translated by Crooke, was published in 1631, followed by a second edition (possibly a reissue with a variant title page; see below) of the epitome in 1634. Finally, several years after Crooke's death, a third edition of *Mikrokosmographia* was published in 1651. Copies of all of these editions and issues exist today, but first and second editions are respectively more common than the third. Although no extensively annotated

of being intermediate between two extremes"; *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. "mediocrity, n.," def. 1.b. Consider, for example, Spenser's *Shepherd's Calender*, in which "vertue dwelleth in the midst...all bountye dwelleth in mediocritie"; Edmund Spenser, *The Shepherd's Calender* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1579), H2^v.

copy of any edition has yet come to light, there are many copies containing legible marginalia and other interesting bibliographic features. The second edition in particular has intriguing connections to early English editions of Ambrose Paré's translated works, some of the most important surgical texts of the seventeenth century.

II. The First Edition

Crooke mentions in the preface to *Mikrokosmographia* that he worked on his anatomy book for sixteen years (¶1^v), which places its origins in the late 1590s, around the time Crooke returned from studying anatomy in Leiden to complete his MD at Cambridge. The physician writes, "My first and most simple intent was the bettering of my owne knowledge in so necessary a part of my profession, so being perswaded that thy profit might fall in with the same, I have set before thee a Mirrour, wherein thou may see the true representation of thine owne Originall, Structure, Growth and Accomplishment" (4Q3^r). He speaks here to the members of the barber-surgeons' company, to whom *Mikrokosmographia* is dedicated. The origin narrative Crooke establishes in this one sentence indicates that his writing began as a part of his own medical education before he decided to expand his audience to include other, and other sorts of, medical practitioners for their additional edification. By the time the work neared completion, Crooke was a licensed physician living and practicing medicine in London. But in order to get his book printed, he needed a publisher.

Edmund Willoughby posits that Crooke may have met his future publisher, William Jaggard, because Crooke was the physician who treated the London printer for

syphilis in early 1612, but unfortunately the evidence does not support this postulation.² Willoughby cites Sloane MS 640, which includes an unattributed note describing an instance of medical treatment: “Jagger prynter being long subject to cathars [catarrhs, a buildup of mucus] and arthritik passions *tandem bene affectus, & virga valde exulcerata* [finally feeling well, and his rod (i.e., penis) extremely ulcerated] the humor by mercurial waters and upitalls drive backe and thereupon receiving a diaphoretik [a drug inducing perspiration] became blind.”³ Either the disease or the treatment could have been responsible for Jaggard’s ensuing blindness. The passage does not name the medical practitioner who administered the treatment, nor can the note be confirmed as Crooke’s own record of patient care, as the handwriting does not match that of the MS version of Crooke’s 1597 thesis, which itself cannot be positively identified as the physician’s own handwriting.⁴ Furthermore, the method described is the sort of treatment for syphilis that would have more likely fallen within the purview of a surgeon rather than a physician. Syphilis fit well into the theoretical frameworks and therapeutic practices of the early modern surgeons. While physicians and empirics did also treat patients for the disease, at the turn of the seventeenth century the recognized authority on syphilis, or “pox” as it was more commonly called, was a learned surgeon named William Clowes, whose

2. Edwin Elliot Willoughby, *A Printer of Shakespeare: The Books and Times of William Jaggard* (New York: Dutton, 1934), 103.

3. Sloane MS 640, British Library, 192^f.

4. K. F. Russell claims that the MS thesis “is more likely a copy rather than an autograph” but does not explain his reasons for thinking so; Russell, *British Anatomy, 1525-1800: A Bibliography of Works Published in Britain, America, and on the Continent* (Winchester, Hampshire, UK: St. Paul’s, 1987), 56. A printed copy of the thesis does exist at the University of Leiden. If the MS thesis is *not* in Crooke’s hand, it allows the possibility that the record of Jaggard’s treatment *is* his, but without any further evidence or reason to suggest it, no such claim can be conscionably made.

“confidence came from the knowledge that ‘the perfection of the whole cure’, the ‘use of unctions or ointments’ was indisputably the surgeons’ business.”⁵ Lacking any further evidence, it seems unlikely Crooke was personally responsible for Jaggard’s mercury treatment.

Regardless of how the two men first met, Jaggard decided to print and publish the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*.⁶ At the end of the anatomy manual, a letter written by Jaggard from “The Printer to the Reader” describes the larger scope of plans for the printing house and how Crooke’s book fit within that framework. In the letter Jaggard specifically mentions that anatomy is “a matter much affected by mee,” and it has long been surmised that one of Jaggard’s main motivations for printing an anatomy book was his own father’s career as a barber-surgeon on the outskirts of London.⁷ As Willoughby admits, however, there is no solid proof that John Jaggard, William’s father, was a skilled surgeon or even practiced surgery at all; while records state that John was a member of the barber-surgeons company, barbers and surgeons were two separate professions united in one guild. Furthermore, “Barbers were forbidden to practise any form of surgery other than the drawing of teeth and the letting of blood and surgeons were forbidden to practise

5. Andrew Wear, *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 264-66.

6. If Willoughby’s dates are correct, Jaggard was blind by 1613 and so never actually saw the completed volume, but if he did meet Crooke (under whatever circumstances) before losing his sight, the printer may have physically viewed the book as a manuscript in draft.

7. Willoughby, 36-38. Adam Hooks also mentions that from the beginning to the end of his career “Jaggard possessed an acute awareness of the intellectual, ethical, textual, and material value of the books he produced”; *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2016), 124.

barbery.”⁸ John Jaggard may very well have been a barber and not a surgeon at all, and his son’s self-professed interest in anatomy may have stemmed from some other source entirely. But in testament to his medical interests, Jaggard did print a substantial number of medical books, including an edition of Thomas Elyot’s *Castle of Health* (1610) and Thomas Hill’s *Art of Physiognomy* (1613) just prior to taking on *Mikrokosmographia*. Willoughby figures the shop’s total output of scientific books at 11% of all known books published.⁹

The content of the printer’s letter reveals further insights beyond Jaggard’s personal investment in publishing the book. For one thing, Jaggard appears to downplay Crooke’s role in the volume’s production, mentioning him nowhere by name, and instead referencing “those two famous Anatomists, *Iaspar Bauhinus* and *Andreas Laurentius*, with divers other[s]” as the authors of “this excellent labour.” Even though Crooke draws on many sources, including Bauhin and du Laurens, for the content of his book, the literary “labour” of writing *Mikrokosmographia* is Crooke’s; the actual labor of physically creating the book is the printer’s.¹⁰ In such a way Jaggard credits both Crooke’s work and his own as “excellent” even though he abstains from naming the volume’s author. Jaggard also explains that before taking on Crooke’s anatomy manual

8. Willoughby, 37. The distinct but “vexed Trinity of ‘barber,’ ‘surgeon,’ and ‘barber-surgeon’” is explored at length by Eleanor Decamp in *Civic and Medical Worlds in Early Modern England: Performing Barbery and Surgery* (New York: Palgrave, 2016), 4-6.

9. Willoughby, 186; the “scientific” category includes “astronomy, mathematics, zoology, human anatomy, medicine and surgery” (187-88). Willoughby notes that Jaggard’s proportion of non-religious printing is unusually high for an average London printer of the time (186).

10. “Labor” is the same term Crooke himself uses in reference to his anatomy manual as well as to *Paramythion*. It is a common term for this context, but not the only term available, and so worth noting as Crooke’s evident preference.

he originally planned to publish the “ingenious worke” of Ambrose Paré. Some scholars have understandably assumed this is a reference to the French surgeon’s *Method of Curing Wounds made by Gunshot*, which William Jaggard’s son Isaac would publish in 1617; however, it more likely refers to a translation of Paré’s *Complete Works* that would not be published until 1634.

Jaggard’s initial motivation for undertaking the printing of Crooke’s compiled anatomy volume seems to have been to provide more detailed anatomical knowledge as a foundation to Paré’s surgical instruction. Laying the groundwork, however, proved in itself a monumental task. Even with the immense size of *Mikrokosmographia*, Jaggard was not able to print all of the material Crooke originally intended to provide—despite, as Willoughby repeatedly notes, the printer’s fondness and capacity for producing large folio volumes.¹¹ Jaggard asserts in his letter, “Yet let me not be misinterpreted herein, as one fearefull to adventure on a worke of farre greater moment, the Authors [i.e., Bauhin and du Laurens] being so renowned, and the expectation only to the publique benefit of my country.” The printer’s expectation that producing Crooke’s anatomy manual would publicly benefit his country indicates his awareness of a general need for detailed anatomical instruction. The English surgeons had to know the identity and relationship of

11. Crooke writes in his preface dedicated to the barber-surgeons that “had not the bulke of the volume growne too great, and so too chargeable to the Printer, I intended beside these thirteene Bookes” five others (¶2^v). Considering the printer’s career as a whole, Willoughby notes Jaggard’s ability “to produce a disproportionate number of large and expensive folio volumes” and his “fondness for large illustrated folios” (185, 186). In regard to *Mikrokosmographia*, Willoughby concludes, “the fact that Jaggard was able to undertake so expensive and slow selling a volume is further evidence of his prosperity” (106).

the complex parts of the human body before they could hope to learn Paré's techniques for treating them.

Whether from exposure to his father's surgical practice, his own firsthand experience of medical treatment, or some other reason, Jaggard apparently had enough understanding of both the workings of the human body and the state of anatomical knowledge in England at that time to recognize that Paré's advanced surgical insights and instruction would be difficult for its intended readership to follow, even when translated into the vernacular, unless they had better foundational anatomical information. Of course, the printer also could have received advice regarding the value of a comprehensive anatomy manual to a vernacular English audience. For instance, if Croke somehow heard that Jaggard was planning to publish a translation of Paré, the physician might (opportunistically) have informed the printer that the finer points of Paré's superior and extensive medical knowledge would be lost on the poorly-educated English barber-surgeons who had no formal training in anatomy—nor could they easily attain any, since there was no learned anatomy text available in the English language. But if Jaggard were to print a comprehensive anatomy volume, edited and translated by an educated and experienced physician, the printer could profit both from that book as well as from the correspondingly increased sales of the planned Paré edition, another large and costly volume.

The matter of profit is somewhat vexed in this context. Although literary scholars have come to accept economic motivation as a major (and ongoing) canon-shaping force, much of medical history throughout the twentieth century denigrated any perceived pecuniary interests on behalf of its subjects of study. There is an inherent conflict of

interest in matters of money and medicine. Any medical endeavor that appears to have been undertaken primarily as a profitable venture appears suspect, and historians have frequently been eager to condemn both Crooke and Jaggard for apparent greediness. *Mikrokosmographia* was a large, showy book, obviously intended to make money for both its author (by providing publicity and legitimacy for his medical practice) and its publisher (through book sales). But just because the book was a for-profit endeavor does not mean that it had no other value, or that its creators had no other motivations. The evidence suggests that these two men saw an opportunity to make a tangible, positive impact on the state of medicine in early modern England while at the same time earning a living, and neither of those results precludes or discredits the other. In his letter Jaggard explicitly states that despite the challenges posed by printing *Mikrokosmographia* he persevered with the project for nothing less than “the publique benefit of [his] country.” He deemed the book worth his trouble because of its potential to advance the education of English medical practitioners as well as patients and thereby improve public health.¹² Furthermore, both Jaggard and Crooke chose to stand by the project in its original form when threatened with censorship by the College of Physicians. The far safer thing to do financially would have been to acquiesce and proceed with a revised and sanctioned

12. One purpose for a lay readership of medical literature was in “consultation between the gentleman or woman and the doctor. The prefaces to the regimens and textbooks often insist on their usefulness to patient-physician relationships”; Paul Slack, “Mirrors of Health and Treasures of Poor Men: The Uses of the Vernacular Medical Literature of Tudor England,” in *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979), 260. An ability to better communicate symptoms and understand diagnostic suggestions undoubtedly led to more accurate and successful treatments.

version of the book.¹³ The gamble, of course, paid off; undoubtedly they sold more copies of the book after the scandal than they would have without it, and the book considerably improved the state of vernacular knowledge about the female body (neglected in earlier English anatomies), helping Jaggard achieve his goal of “publique benefit.” But both men would have experienced significant financial loss had the College carried through with its threats to have the book burned.¹⁴

The first edition of *Mikrokosmographia* is an impressive book. Its title page features two woodcuts also used elsewhere in the text: On the left, a male figure exhibiting the “Skin-Veines” (H2^r) looks off the page to the book’s spine, a bland expression on his face and the lower half of his left arm inexplicably absent. The female figure on the right is, in some ways, less naked; she retains most of her skin as well as a full head of hair, and she has been depicted in a naturalized setting, standing on a mound of grass from which a branch protrudes. While her hands demurely cover her groin and

13. Part of the difficulty with understanding how Crooke and Jaggard chose to handle the College of Physicians’ threats of censorship is not knowing how far along they were with printing copies when the College raised its objections. Although reprinting a (nearly) finished book would have been prohibitively expensive, the offending illustrations were limited in number and might have been pasted over or otherwise modified. Crooke ultimately tries to skirt the issue by explaining in his preface to book 4 that “we have so plotted our busines, that he that listeth may separate this booke from the rest” (S3^r), although I have not yet seen or heard of any copies where such a complete removal of the objectionable section has occurred.

14. Although the ultimate authority for book burning lay with the ecclesiastical authorities and the Stationers’ Company (who worked together, under the orders of James I, to police the London printing trade), the College of Physicians, as a civic institution charged with regulating not only its own members but all medical practitioners within a seven-mile radius of London, worked with the Bishop of London to examine texts relevant to their purview. The censorship efforts directed at *Mikrokosmographia* are recorded in the College’s Annals as a joint effort of the Bishop of London and the officers of the College of Physicians. For more on censorship and book burning in early seventeenth-century London, see Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001).

half her breast, the area between them has been partially dissected to expose her gravid uterus and the organs surrounding it.¹⁵ Just above and between the two figures' heads is a Latin epigraph from book 2 of Virgil's *Georgics*, "—————Etiam Parnassia Laurus / Parua, subingentimatrix se subiicit umbra."¹⁶ One modern translation suggests, "...the Parnassian bay-tree also, / when tiny, shelters beneath the immense shade of its mother."¹⁷ Scholar and clergyman Abraham Fleming completed the first translation of both Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, published together in 1589.¹⁸ Fleming's translation of these lines reads, "...baies of *Parnasse* hill (for Phæbe) / (Which) being litle (or but yoong) doth cast (or lift it selfe) / Up under the shadow great of mo-ther."¹⁹

The lines of Virgil on the title page position the anatomy book in a specific relationship to its source texts. Crooke pays homage to the debt he owes his sources through the metaphor of the bay laurel trees. *Laurus nobilis* reproduces by way of flowers and berries; the seeds can be dispersed when the latter are eaten by birds or, logically, when the berries simply fall from the tree to the ground below, so the image of the sapling in the shadow of the "mother" tree is not unrealistic. Native to the Mediterranean, the trees' location on the slopes of Mount Parnassus is also factually believable, although

15. While nothing about the image itself suggests the woman is pregnant, the description accompanying the woodcut where it appears in Book 4 explains this is "the portraiture of a woman great with child whose wombe is bared and the Kel [caul fat, which envelops the intestines] taken away, that the stomacke, the guttes and the womb might bee better scene" (V5^v).

16. Crooke quotes the same lines in his Latin dedication to King James I, which has not yet been translated in its entirety.

17. C. Day Lewis, trans., *Virgil: The Eclogues and The Georgics*, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009), 69.

18. Fleming is best remembered for his work revising the 1587 edition of *Holinshed's Chronicles*.

19. Abraham Fleming, *The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London: T. O., 1589), C4^r.

the mountain's association with literature undoubtedly plays a role in its inclusion as well, for both Virgil and Crooke.²⁰ There is something ironically humorous about the depiction of the substantially-sized *Mikrokosmographia* as “tiny” or “litle,” but the correlation of the amount of knowledge conveyed in his book to the much larger volume of existing human knowledge about his subject may have been an accurate representation for Crooke—and, as Fleming's alternate translation suggests, the adjective *parvus* can also mean young, which the book certainly is.²¹ Additionally, the laurel's classical associations are obviously desirable to Crooke's aims.²² The parental relationship established by the use of Virgil's metaphor is particularly important. The framing of Crooke's paratexts indicates he was apprehensive about the reception of his work even before its attempted suppression. The “Preface to the Chyrurgeons,” for instance, is a great deal concerned with how Crooke's audience should receive the anatomy book and the role he intended it to have in the English medical community. Crooke knows he makes no original scientific contributions to the field, but by portraying his contribution as the child or offspring of his sources he both establishes and legitimizes a legacy for his work. Identifying *Mikrokosmographia* as the child of its predecessors not only clarifies the book's relationship to its sources but also validates its heavy resemblance to them.

20. The mountain near Delphi was “sacred to Apollo and the Muses”; R. O. A. M. Lyne, notes on *Virgil: The Eclogues and The Georgics*, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009), 131n.

21. The rhetorical figuring that seems to diminish *Mikrokosmographia* is similar to Jaggard's portrayal of the anatomy book as supplementary to other surgical works in his letter “The Printer to the Reader.”

22. The bay laurel's common use in cooking may initially seem a more awkward aspect of the comparison, but Crooke himself offers up his text as a “Banquet” he has “Cooked” for his audience within the first few lines of his “Preface to the Chyrurgeons” (¶1').

Jaggard risked significant financial loss if *Mikrokosmographia* did not sell well. Whereas Crooke's loss would have been figured more in terms of time wasted in working on the manuscript and the failure to realize increased professional standing and potential patients, Jaggard had already made a tangible monetary investment in the anatomy manual. Part of that investment was in the newly commissioned woodcuts made to illustrate the book. There are approximately 132 distinct illustrations in the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*; twenty-eight of those illustrations appear twice in the book, and nine appear three times.²³ The bulk of these illustrations appear to have been copied directly from the engravings in Caspar Bauhin's *Theatrum Anatomicum* (1605).²⁴ Bauhin in turn copied various sources, including Vesalius's *De Humani Corporis Fabrica* (1543) and du Laurens's *Historia Anatomica* (1600). Reusing woodcuts in subsequent publications was standard business practice as a practical way to recoup or even profit on the cost of having them made. Jaggard found a clever and resourceful way to quickly make a second book out of *Mikrokosmographia*'s woodcuts. Following the Vesalian model, Jaggard created an epitome version of the large anatomy volume. Jaggard titled his epitome *Somatographia Anthropine, or a Description of the Body of Man* and published it in 1616.

Vesalius published an epitome version of his foundational anatomy in the same month the full-size volume came out rather than a year later, but the basic principle provides a clear model for Jaggard's epitome of Crooke's book. The Vesalian epitome is

23. These figures are based on my own examination of the images. It is not always possible to determine which illustrations might consist of more than one woodcut, but in several instances in *Mikrokosmographia* it is apparent that at least two woodcuts have been used where multiple images appear near each other on the same page.

24. Caspar Bauhin, *Theatrum Anatomicum* (Frankfurt: Matthaei Beckeri, 1605).

in folio like the original, probably because of the size of the woodcuts in the *Fabrica*. The first half of the epitome contains a summary of relevant text, and the second half comprises selected illustrations from the full volume; the entire book is only about 50 pages long. *Somatographia*, on the other hand, is an octavo in eights and contains just over 300 pages, a rather different format than the Vesalian epitome but still resulting in a smaller book far more portable and affordable than the original work it redacts.

Mikrokosmographia's woodcuts are substantially smaller than the *Fabrica*'s, and Jaggard included all of the original book's illustrations, rather than just a selection, including a bonus woodcut that would later illustrate the second title page of the second edition of *Mikrokosmographia* (see below). All but one of the *Mikrokosmographia* woodcuts are approximately an eighth of a sheet in size (roughly a quarter of *Mikrokosmographia*'s folio pages), which means they fill a single page of the epitome nicely, lending themselves to the octavo format, with the woodcut printed on the verso of each leaf and its corresponding index on the recto of the leaf facing. The exact fit of the images on the pages of the epitome may indicate that Jaggard had planned the smaller accompanying volume from the beginning when the woodcuts were being made for the original volume.

The one size exception among the epitome's illustrations is the only woodcut in *Mikrokosmographia* not copied out of Bauhin, an image of a dissection table displaying the tools necessary for conducting an anatomy. This illustration, which does have a predecessor in Vesalius's *Fabrica*, is the single woodcut appearing in book 1 of *Mikrokosmographia*, where it fills approximately half a page. In *Somatographia*, in those copies in which it still exists, this woodcut fills two pages (the full side of one leaf), and so it appears as a special add-on at the very end of the book. Different binders incorporate

the aberrant folio in different ways. To date I have only seen three copies that retain the dissection table woodcut: two at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (one of which is the copy of *Somatographia* imaged on *Early English Books Online*) and one at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. One of the Bodleian copies has the folio sewn in, meaning a small part of the image is lost in the book's gutter. The other Bodleian copy has the folio tipped on back-to-back with the final leaf of the book, so that it functions as a foldout. The Trinity Hall copy has the folio folded in half down the middle as if it were to be sewn in, but instead it is tipped on to the final leaf of the book along the front edge of the fold, so that its leaves align with the rest of the text block but rather less of the image is lost in the gutter than the sewn Bodleian copy. A fourth 1616 copy of *Somatographia* at the Wellcome Library in London has the final two leaves of the book provided in facsimile, along with a facsimile copy of the dissection table woodcut tipped in as a foldout (like the second Bodleian copy), but their records do not show the source of the facsimiles.

Somatographia contains little text other than the indices explaining the images and its cross-references to *Mikrokosmographia*. If the reader requires further information than the epitome provides, notes provide directions on where to look: "See the History of this in the Booke at large, in lib. 7 fol. 438 and in lib. 13 fol. 937."²⁵ "Lib." is short for "liber," meaning "book," the word Crooke uses to designate the thirteen separate sections of his text. "Fol." stands for "folio" and refers to pagination; these numerals correspond directly to page numbers in the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*.²⁶ Otherwise the only

25. William Jaggard, *Somatographia Anthropine* (London: Jaggard, 1616), B7^v.

26. Predictably, since it has no counterpart in the full-sized anatomy, the one woodcut that appears in the 1616 *Somatographia* but not the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*

content the book contains is a preface Jaggard commissioned from the Scottish surgeon Alexander Reid (c.1570-1641) who explains that because *Mikrokosmographia* was “not portable” the printer “of the former great volume hath published this small Manuell, hoping it will proove profitable and delightfull to such who are not able to buy or have not time to peruse the other.”²⁷ Crooke does not appear to have been at all involved in producing the volume. Strangely, Jaggard is not generally credited as the creator of this book, despite the fact that his initials are on the title page and he appears to have been individually responsible for planning, designing, and printing the volume. Instead, Crooke gets recorded as the author of the book in most catalogs, sometimes as co-author with or supplanted by Reid.

III. The Second Edition

When William Jaggard died in 1623, his wife Jane inherited the press, but their son Isaac, who had actively assisted his father in the printing business for at least ten years, managed the day-to-day operations of the business.²⁸ When his mother died in late 1625, Isaac Jaggard took over the press in full. He was only to run it for a short time, however, before he unexpectedly died early in 1627, at approximately thirty-two years of age. His wife of less than two years, Dorothy, then transferred the Jaggards’ printing business in its entirety to the brothers Thomas and Richard Cotes; Thomas had been

does not include such a cross-reference, although it does have two full pages of indexed description.

27. Jaggard, A3^v. Reid’s name is variantly spelled Read or Rhead. Although he initially trained as a surgeon, Reid later earned a medical degree from Oxford and became a Fellow of the College of Physicians alongside Crooke.

28. Willoughby, 177.

apprenticed to William Jaggard some thirty years earlier.²⁹ Thus the printing rights to *Mikrokosmographia* and *Somatographia Anthropine* along with all the woodcuts made for the anatomy manual passed to the Cotes brothers.

The Cotes brothers published a second edition of *Mikrokosmographia* in 1631. At this time Crooke was serving as a censor in the College of Physicians and as Keeper of Bethlem Hospital while continuing his private medical practice in London.³⁰ In 1629 he had given the three-day Extraordinary Lecture in anatomy for the College. If there is little indication how William Jaggard came to print the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*, there is even less regarding why a second edition was undertaken at this point in time, although of course the assumption can be made that the parties involved expected to make a profit. Birken suggests that Crooke “may have contributed his own funds” to the venture, which in turn would have hastened his subsequent financial downfall upon the drawn out legal proceedings that commenced in 1632 regarding his tenure at Bethlem, but no clear evidence supports that conjecture.³¹ O’Malley and Birken both conclude that this second edition was “not especially successful” and “a relative failure,” respectively, on the basis that there were no subsequent issues as there were with the first edition.³² However, it can just as reasonably be argued that the second edition was more successful than the first if the 1631 print run sold out completely and did not leave enough copies to warrant subsequent issues, whereas as the first edition perhaps sold more slowly than

29. Ibid., 179-80.

30. While serving as keeper, “Crooke ministered to private patients in his own home”; there was no stipulation on the Keeper’s frequency of attendance at the hospital, merely a requirement that he “serve in person, rather than via proxy” when he did visit. Jonathan Andrews et al., *The History of Bethlem* (London: Routledge, 1997), 269, 267.

31. Birken, *ODNB*.

32. O’Malley, 17; Birken, *ODNB*.

expected in 1615 and so surplus copies were still being sold off with variant title pages in 1616 and 1618. There simply is not enough evidence to determine which scenario is correct. Of the extant copies on record today, there is a similar number of first editions (counting all three issue dates) as second edition copies.³³

The second edition of *Mikrokosmographia* advertises itself as “corrected and enlarged.” Although the corrections are more difficult to speak for, as the editions have not yet been collated, the enlargements are noticeable and notable. The volume begins with a new, ornate, title page illustration engraved by Martin Droeshout, best known for his portrait of Shakespeare that illustrates the title page of the First Folio (1623).³⁴ The engraving’s wealth of images include, at the top center of the page, the name of God in Hebrew coupled with a single all-seeing eye staring down from the heavens, which are represented by concentric half-circles of cherubim, other angels, stars, demons, and a variety of exotic and fantastic beasts, including a unicorn. In the upper left-hand corner is a vignette of a man being bled from his arm; a physician makes the cut while a surgeon catches the blood in a basin. In the upper right-hand corner the same surgeon sets a man’s broken leg. Just below those respective images is a pair of landscapes, one on the left representing Adam and Eve in the garden, and one on the right depicting, presumably, the barren wasteland to which they are exiled upon sinning. Between the landscapes stretches a span of sea in which three ships attempt to navigate an army of giant fish and fanged

33. A complete census of *Mikrokosmographia* has not yet been completed; this estimate is based on my knowledge of the copies I have personally examined or obtained information on directly from librarians. Reaching a valid count based on data available online is completely impossible due to the high level of cataloging errors and omissions.

34. Droeshout also engraved the familiar funeral shroud portrait of John Donne as well as a portrait of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.

monsters. The imagery reinforces the controlling concept of the volume's title, *Mikrokosmographia*, which figures the human being as a microcosm of the world at large.

In the very center of the page two figures frame the image's main text, which describes the book's contents and author in much the same terms as the first edition. On the left stands Father Time with his long beard and scythe; on the right a *memento mori* of a skeleton holds a long arrow. Between their heads is a clock with hands positioned to the hour 12:30.³⁵ On the left- and right-hand sides of the engraving are new versions of the human figures that appeared as woodcuts on the title page of the first edition. The veined man, on the left, now faces toward the center of the page and has his right arm rather than the left severed at the elbow. He has also gained a bit of landscaping at his feet, which he altogether lacked in his previous incarnation. Most notably, a single lily rises up, its bloom at groin-level in the interest of decency, creating an odd juxtaposition in which the man's subcutaneous circulatory system is revealed while his external genitalia are veiled.³⁶ On the right, the hairstyle and posture of the partially dissected gravid female figure remain the same as in their previous depiction, along with the bit of greenery below her feet.

