

Reviving Sympathy for the Insane: *Hamlet* in Nineteenth-Century America

by Abigail Heiniger

Society's attitude towards the insane was in flux in sixteenth-century England. During the Middle Ages, the British were relatively tolerant of madness.¹ The label "mad" was fairly loose because the medieval worldview held that madness was a part of the human condition. The need to define and label the mad was driven by Renaissance dehumanization of the insane (Thiher 49). Despite medieval stories like the "Ship of Fools,"² H. C. Erik Midelfort claims "[the insane] were mostly at home in the protective custody of their relatives" (7). Thus, those labeled mad generally retained a place within medieval European society. However, in the later half of the sixteenth-century and especially the seventeenth-century, the insane in the West were locked away in asylums where they became victims of inhumanity (Midelfort 9). Shakespeare was aware of the sixteenth-century debates over insanity; several theories about the cause and nature of madness surface in his plays. Shakespeare maintains a medieval tolerance for insanity through sympathetic and thoroughly human characters who suffer from madness or mental distress like King Lear, Lady Macbeth, Macbeth, Ophelia and especially Hamlet.³ His attitude towards insanity is remarkably different from that of later playwrights. Specifically, the Jacobean playwright John Webster portrays insanity as dehumanizing and worthy of cruelty in the play *The Duchess of Malfi* (1614). Webster's attitude became the norm; in the West, the insane were considered subhuman into the nineteenth-century (Laird 170).

Attitudes towards the mad shifted again in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century; the insane were rehumanized. In 1907, Dr. William L. Russell, Medical Inspector for the New York State Commission in Lunacy, notes the transition from "keepers" of "madhouses" to the more humane "attendants" of "mental hospitals" (926). I would like to argue that, centuries after his death, Shakespeare's work was a part of this change in the American attitude towards the insane.

According to Lawrence W. Levine, Shakespeare was the most performed playwright in the U.S. during the nineteenth-century, and *Hamlet* was his most often performed play (34 – 35). Levine claims that Shakespeare was imported to America as elite culture in the late-eighteenth-century, but by the mid-nineteenth-century, he was a part of popular culture (36). Though Shakespeare's plays did not prevent the West from exiling the insane to the inhumanity of madhouses like Bedlam, his sympathetic treatment of the insane in his plays provided the West with a voice of tolerance. Shakespeare

even allowed some of his most celebrated characters to succumb to madness. As an important voice in popular culture, I think Shakespeare possessed the power to shape attitudes towards insanity in a way that we cannot fully appreciate today. I suggest that *Hamlet* kept the debate over the humanity of the insane alive, and thus this play was one of the social forces that allowed for the shift towards tolerance around the turn of the twentieth-century, especially in the United States.⁴

This essay will focus on Edwin Booth's productions of *Hamlet* in New York between 1860 and 1870 because Booth was such an influential actor in the United States, and his productions are the best documented.⁵ For example, in 1870, Charles W Clarke, a twenty-one-year-old bookkeeper without a high school education, created a journal describing Booth's performance at the Winter Garden in New York City (Bundy 99). This journal is acclaimed as: "... the most complete account of Booth's performance in existence, and perhaps the fullest record of any Shakespearean production before the advent of the motion picture and the sound track" (Bundy 99). Although Clarke was an exceptional individual, I believe the journal he left behind demonstrates that even the general, unschooled American public was very aware of the sublimity of *Hamlet*, and thus sensitive to its message about insanity.

Reviews show that Booth was more than a popular performer; he was an artist whose productions had the power to move an audience by drawing them actively into Shakespeare's play. The reason Booth's productions were able to affect cultural work is that they immersed the audience in a sensory experience. These multidimensional plays were moving because they reached the audience on multiple levels. In fact, the visual affects of these productions were so powerful that critics were moved to describe them in reviews. As a result, Booth's performances are some of the best preserved before the advent of film (Bundy 99). Moreover, since Booth was often manager as well as lead actor, he engineered all aspects of his productions.

