

2017-04-26

'Get the Best Article in the Market': Prostheses for Women in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Commerce

Sweet, RC

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/12923>

10.7228/manchester/9781526101426.003.0006

Manchester University Press

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

6. ‘Get the best article in the market’: prostheses for women in nineteenth-century literature and commerce

Ryan Sweet

Published during the aftermath of the American Civil War, Alonzo Hill’s *John Smith’s Funny Adventures on a Crutch* (1869) was a novel that provided a conspicuously gendered role model for maimed American veterans in the form of its eponymous protagonist. ‘[B]ear[ing] his mark with a patriotic sense of humor, and thereby scorn[ing] those who ignore his manly vigor’,¹ the narrator-protagonist of Hill’s novel praises the work of prosthetist B. Frank Palmer, one of the men contracted by the United States government to supply artificial limbs to the nation’s amputee veterans – whose patenting of his devices is explored in depth in this collection by Caroline Lieffers. Smith describes how one amputee walked ‘splendidly on his “Palmer leg”’, and later he refers to Palmer himself as ‘the great manufacturer of artificial limbs’.² Hill was not the only literary figure to recommend Palmer’s artificial legs in this period. Famous poet and physician Oliver Wendell Holmes describes how he was ‘completely taken in . . . by the contrivance of the ingenious Surgeon-Artist’ in his 1864 essay ‘The Human Wheel, Its Spokes and Felloes’.³

While Hill’s novel and Holmes’s essay provided ringing endorsements of Palmer’s artificial limbs, which were specifically designed to, in the words of Erin O’Connor, ‘remasculinize’ the male amputee,⁴ a radically different but equally commercially engaged literary connection with prosthetics pervaded narratives concerning female prosthesis users. A number of prosthesis narratives, more often than not marriage plots, coexisted that showed women exactly which prosthetic devices they should avoid using. These stories provided an important commentary on the kinds of artificial body parts that were deemed acceptable or

lamentable for females to use in this period. Certain marriage plots, including Thomas Hood's satirical poem *Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg* (1840–41), were so popular that international prosthesis makers, such as John S. Drake and A. A. Marks, drew on them for commercial gain and included extracts in their treatises. Furthermore, other makers of artificial body parts, such as Thomas Elliott and Professor Brown drew upon the public penchant for prosthesis narratives by including poems about their products in advertisements. The relationship between literature and the prostheses industry was therefore more fluid and complex than historians and literature scholars have recognised. Writers used fiction as a means through which to critique poorly performing prostheses, while prosthesis makers sought to exploit the contemporary interest in fictional prostheses to their advantage.

This chapter explores the reciprocal relationship between fictional texts and the prosthesis industry in this period. I demonstrate that fictional writing was a key component of nineteenth-century prostheses discourse, a constituent that provided practical advice for its readers on the kinds of prostheses that should be avoided for both social and functional purposes. Popular literary sources provided kinds of advertisement not for but *against* certain prostheses. Meanwhile, both entire fictional works and particular representational strategies were used by contemporary prosthetists interchangeably as means through which to subtly disparage the devices of opposing makers, reinforce the proprietary ownership of particular designs, or promote the concealing abilities of particular devices to female users.

In terms of both the literary and commercial history of prostheses, gender is a major factor. Perhaps unsurprisingly when one considers the historical figures that we so often associate with artificial body parts – pirates, veterans, and maimed industrial workers – much recent critical attention on nineteenth-century prostheses has tended to focus on male users. Studies by Lisa Herschbach, Erin O'Connor, and Steven Mihm, for example, demonstrate the importance of such devices in terms of masculinity.⁵ O'Connor's work in particular is

important from a gender perspective as it reveals that prostheses were perceived as restorative devices that could reinstate a male amputee's supposedly lost sense of masculinity by making him 'whole' and allowing him to work once more.⁶

Yet, like depictions of disabled characters in nineteenth-century literature, the prevalence of disabled females is receiving a growing amount of scholarly attention. Between them, Kirsten E. Gardner, Marquard Smith, Vanessa Warne, and Galia Ofek investigate a wide range of prostheses for women (including artificial legs, breast implants, and wigs).⁷ Warne shows how financial networks are tied to artificial legs in two Victorian marriage plots. Smith explores what he calls 'technofetishism' in the commercial photography of nineteenth-century Chard-based limb-maker James Gillingham, arguing that the exposure of prosthesis for a woman in this period equated to an 'assault to modesty', bringing to the fore 'the pivot between invisibility and visibility, hiding and revealing, concealment and revelation'.⁸ Gardner draws attention to 'the creation of appendages that enhance the realistic nature of the part' in her discussion of breast prosthesis before 1950.⁹ Ofek, on the other hand, describes how, despite its popularity at the mid-century, women's use artificial hair was often treated with distrust in literary and cultural sources.¹⁰ Further exploring the conceptual ties that Smith and Gardner draw between invisibility and the female body, re-examining the links between marriage, money, and prostheses that Warne brings our attention to, and extending analysis of the suspicion that Ofek observes regarding artificial hair to other types of prosthesis, this chapter demonstrates how a particular branch of Victorian marriage plots commented upon the kinds of prostheses that were deemed suitable (and regrettable) for women in this period.

Commenting on the pervasiveness of disabled women in Victorian literature, Cindy LaCom argues that such a trend 'signaled very real cultural fears about women, female sexuality, and the maternal'.¹¹ Along similar lines, Martha Stoddard Holmes's work builds on

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson's thesis to demonstrate that the female and the disabled have long been entangled in patriarchal thought.¹² Stoddard Holmes highlights the transgressive allure of disabled women, arguing that 'As potential signs of both disease and sexuality, disabled women characters functioned not only in parallel ways to "fallen" women in Victorian literature and culture – as containers for the most dangerous qualities associated with all women – but even as stand-ins for fallen women'.¹³ This chapter furthers the work done by the feminist disability studies authors listed above. It shows that prosthesis-using women, in addition to disabled ones, were a common motif in marriage plots.