Finally, the entire lower section of the engraving illustrates an anatomical dissection. Twenty-two distinct male figures, two seated and the rest standing, surround a

35. The engraver has inverted the roman numerals so that where the "VI" ought to be printed for six, instead there is an "IV" (the four position is represented by an "IIII").

36. This image likely provoked Elizabeth D. Harvey's erroneous suggestion that the 1615 edition of *Mikrokosmographia* "features a woman whose genitals are covered with a flower"; "Flesh Colors and Shakespeare's Sonnets," in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*, ed. Michael Schoenfeldt (Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Blackwell, 2010), 320. No edition of Croke's work includes such an illustration.

clothed table on which a man's head sits, his mustache visible. The top of his skull has been removed. A man standing behind the table with a book in his right hand points to the brain with the stick in his left hand. If the scaling is reasonably accurate, the book he holds is approximately the correct size to be a copy of *Somatographia Anthropine*. Based on the styling of his hair and beard, he appears to be the same physician depicted in the bleeding scene in the top left-hand corner of the page. An hourglass, a pocket watch or similarly shaped instrument, and a knife with a curved blade sit on the table. Another man seated at the front of the table has his hands outstretched above the dissected head; the gesture could be intended to show he is lecturing on the subject in front of him, or perhaps it simply represents his amazement at the wonders of the human body. According to at least two sources, this lower portion of the second edition title page engraving includes a portrait of Crooke; O'Donoghue claims it is the man standing just left of center at the very front of the dissection table, where his foot "touches the words 'Printed by T. Cotes,'" while O'Malley asserts the engraving "depict[s] a seated Crooke lecturing on the dissected brain," which of course would make him one of the two sitting figures.³⁷ If this conjecture is true, the title page image is the only known portrait of Crooke.

The second title page of the second edition is more similar to the title page of the first edition, although since the male and female figures have migrated to the engraved title page, they are replaced here by the single woodcut illustration included in *Somatographia Anthropine* that does not appear in the first edition of

37. O'Donoghue, 156; O'Malley, 16. Unfortunately neither author explains the evidence or reasoning behind his claim. If the engraving *does* contain a portrait of Crooke, I would think it more likely to be the physician who appears twice, first working cooperatively with the surgeon in the upper left-hand corner vignette and then again, book in one hand and rod in the other, standing at the back of the table in the lower dissection scene.

Mikrokosmographia. The image is of an écorché figure commonly referred to as the “self-flayed man”; he holds a knife in his left hand and his own bearded skin, on which his gaze is turned, in the other. While this title page only claims that the book has been “Published by the Kings Majesties especiall Direction and Warrant according to the first integrity, as it was originally written by the AUTHOR,” the new engraved title page includes the rest of the description of Crooke as “Doctor in Phisicke Physitian To His Majesty and His Highnesse Professor in Anatomy and Chirurgery” from the variant version of the first edition title page. Regardless of the veracity of Crooke’s original claims in this regard while James I was still ruling, as O’Malley points out by 1631 James had died and Charles I was King of England. Although in this second edition Crooke has replaced his epistle to James I with a dedication to King Charles, he did not enjoy the son’s favor as he had the father’s; Charles would shortly commission the investigation that led eventually to Crooke’s ouster from the keepership of Bethlem Hospital. While O’Malley willingly admits the decision to retain these phrases in the era of a different ruler may have been the choice of the Cotes brothers and not Crooke, he insists “it seems not unlikely that these are further examples of Crookian effrontery.”³⁸ Despite his delightful phrasing, any such effrontery is O’Malley’s own creation, not Crooke’s. A few years later, in 1634, the Cotes brothers also produced a second edition of *Somatographia Anthropine*. Further bibliographic study needs to be conducted, but there is reason to believe that the copies dated 1634 represent a subsequent issue of first edition copies left over from 1616 and given a variant title page, rather than a distinct new edition. Primarily, despite the fact that a new edition of *Mikrokosmographia* had been produced

38. O’Malley, 16.

with different pagination, the references in the epitome directing the reader to the corresponding passages in the full anatomy manual remain unchanged.³⁹

Beyond the new title pages and a second edition of *Somatographia Anthropine*, the other major addition to the new edition of *Mikrokosmographia* is the inclusion of a tract on surgical instruments titled *An Explanation of the Fashion and Use of Three and Fifty Instruments of Chirurgery*. The original text was written in French by Ambrose Paré, but this version has been translated into English by Crooke from a Latin edition. Paré's bibliographer Janet Doe explains, "The *Explanation* is almost as much Helkiah Crooke's composition as it is Paré's. Crooke has abstracted, rather than translated, and has interspersed many comments of his own on surgery and on translation.... He used apparently a Latin edition, for long Latin quotations are given."⁴⁰ O'Malley disdains the effort on a similar basis, observing that "the account is interspersed with Crooke's own comments and occasional criticisms of the French surgeon's procedures."⁴¹ Whether Crooke records his name as author or translator of a work, apparently he cannot catch a break with certain readers. But, as with the anatomy manual, Crooke uses a preface to explain that the tract is meant to educate beginning surgeons. The Cotes brothers funded new woodcuts for all fifty-three of the instruments described, which would be reused

39. While the unchanged page references could be an oversight, it would be a major one for a newly printed book whose main purpose is to cross-reference another volume whose page numbers changed when it was revised for its second edition, printed in the same publishing house. However, the page numbers of *Mikrokosmographia* only changed slightly, and slightly-off page references does seem like the sort of error that might intentionally be allowed to stand for the purpose of quickly and easily selling additional extant copies of the epitome.

40. Janet Doe, *A Bibliography of the Works of Ambrose Paré* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1937), 219-20.

41. O'Malley, 17.

later (as discussed below), like those commissioned for *Mikrokosmographia*. Although the Paré tract has discontinuous signatures and pagination from the rest of the book as well as a separate title page and table of contents, no other evidence indicates it was ever intended to be bound separately or circulate independently of Crooke's anatomy manual. While its signature mark (f2) suggests that the table of contents for the surgical instruments tract was intended to be bound at the back of the book as the last item before the errata list (where it usually appears), in one copy owned by Balliol College, Oxford, it has been placed near the beginning of the volume after the anatomy book's own table of contents, representing perhaps the best extant effort at integrating the tract with the rest of the volume.

The Paré tract appended to the second edition includes one other interesting feature, a leaf featuring a single large woodcut and a brief passage discussing it. In the majority of the fifteen copies of the second edition I have examined, this leaf is bound just after the tract's separate title page, before Crooke's preface. However, its signature, "f," indicates that at the time of printing at least the leaf was intended to go at the end of the tract, as the last item before the table of contents (marked "f2") and the errata list.⁴² The leaf features a large woodcut illustration of a bizarrely disfigured man that takes up three quarters of the first page, followed by a passage of text that runs over to the back of the leaf. The title identifies the text as a letter from "The Printer to the Reader," making

42. One copy owned by University Library, Cambridge, has the later leaves associated with the Paré tract completely jumbled; it is bound so that after *Mikrokosmographia* comes "The Printer to the Reader" (f), the table of contents (f2), the errata sheet (which ostensibly should always be last), the *Explanation* title page, and then Crooke's preface to the tract and the tract itself. Copies at King's College London, the Royal College of Surgeons, and Codrington Library, All Souls, Oxford, have all of the additional material bound properly according to its printed signatures.

this the Cotes brothers' counterpart to Jaggard's letter in the first edition. This letter has an entirely different subject and purpose, however, as it describes the body of a criminal that was "by Chance" brought "from the place of Execution" to the College of Physicians "to be Cut up for an Anatomy" in December 1629. Although not specified in the letter, the date verifies this was the anatomical dissection conducted for Crooke's own lecture in *Extraordinary Anatomy at the College*.⁴³ This may mean that the dissection scene featured in the title page engraving illustrates Crooke's actual lecture, as the criminal pictured here has a large mustache like the partially dissected head on the title page.

The printer's letter explains that the man pictured was "a cruell Wretch, who had murdered the Son of one Master *Scot* a Chyrurgian of goodnote in this City," the crime for which he had been executed. For the author of the letter (who refers to himself in the singular rather than the plural that would indicate he spoke for both brothers; Thomas seems the more likely candidate), the criminal's physical deformity was the physical manifestation of his moral corruption: "This Wre[tc]h was of a very truculent countenance and aspect, as the Almighty God would therein discover the cruelty of his heart." It is clear, however, from both the illustration and the written description that much of the man's supposed "deformity" was mere difference from the western European standard:

His haire was black & curled not very long, but thick & bushy, his forehead little above an inch high, his browes great and prominent, his eyes set deepe in their sockets, his nose crooked with a round knob or butten at the end which also somewhat turned upward: on his upper lip, he had some

43. RCP, *Annals Translation MS*, vol. III, 269.

quantity of blacke haire on his chin, very few stragling blacke, and stiffe:
and his neather lip was as big as three lips. (f^v)

Much of this description of the man's facial features and hair hints at hyperbole, full of subjective qualifiers. When the printer's attention turns to his subject's identifiable deformity, however, the rhetoric of his description become far more objective:

Such was his face, but the greatest deformity was in his feete. . . . For they were both cloven but not alike. One foote (I thinke it was the right) was equally devided betweixt foure and five inches deepe into two toes, joynted like other mens toes but as large each of them as half the foote could make it, with a naile proportionable: the left foote was devided likewise in the middle but the division was not above three inches deepe or scarce so much, the one halfe which was toward the body made one large toe with a naile proportionable like the inward halfe of the right foote, but the outward halfe was compounded of two toes, yet growing close and fast together. (f^v)

As the printer's prose grows more technical, so too does his intention. While this letter reveals its author's aims in a vastly different manner than Jaggard's letter, the message conveys a similar purpose, a wish to educate a broad public and provide personal moral edification.

The printer would not necessarily had to have been present at the dissection conducted by Crooke to see the remarkable body. He could have been at the man's trial or execution, for instance; he notes "there were a thousand witnesses of it." However, he aligns the work of producing the illustration of the man's body with that of the anatomist

when he writes, “This monstrous shape of a man I have thought good to cut,” his description of commissioning the woodcut punning handily with the action of dissection to which the criminal’s body was subjected. The parallel constructed by the pun aligns the process of creating the illustration with the anatomy theater’s “tripartite division of textual authority, living authority, and the passive authority of the body.”⁴⁴ There were three steps involved in making a woodcut: First a draftsman drew the illustration, then a different person traced the picture on the block, and finally a block cutter carved the image into wood.⁴⁵ When the printer puns that he has “cut” the image of the man who was also cut in the dissection process, he aligns the cut wood with the anatomized body, the tracing with the textual authority of the anatomy manual that guides the cutting, and the illustrator with the living authority of the anatomist. Thus both the language and the physical process involved in creating the anatomy manual—making it incarnate, embodying it—connect it to embodied human experience.

IV. Connections to Paré

At the end of his letter in the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*, Jaggard claims that “the Figures, Pieces, and Shapes belonging to the remaining Bookes of *Paræ* Chirurgery, are already prepared, & the worke it selfe fully translated for the presse.” Jaggard saw Crooke’s anatomy—or, at least, the anatomical writings of Bauhin and du Laurens, on which Crooke drew heavily—as “more mature discourse” than what Paré provided, and so Jaggard “made choise for this time to be governed by their worthy enstructions.” The printer’s use of the word “mature” in this context refers to the more

44. Sawday, 65.

45. Kusakawa, 45.

developed nature of Crooke's anatomy, in regard to extent and detail, rather than being a qualification of sensibility; Jaggard highly respects Paré's work but has chosen to foreground it with the greater scope of the multiple authors Crooke has compiled, apparently with the idea that Crooke's book would ultimately make Paré's work more useful to its intended readership. As the printer concludes, upon "thy gentle acceptance of this [anatomy,] my first adventure in this kinde, [the Paré book] will flye unto thee with the swifter speed." This is just one of several ways in which *Mikrokosmographia* is bibliographically intertwined with Paré.

Ambrose Paré (1510-1590) was the pre-eminent surgeon of sixteenth-century France, if not all of Europe. He rose from humble personal and professional origins to serve four kings and elevate the role of surgeon in his country to one of great respect. Decades of experience traveling with the French army and treating battlefield wounds gave him the opportunity make crucial improvements to the methods generally used for treating gunshot wounds, conducting amputations, and preventing infection. He was a prolific writer who authored a brief autobiography as well as many books and treatises.⁴⁶ Paré wrote in French, as he was poorly educated and had no Greek or Latin, something for which his more learned peers criticized him, but his works were translated into several languages, including Latin, German, Dutch, English, and Japanese.⁴⁷ Strangely, he does not appear to have been the subject of much recent scholarship, despite his

46. See Doe's comprehensive bibliography.

47. Geoffrey Keynes, "Introduction," *The Apologie and Treatise of Ambroise Paré containing the Voyages Made into Divers Places with Many of His Writings upon Surgery* (London: Falcon, 1951), i-xxii; Doe, 243-46.

documented impact on the history of Western medicine, the wealth of his writings, and the incredible stories that fill his considerable lifespan.

Jaggard clearly recognized the potential usefulness of Paré's surgical texts to the seventeenth-century medical practitioners of London; Willoughby confirms that the printer's hunch was correct, surmising that because Paré was "a man who loved to ease pain and who genuinely sympathized with the sufferer," the English translation of *Method of Curing Wounds Made by Gunshot*, translated by Walter Hammond and published by Isaac Jaggard in 1617, "had considerable influence among English surgeons."⁴⁸ However, *Method of Curing Wounds* does not appear to be the Paré text Jaggard promised was "already prepared . . . and fully translated for the press" in his letter that accompanied the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia*. Rather, Jaggard likely refers to the work that would ultimately become the 1634 edition of Paré's *Complete Workes* published by Thomas Cotes in 1634, the first time the French surgeon's collected works appeared in English. George Baker, a surgeon who served Queen Elizabeth and examined other surgeons for the Barber-Surgeons' Company, had begun a translation of Paré's works but died in 1612 before it was finished. Ultimately Baker's translation would be completed by Thomas Johnson, an apothecary who had also edited Gerard's *Herball*.⁴⁹ The work in progress, mentioned in Jaggard's letter in *Mikrokosmographia*, would have passed with the rest of Jaggard's titles to the Cotes brothers when they inherited his shop

48. Willoughby, 226.

49. John Gerard, *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes. Gathered by John Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie Very much Enlarged and Amended by Thomas Johnson Citizen and Apothecarye of London* (London: Islip, Norton & Whitakers, 1633).

in 1627, and who finally had it finished and published in 1634.⁵⁰ Unsurprisingly, since Paré's *Workes* was published after *Mikrokosmographia*, and perhaps even because some or all of the woodcuts used in Crooke's anatomy manual were originally commissioned to be used in the Paré translation, the woodcuts from throughout the second edition of *Mikrokosmographia* were used for the 1634 Paré edition—both the anatomical illustrations (also used in the first edition) and the woodcuts accompanying the newly added surgical instruments tract.⁵¹

V. Posthumous Publication

Beginning in 1635 Crooke seems to have lived or traveled outside of London for some time, although he was back living in the city by the time of his death in 1648. Richard Cotes printed a third edition of *Mikrokosmographia* in 1651, reusing the engraved title page of the second edition with some small alterations.⁵² This time the book's type was set in much smaller font, reducing the volume's length to fewer than 800 pages, although it was again printed as a folio in sixes. Cotes omitted the tract on surgical instruments but added a note at the end of the book saying, "Reader, you are desired to take notice, that the works of *Ambrose Parey* are lately printed with Additions."⁵³ This appears to be a reference to a second edition of Paré's *Workes* printed by Richard Cotes

50. Doe, 179-80.

51. Importantly, the use of the woodcuts in Paré's *Complete Workes* therefore represents another iteration of the censorship carried out in the alteration to the illustration of the partially dissected female torso discussed in chapter 4.

52. The alterations are so minor as to sometimes be confusing; I recently identified a third edition copy at the Royal Society of Medicine that had been erroneously cataloged as a second edition, apparently on the basis of the engraved title page.

53. Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*, 1651, 3T5^r.

in 1649 with three additional tracts added.⁵⁴ However, as O'Malley notes, "Caspar Bartholin's anatomical treatise based on his own researches has become available in England in 1633, and even earlier, as Crooke had indicated by his reference to William Harvey, a native English school of anatomy was evolving."⁵⁵ There is no evidence that this final edition of Crooke's anatomy manual found any success, and there are the fewest number of extant copies of the third out of all the editions. *Mikrokosmographia* was no longer the standard reference for anatomical knowledge in England.

Despite its widespread use as a primary source reference for scholars, no modern editions of any of Crooke's writing have been produced. In 1969 a facsimile version of the surgical instrument tract from the 1631 second edition was printed under Paré's name by Da Capo Press as number 141 in a series titled *The English Experience: Its Record in Early Printed Books Published in Facsimile*. The facsimile includes the tract's title page stating it was "Gathered out of *Ambrosius Pareus* ... by H.C." and reproduces the Errata page at its very end, which includes a list of corrections for the text of *Mikrokosmographia* as well as for the surgical tract, but the reproduction includes no supplementary introduction or other materials referencing Crooke. A note on the facsimile's title page says, "The publishers acknowledge their gratitude to the Curators of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for their permission to reproduce the Library's copy. (Shelfmark: H.1.10.Med)." The book is a tall folio, apparently in an effort to reproduce the pages to original scale, though much of the margins are lost. The same facsimile

54. Doe, 182.

55. O'Malley, 18.

appears to have been printed again, this time as a small octavo, by West Port Books,
Edinburgh, in 1982.

Chapter 4: The Censored Body

OPHELIA: I think nothing my lord.

HAMLET: That's a fair thought to lie between maid's legs.

– William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

I. Noticing Nothing

Regardless of varying viewpoints on the intellectual value of Crooke's anatomy manual or the quality of its author's character, the book undeniably represents a significant cultural locus. One point of resonance lies in the way *Mikrokosmographia* figures the female body, which shifts between different printings of the book due to direct interference from professional and civic authorities. As a result of that interference, the female body in Crooke's book gets censored in such a way as to visually exemplify a familiar semantic trope.¹ Scholars regularly point to early modern authors'—especially Shakespeare's—use of the word “nothing” as a bawdy and bodily pun.² While previous readings of the “nothing” pun have focused mainly on its symbolic and linguistic aspects, I show here that it is also connected to an important visual tradition of female anatomical illustration and to attempts at controlling those illustrations that refigured the female

1. Yuri Lotman writes, “A pair of mutually non-juxtaposable signifying elements, between which, thanks to the context they share, a relationship of adequacy is established, form a semantic trope. Tropes are not, therefore, external ornaments, something applied to a thought from the outside—they constitute the essence of creative thinking, and their function extends beyond art”; *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (London: Tauris, 1990), 37.

2. On the more figurative senses of this punning, see Stephen Booth's analytic commentary in *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Ronald Levao, “‘Where Black is the Color, Where None is the Number’: Something from Nothing in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*,” *Literary Imagination* 12.3 (2010); and Gordon Williams, *Shakespeare, Sex and the Print Revolution* (London: Athlone, 2000). Regarding physical manifestations of the pun on stage, see Dympna Callaghan, *Shakespeare Without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage* (London: Routledge, 2000) and Phyllis Gorfain, “When Nothing Really Matters: Body Puns in *Hamlet*,” in *Bodylore*, ed. Katharine Young (Knoxville, TN: U of Tennessee P).

thing (i.e., genitals) into nothing at all. In *Mikrokosmographia*, one of the woodcuts illustrating the female anatomy was altered within a year of printing the first edition, an instance of censorship that has not yet been critically examined.³ Subsequent editions of *Mikrokosmographia* and its companion epitome volume represent missing female genitalia in a way that conflates the literal with the actual. In the woodcut, the vulva has been excised so that the female “no-thing” actually becomes nothing, a mere blank space. The censorship of this seventeenth-century anatomy manual reifies Shakespeare’s linguistic elision of female genitalia, and marks made in several extant copies offer evidence of readers’ response to textual attempts to control the female body, demonstrating willful individual resistance to a persistent cultural meme. The story of the illustration, the controversy surrounding it, and its ultimate alteration shows that interpreting the nothing pun as mere symbolic erasure, literary discourse, or metaphor is highly perilous, as such a reductive reading neglects the obliteration of actual female bodies.

The early modern idea of female genitalia as no-thing makes for ready word play. In perhaps Shakespeare’s clearest use of it, Ophelia says, “I think nothing my lord,” and Hamlet responds, “That’s a fair thought to lie between maids’ legs.”⁴ The pun features in the title of *Much Ado About Nothing* and appears in the sonnets, where Nature creates a man by adding “one thing to my purpose nothing” and where “nothing hold me, so it

3. The first edition of *Mikrokosmographia* was published in 1615 with a second edition printed in 1631 and a third in 1651. Additional copies of the 1615 first edition were issued with the date changed on the title page in 1616 and 1618. It must be noted that those copies do not represent separate editions, as has sometimes been erroneously recorded; see for instance Russell, xxii.

4. *Hamlet*, ed. Philip Edwards (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 3.2.104-05.

please thee hold / That nothing me, a something sweet to thee.”⁵ However, current scholarship has almost exclusively focused on discursive representation while neglecting important printed works that visually represent the female body and actualize the pun’s verbal erasure. Dympna Callaghan, for example, argues that “representation” itself in early modern culture is “dependent upon a construction of the female absence” but never addresses actual representations of female genitalia.⁶ Ronald Levao identifies the parentheses marking out two empty lines at the end of Shakespeare’s *Sonnet 126* as a print representation of nothing but reads their space as “the erasure of the young man as well as of the mind and pen that would memorialize him,” identifying no association with the female body.⁷ Phyllis Gorfain observes that “real bodies are at stake” in puns about nothing but then moves away from those bodies as she argues that “the issue is their status as the symbolic texts on which culture can be inscribed.”⁸ While human bodies did function as symbolic texts in early modern culture, they also constituted the bodies of actual texts in anatomy manuals, which established codified depictions of physical human form both in parts and as a whole.

II. Printing Nothing

Mikrokosmographia was printed by William Jaggard, one of the most important publishers of Shakespeare’s works.⁹ Throughout his career, Jaggard “printed or published

5. *Shakespeare’s Sonnets*, 20 (*Sonnet 20*, l. 12), 116 (*Sonnet 136*, ll. 11-12)

6. Callaghan, 11.

7. Levao, 282.

8. Gorfain, 61.

9. Jaggard had previously printed and published a collection of poems titled *The Passionate Pilgrime* (1599) that were attributed to “*W. Shakespeare*” on the volume’s title page, although only a few of the poems were actually by Shakespeare. Jaggard would also go on to print quarto versions of a number of Shakespeare’s plays in 1619 as

(and at times even commissioned) a remarkable number of large, typographically complicated books, many of which required custom-made woodcuts and engravings.”¹⁰ One of those large illustrated books was, of course, Crooke’s *Mikrokosmographia*. The production of *Mikrokosmographia* represented a large amount of work on Crooke’s part and substantial risk and investment for Jaggard. One significant portion of Jaggard’s cost would have been the anatomy manual’s numerous woodcut illustrations. Nearly all of the illustrations appearing in *Mikrokosmographia* were copied from engravings in Bauhin’s *Theatrum Anatomicum*. Caspar Bauhin (1560-1624), now better remembered as a botanist, was Swiss and published his anatomy book in Frankfurt, Germany. The copperplate engravings that illustrate *Theatrum Anatomicum* were themselves imitations of Vesalius’s illustrations; in turn, even Vesalius’s highly distinctive work drew from previous anatomy images such as those of Valverde. Artistic borrowing was the usual method for sourcing medical illustrations in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe.¹¹ One of the reasons for Vesalius’s broad influence was the extent to which his illustrations were copied and reused. They initially made their way into England via the four vernacular anatomies that preceded Crooke’s: those of Thomas Geminus (1553), Thomas Vicary (1548), John Halle (1565), and John Banister (1578). While Geminus was an engraver whose book merely translated and copied parts of Vesalius, the latter three authors were all surgeons who, similar to the physician Crooke, drew on sources

well as play a significant role in the publication of the First Folio (1623). See Hooks, 109-32.

10. Ibid., 125.

11. On the copying of images in early modern scientific texts, see Kusukawa, 64-65.

such as Vesalius but also added their own interpretations and opinions.¹² The last of these anatomy authors, Banister (c.1532-1599) was a highly respected surgeon who lectured at the Barber-Surgeons' Hall and traveled on expeditions to China and the United Provinces. However, in the preface to his anatomy he explicitly states, "From the female, and that (as I suppose) for sundry good considerations, I have wholly abstained my penne; least, shunning Charibdis, I should fall into Scylla headlong."¹³ Although all of these early English anatomies avoid the female reproductive system, Banister outright refuses to include female bodies in his text. He figures the female body as nothing by conscious choice in refusing to write it into existence.

Banister's book was not only self-admittedly incomplete but also by the 1610s swiftly growing out of date. In the decades since its first printing, continental physicians had been "dissecting, discovering, and writing ever fuller and more advanced treatises" on human anatomy.¹⁴ Although Crooke earned his MD at Cambridge he also spent a winter studying anatomy with Pieter Pauw at the University of Leiden. Leiden was equipped with its own anatomy theater, one of the first in Europe, where Pauw conducted multiple human dissections each year during the cooler months when the bodies of his subjects lasted longer.¹⁵ Under Pauw's guidance, Crooke wrote and defended thirteen

12. See O'Malley, 1; Russell, xvii-xxi. There are entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* for Geminus, Vicary, and Banister, and an interesting side-by-side comparison of excerpts from Vicary's and Halle's texts (as well as a partial bibliography of Halle's books and some account of his life) in E. Barclay-Smith, "Archæologia Anatomica. John Halle: A Sixteenth-Century Anatomist," *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* 34.2 (1900): 275-82.

13. John Banister, *The Historie of Man* (London: John Daye, 1578), B1^v.

14. O'Malley, 1.

15. Prögler, 111.

anatomical theses before returning to England to complete his studies.¹⁶ The training Crooke gained in Leiden uniquely qualified him for the work of writing an anatomy manual in which he translated the best continental anatomy knowledge and shaped it for an English audience. However, some of the shapes his knowledge took caused offense. In *Mikrokosmographia*, books 4 and 5 are titled, “Of the natural parts belonging to generation” and “Of the history of the infant,” respectively. These two sections provide detailed examination and analysis of both the male and female reproductive systems and an extensive explanation of human reproduction, covering everything from conception to birth in the vernacular and, in the case of book 4, accompanied by detailed illustrations.¹⁷ Of the woodcuts appearing in book 4, the first four are male, and the final one depicts dog and cow uteri. The other ten illustrations in book 4 all depict various reproductive organs of the female body; three woodcuts are repeated once each. Of the seven unique images, two are of nude female torsos; four display parts of the womb, two of which include fetuses; and one depicts a full, albeit partially dissected, nude female body.

The woodcut that garnered special attention features an anatomized female torso. Lacking a head, arms, and legs, only a neck and the severed stumps of limbs appear as appendages frozen in a disconcertingly animated pose. Despite being headless, the illustration includes the end of a ponytail hanging over one shoulder, the only area of the

16. It made good sense for Crooke not take a degree from the University of Leiden, which would have been costly. Instead, by taking his MD at Cambridge, he was easily able to obtain license from the College of Physicians to practice in London upon his arrival there.

