

## Judith Wechsler

### PERFORMING OPHELIA: THE ICONOGRAPHY OF MADNESS

Performance brings Ophelia's madness to life. Painters and illustrators responded as much to performance as to text when representing Ophelia. This essay concerns those representations and the impact of the performer on a generation of French Romantic artists, writers, and their audiences.

Iconography and iconology are relevant to analyzing representations of Ophelia. Art historian Erwin Panofsky lays out the various levels of interpretation. The primary classification, he argues, is of factual meaning, the recognition of visible forms, which we know from practical experience, "by identifying the change in their relations with certain actions or events." The psychological nuances we perceive lead to what Panofsky calls "expressional" meaning, apprehended by means of empathy.<sup>1</sup> Actors and visual artists draw on recognizable visible forms and on expressions that evoke empathy. Secondary or conventional subject matter, Panofsky writes, is concerned with the intelligible, as distinct from the sensible, and concerns the identification of images, stories, and allegories. In this essay, both Ophelia's attributes and the cultural contexts of artists from different disciplines who responded to the actress and the role are at play. The third level concerns "intrinsic meaning or content" ascertained through "the underlying principles which reveal the attitudes of a nation, period, class, religious or philosophical persuasion—qualified by one personality and condensed into one work." This constitutes the world of "symbolic values . . . when we deal with the work of art as a symptom of something else which expresses itself in a countless variety of other symptoms." Panofsky calls this level of interpretation "iconology," as opposed to "iconography." Iconography, a description and classification of images, furnishes the basis for further interpretation, Panofsky notes, but it does not attempt to work out this interpretation for itself: "Iconology is an iconography turned interpretive."<sup>2</sup>

In this iconographic and iconological study of Ophelia, we cut across four disciplines: textual analysis, theatrical performance, visual representation, and

---

*Judith Wechsler is National Endowment for the Humanities Professor of Art History at Tufts University. Her books include A Human Comedy: Physiognomy and Caricature in Nineteenth-Century Paris (1983) and Le Cabinet des dessins: Daumier (1999).*

psychiatry.<sup>3</sup> My project concerns reading Ophelia through these different disciplines and the transposition from one medium to another. Do these diverse modalities offer different kinds of evidence and the possibility of inference, or does the intersection of these disciplines create its own problematic? I will try to discern to what extent text, theatre, and visual art inform each other, sometimes directly, at other times by looser association. In essence, the issue is *performing* Ophelia, for to perform the role in a certain way is to construct her as an icon. The different valences in that construction depend upon the kind of performance, its reception, and the media of representation.

At the height of Romanticism in Paris, a theatrical event galvanized critics, artists, audiences, and, subsequently, medical practitioners. The Irish actress Harriet Smithson appeared as Ophelia in Abbott's British production of *Hamlet* at the Odéon theatre in Paris in 1827. Smithson, the daughter of a theatre manager, was born in 1800 and had a modest career in London before joining a troupe headed by the noted actor Charles Kemble for a tour in France. Kemble's leading lady was unavailable, and Smithson was asked, on short notice, to fill the role of Ophelia. She had not played the part in England, where her Irish accent was considered unacceptable, but Kemble must have assumed that Smithson's delivery would not be objectionable to a Paris audience. At the time, the part of Ophelia was considered minor. As it turned out, Smithson's astonishing performance brought significant new attention to the role. There were seven performances before the tour ended in July 1828.

Most of the Paris audience did not understand English. They might have been familiar with Shakespeare in French translation—and the scenario for *Hamlet* could be purchased at the theatre—but the audience came less for the text than for the performance. How then, was the audience moved by a play whose language they did not understand? Ophelia's madness, in particular, is expressed primarily in language; her non sequiturs are symptomatic of derangement. Some indication of the way in which Smithson was able to transcend this barrier may be evident in the observation of Alexandre Dumas, who, overwhelmed by Smithson's mad scene, wrote of the English production of *Hamlet*. "Plays, as the Germans say, are to be seen, not read."<sup>4</sup>