In addition to the recent work on disabled women and prostheses for female users, this chapter is also informed by current disability studies research into the social practice of 'passing' – a term that for the most part 'refers to the way people conceal social markers of impairment to avoid the stigma of disability and pass as "normal"'.¹⁴ Jeffrey A. Brune and Daniel J. Wilson explain how passing is a contested practice in disability studies since it 'can take a psychological toll [on those who attempt to "pass"] and can also reinforce – or, at least, fail to challenge – the stigma of disability'. They also, however, note that 'Even when passing seems to reinforce the stigma of disability, it is more productive, and more just, to challenge the ableism that compels people to pass rather than blame the individuals who choose to do so'.¹⁵ This chapter follows in the footsteps of David Linton, who explores the curious history of how women have had to 'deny their membership' as menstruators in order to avoid 'shame, embarrassment, and ostracism',¹⁶ as it shows how in the nineteenth century physically 'incomplete' women were, more so than men, pressured into and provided advice how to 'pass' by commercially resonant literary texts.

To appreciate why women felt under such pressure to disguise physical losses in the nineteenth century, it is worth bearing in the mind the specific stigma that was attached to disabled or otherwise physically 'incomplete' women – those missing an eye, teeth, or hair,

for instance. First, disabled women were often viewed as unfit mothers. Motherhood was widely perceived as the primary function of women – a sentiment that Sally Shuttleworth and Mary Poovey have shown was buttressed by medical opinion.¹⁷ Such a devastating estimation rendered females considered physically ‘incomplete’, for many, unmarriageable. As physical aberrance came to be seen in wider society as increasingly unfavourable – as Lennard J. Davis has identified, in part, due to the emergence of the concept of ‘normalcy’ – medical attention was drawn to heredity.¹⁸ ‘As a Victorian cultural sign, disability pointed not only backward, to parental transgression and defect, but even more urgently forward, to future generations’.¹⁹ Much attention on physical and mental inheritance resulted in an increased focus on mothers as sources of congenital defects.

Furthermore, wholeness came to be seen as the fundamental hallmark of health meaning that those that lost body parts, however minor,²⁰ were seen as less desirable partners. Since beauty had long been held as an essential trait of womanhood and was ‘legitimised’ as such by scientific papers written by Alexander Walker (1836) and later Havelock Ellis (1904) and Carl Heinrich Stratz (1903),²¹ women were judged more harshly than men for having perceivable physical losses. Prostheses held both the capacity to aid and betray their users as pressures to erase visible marks of physical imperfection proliferated. A convincing prosthesis might allay any suspicions of physical incompleteness; an unconvincing one might not only reveal the user as a ‘defective’ but would draw attention to her supposedly fraudulent attempt at hiding a physical loss. Such a conundrum provided ample material for a number of marriage plots, which served as indexes for the kinds of prostheses that should be avoided.

This chapter begins by juxtaposing images of male and female prosthesis users in an 1888 trade catalogue of successful American artificial limb maker A. A. Marks in order to display the differing ways that artificial body parts were marketed to men and women in the

nineteenth-century. Building upon the conceptual ties between female prosthesis use and invisibility that Marks's treatise makes manifest, the chapter then turns to fictional responses to female prosthesis users in contemporary literary marriage plots. These stories provide the reader with specific guidance on devices to avoid – noisy and showy devices – buttressing the necessity for female prostheses to be unnoticeable. Finally, the chapter highlights the way that such literary stories and representational strategies were utilised to the advantage of various prosthetists, underlining the surprising intersections of fiction and commerce in Victorian prosthesis discourse. These latter sections of the chapter consider false wigs, teeth, and artificial eyes alongside prosthetic limbs. False teeth and wigs are not often seen as prostheses in the traditional sense, yet, as I show, these technologies were often considered alongside other forms of prosthesis as devices of concealment in the nineteenth century. I analyse false teeth and wigs alongside limbs to verify the importance of gender in the relationship between commerce and literature.

Indefatigability and invisibility: A. A. Marks's legs for men and women

Figure 6.1, from American prosthesis franchise A. A. Marks's 1888 *A Treatise on Marks' Patent Artificial Limbs with Rubber Hands and Feet* (authored by George E. Marks), is one of many examples that could be used to reveal the way in which artificial limbs were advertised to men as devices that could, first and foremost, enable them to return to work. The illustration shows a male artificial leg user digging using a shovel. In the testimonial that accompanies the images, the man depicted lauds the functional and enabling capacities of his prosthesis.²² For instance, he boasts 'I have used your make of legs at nearly all kinds of work, such as plowing, spading, hauling logs, and other work. I have walked twenty-five miles in a single day'.²³ Also significant in this image is the fact that the artificiality of the user's false limb is conspicuous: it is uncovered, it is foregrounded, and it is the limb closest

to us as viewers. Curiously, the testimonial fails to mention the aesthetics of the prosthesis. Several similar illustrations of and endorsements from working men appear in the A. A. Marks catalogue marking the practical capabilities of the limbs as a major selling point to male amputees.

[insert figures 6.1 and 6.2 here]

The firm A. A. Marks were keen to draw attention to the fact that its devices were patented (as foregrounded in the title of its catalogue), and there are clear links in the 1888 catalogue between the foregrounding of patenting and the gendered advertising rhetoric of the piece as a whole. Aligning with James F. Stark's observations about the commercial uses of patents in the medical marketplace, Marks's use of patents served to legitimise the promises made about the restorative capacities of the firm's prostheses for male users – the patented parts of Mark's products being the rubber hands and feet, aspects introduced primarily to enhance function rather than aesthetic.²⁴

In contrast to figure 6.1, figure 6.2 is one of only two illustrations of women that appear in the A. A. Marks treatise. The focus of this illustration is less on function and durability and more on appearance and concealment – the latter also being an important feature in the history of artificial eardrums as revealed by Jaipreet Viridi-Dhesi in her contribution to this collection. Indeed in this image the Marks-type leg is imperceptible, virtually invisible. In fact, if it was not for the 'before' image on the left-hand side of figure 6.2 – showing the female user holding her artificial leg in her hand – and the explanatory written material surrounding the illustration, one would hardly know that the illustration depicted a prosthesis user. The invisibility of prosthesis in this image – aided in part by the way that it can be easily hid under clothing – is of course precisely the point. As George E. Marks explains, 'It is very well understood that young ladies wearing artificial limbs are not over-desirous of having it publicly known'.²⁵ Whereas the men depicted in the image

discussed above is named – Lewis C. Cox – the female subject of the only other image of an adult female prosthesis user that appeared in Marks’s catalogue wished to remain anonymous. This wish for anonymity – in addition the images, which highlight how A. A. Marks’s devices could supposedly mask physical loss – shows that it was less favourable for a woman to be perceived as physically incomplete. George E. Marks thus markets his firm’s devices as ones that can enable women, such as the amputee on the right of figure 6.2, to look physically complete and thereby able to pass.