17. There are no illustrations whatsoever in book 5 of *Mikrokosmographia*.

torso that has not been dissected.¹⁸ One breast is bare, the other flayed to show the subcutaneous layers.¹⁹ The stomach and abdomen are fully eviscerated; the accompanying text explains this “Sheweth the lower Belly the Guts being taken away... that the vessels serving for generation may the better be discerned.”²⁰ Between the severed thighs the pubic area is visible (hairless, possibly in keeping with the classical tradition for female nudes), and here the discrepancy between editions arises. In the first edition, this area of the woodcut illustrates the vulva in full anatomical detail. However, in the second and third editions, the anatomical detail has been removed. In place of the female genitals is a blank space: nothing.

III. Censoring Nothing

Portions of *Mikrokosmographia*, including books 4 and 5 and their depictions of the female body, were in circulation as early as November 1614 when the anatomy came to the attention of John King, the Bishop of London. As bishop, King regularly examined books seeking license for publication if the proposed volume discussed anything concerning Church or State; even a subject such as medicine was under his control.²¹ Crooke’s anatomy book caught King’s attention, likely when Jaggard applied for license

18. Will Fisher has pointed out that hair is a crucially gendered feature in this text as a whole; Fisher, *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 129-32.

19. Although breasts are mentioned in the chapters on reproduction, interestingly they receive fullest attention in Crooke’s third book, the section devoted to “Nutrition and nourishment”; this implies the breasts matter primarily as they exist to feed to the (by default, male) infant and less as they equip the woman to successfully reproduce. In modern anatomies, the breasts (i.e., the mammary glands) are listed under the section on the female organs of generation.

20. Crooke, 1615, V2^f; the word “vessels” here refers not to blood vessels but to the parts of a woman that serve as a vessel to the fetus.

21. Clegg, 63-64; Willoughby, 20.

to print, and the bishop sent a copy to the College of Physicians for their input.²² The College was also disturbed by the proposed book, and the two authorities together descended on Crooke and Jaggard in outrage. The cause of complaint was twofold, although the righteous indignation of both parties was united in one cause at the front. Ostensibly, the book was indecent. For the Church, illustrating the female reproductive organs and describing the process of reproduction in the vernacular constituted sacrilege, and Crooke's anatomy manual was an obscene book. The College of Physicians supported the Church's viewpoint, and further objected to having its specialized professional knowledge widely circulated among the general public.

In the early seventeenth century, the physicians' relationship with other medical practitioners and even their patients was highly contentious because of the level of control the College tried to exert over all kinds of healing and caregiving. The College of Physicians worked actively to regulate all medical practice within London and its environs, in part through privileging their specialized education. The idea that Crooke would make the learned knowledge of the physicians available not only to other types of practitioners but also to the public at large posed a tangible threat to the College, both as a transgression of their rules and as a very public demonstration that threatened their tenuous hold on control of the marketplace.²³ Ostensibly, the College's control was intended at least in part to protect the public. Early modern London abounded with medical practitioners of all types. One historian has vividly described the environment as "a wilderness of mirrors" for the ways in which the identities of and services offered by

22. RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 19^f.

23. The College's desire to control its knowledge was both professional and ideological; see Sawday, 125-26.

various practitioners echoed and mimicked one another in a confusing array.²⁴ An ailing person could choose to seek the help of a physician; a barber-surgeon; an apothecary; the servant of a physician, surgeon, or apothecary; a midwife; an astrologer, magician, wizard, witch, or sorcerer; a medical student; or even a mountebank.²⁵ Although some distinct professional groups had their own governing bodies, such as the Worshipful Company of Barber-Surgeons and the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries, the College of Physicians, by mandate of the crown, aspired to authority over them all.²⁶ Any individual practitioner, from a rightful member of the College to an itinerant quacksalver, could be called before the College for remonstrance if he or she ran afoul of the rules. This happened frequently, for a wide variety of reasons, but a common violation was practitioners crossing the boundaries of their proscribed professions: a surgeon writing a prescription, a midwife setting a bone. With the impending publication of Croke's anatomy manual, the physicians were threatened by the idea that their brand of medical care could be employed by the rival practitioners they actively sought to oppress.

While the College of Physicians absolutely protected a highly susceptible portion of the population that fell prey to "barbarous" practitioners at the cost of substantial sums of money or even their lives, its overzealous methods of control also undoubtedly frustrated many sincere and earnest efforts at health care. In the case of Croke's anatomy manual, the College's responsibility for supervision devolved into an attempt to

24. Pelling, 136, 138-39.

25. *Ibid.*, 156-57.

26. *Ibid.*, 1: "...the College had from the outset the task and intention of controlling all practitioners of physic in the capital, as well as the supervision of what it regarded as the subordinate institutions [ie, those of the Barber-Surgeons and Apothecaries] regulating the medical art."

suppress the circulation of valuable, practical knowledge. For its part, the Church showed an unfortunate willingness to value concerns about lasciviousness over the potential good of providing medical practitioners with more accurate knowledge of the anatomy of half the population. The Annals of the College of Physicians record the censorship efforts the two institutions directed at *Mikrokosmographia*. The first entry to mention the matter, dated November 11, 1614, records the initial conversation held by the College:

There was some discussion regarding the partly released English anatomy of Dr. Crooke and whether it was fitting that it should be published. Not a few considered that nothing of this kind should be published in England; some thought that some subjects and more indecent [“obscaeniores,” root word *obscaenus*] illustrations should be removed, and other points ought to be corrected, while many considered that book 4 with the pictures of the generative organs [“partibus generationis”] should be destroyed [“delendum,” root word *deleo*] and that he [Crooke] should be enjoined to confess that it was a translation that is of many subjects from Laurentius and of summaries and illustrations of Bauhin. Finally it was decided that the President, Sir William Paddy and Dr. Lister should wait upon the Bishop of London (who had sent us a copy) to agree that he should not publish the book which ought to be suppressed and that under his authority something should be paid to the printer towards the cost: but however if he

did not do that, then they should insist on the need at the very least to delete book 4 first.²⁷

Although some of the College's members expressed more petty complaints about the originality and presentation of the book's content, the verbs used in the Latin of the original record highlight the real problem in regard to these men's opinion of the female body as represented in *Mikrokosmographia*. The book 4 illustrations they find objectionable—those showing *partibus generationis*, the parts of generation—are classified as *obscaenus*, “dirty, filthy; indecent, obscene,” and the action called for by the College is *deleo*, “to destroy, annihilate, overthrow, extinguish, raze; to blot out, erase, obliterate.”²⁸ Through such rhetoric the College explicitly figures the female body as an obscene subject demanding utter obliteration. By classifying and describing the anatomy manual's illustrations of the female reproductive system in such strongly negative language, the College finds its own justification for their determined outcome, the suppression of Crooke's book. They seemed to think that if the printer, Jaggard, were just offered some money toward the work he had already completed, he would be happy to terminate the project in the interest of staying in the College's and Bishop King's good graces. However, neither Jaggard nor Crooke took the bait, refusing to halt the project or alter its content.

The College then called Crooke to appear before them. When he finally showed, on December 22, 1614, he was questioned by the College President regarding why he had

27 RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 65; for the original Latin, see RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 19^v.

28. John C. Traupman, *The New College Latin & English Dictionary* (New York: Bantam, 1966), 200, 76.

taken so long to appear and reminded that he still owed the fee for his election to candidacy in May of 1613.²⁹ The matter of the anatomy manual is not mentioned in this entry of the Annals, but that does not necessarily mean it was not discussed; another record, the Book of Examinations, held more detailed transcripts of such meetings but unfortunately has been lost to history. Regardless of whether the matter was raised at the December meeting or at some other time, Crooke must have continued his refusal to alter *Mikrokosmographia*, as Jaggard was next asked to appear for further remonstrance. Although the request of an appearance was honored, the printer himself did not go before the College; instead he sent his wife, Jane. In addition to Jaggard having physically gone blind by this time, it was common custom in early modern England for a wife (rather than, for instance, a son) to appeal on behalf of her husband's interest in various instances of accused professional misconduct, including in the publishing industry.³⁰ However, the presence of Jaggard's wife rather than the printer himself does seem to indicate a conscious effort at avoidance, and accordingly, the College made no progress with their case, even though the president asserted "the volume was completely condemned" and threatened that if the demanded changes were not made he would burn all copies of *Mikrokosmographia* "wherever he might find it."³¹ Had these threats been carried out, Jaggard would have faced a sizeable financial and professional blow, and Crooke would have lost years of work.

29. RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 19^v.

30. Pelling explains, "Culturally, it might have been thought that the most effective complainant on behalf of a husband was his wife..." and "this could involve a substantial degree of responsibility and expertise, as well as histrionic skills"; 124, 124n.

31. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 65.

The College's final effort at forcing Crooke and Jaggard to alter the anatomy volume was an attempt to have someone else make the desired revisions. Apparently the leaders of the College thought that if the desired changes were offered complete, Crooke and Jaggard might acquiesce. The College arrived at a unilateral decision to delegate two of its fellows, Drs. Giffard and Clement, to emendate books 4 and 5, the portions of *Mikrokosmographia* featuring the female body. Whether the changes were not completed before the full print run commenced or Crooke and Jaggard outright rejected them, the College was once again unsuccessful. The final entry in the Annals mentioning the anatomy book records the College's plan for the emendations.³² A separate sentence at the end of the entry states, "The whole book was published." Although the entry is dated April 3, 1615, the final sentence appears to have been written in at a later time, presumably after the May 1615 publication date given in the preface to *Mikrokosmographia*.³³ With that note the formal record of censorship falls silent. Despite the fact that Crooke and Jaggard blatantly defied the president of the College of Physicians and the Bishop of London, there are no recorded instances of any actual consequences being carried out against the author, the printer, or the book itself. Books 4 and 5 were printed in their proper place along with the rest of the volume, and no record exists of any copies of *Mikrokosmographia* being burned, despite the College's threats. The title page even brazenly displays one of the explicitly prohibited images, the one woodcut in book 4 that illustrates a full-length female figure. She is nude and pregnant, with her belly partially dissected to reveal her gravid uterus. She gazes directly, almost

32. RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 21^r.

33. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 71. The Latin reads "Totus est editus" in RCP, Annals MS, vol. III, fol. 21^r.

defiantly, at the viewer, one hand demurely covering her groin and the other held to her breast.³⁴

An additional detail on the title page may point to one possible reason for Crooke's audacious defiance of the College's commands. Two versions of the 1615 *Mikrokosmographia* title page exist. Although the objectionable female figure appears the same in both, Crooke as author is described differently. One version merely states, "By Helkiah Crooke Doctor in Physicke"; according to bibliographer K. F. Russell, this is the original version. The altered version of the title page adds to that, "Physitian to his Majestie, and his Highnesse Professor in Anatomy and Chirurgerie. Published by the Kings Majesties especiall Direction and Warrant according to the first integrity, as it was originally written by the Author."³⁵ As Russell notes, given the circumstances of the College's threats, it makes sense that the more detailed claim would be the revised version. The final line stating that the book has been published as originally intended seems to directly address the instance of the College's objections. The other portion of the added lines, however, likely bears more significance than it has yet been ascribed. Although several scholars, most notably O'Malley, have accurately pointed out that Crooke was certainly not the king's personal physician, there were several kinds of royal appointments for physicians: first physician, physicians-in-ordinary, and royal physicians extraordinary. Whereas the first two categories were salaried positions with a set number of appointees, the latter was not and could be claimed by almost any other doctor without

34. Tamara Harvey closely reads this image in *Figuring Modesty in Feminist Discourse Across the Americas, 1633-1700* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 9-11.

35. There are two additional variants of the first edition title page; they both include the "Physitian to his Majestie" claim but have the date changed to 1616 and 1618, respectively.

a standing appointment who had consulted on a case or treatment for any member of the royal household.³⁶ It was likely in this sense that Crooke used the term “royal physician.” However, the addition of such further details to the variant title page may also indicate that Crooke had somehow secured explicit royal favor in regard to the publication of his anatomy manual in its original state, although unfortunately no record of such intervention exists. Still, it would explain the confidence Crooke had in defying the College’s orders and the lack of consequences or explanation in the *Annals of the College*, who likely would not be too keen to record any such interference from the Crown.³⁷

Crooke found an opportunity to have the last word on the matter by addressing various complaints regarding *Mikrokosmographia* within the content of the first edition. Crooke demonstrates full awareness of the problems of reception regarding the portions of his anatomy manual that depict the female body in detail. His epistle dedicating the anatomy manual to the barber-surgeons and his preface to book 4 were likely written after the threats of censorship issued by the College of Physicians with Bishop King’s support, as both passages explicitly address the reader’s approach to the female body in his text and appear to retort to the objections raised by those authorities. Responding to his critics in his dedication to the Barber-Surgeons, Crooke writes that “whilst they

36. Harold J. Cook, *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986), 281.

37. Of the ten 1615 title pages I have personally examined (approximately half of the extant copies), only two have the variant (or cancel) title page that includes the greater detail; notably, however, the Huntington Library copy represented in the database *Early English Books Online* is one of those, and so it is this version scholars more frequently cite. One explanation for fewer extant copies of the variant version may be that Crooke’s support from the king came fairly late in the printing process.

commend the beautie of the wall they undermine and demolish the foundation” (¶2^v). At the most fundamental level, the genitals were considered the core identifier of whether an early modern body was male or female. By removing the vulva from the woodcut illustration, the pictured body become less female and therefore in no need of further censoring. But by removing the part that makes the body female, the censors undermine the illustration’s purpose in the anatomy text.

Crooke also addresses the explicit accusation that his illustrations were as “obscene as *Aretines*,” a reference to sixteenth-century Italian pornographer Pietro Aretino, whose sonnet series *I Modi* (1524) was accompanied by engravings illustrating various sexual positions; copies were available in England by 1584.³⁸ In late sixteenth-century English culture Aretino came to represent a close relationship between learning and libertine texts, particularly in the shape of printed books that by their very form “invoked the intimate crevices of the body.”³⁹ The works of authors such as Aretino were often initially defined as educational resources but devolved into objects of satire and mockery.⁴⁰ Therefore those critical of Crooke’s illustrations may have been as concerned about *Mikrokosmographia* making the art of anatomy something to snigger at as any potential sexual employment of the images. In any case, Crooke’s preface dismisses the obscenity claim as a “shamelesse accusation” on the basis that many other continental anatomists include highly similar images (¶2^v). He is, of course, correct about that. There is nothing more pornographic about Crooke’s illustrations than those of his contemporary

38. James Grantham Turner, *Schooling Sex: Libertine Literature and Erotic Education in Italy, France, and England 1534-1685* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 25.

39. *Ibid.*

40. *Ibid.*, 33-34.

continental anatomy authors.⁴¹ The difference is in the accompanying text.

Mikrokosmographia is written in the English vernacular, whereas the foreign anatomies he references are in Latin and other learned languages the average English citizen would not be able to read.⁴² As he attests in his preface, Crooke's central purpose in writing his anatomy manual is to bring that continental knowledge to a wider English audience, "my purpose being to better them who do no so wel understand that language" (i.e., Latin; ¶2^v). The censorship issue really does then become a matter of socioeconomic prejudice rather than mere prudishness and a strong reinforcement of the idea that Church and State (the Bishop of London and the College of Physicians) wanted, in the perception of the general English public, female genitalia to actually be the "nothing" figured by Shakespeare's bawdy pun.

Mikrokosmographia was not the first English printed book to include pictures of female genitals. The Vesalian woodcut illustrating the anatomized female torso that became, via Bauhin, the model for Crooke's censored woodcut was also copied for an earlier English book. *The Birth of Mankind* (1545), a translation of an early sixteenth-century German midwifery manual edited by the physician Thomas Raynalde (fl.1545-1551) remained in constant publication through 1654.⁴³ While Elaine Hobby suggests the

41. There are continental examples that are decidedly more pornographic than Crooke; see, for instance, J. G. Turner, 20-22, on Charles Estienne's *La Dissection des Parties du Corps Humain* (1546).

42. See also Sawday, 225-26, who asserts "there was an *ideological* stake in controlling the ever more detailed dissemination of public information on the operation of the reproductive body."

43. Although the English translation of *The Birth of Mankind* was first published in England in 1540, the illustrations did not appear until the 1545 edition, when engraved loose leaves were pasted in; woodcuts were finally made and set for printing alongside the text of the 1560 and subsequent editions. See Elaine Hobby's introduction to Thomas

book was directed at “a general reader” seeking basic information on “sexuality, reproduction, and the welfare of babies,” the book is “otherwise named, the woman’s book” on its title page, and its prologue explicitly addresses “women readers,” indicating an expressly female target audience.^{44,45} *Mikrokosmographia* on the other hand, while not excluding female readers, targets an overtly male audience with its dedication to the Company of Barber-Surgeons. The fact that a similar image to the one used by Crooke had already circulated some fifty years before the printing of *Mikrokosmographia* indicates that the intended audience of a volume made a great deal of difference regarding whether its content was deemed acceptable by the presiding authorities. The female body was acceptable for an expressly female audience, but in the presence of a male reader, whether out of squeamishness or prudishness, the female body had to be disfigured into nothing.

Crooke further defends his candor regarding the female body in his preface to book 4, the section containing the protested illustrations. He explains he has written about diseases that affect both the male and female reproductive systems “as thy bee most fearefull and fullest of anxiety especially in the Female sexe, so are they hardest to be cured: the reason I conceive to be, because the parts are least knowne as being veiled by Nature, and through our unseasonable modesty not sufficiently uncovered” (S3^r). A plain lack of knowledge has prevented English medical practitioners from being able to successfully treat venereal diseases, and Crooke offers a simple and obvious way to

Raynalde, *The Birth of Mankind: Otherwise Named, The Woman’s Book*. Ed. Hobby. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), xvii, xix-xx.

44. *Ibid.*, xv.

45. Raynalde, 1, 11.

remedy that negligence. His approach stands in stark contrast to his predecessor Banister, who, while ostensibly determined “to set wyde open the closet doore of natures secrets” flatly refused to discuss the female body.⁴⁶ Crooke states unequivocally that the male anatomy observer is himself at fault for allowing his “unseasonable modesty” to prevent him from learning about the female body. The only “obstacle” to improving female medical treatment was a cultural hesitance “to reveyle the veyle of *Nature*” out of fear the anatomist might “ensnare mens mindes by sensuall demonstrations” (S3^r). Crooke directly confronts the supposed moral and religious motivation behind the resistance to acknowledging and endeavoring to understand the female body:

But what is this I pray you else but to araigne vertue at the barre of vice? Hath the holy Scriptu[r]e it selfe (the wisdom of God) as well as in the old Law particularly, as also in many passages of the new, balked at this argument? God that Created them [i.e., women], did he not intend their preservation, or can they bee preserved and not knowne? Indeede it were to be wished that all men would come to the knowledge of these secrets with pure eyes and eares, such as they were matched with in their Creation: but shall we therefore forfet our knowledge because some men cannot conteine their lewd and inordinate affections? (S3^r)

Crooke decidedly puts the onus on the reader to maintain an appropriate mindset in approaching the female body depicted in his anatomy text. In arguing that because God created women he must have intended for them to “bee preserved” and that preservation

46. Banister, B1^v.

is dependent on knowing about their bodies in order to keep them healthy, Crooke crafts a moral defense for book 4 that places responsibility in the eye of the beholder.

IV. Erasing Nothing

The motivation for making the change to the one illustration after the first printing of *Mikrokosmographia* may lie in the other book for which the woodcuts were used, the epitome volume *Somatographia Anthropine*. The creation of such devices was costly and the printer, who bore that cost, would have looked for another way in which to employ them.⁴⁷ However, the initial reuse of the *Mikrokosmographia* woodcuts was not one of service to a separate project, reusing the same woodcuts merely because it was convenient; rather, Jaggard created a separate project for the purpose of re-employing those particular woodcuts. In Jaggard's epitome, published just one year after the original anatomy manual, all the reused illustrations are identical to those of *Mikrokosmographia* except for the woodcut of the female torso, from which the genitals have been removed.

Jaggard may have decided to alter the woodcut out of a desire to make the smaller volume as salable as possible, since the 1616 printing of *Somatographia Anthropine* is the first instance in which the change appears.⁴⁸ Given the authorities' focus on reception and intended audience, it would be one thing to print an expensive volume that could only be purchased by someone of means and another to print an affordable book seeking a wide and general public. Perhaps after the scandal caused by the printing of *Mikrokosmographia*, Jaggard wished to remove the controversy accompanying the

47. Kusakawa, 50; Willoughby, 114.

48. All copies of the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia* retain the original detail, including the copies issued in 1616 and 1618 with variant title pages. The second and third editions, printed in 1631 and 1651, respectively, include the altered version of the woodcut, since they were printed after the first print run of the epitome.

illustrations whose reuse he hoped to profit by, and he found a direct and deliberate way of doing so. The printer would not have made the alteration himself—as mentioned, he had gone blind in 1612, so he was not physically capable—but he could easily have asked someone in his shop to make the excision. While carving a fresh woodcut takes a certain skill level, cutting out one portion of an existing woodcut would not necessarily require advanced ability, even with leaving the indexical letters (those “y”s) behind.⁴⁹ The choice to make the alteration because of a different, broader audience does not mean Jaggard was socioeconomically prejudiced, only that those pressuring him to make the change were. Jaggard’s desire or need for a profit apparently won out over an opportunity to educate the book’s readers, an opportunity that was already under threat of obliteration.⁵⁰

After the death of William Jaggard’s son Isaac in 1627, publishing rights for Crooke’s anatomy book (and the rest of the Jaggard printing house business) passed to Thomas and Richard Cotes, who printed a second edition of *Mikrokosmographia* in 1631 and a third in 1651, after Crooke had died. There has been no significant work done to collate the three editions and assess the alterations, but several differences are obvious. For example, the second edition (1631) has two new title pages and has been “corrected and enlarged,” most notably by the addition of a tract by Ambroise Paré, and the third edition (1651), while still in folio, has been set with smaller type, condensing the text onto significantly fewer sheets than the previous two editions. The same illustrations,

49. On the technique and craft of creating woodcuts, see Kusukawa, 41-47.

50. It is also possible that Jaggard would have been glad to make the alteration for all uses of the woodcut but the illustrations for book 4 of the first edition of *Mikrokosmographia* had already been printed when the objections arose.

apparently made from the same woodcuts, appear in all three editions of the book.⁵¹ But because the woodcut was altered for *Somatographia Anthropine* in 1616, all subsequent editions of *Mikrokosmographia* feature the censored version of the illustration, giving the image lasting cultural presence.

In condemning *Mikrokosmographia*, the book's censors said far more about their own moral frailty than that of the individuals responsible for originally producing the anatomy. Just as Crooke stood by his decision to write about and illustrate the female body, there is evidence his printer Jaggard also believed in the value of the work and its potential to improve the health of the general population through increased anatomical knowledge, even with his later partial capitulation. In his letter from "The Printer to the Reader," Jaggard explicitly states that, while the size of *Mikrokomosgraphia* had become something of a liability, he persevered with the project for nothing less than "the publique benefit of [his] country." Like Crooke, Jaggard deemed the book worth his trouble because of its profound potential to advance the education of English medical practitioners, particularly in regard to the female body, one of the most significant features of the anatomy manual. Increased knowledge of roughly half the population undoubtedly would improve the state of public health in England. Even if Jaggard made the decision to alter the female torso woodcut for the publication of *Somatographia Anthropine*, his act of compromise may have allowed the book to reach a far wider audience than if he had left the image intact and the book had been condemned. After all, the reader of the epitome only had to look at the larger anatomy to which it was cross-

51. Thanks to Greg Prickman for assistance in comparing woodcut images among editions.

indexed to find the intact image. In fact, the only other printing of *Somatographia Anthropine*, the 1634 edition, also directs the reader back to the original woodcut; although *Mikrokosmographia* was published in a second edition with different page numbers and the censored woodcut in 1631, the 1634 epitome retains page references to the uncensored first edition.

Both Jaggard and Crooke insisted the female body was something substantially more than nothing. Crooke's determination to include detailed description of female anatomy was capable of effecting significant cultural change. In addition to the illustrations, the physician made specific rhetorical choices that further contributed to recognizing the female body as a subject worth studying. One reason he gives for ignoring the protests about the female body in his text is so "those who are sober minded might knowe themselves, that is, their owne bodies" (S3^r), indicating some intended female readership. Although concrete evidence of individual readers is notoriously difficult to trace, there do exist multiple copies of both *Mikrokosmographia* and *Somatographia Anthropine* that contain female owners' marks. An early female owner named Anne Hodgson wrote her name on the title page of the 1634 epitome at the University of Iowa John Martin Rare Book Room. Another 1634 copy of *Somatographia Anthropine*, this one at the Royal College of Physicians in London, records the name Elizabeth Proctor in an early hand. A 1631 *Mikrokosmographia* at the Canterbury Cathedral Library includes record of its purchase by Henry Oxinden in 1636 as well as his gift of the volume to his wife Katherine after their marriage in 1642. And at the

University of Glasgow another 1631 *Mikrokosmographia* had the name Agnes Stewart inscribed on its contents page sometime prior to 1691.⁵²

There is also evidence of female readers in subsequent print books that obviously engage with Crooke's text. Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672) owned a copy of *Mikrokosmographia* and references Crooke directly in her poem "Of the Four Humours of mans Constitution." Noting this, Tamara Harvey has observed that Crooke informed Bradstreet's understanding of "women's bodily processes and organs...as complete and effective in themselves rather than as deprived forms of male perfection," a measure of self-identity that would have been deeply undermined by the censorship of the woodcut in later editions.⁵³ In London in 1671, a midwife named Jane Sharp published a volume titled *The Midwives Book* in which she compiled anatomy knowledge out of "Translations for all Books, either French, Dutch, or Italian...which I offer with my own experience" because anatomy "is the Principal part effectually necessary for a Midwife."⁵⁴ Although she does not name Crooke's anatomy manual, it is clear from the wording of several of her descriptions that he served as one of her primary sources. For instance, in writing about female genitalia she uses words identical to Crooke's.⁵⁵ Moreover, Sharp employs the word "clitoris," which Crooke introduced into the English vernacular as an anatomical term, literally figuring female genitalia as something

52. Information on the Canterbury Cathedral Library and University of Glasgow books provided by Harry Newman via personal correspondence.

53. T. Harvey, 3.

54. Jane Sharp, *The Midwives Book* (London: Simon Miller, 1671), A3^{r-v}.

55. See, for instance, Sharp, D7^v, "two skinny Caruncles," and Crooke, V2^r, "Certaine skinnie Caruncles." For more on Sharp's influences, see Elaine Hobby's introduction to Jane Sharp, *The Midwives Book*, ed. Hobby (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), xxvi, and Sawday, 214-16; both agree with my reading of Crooke's influence.

substantial and specific enough to be named.⁵⁶ Whether Crooke's influence on Sharp's writing was direct or came through other sources, clearly his rhetoric affected her and others' knowledge and description of the female body.

The attempted censorship of *Mikrokosmographia* may seem like a relatively minor episode in the history of gender relations, but the fact that the book was officially threatened at all makes it significant. According to Clegg, "Employing the most conservative estimate of the number of books issued from England's presses between 1603 and 1625, fewer than 1 percent were in any way involved with efforts to suppress them or punish their authors or printers," making any record of even attempted censorship remarkable.⁵⁷ Although the College made wider threats about the book as a whole being "completely condemned," its specific objections point to just one feature of one part of the book, the illustrations of the female body. The specificity of those objections makes the alteration of the woodcut depicting female genitalia highly charged. That the effacement of the woodcut took place without any pressure from professional or political powers, after the official threat had passed, speaks even more strongly to the persistence of a cultural devaluation of the female body at the forefront of scientific advancement.