Composer Hector Berlioz, who fell in love with Smithson after seeing her performance, noted that "the play of the actors, and especially that of the actress . . . the bodily movement and the modulation of the voice, imbued me with Shakespearean ideas and passions a thousand times more than the words of my pale and inaccurate translation."<sup>5</sup> The effect of Smithson's performance on much of the Parisian audience came not from Shakespeare's text, but from her performance of delirium and despair through cadence, intonation, and, above all, gesture and facial expression. The critic of *Le Globe* (15 December 1827) observed: "Miss Smithson has a wealth of mannerisms, a disjunction of movement, an irregularity, one might even say a disconnectedness of gesture and words. One believes that she'll finish with convulsions."<sup>6</sup>

Typically, Paris audiences responded to the stagings and dramatic performances of opera in the nineteenth century through music, its tonalities and rhythms, rather than through the libretto. Since Ophelia is part of a tradition of theatrical madness, manifest in the operas *Luccia di Lammermoor*, *La Sonnambula*, and *I Puritani*, audiences may have been moved by an art where body and voice were sufficient to convey the part. Indeed, Smithson impressed the critics with "the truthful energy of her gestural acting [*pantomimes*]." E.-J. Delécluze, a contemporary critic and chronicler, concluded that since "the finesse of detail escapes one when the language in which it [*Hamlet*] was written is not very familiar, the audience was only preoccupied by the mime of the actors. That which most strikes us in the playing of Mademoiselle Smithson is her gestural acting and the sound of her voice."<sup>7</sup> A more critical perspective on Smithson's performance was provided by the English actress, Fanny Kemble, daughter of Charles Kemble:

Miss Smithson, a young lady with a figure and face of Hibernian beauty, whose superfluous native accent was no drawback to her merits in the esteem of her French audience, represented to them the heroines of the English tragic drama; the incidents of which, infinitely more startling than any they were used to, invested their fair victim with an amazing power over the foreign critics, and she received from them, in consequence, a rather disproportionate share of admiration—due, perhaps, more to the astonishing circumstances in which she appeared before them than to the excellence of her acting under them.<sup>8</sup>

Smithson's beauty may have made her madness more supportable, but Fanny Kemble acknowledged her father's high regard for the critical capacity of the French audience:

A few rash and superficial criticisms were hardly to be avoided; but in general, my father has often said, in spite of the difficulty of the foreign language, and the strangeness of the foreign form of thought and feeling and combination of incident, his Parisian audience never appeared to him to miss the finer touches or more delicate and refined shades of his acting; and in this respect he thought them superior to his own countrymen.<sup>9</sup>

Smithson performed in the white dress of innocence and the long black veil of mourning; her long, loosened hair bore sprigs of straw. These traits had been traditional to the part since Elizabethan and Jacobean times—the stage instructions themselves indicate that in act 4, scene 5, Ophelia enters with disheveled hair.<sup>10</sup> The same attributes had been used in a London production of the same year.<sup>11</sup> Smithson's originality, then, lay in her evocation of madness, which broke with convention. Even in the English theatre, which was regarded as more naturalistic and expressive—David Garrick was noted for introducing more natural gesture in the 1750s—Smithson's performance was exceptionally spirited. Moreau's text accompanying the illustrations of Achille Devéria, a well-known vignettist, and Louis Boulanger, a painter, in the years 1820–1840, noted:

Passing suddenly from the most heartrending grief to a kind of convulsive joy like the sardonic laugh of a dying person, she offers the flowers to those around her and whom she no longer recognizes, and sings, without being aware that she is singing words whose frivolity forms the most melancholy and theatrical contrast with her actual situation. Then she takes off her veil and spreads it out on the stage in shape of a coffin for Polonius; her eyes have no more tears, and her voice no more strength.<sup>12</sup>

The production was a provocation to greater French expressiveness: a critic wrote that he wished to see French actors “study the expressive pantomime and natural declamation of the great English actors.”<sup>13</sup> Another critic noted that the English actors of this time emphasized “suffering, madness and agony—the true models of Romantic acting.”<sup>14</sup>

The Classicists, advocating convention, and the Romantics, in support of naturalism, divided over Shakespeare generally, and *Hamlet* in particular. Negative criticism gives us another insight into Smithson’s performance and its reception. A critic in *Journal des débats* observed that Shakespeare lacks culture and unity, particularly in his conception of Ophelia.<sup>15</sup> A lack of unity may have been particularly appropriate to the performance of Ophelia, however, because she is undergoing fragmentation. If, then, the actress needs to play different aspects of Ophelia’s character and reactions to her circumstances, contrarities may have been the mark of an actress’s talent. As Coleridge observed, citing discordant qualities in a classic Romantic statement:

