

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA  
Edmond, Oklahoma  
Dr. Joe C. Jackson College of Graduate Studies

**Meat Makes the Man:  
The Hierarchies of Masculinity and Meat Eating in  
Shakespearean Drama**

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE  
FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH

By Nicholas A. Brush

Edmond, Oklahoma 2018


**Meat Makes the Man:  
The Hierarchies of Masculinity and Meat Eating in Shakespearean Drama**

A THESIS

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

April 16, 2018

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chairperson

 \_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member

 \_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Timothy Petete for his encouragement and guidance as my Thesis Committee Chair. I would also like to thank Dr. Kate Huber for her willingness to indulge my many off-the-wall discussions over the past year. Perhaps most importantly, I would like to thank Dr. Katrina Lacher. Without her unbridled support and enthusiasm, this project would never have made it off the ground.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF THESIS .....	1
<i>Meat Makes the Man: The Hierarchies of Masculinity and Meat Eating in Shakespearean Drama</i> .....	2
INTRODUCTION.....	2
CHAPTER 1.....	12
CHAPTER 2.....	31
CHAPTER 3.....	47
CONCLUSION .....	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	67

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

AUTHOR: Nicholas A. Brush

TITLE: Meat Makes the Man: The Hierarchies of Masculinity and Meat Eating in Shakespearean Drama

DIRECTOR OF THESIS: Dr. Timothy Petete

PAGES: 67

This thesis explores how Shakespeare's dramatic works highlight the complex relationships between the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating. The theoretical backing consists of both gender-based and ecocritical writings. The works of Carol J. Adams and Rasmus R. Simonsen focus on the basic, binary relationship between meat and masculinity and veganism and queerness; and the works of R. W. Connell and Julia Twigg, two scholars whose works neither Adams nor Simonsen discuss, explain the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating, respectfully. By combining the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating and using that combination as a gastromasculine lens through which to read the works of William Shakespeare, this thesis will argue that Shakespeare's use of meat often reflects the across-the-board connections between masculinity and meat eating.

## Introduction

“Food in the Early Modern period was many things,” writes Robert Appelbaum in his book *Aguecheek’s Beef, Belch’s Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns*, “from an object of delight to an object of contempt, from a symbol of happy sociality to a token of selfish gluttony, from a commodity to be calculated in terms of its weight and bulk to a kind of medicine that, when taken in the right dosage, could all but guarantee a long and vigorous life.”<sup>1</sup> Appelbaum’s observation highlights one of the current trends in the study of Early Modern English literature and culture. This study, often referred to as *gastronomy theory*, is a theoretical branch of the overall study of gastronomy, “the practice or art of choosing, cooking, and eating good food.”<sup>2</sup> Many scholars who specialize in the study of the Early Modern period have begun focusing on the importance of food and food culture to the people of the time, examining not only how food impacted, or even dictated, cultural norms and conditions, but also the effects those impacts had on the period’s cultural artifacts, such as the literature.

For the Early Moderns, “food practices . . . [were] a form and medium of communication”<sup>3</sup> but “food [was] not a *closed* system of communication.”<sup>4</sup> As such, the

---

1. Robert Appelbaum, *Aguecheek’s Beef, Belch’s Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), xvii.

2. “Gastronomy | Definition of Gastronomy in English by Oxford Dictionaries,” Oxford Dictionaries | English, accessed December 02, 2017, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/gastronomy>.

3. Appelbaum, 29.

4. Appelbaum, 10.

literature of the time could, debatably, have served as a type of metacommentary whenever food was included. What is *not* up for debate, however, is that food was incredibly important to the culture and the literature of the time. Many of the period's greatest writers, such as Marlowe, Kyd, Spenser, Milton, and others, all featured food in their works. Justice is finally meted for Marlowe's Barabas at a great feast in *The Jew of Malta*; the feast-table marks important moments in Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*; the narrator of Spenser's *Fairie Queene* mentions the word *food* thirty-one times throughout the poem; and Milton's Adam and Eve bite into the most important piece of fruit in the history of mankind in the poet's epic masterpiece, *Paradise Lost*. These examples are but a few from some of the period's most important and influential writers, so it should come as no surprise that gastronomy theory has been a focus of Early Modern studies for the past few decades. One Early Modern writer from this period is omitted, perhaps glaringly so, from the above list: Shakespeare. This is not to say that Shakespeare is ignored when it comes to gastronomy theory and the study of Early Modern literature, of course. In fact, many important Early Modernists working through the lens of gastronomy theory focus solely on Shakespeare's work and how the period's most well-known dramatist utilized food and food imagery in his work.

One of the most important modern scholars of this field is David B. Goldstein, author of *Eating and Ethics in Shakespeare's England* and one of the editors of *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England*. Goldstein's primary argument in *Eating and Ethics* is based on a modern view of eating compared to how people of the Early Modern period viewed it. Goldstein explains, "In contemporary discussions of eating, we tend to give inordinate emphasis to what we as individuals put

into our mouths and why, while ignoring the power of food to build and destroy the lineaments of society.”<sup>5</sup> For the Early Moderns, however, “eating, commensality, and community were bound together. When authors imagine the act of eating, they automatically activated a system of relationships both far-reaching and inescapable. Commensality—eating together—means something different from conviviality, the enjoyment of another’s company.”<sup>6</sup> In summarizing his argument, Goldstein addresses the major difference between how we view the process of eating today versus how those in Early Modern England did:

Eating was viewed primarily as a commensal rather than an individual act . . . Eating forced Renaissance thinkers to consider questions about how communities were formed and shattered; the creation and dissolution of true fellowship; the inclusion and exclusion of groups and individuals; the tensions among hospitality, obligation, and agency; and the contested, even illusory, boundary between the self and the world. Further, to think about eating was to acknowledge that the individual did not just have a *relationship* with the world but was *made* of the world, utterly inseparable from it.<sup>7</sup>

Here, Goldstein points out that eating, and therefore food, was all about a person’s place within the community and their relationship with it, both locally and globally. For these people, as Goldstein argues, “Food . . . is not *only* or *precisely* a material object, a ‘thing’ one simply eats, digests, and excretes. It is more properly a function or relationship, like a language—a dynamic inhabiting of the nexus between earth and human, idea and sustenance, divinity and mundanity, ideology and instrument.”<sup>8</sup>

---

5. David B. Goldstein, *Eating and Ethics in Shakespeare’s England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 3.

6. Goldstein, *Eating and Ethics*, 5.

7. Goldstein, 6.

8. Goldstein, 7.



Goldstein believes that “we are tied together in the bonds of obligation because we eat, and to eat is to relate and be related,”<sup>9</sup> and, because of these bonds and relations, “when Early Modern English writers consider eating, they do so in ways that underscore and force consideration of the relational quality of the self”<sup>10</sup> primarily because “food is a conduit for our relationship to our bodies and to the communities of which we are a part.”<sup>11</sup> For Shakespeare, Goldstein suggests, this was no different: “Food and drink, in Shakespeare as in all other literature, always occurs in and is inflected through social context.”<sup>12</sup> Goldstein’s argument plays a crucial role in how this thesis will examine Shakespeare’s use of foodstuffs, particularly meat, as an examination of masculinity both in Shakespeare’s day and our own. “For Shakespeare,” suggests Goldstein and Amy L. Tigner, Goldstein’s co-editor of *Culinary Shakespeare*, “the culinary is primary.”<sup>13</sup> Just *how* primary was the culinary for England’s most famous playwright? Goldstein and Tigner have an answer:

Shakespeare was fascinated by how the meanings of food and drink change according to different contexts, and his fantastical uses of food always bring us back to lived experience. His plays—with their frequent mentions of particular comestibles; the physical and emotional changes that food effects in the body; the rituals and bonds created or broken by cultures of the table; and the metaphors that food activates in religious, sexual, theatrical, and intellectual experience—

---

9. Goldstein, 14.

10. Goldstein, 14.

11. Goldstein, 9.

12. David B. Goldstein and Amy L. Tigner, introduction to *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2016), 3.

13. Goldstein and Tigner, introduction to *Culinary Shakespeare*, 3.

explore the tremendous power of food and drink in all manner of cultural phenomena.<sup>14</sup>

As Goldstein and Tigner argue, Shakespeare found the culinary both an exciting and a transformative lens through which he could examine social contexts of the community, the self, and various combinations and permutations of both. Food offered Shakespeare numerous opportunities to explore, as the authors describe them, “the body,” “rituals and bonds,” and even “sexual . . . experience,” all within Early Modern culture. As gastronomy theory moves forward, indicating a not-too-new-yet-not-all-that-well-examined look at Shakespeare’s work, we find that “Shakespeare studies has emerged at the forefront of this research,”<sup>15</sup> all the more reason to use a gastronomic lens to study another important facet of culture and the self that Shakespeare frequently explored: masculinity.

Men in the Early Modern period were dealing with a shift in masculinity from the chivalric High Middle Ages to a more, no pun intended, modern outlook on how a man’s masculine identity fit not only himself but the society around him. In “Between Men in Early Modern England,” Goran V. Stanivukovic, Professor of English at Saint Mary’s University, discusses how men, and their relative masculinities, influenced the developing culture around them. He writes, “[The] historiography of Early Modern masculinity has explored masculinity in spaces that produce it as normative, ranging from the battlefield to the court, from parliament to pulpit, from travel to conquest. In Early Modern England (and Europe), these are spaces that enable masculine self-identification

---

14. Goldstein and Tigner, 5.

15. Goldstein and Tigner, 3.

as powerful and central to the foundation of the Early Modern state.”<sup>16</sup> Stanivukovic suggests that, in this period, men sought to find their positions within society based on how their masculinities interacted with one another. These interactions that, as Stanivukovic claims, enabled the self-identification of one’s masculinity also engendered the solidification of placement within hierarchies of social class, religiosity, gender, and even within masculinity itself. As men “found themselves” through the self-identification of their masculinities, public displays of said masculinities also took shape, oftentimes in ways that violated the hegemonic, or standard, version of masculinity that these men were used to. On this very shift, Stanivukovic argues, “It is because of this dependence of masculinity on publicity that difficulties with, as well as ambiguous complexities of its representations, occur once that masculinity transgresses the boundaries of normativity.”<sup>17</sup>

Many of these “transgressions,” as Stanivukovic refers to them, can be found in Shakespeare’s explorations of masculinity, love, and the interactions between the two. In fact, many of these transgressional explorations are continuously debated as evidence of Shakespeare’s examinations of masculinity, heteronormativity, and queerness. These three concepts all work hand-in-hand, however, to better showcase what masculinity meant for men in Shakespeare’s time and, as this thesis will touch on, for twentieth- and twenty-first-century men, as well. As Eve Sedgwick writes in her groundbreaking *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, there exists a “distinctive

---

16. Goran V. Stanivukovic, “Between Men in Early Modern England,” in *Queer Masculinities, 1550-1800: Siting Same-Sex Desire in the Early Modern World* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 232.

17. Stanivukovic, “Between Men in Early Modern England,” 232-33.

relation of the male homosocial spectrum to the transmission of unequally distributed power,”<sup>18</sup> a spectrum that still continues to this day through, as this thesis will later explain, a hierarchy of masculinity that affects male homosocial relationships at all levels, as well as relationships between men and women. I can think of no better way to explore Shakespeare’s inclusions of the hierarchical natures of maleness and masculinity than through the lens of gastronomy theory, discovering how Shakespeare uses food, meat in particular, to highlight how the importance of food to Early Modern culture directly reflects that society’s views of masculinity, especially when we remember how central the culinary is to Shakespeare.

This thesis will first establish a theoretical grounding, a newer and perhaps more condensed way of viewing masculinity through gastronomy theory and food studies. Chapter 1 of this thesis discusses masculinity and meat eating, beginning with the work of Carol J. Adams in her book *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. Mostly a manifesto on how one cannot truly be a feminist without giving up meat, *Sexual Politics* begins with a look at how meat has, throughout the centuries, been a wholly masculine foodstuff, and how meat eating is itself a masculine activity. Rasmus R. Simonsen’s response to Adams’s work, “A Queer Vegan Manifesto,” argues that if meat is masculine, then its antithesis, veganism, must be queer. Even though this argument helps construct a binary, there are issues with this binary that the chapter will address via the hierarchies of masculinity as explored in R. W. Connell’s seminal work, *Masculinities*. Connell breaks down Eurocentric, patriarchal masculinities into four

---

18. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 18.

ranked categories: hegemonic, complicit, marginalized, and subordinate. These categories, while distinctly modern in their presentation, existed during Shakespeare's time; and many of his works reflect the hierarchical relationships established between the different masculinities, particularly the hegemonic and the subordinate. The first chapter also covers Julia Twigg's hierarchy of meat eating found in "Vegetarianism and the Meanings of Meat." The hierarchy of meat eating (red meat, white meat, vegetarian foods, vegan foods) has, up until the writing of this thesis, never been examined in conjunction with Connell's hierarchy of masculinities. With these two hierarchies working in tandem, it will become clear that both Adams and Simonsen were correct in their understandings of meat and masculinity but perhaps even more so than they originally thought. By combining these two hierarchies, this thesis will establish a new theoretical approach, which I refer to as *gastromasculinities*, to examine the works of Shakespeare and analyze how meat eating reflects the hierarchical nature of masculinity.