V. Rewriting Nothing

Intriguingly, multiple early modern readers responded to the erased woodcut illustration in ways that demonstrate the power of a single pen stroke in the face of cultural negligence. Crooke's alma mater, St. John's College, Cambridge, owns a 1631

56. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. "clitoris, n."

57. Clegg, 19.

copy of *Mikrokosmographia* containing the altered version of the woodcut. The copy was previously owned by another St. John's alumnus, Sir Thomas Bendish (1607-1674), who served as the English Ambassador to Turkey for over twenty years. Whether it was Bendish or someone else, an early reader has, in all three places where the female torso woodcut appears in the book, made marks to represent the excised vulva in the blank space created by the woodcut's alteration. The copy carries no other readers' marks, making even these smallest of pen strokes all the more noticeable. Elsewhere at Cambridge, in the University Library, a 1634 copy of the epitome *Somatographia Anthropine* has also been marked in a similar fashion. A reader's name was once recorded on the book's last leaf, but the last name has been rubbed out so that all that remains legible is "John ... E[x]libris 1686." As in the larger anatomy at St. John's, where the censored, anatomized female torso appears, a reader has drawn in a mark to represent the excised vulva. And a third book, another 1631 copy of *Mikrokosmographia* owned by the Wellcome Library in London, also contains a mark representing the missing vulva in one of the three places the altered female torso illustration is printed.

By reinscribing the text in this way, "nothing" has been remarked upon in a very tangible sense. While I may have been the first to record the censorship of this woodcut as a bibliographic feature of an early modern book, these marks indicate I am not the first to notice it or find it problematic. These early readers were attentive, active, and engaged. Because of the nature of this particular erasure, its observers were able to make a significant cultural comment with the smallest of pen strokes. While the removal of the vulva from the original woodcut in one sense erased the represented female body, the reinscription of the female genitalia in even the simplest of ways restores the female

figure as human and gives definable value to the female sex. She does not have nothing, if something has gone missing. The early modern concept of female genitalia as no-thing inherently sexualizes the female body. As Hamlet observes, “There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so.”⁵⁸ Thinking of the female genitals as an absence makes them shameful, appropriates them so that they only exist in their relativity to the male form, a reductive sexual binary. But a text, whether type or woodcut image, cannot think; it can only record, state, document, illustrate an idea. The altered woodcut’s reification of female genitalia as no-thing attempts to stabilize gender relations according to a dominant cultural tenet but fails as it is itself reinscribed and effaced.

Despite threats from the authorities and the actual physical disfigurement of one illustration, Crooke’s book did have documented influence in educating women about their own bodies and lasting cultural significance. As it stands four centuries later, the altered woodcut now appears a rather impotent instance of censorship. Of course, calling the effort impotent puns on the sexual context mapped onto the image of the female body by the act of censorship, but I find the term particularly apt. In addition to its common sexual connotation, the word “impotent” in the seventeenth century could also mean “Not master of oneself; unable to restrain oneself; . . . headlong, passionate.”⁵⁹ I see a sense in which the latter definition is an accurate representation of the fervor that motivated someone to alter an image that had already widely been made public. The act of censorship did not fail; the woodcut was effaced, and hundreds of books were printed with the altered image. But the censorship failed to halt increased cultural knowledge of

58. *Hamlet*, 2.2.239-40.

59. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “impotent, adj. and n.,” def. A.3.

the female body. If anything, it had the opposite effect and drew greater attention to what readers believed belonged between a woman's legs. Although the censorship action reified Shakespeare's bawdy linguistic pun, readers emphatically insisted the female "nothing" was actually something worth noting after all.

Chapter 5: Book, Body, and Soul

[Man is] the horizon of corporeall and incorporeall things.
– Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*

I. Corpus Anima

While *Mikrokosmographia* has served as a useful reference point for a wide range of recent scholarship on topics including the history of medicine, anatomy practices, and sensory perception in the early seventeenth century, close attention to the text itself, as chapter 4 demonstrates, reveals carefully crafted content and structure that warrants deeper engagement than if it were merely a record of early modern thinking about physical bodies. But while the previous chapter examines broader cultural tropes to understand external influences on Crooke's book, this chapter looks to details of the book's rhetoric to illuminate broader concepts and cultural epistemologies.

Mikrokosmographia elucidates the role of anatomical dissection in the formation and comprehension of individual and social identity in early modern England. Reading the anatomy volume as a literary work rather than a reference book transforms the possibilities for understanding other texts of the period that are more commonly categorized as "literary." Such reading, of course, is largely limited to texts pre-dating the so-called "scientific revolution" that would by the end of the seventeenth century more staunchly demarcate the fields of medicine and natural history from the humanities.¹

1. I use the term "scientific revolution" here not in the sense of an historical occurrence (which is now generally agreed not to have happened quite as neatly as once supposed) but rather as a designation for a backward-looking era-defining shift in categorization. In other words, even if the scientific revolution is not an identifiable late seventeenth-century event, its long-supposed existence still underpins current epistemological demarcations, a systemic flaw this chapter helps to address.

Books that might now be categorized as “scientific”—anatomy manuals, for instance—were once not required or even expected to abstain from religious and philosophical commentary, poetic rhapsodizing, or opinionated quips. As Crooke himself was well aware, and expounds upon at length in the first book of *Mikrokosmographia*, writing on human anatomy at the turn of the seventeenth century was not about dissection; it was about man.² Per Crooke’s own reasoning, “The worth and Excellencie of an Art, is greater or lesse, according to the dignity or basenesse of the Object, whereabout it is conversant” (B1^r); because the object of anatomy was man, and man was created in God’s image, and God was the creator of the universe, therefore it was well worth spending more than a thousand pages discussing anatomy. Such reasoning, however, demands consideration of man not as a lifeless corpse but rather as human being, body *and* soul. Therefore when Crooke constructs his anatomy manual, the soul is neither tangential nor peripheral to his discussion of the body but absolutely central. As he firmly establishes in the preface to book 7, “MAN who is the subject of our Discourse, consisteth of a Soule and a Body” (204^v). In this book as in other early modern texts (both those now labeled literary and those considered, perhaps, otherwise academic), the soul functions materially and symbolically to enable a mutually constitutive intimacy between books and bodies.

In the seventeenth century *Mikrokosmographia* served as a central text to the development and crystallization of core paradigms regarding the role of the physical body in both social and self-identity. In part, this was because of the work Crooke undertook in

2. In using this term I am not gender exclusionary but rather accurate to the subject as it was conceived of within the context of its original culture; see book 1 of *Mikrokosmographia*.

bringing much-needed anatomy knowledge to England from the continent and making it available in the vernacular, where it could reach a wide audience. But the volume was also meaningful for the particular way Crooke executed his work. The anatomy book was poised to have significant cultural impact simply by virtue of what it was, but the nature of that impact was shaped by the editorial, authorial, and rhetorical choices Crooke made in writing his text. The resonance of *Mikrokosmographia*'s influence is codified by its correspondence with writing across genres, so that reading the anatomy manual alongside literary works by canonical authors including Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, and Donne illuminates the relationship among book, body, and soul as employed by a range of authors throughout early modern English writing.

The soul's presence pervades *Mikrokosmographia*. It figures in the volume's title, which Crooke explains at the end of the preface to book 1. Because the human soul and body both "carieth the image of God," the soul imprinted with it and the body serving as "a representation of all the most glorious and perfect works of God ... hence it is, that man is called a *Microcosme* or little worlde, as in the following discourse will more at large appeare" (B1^v). Crooke expects *Mikrokosmographia* as a complete volume to demonstrate the complete body of man, which the soul pervades. The soul figures more prominently ("more at large appears") in some books and chapters than others, but it remains a recurring thematic element throughout the text. The soul infuses the body of Crooke's anatomy volume just as it infuses the human body Crooke describes. Crooke writes that close examination of the soul may belong to "a higher contemplation" than he has undertaken in writing an anatomy manual, but that does not mean that mention of the soul must be absent from *Mikrokosmographia* (B2^v). In fact, not only mention of it but

use of the soul as a rhetorical device is essential to the communication of anatomy instruction because of the soul's integral role in early modern concepts of how the human body works.

Reading Crooke's anatomy manual as a literary work is possible in part because the book is comprehensive in treating its human subject. The paradoxes intrinsic to anatomy practice in the early modern era necessitate continuous attention to all aspects of human identity despite the procedure's presumptive focus on the physical being. Examination of the way Crooke, in his wide-ranging volume, describes and employs the soul lends insight into the way the early modern notion of the soul as an epistemological agent enabled greater knowledge of both the anatomy process and the living self. No longer merely dust returning to dust, under the eyes of the anatomist and his audience the corpse becomes the most essential component of the process by which observers increase their knowledge, followed in close second by the anatomy book. As Crooke's text reflects, the practice of anatomy in the early modern era was not simply about identifying or understanding the rudimentary mechanical functioning of the body's physical parts. It could not be, because the physical body was not clearly delineated. Even when "soul" and "body" were identified as separate parts of one human being, to discuss that human being solely in regard to one or the other of those parts was ontologically impossible. René Descartes's substantial philosophical writings would not appear in print until the 1630s; in 1615, when *Mikrokosmographia* first appeared, neither scientists nor philosophers had a ready answer regarding where the body stopped and the soul began, or what functions each controlled. An early seventeenth-century study primarily concerned with the physical aspects of man did not have the physical aspects of man as its end goal:

the physical aspects, and greater understanding thereof, functioned as a way to better understand man as a complete being.

Because of the integrated ontology of early modern human being, when Crooke composed his anatomy manual not even a designated focus on “the other part of Man, namely, the Bodie, which more truely and properlie is the subject of our Discourse” (B2^v) intended to eliminate the soul from the endeavor. Crooke focuses on the body, but not to the exclusion of the soul. *Mikrokosmographia* does not simply transmit knowledge about physical humanity; in examining the physical body it exposes deeper knowledge about the human being. The soul is an integral part of that human being—perhaps even that which makes it distinctly *human*—and therefore performs a critical function within the early modern anatomy manual. While the soul serves as an internal context for the body, the inward manifestation of human identity, the book serves as an external context, a location for outward manifestation of personal identity. *Mikrokosmographia* connects body, soul, and book in one material object.

II. Incorporatio

The anatomy manual’s organization matters greatly to its success in integrating its various elements for their intended instructional purpose. At first glance, Crooke’s extensively indexed book looks like a prime candidate for the non-chronological reading that was common for texts in the early modern period. However, Crooke explains in book 1 the various ways of ordering anatomical dissections and the reasoning behind each.

Now this order of anatomy is three-fold; of Dignity, of Scituation or dissection, and of Preservation or continuance. The order of Dignity requireth, that we shold begin with the braine, as with the most noble part.

The order of Scituatiō or dissection, requires that we should first demonstrate those parts which first appear in view to the beholders; and for Diuturnity, if we would keepe a body long, the dissection must be begun at those parts which are most subject to corruption; & therefore, first cut up the lower belly, then the Chest, after the Head, and lastly the joynts. (C4^f)

Crooke explains it is the last of these possible orders that is currently used in “Schooles, and in all publique dissections” across Europe, and so in this order he has partitioned and organized the books of his anatomy manual (C4^f). Crooke presents his information on the parts of the body in the sequence in which those parts would be encountered in a standard dissection of his day, creating an order that is simultaneously chronological and physiospatial, and indicating that his anatomy book is intended to be read from first to last.³ Reading the book is simultaneously reading the body, making a narrative of its physical form. *Mikrokosmographia*'s order, then, inherently promotes the importance of its first book. Because the entire volume is meant to be read from beginning to end, the placement of the information in book 1 indicates that information is intended to serve as essential, foundational instruction to proceeding with reading the rest of the manual. Therefore, the information Crooke includes in book 1 warrants special attention for understanding the purpose and function of the volume, and the soul plays a crucial role.

3. As a pedagogical tool, one advantage of the book over an actual cadaver is that ultimately the reader can decide what order in which to read (or re-read) the anatomical information; the process is not controlled by a lecturer, and the book does not decompose like a dissected corpse.

Because of its importance, the soul appears at the very start of the anatomy book. *Mikrokosmographia* contains thirteen books, each comprised of multiple chapters, but only twelve of those books are devoted to parts of the body. Crooke uses his entire first book—twenty-one chapters followed by a series of ten questions and corresponding answers—to situate his reader in relationship to his text.⁴ The first chapter of the first book is devoted to “The Excellency of Man,” an elucidation of the human mind, body, and soul and the relationship of these three components (“parts,” in Crooke’s terminology) to one another. Although Crooke and his readers ostensibly embark on a primarily physical process in conducting an anatomical dissection, Crooke makes clear that the soul is absolutely necessary to the endeavor. This is because the goal of the anatomy is not to dissect a body; the goal is to increase man’s knowledge of, primarily, himself and, secondarily, God. Crooke explains that the soul “is incorporeall and diffusive, quickning, sustaining, governing and mooving the whole body, and every part thereof, even as God supporteth and ruleth the whole world” (B1^v). Furthermore, “the Soule of man *Is wholly in the whole, and wholly in every particular part*” (B2^v).⁵ If his readers want to learn more about the body’s parts, they must also learn about the soul, because the soul is part of every part.

Some critics have attributed the presence of the soul in Crooke’s anatomy manual to hopeful but misguided (and therefore vain) aims. For instance, David Hillman notes, “Crooke’s rhetoric . . . conflates an objective knowledge of the human body with an understanding of subjective human nature. But of course anatomy does not in fact reveal

4. Quantitatively, by page count, book 1 represents approximately 6% of the anatomy manual’s total content.

5. Crooke’s source for this concept is likely St. Augustine of Hippo’s *De Trinitate*.

anything about the interiority of the other: peering into ‘the house of the soul’ does not guarantee so much as a glimpse of the soul itself.”⁶ Such an assertion, however, too readily discounts the value of objective knowledge of the human body to the early modern concept of self. For example, knowing what or where something is *not* can be as helpful as knowing what or where it *is*. When dealing with a subject as intangible and incomprehensible as the human soul, early anatomists could helpfully assert for themselves that they could not physically locate it within the body. We readily recognize now that the soul cannot be located *in* the body, no more than “heaven” can be located *in* the sky—but once the initial hypothesis was conceived, someone had to go looking to prove or disprove it.

Scholars have yet to explore whether Crooke succeeded in increasing general understanding of the self through the rhetoric of his anatomy manual, but he makes it an identifiable goal in book 1 with an entire chapter devoted to “How profitable and behooveful Anatomy is to the knowledge of Mans selfe” (B6^v). Unlike Hillman and others who focus on Crooke to diagnose the anatomy’s unscientific faults, I am interested in how Crooke articulates his understanding of the connections between body and soul. For example, Crooke asserts that “man had an upright frame & proportion, that he might behold and meditate on heavenly things”; the soul within the body yearns to return from whence it came and so holds “the frame of his body erected upward towards heaven” (B3^r). Although this explanation is in no way supported or accepted by modern science, it is incredibly useful as a paradigm for understanding early modern concepts of human

6. David Hillman, *Shakespeare’s Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body* (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 34.

nature and identity. Crooke should not be dismissed because he makes subjective errors, but rather recognized and engaged as a valuable perspective on how physical dissection might have provided insights on subjective human nature to the early modern anatomist. Even if those insights were perceived and not actual, the means do not automatically discount the end.

The soul, according to Crooke, is both malleable and containable, but it is also capacious. The soul “carrieth a deepe stampe” because it has been “imprinted” (B1^v). Repeated use of the verb “imprint” highlights the contiguity between human being and book, pointing again to the soul as the point of contact through a shared process that allows both objects to carry metaphysical content. The physical body is “fram’d to hold” the soul, but the soul is not put into the body as a painting is put into a frame, or even as a building is constructed upon a frame. Instead, the soul is “infused” into the body (a word Crooke uses several times), permeating the body itself and supporting Crooke’s previously mentioned claim that “the Soule of man *Is wholly in the whole, and wholly in every particular part*” (B2^v). The soul itself is also layered, to the extent that it exhibits both an inward part and an outward part: “As for the qualities of the soule, they are either internall, or externall” (B1^r). The soul’s internal qualities include “wisedome, justice, and sanctity” (B1^r), contemplative and introspective traits. The soul’s external qualities are “majesty, dominion, and soveraignty over the creatures” (B1^r); these traits are demonstrative and imposing. So expressed, the soul’s dual nature stands indicative of man’s dual nature and in juxtaposition to the physical human body Crooke describes. The physical body itself works logically, almost mechanically; when design or function cannot be described in such terms, the soul becomes the ready explanation for how or

why something performs as it does. In explaining how a person identifies what he sees (such as another person), for instance, Crooke writes, “the Eye seeth not a *Man* but those things which are visible in a *Man*, as colours together with the scite, figure, magnitude, number and motion of his partes, out of which afterward the Soule collecteth that that thing is a Man” (3C2^v). Crooke explains the sense of taste in a similar manner: “For as the object of Sight is Colour, so the object of Tast is Sapor.... Wherefore we say that the Tong doth Taste the Sapor of wine, not the wine; yet from this Sapour the Soule gathereth that it is wine which wee Taste” (3H4^v). The soul’s function in “collecting” sight and “gathering” taste highlights the difference between perception and actuality in Crooke’s rhetoric.

The internal and external layers of the soul also enable it to contain things: “in [man’s] soule is the power and force of all living and sensible things” (B2^r); “the soule of man receives and entertaines the generall and universall notions of things” (B2^v); “in the Soule are imprinted the universall forms of things” (B2^v). This last example reprises the soul’s malleability. Interestingly, the soul is not imprinted *on*, which would make it passive and receptive. Instead, the imprint exists *in* the soul, demonstrating a soul capable of containing things, a concept reiterated in Crooke’s subsequent observation, “...there is in the soule of Man something Metaphysicall” (B2^v). Crooke’s capacious soul recalls Claudius’s observation of Hamlet:

There’s something in his soul
O’er which his melancholy sits on brood,
And I do doubt the hatch and the disclose

Will be some danger...⁷

This metaphor makes the soul a sort of egg or nest, but the comparison sheds further light on the intricate relationship understood between the soul and body in this era.⁸ According to humoral theory, too much black bile is a physical condition that produces a melancholy humor. Although the metaphorical brood-hen of melancholy may not be tangibly physical, the physical body produces it. It “sits on brood,” however, not over a physical object (or, thankfully, an egg of its own laying), but “something in his [Hamlet’s] soul,” indicating that Hamlet’s brooding cannot be wholly attributed to either his soul or his body but to a concentrated effort from them both.⁹ Earlier in the play, Hamlet himself also muses on the relationship between the soul and body:

Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his own conceit
That from her [the soul’s] working all his visage wanned,
Tears in his eyes, distraction in’s aspect,
A broken voice, and his whole function suiting
With forms to his conceit?¹⁰

7. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Philip Edwards, New Cambridge Shakespeare (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 3.1.158-61.

8. The soul could also possibly be conceived of as a henhouse; it is not completely clear whether the brooding melancholy is contained within the soul, or if it “sits on” both the soul and what the soul contains.

9. *Hamlet*, 3.1.158-9.

10. *Ibid.*, 2.2.503-09. The early modern soul is commonly figured with female pronouns, per classical tradition; see Crooke, B3^f.

Crooke explains that one function of the soul is “governing and mooving the whole body, and every part thereof” (B1^v). Hamlet’s player is able to “force his soul” in order to control not just his actions but his physical appearance; his face pales and he weeps. As Philip Edwards points out, “He doesn’t pretend to cry; he pretends until he cries.”¹¹ The question then arises: Who is the “he”? If the individual human being is made up of body and soul, what other part exists to control them both? Hamlet does not say “his soul forces itself,” and the body forcing the soul seems unlikely since the body is what the soul works upon when forced.¹² But however the parts comprising the human being are labeled, the whole is figured as more than the sum of those elements.

The decidedly complex relationship among body, soul, and self necessarily complicates the anatomist’s task. Crooke begins his anatomy instruction with a discussion of the soul, but the conclusion of the first chapter of book 1 reveals the depth of the author’s ambivalence regarding this approach. Although Crooke raises questions about his own discussion of the soul, he turns his focus to the physical body without answering them:

But stay : Why should I presume to describe the essence of the Soule,
seeing it partaketh of so much Divinity? for of divine things *Symonides*
hath sayde well, We can only say what they are not, not what they are.

11. *Hamlet*, 2.2.508-09n; or, in twenty-first-century parlance, “Fake it ‘til you make it.”

12. Our current viewpoint might suggest “the mind” as capable of exerting power over both soul and body. However, as noted above, Descartes’s philosophy did not widely circulate until well after both *Mikrokosmographia* and *Hamlet*. Furthermore, Descartes uses the term “mind” interchangeably with “soul”; see Scott Manning Stevens, “Sacred Heart and Secular Brain,” in *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern England*, ed. David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997), 268.

Why should I paine my selfe to open that shrine which *Nature* her selfe hath veiled and sealed up from our sences, least it should bee prophaned therewith?

Hence it is, that *Hippocrates* calleth it Φύσινάφανέα, *The inaspectible or invisible Nature*, which can no more be described by us, then our eye is able to see it selfe. These things therefore belong to a higher contemplation, and require a more skillful Workman to draw but the lines, or even to shadow them out. Let us content our selves to handle that that may be handled, or at least is subject unto some of our sences, and so proceede to the other part of Man, namely, the Bodie, which more truely and properlie is the subject of our Discourse. (B2^v)

In this passage Crooke admits he is unqualified to offer an extensive discourse on the soul. Yet he has offered some, and he places it prominently in his text. Crooke himself asks, “Why should I?” but offers no direct answer here. The necessity and appropriate placement of Crooke’s discourse on the soul, however, immediately becomes apparent as the reader continues. Chapter 2 of book 1 is titled “Of the Dignity and wonderfull frame of Mans Body,” but in the proceeding text that body is immediately situated in its relationship to the soul: “As the soule of man is of all sublunary formes the most noble, so his Body, the house of the soule, doth so farre excell ... the measure and rule of all other bodies” (B2^v). Crooke then outlines the four things by which the “excellency of mans body is sette forth” (B2^v). The first of those four things is man’s “upright frame.” Man stands upright for two reasons, Crooke tell us, and “the primary, is the soule” (B3^r).

Even when Crooke turns his attention fully and specifically on the physical body, the presence of the soul pervades.

III. Corpus to Corpse

However, in the process of anatomical dissection, the necessary first step is the separation of the soul from the body, a defining aspect of death since ancient times and across cultures. Despite contemporary enthusiasm for the idea, it seems logically improbable that early modern anatomists would have sought to identify the precise location of the soul within the body: these dissections were conducted on dead bodies. Crooke firmly instructs that only dead bodies should be dissected. Although he observes that “the ancient Physitians” and even some of his closer contemporaries, including Vesalius, “did anatomize the bodies of condemned wretches even whilst they were alive,” Crooke roundly condemns the idea, saying, “I hold it a very frivolous and vaine thing, beside the horror and inhumanity of the fact” and maintains there is nothing to be gained by the practice, which “violate[s] the sacred Law of nature, and of religion” (C3^v). If death is defined as the soul leaving the body, then after death occurs the soul would no longer be located in the corpse for the finding. However, just as an observer would be able to determine whether someone had been living in a house upon entering the structure even after the person had left, anatomies such as those Crooke describes seem to find evidence of the soul’s former presence and activity in the lifeless corpse.¹³

As he finally reaches the actual business of anatomical dissection in book 2, Crooke carefully and skillfully engineers a transition between living body and deceased

13. See Lianne Habinek, “Untying the ‘Subtle Knot’: Anatomical Metaphor and the Case of the *rete mirabile*,” *Configurations* 20 (2012): 239-77.

body in which the soul plays a crucial role. In his book 2 preface, Crooke first acknowledges the anxiety regarding the action he and his readers are about to undertake, “Being now to dissolve this goodly frame of Nature, and to take in pieces this Maister-piece” (F6^v). He makes the proposed violation of God’s work seem less abhorrent by figuring the living body as weak. Its weakness is not by fault of design; the body “indeede is but the Sepulchre of that God at first created,” but because of the fall humanity has been exposed to violence of the world, “so that the soule is truly saide *Inhabitare immunitam Civitatem* [to live in an unprotected city]; for to death and diseases we lie open on every side” (F6^v). While the body lives, it remains in great peril: “The world is a Sea, the accidents and divers occurrents in it are waves, wherein this small Bark [i.e., the body] is tossed and beaten up and downe, and there is betwixt us and our dissolution, not an inch boord, but a tender skinne, which the slenderest violence even the cold aire is able to slice through” (F6^v). The world’s dangers (here in the form of beating waves) threaten not the body’s death but its “dissolution”—its injury, failure, evisceration. But these harms threaten only the living body. The “violence” of the cold air that “slice[s] through” the “tender skinne” is precisely the sort of violence to which the dead body is completely immune. A living body senses cold acutely but a dead one of course cannot feel cold or heat—or, for that matter, slicing, which is the perceived violence the anatomist is about to undertake.

Again, Crooke underscores his point that human physical frailty is not the fault of God, as the only thing saving the fallen body is that it was “put together with wonderfull Art, and framed according to Geometricall proportions” (F6^v). For an explanation of those proportions, Crooke relies on Edmund Spenser (whom he calls “the English Poet”)

and an excerpt from *The Faerie Queene* book 2, canto 9, which explains that the human body represents geometric perfection in its combination of circle (head), triangle (legs), and square (torso).¹⁴ This is not the first instance in which geometry has appeared in *Mikrokosmographia*; in his “Preface to the Chyrurgeons” Crooke writes,

For as it is a rule in Geometry, that *Rectum est index sui & obliqui*, *That which is Right measureth both it selfe and that which is crooked*; so in our Art, he that knowes what should bee the natural disposition of everie part will be best able to judge when Nature declineth from that integrity, and how far the declination is from the true and genuine constitution. (¶11^r)

In other words, the dissected body described and illustrated in the anatomy manual is meant to serve as a comparative reference for not only identification but also diagnosis and recognition of abnormalities. But in explaining the purpose of the anatomy book Crooke also describes its form, which constructs a close homology between body and book. Henry Turner explains that the use of geometry in such a rhetorical construction is a mode of prescientific thought that developed in writing across genres in the early modern period.

Geometry provides one of the oldest and most enduring ways of thinking about the problem of form (the geometrical “statement” is, in the end, purely a formal one); in the late sixteenth century, mathematical notions of form that were primarily structural, spatial, and quantitative began to compete with rhetorical notions of form that were primarily linguistic,

14. For more on Crooke’s use of Spenser, particularly his allegory, see E. Harvey, “Sensational Bodies.”

stylistic, and qualitative, with the result that early modern writers began to develop new ideas of form for their poems and plays.¹⁵

Crooke's use of geometry in the prefatory materials that appear throughout his anatomy manual represents another instance of the development of form Turner describes. But Crooke's example is further significant for the purpose his writing's form is put to. In *Mikrokosmographia* Crooke endeavors to make a large amount of specialized knowledge accessible to a wide audience. For Crooke's readers, in their desire to understand anatomy, the human body is the book they seek to read. Therefore, Crooke shapes the form of his book into the form of the human body to provide a readable version of the desired subject, a geometrically "Right" version by which his audience can comparatively come to understand the more messy and confusing version on display in the anatomy theater or encountered in professional practice.