Imagination reveals itself in the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities: of sameness with difference; of the general, with the concrete; the idea with the image . . . with enthusiasm and feeling profound or vehement; and while it blends and harmonizes the natural and the artificial, still subordinates art to nature; the manner to the matter. . . .<sup>16</sup>

The lack of unity that made the role of Ophelia particularly hard to play, however, also made it very difficult to capture Ophelia’s madness in illustrations. One aspect of that difficulty was suggested by a critic in *Le Courier Français* (13 September 1827) who noted that French sensibilities find Shakespeare too full of extravagances.<sup>17</sup> While Smithson’s grimaces were part of her performance of madness, a critic in *Le Corsaire* (1 December 1828) complained, “Yet people of taste regret that this actress spoils her facial expression by frequent grimaces. One would not tolerate that in our French actresses.”<sup>18</sup>

Most of the critics regarded Harriet Smithson as a great beauty, noting her languorous arms and upturned eyes. They found her religious and naive quality poetic and sweet, and contended that Smithson gave a perfect imitation of nature.<sup>19</sup> *La Gazette de France* (13 September 1827) praised Smithson’s representation of madness for the gentleness in her words and the uncertain modulations of her song. *La Réunion* noted, on the same day, that despite

Smithson’s absence of nobility (and national pride apart), hers was the only type to consult in acting madness.<sup>20</sup> Many regarded her as a great *tragedienne*, and she became an instant celebrity.

Smithson’s seeming state of distraction was one of the most noticeable traits of her performance. “Distracted” and “mad” were used synonymously by Elizabethan writers; Folio stage directions note that Ophelia “enters distracted.”<sup>21</sup> Smithson moved about as if in a trance, oblivious to her surroundings and uncertain in her lines. She let her veil fall, burst into tears, and walked off stage.<sup>22</sup> According to her own account in *La Gazette musicale* (7 December 1834), fearing disapproval by the director and other actors, Smithson had played the part according to tradition in the rehearsals and only on opening night, before an audience that was deliriously enthusiastic, did she dare play Ophelia in her own manner. Her trembling and uncertain voice were perceived as signs of the perfection of her art.<sup>23</sup>

Writer and theatre critic Jules Janin, as Peter Raby has noted, argued that Smithson prepared the way for the great French actress Rachel by accustoming the French public to seeing tragedy as a woman’s domain as much as a man’s.<sup>24</sup> (Rachel would subsequently be credited with bringing Shakespearean qualities to the acting of Racine.)<sup>25</sup> Traditionally seen as a type of distraught woman destroyed by her own unfulfilled passion, Ophelia was now regarded as a character with more universal qualities, with whom men, too, could empathize. While women had important tragic roles in Racine and Corneille, Mademoiselle Mars and other contemporary leading actresses were not regarded as embodiments of the tragic, as the Napoleonic actor Talma had been. Indeed, the acknowledgment of a character who is not at the center of the story as the subject of tragedy is also a new development. Smithson’s Ophelia, traditionally a marginal figure, took center stage, both in her mad scene and in the imagination of her admirers.

Much had been written about the French reception of Shakespeare and, particularly, *Hamlet* in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century. Voltaire’s criticism of the play’s emotional excesses and lack of coherent structure was challenged. Stendhal, in his 1822 book *Racine et Shakespeare*, set out the distinctions between English and French theatre, and, critical of the classical dogma of imitation, defended Shakespeare’s virtues. The point, Stendhal argued, was not to imitate Shakespeare, but to find in his dramas “the manner to study the world in the midst of which we live.”<sup>26</sup>

French Romantic writers and artists responded particularly to the scenes in *Hamlet* that offended the neoclassicists and appealed to their own appreciation of emotional discord and extremes: Ophelia’s madness and death, the ghost scenes, the play scene, and the gravediggers’ scene.<sup>27</sup> Interest in Ophelia’s madness was significantly enhanced by Smithson’s performance, which brought more public attention to and understanding of the play than had contemporary

new translations and commentaries. Alexandre Dumas said of Ophelia singing her mad songs and other dramatic scenes in *Hamlet*, “It was the first time that I saw in the theatre real passions, animating men and women in flesh and bone.”<sup>28</sup>