Chapter 2 begins the critical analysis of Shakespeare's work, focusing on close readings instead of secondary criticism. While there are some instances of secondary criticism included in the chapter, the primary purpose of Chapter 2 is to establish *gastromasculinities* as an appropriate and viable theoretical lens for reading Shakespeare. Beginning with a short introduction on the importance of meat to the Early Moderns, the chapter then dives into some of Shakespeare's most well-known plays from multiple genres to reveal how meat eating in the playwright's works reflect these hierarchical nature of masculinity and masculine relationships. The first play examined is *As You Like It*, one of Shakespeare's greatest comedies and discourses on gender. The play's fool, Touchstone, provides an excellent first look at how masculine relationships change and

interact with one another once meat comes into the fold, even when that meat is metaphorical. *The Taming of the Shrew*, another of Shakespeare's comedies, comes next, with a look at how Petruchio uses, or does not use, meat in order to woo Katherine, the beastly woman he is intent on wedding for the sake of a bet. Lastly, the chapter includes a character examination of Sir John Falstaff and expressions of masculinity through meat in both *The First Part of Henry the Fourth* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Falstaff, an aged, overweight knight who eschews honor for the sake of sack, his favorite alcoholic beverage, also eschews masculinity, at least as far as *IH4*'s other characters, especially Prince Hal, the King Henry's son, are concerned. Falstaff's failed, yet comedic, attempt to regain his masculinity through food imagery in *Merry Wives* rounds out the chapter, spending a bit of time with Christian M. Billings's extraordinary work on Shakespeare's most popular character.

Chapter 3 finishes with a close examination of one play: *Timon of Athens*. One of Shakespeare's least popular and least known plays, *Timon* provides gastromasculinity bountiful opportunities to further establish itself. First focusing on the hierarchical nature of the feast-table and feasting in *Timon* and the relation between the table and masculinity, the chapter then moves on to a discussion of queer veganism, looking at two of the play's most important characters, both the titular Timon and his Cynical foil, Apemantus. Through the eating of roots, Timon and Apemantus take their places as subordinated men based on their decidedly subordinated diet of non-meats. Even though, as a play, *Timon of Athens*, a collaboration between Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton, another great Early Modern playwright, may not be the most structurally sound, it still

provides multiple critical points in which gastromasculinity, as a theoretical approach, can get its fill.

Overall, this thesis is merely the beginning of a larger body of work. There are far too many plays with examples of hierarchical relationships between masculinity and meat eating to include here. Two specific examples, *As You Like It*'s Jacques and most of *Titus Andronicus*, will both be briefly mentioned in the conclusion. Other plays, many of which are mentioned in Chapter 2, will also be included in the expanded version of this work once more research can be completed. While complete as its own individual artifact, this work is far from whole. What began as an "interesting idea" focusing on queer forms of gluttony, has found itself fleshed out in ways I never would have imagined. Bearing in mind that, while this thesis *does* firmly ground gastromasculinity as a viable theoretical lens through which we can examine Shakespeare, there is far more food for thought ready for consumption.

## **Chapter 1: Establishing the Relations between the Hierarchies of Masculinity and Hierarchies of Meat Eating**

“To recognize diversity in masculinities is not enough,” says R. W. Connell in *Masculinities*. “We must also recognize the relations between the different kinds of masculinity: relations of alliance, dominance and subordination.”<sup>19</sup> In this thesis, I will argue that we must recognize not only the relations between the different kinds of masculinity but that we must also recognize the relations between the different kinds of masculinity and their relations between different kinds of, and approaches to, the eating of meat. Current theory suggests that these relations are quite simple: to borrow from Connell, either dominant or subordinate. This way of thinking provides us with a binary, a good starting point from which to approach the connections between the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating. To establish this binary, I will first examine the works of two authors who each address one of the two binary poles of a unified “spectrum” of sorts on which I can begin laying down my theoretical foundation. The binary, simply put, connects masculinity and meat eating through polar opposites on their respective spectrums of masculinity and meat eating, both of which will be expanded on and combined later in this section as the true hierarches of masculinity and meat eating are brought together as one. These polar opposite masculinities, the dominant and subordinate, are rather generalized but engender a better position for the theoretical establishment of the connections that I will make later. At its most basic, the links are rather simple: meat = masculine (dominant), veganism = non-masculine/queer (subordinate).

---

19. R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 37.



The link between meat eating as a form of dominant masculine performativity is covered at length in feminist and animal rights activist Carol Adams's seminal book *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. Adams states, "People with power have always eaten meat."<sup>20</sup> The power to which Adams refers is the power dynamic between men and women in a patriarchal society with men in power and women considered less-than when compared to men in all aspects of that society. The power imbalance, Adams argues, also applies to the foods that women eat: "Women, second-class citizens, are more likely to eat what are considered to be second-class foods in a patriarchal culture: vegetables, fruits, and grains rather than meat."<sup>21</sup> While the book as whole discusses what Adams calls "sexism in meat eating,"<sup>22</sup> this thesis focuses primarily on the initial argument that supports Adams's overall discussion on the meat-based, patriarchal power struggle between men and women throughout history: "meat is a masculine food and meat eating a male activity."<sup>23</sup>

Adams's assertion that meat is masculine and meat eating a masculine activity is important as the construction of the masculinity and meat eating spectrum begins. Because "[m]eat eating is the re-inscription of male power at every meal"<sup>24</sup> due to meat

---

20. Carol Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (New York: Continuum, 1990), 26.

21. Adams, *Sexual Politics*, 26.

22. Adams, 26.

23. Adams, 26.

24. Adams, 187.

symbolizing the “patriarchal control of animals”<sup>25</sup> instead of the patriarchal control of women, this dominance further exemplifies the importance of meat and meat eating as a form of control over not only women, but the entirety of society itself, both human and animal. The patriarchal-esque control over animals comes from the male desire to emulate the ravaging, destructive, and dominant role of carnivorous predators hellbent on killing their prey and wrenching its bloody flesh from its bones. Adams elaborates: “Through symbolism based on killing animals, we encounter . . . images of absorption, control, domain, and the necessity of violence.”<sup>26</sup> These images are well-covered in Connell’s concept of dominant masculinity, that general form of masculinity that seeks not only to dominate women but also non-masculine men who perform the generalized subordinate masculinity, one with which I can clearly see in the shift from anthropocentricity, the focus on humans above all other forms of life, to patriarchy, which I will cover later.

For example, Adams suggests that, according to masculine patriarchal culture, “men are strong, men need to be strong, thus men need meat. The literal evocation of male power is found in the concept of meat;” therefore, “meat promotes,” and is used to promote, “strength; the attributes of masculinity are achieved through eating these masculine foods.”<sup>27</sup> One might infer, then, that eating non-masculine foods would make a man non-masculine. In terms of the two generalized masculinity categories, the eating of non-masculine foods would place men into the subordinate masculinity category in which

---

25. Adams, 16.

26. Adams, 189.

27. Adams, 33.

men are now ruled over by their dominant, meat-eating counterparts. “Men’s need to disassociate themselves from women’s food,”<sup>28</sup> vegetables, fruits, and grains, engenders the belief within the dominant masculinity category that “men who choose not to eat meat repudiate one of their masculine privileges”<sup>29</sup> and that these men are not “real” men. Adams agrees, saying, “Men who decide to eschew meat eating are deemed effeminate; failure of men to eat meat announces that they are not masculine.”<sup>30</sup> By eschewing meat eating, these men are no longer “real” men and, therefore, do not belong at the “real man’s” table, losing their place of power within dominant masculinity.

In response to, and in support of, Adams’s work in *Sexual Politics*, Rasmus R. Simonsen’s “A Queer Vegan Manifesto” examines the subordination of masculinity through veganism, a position which, as I alluded to earlier, allows for the creation of the binary base. Like Adams, Simonsen seeks to further cement the connection of masculinity and meat eating. Unlike Adams, however, Simonsen does not approach the topic as “taking a stance against patriarchal culture” but “specifically, a way of resisting heteronormativity, since meat eating for men and, perhaps to a lesser degree, women is tied to the rhetorical as well as the actual reproduction of heterosexual norms and practices.”<sup>31</sup> Simonsen argues that veganism, or the refusal to eat meat in general (i.e., vegetarianism), connects directly to sexuality. He agrees, as do I, that “different food

---

28. Adams, 36.

29. Adams, 38.

30. Adams, 34.

31. Rasmus R. Simonsen. “A Queer Vegan Manifesto,” *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* 10, no. 3 (2012): accessed June 8, 2017, [http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp\\_aafhh/8/](http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp_aafhh/8/), 55.

items carry specifically gendered connotations” but goes further than Adams and her “meat is masculine” argument by highlighting the fact that men “refusing to partake in the proscribed consumption of meat disrupts the discourse on male sexuality and gender,” creating and becoming “a problem within heterosexual discourse.”<sup>32</sup>

Simonsen’s focus on anthropocentrism, which would, in turn, engender the anthropopatriarchal society from which Adams bases her argument, forces us to reexamine the role of meat as masculine from a subordinated perspective, as, for men, going vegan “is learning—everywhere and always—to challenge and negate the inherited norm of [anthropocentrism].”<sup>33</sup> By challenging the meat-eating, and therefore masculine and dominant, norms of anthropocentrism, “[q]ueer veganism affirms deviation”<sup>34</sup> and establishes the male vegan as less-than in his masculinity, placing him in the generalized subordinate substructure of masculinity.

Abandoning their role as dominant male by refusing to participate in the heteronormative subculture of meat eating, male vegans, self-subordinating their masculinity, also refuse to participate in “asserting or performing . . . masculinity”<sup>35</sup> but oftentimes do not “consider the performative aspect involved in eating different foods”<sup>36</sup> and do not realize what they are doing queers them, subordinates their masculinity, and places them at the bottom of the patriarchal food chain. Veganism, Simonsen says,

---

32. Simonsen, “Queer Vegan,” 55.

33. Simonsen, 57.

34. Simonsen, 57.

35. Simonsen, 53.

36. Simonsen, 52.

“comes to constitute a set of gendered acts that are linked to the whole of what signifies as male (and female),”<sup>37</sup> and these performances<sup>38</sup> of gender acts redefine the vegan as queer in both his eating habits and his sexuality. Performances of veganism, just like performances of gender and queerness, are “marker[s] of identity”<sup>39</sup> and push those men who choose to eschew meat further outside the social norms established by the relationship between masculinity and meat eating. As these men find themselves on the outskirts of the patriarchal, meat-eating society, their subordination causes them to be “rendered deviant by normative society,”<sup>40</sup> a process that “can almost be compared to the act of coming out for queer-identified individuals.”<sup>41</sup>

Establishing these categories of meat eating and veganism as representations of dominant and subordinate masculinities provides us with a starting point for the “spectrum” of meat eating and veganism as they relate to their dominant and subordinate counterparts. But this “meat-eating men are dominant therefore non-meat-eating men are subordinate” concept is a gross oversimplification of the theoretical lens through which this thesis will examine the works of Shakespeare. These categories of dominant and subordinate can be further broken down into two subcategories each, as can the categories of meat-inclusive and meat-exclusive diets. As the argument currently stands, we have an anthropocentric, anthropopatriarchal, “us versus them,” “carnivores versus

---

37. Simonsen, 52.

38. These concepts of performance and performatives are defined by Judith Butler in *Gender Trouble*.

39. Simonsen, “Queer Vegan,” 54.

40. Simonsen, 55.

41. Simonsen, 55.

herbivores” battle raging between dominant and subordinate masculinities and the men who occupy these categories. Unlike vegans, vegetarians eat animal products, such as dairy and eggs, which excludes them from the realm of veganism. The vegetarian, like the vegan, does not eat meat, though, so he does not fit into the realm of the meat eater, either. And what about the omnivore who eats both meat and vegetables, fruits, and grains? What about men who eat chicken and fish but not beef, or any other kind of red meat for that matter? None of these men seem to fit on the currently established spectrum for one reason: this spectrum cannot exist with only two polar opposites; there needs to be some kind of allowance set up for those who fit somewhere between the two poles. By looking at the hierarchies of masculinity established by R. W. Connell and the hierarchies of meat eating established by Julia Twigg, this thesis will construct a full, spectrum-like hierarchy of masculinity and meat eating that includes all men, no matter their dietary preferences. This combined hierarchy will not disprove nor discredit anything argued by either Adams or Simonsen, but will further prove their arguments, building the “in-between” currently missing in the relations established in this thesis thus far. As I have already pointed out, what Adams and Simonsen contributed to the analysis of masculinity and meat eating hierarchies established the binary with which I can further anchor the hierarchies themselves.