Crooke's use of Spenser as his geometric reference is further significant. The passage used in the preface to book 2 of *Mikrokosmographia* is part of Spenser's description of the allegorical Castle of Alma. Crooke explains for his reader that Spenser's "Alma" is "the soule" (F6^v). But the castle of Alma "is not merely the body inhabited by the soul but also the house that is the soul" whose tripartite functions (also mentioned by Crooke in his preface to book 1) could similarly be geometrically represented by a circle, triangle, and square.¹⁶ Spenser's geometric conflation of body and soul in the form of the Castle of Alma recalls Crooke's anatomical assertion that "the Soule of man *Is wholly in the whole, and wholly in every particular part*" of the body

15. H. Turner, 581.

16. A. C. Hamilton et al., eds. *The Spenser Encyclopedia* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990), 25.

(B2^v). The form thus described by both Crooke and Spenser becomes not only physiospatial but also, simultaneously, spiritual—in other words, human. Although the preface to book 2 begins with Crooke’s vivid illustration of the weakness and vulnerability of the human body (the “small Bark . . . tossed and beaten up and downe”), by constructing a rhetorical argument that successfully combines structural and stylistic concerns through geometric form (and not coincidentally by means of an overtly literary work) he manages to convincingly assert that “excellent proportion and structure maketh this Paper-sconce high perrill-prooffe” (F6^v), a reference that could as well describe his anatomy manual as the human body to which it ostensibly refers.

Crooke’s rhetorical move literally—by the means of words—reinforces the frail body, easing the text’s progression from a vulnerable living corpus to resilient dead one, thus acclimating the reader to the process of anatomy. The precise moment of transition occurs midway through the book 2 preface: “It shall be sufficient in this place, to draw the Curtaine and to shew you the case, rather the Coffin or winding sheete wherein nature hath wrapped this living body of death” (G1^r). Crooke’s metaphors for human skin and its relationship to the body have gone from the “tender” hull of a boat to a “Paper-sconce high perill-prooffe” to a “Coffin or winding sheete.” An organ once far more vulnerable than “an inch board” is buttressed by “excellent proportion and structure” to become “a muniment to defend” the inner body. Crooke has moved from a body that was alive and yet a “Sepulchre” to a body that is dead and yet somehow “living.” The idea of the “living body of death” functions as an expression of the anatomized body’s active role in the dissection process, despite the individual’s deceased state. Rather than the
living death...

...a moving grave,
Buried and yet not exempt
By privilege of death and burial
From worst of other evils, pains and wrongs

of Milton's "Samson Agonistes" (c.1665), who experiences death while still alive because he is blinded but retains all other sensation, Crooke's "living body of death," the anatomy subject, effects life while dead because it has lost all sensation but still serves a visible and visual purpose.¹⁷ In the way that early modern authors such as Milton figured the Bible as the living word of God, Crooke figures the anatomized subject of *Mikrokosmographia* as the living body of death. The anatomized body is the content of Crooke's book; whether purposefully or not, in finally describing human skin as "a muniment" he invokes the term's other definition of an archival document.¹⁸

IV. Liber De Corpore

For Crooke, the body actually is a book. In chapter 6 of book 1, "How profitable and helpfull Anatomy is to the knowledge of God," he directly states that "the frame of man is Gods Booke" (C1^v).¹⁹ The idea that Crooke finds the book-of-God concept useful to his argument is surprising, as the obvious association with the phrase "The Book of God" is the Bible. But the Bible of course is the *word* of God, and its status as a "book" at varying points in history is terribly fraught, making Crooke's distinction intriguing,

17. John Milton, "Samson Agonistes," in *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, ed. John Carey (London: Longman, 1971), ll. 100, 102-05.

18. Used in this sense since at least the fifteenth century; see *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. "muniment, n.," def. 1.

19. Crooke acknowledges that the idea of the human body being a book is not original to him, although unfortunately he does not specify precisely to which "ancient Writers" he refers (C1^v).

even if not original. Crooke seems to figure the Bible as God's oral record that has been written down and collated or bound in various (and relatively inconsequential) ways, while the human body is a physical book that has been materially hand-crafted by God to convey a specific message. Similarly, John Donne frequently turns to the object lesson of the book to make salient points in his sermons. On one hand, this seems an obvious rhetorical move; the Christian religion Donne preaches is based on the study of one holy book, the Bible, to which the congregation is exhorted to return again and again. But Donne uses the concept of the book in delightfully creative ways in the midst of his biblical exegesis. For example, in sermon 19 he observes,

These be the Records of vellum, these be the parchmins, the endictments, and the evidences that shall condemn many of us, at the last day, our own skins; we have the book of God, the Law, written in our own hearts; we have the image of God imprinted in our own souls; we have the character, and seal of God stamped in us, in our baptism; and, all this is bound up in this vellum, in this parchmin, in this skin of ours, and we neglect book, and image, and character, and seal, and all for the covering.²⁰

Donne equates his listener's skin with vellum binding to evoke a vivid image of a person as a living book in order to drive home his point about judging people on appearances alone, but the description strongly echoes Crooke's depiction of human skin as a muniment. In sermon 27 Donne warns, "He that desires to Print a book, should much more desire, to be a book; to do some such exemplar things, as men might read, and

20. John Donne, *Fifty Sermons* (London: Flesher, Marriot, and Royston, 1649), 2:113.

relate, and profit by,” similarly turning people into books as a way to help his congregation better understand their relationship, and responsibility, to one another as fellow human beings.²¹

In Crooke’s chapter on man as God’s book, the human body is a physical model whose intricate manifold wonders irresistibly portray the wonder and power of God. This means that the body’s successful function as a “book” relies on its physical form, not its capability to carry or convey any particular words or speech. The anatomized body—here, anatomized by Crooke’s words rather than the surgeon’s knife—carries God’s most profound and essential message to all who look upon it. Crooke sees the body as so successful in the role of “Gods Booke” that he is sure the viewer will be convinced of an “admirable Architect” and an “unimitable workeman” even if he is “an Atheist, and acknowledgest no God at all” (C2^r). God’s “power” is not only made visible in the anatomized body, but it is “palpable” (C1^v); it is a physical object that can be touched, handled, manipulated. The wonder of this physical substance is not the nature of the matter itself (although Crooke considers that, too, amazing), but the way that all of these many, many parts fit and work together to create the whole human body.

Crooke further emphasizes the importance of the structure itself in conveying the book’s essential message over any explicit content. In fact, the “composition and frame of mans bodie” are situated in and of themselves sufficient and successful as “dumbe Schoolemaisters”—they do not require the faculty of speech to convey their lesson. They are “the Doctors and teachers of Divine wisdom,” indicating they are educated professors of higher learning. Most significantly, though, they are “the Bookes of vulgar

21. *Ibid.*, 2:237.

Divinity,” meaning they convey God’s divine nature in the common (“vulgar”) tongue; the body, without words, portrays God’s power to even those lacking an advanced formal education (C2^r).²² These claims and interpretations regarding the human body reflect back on Crooke’s own anatomy venture in interesting ways. Firstly, the key significance of *Mikrokosmographia* is its status as the first comprehensive anatomy manual published in the English vernacular—the “vulgar” tongue. In his book, Crooke tries to do the wondrous human body justice, to figure it in words that serve the purpose and function he sees it capable of. He puts words—the best words to fit his audience—onto the human body to help English readers (readers of books *and* bodies) better understand what it is they are seeing. This effort at putting anatomy knowledge into terms his readers will understand reaches beyond words all the way down to the level of individual letters. The parts of bodies portrayed in the anatomy’s illustrations are indexed with alphabetical markers, underscoring the discourse of physical and literal forms, or what Jeffrey Masten calls the “corporeality of letters.”²³

Secondly, through the crucial emphasis on “composition and frame” in figuring God as the author of the book that is the human body, Crooke champions his own role as author of the book he has written.²⁴ Historians of medicine have criticized and dismissed *Mikrokosmographia* for relying so heavily on other authors. Yet Crooke’s work not only as translator but also as selector, collector, compiler, editor, and organizer of those

22. This is particularly intriguing in an anatomy published just four years after the completion of the King James Bible.

23. Jeffrey Masten, *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare’s Time* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2016), 8, italics in the original.

24. Crooke’s phrasing recalls the line from Donne’s “The Ecstasy,” “Of what we are composed, and made” (ll. 46); in *John Donne: Selected Poetry*, ed. John Carey, Oxford World’s Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996), 115.

materials is crucial. Crooke has gathered all of the requisite material to craft a complete and thorough anatomy, but that anatomy cannot function unless all those various parts are put together—composed and framed—in just the right way. Crooke is not trying to be God, but he is trying to emulate and honor God’s design as an author. Therefore it makes sense that Crooke figures his book primarily as his “labor” in the preface addressed to the barber-surgeons. It is not his own body, or even his own anatomies, that he writes about, so his book does not stand as his personal proxy to the world. Instead, the book represents difficult and complex work Crooke has completed (he writes that he spent sixteen years) in taking “all the best authors” of anatomy writing in various languages and at various times throughout history and selecting, condensing, and combining their knowledge in a way that makes sense and then presenting that structure in a language a wide audience can understand. The English vernacular may not be quite as universally “vulgar” as the human body itself, common currency to our entire species, but it certainly gets far closer than the existing anatomy texts in England up to this date.

Chapter 6: Dangerous Doctors

Implicit Fayth is the highway to perdition...
– Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*

I. Medicine and Magic

In Christopher Marlowe's play *Doctor Faustus*, once Faustus has pledged his soul to Lucifer his very first question for the demon Mephistopheles is "where is the place that men call hell?"¹ The demon insists throughout the play that hell is any place other than heaven. However, not long after, Faustus ponders repentance because he so badly wants to see heaven when, in a curious turn, Mephistopheles tells him that heaven "is not half so fair / As thou, or any man that breathe on earth"; because heaven "was made for man; then he's more excellent" than heaven.² In the Christian paradigm, the physical body does not travel to heaven; when the soul separates from the body upon death, the soul goes to heaven, leaving the body behind. Therefore the physical human body and heaven are conceived of as alternate locations for the soul. But "man," by definition and in this context, is not soul only. Crooke establishes that "MAN ... consisteth of a Soule and a Body" (204^v), and Faustus is certainly still physical embodied when Mephistopheles tells him heaven is "not half so fair as thou." By the demon's logic, then, the supreme situation for human being is not the disembodied soul's location in heaven but existence in the physical body, a startling rearrangement of the expected hierarchy of early modern

1. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* (B-Text), ed. David Scott Kastan, Norton Critical Edition (New York: Norton, 2005), 2.1.111. Throughout this chapter I quote from the B-text, as the woodcut discussed below illustrates that version of the text; however, all lines quoted here appear in both the A-text and B-text versions of the play, with only very minor variations.

2. *Ibid.*, 2.3.6-7, 9.

English epistemology—and one which Faustus cannot well argue, having never been to heaven.

Mephistopheles's assertion promoting physical embodiment over spiritual achievement, even if the dubious argument of a demon, illustrates something Patricia Fumerton calls "the emergence of a new kind of secular subjectivity in the [early modern] period, one that was not solely God-based but that could—even while perhaps anchored by the godly 'eye'—at the same time sense a more modern notion of singularity and disconnection."³ Fumerton's concept usefully moves beyond the question of conscious interiority, which has been clearly established for even "pre"-moderns, and operates separately from the later-seventeenth-century concept of the Cartesian divide. Such "secular subjectivity," in addition to being part of the experience of the "unsettled poor" examined by Fumerton, manifested in the general public's interactions with a wide variety of medical practitioners. At one end of the spectrum were the physicians, learned and licensed, who at the turn of the seventeenth century actively endeavored to completely sever themselves from their ecclesiastic origins and who successfully demonstrated that the body could be healed by physical means, without God's help. At the other end were the cunning-folk and quacksalvers whose "magical" means and methods seemed to work by human manipulation of the natural world God had created or even to directly contradict God's divinity.⁴ Some such individuals achieved high levels of

3. Fumerton, xiii.

4. The word "magic" meant something rather different in the early modern period than it does now, although a notable shift in its definition was occurring during the early seventeenth century; for more on this, see John Henry, "The Fragmentation of Renaissance Occultism and the Decline of Magic," *History of Science* 46 (2008), 8-11. Pelling similarly notes "those standard polarities, the physician and the quack" (6).

apparent success and subsequent notoriety, but their dubious methods posed a serious threat to the health and wellbeing of their vulnerable patients.

In between the ideal doctor and the irredeemable quack—neither of which, of course, actually existed in the embodiment of any one individual—flourished a full range of other types of practitioners. An ailing person in early modern London might seek the help of a full range of different types of practitioners, from those who were members of organized companies to those whose only qualifications were self-professed.⁵ These manifold and frequently overlapping categories, in which neither credentials nor intentions were necessarily clear, made the medical marketplace complex and confusing. But during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the practice of medicine in England underwent significant changes. These changes were due as much to the development of professional organizations and standards as they were a product of more-commonly recognized Renaissance developments such as advances in science and the spread of humanist philosophy. The physicians in particular worked to move away from their original association with the church, but all of these purported healers offered their patients a view of the “secular subjectivity” Fumerton describes, a sense of self that acknowledged God’s dominion but also recognized individual physical needs deeply rooted in material identity. In many ways, the physicians’ profession, which developed extensively during the first few decades of the 1600s, depended on the establishment and widespread acceptance of secular subjectivity.

At the other end of the spectrum were the purported healers whose practices outright defied God’s laws: magicians, conjurers, sorcerers, witches, and cunning-folk.

5. See Pelling, 151, 156-57.

As Davies observes, such practitioners “were individuals who stood out in society for possessing more knowledge than those around them, knowledge that was acquired either from a supernatural source, from an innate, hereditary ability, or from being able to understand writing,” capabilities that displaced them from their usually lower-class origins in society and made them inherently suspect to their peers.⁶ Yet these practitioners also produced results for their patients, or else people would not have repeatedly consulted them. The difficulty for the general public lay in discerning reputable and reliable medical practitioners from the untrustworthy and outright dangerous individuals advertising themselves as healers. Labels and titles, whether self-imposed or granted by others, were not always predictable indicators. Few physicians made such blatant deals with the devil as Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus, although representations of medical practitioners on the early modern stage and in other forms of popular entertainment influenced the public’s impression and understanding of the contentious marketplace they faced. But the practice of magic, whether admitted or concealed, was not the only factor that contributed to the reputation of medical practitioners; so too did politics (particularly political favor), professional regulations and standards, social networks, economic status, and national identity. It seems to rarely have been clear how far a prospective patient might trust what a practitioner purported to be, whether that trust was based on the practitioner’s own promises or the recommendations of friends and neighbors. The level of uncertainty and the number of contributing factors to any given practitioner’s reputation meant that a caring, qualified physician could easily appear untrustworthy, and a patient might unwittingly consult a dangerous doctor for

6. Davies, viii.

treatment. The high level of competition also meant that many practitioners were all too ready to cast accusations of every sort against one another, even at those sanctioned within their own professional category.

None of our current ideas about modernity—not secular identification, individual subjectivity, the Cartesian divide, or even the scientific revolution—fully explains the shift that occurred during the early modern period in the public’s perception of medical practitioners and their specialized knowledge. Changing ideas about and definitions of “medicine” and “magic” and the relationship between the two played out in both fictional literary dramas and real-life conflicts, sometimes in intriguingly similar ways. This transitional period in historical medical culture is most clearly identifiable at moments like the confluence of material texts—institutional records, ballads, plays, etc.—that help distinguish the complex relationship among members of the public, conventional healers, and the rise of a new class of professional physicians. Medicine and magic were clearly conceived of as complementary methods by a significant portion of the population, but formal attempts to delineate their separate practice focused attention on and increased anxiety about their confluence. The physicians’ struggle to delineate their profession is not unlike the tension present amongst barbers, surgeons, and barber-surgeons, three distinct yet related professions in this era; in turn, barbers and surgeons share a common origin with those practicing physic as roles all once performed by members of holy orders.⁷ The move toward secular subjectivity is visible in the efforts of manifold types of medical professionals to separate themselves from spiritual and divine practitioners of any kind, even while maintaining demonstrable respect of God’s authority and dominion.

7. See Decamp, 4, 7.

Although the College of Physicians had been mandated at their formation by King Henry VIII to regulate medical practice, they struggled mightily to achieve widespread control. The landmark study of their attempts is Pelling's *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians, and Irregular Practitioners, 1550-1640* (2003, with Frances White). Pelling's book provides a full and meticulously researched picture of the medical marketplace and the ways in which the College attempted to regulate all types of practice throughout London. The study focuses primarily on the 714 practitioners (or "irregulars") reprimanded by the College as recorded in their Annals between 1550 and 1640. Pelling's prosopographical study successfully identifies and examines the common characteristics of these diverse and largely obscure individuals. I wish to supplement her impressive historical work with a biographical and literary study focused on just two of her subjects, Dr. Helkiah Crooke and "Doctor" John Lambe. These men's respective representation of the two ends of the medical practitioner spectrum and their direct personal encounter through the College of Physicians makes these individuals unusually fruitful subjects for close inquiry. Their example illuminates the role of popular literary representations in contributing to public perceptions of the medical profession and the effects of the complex political and socioeconomic forces that continuously reshaped the marketplace.

II. The Tragedy of Doctor Lambe

On the afternoon of Friday, June 13, 1628, a London celebrity known as Doctor Lambe attended a play at the Fortune.⁸ There Lambe, an elderly man in his early eighties, was noticed by a number of the other attendees—mostly apprentices, "boyes of the

8. Unfortunately, no record survives of what play was performed that day.

towne, and other unruly people”—who began to harass him as he left the theater.⁹

Fearing for his safety as the mob grew, Lambe hastily employed a group of soldiers he encountered to act as his bodyguards and guide him safely home. He apparently felt secure enough to stop at a tavern for supper before proceeding on his way, but the crowd lingered and became increasingly aggressive as the evening pressed on. Lambe ducked into yet another tavern for respite from the mob’s mounting advances; when they began to attack the building, he was forced back onto the street, where he found his bodyguards had been driven off. Before long, stones were hurled and cudgels swung at the old man, who was beaten until “his skull was broken, one of his eyes hung out of his head, and all partes of his body bruised and wounded so much, that no part was left to receiue a wound.”¹⁰ City constables had been called to the scene, and they carried the fatally wounded Lambe to the Poultry Counter, where he died in the early hours of the next day.¹¹

In life, John Lambe was famous as a conjurer and self-proclaimed “physician” who practiced a combination of medicine and magic for a wide range of clients ranging from laundry women to noblemen, most notably including George Villiers, who became Lambe’s close friend and patron around the same time James I made Villiers Duke of Buckingham in 1623. An anonymous biographical pamphlet published shortly after Lambe’s death indicates that his “first steppe” toward his “wicked course” was his choice

9. *A Briefe Description of the Notorious Life of Iohn Lambe* (Amsterdam [London], 1628), C3^v. (The pamphlet’s printers likely used the false imprint for fear of legal/political repercussions.)

10. *Ibid.*, C4^r.

11. Also known as the Poultry Compter, the Counter was a small prison in the Cheapside neighborhood of London. My account of these events is taken primarily from the anonymous biographical pamphlet cited above, with some assistance from Bellamy.

to begin practicing “Physicke,” an endeavor he apparently undertook without any formal training; it was at this point he began calling himself “doctor.”¹² Soon thereafter he began telling fortunes and performing other sorts of supposedly magical feats alongside his medical practice, such as “telling of Fortunes, helping of diverse to lost goods, shewing to young people the faces of their Husbans or Wives, that should be, in a Christall glasse: revealing to wives the escapes and faults of their Husbands, and to husbands of their wives.”¹³ As Lambe’s fame and influence grew, so did the magnitude of his magic; he was accused of attempting to “sap the strength” of the sixth Lord Windsor and “invoking spirits” in 1608.¹⁴ Once he came under Buckingham’s protection, he more easily escaped punishment, if not suspicion. As Lambe’s reputation spread, the rumors of his abilities grew. In 1626 he was reportedly seen floating in a mist upon the Thames near Buckingham’s residence, and popular opinion credited him with conjuring the strange weather anomaly.¹⁵ Lambe’s troubled career as a doctor and conjurer and his violent public death took place during the rise of a new class of professional physicians in England who, as a sanctioned institution, sought to regulate all unconventional practitioners and not only discredit but actively punish those they found unqualified.

In Lambe’s case, a variety of extant textual artifacts, each with a distinct narrative or viewpoint, provide insight into the early modern experience of magic and medicine and the specialized knowledge that so many people, understandably, found frightening

12. *Briefe Description*, A2^f. Lambe long insisted he had been granted a license to practice medicine by the bishop of Durham but had no proof to that effect; Anita McConnell, “John Lambe (1545/6–1628),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

13. *Briefe Description*, A2^v.

14. McConnell, *ODNB*.

15. *Ibid*.

and even personally threatening. The various textual ephemera produced in direct response to Lambe's death include the aforementioned biographical pamphlet; multiple orally-transmitted verses recorded in various manuscripts; and "many broadsheets and ballads," only one of which survives, a ballad printed in 1628 shortly after Lambe's death.¹⁶ The position of ballads as material texts of both utmost immediacy and broad circulation makes them particularly useful for cultural inquiry. Early modern ballads represent "the truest and most immediate indicators of which way the cultural wind blows."¹⁷ While up to this point most scholarly work on ballads has been limited to fairly narrow inquiries within the purview of specific disciplines, recently scholars have called for "delimited work" that considers ballads holistically by inquiring into "their wider aesthetic or cultural significance," the approach this chapter takes.¹⁸ Part of what makes Lambe's real-life story so intriguing is its startling resemblance to that of a fictional doctor-turned-devil-worshipper, the tale told in Marlowe's play *Doctor Faustus*. Originally performed around 1590 and first appearing in print in 1604, the play is not a product of Lambe's life or death but rather an analogue, particularly intriguing in its anti-mimesis as a fictional predecessor to the true story. Furthermore, the ballad's main illustration highlights Lambe and Faustus's contemporary cultural correspondence. Visually arresting in size and immediately recognizable, just below the ballad's title appears the famous Faustus woodcut used on the 1612 and subsequent early B-text editions of the Marlowe's play. Reading the ballad, a popular but fleeting material text,

16. See Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, eds., "Early Stuart Libels," *Early Modern Literary Studies Text Series I* (2005); McConnell, *ODNB*.

17. Fumerton and Guerrini, 1.

18. *Ibid.*, 2.

alongside a literary work bearing greater cultural presence (both then and now) illuminates the correlation between medicine and magic in early seventeenth-century London as well as the influence of various material texts on public perception.¹⁹

The 1628 ballad titled “The Tragedy of Doctor Lambe” was written by Martin Parker. Most ballad authors of the period are anonymous or unknown, and Parker, despite his relative obscurity, is one of the best-known balladeers.²⁰ He was active as such from 1624 to 1647, placing the Lambe piece fairly early in his canon, which amounts to about a hundred ballads and chapbooks in total.²¹ In 1641 Parker wrote a chapbook titled *The Poet’s Blind Mans Bough* as a form of revenge for some perceived slights against his writing that had recently been published:

I might my pen dip in that learnean Sinke,
Which the infernall furies use for ink,
Or with Iambean rimes Ironicall,
Make lines should serve for ropes to hang them all.²²

In twelve dizzying pages of continuous couplets the balladeer wreaks his vengeance, in the course of which he names no less than Chaucer, Spenser, and Surrey as his literary

19. By “various material texts” here I mean, basically, print artifacts other than books; I hesitate to describe such texts as “minor” or “lesser-known,” because there is no evidence that such qualifications were true during the time period in which the texts were produced (and, in part, the argument of this chapter directly opposes such a categorization).

20. Parker was also “an alehouse-keeper”; Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 68.

21. Of course, we cannot be certain that every work attributed to Parker was actually his; he was “usually known just as M.P.” (Ibid., 80), and other booksellers likely tried to capitalize on Parker’s popularity by adding his initials to their ballads, a known commercial practice (McConnell, *ODNB*).

22. Martin Parker, *The Poet’s Blind Mans Bough* (London: F. Leach, 1641), A3^r. “Bough” here is pronounced “buff”; the title is a reference to the game “blind man’s buff,” a form of tag in which the person designated “it” wears a blindfold.

predecessors.²³ The relationship between Parker's verses and the poetry of such celebrated authors may not be evident in the writing itself, but the reference makes clear that the balladeer was familiar with an English literary tradition and felt justified positioning himself within it, not just despite but perhaps because of the success of his writing as a saleable commodity.²⁴

In his ballad recounting the events surrounding Lambe's death, Parker uses subtle rhetorical manipulation to cast his subject in a negative light. Perhaps the most striking instance occurs in the verse that describes how during one of his tavern stops Lambe "supt, / ... with half a pig."²⁵ No other extant accounts record this detail, but regardless of its veracity, Parker's decision to include it works as both colorful creative embellishment and vivid illustration of Lambe's perceived greed and gluttony. Such characteristics represent Lambe's social ascent, something the public despised him for.²⁶ The ballad as a whole conveys a clear sense of rejoicing; as one historian observes, it "cheered Lambe's death."²⁷ But Parker never describes the murder in positive terms, preferring litotes to blatant celebration. For instance, the opening lines read, "Neighbors cease to mone, / And

23. Ibid. Parker claims "All Poets (as addition to their fames) / Have by their Works eternized their names / As Chaucer, Spencer, and that noble earle" (A3^f); he also refers to "Sydney and Shaksspire, Drayton, Withers and / Renowned Ionson . . . / Decker, Learn'd Chapman, Haywood . . . / And that sweet Seraph of our Nation, Quarles" as examples of his contemporary authors (A3^v).

24. On Parker's interest in the income generated by the publications he authored, see Watt, 287, 298-99.

25. Martin Parker, "The Tragedy of Doctor Lambe" (London: H.G., 1628), ll. 66-67; subsequent references in this paragraph provided parenthetically.

26. Lambe rose from his first employment as a tutor to the children of gentry to become one of the closest confidantes of Buckingham, a royal favorite who was also despised by the general public. The theater Lamb visited the night of his death, however, was "a popular haunt of the lower classes," and the mob that killed him was comprised largely of apprentices and their cohort (McConnell, *ODNB*).

27. Bellany, 47.

leave your lamentation,” and Parker observes of the public that “few are griev’d at heart” (ll. 1-2, 113). While the ballad’s subtitle does state that Lambe “dyed” and the penultimate stanza similarly asserts, “Thus Doctor Lambe is dead” (ll. 116), Parker elsewhere favors euphemisms such as “Doctor Lambe is gone” and “he’s gone the way / Thats fit for such a liver” (ll. 3, 21-22) and describes “Doctor Lambe’s Tragedy” and how “Some Prentises did ayde them, / To take the Doctors breath” (ll. 34, 72-73). With these careful word choices, Parker skillfully avoids tasteless merriment over the man’s death, despite his “vulgar” medium.

Parker’s subtlety seems evidence that the balladeer was aware of the dangerous political situation surrounding Lambe’s death and the potential impact of his verses, although, despite his rhetorical delicacy, negative consequences still occurred. The author himself apparently escaped direct punishment for the verses, but Buckingham had “the singer, seller and printer of Martin Parker’s ballad imprisoned”—although this threat must have been short-lived since Buckingham died only two months after Lambe, and the ballad would have been produced within the time intervening.²⁸ Lambe’s murder was an outrage and threat to Buckingham but a victory for the common people who had grown to hate both men. No one was willing or able to give testimony against any guilty parties, and eventually, at Buckingham’s prompting, the king’s privy council fined the city itself for allowing the riot and failing to bring anyone to trial.²⁹ But the general public commemorated the death of Lambe, “the Duke’s devil,” in story and song, heralding his patron’s downfall with warning rhymes such as, “lett Charles & george doe what they

28. Gaskill, 295.

29. Ibid., 296.

can / yet george shall dye like Doctor Lambe.”³⁰ The prompt production of the ballad and the story it creates—“Your patience for a space, / Whil’st I make his narration”—indicate that the verses were as much intended to circulate the news of what had happened as to celebrate it.³¹ Parker’s promise to “make his narration” reveals his intention to turn Lambe into a story, reflecting the craft behind his authorship of the ballad and establishing a link between the facts of the event and the embellishments of Parker’s tale-telling. While Parker influences the public’s perception of Lambe in his ballad depiction, he also turns Lambe into a cautionary tale that functions on behalf of the public to warn other exploitative would-be medical practitioners.