Descriptions of the physical set and the action on stage are embedded in Clarke's record of the dialogue. He lists the scenery, costumes, entrances of characters, and blocking. Reviewers in the *New York Times* claimed that the physical set in Booth's later productions of *Hamlet* was the best in New York theatre history: "The play [*Hamlet* was] put upon the stage with more painstaking [sic] than had been ever before bestowed on the tragedy in this country" ("Career of Edwin Booth" 2). The purpose of this elaborate setting was to effect *memesis*—to bridge the gap between the audience and the actors ("Music and Drama"). By bridging this gap, the set made the drama more accessible to the audience, allowing them to participate in *Hamlet*'s experience.

A successful performance of *Hamlet* depends on the verbal acuity of the actors and especially of *Hamlet*. Reviews like "Amusements" (Nov. 17, 1862), "Amusements" (May, 4 1864), and "Career of Edwin Booth" in the *New York Times* consistently praised Booth for his verbal mastery in the role of *Hamlet*. Clarke claimed that Booth's performance, and especially his use of language, encouraged the audience to imaginatively participate in the drama:

I could not be more complimentary to Booth than I am in saying that his acting frees my fancy and makes each word and motion the little stereoscope through which some great glowing view of grand emotion or a magnificent idea is for the instant placed before my eyes. (Bundy 101)

This response was not unique to Clarke. Other reviewers noted Booth's paradoxical passion and subdued style. After one of his first appearances in New York, critics com-

mented on both Booth's quiet, almost timid style ("Amusements" Nov. 27, 1860) and his incredible pathos and passion ("Amusements" Nov. 17, 1862). One reviewer described Booth's convincing portrayal of Hamlet's acute mental anguish, his progression from melancholy to frenzy, and then praised Booth for avoiding emotional extremes ("Amusements" May 4, 1864). These seemingly paradoxical comments suggested that because Booth did not overact the part, he was able to call on the imagination of the audience. This imaginative connection made his Hamlet an especially sympathetic character. Five of six reviews commented on Booth's sublime, sympathetic portrayal of characters.

Though Booth did not overact the part of Hamlet, he did not downplay the role either. As a part of his power to evoke sympathy, Booth embraced the full, complex humanity of the characters he portrayed.⁶ In portraying the complexity of Hamlet, Booth embraced the fullness of Hamlet's madness. Even in a rather critical evaluation of an early performance, the reviewer claimed that Booth had a thorough conception of the character and effectively conveyed Hamlet's complexity: "three parts philosopher and one part madman" ("Amusements" Nov. 27, 1860). A later reviewer claimed that Booth's Hamlet was so popular because of his combination of "wit and madness" ("Amusement" Nov. 17, 1862).

Booth mastered the melancholic disposition and moved the audience in his sympathetic descent from a "settled" depression to an "unsettled tribulation" ("Amusement" May 4, 1864). The reviewer claimed that Booth's performance was so natural, so convincing, that the audience empathized with the hero's madness. The audience did not passively observe Hamlet's descent into madness; Booth's performance encouraged his audience to imaginatively participate in *Hamlet* and to share the hero's acute mental anguish. By means of a thoroughly sympathetic, even empathetic, portrayal of Hamlet, Booth inadvertently inspired sympathy for madness. It may be argued from Clarke's journal that, during Booth's performance, the mad were integrated into society once again as the audience shared Hamlet's experience (Bundy 101).

One of the reasons that Hamlet's madness was more complex and more sympathetic in Booth's production was that Booth included more of Shakespeare's text than earlier actors. For example, Booth included the scene where Hamlet decides not to kill Claudius while he prays ("Amusement" Nov. 27 1860) and the scene where Hamlet contemplates Yorick's skull ("Amusement" Nov. 17, 1862). Both of these scenes provide insights into Hamlet's complex interior; they humanize Hamlet and make him more accessible to his audience.

In the text of Shakespeare's play, Hamlet's madness is not bestial; it is a decidedly human condition springing from overwhelming emotions, stressful external circumstances, or even from contact with the divine. Hamlet further complicates his madness with the conflicting claims that it is an act (1.5.191–92) and a reality (5.2.251). Hamlet's madness remains an elusive condition throughout the play because Shakespeare's exploration of madness is not driven by the Renaissance taxonomical ambitions to label and isolate the insane. *Hamlet* does not encourage a concrete definition of madness. In fact, Shakespeare scoffs at the desire to label madness through Polonius' artless attempt:

Your noble son is mad,
'Mad' call I it, for, to define true madness,
What is 't but to be nothing else but mad? (2.2.99–101).