The first of the two hierarchies originate from Connell’s groundbreaking work *Masculinities*. In this book, Connell establishes a hierarchy of four masculinities: hegemonic, complicit, marginalized, and subordinate. As previously mentioned, the dominant and subordinate categories to which Adams, and, to some extent, Simonsen, refer were generalized and needed to be further broken down in order to better understand

the relationships between masculinity and meat eating. We cannot understand those relationships, though, unless we understand the relationships between the masculinities themselves; and to do that, we must deconstruct them. The dominant category consists of hegemonic and complicit masculinities, and the subordinate category consists of marginalized and subordinate masculinities. By splitting each category into two subcategories, Connell, and her explanations of these masculinities, provides us with clearer and more precise categories with which we can hierarchize these four masculinity types.

“To recognize more than one masculinity is only a first step,” says Connell. “We have to examine the relations between them.”<sup>42</sup> The hierarchical relationship that Connell suggests requires that we not only examine the relations between the different masculinities but also understand how these relations work with and against one another. The two generalized categories, dominant and subordinate, provide clues about how these masculinities work in relation with one another but do not *fully* explain how. Before beginning the examination of these masculinities’ relations, it is important to remember that “we must not take them as fixed categories”<sup>43</sup> and that “[m]asculinity as an object of knowledge is always masculinity-in-relation,”<sup>44</sup> meaning that these categories, while appearing rigid and uncompromising, are actually fluid and allow for the possibility of movement between them, albeit rather limited based on which category one begins in and

---

42. Connell, *Masculinities*, 76.

43. Connell, 37.

44. Connell, 44.

strives to end up in. As such, this thesis utilizes these hierarchies based on the standard of *all* Eurocentric, patriarchal societies, which is based on the culture of white- and male-dominated societies, regardless of the time period. Connell argues, “Masculinity and femininity are inherently relational concepts, which have meaning in relation to each other, as a social demarcation and cultural opposition. This holds regardless of the changing content of the demarcation in different societies and periods of history.”<sup>45</sup> This cultural opposition means that these hierarchies, which are primarily based on twentieth- and twenty-first-century understandings of masculinity, are still applicable to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century masculinities. Modern hierarchies and Early Modern hierarchies are, for all intents and purposes, one and the same.<sup>46</sup> This similarity allows me to take these newly established modern theories and apply them to Early Modern works.

The highest level of masculinity, hegemonic, is, the “correct” or “right” form of masculinity, one that is based on the power held within the highest ranks of a given society. Hegemony can “be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideal and institutional power,”<sup>47</sup> meaning that hegemonic masculinity is established by those already in power and used to further their control and lend support to their authority. Connell says, “It is the claim to authority . . . that is the mark of

---

45. Connell, 43-44.

46. Twentieth- and twenty-first-century Western culture is predominantly Eurocentric and patriarchal, perhaps even less so than in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Gender binaries were even more socially dominant than they are now, but many of these same gender binaries still exist. As such, Connell’s hierarchies work in both modern and Early Modern contexts.

47. Connell, 77.



hegemony,”<sup>48</sup> and this “claim to authority” exists solely to further push the hegemonic standard that it sets. For Eurocentric societies, hegemonic masculinity requires men be white, heterosexual, and cisgender. Men must also exhibit traits of the “man’s man,” such as physical fitness, the lack of emotion, and a propensity for aggressive, but not necessarily violent, behavior.<sup>49</sup> This standard is the current position of power to which hegemonic masculinity’s authority clings. Bear in mind that this standard for hegemonic masculinity is for Eurocentric cultures *only*. As Connell points out, “‘Hegemonic masculinity’ is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is, rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations.”<sup>50</sup> Definitions of hegemonic masculinity vary from culture to culture; but in Eurocentric cultures, these standards remain the same across the board.

The second of the dominant masculinities, complicit, is defined by Connell through its relation to hegemonic masculinity:

If a large number of men have some connection with the hegemonic project but do not embody hegemonic masculinity, we need a way of theorizing their specific situation. This can be done by recognizing another relationship among groups of men, the relationship of complicity with the hegemonic project. Masculinities constructed in ways that realize the patriarchal dividend, without the tensions or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy, are complicit in this sense.<sup>51</sup>

---

48. Connell, 77.

49. See “Investigating Hegemonic Masculinity: Portrayals of Masculinity in Men’s Lifestyle Magazines” by Rosemary Ricciardelli, Kimberley A. Clow, and Philip White, for more information on how hegemonic masculinity is represented in Western culture.

50. Connell, 76.

51. Connell, 79.

Men who fall under the label of complicit masculinity must meet all of the identity-based traits of hegemonic masculinity; they must be white, heterosexual, and cisgender. What separates complicit masculinity from hegemonic is the lack of other previously-mentioned traits of hegemonic masculinity. Complicit men may not be physically fit but instead are quite slim or overweight. Complicit men may not be afraid to show their emotions or may not be prone to aggression. No matter what these men are missing, though, they, by categorical definition, cannot fit under the hegemonic umbrella. These men are, however, still supportive of the hegemonic standard, hence their “complicit” stance regarding masculinity and continue to either try to reach the hegemonic standard or, possibly, believe they already have. Interestingly, as Connell points out, “Normative definitions of masculinity . . . face the problem that not many men actually meet the normative standards. . . . The number of men rigorously practising the hegemonic pattern in its entirety may be quite small. Yet the majority of men gain from its hegemony, since they benefit from the patriarchal dividend.”<sup>52</sup> It is this benefit that establishes this complicit nature in men, most of whom believe that hegemonic masculinity is the “best” version of masculinity even though most fail to meet the requirements of it.

The first of the subordinated masculinities, marginalized masculinity, lies on the third level of the masculinity hierarchy. The term *marginalized* is itself problematic, as Connell explains: “Though the term is not ideal, I cannot improve on ‘marginalization’ to refer to the relations between the masculinities in the dominant and subordinated classes or ethnic groups.”<sup>53</sup> These subordinated classes and ethnic groups to which Connell is

---

52. Connell, 79.

53. Connell, 80.

referring are disabled white men and all men of color. The marginalized category, in fact, covers *all* heterosexual and cisgender men who do not fit into either the hegemonic or complicit categories. Unlike their complicit counterparts who *can*, eventually, come to meet the requirements of hegemonic masculinity and can, therefore, move up the hierarchical ranks of masculinity, men in the marginalized category cannot and will always remain there in a Eurocentric society. Even if these men support the hegemonic status quo, even if they are near-complicit in their performance of and adherence to hegemonic standards, they are forever relegated to the status of marginalized within the hierarchies of masculinity.

The last of the masculinities, and the lowest on the hierarchy, is subordinate masculinity. The generalized category, which has the same name, should not be confused with this specific type of masculinity. The subordinate category contains both marginalized and subordinate masculinities, but subordinate masculinity does *not* cover those men who fall into the marginalized category; subordinate masculinity is its own type. Subordinate masculinity arises out of the “dominance of heterosexual men and the subordination of homosexual men.”<sup>54</sup> “Oppression positions homosexual masculinities at the bottom of a gender hierarchy among men,” argues Connell. “Gayness, in patriarchal ideology, is the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity.”<sup>55</sup> Hence, everything “not-masculine,” based on the binary opposition of male-female gender roles in Eurocentric societies, must, therefore, be feminine; so, “from

---

54. Connell, 78.

55. Connell, 78.

the point of view of hegemonic masculinity, gayness is easily assimilated to femininity.”<sup>56</sup> Important to remember, though, is that “[g]ay masculinity is the most conspicuous, but is not the only subordinated masculinity.”<sup>57</sup> Subordinate masculinity could also be referred to as *queer masculinity*, covering any men who do not fit into any of the other three categories. Any non-heterosexual, non-cisgender men would be considered subordinate in their masculinity, thus the use of the word *queer* to describe the men who find themselves in this category. As Connell mentions, however, subordinate masculinity is not limited to men who would, traditionally, be referred to as *queer*: “Some heterosexual men and boys too are expelled from the circle of legitimacy.”<sup>58</sup> This subordinating, this queering, of even heterosexual men reveals that the oppressive nature of hegemonic masculinity, the top of the masculine food chain, will prey on its own they fail to meet the societal standards set forth for what makes a man a man in the eyes of said hegemonic practices.

The following chart simplifies the hierarchies of masculinity for better understanding of how these masculinities interact with one another. This thesis will revisit this chart in order to help better establish the links between masculinity and meat eating and how those hierarchies coexist and support one another. For now, this chart offers a basic look at the aforementioned hierarchies of masculinity as explained by R. W. Connell.

---

56. Connell, 78.

57. Connell, 78.

58. Connell, 78.

<b>Masculinity Type</b>	<b>Qualities</b>
Hegemonic	White, heterosexual, cisgender, physically fit (muscular), does not share emotions, aggressive. The “man’s man” stereotype.
Complicit	White, heterosexual, cisgender, but missing one or more aspects of hegemonic masculinity. May be slim or overweight, emotional, unaggressive. Believes that hegemonic masculinity is “correct” and strives to achieve it.
Marginalized	Men of color or disabled white men who otherwise meet all the requirements of either hegemonic or complicit masculinity.
Subordinate	Non-cisgender, non-heterosexual (i.e., queer); Some heterosexual men.

Figure 1

Fortunately, the hierarchies of meat eating, as established by J. Twigg, while requiring some explanation, do not need such detailed coverage as the work of Connell. Twigg’s initial argument describes exactly what Adams and Simonsen argued in their respective pieces; but, interestingly, neither of those scholars ever mentioned Twigg’s work. Twigg’s article, however, *does* cover the entire spectrum of meat eating, so the omissions of Adams and Simonsen are hardly nefarious. Twigg’s scholarship would, unfortunately, help both Adams and Simonsen rather than negate their works; so the omissions are somewhat confusing. In any case, Twigg’s examination of the hierarchy of meat eating, and a bit on the relation of how that hierarchy interacts with masculinity, can help further evidence my argument of the link between the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating.

“Meat is the most highly prized of food,”<sup>59</sup> says Twigg as she begins constructing her own hierarchy, one that places meat at the top: “At the top of the hierarchy, then, we find meat, and in particular red meat, for the status and meaning of meat is

---

59. Julia Twigg, “Vegetarianism and the Meanings of Meat,” in *The Sociology of Food and Eating: Essays on the Sociological Significance of Food*, ed. Anne Murcott (Aldershot: Gower, 1983), 21.

quintessentially found in red meat.”<sup>60</sup> Twigg goes on to make the connection between red meat and manhood, leaving one to wonder why Adams never addressed Twigg’s work. Because “food in the west is culturally patterned,”<sup>61</sup> it makes sense, then that “[m]en in particular are thought in some sense to need meat, especially red meat, and a series of masculine qualities are encapsulated in the idea of redbloodness”<sup>62</sup> that comes with the eating of red meat. One point of contention between Twigg’s theory and my own lies in her suggestion that “red meat and men, white and women”<sup>63</sup> fits the social hierarchy sustained and engendered by a patriarchal, Eurocentric culture. While I do agree that white meat could be considered the “feminine” meat, I do not agree that it should be linked exclusively to women. If, as Adams argues, meat is inherently masculine, then white meat could *not* be truly feminine; it would still be masculine in some form, giving it back to maleness.