In addition to its text the ballad features two woodcut illustrations, one more prominent than the other. The smaller woodcut, located on the verso above the second part of the ballad, is apparently meant to illustrate the violent mob beating. It appears figuratively rather than literally representative, as the woodcut pictures five brawling monks, three with cudgels, suggesting the image was used mainly because it shows several people beating another. The woodcut was previously used in a 1620 edition of *The Historie of Frier Rush*.³² The history itself, “Being full of pleasant mirth and delight for young people,” tells the story of a corrupt “Cloister of Religious men” and the devil named Rush who is sent to “keepe them still in that state, and worse if it might be.”³³ The woodcut later re-used for the Lambe ballad illustrates an excessively violent scene in which Rush makes truncheons and staves for the monks and then incites them to a bloody

30. Bellany and McRae, “Early Stuart Libels,” s.v. Pi1.

31. Parker, “Tragedy,” ll. 36-37.

32. *The Historie of Frier Rush* (London: Edw. Allde, 1620), B2^r.

33. *Ibid.*, A2^r.

brawl.³⁴ The demon Rush himself appears in the woodcut as a monk sporting horns and chicken-like feet. The viciousness of the mob beating, while not focused on any one person in the history, most clearly links the woodcut to Lambe's demise, as there were no monks present in the crowd by any account of his death. The illustration also has a curious resonance with the close of Act 3, scene 2 in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, where an invisible Faustus and Mephistopheles beat up a group of friars, but this is likely mere coincidence rather than a point of significance.

The Faustus woodcut appearing just under the ballad's title, however, is far more interesting. This illustration portrays a man wearing seventeenth-century doctor's robes standing inside a circle of astrological symbols; in his left hand he holds an open book and his right a staff or wand. On the wall behind him, from left to right, is an armillary sphere; a closed window; a shelf holding a set of three books and some sort of round instrument, possibly an astrolabe; and, beneath the shelf, a cross. In the foreground, a black devil, winged, clawed, horned, and tailed, emerges through a hole in the floor, beckoning to the man. The illustration first appeared as an engraving that accompanied a 1598 ballad about the German Doctor Faustus.³⁵ However, the image is more commonly associated with its initial appearance in woodcut, which was used on the title page of the 1616 B-text edition of Marlowe's play *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* printed for John Wright and reused for subsequent editions in 1620, 1624, and 1631. As Gaskill has observed, when the illustration appeared on Parker's ballad about Lambe in 1628 it was "a visual reference which many—in London at least—

34. *Ibid.*, B1^v-B3^f.

35. W. Chappell and Joseph Woodfall Ebsworth, eds., *The Roxburghe Ballads* (New York: AMS, 1966), 6:703.

would have understood.”³⁶ The woodcut’s presence might suggest an even stronger link between Lambe and Faustus if, for instance, there was evidence suggesting the printer actively sought out the Faustus woodcut for use in the Lambe ballad; the printers of the two texts, Henry Gosson (the ballad) and John Wright (the play), are known to have associated professionally.³⁷ But even without such evidence the inclusion and prominence of this particular woodcut creates two significant connections for the ballad’s subject. It strongly ties Lambe to Faustus, and to Marlowe’s Faustus specifically. But it also reinforces Lambe’s public status as a “doctor” (even if not officially sanctioned as such), especially alongside the ballad text.

III. Identifying the Dangerous Doctor

The term “doctor,” of course, was neither then as now exclusive to medical professionals but could also indicate a doctorate in another field, such as theology or law. Although the title does apply to both Lambe and Faustus in its medical sense, its use in any sense underscores the perceived weight of the label “doctor” and the expectations and responsibilities it carried in early modern culture. The title “doctor” indicated a person who was exceptionally learned and who laid claim to a certain amount of social privilege. One historical paradigm figures the collegiate physicians as occupying a “middling sort” of social standing, a kind of predecessor to the middle class. Pelling suggests the physicians may have provided “a template” for the middle-class values that

36. Gaskill, 296-97. Gaskill records “at least ten editions of the play . . . including one in 1628,” a claim supported by the *ESTC*; but as there are not images of all ten editions in the *Early English Books Online* database, I can only confirm the four for which I am certain the woodcut was used.

37. See Natascha Würzbach, *The Rise of the English Street Ballad, 1550-1650*, trans. Gayna Walls (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 19.

would later evolve in English society “with their dependency on decorum, ... their sensitivity about social privilege, their faith in rational negotiation, their appeal to legislation, and, above all, their definitive emphasis on (but not involvement in) education.”³⁸ That Lambe aligned himself with a group of such anxiety-prone and anxiety-producing social standing, coupled with the favoritism he enjoyed from a prominent member of the upper class, pits him against the apprentices and “boyes of the towne” who mobbed and killed him. More deeply encoding Lambe as a “doctor” through use of the Faustus woodcut may have also served to underscore Lambe’s culpability by aligning him with the evil Doctor Faustus, thereby making the public less complicit in his death as a wrongdoing. Parker’s ballad clearly labels its subject “Doctor Lambe” not only in the title but also in its twenty-five verses, wherein he is referred to as “Doctor Lambe” four times, “the Doctor” twice, and never by his surname alone.³⁹ There is no specific mention of the medical aspect of his practice, but Parker provides no examples of his magic either, simply stating, “I neede name none on’s feates, / That are well knowne olready.”⁴⁰ The ballad, buttressed by its link to Marlowe’s play, thus reinforces the cultural idea that “doctors” are inherently dangerous because of the way both literary artifacts (Parker’s ballad and Marlowe’s play) demonstrate them behaving.

Misbehaving doctors were one of the main types of “irregular” practitioners targeted by the College of Physicians, although the full gamut of practitioners appear in the College’s records as recipients of a wide variety of punishments (sometimes only threatened, often realized) meted out by the official governing professional medical body.

38. Pelling, 15.

39. All other references are simple, standard singular masculine pronouns.

40. Parker, “Tragedy,” ll. 31-32.

The College of Physicians “was the premier medical corporation of early modern England” and had “the task and intention of controlling all practitioners of physic in the capital, as well as the supervision of what it regarded as the subordinate institutions regarding the medical art.”⁴¹ The college awarded licenses, but on a strict and limited basis, and anyone caught practicing without one could be punished by fine or imprisonment. The previous ecclesiastical licensing system (to which Lambe laid claim, and which the College worked aggressively to replace) had been more inclusive, and “the College effectively defined itself by ‘prosecuting’ those whom it saw, and described, as ‘irregular’ practitioners.”⁴² In order to maintain its control, the College actively sought to punish these “irregulars” any time their behavior caused detriment, perceived or real, to the institution or the general public.

Lambe first came to the College’s attention on May 7, 1619. The complainant was one Matthias Evans, who is only identified in the Annals of the College as a resident of the Minories (also known as Minories Holy Trinity), a former civil parish located near the Tower of London. The College’s record identifies Lambe as “a notable Mountebank and Impostor.” Evans accuses Lambe of supplying unsuccessful treatments and charging excessive fees, listing no fewer than eighteen individual patients to whom Lambe “gave physick to and gott great sommes of money thereby this last yere,” including two women who died while under Lambe’s care. Evans also observes that Lambe was “a quack ‘yt he called all ye Collegiates asses and Dunces,” which cannot have sat well with the College. After Evans had supplied all of his evidence, the College concluded that “Lambe should

41. Pelling, 1.

42. Ibid., 2.

be summoned and that when he appeared, Evans, who had made this statement, should be present.”⁴³ Apparently, however, Lambe never made that appearance, as there is no further record of him the Annals for several years. The incident highlights one of the major flaws in the College’s attempts at control: Even when extensive evidence of malpractice was laid before them, they had no means by which to pursue prosecution. The College could only leverage the defendant’s desire to stay in the institution’s good graces as a way to convince individuals to appear before them. When irregular practitioners, such as Lambe, had no care for the College’s sanction they merely continued their practice. While such behavior would certainly hurt their reputation, such practitioners also seem to have risked little other consequence unless they behaved badly enough to run afoul of the law or a large enough portion of the public, both situations Lambe would later encounter.⁴⁴

Lambe’s first serious legal troubles came in 1622, when he was tried at the Worcester assizes and “found guilty of two severall Inditements; one from unchristian and damnable practices against the person of an Honourable Peere of this Realme; and the other for damnable invocation and worship of evill Spirits.”⁴⁵ The acts of witchcraft for which Lambe found himself on trial had supposedly occurred in 1607 and 1608 and were committed against Thomas, sixth Lord Windsor. Luckily for Lambe, for reasons that are now unclear, he was saved from the gallows by a reprieve and instead imprisoned, first at Worcester Castle and then at the King’s Bench prison in London

43. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 125.

44. For further examples of practitioners who resisted or refused to appear before the College of Physicians, see Lauren Kassell, *Medicine and Magic in Elizabethan London: Simon Forman: Astrologer, Alchemist, and Physician* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 87.

45. *Briefe Description*, A3^r.

where “with the freedom of movement and actions allowed by many early prisons, he resumed his practice as a magical healer and counselor.”⁴⁶ While imprisoned at King’s Bench, Lambe made the acquaintance of Buckingham, whose favor proved essential when Lambe encountered further legal charges in 1624. This time Lambe was accused of raping an 11-year-old girl who had delivered herbs to his cell. Convicted of the rape, Lambe again avoided the gallows when Buckingham secured him a royal pardon that also released him from prison.⁴⁷ Not only was Lambe’s indebtedness to Buckingham thereby secured, but also the worst side of his character seemed to have been revealed.⁴⁸

Lambe immediately returned to his questionable practice, but finally found himself unable to avoid appearing before the College of Physicians in December of 1627 when the Bishop of Durham had Lambe himself deliver them a letter explicitly requesting that the collegiate physicians examine the purported doctor’s level of fitness. Doctor Lambe by now was in his early eighties, just six months prior to his murder.⁴⁹ In this instance the record in the Annals themselves provides a clear and concise summary of the situation:

The reputation of this man namely John Lambe had been on the lips of everyone for some time, due to his knowledge of magic, astrology and of

46. Bellany, 50.

47. See Bellany, 50, and Gaskill, 293.

48. On the dismissal of the rape conviction, Gaskill reports the following: “The lord chief justice, Sir James Ley, one of Buckingham’s kinsmen and judicial appointments, arranged a meeting with Lambe which wavered between interrogation and consultation... Ley undermined the evidence for the rape, having secured proof that the victim was still a virgin and that her ‘lewde & contentious’ mother had once falsely accused neighbours of bewitching the girl” (293). The *ODNB* entry for Lambe comments, “Ley found that the girl’s father owed Lambe money, and that the charge of rape had only been laid some weeks later when Lambe tried to recover this debt.”

49. On Lambe’s age, see Bellany, 37-38.

other mystic sciences. For which reason he was esteemed by not a few women of rank and was supported on a generous scale at their expense. But this most wretched rascal had been known to the College previously on account of tricks and many shameful deeds. When at that very time by the command of some nobles he was held in prison, in order to free himself he pretended to be a physician to the Bishop of Durham, from whom he might have concealed the extent of his charges. Wherefore he was sent by the aforesaid Bishop to the College and as will be seen from the following examination was found to be alien from all erudition or rather completely stupid.⁵⁰

The Bishop of Durham at this time was Richard Neile, who is described by his biographer as a man of “practical rather than academic proclivities” and who was, in his own words, “counted as a heavy-headed lubber” at school.⁵¹ Neile was well liked by James I and, despite his diocese’s location in York, “was a devoted Londoner who ... always spent the bulk of the year in London,” making his relationship with Lambe more understandable.⁵² Neile ensured Lambe’s personal appearance before the College of Physicians by making Lambe the bearer of the letter regarding his own capabilities. In the

50. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 241.

51. Andrew Foster, “Richard Neile (1562–1640),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004). Interestingly, Neile was at St. John’s College Cambridge between 1580 and 1600, the same time frame during which Crooke studied there, although no existing record indicates they met. A 1615 copy of *Mikrokosmographia* at the Royal College of Surgeons has its title page inscribed with the name “Wm Neile” and the date November 14, 1616; Richard Neile had an elder brother named William who kept house for him for over twenty years prior to 1625 (*ODNB*), and the copy could conceivably have belonged to him.

52. *Ibid.*

letter, which is copied in the College's Annals, the bishop explains that Lambe had "professed" to him that he had for some time made a living by practicing "Phisicke and Chirurgery, whereto by his long experience and practise he holdeth himself sufficient, affirming that he hath done many and great Cures in each Kind." The bishop also asserts that Lambe has been sent to the College upon the command of "His Majestie" James I so that the physicians "may both deliver your opinions of his fitness as also take such further course with him according to your opinions of his worth as appertayneth to the care and trust of the welfare of his Majesties Subjectes inhabiting in and about the City of London by Law committed unto you."⁵³

There were twelve collegiate physicians present at Lambe's examination, including the president John Argent. Also present was Crooke, who had by that time been elected one of four censors. The duty of the censors was "to enquire about all practitioners of medicine both native and alien in London, in the suburbs and throughout the kingdom, to examine, correct and govern them, if necessary to prosecute them at law, to learn what were their methods of treatment, to judge medicines, to burn or throw away those that were vitiated and to report recalcitrant apothecaries to the president and College."⁵⁴ Newly elected to his post, Crooke undoubtedly had a direct and vested interest in the examination of Lambe. Although the Annals record the questions posed to Lambe as well as his responses, they do not say which physicians were directly responsible for the examination. However, Crooke's signature is one of only six given at

53. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 240-41.

54. Clark, 1:92.

the close of the letter the College sent by way of response to the Bishop of Durham, indicating he played a key role in the proceedings.

The collegiate physicians, as they report in their letter, gave Lambe every accommodation. They allowed him to be examined in English rather than the standard Latin, and they asked him “in the easiest way of Phisicke and Chirurgery, that we could think of.” The record of Lambe’s examination lists his responses to seven points of inquiry. Reading them closely, two things become clear: Lambe was quite clever, but he had absolutely no actual medical knowledge. For instance, when asked the signs by which he recognized any given disease, Lambe responded, “He knoweth no signes but only as he is told by the party.” Lambe’s implication that he based his practice solely on the patient’s specific complaint is a sly dig according to one of the common complaints about physicians, whom patients suspected of inventing more complex diseases to elicit more costly cures. When questioned about the surgical technique known as “Revulsion or Derivation,” Lambe merely insisted that the terminology was unfamiliar to him. Finally, when the College challenged him regarding “the notoriousnes of his practise and publique fame,” Lambe protested that he could not help it if people came to him and maintained “that all he did was trifles, fooleryes, and bables to gett a little mony.”⁵⁵ He seemed to think that if he could make himself look trivial enough, the College would merely dismiss him as insignificant.

The College, of course, was not fooled. One of its most senior members, Sir William Paddy, carried the official response to the bishop. In their letter the physicians indicate their appreciation that the Bishop of Durham had finally “Caused the offender to

55. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 242-43.

be brought hether, as the true and proper place of his Tryall.” They maintain the ease and fairness of the proceedings, but conclude “Mr. Lamb standes Convict and guilty of all manner insufficiency and ignorance.”⁵⁶ Despite their complete and utter damnation of Lambe, the College’s conclusions had little real-world impact. No formal action was taken against him, possibly because of Buckingham’s influence, a situation that of course would be addressed by the public a few months later. The College’s failure to take action against a practitioner threatening enough to incite mob violence presents another salient example of their incompetency in trying to maintain control of the medical sphere in London. But Lambe’s examination before the College illuminates the institution’s management failures in another sense. By historical definition, both Lambe and Crooke fall into the same category, “irregular practitioners,” as individuals called before the College to account for their actions in the medical marketplace. Although both were initially called before the College for accusations of misconduct in the 1610s, these men’s actual actions and career paths are so divergent that a decade later Crooke is a fellow and elected officer of the College who participates in the prosecution of Lambe. Such evidence is entirely circumstantial, but it still points to the pettiness and misdirection of some of the complaints on which the College wasted its time and energy.

IV. Truth and Consequences

While Crooke found some redemption (at least for the time being), both Lambe and Faustus come to ruin, the former beaten to death by a mob and the latter dragged off by a host of demons, their poor choices and misbehavior meeting the ultimate punishment. But the magic they practiced while still living reflects a worldview too

56. *Ibid.*, 242.

complex to be reduced to such a simple morality. One of the things that must have made these men both remarkable and fearful to their audiences—Faustus playing on stage, Lambe performing tricks in parlors—was their willingness to defy the supremacy of God. It is no surprise that the literary culture of early modern London moralized the narratives of characters like Faustus and Lambe. But the social changes such works reflect are about more than a predominating moral message. The correlation between “magic” doctors and the changing values of their time illustrates a period of significant professional and cultural transition. The Faust of German legend is wicked because he chooses human knowledge over knowledge of the divine, preferring his doctorate of medicine over his doctorate of divinity. Marlowe retains this detail; in the play’s opening lines, Faustus proclaims his dissatisfaction with divinity, asserting instead, “Be a physician, Faustus. Heap up gold / And be eternized for some wondrous cure.”⁵⁷ But this occupation is not enough for him either; frustrated that he has not been able to “make man to live eternally / Or, being dead, raise them to life again,” Faustus turns to the “metaphysics of magicians” for the ultimate power trip.⁵⁸

Doctor Lambe’s path to sorcery followed a similar trajectory in that he also established himself as a doctor first and conjuror second. For Faustus, the authority of his knowledge came from the university education he already had; his books feature prominently in the play. But Lambe did not have such a pedigree. As Owen Davies explains in his historical study of magician-healers such as Lambe, “assuming the title of ‘Doctor’ was an important first step.... Healing was central to their business and having

57. *Doctor Faustus*, 1.1.13-14.

58. *Ibid.*, 1.22-23, 48.

an appropriate title generated social respect.”⁵⁹ Such social respect could rapidly build to animosity, however, when practitioners took advantage of the power generated by people’s trust. The *Briefe Description* of Lambe’s life could as well describe Faustus when it says, “The first steppe that euer hee made towards that wicked course, which hee was afterwards accused for, was the profession of that noble and deepe Science of Physicke, (a colour which many base Impostours have used to lewde and juggling practises, as the best things are subject to the greatest abuses).”⁶⁰ This passage describes what the two men’s career paths both demonstrate: practicing medicine is a personally and publically beneficial profession, but magic is dangerous and inevitably leads to ruin. The assertion of the common narrative in the ballad and the play predicts and encourages the imminent cultural shift away from “the metaphysics of magicians” to the “noble and deepe Science of Physicke” as the safer and more reliable means of healing.

The example of Lambe and Faustus also shows the complexity of the connections among historical events, textual records, and fictional literary representations. Because books, plays, pamphlets, and ballads are material objects, they can have both physical and conceptual relationships to one another. Coincidence—of a word or a woodcut—is not always mere happenstance; it is often co-incidence, demonstrating meaningful correspondence and confluence. Closely examining the full documentary landscape reveals a clearer picture not only of early modern culture itself but also of the individuals who comprise that culture.

59. Davies, 73-74.

60. *Briefe Description*, A2^r.

Chapter 7: Bedlam and Beyond

ALIBIUS: By madmen and fools we both do thrive.
– Middleton & Rowley, *The Changeling*

I. Bedlam's Keeper

As the previous chapter shows, Crooke found professional respectability during the latter part of his career in his capacity as a fellow and censor of the College of Physicians, and his role in the examination of John Lambe landed him on the side of triumph. But Crooke also remained the ambitious physician who had sought out training with a world-renowned anatomist and achieved the king's favor in defiance of his own professional institution. He was not content to rest on his modest but respectable laurels and while away the days attending comitia. Instead, Crooke looked beyond the realm of his professional body to the civic sphere, which promised both great risk and higher reward, although it is likely the latter that occupied his vision.¹ In 1619, capitalizing on the continued favor of King James I and rankling administrative disfavor with the man currently holding the position, Crooke catalyzed the removal of the keeper of Bethlem Hospital and obtained the post for himself. The story of his installment and tenure there, however, has been subject to widely varying accounts and interpretations, including (not unlike the infamous Doctor Lambe) popular fictional versions that may have carried significant weight for the public's, and history's, view of him.

The College president received “a letter of submission” from Crooke that he read aloud to the College on July 3, 1618. The Annals record the letter, apparently in its

1. I use the word “civic” in Decamp's sense, pertaining to “the world of urban governance, community and administrative affairs” (5), in apposition to the professional realm of the College of Physicians that was “a social resort” (Clark, 1:185) and comprised the daily business of private practice.

entirety. With all due respect and humility, Crooke suggests he has been kept “in suspense for the whole of these five years,” a reference to the amount of time that has passed since he was made candidate.² The institution’s charter mandated a limited number of fellowships, and those members holding candidacy usually had to wait for an existing fellow to die before a place became available.³ In the meantime, however, candidates could be put to a vote and made “fellow-elect,” effectively putting them next in line, the status Crooke apparently sought with his apology. In his letter Crooke makes a strong effort at appearing humble. While admitting to “bombastic stirring and patronising language,” he insists he engaged in such behavior only because he “forgot that it was not pleasing to you.” He appeals to the College’s “spirit of tolerance” in his wish to be allowed “to satisfy my sense of duty towards you as well as to myself.” The twenty members present (including the president) must have found the missive satisfactorily convincing, as the entry subsequently notes, “After this the President proposed that Dr. Crooke should be elected into the next vacant place as a Fellow. Thence in a ballot he was elected by seventeen votes on that account,” a majority even O’Malley would be hard pressed to call “grudging,” despite Crooke’s erstwhile inflammatory encounters.⁴

Crooke submitted a complaint against Thomas Jenner, the sitting keeper of Bethlem Hospital, in late 1618, after being made fellow-elect by the College of

2. Physicians were expected to practice medicine in London for at least four years before being considered eligible for election to fellowship; Clark, 1:133.

3. Death was not strictly the only way a fellowship could open; Crooke himself would ultimately sell his fellowship back to the College in 1635, ostensibly because he was leaving London but probably also because the legal proceedings surrounding his removal from Bethlem had bankrupted him (see below).

4. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 114.

Physicians.⁵ The central charges leveled by Crooke were that Jenner was “not fitted for his office” and “was inadequate in medical matters.” On December 10 James I issued an official commission to twenty-four individuals including the Bishop of London, several judges, multiple city aldermen, and two physicians to examine how Bethlem was being run and identify anyone in a position of authority who ought to be replaced. Crooke was recommended to supervise the hospital in the meantime and was provided a small allowance from the hospital revenues in support of his role.⁶

However, a more complex civic conflict existed beyond Crooke’s accusations regarding Jenner, whose misdeeds were apparently already known. Five months prior to the king’s formal commission, “the Court of Aldermen had already set up their own committee to hear and examine ‘all the complaints made against the keeper of Bethlem and his deputy,’” and within two days they had Jenner and his deputy Edward Harper committed to Newgate; as early as October 1618 another Court of Aldermen committee was already considering a recommendation from James I that Crooke be put in charge of the hospital. This evidence points to some level of disagreement over who was in control of Bethlem, the king or the city government, and a fair amount of posturing in James I’s commission.⁷ Crooke may have been aware of the tension and saw himself in a position to gain from it. As Allderidge points out, Crooke’s motives are simply not discernable from the extant evidence. What is clear by all accounts is that Jenner had to go, and

5. Bethlem was known colloquially as “bedlam” and is the etymological origin of the term. The hospital was originally founded as the Priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem in 1247; see Andrews et al., 131.

6. Patricia Allderidge, “Management and Mismanagement at Bedlam, 1547-1633,” in *Health, Medicine, and Morality in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Charles Webster, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979), 155.

7. *Ibid.*, 155-56.

Crooke was all but guaranteed the post by his favor with the king. However, that favoritism alone may have been enough to sour the Aldermen against him, given the conflict between their court and the king in the struggle for control of the hospital.

Crooke was the first physician since the fifteenth century to serve as keeper at Bethlem, where he was installed on April 13, 1619.⁸ He was not without a rival to the post; one John Perie was also put up for election. But Perie stood little chance against the long line of recommendations Crooke had managed to secure on his own behalf, which included letters from the king, the Duke of Buckingham, and the commissioners of the Jenner inquiry, including the Bishop of London and the Lord Chief Justice.⁹ After the management problems the hospital had suffered for the past century, Crooke, as the new keeper, was required to agree to a series of articles, which were supplied prior to the election. Allderidge points out that by the end of his tenure Crooke would have broken each and every one of these promises “to the point of complete reversal,” but she also observes that Crooke’s agreement to the articles in the first place “may indicate that at the beginning he really did intend *se bene gerere*,” to conduct himself well.¹⁰ Even O’Donoghue admits, “I see no reason to doubt the sincerity of his demand for sweeping reforms—in the flush of his enthusiasm.”¹¹ Crooke petitioned the king for specific, actionable changes, including greater financial support from the crown as well as the separation of the governance of the hospitals Bridewell and Bethlem, which had been placed under joint administration in 1557 and badly mismanaged almost ever since.

8. “Three of the Hospital’s fifteenth-century Wardens, as they were usually known at the time, also served as physicians or surgeons to the King”; Andrews et al., 85.

9. Allderidge, 156-57.

10. Ibid., 157.

11. O’Donoghue, 158.

Unfortunately, Crooke clashed with the hospital's governing board almost as soon as he was installed. The years of ensuring conflict, primarily over financial concerns and questions of transparency over how money was being spent, have caused many historians to label Crooke as greedy and ambitious.¹² But Allderidge asserts that "if his recommendation had been followed through and the hospital had been given its own separate administration, the history of the care of the insane over the next 200 years might have been radically different."¹³ Installing proper governance and ensuring adequate care of patients of course did require a certain amount of funding, and tensions between the crown, the City, and the hospital's governors could not have been helpful to Crooke's situation.¹⁴

The tensions with the board of governors at Bethlem, however, do not seem to have had any impact on Crooke's standing with the College of Physicians, likely because the hospital's civic management was beyond their purview. Whatever Crooke's perceived faults were in his new role as keeper, they were not anything that affronted the College. Crooke finally had the opportunity to be made a fellow of the College at the comitia of April 10, 1620, when two former fellows died. The record of that meeting states that the names of all the current candidates "were carefully examined" but Crooke and another physician present, Dr. Thomas Bowne, both "earnestly sought election." Sir William Paddy, however, raised the matter of some of Crooke's former conflicts with the College

12. See O'Donoghue, 167-68; O'Malley calls him "shameless" (14).

13. Allderidge, 156.

14. My conclusions align with those of Allderidge, who writes, "Crooke's whole association with Bethlem is closely tied up with the complicated political relationships existing between the crown and the rich merchants who governed the City and its hospitals" (156).

in objection to his immediate election as a fellow (although he mentions nothing of Bethlem). Crooke appears to have attempted a rejoinder, but an unnamed physician intervened by pointing out that Crooke's promotion to fellow-elect two years earlier "had been decreed by the President, Dr. Atkins" who held seniority over Paddy and who reinforced his former action by again proposing Crooke as a fellow, along with Bowne. Despite the vote Crooke had already (successfully) gone through, the 23 members present voted again on both candidates becoming fellows. Crooke was elected by the minimum numbers of votes needed, twelve, and Bowne by nineteen. Although neither could actually be made a fellow at that meeting as they both had long outstanding debts to the College for previous years' dues and fees, they both managed to pay in full at the next meeting on April 21, 1620, and on that day were officially admitted Fellows of the College of Physicians.¹⁵

II. Enter Alibius

In 1622 Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, first licensed Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's new play *The Changeling* to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's servants at the Phoenix.¹⁶ Scholars have long speculated that the play's madhouse keeper, a character named Alibius, may have been based on Crooke, who by then had served as keeper of Bethlem Hospital for the past three years. The connection holds merit; in addition to the fitting timeline, the character Alibius is specified a "doctor," and Crooke was the first medical man to hold the keeper position in some two hundred years. He

15. RCP, Annals Transcription MS, vol. III, 135-36.

16. N. W. Bawcutt, "Introduction," in *The Changeling* by Thomas Middleton and William Rowley (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958), xxiv; he also writes, "The earliest record of an actual performance dates from 4 January 1623/4, when the play was produced at Court" (xxv).

would also be the last person to hold the position at all, as after his removal in 1633 the hospital was run by a steward who answered directly to a board of governors, marking a significant milestone in the evolution of the institution's administration.¹⁷ Ultimately, however, it does not matter whether any Jacobean playwright had Crooke explicitly in mind when crafting a madhouse-keeper character for the London stage (and there is little hope of proving such a thing anyway). The historical situation and the dramatic works matter together not for any direct influence on one another but for the distinct and concurrent viewpoints they provide onto the culture of spectacle and theater in early seventeenth-century England. As literary scholar Ken Jackson points out in his study of the relationship between Bethlem and the early modern stage, "In the case of Bethlem, in some extraordinary sense, literature is history, history literature"; yet no one has yet paid sustained attention to Crooke as one of the central figures in this "extraordinary" moment of crux.¹⁸ Examining the differences between actual spectacle and enacted theater illuminates how the confluence of the historical drama playing out at Bethlem and the dramatic representations of bedlam on the popular stage have influenced Crooke's characterization and the role of his life and work in the study of the early modern period.