Historians J. Q. Bergerhoff, Helen Phelps Bailey, and James M. Vest have summarized Ophelia’s literary reception in nineteenth-century France. They note that Hugo, Dumas, Lamartine, de Vigny, Nerval, and Sainte-Beuve were influenced by Smithson’s performance. Through her interpretation, Ophelia came to be regarded as emblematic of the romantic artist, the suffering individual pitted against the politics of the state, the individual undone by the machinations of power. Vest indicates that Musset viewed Ophelia’s madness and drowning as muselike, poetical, and liberating, and points out that Victor Hugo saw Ophelia as an extension of the basic philosophical nexus of the play:

[A] more organic vision of growth and melancholy, of lovely derangement and threatened innocence . . . Ophelia is a victim of deception, rage, and violence, rather than love. . . . Hers is the realistic madness of the asylum, [Hamlet’s], the universal, romantic madness of the dreamer. Together their alienation is emblematic of an entire age.<sup>29</sup>

Hugo diagnosed Ophelia’s insanity as a disease with broad social implications. George Sand saw Ophelia as a victim of deception and abuse, as a paradigm of feminine weakness and dependency, and questioned whether modern madness was more like that of Ophelia or of Hamlet. As Vest observes, “After the Revolution [Ophelia] evolved to represent alienated humanity for Madame de Staël, abused womanhood for George Sand, lost innocence and beauty for Musset, mystery and challenge for Hugo.”<sup>30</sup> Indeed, Ophelia’s madness came to be perceived by French writers as a function of a world and time out of joint, *le mal du siècle*.

Images of madness appear in such paintings, drawings, and prints in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as Hogarth’s *Bedlam* from *The Rake’s Progress* (1735); Fuseli’s *Nightmare* (1782) and *Crazy Kate* (1806); Goya’s *Madhouse at Saragossa* (1794), *Madhouse* (ca. 1810), and his series of etchings *Los Disparates* (1814); and Géricault’s paintings of the insane from 1821 to 1824.<sup>31</sup> None is a specific precedent for illustrations of Ophelia, but the interest in representing madness was current in nineteenth-century Europe, particularly in England following the madness of King George III and the movement to reform insane asylums.

In an effective illustration, the outer countenance is reflective of the inner state. The visible traits of a mental disturbance that expresses itself as madness are best seen in a continuum. The challenge for the artist, then, is to represent Ophelia in a moment and with a single posture and physiognomy that embody madness. The image, as Lessing wrote in his *Laocoön*, has to express the whole

story in a single moment, and that moment needs to convey what has come before and what will follow.

Literature, theatre, and visual representation each have their own form of temporality. The transposition from one medium to another affects the iconography of Ophelia, and raises such questions as: How did visual artists convey character and derangement? What is the metonymy of madness? Did the preoccupation with reading character from external traits, a nineteenth-century fascination codified most comprehensively by the Swiss physiognomer Johann Caspar Lavater between 1775 and 1778, further an understanding of Ophelia? How did the particularizing of Ophelia, through the association of the role with the actress Harriet Smithson, affect illustrations of the mad scene?

The tradition of painting leading actors in their famous roles was a cross between portraiture and the commemoration of a performance. One early image of Ophelia as played by a particular actress is that of Mrs. Sarah Siddons, painted in 1775, which shows her as a monumental serpentine figure, hand to her brow. She bears neither flowers nor black veil. In the background are the Queen, Polonius, and other figures from the court. The popularity of such portraits suggested the public was interested in seeing paintings of scenes from Shakespeare’s plays.<sup>32</sup> In that spirit, the Boydell Picture Gallery, established in the 1780s, commissioned paintings from artists living in England, most notably Joshua Reynolds, Benjamin West, and Henry Fuseli. Scholars have noted, however, that the paintings for the Boydell Gallery were not based on actual performances.<sup>33</sup>