By refusing to define the nature of madness, Shakespeare encourages the medieval belief in the universality of madness. The mad and the sane are not two distinct groups in Shakespeare's play because madness is a part of the human condition.

Gertrude insists that Hamlet's madness is a product of his grief (2.2.59–60). Hamlet claims that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern were summoned because he “lost all [his] mirth” (2.2.321). This description corresponds to the medieval idea of melancholy: “people cry for no reason, they fear where there is nothing to fear, and they are forever afflicted with suffering” (Thiher 18–19). Melancholy was believed to be caused by an imbalance of humors; it was a physical condition that did not detract from the humanity of the sufferer (Thiher 18). Hamlet is accused of displaying an excessive amount of grief (1.2.100–101), and he is warned that this unnatural grief is interfering with his rationality (1.2.106–108). Hamlet does not argue the rationality of his emotions, but rather he states that grief is natural and human (1.2.154).

Hamlet's response demonstrates the belief that human experience exceeds the bounds of strict rationality. This challenges the worldview adopted by early-modern Europe, which deified reason and banished the insane (Thiher 55). Thus, Shakespeare's text offers the nineteenth-century audience an alternative worldview which is tolerant of the nonrational.

Polonius believes it is not grief but unrequited love that is driving Hamlet mad (2.2.155–60). After deliberately watching Hamlet with Ophelia, the King does not believe Hamlet has been driven mad by love (3.1.177–78). In fact, the King suspects that Hamlet is plotting revenge for his father's murder (3.1.1778–82). However, Hamlet concludes his conversation with Ophelia overtly stating that her inconsistency has driven him mad (3.1.159). Ophelia, who apparently has had a close relationship with the prince, believes him:

O, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!...
That unmatched form and stature of blown youth
Blasted with ecstasy (3.1.163, 173–74).

Thiher claims that this was a common sixteenth-century theory popularized by Ficino (54–55). Though love does not regularly cause people to become clinically insane, the frustration and irrationality of romantic relationships is a common human experience with which the audience can sympathize. Even Polonius claims: “I suffered much extremity for love, very near this” (2.2.207–08). A 1876 article from the *Indianapolis Journal* lists a failure to marry as one of the symptoms of madness (“An Old Man's Sad Death”). According to Clarke, Edwin Booth's performance of this scene was very moving; his voice and his movements expressed his agitation (Bundy 100–101). Again, Booth's production of the text garners sympathy from the audience, emphasizing the commonality of their experience and Hamlet's.

The play repeatedly suggests that Hamlet's madness may be the result of his contact with his father's ghost. Horatio voices the commonly held medieval belief that conversing with the divine could deprive a mortal of reason (1.4.81–83). This also resonates with nineteenth-century beliefs about madness.⁷ According to Clarke's journal, Booth emphasized the dark spiritual potential and the emotional trauma of this encounter (1.4.42–1.5.212) through his manipulation of language and movements (Bundy 100–101). Initially, Booth's Hamlet was shocked when he saw the ghost. He staggered, and his voice fell to a terrified whisper. His tone then crescendoed from a whisper to a round, full tone, reaching his loudest with the phrase “blast from hell,” (1.4.45–46). Thus, Booth's language emphasized the dark spiritual forces, which could inspire madness. The rising tone demonstrated rising passion as well.