Conducting work that closely integrates historical study with literary analysis can be tricky, but "fictions encode culture as do facts, and form part of the landscape of

17. Allderidge, 163.

18. Ken Jackson, *Separate Theaters: Bethlem ("Bedlam") Hospital and the Shakespearean Stage* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005), 20. Jackson's book combines historical and literary study to illuminate two "distinct, but related, cultural institutions"—the hospital and the stage—that "each had a decidedly different function" (eliciting sympathy or providing pleasure, respectively) in order to show how performance shaped early modern concepts of charity and madness (34). He mentions Crooke repeatedly, but the physician's story is not where Jackson's focus lies.

history, not obstacles spoiling the view.”¹⁹ Jackson’s work provides one model in addressing the same perceptible connections between history and fiction as this chapter, albeit with a different focus. While Jackson is concerned with “mad shows” conducted in real life and on stage in the context of eliciting charitable giving, he connects Crooke to the dramatic literature in order “to traverse a particular literary history” with the goal of producing “a productive historical conversation.”²⁰ I take a similar approach but maintain focus on Crooke and his historical situation and reputation, considering the ways in which fictional representations of madhouse keepers on stage influenced the culture of which Crooke was also a part, as an actual keeper with real consequences to his words and actions. In chapter 6, Crooke functions as an exemplar against which Lambe’s conduct and the literature describing his life can be examined. In this chapter, the deep confluence between history and literature forms part of the landscape of Crooke’s own life, revealing a view of the physician that in many ways contradicts the manner in which he has heretofore been remembered.

O’Donoghue initially suggests that the timing of Crooke’s appointment as Keeper of Bethlem positioned him as a possible model for Alibius. Upon observing that Crooke was elected keeper in 1619, O’Donoghue muses, “In this year or the next Middleton must have been writing the greatest of his plays, ‘The Changeling.’ In it we hear ‘the chimes of Bedlam go’: a comic scene is transferred from such a ward as ours; and one of the characters is the keeper of the house—possibly Dr. Crooke.”²¹ While, as chaplain of Bethlem, O’Donoghue had unparalleled access to the institution’s records, his research

19. Gaskill, 297-98.

20. Jackson, 20-21.

21. O’Donoghue, 158.

methods and approach to his subject matter are not those of a trained historian, and his writing takes a rather less-than-scholarly tone. Still, his hefty tome remained the central reference on the hospital's storied past until the respective work of Patricia Allderidge in the 1970s and Jonathan Andrews in the 1990s. Meanwhile, in 1952 literary scholar Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr., also suggested a direct connection between Crooke and Alibius. Citing O'Donoghue's earlier observation, Reed notes, "The two men have definite similarities; Alibius, in the manner of Dr. Crooke ... leaves the management of his asylum to his steward" and "has no professional scruple against easy money" as well as "a close connection at court," a reference to Crooke's support from James I.²² The similarity between the two keepers' recorded conduct has remained their most notable point of connection, in large part because it comprises the bulk of extant knowledge regarding each. Still, the potential reference is convincing enough to be recorded by Birken in his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Crooke, which mentions, "The greedy mad-doctor, Alibius, in Thomas Middleton's play *The Changeling*, first performed in 1622, may have been modeled on the public and stormy tenure of Crooke at Bethlem."²³

In his 1958 preface to The Revels Plays edition of *The Changeling*, N. W. Bawcutt takes a firm stance against interpreting Alibius as a representation of Crooke, insisting that "Reed is overstating his case" (xxxvii). Bawcutt's counterargument relies primarily on one assertion:

22. Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr., *Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1952), 47-48.

23. Presumably the designation "mad-doctor" is meant to indicate that Alibius is a doctor to the mad, not that the doctor himself is insane, which the character shows no sign of being (despite his perhaps paranoid jealousy regarding his wife).

All the mad-house scenes mentioned above [i.e., all those in Jacobean drama] ... have strong generic resemblances, and must all owe a good deal to Bethlehem Hospital ... All these mad-houses, real or fictitious, admit “daily visitants,” and have a governor with one or more assistants. In all the plays mentioned it is quite customary, when a new patient is brought to the asylum, for the keeper to be given a sum of money to look after him.²⁴

In other words, Bawcutt sees no distinctive feature of Alibius or his madhouse that identifies the setting of the play’s sub-plot as Bedlam Hospital *per se* and therefore believes the keeper in *The Changeling* should not be connected to the real-life figure of Crooke as keeper of Bethlem.²⁵ Bawcutt concludes, “It is hard not to feel, in short, that the mad-house of *The Changeling* is not so very much closer to Bethlehem Hospital than the other mad-houses of Jacobean drama, and that if Middleton and Rowley had intended to satirize a contemporary institution and its officials, they would have done so much more plainly,” but he immediately concedes, “As yet no very definite source has been discovered for the incidents which occur in the sub-plot” (xxxvii-xxxviii).

Jackson provides a new reading of *The Changeling* that addresses Bawcutt’s concerns by establishing a missing link that both makes Middleton and Rowley’s satire more apparent and gives a source for the play’s sub-plot. Jackson connects *The Changeling* to an earlier play, John Fletcher’s *The Pilgrim* (1621), and thereby to Crooke. Although other scholars have noticed correspondence between the two plays, Jackson is

24. Bawcutt, xxxvii.

25. While the term “bedlam” is used multiple times in the play’s dialogue, the word was in use as a general reference to a mad person or insane behavior as early as the sixteenth century; *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “bedlam, n.,” def. 3b, 5, 6.

the first to link the association to Crooke.²⁶ For Jackson, the subplot of *The Changeling* directly responds to Fletcher and *The Pilgrim*, reshaping Fletcher's "valorized" madhouse keeper into a "satirical, sexualized version" of charity.²⁷ In this reading, Middleton and Rowley "recast Fletcher's 'master,'" changing him from a "skilled, careful physician that shows the mad [to the public] as a charitable function" into the "money-motivated and newly stagestruck Alibius who tries to take pitiful sights and make them a 'frightful pleasure.'"²⁸ Jackson sees both the madhouse sub-plot and the keeper character of *The Changeling* as created in direct response to and comment on Fletcher's play.

The Pilgrim fits into the timeline, having been dated by Fredson Bowers to "sometime between 18 September 1621 ... and New Year's Day, 1622, when the play was performed."²⁹ Crooke would have held of the office of keeper of Bethlem for a full two years prior, plenty of time for his service to inspire creative response in the playwright, even if the play's audience was probably not generally aware of Crooke or his situation. Fletcher's play features a "Master," who is in charge of the madhouse, and two "Keepers" who handle the patients.³⁰ As Jackson notes, a key difference between *The Pilgrim* and *The Changeling* is that in the former actors portray actual madmen on the

26. See Jackson, 287n.

27. Ibid., 229, 231.

28. Ibid., 231.

29. Fredson Bowers, ed., *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985), 6:113.

30. The individual officially in charge of Bethlem Hospital was known as its Master, Warden, or Keeper at various (and often concurrent) times throughout history, and the terms are used largely interchangeably in current scholarship. The crucial point for the study at hand is that the office was abolished after Crooke, who was the last person to serve in that particular capacity at Bethlem. For more on the complex and continually shifting hierarchy of management during the hospital's first 400 years, see Andrews et al., 84-91.

stage whereas in the latter actors only portray gentlemen feigning madness. In a further notable variance, the actions and behavior of the Master in *The Pilgrim* are more clearly respectable than those of Alibius in *The Changeling*.

Jackson's treatment of Crooke's relationship to the two plays remains tentative. While he does discuss the real-life physician and references the historical situation and cultural conditions of Crooke's keepership at Bethlem, he refrains from making a clear claim regarding influence, preferring the more conservative realm of possibility. For instance, Jackson observes of *The Pilgrim*,

The challenge to the master's authority and skill, followed by a quick and dramatic confirmation of that authority and skill, could be seen as a gesture of affirmation towards King James's controversial appointee: Hilkiah Crooke. ... In a stark contrast, the master of the madhouse in *The Changeling*, Alibius, requires reformation (5.3.210-16). The play ends with his "change," like Crooke's fate, still to come.³¹

There are several further examples of such qualifying language scattered throughout Jackson's discussion of the two plays, but his restraint does not go without explanation. Jackson asserts that even if Crooke is accepted as the model for the characters in *The Pilgrim* and *The Changeling* "we should not begin by speculating about topical connections" but rather should recognize, "to the extent that Middleton and Rowley are responding to James, Crooke and ... Bethlem, their response is mediated by the dramatic

31. Jackson, 217. The latter statement is a reference to the fact that at the time *The Changeling* was first performed Crooke's conduct as keeper of Bethlem had come under public scrutiny but he had not yet been removed from office (and would not be until 1633, a decade later). In *Separate Theaters* Jackson spells Crooke's first name alternately as either Helkiah or Hilkiah.

exchange with Fletcher.”³² However, the formula can be refigured another way: the dramatic exchange between the playwrights and their respective plays mediates the cultural perception of Crooke in his role as keeper. In other words, it does not matter whether either, both, or neither of the fictional madhouse keepers were in any way inspired by Crooke, but it matters a great deal how these two fictional madhouse keepers were portrayed on the London stage during Crooke’s actual keepership at a very real London madhouse. Public perception of all three keepers shaped the cultural identity of that position at a time when the office was under intense scrutiny, an object of political and civic contention, and, as it would turn out, in its final incarnation. The performative aspects not only of the popular theater and the madhouse spectacle but also of Crooke’s public and professional identity illuminate the underlying assumptions that shaped public perception at that time and have influenced historical memory since.

III. Performance and the Physician

Crooke’s status as a physician constitutes a crucial aspect of his tenure at Bethlem Hospital and the relationship between Bethlem and the stage. Features of performance figured in multiple areas of early modern medical practice, from physician education to patient treatment. Perhaps the most commonly recognized point of connection between medical practice and performance is the parallel scholars such as Sawday and Hillary M. Nunn have drawn between the popular theater and the anatomy theater. In the medieval era dissections were highly scripted affairs with specially trained participants strictly following a designated process. In the sixteenth century Vesalius introduced a new energy into the dissection performance by taking on multiple roles himself and actively

32. Jackson, 229.

arguing over Galen's ancient text as he conducted anatomies, which did more to raise the entertainment value of the anatomy theater than reduce its ritualistic force. During the Renaissance, physicians and surgeons across Europe attended dissections in purpose-built anatomy theaters in order to learn about the human body. Members of the general public also had the opportunity to view anatomy demonstrations, usually for a fee, although there is some contention regarding how often and in what numbers they actually attended dissections in locations such as London.³³ But according to Nunn, regardless of whether audiences had seen both a dissection and a play, the anatomy theaters of early modern London were run with the same "dynamics of performance" as the popular stage and encouraged "strikingly similar habits of viewing" as those of playgoers.³⁴ Of course, in *The Body Emblazoned* Sawday elucidates the underlying fascination with dissection demonstrably present in Renaissance culture throughout Europe, not only in theater performance but also in all kinds of literature and art. Crooke himself would have been well aware of the performative aspects of dissection due to his own medical training as well as the work he completed in authoring his anatomy manual, which served in one sense as a script for the dissection performance.

Another highly performative aspect of the physicians' profession was visible in the way the doctor presented himself in his interactions with patients and the public, particularly as a means of distinguishing his qualifications above those of the other

33. Decamp claims, "Despite appearances, the early modern anatomy theaters were not straightforwardly parallel to theatrical worlds ... and it does not seem that they were particularly public venues: for the most part they were imaginatively rather than physically accessible" (61), although she does not elaborate further.

34. Hillary M. Nunn, *Staging Anatomies: Dissection and Spectacle in Early Stuart Tragedy* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 204.

medical practitioners who thronged London. A 1651 pamphlet “Written by a Doctor of Physick in Queen Elizabeths dayes” catalogs the sort of personal performance physicians ought to put on in order to differentiate themselves from the “unskillful physitians” its unnamed author warns against, deceitful practitioners such as Lambe. Quoting a range of sources including Hippocrates, Galen, Plato, and “Master Doctor Silvius” of Paris (likely a reference to Jacque Dubois, a leading French anatomist of the sixteenth century), the pamphlet lays out a list of attributes by which a patient should choose a physician:

The Physitian must be of a good colour, and comely countenance, and of a good disposition of the body, he must also be had in estimation among the common-people, by comly apparrell, and by sweet favours (so that he not be suspected of too much excesse) ... the Physitian must see and studie, that he be of a modest and sober mind, and not only concerning modest talk, but also in other things concerning his behaviour, he must be well disposed ... his countenance must be like one that is given to studie, and sad, and yet not overmuch, for he should be taken to be stubborn and scornfull, and like one that disdaineth other mens company: but on the contrary, hee that hath always a laughing countenance, and is given to too much gesture and mirth, is taken for a leud person ... Also he must be just and bear himself upright in all his business and affaires, &c.³⁵

The list, which continues for several pages, includes features of both physical appearance and moral character, not all of which the physician himself could logically control.

35. *A Detection of some Faults in Unskillful Physitians* (London: Gartrude Dawson, 1651), K1^v-K2^r.

However, the list is not meant for the would-be-hired physician to style himself by; rather, the list itemizes the visible characteristics by which readers can judge a potential caregiver. In other words, the description of the physician provided by the pamphlet is not something meant for a doctor to aspire to but rather constitutes an ideal perceived by the patient (functioning, essentially, as an audience), emphasizing the performativity of the physician's professional role.

The importance of the physician's professional performance is further emphasized by the attitudes recorded in the Annals of the College of Physicians, the profession's governing body. The College was extremely concerned with keeping up appearances when it came to the way their licentiates and members conducted themselves. Crooke's repeated presence in the Annals during the years he sought to obtain the votes needed for candidacy to fellowship in the College (1610-1613) provide an excellent example of the institution's concern with the behavior of its members. In April 1612 Crooke questioned why he once more had been refused candidacy and was told the reason was, at least in part, that "not a few instances of obtrusion on his part" had been reported to the College "by a number of people"; Crooke "was advised to behave himself with more regard to authority: and in the meantime the decisions recorded would remain unaltered."³⁶ It would take the young physician a full year of good behavior before he obtained a favorable decision. Crooke was not highly unusual in his struggle to fit the expectations of the College. The Annals are rich with records of complaints about misbehaving physicians—or, perhaps more accurately, physicians perceived as misbehaving by their complainants—and the College's attempts at remonstrance.

36. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 34.

Even after achieving candidacy, Crooke continued to behave in ways that irritated the College's leaders. In 1613 he was called out in front the entire assembly by the president, who rebuked Crooke for too casually wording a letter sent by way of apology for not appearing when called. The Annals note that "because it concerned him the President could not easily ignore it, especially when he had hoped for better things from him."³⁷ Crooke was again discussed unfavorably by the leaders of the College upon the publication of his anatomy book, whose graphic depictions of the female body and vernacular language represented to the College's way of thinking absolutely inappropriate ways for a physician to present himself. Although the king's interest in the book may have protected Crooke from more serious professional consequences, the College still resisted advancing him. When Crooke sought promotion to fellow-elect in 1618, one of his seniors objected on the basis that Crooke "had written in a letter to the King that they themselves in public dissections exhibited the human body of either sex to be seen and touched ... from which it seemed that he [Crooke] had brought discredit to the College and our anatomy lectures."³⁸ Despite Crooke's extensive and detailed retort to the accusation, the apparent impropriety appalled his fellow physicians enough for them to reject his promotion for the time being. In order to make progress with the College, Crooke had to get his behavior in line. In an earnest and eloquent "letter of submission" written two and half months later, Crooke admits, "I have perhaps indulged more than I should in bombastic stirring and patronising language" but insists "I have never talked foolishly to anyone" and that he "is more than anxious to please" his

37. *Ibid.*, 53.

38. *Ibid.*, 111.

professional institution. The letter apparently appeased the members of the College, who voted favorably “that Dr. Crooke should be elected into the next vacant place as a Fellow,” officially making him a fellow-elect.³⁹ Such interactions show that the College valued the same sorts of attributes in their physicians as the anonymous pamphlet discussed above: a modest and sober mind, modest talk, well disposed, upright in all business and affairs.

Even though Crooke seems to have learned to play the part of a respectable physician, the role of Keeper of Bethlem proved a greater challenge. Yet the fault was not necessarily with Crooke’s character at all but largely a feature of the position in which he found himself. Bethlem Hospital, founded as a religious order in 1247, was by the mid-sixteenth century being generally managed by a board of governors who also oversaw the Bridewell hospital and prison (a sort of orphanage and poorhouse to Bethlem’s asylum). However, the city of London was officially responsible for Bethlem and retained control over the keepership.⁴⁰ When the king interfered by installing Crooke, it put the physician in a rather difficult position between the governors, the city alderman, and the throne. Initially, things seem to have gone well enough. Crooke took tangible steps to improving conditions at the hospital, and there are records of multiple early meetings with the governors to acquaint Crooke with the way the institution was run. The new keeper made arrangements for physical improvements, including a new sluiceway to remove foul water from the grounds and new cupboards and shelving units for the kitchen, all within a

39. *Ibid.*, 113-14.

40. Andrews et al., 62-63.

few weeks of his installation.⁴¹ But by November of 1619, just a few months later, the governors were complaining to the city aldermen about Crooke's "business"; the new keeper had asked for more money to support the hospital's patients, one of the things he had explicitly sworn not to do upon taking office. The relationship gradually devolved from there.⁴²

All of the complaints regarding Crooke's behavior as Keeper of Bethlem involved money. He was accused of taking money he should not, failing to give money he should, and accepting money intended to benefit other parties. Crooke's apparent greed is often cited as his main point of connection with Alibius, the madhouse keeper in *The Changeling*. But while Crooke's exact actions and motivations remain obscured to history, the play provides a record of Alibius's aspirations. The fictional keeper plans to take "A mixture of our madmen and our fools" to the castle as wedding entertainment, something he will be paid for doing.⁴³ When his wife, Isabella, expresses some distaste at this behavior, observing that by Alibius's actions "Madmen and fools are a staple commodity," her husband rejoins, "Oh wife, we must eat, wear clothes and live; / ... By madmen and fools we both do thrive."⁴⁴ While the idea that the keeper expects to profit off his patients may initially seem reprehensible, there is a sound logic to the point he makes. For Alibius as for Crooke, the keepership is a form of employment, not one of charity. It is a position with financial responsibilities and a designated income attached.

41. Ibid., 63-64.

42. Ibid., 64.

43. *The Changeling*, 3.3.256.

44. Ibid., 3.3.276-77, 279.

Ostensibly, the patients themselves cannot profit unless their keeper does first.⁴⁵ As with many of the comedic lines spoken on the Jacobean stage, there is a meaningful truth attached to Alibius's rejoinder.

Crooke's keepership perhaps finds more significant redemption, however, in Alibius's predecessor, the Master of Fletcher's earlier play *The Pilgrim*, to which *The Changeling* responds. Even while Alibius's level of despicability is open to interpretation, Fletcher's Master is, as Jackson points out, obviously a more positively-depicted character who represents "a much more compassionate madhouse master, one less interested in staging and finances than in proper treatment of his patients."⁴⁶ The first madhouse scene in *The Pilgrim* depicts a patient who has been erroneously freed by two independent investigators. When the patient suffers a breakdown, the Master quickly and confidently rescues him, reassuring the audience that the patient does indeed belong in the hospital and that the Master is skillful and competent. Jackson notes this scene "could be seen as a gesture of affirmation towards the King James's controversial appointee: Hilkiah Crooke."⁴⁷ So, what if we do see it as such? A positive representation of a madhouse keeper on stage immediately preceding a more negative portrayal could reflect the progression of Crooke's career as keeper, initially positive and swiftly devolving into controversy. It could also indicate, as Jackson's reading suggests, that Alibius is more of a response to Fletcher's Master character than a depiction of Crooke directly.

In their comprehensive history of Bethlem Hospital, Andrews et al. generally praise Crooke as a man of "caliber" who acted as a "harbinger of new thinking" and

45. On the ethics of "the charitable purpose of showing the mad," see Jackson, 228-29.

46. *Ibid.*, 229.

47. *Ibid.*, 217.

played a necessary role in instigating change for the institution; at the same time they remain understandably reluctant to draw any historical conclusions in regard to dramatic representations of Bethlem or its management.⁴⁸ But if the reality of Bethlem cannot be reconstructed from the dramatic fictions it inspired, neither can the truth about Crooke be reclaimed from characterizations crafted for the stage. As Andrews et al. write, “Indeed, far from portraying reality, [Jacobean playwrights] probably contributed to the creation of an unreality.”⁴⁹ Yet neither reality nor fiction is black and white. Jackson rightfully pushes back against Andrews et al., asserting that “‘Bedlam’ fictions are not completely separate and incompatible from Bethlem’s real or material history, but part of the same cultural, historical matrix. ... The relationship between the [real-life] show of Bethlem and the stage, in other words, is more fundamental than representational.”⁵⁰ Likewise, the relationship between the fictional characters and the real historical figure of Crooke is fundamental; the Master and Alibius must be read alongside Crooke as representations created out of the same culture in the same historical moment. All three are versions of what it looked like for a physician to care for mentally unstable patients in full view of the public.

IV. The Beginning of the End

Crooke was relatively secure in his position as Keeper of Bethlem as long as he had the protection of the king, and he managed to avoid much actual interference from the hospital governors until James I’s death in 1625. At that point, however, the governors immediately proceeded to draw up an official complaint against the keeper,

48. Andrews et al., 63, 86, 145; see also 135-36.

49. Ibid., 137.

50. Jackson, 33.

which they submitted to the Court of Aldermen. Regardless, Crooke's conduct cannot have been too egregious, as he was not actually prosecuted until 1632. By that time, the keeper had been relatively absent from the hospital "for several years ... appearing only at quarter days to make up his bills."⁵¹ Initially, most of the complaints were blamed on the steward, who was in charge of daily operations at the hospital; to address that issue, Crooke replaced the existing steward with his own son-in-law, Thomas Bedford, presumably a more reliable administrator. Finally, a second inquiry was conducted in which Crooke was charged on four specific counts, and the Commissioners appointed to the case held no fewer than twenty separate meetings to hear his responses. Crooke's explanations and the Commissioners' rebuttals led to long and heated conversations, with neither party willing to accept the accounts of the other. Part of Crooke's fault may have lain in protesting too much, when he insisted that not only had he not personally profited from the keepership but "he had in fact disbursed over the years £1,000 more than he had received," which the Commissioners found a bit difficult to swallow.⁵² Still, some of Crooke's explanations shed light on what life was really like for the patients of Bethlem hospital. Crooke claimed that when first installed as keeper he had, as a physician, personally treated and healed seventeen patients, but then ceased such work because the governors continuously refused to pay his apothecaries' bills. As Allderidge observes, it was the patients who suffered most because of the political tensions surrounding the hospital's control and operation.⁵³

51. Allderidge, 161.

52. *Ibid.*, 162.

53. *Ibid.*, 163.

On May 24, 1633, Crooke and his son-in-law, as keeper and steward, were both reported for prosecution by the Attorney General for their perceived crimes. Although ultimately Crooke was not put to trial, he was immediately removed from office, and the position of keeper was altogether discontinued at Bethlem. New rules were established which appointed a steward who was responsible for daily affairs and who reported directly to the hospital's governors. Although the change did seem to aid in making it possible to more directly identify which parties were responsible for various aspects of the hospital's management, unfortunately "the governors did not in fact show much more acumen in electing stewards than had their predecessors in choosing masters and keepers."⁵⁴ Income at the hospital was still lower than necessary for adequate care of the patients committed there, and conditions remained harsh. If the situation at Bethlem had instantly or even quickly transformed into something much better, it would be easier to lay more blame upon Crooke. He was not the blameless savior of Bethlem he might have once hoped to become, but in many ways he was made a scapegoat, at least in memory.

The Annals of the College of Physician cast a rather different light on Crooke's professional life during his years as Keeper of Bethlem. Once finally named Fellow in 1620, he appears regularly in the lists of physicians attendant at comitia and other meetings. He was elected one of four Censors in 1627, a post he successfully and effectively held for five consecutive years. In 1629 and again in 1630 he was appointed to give series of lectures on morbid anatomy.⁵⁵ He seems to have been on friendly terms with other members of the College, including William Harvey, whom Crooke extolled as

54. Ibid., 164.

55. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 269, 297.

“most gifted and observant” in the dedication to Charles I that appeared in the second edition of *Mikrokosmographia*, printed in 1631. Although he did not revise the content of his anatomy manual to account for Harvey’s recent discovery regarding the circulation of the blood, Crooke insisted in his dedication that his own study of anatomy had been “deeply cultivated and enriched” by his learned colleague; Birken has observed that these comments of Crooke’s “constitute one of the earliest appreciations of Harvey in print,” a significant first endorsement of a physician whose memory has come to loom large in the history of medicine in England.⁵⁶

But the court proceedings that commenced in 1632 regarding Crooke’s position at Bethlem were drawn out and costly. Furthermore, the new edition of *Mikrokosmographia* printed in 1631, which Crooke may have contributed his own money to funding, was lavish, including a new title page engraved by Droeshout and a treatise on surgical instruments translated by Crooke out of Paré, but it did not sell as well as hoped.⁵⁷ Crooke continued to fight for his reinstatement as Keeper of Bethlem for some time after his removal, but to no avail. Finally, in 1635, the Annals of the College of Physicians record that “being totally to leave the towne [Crooke] was desirous to give over his fellowship, and petitioned Mr. President, that he might have the benefitt of the fees of a fellowes admission to helpe to beare his Charges which was graunted him and he had five pound delivered him by the Treasurer.”⁵⁸ O’Malley almost gleefully conjectures that “the College was happy to grant him five pounds to be rid of him” but Birken more

56. Birken, *ODNB*.

57. See O’Malley, 17, and Birken, *ODNB*. Crooke’s imminent bankruptcy seems to support this reading of the edition’s sales (if he did indeed fund the venture), but no bibliographic evidence yet discovered directly confirms the supposition.