This disagreement gains even more ground when considering Twigg’s own argument for how vegetarianism and veganism fit into this social hierarchy of masculinity and its ties to meat eating. Twigg argues that “vegetarianism’s relationship to the dominant culture’s perception of food” makes it “clear that vegetarianism shares many aspects of the hierarchy” while it, simultaneously, also “draws on and . . . disrupts this traditional imagery of meat.”<sup>64</sup> Vegetarianism and its stricter cousin veganism both

---

60. Twigg, “Vegetarianism,” 22.

61. Twigg, 18.

62. Twigg, 24.

63. Twigg, 24.

64. Twigg, 26.

seek to disrupt this social hierarchy of meat eating and, in so doing, also disrupt the social hierarchy of masculinity. Just as Simonsen argues that veganism affirms deviation for the male, therefore queering him and subordinating his masculinity, Twigg says the same thing, albeit from a more hierarchical perspective: “Those who adopt the most thoroughgoing of vegetarian diets – the vegan – eat, as it were, down the hierarchy, restricting themselves exclusively to the category furthest from the top.”<sup>65</sup> By eating down the hierarchy, men subordinate themselves and move further away from hegemonic masculinity, because, as I have already mentioned, and Twigg reaffirms, “[v]egetarian food is, as we have noted, female food in the grammar of conventional eating,”<sup>66</sup> which places a non-meat-eating male at the bottom of the masculinity food chain, as expressed in her own chart detailing the hierarchies and relationships between diets that include meat and those that do not.<sup>67</sup>

But what does this mean for Twigg’s argument regarding women and the eating of white meat? If vegetarian foods are inherently feminine, why is white meat also considered feminine? What is the difference between vegetarianism and veganism in the meat eating hierarchy? How do those two methods of approaching food interact with one another in a hierarchy? These questions are what drew me to theorize the full connection between Connell’s hierarchy of masculinity (hegemonic, complicit, marginalized, subordinate) and Twigg’s hierarchy of meat eating (red meat, white meat, vegetarian diet,

---

65. Twigg, 27.

66. Twigg, 27.

67. Twigg, 21.

vegan diet). The connection between the two appears all the clearer when we look at a newly-constructed chart in which we have both hierarchies placed together.

<b>Masculinity Type</b>	<b>Meat eating</b>
Hegemonic	Red Meat
Complicit	White Meat
Marginalized	Vegetarianism (animal products allowed)
Subordinate	Veganism (fruits, grains, vegetables only)

Figure 2

When we look at the two hierarchies side-by-side in one unified theoretical position, we find the answers to my questions. White meat is complicit in that, while it is still *meat*, it is “not as meat” as red meat is, fitting perfectly with the concept of complicit masculinity as established by Connell, a near-the-top-but-not-quite form of meat eating that is limited to fish and some cuts of chicken. Thus, white meat, while the more feminine of the two kinds of meat, is not feminine itself as connected to the hierarchy of masculinity.

We also find the hierarchical positions for vegetarianism and veganism. As Twigg argues, and as we see in Figure 2, vegetarian-style diets still cause men to eat themselves down the masculinity food chain; but there is a significant difference between vegetarianism and veganism as they apply to a man’s masculine position within his culture. Vegetarianism, while still disrupting the social norms of meat eating required of men in patriarchal, Eurocentric cultures, could still be seen as *somewhat* socially acceptable even though vegetarian men find themselves as outliers, on the margins of masculinity. Vegans, though, find themselves completely subordinated, as Simonson argues, queering themselves either intentionally or unintentionally as they take on a vegan diet, completely eschewing any meat or animal products in their diets. Whereas vegetarianism is a disruption of the hierarchy, veganism is an outright protest against it,



subordinating the male vegan's masculinity and queering his position within a meat-centric society.

What this thesis addresses in terms of the uber-masculinity of red meat and the queerness of veganism is nothing new; but what *is* new is its providing a middle ground and the full connections between masculinity and meat eating, allowing us to further explore these connections on a spectrum of masculinity and meat eating instead of these rigid social hierarchies and problematic binaries. No longer do we have only the polar opposites as presented by Adams and Simonsen; we now have a full-on spectrum that allows us to better explore these connections between masculinity and meat eating without having to rely on an "if this, then this" mentality. We can use gastromasculinity as a unified lens through which we can examine every facet of culture, whether it be our own or those that came before us. By tearing down the binary, we allow for more inclusivity within an understanding of gastronomy theory itself, giving those previously excluded by the binary a place at the gastromasculine table. Furthermore, we can further solidify the connections between masculinity and meat eating, examine how the hierarchies work in tandem, and explore how these hierarchies are expressed throughout literature, particularly, as this thesis will explore, the works of William Shakespeare.

To be candid, I must stress that this thesis does not seek to assert that Shakespeare utilized the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating as he wrote his plays as a way to speak on or speak out either for or against these hierarchies. What this thesis *does* seek to assert is that Shakespeare's plays reflect the entrenching of these hierarchical relationships in a Eurocentric patriarchal culture, so much so that the actions and words of his characters make even more sense, and are much more relatable, when viewed

through a gastromasculine lens. In this thesis, the gastromasculine approach focuses on the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating, allowing us to examine the works of William Shakespeare with new eyes, seeing, perhaps for the first time, that what goes into the mouth of these characters, or what does not, is just as important as what comes out.

## Chapter 2: Shakespeare's Meat and Other Dubious Food-Based Phrases

Shakespeare's love of using food, especially meat, in his plays signals a cultural attachment to food that we in the twenty-first century are no stranger to. Many of our most important cultural identifiers lie in the types of foods we eat, how we spice them, and even with what we use to eat them. For a Eurocentric, patriarchal society, meat remains at the top of the gastromasculine food chain, with meat serving as the cultural identifier for what type of food "makes a man." A quick Google search of the phrase *eat like a man* results in numerous cookbooks that feature meat on the cover, further evidencing this meat-centric connection between meat and masculinity as mentioned by Adams in Chapter 1 and better covered through my own explanations of the hierarchical connections between masculinity and meat eating.

These connections are literally in-your-face as both visual reminders and gastronomic reminders of the gastromasculine nature of equating masculinity to meat eating, and vice-versa. Shakespeare's explorations of masculinity take a decidedly interesting turn when we start examining these explorations through the lens of gastromasculinity, allowing us to better glimpse moments in the Shakespearean canon that, while possibly ignored as anything more than fleeting food-based moments, actually dig deep into the heart of masculine expression through foodstuffs.

Before we begin, I must reiterate that this thesis does not intend to argue, assume, or state that Shakespeare used meat in his plays to suit any gastromasculine purpose. We will not delve into intentional fallacy territory. Even though many of Shakespeare's plays do contain critiques and criticisms of various aspects of Early Modern society and culture, his use of meat eating, more than likely, is *not* focused on critiquing or criticizing

Early Modern masculinity and the role of meat in the support of Eurocentric patriarchy. To repurpose and reword a popular turn of phrase, sometimes a steak is simply a steak and meat is simply meat. Appelbaum is quick to point out, “Every now and then, you will notice, a writer of the early modern period has something to say about food.”<sup>68</sup> As Appelbaum suggests, it is not uncommon for writers of Shakespeare’s time to include mentions of food within their works; food served as an important cultural identifier just as it does today. These writers, however, are not always writing about the food *itself*, but everything that we as an audience would associate with that food. A writer like Shakespeare “interjects something about food in order to score a point about something else, yet the interjection is, finally, *about food too*—about what we do with it, what we want from it, what it means,”<sup>69</sup> revealing these double meanings which, I intend to show, underscore Shakespeare’s messages even if these gastromasculine moments are not the central focus of their respective scenes.

With Shakespeare’s wit and the prevalence of sexual innuendo and double-entendre present in so many of his plays, though, it would be hard to argue that Shakespeare’s choices are not serving representations of masculinity. Therefore, this thesis, while exploring Shakespeare’s canon through this gastromasculine lens and illustrating the hierarchical connections between masculinity and meat eating, will not make any authorial claims to the intentions behind the Shakespeare’s choices, merely that these choices *reflect*, but do not necessarily *speak to*, these connections in Early Modern

---

68. Appelbaum, *Aguecheek’s Beef*, xi.

69. Appelbaum, xii

England. For these Early Moderns, food served not only as a “biological function, or an economic reality answering to a biological function, but also the object of a discourse,”<sup>70</sup> because “food in this period, as in any other—yet in its own way, in keeping with its own specific material conditions, assumptions, attitudes, and languages--bears a unique identity or set of identities.”<sup>71</sup> Even though, as this thesis will argue, we can read Shakespeare’s body of work and key in to these distinctly modern theories from the likes of Connell, Twigg, Adams, Simonson, and others, and pick up on notions of gastromasculinity that extend from both before and beyond the Early Modern period, much of what Shakespeare does with meat *in his plays* and *in this period* differs from modern explorers of the connections between masculinity and meat eating.

### Meating Shakespeare

For Shakespeare, along with other Early Moderns, “Meat was considered the most desirable food” of the period.<sup>72</sup> Published in 1587, physician Andrew Boorde’s *Breuiarie of Health*, a manual for health and wellness, mentions that meat was particularly the realm of the man’s appetite: “In English it is a mans appe / tide to meat.”<sup>73</sup> Boorde makes mention of other medicinal qualities of meat in *Breuiarie*, most of which deal with

---

70. Appelbaum, xii-xiii

71. Appelbaum, xiii

72. Mary Anne Caton and Joan Thirsk, *Fooles and Fricassees: Food in Shakespeare’s England* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1999), 14.

73. Andrew Boorde, *The Breuiarie of Health: Vvherin Doth Folow, Remedies, for All Maner of Sickneses & Diseases the Which May Be in Man or Woman: Expressing the Obscure Termes of Greeke, Araby, Latin, Barbary, and English, concerning Phisick and Chirurgerie* (London: Thomas Este, 1598), Ch. 27, p. 8.

humoral theory<sup>74</sup>, which survived well beyond the Seventeenth Century.<sup>75</sup> In this moment, though, we have a direct link between a “man’s appetite” and meat’s importance to it from a writer of Shakespeare’s own time; and from a physician, no less. For Shakespeare to glom onto this connection between masculinity and meat eating, then, should come as no surprise to readers. Shakespeare’s inclusion of meat as a symbol of masculinity could, then, be “[derived] from the stereotypical depiction of strength as a masculine characteristic,”<sup>76</sup> allowing “masculinity [to] emerge as [one of] meat’s core cultural meanings”<sup>77</sup> throughout his plays.

Many of Shakespeare’s uses of meat, and its connection to masculinity, focus on the sexual innuendo provided by the word itself. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word *meat* had many of the same sexual connotations that it does now. When, in *As You Like It*, Touchstone tells Audrey that “to cast away honesty / upon a foul slut were to put good meat into an unclean / dish,”<sup>78</sup> he is not only making the remark

---

74. “Humoral theory was one of the central principles in Western medicine from antiquity through the 19th century. ‘Humoral’ derives from the word ‘humor,’ which, in this context, means ‘fluid.’ The human body was thought to contain a mix of the four humors: black bile (also known as melancholy), yellow or red bile, blood, and phlegm. Each individual had a particular humoral makeup, or ‘constitution,’ and health was defined as the proper humoral balance for that individual.’ From “Humoral Theory,” Open Collections Program: Contagion, Humoral Theory, accessed March 31, 2018, <http://ocp.hul.harvard.edu/contagion/humoraltheory.html>.

75. Ken Albala, *Eating Right in the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 8.

76. Bettina Heinz and Ronald Lee, “Getting Down to the Meat: The Symbolic Construction of Meat Consumption,” *Communication Studies* 49, no. 1 (1998): 92, accessed July 17, 2017, doi:10.1080/10510979809368520.

77. Heinz and Lee, “Getting Down,” 86.

78. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997), 3.3.35-37.

about putting a good piece of roast into a pan that has not been properly prepared for the meat's presentation. Touchstone also references what it would be like for a man like him, a man of the court, to put his "meat," his penis, into Audrey's "dish," her vagina, since she is a poor shepherdess and of the lower class. An Early Modern audience would have picked up on this context quite quickly; but modern audiences, often assuming that Shakespeare would *never* make jokes like that, might miss the connection between masculinity and meat in this line.

This bawdy moment is not Touchstone's only use of *meat*, though. He uses it two other times in the play, the final time showcasing exactly how meat connects to masculinity, especially for him. Upon seeing William, Audrey's potential suitor, for the first time, Touchstone realizes his "masculinity is about to be challenged"<sup>79</sup> and that he must overcompensate through hypermasculinization in order to overcome this challenge, especially because William's masculinity, as close as we can tell, fits into hegemony, whereas Touchstone's is complicit at best. What Touchstone says as William approaches is telling. For Touchstone, "It is meat and drink to see a clown."<sup>80</sup> Touchstone, the fool of *AYL*, is listed as a clown in the *Dramatis Personae*, which makes this moment even more humorous. *The Riverside Shakespeare* notes that, in this instance, *clown* means "country yokel."<sup>81</sup> The effect is the same either way. It is Touchstone's insistence that seeing William is "meat" to him that signals the gastromasculine connection. Touchstone must

---

79. Emily Huegatter, "Interview with Emily Heugatter," interview by author, November 11, 2017.

80. Shakespeare, *AYL*, 5.1.10.

81. William Shakespeare, *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Gwynne Blakemore. Evans, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 429.

dig into the most masculine parts of his person in order to present a challenge to someone who is physically larger and stronger than the witty, intellectual fool. As the sight of William is meat for Touchstone, the ingestion of such will enable him to face this challenge to his masculinity. Riley Turner's 2017 performance as Touchstone in the University of Central Oklahoma's production of *AYL* presented, as far as I have seen, the best example of this hypermasculinization as the court fool approaches the country yokel.