Booth's production also emphasized the emotional trauma of death. American Gothic literature of the nineteenth-century was peppered with accounts of people driven mad by

grief and guilt over death.⁸ Booth's American audience was especially susceptible to the suggestion that grief could lead to madness. Moreover, in the decades following the Civil War, many members of Booth's audience were familiar with the trauma of losing a loved one.⁹ In his production, Booth drew out Hamlet's naming of the ghost (1.4.49–50). With each new title, Booth's actions and his tone suggested a different relationship between Hamlet and the departed king (Bundy 101). Although Booth does not alter the text of the play to convey this, his emphasis on the emotion of grief and its possible connection to Hamlet's condition reflects the nineteenth-century context of the production more than the sixteenth-century writing of the script. Thus, Hamlet's vision of the ghost was portrayed as a traumatic emotional experience which the audience vicariously experienced through Booth's performance. By emphasizing this factor in Hamlet's madness, Booth again made madness a condition with which the audience could empathize.

While Shakespeare is ambiguous about Hamlet's mental state, Hamlet's symptoms correspond to cases of insanity documented in popular nineteenth-century publications.¹⁰ Thus, Booth's audience would have recognized Hamlet as mad according to their standards. Unlike the eighteenth-century critic, Samuel Johnson, nineteenth-century critics assumed Hamlet was mad, just as Frederic Carpenter does in the article "The Elizabethan Attitude Towards Insanity." In fact, into the 1920s, scholars such as Maurice Baudin confidently assumed Hamlet suffered from insanity (186). Thus, a nineteenth-century audience was vulnerable to *Hamlet's* treatment of madness. Hamlet states that he is only mad "north-north-west" (2.2.402); his assertion challenges rigid classification of the insane. Shakespeare's ambiguous treatment of Hamlet's mental state defies the fixed boundaries of the sane/mad dichotomy in nineteenth-century society and the intolerance generated by those beliefs. Despite the fact that Carpenter assumes that Hamlet is mad, even he cannot get past Shakespeare's ambiguity (93–94). Thus, *Hamlet* kept the debate about insanity alive in the nineteenth-century, and that debate paved the way for change.

The verbal nature of Hamlet's madness is the most empathetic aspect of his insanity. Booth recognized this and brought out the significance of Hamlet's language. His 1860s and 1870s productions include more text than previous American productions of *Hamlet*; specifically, Booth includes two soliloquies previously excluded from the American stage. Hamlet's language is significant because language is an undeniable human characteristic. In Jacobean plays that dehumanize the mad, the insane are reduced to inarticulate noises, and they exhibit animal behavior. In contrast, Hamlet maintains communicative interaction with the audience, constantly reminding them of his humanity.

The verbal nature of Hamlet's madness invites the audience to participate in his non-rational or extra-rational thought process and thus experience his madness. Although Hamlet's madness is conveyed by his language, his speech never descends into senseless babble; rather, it makes a mad sort of sense. For example, Hamlet says:

O God, I could be bounded in a nutshell and
count myself a king of infinite space, were it not
that I have bad dreams. (2.2.273–75)

This statement is irrational if taken literally, but on a metaphysical level this statement makes sense.¹¹

More often, Hamlet's speech consists of a disjointed series of seemingly unrelated ideas, such as his outburst "O Jephthah, judge of Israel, what a treasure/hadst thou!" (2.2.427–28). This statement is embedded in a discussion of theatre, and Hamlet only hints at the significance. Thus, it seems to demonstrate an abnormal thought process.

In order to understand *Hamlet*, the audience is forced to infer the unspoken connection between Hamlet's sporadic statements. For example, Hamlet's reference to Jephthah is a barb aimed at Polonius. Participating in his thought processes, the audience can agree with Polonius' assessment of Hamlet's speech:

... How
pregnant sometimes his replies are! A happiness
that often madness hits on, which reason and
sanity could not so prosperously be delivered of. (2.2.226–29)

By stating that non-rational language is occasionally the most accurate way to describe certain aspects of life, *Hamlet* suggests that life occasionally demands the non-rational, the mad. It is through statements such as this that *Hamlet* does the unintentional cultural work of arguing for tolerance of the mad in society.

The soliloquy in which Hamlet decides not to kill the praying Claudius (3.3.77–101) is another instance where Hamlet verbally reveals his thought process. This scene was excluded from American staged versions of the play until Booth's 1860 debut in New York City ("Amusement" Nov. 27 1860). Booth chose to include this scene because it demonstrated the complex motivations behind Hamlet's actions. Though Hamlet's decisions are not strictly rational, they are not thoughtless, and they are certainly not bestial instincts.