58. RCP, Annals Translation MS, vol. III, 418.

sympathetically observes that Crooke “seems to have become a broken and weary man,” now nearly sixty years old, “driven to selling his fellowship back to the College.”⁵⁹

Although Crooke resigned his position on the premise he was leaving town, it is once again unclear where he went or for how long.⁶⁰ The final official record of his existence notes his burial in Clerkenwell on March 18, 1648. The churchyard has long since been disturbed and no stone remains to mark the place where “this erstwhile medical buccaneer” lies.⁶¹

59. O'Malley, 18; Birken, *ODNB*.

60. O'Donoghue notes that during Crooke's time at Bethlem the physician apparently owned a farm in the country outside of London, as one of the claims he made during the governors' inquiries was that “the hospital was still indebted to him for eggs and butter supplied to the patients from his farm in Essex” (167); possibly it was to thence Crooke retired.

61. O'Malley, 18. Birken commemorates Crooke more positively: “A brilliant and compassionate physician, Crooke's virtues, progressiveness, and accomplishments were obscured by an almost pathological inability to get along with other people or to manage his money; which in turn raises the possibility that Crooke himself may have suffered from the depression or melancholia he tried so hard to relieve in others, and to which he seemed so genuinely sympathetic” (*ODNB*).

Chapter 8: Conclusions Regarding Use and Influence

It remaineth now, that we untie such knots as might in this entrance
intangle us,
and so hinder our progresse to that wished end which we set before us.
– Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*

I. The Otherness of the Past

Reading a four-hundred-year-old anatomy book feels like getting your hands dirty. This is certainly true for those lucky enough to handle a physical copy, feel the calfskin and heavy paper, look for lines of ink and flecks of blood in the wide margins, and wonder what finger left its print or whose wisp of hair remains embedded in the gutter's crevice. But it is also true for those who read electronically via *Early English Books Online*. Even with the database's imperfect images—photocopies of microfiche film, black and white and sometimes barely legible—comes the thrill of perusing a primary source, parsing blackletter type, navigating throngs of long s's, and translating intermittent passages of Latin. It is work. It takes tools, time, and tangible effort. It is, to use Crooke's term, labor.

Such reading takes work for the very reason it beckons the reader in. The same strangeness and unfamiliarity that creates a level of difficulty in the text also fosters wonder. Old books seem to offer a portal to history. They allow their readers to revel in the beguiling otherness of the past, a faraway time when books look and smelled and were made and used differently, a distant reality that seems to gain focus with sustained attention but remains tantalizingly just out of reach.¹ Wonder at the object of study is

1. On "the otherness of the past," see Gabrielle M. Spiegel, who defines it as a "founding belief" of historians that "conferred on history its proper function, which was to recover

good; it motivates and engages the scholar. But a problem occurs when the otherness of the past becomes the Othering of the past, dehumanizing and commodifying history. With few exceptions, books survive the hazards of time because of their ubiquity. When an individual text is separated out as a cultural or literary touchstone, it begins to take on a life of its own distinct from its original agency within the system and community that produced it: It becomes a zombie book. In order to maintain accurate meaning and useful function, a book must remain firmly connected to the place and time in which it was an ordinary object. The fetishization of historical texts can only be avoided by thoroughly and accurately recontextualizing them, recognizing that books are not people but are deeply intimate with the people who write, print, buy, bind, read, copy, and otherwise use them.

Questions of how—and how closely—people engage with books can be especially charged when the relationship is reciprocal. Books such as anatomy manuals are volumes wholly involved with human beings. As explored in this dissertation, early modern anatomy texts such as Crooke’s provide an especially intriguing example for the way they insist on the humanity of their subject.² *Mikrokosmographia* examines the fragmented pieces of the human body in minute detail, but it also insists on the human being’s spiritual, mental, and emotional capacities as fundamental and inseparable aspects of the physical form. For centuries, one of the greatest recognized advances of science was its ability to separate the physical body from the human being, firmly

that past in as close an approximation of ‘how it actually was’ as possible”; “The Task of the Historian,” *American Historical Review* 114.1 (2009): 1.

2. For a broader approach to “learned medicine in the age of medical humanism” (albeit one that does not mention Crooke), see Ian Maclean, *Logic, Signs and Nature in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2002).

demarcating the “hard” sciences from the social sciences and humanities. Recently, however, there has been a resurgence of interest in and support for interdisciplinary work, particularly work demonstrating the value of conducting humanistic and scientific inquiry concurrently and in communication with one another. While a book like *Mikrokosmographia* may not provide a model for twenty-first century scholarship, when considered within the context of its original culture it does provide a useful and relevant case study of how to write about the human being while being human.

II. Visceral Insulation

The price of increased knowledge is often increased anxiety, in some ways a hallmark of modernity. The archaeologist Timothy Taylor writes about “a pervasive cultural style” he calls “visceral insulation,” a term meant to describe “the way in which the necessary specialization of the modern world screens or insulates people from ‘visceral’ things—bodies, blood, death.... Visceral insulation is a recoil from corporeality, as if we feel that, by coming too close to what is bodily, our inevitable mortality will somehow make itself too painfully known.”³ An anatomy text such as *Mikrokosmographia* initially seems to eschew visceral insulation by staring boldfaced at human mortality, providing a literal postmortem of the human corpse. However, there is also a way in which the anatomy manual provides visceral insulation for its reader by inserting itself as a protective layer between the dead body and the student of anatomy; it turns flesh into paper, blood into ink. Crooke tells his reader, “I have set before thee a Mirrour, wherein thou mayst see the true representation of thine owne Originall,

3. Timothy Taylor, *Buried Soul: How Humans Invented Death* (London: Fourth Estate, 2002), 277.

Structure, Growth and Accomplishments” (4Q3^r); but at the same time the mirror perpetuates an image via reflection it also deflects direct engagement with the original subject.⁴ *Mikrokosmographia* offers both corporeal and conceptual insulation from the necessary yet unavoidably disturbing act of human dissection. The incarnation of the physical book form itself seems to promise a sort of immortality, the ultimate insulation from death. Not only do the author’s ideas “live on” through the book, but also books as material objects have proven to enjoy a considerably longer shelf life than people. Many copies of Crooke’s anatomy manual still exist; Crooke himself does not.

Crooke and his book are not one and the same. The history of English literature has proven this statement less obvious than it sounds.⁵ But, in this case, it is an important distinction to make. *Mikrokosmographia* is Crooke’s labor, but the work that is synonymous with the book is different from the work Crooke conducted in creating the book. As the sometimes-contested author of *Mikrokosmographia*, Crooke studied existing anatomy texts, qualified which were most desirable for his purposes, selected passages to include in his book, translated or selected an existing translation of those passages, organized his selections, incorporated his own experiences and knowledge, and framed all of it with his own rhetoric and guidance to the reader.⁶ The book itself, of

4. For more on the cultural and historical relationship between the anatomy manual, the mirror, and *autopsia*, see Sawday, 6-15.

5. See Shakespeare.

6. Crooke’s authorship of *Mikrokosmographia* has been challenged because of the question of how much of the anatomy knowledge is actually his own. Some of his harsher critics have dismissed him as a plagiarist, because Crooke himself did not conduct any new anatomies and he drew heavily on classical and continental sources. As this dissertation shows, however, the most significant features of Crooke’s anatomy manual are not its (non-existent) contributions to medical science but rather its striking and purposeful humanistic features.

course, does none of those things that its author did, but it does conduct and represent its own highly significant labor: the act of anatomy.

Anatomy is “the process, subject, and products of dissection of the body” as well as “the science of bodily structure; structure as discovered by dissection.”⁷ In a day and age when anatomical dissections were few and far between, a medical student had little hope of gaining much hands-on practice with the subject. In writing *Mikrokosmographia*, Crooke did not merely identify an opportunity to fill a gap in the English medical book market. He recognized that the act and process of both writing and reading an anatomy manual simulates actual anatomical dissection in recreating its process and determining its structure. A vernacular anatomy book was the most advanced pedagogical technology available to the medical practitioners of early modern England. The reader of *Mikrokosmographia* sees each body part revealed at the turn of a page like the audience in the barber-surgeons’ hall watching the demonstrators remove the “fayer clothes” from the “partes deseected.”⁸ Undoubtedly the experience of reading a book could never hope to reproduce the experience of attending a dissection in a seventeenth-century anatomy theater. But in some ways, as a learning experience, the book was probably more practically useful. The reader could proceed in whatever order she wished, she could spend as much time as she liked on any given section, and she could accurately recreate the experience on demand. The book itself reproduces the labor of anatomy.⁹

7. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “anatomy, n.,” def. I, II.

8. Young, 315.

9. For more on text as organizing structure and the conceptual relationship between text and body, see William E. Engel, “Montaigne’s *Essais*: The Literary and Literal Digesting of a Life,” in *The Rhetorics of Life-Writing in Early Modern Europe: Forms of*

III. Directions for Future Research

At the end of the first paragraph in *Mikrokosmographia*, Crooke writes, “I began with Anatomy” (§1^r). He presents his book as a beginning. The volume provides essential basic information about the human body necessary for all types of medical practitioners (“...for a Physition, a naturall Philosopher, a Chirurgion, and an Apothecary, it is not onely profitable, but even also absolutely necessary”; C2^v) but is useful for others, too: “There are also other benefites and commodities of Anatomy proper and peculiar to Poets, Painters, yea, and to the most part of handy-crafts men and Artificers, to teach them the better to bring their Arts to perfection” (C2^r). For the printer Jaggard also, the volume represented foundational knowledge for the reader who might proceed to a variety of other texts, information so vital and generally relevant he believed it would serve “the publique benefit of my countrey” (4Q4^r). *Mikrokosmographia* remains poised to provide a wealth of information and insight on early modern English literature and culture. But the book itself is just the beginning. This dissertation provides the next step toward making better use of this one exceptional primary resource, but plenty of work remains.

For one, there are practical, literal concerns. *Mikrokosmographia* begins with a four-page dedication to King James I that is written in Latin and still needs to be translated in its entirety. The three distinct editions of *Mikrokosmographia* have not yet been collated, nor have the two editions of *Somatographia Anthropine*, the epitome volume. *Mikrokosmographia* also needs to have all of its sources tallied and specifically

Biography from Cassandra Fedele to Louis XIV, ed. Thomas F. Mayer and D. R. Woolf (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995), 283-98.

identified, especially regarding what content is attributable to which other authors, in the service of identifying just how much of the book is Crooke's original writing and recognizing how he shaped what is not. Also, a complete and detailed census of all extant copies of both *Mikrokosmographia* and *Somatographia Anthropine* remains to be conducted.

There is also significant potential for further historical and theoretical work. Crooke's work as a practicing physician warrants more focused study. In the 1610s he apparently kept his own shop in which he employed one Thomas Lord as his "private apothecary."¹⁰ In 1630, while serving as keeper of Bethlem Hospital, Crooke personally collected a patient from Bedford County and committed the man to private care in his own home back in London:

And thereupon the said Doctor Crooke came down ... from London in his Coach and four Horses, attended with three men and came to the said Edmunds house about Seven of the Clock in the morning ... and finding him in bed intreated him fairly, caused him to make him ready, and to break his fast and carried him to London to the Doctors own house where he was fairly intreated and well used & carefully provided of a good Lodging and wholesome and good dyet, according to the Quality of his person and nature of his Infirmary.¹¹

10. Pelling, 126-27n.

11. *The case of Edmund Francklin a lunatic, c. 1630, Bedford County Record Office, Francklin MSS., FN. 1060-84, transcribed in Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860: A History Presented in Selected English Texts*, ed. Richard Hunter and Ida Macalpine (London: Oxford UP, 1963), 104.

Mikrokosmographia is also one of the many named sources drawn on by Robert Burton for his massive compendium *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, first published in 1621. While the use of Crooke's anatomy book by a few known women writers is noted at the end of chapter 4, he likely has additional literary legacies that have not yet been recognized. Furthermore, as chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate, the prose of *Mikrokosmographia* itself provides rich prospects for interpretive reading and literary analysis far beyond its use as an historical reference.

Crooke drew from many sources, but he was particularly fond of Hippocrates. He writes of the ancient Greek physician, "This Man, when the art of Physicke was yet rude and unpolisht, so laboured upon it, that he left it smooth and terse: the knotted budde, by the strength of his wit and vigorous rayes thereof, he made to spread into a glorious flower" (C4^v). No accurate interpretation can call *Mikrokosmographia* either smooth or terse, but I hope no one will fault me for suggesting that by his "great labor" Crooke managed to coax the thorny problem of English anatomy into a Tudor rose.¹²

12. The reign of the House of Tudor ended, of course, with the death of Elizabeth I in 1603. However, according to Crooke's preface, *Mikrokosmographia* was already well underway by then; also, regardless of the book's later publication date, the Tudor rose has been the traditional English floral heraldic emblem since the sixteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allderidge, Patricia. "Management and Mismanagement at Bedlam, 1547-1633." In *Health, Medicine, and Morality in the Sixteenth Century*, 141-64. Edited by Charles Webster. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Andrews, Jonathan, Asa Briggs, Roy Porter, Penny Tucker, and Keir Waddington. *The History of Bethlem*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Bacon, Francis. "Of Studies." In *The Essays*. Edited by John Pitcher. New York: Penguin, 1985.
- Banister, John. *The Historie of Man*. London: John Daye, 1578.
- Barclay-Smith, E. "Archæologia Anatomica. John Halle: A Sixteenth-Century Anatomist." *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* 34.2 (1900): 275-82.
- Bauhin, Caspar. *Theatrum Anatomicum*. Frankfurt: Matthæi Beckeri, 1605.
- Bawcutt, N. W. "Introduction." In *The Changeling*. By Thomas Middleton and William Rowley. Revels Plays ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958.
- Bellany, Alastair. "The Murder of John Lambe," *Past and Present* 200 (2008): 37-76.
- Bellany, Alastair, and Andrew McRae, eds. "Early Stuart Libels: An Edition of Poetry from Manuscript Sources." *Early Modern Literary Studies Text Series I* (2005). <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels/>.
- Birken, William. "The Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians of London, 1603-1643: A Social Study." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1977.
- . "Helkiah Crooke (1576-1648)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed October 30, 2012. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/6775.
- Birmingham, Kevin. "'The Great Shame of Our Profession': How the Humanities Survive on Exploitation." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 12, 2017. Accessed February 19, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Great-Shame-of-Our/239148>.
- Bowers, Fredson, ed. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- A Briefe Description of the Notorious Life of Iohn Lambe*. Amsterdam [London], 1628. Early English Books Online (STC / 803:09).
- Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare Without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Carlson, Eric Josef. "Richard Greenham (early 1540s-1594)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/11424.
- Chappell, W., and Joseph Woodfall Ebsworth, eds., *The Roxburghe Ballads*. Vol. 6. New York: AMS, 1966.
- Clark, Sir George. *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London*. Vol. 1. London: Oxford UP, 1964.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Cook, Harold J. *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.

- Cotta, John. *Unobserved Dangers of Severall Sorts of Ignorant and Unconsiderate Practisers of Physicke in England*. London: William Jones and Richard Boyle, 1612. Early English Books Online (STC / 779:08).
- Cregan, Kate. "Blood and Circuses." In *Images of the Corpse: From the Renaissance to Cyberspace*, 39-62. Edited by Elizabeth Klaver. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2004.
- Crooke, Helkiah. *Theses Anatomice*, cataloged as "De Corpore humano, ejusque partibus," Royal Society of Medicine, London.
- . *Mikrokosmographia*. London: William Jaggard, 1615.
- . *Mikrokosmographia*. London: R. C., 1651.
- C[rooke], H[elkiah]. "An Epigrame to the Reader." In *Paramythion: Two Treatises of the Comforting of an Afflicted Conscience*, A4^v. By Richard Greenham. London: Richard Bradocke, 1598. Early English Books Online (STC / 298:10).
- . "To the Reader." In *Paramythion: Two Treatises of the Comforting of an Afflicted Conscience*, A3^{r-v}. By Richard Greenham. London: Richard Bradocke, 1598. Early English Books Online (STC / 298:10).
- . "To the right worshipfull S. Drue Drurie Knight." In *Paramythion: Two Treatises of the Comforting of an Afflicted Conscience*, A2^{r-v}. By Richard Greenham. London: Richard Bradocke, 1598. Early English Books Online (STC / 298:10).
- Darnton, Robert. "'What is the History of Books?' Revisited," *Modern Intellectual History* 4.3 (2007): 495-508.
- Davies, Owen. *Cunning-Folk: Popular Magic in English History*. New York: Hambledon & London, 2003.
- Decamp, Eleanor. *Civic and Medical Worlds in Early Modern England: Performing Barberly and Surgery*. New York: Palgrave, 2016.
- A Detection of some Faults in Unskilful Physitians, Ignorant and Careless Apothecaries, and unknowing running Chirurgeons*. Printed and bound with *The Urinal of Physick* by Robert Record. London: Gartrude Dawson, 1651. Early English Books Online (Wing / 2151:21).
- Doe, Janet. *A Bibliography of the Works of Ambrose Paré*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1937.
- Donne, John. *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions, Together with Death's Duel*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 2003.
- . *Fifty Sermons*. Vol. 2. London: Flesher, Marriot, and Royston, 1649. Early English Books Online (Wing / 1526:04).
- . "The Ecstasy." In *John Donne: Selected Poetry*, 113-16. Edited by John Carey, Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Engel, William E. "Montaigne's *Essais*: The Literary and Literal Digesting of a Life." In *The Rhetorics of Life-Writing in Early Modern Europe: Forms of Biography from Cassandra Fedele to Louis XIV*, 283-98. Edited by Thomas F. Mayer and D. R. Woolf. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995.
- Fisher, Will. *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Fleming, Abraham. *The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro, prince of all Latine poets; otherwise called his pastoralls, or shepherds meetings. Together with his*

- Georgiks or ruralls, otherwise called his husbandrie, conteyning foure books.* London: T. O., 1589. Early English Books Online (STC / 369:04).
- Foster, Andrew. "Richard Neile (1562–1640)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed November 25, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/19861.
- Fumerton, Patricia. *Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006.
- Fumerton, Patricia, and Anita Guerrini, *Ballads and Broadides in Britain, 1500-1800*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2010.
- Gaskill, Malcolm. "Witchcraft, Politics, and Memory in Seventeenth-Century England," *Historical Journal* 50.2 (2007): 289-308.
- Gerard, John. *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes. Gathered by John Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie Very much Enlarged and Amended by Thomas Johnson Citizen and Apothecarye of London*. London: Islip, Norton & Whitakers, 1633. Early English Books Online (STC / 1546:08).
- Ginzburg, Carlo. "Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about It," *Critical Inquiry* 20.1 (1993): 10-35.
- Gorfain, Phyllis. "When Nothing Really Matters: Body Puns in *Hamlet*." In *Bodylore*, 59-87. Edited by Katharine Young. Knoxville, TN: U of Tennessee P.
- Greenham, Richard. *Paramythion: Two Treatises of the Comforting of an Afflicted Conscience*. London: Richard Bradocke, 1598. Early English Books Online (STC / 298:10).
- Grell, Ole Peter. "The Attraction of Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590-1642." Chap. 11 in *Calvinist Exiles in Tudor and Stuart England*, 221-40. Aldershot: Routledge, 1996.
- Habinek, Lianne. "Untying the 'Subtle Knot': Anatomical Metaphor and the Case of the *rete mirabile*," *Configurations* 20 (2012): 239-77.
- Hamilton, A. C., ed. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. With the assistance of Donald Cheney, W. F. Blissett, David A. Richardson, and William W. Barker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990.
- Harvey, Elizabeth D. "Flesh Colors and Shakespeare's Sonnets." In *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 314-28. Edited by Michael Schoenfeldt. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Blackwell, 2010.
- . "Sensational Bodies, Consenting Organs: Helkiah Crooke's Incorporation of Spenser," *Spenser Studies* 18 (2003): 295-314.
- Harvey, Tamara. *Figuring Modesty in Feminist Discourse Across the Americas, 1633-1700*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.
- Henry, John. "The Fragmentation of Renaissance Occultism and the Decline of Magic," *History of Science* 46 (2008): 1-48.
- Hillman, David. *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body*. New York: Palgrave, 2007.
- The Historie of Frier Rush: how he came to a house of Religion to seek service, and being entertained by the Priour, was first made under Cooke*. London: Edw. Allde, 1620. Early English Books Online (STC / 1005:01).

- Holland, Henry. "The Preface to the Reader." *The Works of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham*. Ed. Holland. London: Felix Kingston, 1599. Early English Books Online (STC / 1102:01).
- Hooks, Adam G. *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2016.
- Hunter, Richard, and Ida Macalpine, eds. *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860: A History Presented in Selected English Texts*. London: Oxford UP, 1963.
- Innes Smith, R. W. *English-Speaking Students of Medicine at the University of Leyden*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1932.
- Jackson, Ken. *Separate Theaters: Bethlem ("Bedlam") Hospital and the Shakespearean Stage*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005.
- Jaggard, William. *Somatographia Anthropine*. London: Jaggard, 1616.
- Kassell, Lauren. *Medicine and Magic in Elizabethan London: Simon Forman: Astrologer, Alchemist, and Physician*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Keller, Eve. *Generating Bodies and Gendered Selves: The Rhetoric of Reproduction in Early Modern England*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 2007.
- Keynes, Geoffrey. "Introduction." In *The Apologie and Treatise of Ambroise Paré containing the Voyages Made into Divers Places with Many of His Writings upon Surgery*, i-xxii. Edited by Keynes. London: Falcon, 1951.
- Kusukawa, Sachiko. *Picturing the Book of Nature: Image, Text, and Argument in Sixteenth-Century Human Anatomy and Medical Botany*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2012.
- Larminie, Vivienne. "Samuel Crooke (1575-1649)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/6776.
- Levao, Ronald. "'Where Black is the Color, Where None is the Number': Something from Nothing in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*," *Literary Imagination* 12.3 (2010): 275-86.
- Lewis, C. Day, trans. *Virgil: The Eclogues and The Georgics*. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Lotman, Yuri. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: Tauris, 1990.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. Notes on *Virgil: The Eclogues and The Georgics*, Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Maclean, Ian. *Logic, Signs and Nature in the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus (B-Text)*. Edited by David Scott Kastan. Norton Critical Edition. New York: Norton, 2005.
- Masten, Jeffrey. *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare's Time*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2016.
- McConnell, Anita. "John Lambe (1545/6-1628)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed February 15, 2014. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/15925.
- McKerrow, R. B. *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books, 1557-1640*. London: Blades, East & Blades, 1910.

- Middleton, Thomas, and William Rowley. *The Changeling*. Edited by N. W. Bawcutt. Revels Plays ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958.
- Milton, John. "Samson Agonistes." In *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Edited by John Carey. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1971.
- Nashe, Thomas. "Somewhat to read for them that list," in *Astrophel and Stella* by Philip Sidney. London: Thomas Newman, 1591. Early English Books Online (STC / 538:18).
- Noble, Louise. *Medical Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. New York: Palgrave, 2011.
- Norton, David. "John Bois (1561–1644)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/2780.
- Nunn, Hillary M. *Staging Anatomies: Dissection and Spectacle in Early Stuart Tragedy*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.
- O'Donoghue, Edward Geoffrey. *The Story of Bethlehem Hospital from its Foundation in 1247*. London: Unwin, 1914.
- O'Malley, C. D. "The Fielding H. Garrison Lecture: Helkiah Crooke, M.D., F.R.C.P., 1576-1648," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 42.1 (1968): 1-18.
- Parker, Kenneth L., and Erik Josef Carlson. *Practical Divinity: The Life and Works of Revd Richard Greenham*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 1998.
- Parker, Martin. *The Poet's Blind Mans Bough*. London: F. Leach, 1641. Early English Books Online (Thomason / 30:E.172[6]).
- . "The Tragedy of Doctor Lambe." London: H.G., 1628. Pepys Library, Pepys Ballads 1.134-135. English Broadside Ballad Archive (EBBA ID: 20059).
- Peacock, Edward. *Index to English Speaking Students who have Graduated at Leyden University*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1883.
- Pelling, Maragaret. *Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians, and Irregular Practitioners, 1550-1640*. With Frances White. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Plomer, Henry R. *Abstracts from the Wills of English Printers and Stationers, from 1492-1630*. London: Blades, East & Blades, 1903.
- Prögler, Daniela. *English Students at Leiden University, 1575-1650*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.
- Raynalde, Thomas. *The Birth of Mankind: Otherwise Named, The Woman's Book*. Ed. Elaine Hobby. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr. *Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1952.
- Robb-Smith, A. H. T. "Cambridge Medicine." In *Medicine in Seventeenth Century England*, 327-69. Edited by Allen G. Debus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.
- Royal College of Physicians, London. *Annals of the College of Physicians MS*, vol. III.
- . *RCP Annals Transcription and Translation MS*, vol. III. Transcribed and translated by J. Emberry, S. Heathcote, and M. Hellings.
- Russell, K. F. *British Anatomy, 1525-1800: A Bibliography of Works Published in Britain, America, and on the Continent*. Winchester, Hampshire, UK: St. Paul's, 1987.
- Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995.

- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Edited by Philip Edwards. New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- . *Romeo and Juliet*. In *Romeo and Juliet: Texts and Contexts*, edited by Dymphna Callaghan. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.
- . *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Edited with analytic commentary by Stephen Booth. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Shapin, Steven. *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as if It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010.
- Sharp, Jane. *The Midwives Book*. London: Simon Miller, 1671. Early English Books Online (Wing / 2273:04).
- . *The Midwives Book*. Ed. Elaine Hobby. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Slack, Paul. "Mirrors of Health and Treasures of Poor Men: The Uses of the Vernacular Medical Literature of Tudor England." In *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*, 237-73. Edited by Charles Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979).
- Sloane MS 640, British Library.
- Spenser, Edmund. *The Shepheardes Calender Conteyning twelve Eglogues proportionable to the twelve monethes*. London: Hugh Singleton, 1579. Early English Books Online (STC / 354:24).
- Spiegel, Gabrielle M. "The Task of the Historian," *American Historical Review* 114.1 (2009): 1-15.
- Stevens, Scott Manning. "Sacred Heart and Secular Brain." In *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern England*, 263-84. Edited by David Hillman and Carla Mazzio. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Taylor, Timothy. *Buried Soul: How Humans Invented Death*. London: Fourth Estate, 2002.
- Traupman, John C. *The New College Latin & English Dictionary*. New York: Bantam, 1966.
- Turner, Henry. "Lessons from Literature for the Historian of Science (and Vice Versa): Reflections on Form," *ISIS* 101 (2010): 578-89.
- Turner, James Grantham. *Schooling Sex: Libertine Literature and Erotic Education in Italy, France, and England 1534-1685*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Usher, Brett. "Appendix: Will of Thomas Crooke." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, 107-12. Edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell, 2006.
- . "Thomas Crooke (c.1545–1598)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/6777.
- . "Sir Thomas Crooke, first baronet (c.1574-1630)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/72026.
- . "Stephen Egerton (c.1555-1622)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Accessed January 4, 2016. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8593.
- Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Wear, Andrew. *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Williams, Gordon. *Shakespeare, Sex and the Print Revolution*. London: Athlone, 2000.
- Willoughby, Edwin Elliot. *A Printer of Shakespeare: The Books and Times of William Jaggard*. New York: Dutton, 1934.
- Würzbach, Natascha. *The Rise of the English Street Ballad, 1550-1650*. Translated by Gayna Walls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, Sidney. *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London*. London: Blades, East & Blades, 1890.