The fact that only two images of women appear in Marks’s treatise is also telling of the gendered consumer culture surrounding these products – a theme also taken up by Laurel Daen in the next chapter. Such suggests that men were the main consumers of artificial limbs in the 1880s – unsurprising considering the number of surviving Civil War amputees who still occupied a significant place in the cultural consciousness during this decade.²⁶ Fitting the economic situation of the time, the lack of illustrations depicting female consumers also suggests that men were the ones with the capital available to purchase such devices, which were relatively expensive.²⁷ Marks’s treatise is aimed primarily at respectable working-class men (including farmers, skilled-workers, and clerks), middle- and upper-class men, and veterans (in particular those provided with a US government subsidy for an artificial limb). In other words, the prosthetics were marketed at the men who could afford them. Men were also responsible for purchasing artificial limbs for their wives and daughters. One Wilbur S. Studwell wrote to A. A. Marks in 1887 to thank the limb maker for the artificial leg that he bought for his wife. To Studwell’s delight, his wife’s prosthesis did an excellent job at disguising her physical loss: ‘strangers, even experienced doctors, seeing her walking, or at work, can never detect that she is wearing a false limb’.²⁸ Studwell’s quote shows that the promise of invisibility was as much an assurance to the husband of a female amputee as it was to the amputee herself.

We must of course consider axes of representation, such as social class, as significant factors in the marketing materials just discussed, but these images show how the aspects of artificial limb design that were considered most important depended, in part, on the gender of the amputee subject – the mimetic capacity of artificial body parts was also important for middle- and upper-class gentlemen because of the stigma attached to bodily loss.²⁹ Since marriage and motherhood were both ideologically and economically considered the best routes for women in life, and because such virulent prejudices stood in the way of both spinsterhood and physically ‘incomplete’ females marrying, women were forced, by necessity, to mask their physical imperfections in order to give themselves the best chance possible to find an eligible partner and get married. An 1882 article for the *New York Sun* reflected that ‘the young woman will dance all night with that substitute leg without her partner suspecting its existence’, highlighting the impressive verisimilitude of contemporary prostheses while gesturing towards prejudices against limbless women.³⁰ Similarly, affirming the importance of a good quality prosthesis that will not give itself away to a potential partner, and forming the title for this chapter, William Chambers’s 1877 *Chambers’s Journal* article ‘The Wooden Leg’ advises its female readers to not compromise when it comes to selecting a prosthesis: ‘A keen regard for economy in a matter of this kind is poor policy. I should say if you want an artificial leg that will look and act as nearly as possible like a real one, do not grudge the money. *Get the best article in the market*’ (emphasis added).³¹

For women already married, however, the functionality of prosthetic body parts was also important. Concealing their physical loss as much as possible from their husbands and, more importantly, from friends, acquaintances, and the general public (to protect the reputations of their spouses) was important for such women, but it was also essential for them to be able to continue their domestic duties. The Marks artificial leg user Mrs S. E. Silley wrote a poem to A. A. Marks, included in the firm’s 1888 treatise, which reveals both the

value of artificial legs that can enable one to perform household chores and the close link between literary texts and commercial works in this period. The poem included the following lines:

I now could walk around the room,
 Then o'er the house about my home;
 Could cook and wash and iron too,
 And do all the work that others do.³²

This poem shows us that invisibility as well as functionality was important for women who had domestic duties to perform.

The concept that prostheses could enable physically ‘incomplete’ women – including not just those who had had limbs amputated, but also those who lacked hair, were missing teeth, or who had lost eyes – to appear ‘whole’ to eligible men proved a point of contention for some. Indeed, William Blanchard Jerrold famously debated the virtues and vices of prosthetics – including artificial limbs, eye, teeth, and hair – identifying that some saw artificial body parts as ‘emblem[s] of deceit’, ‘device[s] of ingenious vanity’, or items that ‘cover[ed] the wearer with gross and unpardonable deceit’.³³ An 1861 *Chambers’s Journal* fictional text purporting to be an article drew from such claims, suggesting that women, in particular single ones looking for partners, had less of a right than men to use prosthetics:

I admit, if the lady I pay my addresses to has the misfortune to have one of her legs made of cork, I should prefer to be apprised of the fact before I put up the bans, rather than after the marriage-ceremony. Perhaps she, too, has some claim to be made acquainted with the circumstance, that my prepossessingly

natural appearance is not altogether free from a certain alloy of unreality. But we will let that pass.³⁴

This quotation draws our attention to the seemingly impossible position faced by a single woman who had lost a body part. 'For her own sake', and her family's, an 'incomplete' woman would mostly likely face significant pressure to use a prosthesis and try as hard as possible to mask her loss in order to attract a future husband. However, the implication in the passage above is that she should not try to deceive potential suitors. This assertion is troubling when one considers the stigma that accompanied physical loss in this period. Men were encouraged to avoid copulating with physically aberrant women. Thus 'incomplete' women faced a conundrum: did they use a prosthesis and risk discovery? Or did they give up on the possibility of marriage altogether and face an also stigmatised life of spinsterhood? Such a situation reveals that life-shaping decisions like this were informed less by impairment itself than by the social conditions that prohibited intermarriage with physically aberrant women. The next section of this chapter draws from this context as we turn our attention to the discourse surrounding a different type of prosthesis that women were advised to select with care: false teeth.

Fiction and falsehood: literary guides for selecting false teeth and artificial legs

One might assume that the reception of nineteenth century female artificial leg and false teeth users was radically different, but both types of prosthesis user was subject to similar stigma regarding either (or both) sexual unattraction and/or duplicitousness depending on the mimetic capacity of the user's device. Many writers, including Jerrold and Chambers, considered such devices alongside one another as concealers of physical disfigurement,

ignoring issues of impairment versus aesthetic preference. Like wooden legs, false teeth were also seen as fair game for comic stories by fiction writers.