In the play, Turner's Touchstone begins by trying to begin a battle of wits with William, played by Beau Nelson, which is the only way, so far, that Touchstone knows how to challenge someone. It quickly becomes obvious that this approach will not work, and Touchstone's aggression becomes more and more pronounced until we get to the moment when he becomes hegemonic aggressor and not complicit pacifist. As Touchstone begins his tirade, breaking down the meaning of his own elevated words for the unintelligent William, Turner took this moment to begin acting physically aggressive toward Nelson, placing his finger on Nelson's chest, poking him and pushing him backward. Turner then began lowering his tone, raising his voice, and actively pursuing him across the stage until finally reaching the moment when Touchstone threatens William's life unless the bumpkin leaves Audrey alone:

**TOUCHSTONE**

Therefore, you clown, abandon—which is in the vulgar leave—the society—which in the boorish is company—of this female—which in the common is woman; which together is, abandon the society of this female, or, clown, thou perishest; or to thy better understanding, diest; or (to wit) I kill thee, make thee away, translate thy life into death, they liberty into bondage. I will deal in poison with thee, or in bastinado, or in steel; I will bandy with thee in faction; I will o'errun thee with [policy]; I will kill thee a



hundred and fifty ways: therefore tremble and depart.<sup>82</sup>

These threats of physical violence and the actual physicality as displayed by Turner in his performance reveal this “meat,” as Touchstone described it, in order to actively engage the hegemonic William from Touchstone’s complicit standpoint. William’s lack of intelligence forces Touchstone to move up the masculinity hierarchy and press William from his own level and, therefore, pushing him down to Touchstone’s original position. Touchstone’s meat, here, demonstrates the gastromasculine connection and the hypermasculinizing effects of meat itself.

Touchstone’s speech plays, no pun intended, on the notion of his masculinity’s dominance over that of William’s. What begins as mere insults quite quickly shifts into threats of physical violence, and even death, should William not succumb to Touchstone’s transformation from complicit to hegemonic. The first half of the speech, which could come across as Touchstone’s normal witty banter, similar to the conversations had with Corin and Jacques in earlier scenes, devolves into a frighteningly grotesque display of hypermasculinity as Touchstone’s “meat,” William, becomes the fool’s gastromasculine prey and falls victim to more than a few witty words insulting the young shepherd’s intelligence. The overaggressiveness of Touchstone’s actions, which Turner portrayed with brute anger and force, gives us our first look at Shakespeare’s handling of how meat and masculinity find their hierarchical links. As Touchstone’s meat, William finds his masculinity dropped down a notch from hegemonic to complicit and Touchstone’s takes over.

---

82. Shakespeare, *AYL*, 5.1.46-57.

In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Shakespeare provides us another glance at the “meat as masculine” concept. Katherine, her diet quite restricted by Petruchio, has her dinner placed in front of her. Petruchio, the man attempting to “tame” Katherine and turn her into the perfect wife, quickly angers, exclaiming that the food is “burnt, and so is all the meat.”<sup>83</sup> Kate disagrees, however, stating “The meat was well.”<sup>84</sup> This play on words, the meat being both *not* burnt but well-cooked and good or pleasing to the palate, suggests that there may be underlying gastromasculine themes at play. Petruchio, rebutting Katherine, argues that the meat “engenders choler” and “planteth anger,”<sup>85</sup> and that since both he and Katherine are already choleric,<sup>86</sup> that is, short-tempered, that they should “fast”<sup>87</sup> and not fill their bellies with “overroasted flesh.”<sup>88</sup>

Petruchio’s argument that meat induces choler does not stray far from Early Modern understandings of how food interacted with bodily humors. Additionally, Katherine *does* have quite the temper; but so does Petruchio. Petruchio’s insistence that Katherine not have meat has a more sinister origination that concern over both lovers’ tempers:

PETRUCHIO  
Another way I have to man my haggard,

---

83. William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997), 4.1.161.

84. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.169.

85. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.172.

86. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.174.

87. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.173.

88. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.175.

To make her come, and know her keeper's call,  
 That is, to watch her, as we watch these kites  
 That bate and beat and will not be obedient.  
 She eat no meat to-day, nor none shall eat;  
 ...  
 I'll curb her mad and headstrong humor.<sup>89</sup>

Petruchio wants to deny Katherine meat because of how headstrong she is, her somewhat masculine attitude and aggressiveness are threats to Petruchio's masculinity. He cannot tame Katherine when she acts and speaks with masculine aggression and overtones, so she must be denied the food that must be at the root of it all: meat. Petruchio cannot make Katherine come to his every beck and call, he cannot make her totally obedient, if she eats a food that makes her strong-willed and masculine. He must bring her to a subordinated position, a feminine position, if he is to woo her and bring her to heel. If she continues displaying acts of masculinity when she should be expressing herself as feminine, she is placing herself within the upper reaches of the masculinity hierarchy, which simply cannot happen.

Later in Act 4, Katherine complains to Grumio about her treatment at the hands of his master, Petruchio. She cries she is "starv'd for meat"<sup>90</sup> and begs Grumio to bring her some "wholesome food."<sup>91</sup> Grumio taunts her, offering her various meat dishes, knowing full well that while she desires them, Petruchio has clearly stated that she is not to have meat. Grumio offers her a "neat's foot,"<sup>92</sup> meaning the foot of an ox, "a fat tripe finely

---

89. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.1.193-197, 209.

90. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.9.

91. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.16.

92. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.17.

broil'd,"<sup>93</sup> and "a piece of beef and mustard."<sup>94</sup> All of these dishes sound mouth-watering to Katherine; but Grumio pulls back each offer, citing their choleric<sup>95</sup> natures. Katherine finally has enough and exclaims, "Go get the gone, thou false deluding slave, / That feed'st me with the very name of meat."<sup>96</sup> Between lines 31 and 32, the stage directions indicate that Katherine physically assaults Grumio for suggesting he bring her all these meat dishes but doing so in name only. This exchange further highlights Petruchio's decision to, quite literally, rub his meat in Katherine's face through a gastromasculine, pseudo-phallic bit of hypermasculine sexual assault. This "eat my meat" mentality, which I will further cover in Chapter 3, firmly places Petruchio at the top of the masculinity food chain. No longer will Katherine's supposed masculine traits dominate their relationship. Petruchio, through Grumio, engages in the verbal rape of Katherine with promises of providing her meat-based pleasure but, every time, pulls out at the last minute. The masculine pleasure provided by the meat dishes, both gastronomically and sexually, is simultaneously denied to Katherine as a means to tame her. Petruchio uses his sexuality and hegemonic masculinity, intent on the oppression of women and all non-hegemonic men, as a means of gastromasculine sexual assault, both providing and denying Katherine the very thing she wants so that she can be herself once again: meat.

Far from sexual assault, but still an assault on one's masculinity, comes at the hands of Prince Hal in *The First Part of Henry the Fourth's* famous "mock court" scene

---

93. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.20.

94. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.23.

95. See previous reference to humoral theory on page 31.

96. Shakespeare, *TS*, 4.3.31-32.

at the Boar's Head Tavern. In this somewhat metadramatic scene, Hal and Sir John Falstaff, the target of Hal's ire, exchange words with Hal playing the role of his father, King Henry IV, and Falstaff playing Hal. Falstaff, who has lied to Hal numerous times throughout their friendship, appears to finally cut too close to Hal and angers the young prince. What begins as a bit of witty banter and harmless insults turns into an aggressive assault on Falstaff's personality, body, and masculinity, somewhat echoing Touchstone's previously mentioned attack on young William. Falstaff, as Hal, suggests that his old friend Sir John Falstaff is a good man and someone that Hal should continue his companionship with. Hal, as King Henry, says he has heard otherwise about the "noble" Falstaff. To "Hal," that is, Falstaff, "King Henry" says

PRINCE

Swearst thou, ungracious boy? henceforth  
 ne'er look on me. Thou art violently carried away from  
 grace, there is a devil haunts thee in the likeness of  
 an old fat man, a tun of man is thy companion. Why  
 dost thou converse with that trunk of humors, that  
 bolting-hutch of beastliness, that swoll'n parcel  
 of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuff'd  
 cloak-bag of guts, that roasted Manningtree ox with  
 the pudding in his belly, that reverent Vice, that grey  
 Iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in years?  
 Wherein is he good, but to taste sack and drink  
 it? wherein neat and cleanly, but to carve a capon and  
 eat it? wherein cunning, but in craft? wherein crafty,  
 but in villainy? where in villainous, but in all things?  
 where in worthy, but in nothing?<sup>97</sup>

There are many pieces of this speech that must be examined individually that, when put back together, reveals the outright subordination of Falstaff at the hands of Prince Hal.

---

97. William Shakespeare, *The First Part of Henry the Fourth*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 2.4.445-459.

First, Hal addresses Falstaff's most visible feature: his weight. Per the hierarchy of masculinity, unfit men, whether overweight or thin, fall under complicit masculinity. Here, Hal places Falstaff firmly beneath him in the hierarchal masculinity structure. And he does it not once, but twice. Referring to Falstaff as "an old fat man" and "a tun of man" drives Falstaff directly down the ranks of the masculinity hierarchy, suggesting that Hal thinks of Falstaff as less than a man, or at least a lesser man than Hal himself.

Second, while still addressing Falstaff's weight, Hal comes at Falstaff with accusation after accusation regarding his love for sack, which is a type of cheap wine. Alcoholism, a noted disability and one with which Falstaff certainly suffers, causes Falstaff to slide further down the masculinity hierarchy into marginalization. Third, the mention of the capon, a castrated rooster raised solely for eating, seals the deal for Falstaff's masculinity. This mention of meat, even though white, is more a jab at Falstaff's masculinity or, in this case, the lack thereof. Like a capon, Falstaff himself is castrated and has no manliness about him whatsoever, lowering him into the category of subordinate masculinity.

Hal's subordination of Falstaff's masculinity, especially in front of a tavern filled with their mutual friends, marks the turning point for Hal's openly negative views of Falstaff, which he may have been harboring for some time. Hal squares himself in the category of hegemonic masculinity and drops Falstaff as far down as he can go, taking every last bit of the old knight's credibility and masculinity with him. This scene, while similar to the previously mentioned speech from *As You Like It*, is inherently more vicious and cruel in its nature. While Hal's speech somewhat mimics Touchstone's hypermasculine aggression, the speakers' goals are entirely different. Whereas

Touchstone is simply trying to get rid of William so he can put his “good meat” into Audrey’s “unclean dish,” Hal is verbally reducing Falstaff’s masculinity to nothing, turning the old man into a bombard-like capon himself. Not only is Falstaff an obese alcoholic, taking him down to complicit and marginalized masculinities respectively, he, like the capon, has no testicles and therefore no masculinity. Hal degrades Falstaff’s very person and subordinates the old knight and his masculinity, emasculating him in front of the very people Falstaff desperately tries to impress and befriend through a relentless gastromasculine assault. Falstaff does attempt to regain his masculinity, claim his virility, and reclaim his “manhood;” but this does not happen in *IH4*. Instead, one of Shakespeare’s follow-ups to *IH4*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, gives Falstaff another chance at being a man.

Falstaff’s attempts at reclaiming his manhood in *Merry Wives* goes about as well as one would expect; they don’t. Complaining about his mistreatment at the hands of the play’s women, Falstaff offers playgoers an impressive gastromasculine analogy:

FALSTAFF

...I suffer’d  
the pangs of three several deaths: first, an intolerable fright, to be detected with a jealous rotten bell-wether; next, to be compass’d like a good bilbo in the circumference of a peck, hilt to point, heel to head; and then to be stopp’d in like a strong distillation with stinking clothes that fretted in their own grease. Think of that—a man of my kidney. Think of that—that am subject to heat as butter; a man of continual dissolution and thaw. It was a miracle to scape suffocation. And in the height of this bath (when I was more than half stew’d in grease, like a Dutch dish) to be thrown

into the Thames, and cool'd, glowing-hot.<sup>98</sup>

Falstaff, stewing in his own grease like a Dutch dish, tries to recapture his masculinity and reestablish himself within the hierarchy of masculinity. This comedic turn fails spectacularly, of course, as his description does not fill the metaphorical space left from Hal's previous jabs. One key word in this speech is *stewing*, taking a Shakespearean double-meaning that also references the "Dutch dish" Falstaff says he felt like. Most well-known Dutch stews, such as *hutspot*,<sup>99</sup> while served *with* meat, do not contain meat themselves. Falstaff considers himself a vegetable stew, or more appropriately, a potato soup, based on his later exclamation in Act 5 to Mistress Ford: "Let the sky rain / potatoes."<sup>100</sup> Instead of a meaty, masculine dish, Falstaff serves himself up as a vegetarian dish, remarginalizing his masculinity, not reestablishing its hegemonic status as he seems to be trying to do. It would not be a stretch to also link Falstaff's mention of the Dutch dish back to the earlier conversation regarding Audrey's "dish." Falstaff inadvertently transforms himself into a literal vagina when he describes himself as the vegetarian stew.