Thus, Hamlet makes madness a part of the human experience and specifically a part of the audience's experience. *Hamlet* returns the mad to society. By emphasizing the sympathetic nature of Hamlet's madness, Booth's production of *Hamlet* did the cultural work of making the insane into humans who deserve sympathy and humane treatment. Shakespeare did not prevent the West from centuries of intolerance towards insanity. However, his plays kept alive the idea of the humanity of the insane. It is not a coincidence that at a time when *Hamlet* and Shakespeare were popular in American culture, America's treatment of the insane improved dramatically.

Hamlet's emphatically human experience of madness in *Hamlet* runs counter to the Western understanding of madness from the seventeenth-century to the nineteenth-century. In 1841, Dorothea Dix made a methodical study of the treatment of the insane in Massachusetts (Deutsch 987–89). After two years of research, she presented her findings to the Massachusetts State Legislature: "I proceed, Gentlemen, briefly to call your attention to the state of insane persons confined within this Commonwealth, in *cages, closets, cellars, stalls, pens: Chained, naked, beaten with rods*, and lashed into obedience!" (Deutsch 990–91). She proceeded to methodically list the cities she visited, the number of insane confined there, and their living conditions. It is important to understand that these individuals were not confined and abused because they were dangerous, but because they were considered subhuman.

The treatment of the insane observed by Dorothea Dix in nineteenth-century Massachusetts was the same as the treatment of the insane in post-Shakespearean Renaissance dramas, indicating that the American attitude towards insanity was inherited from European Renaissance intolerance. For example, the belief in the literal bestiality of the insane was proposed by André Du Laurens in 1597 (Thiher 73–74). Likewise, in John Webster's 1614 production, *The Duchess of Malfi*, the character Lord Ferdinand is afflicted by an excess of black bile, or melancholy humor (5.2.9). It causes him to become bestial: he believes that he has been transformed into a wolf (5.2.10), and he behaves accordingly. Ferdinand's insanity merits abuse and confinement. The doctor beats him (5.2.25) and pelts him with forty urinals full of water (5.2.68). I am not

suggesting that Webster's mediocre play played a major role in shaping western attitudes towards the insane. However, it did contribute to the cultural trend of viewing the insane as subhuman beasts worthy of abuse, and it is characteristic of other works produced during that time.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* suffers from the same basic physical disorder as Webster's Ferdinand: an excess of the humor black bile, or melancholy (*Hamlet* 2.2.630; *The Duchess* 5.2.9).¹² Not only does this imbalance of humors have two very different effects, Ferdinand and *Hamlet* are treated in two very different ways in their respective plays. *Hamlet* is never confined or isolated by those around him. Claudius sends him off to England with orders for the King of England to execute him, but this is because Claudius fears *Hamlet* (4.4.75–76), not because *Hamlet* is mad. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are sent for to follow *Hamlet* and learn if there is anything that can be done to help him (2.2.1–25). Unlike Ferdinand, *Hamlet* is never isolated or treated like an animal. This consistent acceptance of *Hamlet* and his madness by the other characters does the unintentional cultural work of encouraging the audience to tolerate the mad within society.

The theater is both a product of culture and producer of culture. The attitude of these plays towards insanity both reflects and contributes to the attitude of society. Webster's play demonstrates the intolerance of early-modern society which was carried over to the United States and practiced into the nineteenth- and even the twentieth-century. However, Shakespeare gained new prominence in American theater, and America was exposed to changing ideas about insanity in the mid-nineteenth-century. Without speculating on the cultural impact of these plays, nineteenth-century scholars like Carpenter noticed the contrasting treatment of insanity in these two plays (93–94).