Though historian John Woodforde suggests that references to false teeth are virtually absent in Victorian novels, the periodical press reveals several marriage plots in which female false teeth users are brutally exposed – usually resulting in the withdrawal of a marriage proposal.³⁵ Such stories include ‘Too Hard upon My Aunt’ (1863), A. M.’s ‘Was She False’ (1875), and ‘Kitty the Careless’ (1883) to mention but a handful. Woodforde is right about the lack of false teeth references in canonical novels, but the relative popularity of them in periodical sources, such as the *All the Year Round*, *The London Reader*, and *Judy* (in which ‘Too Hard upon My Aunt’, ‘Was She False’, and ‘Kitty the Careless’ appeared respectively), draws our attention to their status as popular motifs in light-hearted stories designed to elicit mild shock and comic revulsion. It is true that these prostheses served a primarily comic function. However, such representations not only reinforced prejudices against those missing teeth but also provided a reminder to readers of devices to be avoided: namely, dentures prone to malfunction or those that appear overly striking. Like the *Tit-Bits* journalist described by Graeme Gooday and Karen Sayer in their chapter of this collection, who critiqued poorly performing artificial ear drums and their sometimes disreputable sellers, literary texts provided advertisements *against* certain prosthesis types. Since together *All the Year Round*, *The London Reader*, and *Judy* covered a wide readership, it seems that readers from the literate working class upwards were exposed to similar directives concerning prostheses for women. The rest of this section will show how two of these stories, ‘Kitty the Careless’ and ‘Was She False’ provided particular advice to women regarding two kinds of false teeth to avoid: partial plates and overly white dentures.

‘Kitty the Careless’, which appeared as the sixth part of a series called ‘The Misses Lovibond’s Refusals’ in the London-based comic journal *Judy*, provides a comic example of

how young women should not act while also highlighting a kind of dental prostheses they should avoid – in this case, a partial dental plate. In this sketch we are told of the careless habits of an otherwise very attractive young woman called Kitty. Having lost her three front teeth after trying to slide down a bannister (an action that the sketch chastises as ‘unladylike’) she is fitted with three false ones, it would appear, as part of what was known as a partial set – an upper or lower plate, usually by this time made of vulcanised rubber but occasionally celluloid, gold, or ivory, with false teeth, often porcelain but occasionally human teeth, positioned only in place of the missing teeth.³⁶ When a childhood lover, who since he last met Kitty has earned his fortune in the colonies, returns to renew his devotion to her, the careless girl drops her false teeth out of her mouth, frightening her devotee into making an abrupt exit.

We learn from Woodforde’s work that such malfunctions were not uncommon in prostheses of this design.³⁷ Indeed, springless plates had been around since the eighteenth century, but they remained often ineffective throughout the nineteenth century – in part because few makers or users understood how atmospheric pressure worked.³⁸ Stories of false teeth being swallowed or fired out were common in surgical and dental journals, as well as periodicals directed at untrained readers. R. H. Rozenzweig, for instance, wrote in *The British Medical Journal* in 1891 of a patient who swallowed and then excruciatingly passed a golden false teeth plate.³⁹ Ever the source of cruel jokes about prosthetics, *Fun* jested, ‘The poor lady who was found suffocated in bed the other morning through swallowing her false teeth ought to be a warning to others, *by gum!*’⁴⁰ Kitty evidently experiences difficulties keeping her false teeth in. But her appearance is described as deceptively flawless: ‘Those who gazed with rapture at her ruby lips, which as they parted displayed a row of pearly teeth, were far from suspecting the truth’.⁴¹ Thus while this story does not attack the aesthetics of partial dental plates, which, it suggests, could be alluring to look at, it does scrutinise the reliability of such devices.

By the time that ‘Kitty the Careless’ was published, partial plates were a fairly outdated mode of replacing lost teeth on a low scale, explaining, in part, their critique in this instance. Following the inventions of safe dental cement (an oxyphosphate of zinc) in 1869 and the foot-operated dentist drill in 1871, fixed replacements, such as crowns and bridges, took preference over partial dentures. The implementation of such fixed replacements became known as ‘American dentistry’ in Britain, reflecting the superiority of American dental expertise in the second half of the century. Crowns and bridges were more expensive than partial plates in the 1880s, but were generally preferred to artificial teeth since they carried less stigma and were less prone to falling out.⁴² ‘Kitty the Careless’ uses a comical mode to warn women against making the ‘careless’ mistake that Kitty does – that is, using a partial plate – as it subtly endorses ‘American dentistry’. The *Judy* sketch reflects the aspirational interests of the journal’s lower-middle-class readership as it attacks what was by the 1880s an inexpensive,⁴³ yet unfashionable and outdated, mode of fixing teeth, thereby providing implicit support for ‘American dentistry’, which was, for dentists, a more profitable and, for the public, a more respectable method for replacing lost teeth.

Overly showy prostheses also received scrutiny in Victorian marriage plots. Such devices were feared to draw too much attention and scrutiny to the appearance of the female user, thereby risking discovery. A story that reveals the possible consequences of using a device that looks better than the real thing, which also concerns false teeth, is the 1875 *London Reader* short story ‘Was She False?’. In this tale, a man called Mr Mortimer breaks his engagement after it is revealed to him that his betrothed, Miss Hopkins, wears false teeth. The reader’s suspicions are alerted about the questionable authenticity of Miss Hopkins’s teeth (if not by the title of the story!) when her looks are eulogised over in larger-than-life terms: ‘Eyes deep blue, like midsummer sky – hair lustrous as flaxen gold – teeth like twin rows of pearls’. The description of her teeth as akin to ‘pearls’ highlights their preciousness,