There's more to the stew than that, though, according to Christian M. Billing.

Billing argues that in this scene, we have "an image of a man so pathetic, so desperate to

---

98. William Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 3.5.107-120.

99. According to Lisa Bramen of *Smithsonian.com*, Dutch lore sets the origins of *hutspot* in the Sixteenth Century, "at the end of the Siege of Leiden during the Eighty Years' War." From Lisa Bramen, "Hutspot-the Taste of Dutch Freedom," *Smithsonian.com*, October 01, 2010, accessed March 31, 2018, <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/hutspotthe-taste-of-dutch-freedom-101179337/>.

100. Shakespeare, *MW*, 5.5.18-19.



prove his virility, that he seeks to capture even the briefest moment of metaphorical masculinity as proof of social and sexual status.”<sup>101</sup> This desire to prove his sexual status, Billing claims, is an “image . . . born of anxiety” and that “it betrays the apprehension felt by men who define their masculinity in phallic terms yet know deep down that the pathetic dangling appendage they are indecorously endowed cannot sustain the perpetual demands that patriarchal society places upon The Phallus.”<sup>102</sup> After his verbal castration at the hands of Prince Hal, Falstaff desperately attempts to reclaim his masculinity through hyperbolic gastromasculine images of stewing in his own grease. The issue with this, though, is not that it marginalizes Falstaff’s masculinity. The issue is that it subordinates his masculinity: “As Falstaff attempts comically to cast himself in virile terms, he exemplifies paradigmatic adherence to the kind of humoral philosophy that puts men in danger of dissolving into femininity; because his fantasies of rampant masculinity are so ridiculous, Falstaff fights a continually losing battle.”<sup>103</sup> In other words, the more Falstaff tries to exclaim, acclaim, and reclaim his masculinity, the more feminine he becomes. Falstaff unsuccessfully takes back what Hal took from him and instead further proves that Hal’s subordinating of Falstaff was not mere rhetoric. Falstaff is subordinate to Hal, and Shakespeare’s other men, in every gastromasculine sense of the word.

While these instances of gastromasculinity through meat eating are some of Shakespeare’s finest, they are far from the only examples found in his canon. From the

---

101. Christian M. Billing, *Masculinity, Corporality and the English Stage 1580-1635* (London: Routledge, 2016), 76.

102. Billing, *Masculinity*, 76.

103. Billing, 76.

tragedies of *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Othello*; the comedies of *Much Ado about Nothing*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *The Comedy of Errors*; and the romances of *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Shakespeare relies on meat imagery, whether literal, metaphorical, or a combination of both, in many moments wherein masculinity takes center stage. Many of the examples are sexual in nature, similar to Touchstone's comment about "good meat," but others highlight the importance of meat as a metaphor for masculinity as a whole, at all stages of the hierarchy. One play, however, stands out above all the rest: *Timon of Athens*.

### **Feast or Famine in *Timon of Athens*, Shakespeare's Gastromasculine Masterpiece**

*Timon of Athens* does not stand out as one of Shakespeare's most popular plays, often forgotten or ignored as part of many studies on Shakespeare's work. The play is itself not without merit, though. Considered "a work of profound and disturbed feeling, of broken and uneven magnificence" but, formerly, "perhaps not a full play at all,"<sup>104</sup> "few critics today assume that *Timon* is immature or incomplete" and "that its richness and complexity allow for-and generate-various responses, responses that work on several levels."<sup>105</sup> In *Timon*, Shakespeare presents a lush and bountiful drama through which readers and playgoers can discover the epitome of gastromasculine examples from within the Shakespearean canon.

*Timon* offers the perfect place to solidify a gastromasculine reading of the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating due to the play's reliance on food and feasting. As Fitzpatrick points out, "In *Timon of Athens*, . . . there is conspicuous consumption in feasting, but here food becomes a vehicle for punishment."<sup>106</sup> This punishment, while not the central focus of this chapter, is still of the utmost importance when it comes to a gastromasculine reading of the play. How Timon reaches his punishment, his end, however, is even more important than the punishment itself. The feast is both the "vehicle" for this punishment and what drives it forward, bringing Timon closer toward

---

104. M.C. Bradbrook, *The Tragic Pageant of 'Timon of Athens'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 1.

105. Greg W. Bentley, *Shakespeare and the New Disease* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1989), 140.

106. Joan Fitzpatrick *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays* (Alderston: Ashgate, 2007), 9.

his end. To better understand how the feast brings about Timon's gastromasculine demise from hegemony to subordination, we must first understand the importance of feasting in Renaissance culture and how feasting itself affects the world of Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*.

According to Diane Purkiss, "Renaissance feasts are moral experiences illustrating the precept that what we eat must become us."<sup>107</sup> There can be no better way to describe Shakespeare's use of the feast in *Timon*. The experiences to which Purkiss refers come bubbling to the surface in the pot of morality which Timon himself brings to his feast table. The feast itself could be considered its own genre,<sup>108</sup> so classifying *Timon* as not only a tragedy but also a feast-tale would not be entirely inappropriate, especially considering the gastromasculine approach to which this thesis adheres to and explores. The classification of the play, and the food of the feast, aside, it is important to note that "the feast came to mean a blowout for the rich rather than the inclusion of the poor,"<sup>109</sup> a hierarchical subordination of the hegemonic rich compared to the lowly poor. While class does not appear to be a factor in Connell's original hierarchy of masculinity, to ignore it here would be ignoring the overt yet nuanced methods of class-based subordination at Timon's feast table: "The fraternity of the feast is contrasted with signs of difference

---

107. Diane Purkiss, "The Masque of Food: Staging and Banqueting in Shakespeare's England," *Shakespeare Studies* 42 (January 2014): 91, accessed July 15, 2017, [vortex3.uco.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=98888064&site=ehost-live](http://vortex3.uco.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=98888064&site=ehost-live).

108. Purkiss, "Masque," 91.

109. Purkiss, 92.

between people: the display of wealth and manners, and respect for the constraints imposed by the ritual, which reveal the social standing of the guests.”<sup>110</sup>

One could argue that, just like most other feasts found in Shakespeare, that “hospitality rules”<sup>111</sup> *Timon*’s feasts; and that would be an appropriate reading on the surface. After all, “at first glance it is not obvious why dining, real or metaphorical, should play so prominent a role,”<sup>112</sup> in *Timon*. What marks *Timon* as such a perfect example of Shakespeare’s proliferation of adherences to the hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating, though, is the subtext through which the protagonist shares his feast table. What begins as a joyous celebration for Timon devolves into revenge against those who has wronged him socially and financially and, ultimately, brought about his gastromasculine demise. Timon’s original purposes for his feasting and those he invited could make sense when we consider that the “feasts themselves could be engineered for a variety of reasons and managed in a way that either encouraged alliance or affinity,” but these same feasts may have “had an adverse effect on relationships” because the “relationships between those feasting together could be less than amicable, either before or as a result of the event.”<sup>113</sup> This understanding of the feast provides readers with an

---

110. Michel Jeanneret, *A Feast of Words: Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance*, trans. Jeremy Whiteley (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 39.

111. Bentley, *New Disease*, 6.

112. Douglas M. Lanier, “Cynical Dining in *Timon of Athens*,” in *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2016), 135.

113. Paul S. Lloyd, *Food and Identity in England, 1540-1640: Eating to Impress* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 149

interesting conundrum, forcing them to look at Timon as a dichotomy of naiveite and deceitfulness.

In the beginning of the play, we see Timon repeatedly mention his “supply of money,”<sup>114</sup> and willingly give it away, in one form or another. Timon’s utter disregard for his supposed fortune exudes class-based hegemony and forces his compatriots and fellow Athenians into a state of class-based subordination, queering them even though they are, as far as we know, ranked financially close to, or exactly the same as, Timon. While this subordination could certainly come across as malicious, it could easily be taken as nonchalant or outright ignorant of the state of one’s financial outlook and output, especially when we consider that Timon’s financial situation is, in fact, quite dire. When Flaminius, Timon’s servant, seeks to get back all the money Timon loaned to his “friends,” using that term loosely, those same men to whom Timon freely shared his wealth with are remiss to give him any coin in return. These instances of double-crossing may, to some readers, appear as evidence of Timon’s blindness to the two-faced nature of his fellow Athenians with which he was quick to share his money, and his feasts. And not just any feasts. These were “grand feast[s] rather than . . . banquet course[s].”<sup>115</sup> Timon spared no expense when inviting his friends to his feast table; but did this hegemonic display of wealth via food, a feast to which Alcibiades “could wish [his] best friend”

---

114. William Shakespeare, *The Life of Timon of Athens*, in *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 2.2.197.

115. Tracy Thong, “Performances of the Banquet Course in Early Modern Drama,” in *Renaissance Food from Rabelais to Shakespeare: Culinary Readings and Culinary Histories* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 110.

because, at Timon's feast, "there's / no meat like 'em'?"<sup>116</sup> Was he ignorant of his own financial situation, focusing on whether or not he *could* throw such feasts instead of thinking about whether or not he *should*? Eike Kronshage, Professor at Technical University Chemnitz, provides us with a possible answer to this situation, writing that "Timon is not, as is often claimed, unaware of what is going on around him, that he is not simply the victim of his avaricious guests, but [that he is] rather complicit in his own delusions."<sup>117</sup>

The "single purpose" of Timon's feasts, Kronshage argues, is to "[increase] his own prestige in Athens. His idea is that the good he does to his friends by showering them with expensive gifts is a good he does to himself, not because he holds the misguided opinion that it will increase the number of his friends, but because he is certain that it will increase his prestige."<sup>118</sup> Timon wants to increase his prestige through the use of feasts, ones with tables full of meat, as mentioned by Alcibiades, as a means to further his hegemonic status among the Athenian elite. There is no naivete here; Timon moves with reason, however possibly misguided, but not out of ignorance. He knows exactly what he is doing as he presents these feasts to his fellow Athenians: "The fraternity of the feast is contrasted with signs of difference between people: the display of wealth and manners, and respect for the constraints imposed by the ritual, which reveal the social

---

116. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.2.79-80

117. Eike Kronshage, "Conspicuous Consumption, Croyance, and the Problem of the Two Timons: Shakespeare and Middleton's *Timon of Athens*," *Critical Horizons* 18, no. 3 (August 2017): 3-4, accessed July 5, 2017, doi:10.1080/14409917.2017.1293892.

118. Kronshage, "Conspicuous Consumption," 6.

standing of the guests.”<sup>119</sup> Timon’s “display of wealth and manners” comes in the form of feast tables filled with meats, creating a combined class-based and gastromasculine subordination for his guests. Timon’s mistake, however, is breaking the rules of the feast with the Cynic, Apemantus. “To be barbarous is to eat your guests,” says Robert Appelbaum. “To be nobly savage is to eat your enemies. To be civil is to feast the former and, in the name of justice, torture the latter.”<sup>120</sup>

When Apemantus arrives at the feast, Timon inquires if the philosopher will join him at the feast table. Apemantus’ response signifies the hegemonic gastromasculine failure of Timon’s feast before it even begins:

TIMON  
Wilt dine with me, Apemantus?

APEMANTUS  
No; I eat not lords.<sup>121</sup>

As Bentley argues, “By denying that he eats lords, Apemantus dissociates himself from [those] who prey upon Timon.”<sup>122</sup> The other Athenians around Timon’s feast table eat not only the meat on the table, but the host himself. Timon serves himself up as a cannibalistic delicacy for the very men he invited to partake of his gastromasculine hegemony. Apemantus, though, rails against the hegemony of the meat-filled table, instead choosing a different type of meal with which to satisfy himself.