It is difficult for a twenty-first-century critic to understand the role of theatre in nineteenth-century society; thus, it is difficult to appreciate *Hamlet's* potential for cultural work in nineteenth-century America. However, a wide variety of casual documents testify to the social power of theatre in popular American culture. For example, a two-paragraph article published in the *New York Times*, entitled "Hamlet and Hysteria," (Jan. 5, 1896) demonstrates that this sympathy for insanity inspired by *Hamlet* persisted beyond the theatre walls. The unnamed author of "Hamlet and Hysteria" states that *Hamlet's* madness is perfectly understandable, given his circumstances. He goes as far as suggesting that madness is a natural response to an unbearable situation. This brief statement reveals a recognition of the universal potential for madness which is the beginning of tolerance. According to Thiher, medieval tolerance for insanity springs from the medieval belief that all mankind was a little mad: "If we are all born into sin and madness, then we are all to some degree mad" (49). This article demonstrates the cultural work of *Hamlet* and its influence on American society.

In "William Shakespeare and the American People," Levine attests to the overwhelming prevalence of Shakespearean plays in America in the late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century. He claims that Shakespeare became more prominent in the United States than in England during this era. Moreover, Shakespeare was not the property of the intellectual elites by the nineteenth-century; it was popular entertainment (Levine 39) enjoyed by both socialites and clerks like Charles Clarke: "Nineteenth-century America swallowed Shakespeare, digested him and his plays, and made them part of the cultural body" (Levine 42). Levine claims that the nineteenth-century attitude towards theatre and Shakespeare in America parallels twenty-first-century attitudes towards sporting events like football. Thus, the line between audience and actor often became blurred, as reviews of Booth's performance suggest. Since the audience

participated in the play, it may be assumed that theatre had the opportunity to impact American society in a powerful way. In this receptive atmosphere, Booth's *Hamlet* would have been able to revive sympathy for the insane and contribute to a tolerance for mental illness within society.

By the turn of the century, addresses by nurses like S. Louise Lard, Miss. Wood and Miss. Richards stress the new need for kind, humane nurses in mental hospitals (179–80). Records from city councils begin to show that communities were concerned for the plight of the insane within their midst (Hunter 139–40). Even the language used to describe the insane was changing in response to public recognition of the humanity of the mentally ill (Russell 926). While social reformers like Dorothea Dix were especially important in changing the physical treatment of the insane, social attitudes were changed by a wide variety of subtle (and often unintentional) forces, like the preeminence of *Hamlet* in nineteenth-century America's popular entertainment industry.

Notes

1. This essay will use the term "madness" because it was a term with which Shakespeare was familiar, and it persisted throughout the nineteenth-century. Midelfort argues that twenty-first-century psychological jargon cannot accurately describe sixteenth-century mental conditions (11–12). Thus, scholars should limit themselves to the language of the historical era they discuss.

2. There are some late medieval accounts of mental deviants and fools being sent off in a ship. Historian Michel Foucault argues that this really occurred, but H. C. Erik Midelfort claims "there were no real ships of fools" (6).

3. I recognize that Shakespeare's tolerance of insanity was not a conscious endorsement of tolerance. I am not trying to argue for the intentionality of either Shakespeare or nineteenth-century performers. This essay accepts the un-intentionality of cultural poetics described by Stephen Greenblatt in "Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture" (221).

4. In *Understanding Hamlet*, Peter Winders claims that Shakespeare's character Hamlet would not have been understood as mad by Elizabethan society, and therefore was not in fact mad (47). This essay is not a part of that debate. Rather, this essay is concerned with nineteenth-century American performances of *Hamlet*, specifically the performances of Edwin Booth. Whether or not Shakespeare's Hamlet was mad, these American performances did the cultural work of encouraging tolerance towards the insane. In fact, I will argue that *Hamlet's* reintroduction of the ambivalent medieval attitude is a part of tolerance for madness.

5. Booth was the "leading American actor of his day" (Boyce 69), best known for his portrayal of Hamlet. His onw-hundred-night run in 1864 was a record that remained unbroken until 1922. In fact, his valedictory performance was of Hamlet in 1891 (Boyce 70).

6. Even Booth's Iago, the two-dimensional antagonist in *Othello*, was unusually complex and human according to the *New York Times* ("Amusements" Dec. 12, 1868).

7. Even when contact with the supernatural was not directly involved in cases of insanity, it is used metaphorically to describe symptoms and obsessions, like in the *New York Times* article "An Old Man's Sad Death."