suggesting that they are assets that alone make their owner worthy of marriage. Their appearance also communicates in coded terms that they may not be human. Miss Hopkins's deceptively youthful appearance also raises suspicions: she is described as 'five-and-thirty, but . . . has the complexion of eighteen'. Our inkling about her potentially augmented physical appearance is vocalised by Mr Mortimer's handsome nephew, Harry, who postulates his fear that the 'desperate old maid that Uncle Mortimer is going to marry is painted like a Jezebel'. The reader's suspicions shift to an impending sense of marital catastrophe as we learn that Mr Mortimer is, typically, strongly opposed to artificiality: 'one don't want to look as if one were varnished all over or dipped in a jar of boiling oil, like the forty thieves in the Arabian Nights'. This discriminatory attitude is soon put to practice: Harry discovers a box of false teeth with Miss Hopkins's name on it at the dentist's and mischievously arranges for the teeth to be delivered to her lover – who, of course, is unaware of her 'falseness'. Mr Mortimer then seeks confirmation from Miss Hopkins's servant that his lover uses false teeth and breaks his engagement immediately. He angrily asserts, 'She's treacherous! I have been deceived all through. I daresay the rest of her is as false as her – but no matter! I am disenchanted at last. I have bidden her an eternal adieu!'.⁴⁴ Here, then, it is the fact that Mortimer feels 'deceived', the shock of discovery, and the fear that 'the rest of her is . . . false' that drives him to end the relationship. Her actual 'defects', while one would imagine still important, are a secondary concern. In this case, the fraudulent capacity of the woman's prosthesis, its very success in masking physical loss, is what makes it, in the male suitor's eyes, so deplorable. Echoing Jerrold's earlier fears, that prostheses are 'device[s] of ingenious vanity' that obscure dominant physiognomic means of judging people,⁴⁵ 'Was She False' comes to the problematic conclusion that those who conceal their physical 'defects' are more likely to have other secrets that they wish to conceal. Above all, though, this story demonstrates that overly white and straight, 'pearly', false teeth can arouse suspicions and, in

the case of female users, result in tragic consequences: discovery. Marriage plots such as ‘Kitty the Careless’ and ‘Was She False?’ provided advice for female readers about what kinds of prostheses should be avoided. Literature, however, was also used in a similarly rhetorical but even more commercially driven way by contemporary prosthetists.

Lumbering legs and wonderful wigs: commercial literature and fiction

In terms of showy prostheses, artificial body parts do not come more ostentatious than the golden artificial leg that is used by the eponymous protagonist of Thomas Hood’s *Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg*, a poetic parable that was popular and well-remembered throughout the nineteenth century.⁴⁶ The resounding message in Hood’s poem, like the previously mentioned *London Reader* story, is that eye-catching prosthetics, and pretentiousness in general, should be avoided by women. Hood’s poem comically portrays a pompous countess, who, after losing a leg in a riding accident, demands to be adorned with an artificial leg made of solid gold. The eponymous protagonist later marries an in-debt Italian count who demands that she sells her leg to pay off his gambling debts. After she refuses, he bludgeons her to death using the very leg that he so wishes to sell. Hood’s poem is certainly a parable that warns against materialistic avarice – as Warne notes, ‘Hood’s heavy-handed moral is clear: the love of gold costs Miss Kilmansegg both life and limb’.⁴⁷ However, the poem also provides a commentary on a kind of prostheses that women should avoid using: showy, impractical devices that attract unnecessary attention. Though the leg is visually impressive – ‘’Twas a splendid, brilliant, beautiful Leg’⁴⁸ – it draws considerably more attention, good and bad, than any other kind of prosthesis imaginable: while money-driven suitors are transfixed by it, others are outraged by its obnoxiousness – ‘The jeers it had met, – the shouts! the scoff! / The cutting advice to “take itself off,” / For sounding but half so heavy’.⁴⁹

The criticism that Hood's poem levied towards Miss Kilmansegg's noisy leg was such a lasting concern that it was invoked on a couple of occasions several decades later by American artificial limb makers. Such highlights the transatlantic appeal of Hood's poem, the longevity of its engagement with topics pertinent to prosthesis marketing, the international nature of prosthesis discourse, and the important role that literature played more widely in prosthesis commerce. Hood's golden leg was cited in the commercial texts of American prosthetists John S. Drake and A. A. Marks as an example of bad prosthesis. In praise of Drake's artificial legs, an article in the *Boston Evening Gazette* in 1859, quoted by Drake in his manual of the same year, noted that

Instead of the cumbrous and clattering pedals which, like Miss Kilmansegg's wonderful leg, go

‘ – clump, clump, clump,

Like the ghost in Don Giovanni,’

Dr. Drake has made a delicate and ingenious machine, that bends naturally with the motion of the body, provided with springs that answer the purpose of muscles and sinews.⁵⁰

Similarly, George E. Marks also commented on Miss Kilmansegg's noisy gait in his 1888 treatise on artificial limbs, describing her leg as a ‘fascinating perambulator’.⁵¹ The mutual concern that Hood's text, the *Boston Evening Gazette* journalist, and George E. Marks all have regarding the weightiness of prosthesis brings to our attention the widely held view that prostheses, especially those used by women, should be as silent (both literally and figuratively) as possible – a logical extension one might say to the Victorian ideal of women as muted and passive. The reuse of the golden leg as a comical example of a poorly designed

prosthesis reveals the enduring concerns that prosthetists had regarding the weight of their devices throughout the century. In terms of the commercial use of such a text, we see the prosthesis narrative serve as a kind of *anti-advertisement* used for particular marketing ends. In the Drake example in particular, Miss Kilmansegg's leg is a referent used in a simile that disparages the 'cumbrous and clattering' artificial legs of rival limb makers. The use of a comical literary referent, in combination with the fact the words are quoted from a newspaper – therefore distancing them slightly from the prosthesis maker – softens the tone of what is otherwise a denigrating remark about artificial limbs that are not made by Drake.

The reference to Miss Kilmansegg's leg in nineteenth-century discourse relating to real-life prosthesis highlights not only the popularity of Hood's poem but also the way that fictional texts were understood to inform or educate people's views on new or existing technologies. George E. Marks included not just an allusion to Miss Kilmansegg but a whole section on 'Literary Amenities on Artificial Limbs', including a full transcript and comment on the popular song 'The Cork Leg', in his 1888 treatise on prosthetics, in part to dismiss popular misconceptions regarding his devices. Like *Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg*, 'The Cork Leg' was another British text thus attesting to the transatlantic exchange of prosthesis discourse in this period. Not only did the firm A. A. Marks include British literature in its treatises but it also sold artificial limbs to British amputees via its popular mailing system. In his 1886 catalogue, A. A. Marks included a section called 'Our Foreign Trade' featuring a testimony from Frank Mills of Bath, England.⁵² A. A. Marks included instructions and prices for overseas orders from its 1888 catalogue onwards – \$1.50 for orders to Liverpool and \$1.75 for orders to London.⁵³ In its 1908 *Manual of Artificial Limbs* (authored by James Law), A. A. Marks included no less than nine testimonials from English amputees.