---

119. Jeanneret, *Feast of Words*, 39.

120. Appelbaum, *Aguecheek’s Beef*, 254.

121. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.1.204-205

122. Bentley, *New Disease*, 179.



“I eat root”: Queer Veganism and Subordinate Masculinity

APEMANTUS

*Apemantus' grace.*

Immortal gods, I crave no pelf,  
 I pray for no man but myself.  
 Grant I may never prove so fond,  
 To trust man on his oath or bond;  
 Or a harlot for her weeping,  
 Or a dog that seems a-sleeping,  
 Or a keeper with my freedom,  
 Or my friends, if I should need 'em.  
 Amen. So fall to't:  
 Rich men sin, and I eat root.<sup>123</sup>

Apemantus' satirical pre-feast blessing in Act 1, Scene 2, the first of ten moments in *Timon of Athens* that include the word *root*, reminds us that the play is a philosophical struggle between, as Joan Fitzpatrick describes it, “food and sex” and “food and revenge.”<sup>124</sup> Fitzpatrick further comments that, in *Timon*, “Apemantus is alert both to literal and sexual feeding.”<sup>125</sup> This “sexual” feeding to which Fitzpatrick refers lies at the heart of, and provides the best Shakespearean example of, the gastromasculine connections between masculinity and meat eating and queerness and veganism.

Throughout *Timon of Athens*, we find the words *meat* and *root* more times than in any of Shakespeare's other plays, revealing the dichotomy between the “masculine activity”<sup>126</sup> of meat eating, “a powerful way of asserting or performing one's

---

123. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.2.61-71.

124. Fitzpatrick, *Food in Shakespeare*, 113.

125. Fitzpatrick, 113.

126. Heinz and Lee, “Getting Down,” 92.

masculinity,”<sup>127</sup> and the “deviant,”<sup>128</sup> queer nature of veganism. As previously discussed in Chapter 1, Adams argues that the “literal evocation of male power is found in the concept of meat,”<sup>129</sup> and nowhere in the Shakespearean corpus is that more evident than in *Timon of Athens*. Containing thirteen instances of the word *meat*, the play explores the subordinate pushback against the hegemonic ideals of meat eating through Amepantus’, and later Timon’s, insistences on “eating root” as a means to queer oneself, whether said queering comes from internal or external sources. But, before I dive deeper into *Timon* as a play, there are a couple of questions that first require answering: *What makes “eating root” (i.e. practicing veganism) queer?* and *How exactly does “eating root” queer one’s self?*

To answer the first question, we must look back at Adams and Simonsen. Adams says, “Meat’s recognizable message includes association with the male role; its meaning recurs within a fixed [binary] gender system”<sup>130</sup> and that there exists an “overt association between meat eating and virile maleness.”<sup>131</sup> Adams continues, “Because meat eating is a measure of a virile culture and individual, our society equates vegetarianism with emasculation or femininity.”<sup>132</sup> Therefore, as previously noted in

---

127. Simonsen, “Queer Vegan,” 53.

128. Simonsen, 53.

129. Adams, *Sexual Politics*, 33.

130. Adams, 14.

131. Adams, 13.

132. Adams, 15.

Chapter 1, “Men who decide to eschew meat eating are deemed effeminate; failure of men to eat meat announces that they are not masculine.”<sup>133</sup> This eschewing holds true for Apemantus, as “a vegetarian diet was regarded with suspicion in the early modern period”<sup>134</sup> and “[g]reenstuff and fruit had traditionally been thought fit only for the poor and for those who chose the monastic life”<sup>135</sup> prior to Shakespeare’s time. Apemantus is both poor, referring back to the previously mentioned class-based subordination of those around Timon’s feast table, and monastic, living his life as a Cynic philosopher. Adams’s explanation of equating vegetarianism with femininity brings more evidence that Apemantus begins setting himself apart from the cannibalistic Athenian elite who are there to eat both Timon and Timon’s meat.

Simonsen’s “Manifesto” latches onto Adams’s assertion that the refusal to eat meat makes one “less than” a man and takes it one step further from the realm of vegetarianism into the realm of veganism: “From the position of dominant meat-eating society, veganism is considered odd, or indeed queer”<sup>136</sup> and “refusing meat . . . does not only involve taking a stance against patriarchal culture . . . ; it is also, specifically, a way of resisting heteronormativity, since meat-eating for men . . . is tied to the rhetorical as well as the actual reproduction of heterosexual norms and practices.”<sup>137</sup> Here, we have

---

133. Adams, 34.

134. Fitzpatrick, *Food in Shakespeare*, 114.

135. Caton, *Fooles and Fricassees*, 16.

136. Simonsen, “Queer Veganism,” 53.

137. Simonsen, 55.

both Simonsen and Adams arguing for a gastromasculine queering of men through the act of veganism.

Queer men, as previously mentioned per Connell's *Masculinities*, are considered subordinate in their masculinity, found at the bottom of the hierarchy of masculinity, whereas heterosexual men are, in a heterosexual, cisgender, white, and patriarchal society, hegemonic, and found at the top. The earlier pairing of Connell's hierarchy of masculinity alongside that of Twigg's hierarchy of meat eating revealed that Adams's and Simonsen's notions of masculinity and meat and veganism and queerness line up evenly across the board, giving us a more accurate way to answer the second question through Apemantus', and later Timon's, eating of roots.

Apemantus' insistence that he "eats root" queers himself from the remainder of Timon's guests because, as Apemantus states earlier, Timon's feasts are good for nothing but "see[ing] meat fill knaves, and wine heat fools."<sup>138</sup> Apemantus, therefore, chooses not to participate in the feast proper, highlighted all the more so in the previously mentioned pre-meal grace he provides before the feast begins. Even before Apemantus asserts his vegan queerness via the "prayer," Timon presses the philosopher to partake of the hegemonic, masculine meal, telling Apemantus, "let my meat make thee silent."<sup>139</sup> Here, argues, Lanier, "Timon seeks to use a gift—the banquet itself—to enmesh Apemantus in a web of obligation so as to silence his dissident tongue, all the while denying that he is engaged in any exercise of power."<sup>140</sup> This phrase contains a double meaning, though,

---

138. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.1.261-62.

139. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.2.37.

140. Lanier, "Cynical Dining in Timon of Athens," 144.

both a literal *be quiet and eat this meat* and a metaphorical *place my genitalia in your mouth so that I may silence you*. “Vegetarianism,”<sup>141</sup> argues Adams, “seeks meaning in a patriarchal culture that silences it.”<sup>142</sup> Timon attempts to silence Apemantus as the philosopher makes his own attempt to silence the hegemonic patriarchal oppression presented by Timon’s meat-fill feast. Therefore, what we may take as Apemantus’ self-queering through his claim of “eating root,” that is, veganism, should be seen as Timon’s queering of Apemantus as the subordinated among the guests as well as his own hegemony via the meat on the table and under his robes.

*The Riverside Shakespeare* notes that, in Timon’s line, we should read that Timon does “not desire the power to make [Apemantus] silent (which the rule of hospitality forbids).”<sup>143</sup> Apemantus’ response, reaffirming Fitzpatrick’s previously mentioned assertions, plays on both meanings of Timon’s exclamation, revealing the dual nature of Timon’s jab at Apemantus’ queerness. The philosopher says, “I scorn they meat, ‘twould choke me.”<sup>144</sup> In the most literal sense, Apemantus refuses to eat the meat laid out before him because of his self-queering among Timon’s other guests. He doesn’t feel as though he belongs in this group of men who “dip their meat in one man’s blood”<sup>145</sup> in a quasi-

---

141. I would argue that veganism falls under the category as Adams describes here.

142. Adams, *Sexual Politics*, 133.

143. William Shakespeare, *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Gwynne Blakemore. Evans, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 1497.

144. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.2.38-39.

145. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 1.2.41.

cannibalistic Last Supper with Timon as Athens' savior. As Tracy Thong points out, "The descriptions [of the feast] . . . signify rather unusual exotica, since the meat, or food, on the table suggests Timon's flesh, as Shakespeare draws a comparison between Timon's banquet and the Last Supper."<sup>146</sup> In the metaphorical sense, Apemantus states that Timon's displays of gross hegemonic masculinity make him literally sick to his stomach instead of providing holy sustenance and grace. The opulence of the feast from which all of the men, save Apemantus who, due to his expression of veganism, is anything *but* a man, sets him apart as the odd man out, his queerness already established long before he tells the men gathered that he "eats root" in defiance of patriarchal, hegemonic masculinity.

Apemantus' self-queering and self-subordinating further escalates the situation in which Timon finds himself later in the play, when the formally rich, noble Athenian finds himself penniless and without friends as he wanders in the wilderness, himself now queered from the rest of Athenian society. As Timon struggles in the woods, he must learn to survive without meat, a forced queerness brought about by a forced vegan diet of, you guessed it, roots. "Destruction fang mankind!" screams Timon as he digs in the soil. "Earth, yield me roots!"<sup>147</sup> After encountering Alcibiades, Phrynia, and Timandra, noble Athenians who, as a group, try to offer Timon money to help him survive, the former nobleman spurs them, insisting he "hate[s] mankind"<sup>148</sup> and wants nothing to do with

---

146. Thong, "Performances," 110.

147. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.23.

148. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.54.

them, instead desiring sustenance from the feminine Mother Earth and her roots. Timon embraces his vegan queerness, his subordinate masculinity, “part as an expression of penitence and in part to preserve his cannibalized identity from further consumption by the citizens of Athens.”<sup>149</sup> He accepts his gastromasculine punishment as queer vegan, digging in the soil and crying out in a glorious lamentation:

TIMON

That nature being sick of man’s unkindness  
Should yet be hungry! Common mother, though  
Whose womb unmeasurable and infinite breast  
Teems and feeds all; whose self-same mettle,  
Whereof thy proud child (arrogant man) is puff’d,  
Engenders the black toad and adder blue,  
The gilded newt and eyeless venom’d worm,  
With all th’ abhorred births below crisp heaven  
Whereon Hyperion’s quick’ning fire doth shine:  
Yield him who all the human sons do hate,  
From forth they plenteous bosom, one poor root!  
Ensear thy fertile and conceptious womb,  
Let it no more bring out ingrateful man!

. . .

--O, a root, dear thanks!--

Dry up thy marrows, vines, and plough-torn leas,  
Whereof ingrateful man, with liquorish draughts  
And morsels unctious, greases his pure mind,  
That from it all consideration slips--<sup>150</sup>

In Timon’s lament, we hear racked pains and accusatory rejections of masculinity:

*arrogant and ingrateful man*. We also hear a desire for the feminine: *plenteous bosom* and *fertile and conceptious womb*. These desires strike against masculinity, to which the

---

149. Keri Behre, *Renaissance Fare: Appetite and Authority on the Early Modern English Stage*, PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2011, 133, accessed June 29, 2017, <https://search-proquest-com.vortex3.uco.edu/docview/873394697?pq-origsite=primo>.

150. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.176-96.

feminine must “dry up” as payback for what Timon considers the hegemonic oppression of the subordinated within the gastromasculine Athenian society: “Angry at a society that has used him up and then failed him, but also recognizing and repenting his own folly, Timon clings to the wisdom espoused by the churlish Apemantus all along and seeks to alleviate his pain and fault with angry words and an austere diet.”<sup>151</sup>

As Timon finishes his pained cries, Apemantus appears, bringing “eating root” full circle as the internally subordinated vegan encounters the externally subordinated Timon. Timon calls Apemantus a “fool” and bids him depart,<sup>152</sup> but Apemantus informs Timon that he “love[s] thee better now that e’er [he] did.”<sup>153</sup> Granted, the reason for this love is because Apemantus finally gets to see Timon for the “caitiff,”<sup>154</sup> or cowardly person, that he really is, Apemantus’ own jab at Timon’s now-queer masculinity; but the two still share a moment with the roots Timon dug up to satiate his appetite. Timon eats a root, and Apemantus says he “will mend thy feast,”<sup>155</sup> offering Timon another one. At this point, the cycle is complete, and the hierarchy is inverted. The hegemonic has become the subordinate, and the masculine has become the feminine. Apemantus’ eating of roots signaled a decidedly queer worldview of the hegemonic, meat-eating Athens; and

---

151. Behre, *Renaissance Fare*, 139.

152. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.232.

153. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.233.

154. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.235.

155. Shakespeare, *Tim*, 4.3.282.



Timon's craving of the root, after insisting that Apemantus allow Timon's meat to silence him, brings the struggle between Fitzpatrick's "food and sex" now at an end.