8. Edgar Allan Poe's popular stories "The Fall of the House of Usher" (1839) and "The Tell Tale Heart" (1843) are late-nineteenth-century American Gothic stories in which the protagonist is driven mad by guilt or grief over death. In stories like these, the emotional trauma of death is connected with madness.

9. The Civil War claimed the lives of 625,000 Americans.

10. According to articles such as "An Old Man's Sad Death" (*Indianapolis Journal*, 28 September 1876), "The Kingston Tragedy," (*New York Times*, 19 June 1868), and "The Fox Will Case," (*New York Times*, 21 March 1870) symptoms of insanity may include a failure to marry, contact with the divine, paranoia, and eccentric or inconsistent behavior. All of these are behaviors exhibited by Shakespeare's Hamlet.

11. This statement, which demonstrates the sense behind Hamlet's madness continues to

provoke debate among scholars today. For example, it is one of the philosophical conundrums at the center of physicist Stephen Hawkins' book, (Bantam Press 2001).

12. It is significant that nineteenth-century scholars like Carpenter recognized both of these characters as insane in his article "The Elizabethan Attitude Towards Insanity" (93–94).

Works Cited

-
- "Amusements." *New York Times* 27 Nov. 1860. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- "Amusements." *New York Times* 17 November 1862. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- "Amusements." *New York Times* 4 May 1864. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- "Amusements." *New York Times* 12 Dec. 1868. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Baudin, Maurice. "The Role of the Ghost in Hamlet." *Modern Language Notes*. 37:3 (1922): 185–86.
- Boyce, Charles. "Booth, Edwin." *Shakespeare A to Z*. Delta: Roundtable Press, 1990. 69–70.
- Bundy, Murray W. "A Record of Edwin Booth's *Hamlet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 2:2. (1951): 99–102. JSTOR. 23 Oct. 2006.
- "Career of Edwin Booth" *New York Times* 15 May 1881. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Carpenter, Frederic Ives. "The Elizabethan Attitude Towards Insanity." *Modern Language Notes*. 11:3 (1896): 93–94.
- Deutsch, Albert. "Dorothea Lynde Dix: Apostle of the Insane." *The American Journal of Nursing*. 36:10 (1936): 9987–997. JSTOR. 9 Oct. 2006.
- "The Fox Will Case." *New York Times* 21 Mar. 1870. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture." *Literary Theory/Renaissance Text*. Ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins U P, 1986. 210–224.
- "Hamlet and Hysteria." *New York Times* 5 Jan. 1896. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Hunter, John M. "Need and Demand for Mental Health Care: Massachusetts 1854." *The Geographical Review* 77:2 (Apr. 1987): 139–40.
- "The Kingston Tragedy." *New York Times* 19 June 1868. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Laird, S. Louise. "Nursing of the Insane." *The American Journal of Nursing* 2:3 (1901): 170–180. JSTOR. 9 Oct. 2006.
- Levine, Lawrence W. "William Shakespeare and the American People: A Study in Cultural Transformation." *The American Historical Review* 89.1 (1984): 34–66. JSTOR. 9 October 2006.
- Midelfort, H.C. Erik. "Madness and the Problems of Psychological History in the Sixteenth Century." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 12:1 (1981): 5–12.
- "Music and the Drama." *New York Times* 13 May 1870 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 October 2006.
- "An Old Man's Sad Death." *Indianapolis Journal* 28 Sept. 1876.
- Russell, William L. "Nursing the Insane." *The American Journal of Nursing* 7:12 (1907): 926–33. JSTOR. 9 Oct. 2006.
- "Scoffing Cynic in World of Sham." *New York Times* 4 January 1908: BR12. ProQuest Historical Newspapers *New York Times* (1851–2003). 23 Oct. 2006.
- Thiher, Allen. *Revels in Madness: Insanity in Medicine and Literature*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999.
- Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi*. 1614. *The Duchess of Malfi*. Ed. John Russell Brown. London: Methuen, 1964.
- Winders, Peter. *Understanding Hamlet*. Canada: Pergamon Press, 1975.