For A. A. Marks and others on both sides of the Atlantic who saw Hood's poem as a comment on unsuitable false limbs and artificiality, literature was seen as a powerful means of shaping people's views concerning prostheses. A. A. Marks's inclusion of internationally popular pieces of literature such as Hood's poem in its prosthesis treatises reveals an intriguing marketing strategy. By evoking these popular narratives, prosthetists such as A. A. Marks and Drake hoped to conjure an association between popular pieces of literature about prosthetics and their firms' artificial limbs. These limb makers literalise Hood's representation of an artificial leg but do so in an attempt to implant their prostheses in the popular imagination as real life solutions to the issues that Miss Kilmansegg encounters in Hood's poem. A. A. Marks and Drake hoped that amputees would think of their artificial limbs when reading, or listening to, popular pieces of verse, such as *Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg* and 'The Cork Leg'. Implicit in the use of such texts, this kind of literary engagement also bolstered the intellectual property protection of Marks's prostheses, which were already protected by a patent.

Medical historian Claire L. Jones has shown us how eponymously named devices were deployed by medical men in trade catalogues as an informal and respectable means of enforcing intellectual property protection.⁵⁴ Neither *Miss Kilmansegg* nor 'The Cork Leg' directly mention Marks's patented artificial legs with rubber feet in order to further enforce the proprietary ownership of Marks's design, but the incorporation of these stories in Marks's advertising texts implanted into the imagination of the reader a negative image of an artificial leg against which the maker's 'superior' leg could stand. In other 'Literary Amenities' appended in Marks's treatise, however, more direct reference is made to the firm's artificial legs. For instance, in the poem mentioned above by Mrs S. E. Silley, the speaker references Marks directly and draws attention to his devices' patented aspect: 'I tried it on; it fitted neat, / With rubber foot and straps complete'.⁵⁵ Elsewhere, a humorous (though problematic)

literary sketch called ‘A Part of Stewart’s Body’ was printed in full, which, like Silley’s poem, praised the capacities of Marks’s rubber-footed artificial legs. The sketch once again draws our attention to the conspicuously gendered discourse of Marks’s treatise. The firm’s rubber feet enable the protagonist Stewart to ‘run, skate, play billiards, drink . . . and spend money as well as any of the boys’.⁵⁶ Specially crafted literary texts were therefore included in Marks’s trade catalogues as endorsements for, and reminders of, the manufacturer’s patented features. Meanwhile, internationally recognised literary depictions of suspect prostheses were included to contrast Mark’s limbs and therefore emphasise the ingenuity of the firm’s products.

The American artificial limb makers were not the only ones to utilise literature in the nineteenth century. Indeed, from the mid-century when the fashion for artificial hair was at its height, British wig makers such as Thomas Elliott and ‘Professor Brown’ used poetry for advertising purposes.⁵⁷ On one of Elliott’s circa-1860 posters, he included a ballad entitled ‘The Baffler of Time’, which pondered

’Tis rueful when we think how Time pursues his reckless way,
 In hast’ning Locks on youthful heads to premature decay;
 And as for older heads, not he would let a hair remain,
 If Art or Science could not check his too encroaching reign.⁵⁸

On his 1863 poster, on the other hand, ‘Professor Brown’ used a poem written ‘In something like a measur’d verse’ to assure readers that ‘Hereafter you’ll patronize no one but Brown,/And soon have fine Tresses of Hair’ (1863). This poem capitalised on the anxieties of ‘incomplete’ women evoked by contemporary marriage plots, such as ‘Kitty the Careless’ or ‘Was She False?’, while also using such stories as familiar and popular frameworks for

expressing more commercially driven messages about prosthetics. These literary components of nineteenth-century prosthesis advertising promised female users restored youthfulness, beauty, and the ability to go unnoticed as ‘incomplete’ women. Such poems used witty verse to make the eponymous devices of wig makers memorable while emphasising the link between women and the necessity to erase visible physical ‘defects’.

Corresponding with the increase in medical trade catalogues towards the end of the nineteenth century identified by Jones, other literature to do with prosthesis responded directly to such commercial messages and the commodification of artificial body parts. Such sources can be read in context with the ethical resistance to medical advertising described by Anne Digby and Jones.⁵⁹ The 1881 *Punch* poem ‘To Lydia’s Glass Eye’, for instance, includes an epigraph quoted from the *Times* that explains, ‘From particulars supplied to the reporter of a Chicago paper by a dealer in glass eyes in that city, it appears that there are as many as a thousand wearers of these eyes in Chicago’. The proceeding poem purports to be a poetic advertisement for a Chicago ocularist and draws from both contemporary marriage plots that include prosthesis users and the commercial poetry published by prosthesis makers as it comically portrays a glass-eye-using speaker addressing his lover, who also wears a glass eye.

The poem evokes an ironic degree of tenderness centring on the speaker and subject’s mutual use of glass eyes – ‘Wink at me only with glass eye,/And I respond with mine’ – which it rebuts with grotesque imagery intended to draw the reader’s attention to the unnaturalness of artifice: ‘smile not when the harmless fly/Goes crawling over thine’. The poem also mocks the commercial rhetoric of contemporary prosthesis manufacturers as the speaker tells his lover,

I sent thee late a new glass eye,

Impervious to the tear,
 Tinged with some new aesthetic dye,
 And quite 'too utter' dear.⁶⁰

Here the poem directly evokes contemporary ocularists, who like artificial limb, teeth, and hair makers made bold claims about the abilities of their devices to mimic nature, function correctly, and resist wear and tear. Indeed, in the 1850s and 1860s, French artificial eye maker Auguste Boissonneau, who was very much a market leader in Europe at the time, described in his 1854 British patent specification an important innovation that made his artificial eyes, to use the words of the *Punch* poem, 'impervious to the tear': '[by means of a notch or aperture] on any point of the inferior palpebral section of the artificial eye[,] . . . communication is established between the internal and external parts of the artificial eye which prevents the stagnation and decomposition of the tears in the concavity of the eye'.⁶¹ In less technical terms, Boissonneau's 1864 *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* advertisement posited 'the unpleasant, dirty appearance of a glass eye' against his superior enamel artificial eyes.⁶² It seems to be such bold claims and the use of jargon seen in contemporary advertisements that make the prosthesis market the target of *Punch*'s humour in 'To Lydia's Glass Eye'.