In sum, I am *not* arguing that Shakespeare is using a gastromasculine lens as he writes *Timon of Athens* nor is he making any social commentary regarding the relationship between masculinity and meat eating or between queerness and veganism. On the contrary, I *am* arguing that as we look at *Timon* through a gastromasculine lens, we see that, as Adams states, "men who choose not to eat meat repudiate . . . masculine privileges,"<sup>156</sup> queering themselves through the own language of veganism. When we examine the works of Shakespeare, and others to whom food served as central foci in many aspects, we realize that "meat-masculinity association derives from the stereotypical depiction of strength as a masculine characteristic"<sup>157</sup> and that "meat profits from the dominant placement of male and masculine symbols in the overarching culture."<sup>158</sup> So, while "Timon's foraging for roots would have struck an early modern audience as distinctly bestial, indeed pig-like,"<sup>159</sup> a gastromasculine reading sees it for what it truly is: distinctly vegan, and distinctly queer.

---

156. Adams, *Sexual Politics*, 38.

157. Heinz and Lee, "Getting Down," 92.

158. Heinz and Lee, 95.

159. Joan Fitzpatrick, "'I Must Eat My Dinner': Shakespeare's Foods from Apples to Walrus," in *Renaissance Food from Rabelais to Shakespeare: Culinary Readings and Culinary Histories* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), 133.

### **Conclusion: The Future of Gastromasculinity and Shakespeare**

As this thesis has shown, gastromasculinity, the theoretical approach created through the combining of masculinities and gastronomy theories, works quite well when analyzing the works of William Shakespeare. The analyses in this thesis allow readers to further understand the nature of masculinity and its relation to meat in a Eurocentric, patriarchal society. Adams is quick to note exactly how meat eating affects all aspects of society and not only ones that deal with gender: “As much as white people determine what is normative and important while ignoring the culture and experience of people of color, so have meat eaters of all races, sexes, and classes presumed the normativeness and centrality of their activity.”<sup>160</sup> Adams argues that meat eating, and its inherent normativeness, engenders the subordination of *all* non-meat-eaters. While whiteness generally provides multiple opportunities for the subordination of all things non-white, meat eating provides multiple opportunities for the subordination of vegetarians, vegans, and other people who eat non-meat-centric diets. Many of these same dietary types exist within the world of Shakespeare’s plays, othored by their choices of what, or what not, to eat. Whether it be meat, *hutspot*, or earthy roots, Shakespeare’s canon affords those wanting to use a gastromasculine lens ample opportunities to do so. What this thesis has covered, though, is far from everything that should be addressed.

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis is to be part of a larger body of work. After numerous months of reading, research, and writing, I have found that there is much more that needs to be said about gastromasculinity and Shakespeare. Many of Shakespeare’s works not discussed in this thesis contain multiple examples of meat and

---

160. Adams, *Sexual Politics*, 153.

meat eating, vegetarianism, veganism, and a plethora of other gastronomic references to which a gastromasculine lens could easily be applied. Due to the length of this piece of writing, however, much of what has been written on the topic, what little there might be depending on the particular play, quite a bit of the research I have completed as part of this thesis had to be omitted for the sake of conciseness and clarity.

One such example concerns *As You Like It*'s Jacques and his lament over the hunted deer. This moment would offer me a chance to further explore Jacques's previously established otherness as the melancholy of the group while, based on a gastromasculine reading, further grounding his assertion against cruelty and the harming of this poor beast. A short character examination of Jacques, his relationship to the other men in Duke Senior's "court" now located in the Forest of Arden, and his speech regarding the deer would tie together quite nicely with Chapter 2's discussion of Touchstone and William. Rosalind's dressing as Ganymede, one of Shakespeare's most famous moments of cross-dressing in all of his plays, could also provide more opportunities to examine roles of gender and diet. The other shepherds, lower-class folks, such as Corin and Silvius, may also play into the masculinity and meat eating debate based on Timon's notions of the hegemonic, meat-laden feast compared to a more rural, simple, low-class diet that would focus more on fruits, vegetables, and grains.

One aspect of meat eating itself that is missing from this thesis is the most taboo form of meat eating: cannibalism. As Daniel Cottom, Professor of Literature at SUNY-Buffalo suggests, "Nearly every Shakespeare play at some point threatens to turn eating into cannibalism, or at the very least threatens to call into question the distinctions

between the eating of humans and the eating of other creatures.”<sup>161</sup> Cannibalism is rampant in the Shakespearean canon, from the anagrammed name of *The Tempest*’s Caliban to both metaphorical and literal moments of the eating of men’s flesh. I have already briefly discussed pseudo-cannibalism in Chapter 3, but there lies much more at the heart of *Timon*’s cannibalism that I hope to address at length in the larger version of this project. Many scholars<sup>162</sup> have broached this topic, but none have done so within the context of gender relations or, in particular, masculinity and the relations of masculinities to cannibalism. As the “taboo” form of meat eating, as Twigg lists it on her chart of the hierarchies of meat, cannibalism rests outside the hierarchy itself, away from more “natural” forms of meat eating. A “taboo,” as one might call it, form of masculinity is *toxic masculinity*, which also, in my opinion, rests outside the hierarchy of masculinity.

Looking at cannibalism through a context of masculinity would engender more gastromasculine examples of how the hierarchies come into play with one another in a variety of ways. The fear of Caliban, the “cannibal,” consuming the whiteness of the colonizers in *The Tempest* suggests a false move up the hierarchy of masculinity, from marginalized to hegemonic, even though Caliban is, for all intents and purposes, the hegemonic of the island on which Prospero and crew all find themselves. The possibility of the marginalized native cannibalizing the white identities of the colonizers stokes fear

---

161. Daniel Cottom, *Cannibals & Philosophers: Bodies of Enlightenment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 78.

162. See Robert Appelbaum’s *Aguecheek’s Beef, Belch’s Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns*; Keri Sanburn Behre’s *Renaissance Faire: Appetite and Authority on the Early Modern English Stage*; Joan Fitzpatrick’s *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays*; Ruth Morse’s “Unfit for Human Consumption: Shakespeare’s Unnatural Food”; and Greg W. Bentley’s *Shakespeare and the New Disease*.

in the hearts of the non-natives and offers a post-colonial/gastromasculinity intersection through which I can better examine the play. *Timon of Athens*, of course, still contains multiple allusions and images regarding cannibalism. There is one play, however, whose omission from this thesis is glaringly obvious. That play is *Titus Andronicus*.

No discussion on cannibalism in Shakespeare can move forward without an in-depth discussion of *Titus*. The literal feeding of Chiron's and Demetrius's flesh to their mother, Tamora, is Shakespeare's bloodiest and most taboo of all moments of revenge. *Titus* is a play that, for many, sits outside the Shakespearean canon itself. The most violent of the playwright's works, this revenge tragedy contains numerous points through which a gastromasculine reading could take place. *Titus Andronicus* "presents a domestic sphere overrun by men, with the means of nurturance controlled by men,"<sup>163</sup> one which, at the heart of it, almost requires a grotesque shift in how the presentation of meat eating occurs. With two families divided by never-satiated appetites for war, the change to domesticity is itself taboo for many of *Titus*'s characters. Titus himself finds this position one with which he is unfamiliar, and his desire for revenge after Tamora, queen of the Goths, and her husband, Saturninus, the newly-crowned emperor, leads the former general down a path of the most toxic forms of masculine and meat-eating subversions. As a play, *Titus Andronicus* provides a smorgasbord of gastromasculine moments that will serve as an entire chapter of deep analysis in the expanded version of this work.

Overall, this thesis represents the first step in what I hope becomes an even larger and more comprehensive project, spending more time on not only the plays themselves,

---

163. Ann Caroline Christensen, "Private Supper/Public Feast: Gender, Power, and Nurture in Early Modern England" (PhD diss., University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign, 1991), 173.

but the culture surrounding Early Modern England and its citizens. As there appears to be nothing written on gastromasculinity as a theory, or even the works of Connell and Twigg examined in tandem, further study in this theoretical approach will continue to expand my horizons of Shakespeare studies in the near, and the far, future.

Gastromasculinity does not need to be relegated to Shakespeare studies alone, though. It is my belief that this theoretical approach can be applied to works of all genres, periods, and styles. The hierarchies of masculinity and meat eating, when thrown together into the stew pot of literary theory, create a dish that anyone could easily dip their fingers into for a taste. One thing is certain, though: Shakespeare's plays no doubt reflect the gastromasculine ideas of masculinity and meat eating, leaving us with plenty of food for thought for the future.

## Bibliography

- Adams, Carol J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum, 1990.
- Albala, Ken. *Eating Right in the Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Appelbaum, Robert. *Aguecheeks Beef, Belchs Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Behre, Keri. *Renaissance Fare: Appetite and Authority on the Early Modern English Stage*. PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2011. Accessed June 29, 2017. <https://search-proquest-com.vortex3.uco.edu/docview/873394697?pq-origsite=primo>.
- Billing, Christian M. *Masculinity, Corporality and the English Stage 1580-1635*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Boorde, Andrew. *The Breuiarie of Health: Vvherin Doth Folow, Remedies, for All Maner of Sickneses & Diseases the Which May Be in Man or Woman: Expressing the Obscure Termes of Greeke, Araby, Latin, Barbary, and English, concerning Phisick and Chirurgerie*. London: Thomas Este, 1598.
- Caton, Mary Anne., and Joan Thirsk. *Fooles and Fricassees: Food in Shakespeare's England*. Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1999.
- Christensen, Ann Caroline. "Private Supper/public Feast: Gender, Power, and Nurture in Early Modern England." PhD diss., University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign, 1991.
- Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Cottom, Daniel. *Cannibals & Philosophers: Bodies of Enlightenment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Fitzpatrick, Joan. "'I Must Eat My Dinner': Shakespeare's Foods from Apples to Walrus." In *Renaissance Food from Rabelais to Shakespeare: Culinary Readings and Culinary Histories*, 127-43. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- "Gastronomy | Definition of Gastronomy in English by Oxford Dictionaries." Oxford Dictionaries | English. Accessed December 02, 2017. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/gastronomy>.
- Goldstein, David B., and Amy L. Tigner. Introduction to *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England*, 1-17. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2016.

- Goldstein, David B. *Eating and Ethics in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Heinz, Bettina, and Ronald Lee. "Getting down to the Meat: The Symbolic Construction of Meat Consumption." *Communication Studies* 49, no. 1 (1998): 86-99. Accessed July 17, 2017. doi:10.1080/10510979809368520.
- Huegatter, Emilly. "Interview with Emily Heugatter." Interview by author. November 11, 2017.
- Jeanneret, Michel. *A Feast of Words: Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance*. Translated by Jeremy Whiteley. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Kronshage, Eike. "Conspicuous Consumption, Croyance, and the Problem of the Two Timons: Shakespeare and Middleton's Timon of Athens." *Critical Horizons* 18, no. 3 (August 2017): 262-74. Accessed July 5, 2017. doi:10.1080/14409917.2017.1293892.
- Lanier, Douglas M. "Cynical Dining in Timon of Athens." In *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England*, 135-55. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2016.
- Lanier, Douglas M. "Cynical Dining in Timon of Athens." In *Culinary Shakespeare: Staging Food and Drink in Early Modern England*, 135-55. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2016.
- Lloyd, Paul S. *Food and Identity in England, 1540-1640: Eating to Impress*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Purkiss, Diane. "The Masque of Food: Staging and Banqueting in Shakespeare's England." *Shakespeare Studies* 42 (January 2014): 91-105. Accessed July 15, 2017. [vortex3.uco.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=98888064&site=ehost-live](http://vortex3.uco.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=98888064&site=ehost-live).
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Edited by Gwynne Blakemore. Evans. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 138-76. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.



- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 399-436. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *The First Part of Henry the Fourth*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 884-927. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 320-60. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Life of Timon of Athens*. In *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 1489-525. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Simonsen, Rasmus R. "A Queer Vegan Manifesto." *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* 10, no. 3 (2012): 50-80. Accessed June 8, 2017.  
[http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp\\_aafhh/8/](http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp_aafhh/8/).
- Stanivukovic, Goran V. "Between Men in Early Modern England." In *Queer Masculinities, 1550-1800: Siting Same-Sex Desire in the Early Modern World*, 232-51. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Thong, Tracy. "Performances of the Banquet Course in Early Modern Drama." In *Renaissance Food from Rabelais to Shakespeare: Culinary Readings and Culinary Histories*, 107-25. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Twigg, Julia. "Vegetarianism and the Meanings of Meat." In *The Sociology of Food and Eating: Essays on the Sociological Significance of Food*, edited by Anne Murcott, 18-30. Farnham: Gower, 1983.
- Weiner, E. S. C., and J. A. Simpson, eds. *The Compact Oxford English Dictionary: Complete Text Reproduced Micrographically*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.