However, in spite of its satirising of the contemporary prosthesis market, 'To Lydia's Glass Eye' supports the status quo expressed in contemporary marriage plots regarding female prosthesis visibility. The final lines of this poem use an absurd image to mock the sexual allure of female prosthesis users thus reminding the reader of the importance of imperceptible prosthetics:

You'll wear it, won't you, when you think

How faithful it must be,
For it is warranted to wink
At nobody but me? ⁶³

By drawing ironic attention to the possible unfaithfulness of the speaker's glass-eyed lover, mischievously hinting that the woman might be the subject of other men's winks, the reader is subconsciously reminded of the imperative for prosthetics, in particular for female users, to enable wearers to defy detection as individuals who are physically 'incomplete'.

Conclusion

As we can see from the range of fictional texts explored in this chapter, literature intersected with the contemporary prosthesis market in a number of ways: it echoed and cashed in on messages directed at women in commercial texts that advised that more silent/indivisible prosthetics were superior; it suggested that women should avoid outdated and frankly dangerous devices, such as partial dental plates, as well as ostentatious prostheses, such as overly white false teeth, which could jeopardise their anonymity as invisible prosthesis users; it provided catchy lyrics, memorable images, and endorsements of devices when commissioned for advertising purposes or when hijacked for similar commercial endeavours; it provided a critique of the contemporary prosthesis market, which was seen by some as hyperbolic in the claims that it made regarding the reparative capacities of devices and by others as an industry that dubiously thrived through encouraging fraudulence and deception. Though the relationship between literature and the prosthesis market was certainly complex, literature provided a conflicting but nonetheless socially informed guide for selecting prostheses in nineteenth-century Britain and America. Above all, literary texts and the prosthesis market together propounded the troubling ableist message that women who could

best conceal their physical imperfections were better off in the world than those that could not convincingly hide their physical losses.

The representation of female prosthesis users in popular culture continues today but with more mixed perspectives. Films such as *De rouille et d'os* (*Rust and Bone*; 2012) – directed by Jacques Audiard – strip away the problematic prosthesis mandate for concealment. Audiard's film documents the day-to-day struggles that the former orca trainer Stephanie (played by Marion Cotillard) has with her two artificial legs, while showing how an acceptance of her physically altered state, something facilitated by her relationship with street fighter Ali (played by Matthias Schoenaerts), brings her happiness and contentment. *De rouille et d'os* also eroticises the amputee, shifting and intensifying the kind of fascination displayed towards disabled women in earlier narratives. The film resists a technophilic narrative of passing as it suggests that human relationships and acceptance are the most effective prostheses for limb loss.

Meanwhile, representations such as Jaime Sommers in Kenneth Johnson's 2007 revamped NBC version of the *Bionic Woman* endorse a lingering desire for prostheses to eradicate the appearance of physical loss. In this television series, Sommers (played by Michelle Ryan) is 'rebuilt' following a life-threatening car accident using state-of-the-art prostheses and implants. This use of technology not only makes her physical capabilities magnificent but also renders her injuries invisible. Representations like this – though progressive from one perspective since they endorse a robust form of femininity – validate attempts to eradicate disability via a medical model, which sees physical loss as a potentially fixable issue. In this sense, then, the troubling conceptual tie between female prosthesis users and attempts to render physical loss invisible lingers in the twenty-first century.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to the editor and anonymous peer-reviewers of this book, whose suggestions helped to shape the chapter into the piece that it is today.

Notes

- ¹ Kirsten Twelbeck, 'The nurse, the veteran, and the female scientist: dependency and separation', *European Journal of American Studies*, 10:1 (2015), 2–15, 10.
- ² Alonzo Hill, *John Smith's Funny Adventures on a Crutch* (Philadelphia: J. E. Potter, 1869), pp. 20, 173.
- ³ Oliver Wendell Holmes, 'The human wheel, its spokes and felloes', in Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Sounds from the Atlantic* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1864), p. 318.
- ⁴ Erin O'Connor, *Raw Material: Producing Pathology in Victorian Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), p. 124.
- ⁵ See Lisa Herschbach, 'Prosthetic reconstruction: making the industry, re-making the body, modelling the nation', *History Workshop Journal*, 44 (1997), 23–57; O'Connor, *Raw Material*; Stephen Mihm, 'A limb which shall be presentable in polite society: prosthetic technologies in the nineteenth century', in Katherine Ott, David Serlin, and Stephen Mihm (eds), *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives: Modern Histories of Prosthetics* (New York: New York University Press, 2002).
- ⁶ O'Connor, *Raw Material*, pp. 117–43.
- ⁷ See Kirsten E. Gardner, 'From cotton to silicone: breast prosthesis before 1950', in Ott, Serlin, and Mihm (eds), *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives*; Marquard Smith, 'The vulnerable articulate: James Gillingham, Aimee Mullins, and Matthew Barney', in Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra (eds), *The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future* (London: MIT Press, 2006); Vanessa Warne, "'To invest a cripple with peculiar interest": artificial legs and upper-class amputees at

mid-century', *Victorian Review*, 35:2 (2009), 83–100; Galia Ofek, *Representations of Hair in Victorian Literature and Culture* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

⁸ Smith, 'The vulnerable articulate', p. 54.

⁹ Gardner, 'From cotton to silicone', p. 116.

¹⁰ Ofek, *Representations of Hair*, pp. 9–16, 118–30, and 202–7.

¹¹ Cindy LaCom, "'Is it more than lame": female disability, sexuality, and the maternal in the nineteenth-century novel', in Sharon L. Snyder and David T. Mitchell (eds), *The Body and Physical Difference: Discourses of Disability* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), p. 190.

¹² See Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), p. 27.

¹³ Martha Stoddard Holmes, *Fictions of Affliction: Physical Disability in Victorian Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), p. 69.

¹⁴ Jeffrey A. Brune and Daniel J. Wilson (eds), *Disability and Passing: Blurring the Lines of Identity*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013), p. 1.

¹⁵ Brune and Wilson (eds), *Disability and Passing*, pp. 4–5.

¹⁶ David Linton, 'The menstrual masquerade', in Brune and Wilson (eds), *Disability and Passing*, p. 58.

¹⁷ See Mary Poovey, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Sally Shuttleworth, *Charlotte Bronte and Victorian Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁸ See Lennard J. Davis, *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness, and the Body* (London: Verso, 1995).

-
- ¹⁹ Stoddard Holmes, *Fictions of Affliction*, p. 68.
- ²⁰ See Bruce Haley, *The Healthy Body and Victorian Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 4; O'Connor, *Raw Material*, pp. 103–5.
- ²¹ See Alexander Walker, *Beauty: Illustrated Chiefly by an Analysis and Classification of Beauty in Woman* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1836); Havelock Ellis, *Man and Woman: A Study of Human Secondary Sexual Characters* (London: Walter Scott, 1904); Carl Heinirch Stratz, *Die Schönheit des weiblichen Körpers*, 14th ed. (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1903).
- ²² The penchant for emphasising functionality in the marketing of artificial limbs in the nineteenth and twentieth century is explored in depth in Julie Anderson's chapter in this collection.
- ²³ Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise on Marks' Patent Artificial Limbs with Rubber Hands and Feet* (New York: A. A. Marks, 1888), p. 346.
- ²⁴ See James F. Stark, 'Recharge my exhausted batteries: Overbeck's Rejuvenator, patenting, and public medical consumers, 1924–37', *Medical History*, 58 (2014), 498–518.
- ²⁵ George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 111.
- ²⁶ See Jalynn Olsen Padilla, 'Army of "Cripples": Northern Civil War Amputees, Disability, and Manhood in Victorian America' (PhD dissertation, University of Delaware, 2007).
- ²⁷ In 1888, Marks's top-of-the-range devices could be purchased for between \$65 and \$100. According to measuringworth.com, \$100 for a commodity in 1888 is relative to the 'real price' of \$2,570 in 2014. See <https://measuringworth.com/uscompare/>. Accessed 6 May. 2016.
- ²⁸ Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 312.

-
- ²⁹ See Mihm, 'A limb'; Ott, 'Hard wear and soft tissue: craft and commerce in artificial eyes', in Ott, Serlin, and Mihm (eds), *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives*.
- ³⁰ Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 155.
- ³¹ William Chambers, 'The wooden leg', *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts*, 685 (1877), 81–2, 82.
- ³² Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 287.
- ³³ William Blanchard Jerrold, 'Eyes made to order', *Household Words*, 4:81 (1851), 64–6, 64.
- ³⁴ 'The false hair', *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Arts*, 396 (1861), 65–7, 65.
- ³⁵ John Woodforde, *The Strange Story of False Teeth* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), p. 3.
- ³⁶ 'Kitty the Careless', *Judy* (1 August 1883), 50.
- ³⁷ Woodforde, *The Strange Story*, pp. 69–74, 77.
- ³⁸ Woodforde, *The Strange Story*, pp. 69–75.
- ³⁹ R. H. Rozenzweig, 'False teeth swallowed', *The British Medical Journal*, 2:1614 (1891), 1204.
- ⁴⁰ 'Curt comments', *Fun*, 835 (1881), 187.
- ⁴¹ 'Kitty the Careless', 50.
- ⁴² Woodforde, *The Strange Story*, pp. 77–8.
- ⁴³ For more *Judy*'s readership, see J. Don Vann, 'Comic periodicals' in J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel (eds), *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), p. 285; Heidi Hansson, 'Punch, Fun, Judy and the polar hero: comedy, gender and the British Arctic Expedition 1875–76', in Christine

DeVine and Mary Ann Wilson (eds), *North and South: Essays on Gender, Race and Region* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), p. 67.

Partial plates could be purchased for as little as 2 s. 6 d. per tooth in 1883. According to measuringworth.com, such a price for a commodity in 1883 is relative to the ‘real price’ of £11.24 in 2014. See <https://measuringworth.com/ukcompare/>. Accessed 6 May. 2016. The price for ‘American dentistry’, by contrast, was seldom advertised, reflecting, perhaps, its bespoke form but also its higher cost. For example, see advertisement for Mr. Hogg, consulting dentist, *Sheffield & Rotherham Independent* (1 January 1883): 1.

⁴⁴ A. M., ‘Was She False?’, *The London Reader of Literature, Science, Art and General Information*, 26:656 (1875), 75–6.

⁴⁵ Jerrold, ‘Eyes made to order’, 64.

⁴⁶ For more on *Miss Kilmansegg*’s popularity, see Warne, “‘To invest a cripple’”, 95–6.

⁴⁷ Warne, “‘To invest a cripple’”, 89.

⁴⁸ Thomas Hood, *Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg*, in John Clubbe (ed.), *Selected Poems of Thomas Hood* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), l. 817.

⁴⁹ Hood, *Miss Kilmansegg*, l. 1167–69.

⁵⁰ Qtd. in John S. Drake, *Drake’s Patent Artificial Legs, Hands, Arms, &c.* (Boston: J. Drake, 1859), p. 45.

⁵¹ George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 8.

⁵² A. A. Marks, *Marks’ Patent Artificial Limbs with Rubber Hands and Feet* (New York: A. A. Marks, 1886), p. 27.

⁵³ George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 397.

⁵⁴ Claire L. Jones, *The Medical Trade Catalogue, 1870–1914* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013), pp. 146–50.

-
- ⁵⁵ Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 287.
- ⁵⁶ Qtd. in George E. Marks, *A Treatise*, p. 169.
- ⁵⁷ Ofek, *Representations of Hair*, pp. 37–8.
- ⁵⁸ Thomas Elliott, ‘The Baffler of Time’ (c. 1860), Wellcome Library, London, EPH 160 B, Hair care box 9, poster.
- ⁵⁹ Anne Digby, *Making a Medical Living: Doctors and Patients in the English Market for Medicine, 1720–1911* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 39–68; Jones, *The Medical Trade*.
- ⁶⁰ ‘To Lydia’s Glass Eye’, *Punch* (30 April 1881), 193.
- ⁶¹ Auguste Boissonneau, ‘Specification of Auguste Boissonneau: artificial eyes’, Wellcome Library, London, Pat. vol. 24, .b16462518, patent, no. 1715, (London: Great Seal Patent Office, 1855), pp. 2–3.
- ⁶² Advertisement for A. Boissonneau’s artificial eyes, *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 18:462 (1864): 314.
- ⁶³ ‘To Lydia’s Glass Eye’, 193.