Of the 273 Boydell Gallery paintings cataloged, only four are representations of *Hamlet*.<sup>34</sup> Richard Westall depicts Ophelia just before she drowns. Benjamin West’s engraving (Fig. 1) after a painting, now lost, illustrates act 4, scene 5, in Elsinore, where the stage directions indicate “Re-enter Ophelia, fantastically dressed with straws and flowers.” She appears before the Queen and King. Laertes, enraged by the death of Polonius, here first observes Ophelia’s madness. In the engraving, he supports his deranged sister with one arm, and, with the other, gestures seemingly to a higher power. The illustration is constructed as if on a stage, seen from the perspective of the audience. Frontal and framed, the background, like a set, is parallel to the picture plane. There are spaces for characters to enter and exit. The figures in the background—the women behind the Queen, the Gentleman at center, and the soldiers behind Laertes—suggest the effect of Ophelia’s madness beyond the immediate family and friends. In the engraving, Ophelia wears the traditional white robe indicative of her innocence, and she is strewing flowers. Her loosened hair, with its strands of straw, falls across her right cheek and fans out on the left, suggesting the vehemence of her motion, her strenuous *contrapposto*. Ophelia’s eyes are wide open, frightened and frightening, as if she were seeing a vision. They contrast with the focused looks of all the other figures: Laertes’s

heavenly supplication, the Queen's averted face, the King's recoiling discomfiture, the Gentleman's concerned gaze, and the curiosity of the other bystanders.

T. S. R. Boase has observed that "the frankly lunatic expression of Ophelia [in West's engraving] suggests a study of the works of Fuseli's friend Lavater."<sup>35</sup> In fact, Lavater does not show any comparable illustrations of female madness: his deranged women are classified as imbeciles. West himself was disappointed with the poor quality of the print made from his painting. British diplomat Sir Augustus Foster described the picture in his memoirs: "[T]he subject . . . taken from *Hamlet* was extravagant and disgusting. The King and Queen appear as if they each had a crick in the neck. They told me it was . . . by West but I could not believe it."<sup>36</sup>

Moelwyn Merchant mentions two drawings of *Hamlet* by Fuseli, but neither appears or is noted in Schiff's *catalogue raisonné*. An image referred to as "Ophelia distributing flowers" is described by Merchant as "a light rhythmic drawing in outline wash, with a vividly suggested frenzy in Ophelia's face."<sup>37</sup> A photograph of a drawing by Romney of Ophelia as a statuesque female figure, without attribute or articulated facial expression, in the Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque nationale, has a note on its back that it is one of sixteen drawings preparatory for a Boydell composition.<sup>38</sup> George Cruikshank represented *Miss Kelly as Ophelia*, in 1815, with weeds in her hair and wearing a long wreath of flowers and leaves. One hand is outstretched, with an index finger raised; she holds a basket of herbs in her other hand.<sup>39</sup> James Nixon's engraving of 1833 is a cameo image of a forlorn Ophelia with straw in her hair and leaves and flowers in her basket.

Illustrations appeared in various editions of *Hamlet* and as separate prints or series of prints. One of Moritz Retzsch's thin line illustrations for *Hamlet*, published in London in the *Gallery of Shakespeare* in 1828, also shows a downcast Ophelia, straw in her loosened hair, distributing herbs and flowers. She does not suggest madness explicitly. The *Illustrations to Shakespeare* by Robert Smirke, published in London in 1829, includes the closet scene in which Ophelia is seen wringing her hands. A similar scene appears in Smirke's drawings for *The Picturesque Beauties of Shakespeare*, and in the *Galleries des femmes de Shakespeare* (Paris, n.d.), illustrated by the "first artists of London," there is an illustration of Ophelia holding flowers.

Smithson's performance seemed to spark greater interest in representing Ophelia's madness, based on her actual appearance. In A. de Valmont's *Mlle. Smithson, Rôle d'Offèlia dans Hamlet* (1827), she is shown in a white dress, with a black veil draped from head to toe, and sprigs of straw in her loose dark hair (Fig. 2). She holds a carnation to her breast and looks aghast, but not deranged. The caption reads, "I cannot chuse but weep to think, / they chould lay



Figure 1.  
Benjamin West, *Hamlet*, 4.5 (1802). Boydell Picture Gallery.  
By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

him in the cold ground." Valmont does not suggest a particular moment in the scene, but, rather, a portrait of Smithson in the role of Ophelia.

An album of ten colored lithographs, *Souvenirs du théâtre Anglais à Paris*, was produced in 1827 by Achille Devéria and Louis Boulanger. The illustrations are said to have a close connection to performances. These lithographs and those of de Valmont were seen in many Parisian book and print shop windows.<sup>40</sup> Ophelia is first represented in the second scene from act 3, in her white dress, with rosy cheeks and her hair in a bun. In *Folie d'Ophélie* (*Ophelia's Madness*), she wears a long white dress with straw and flowers in her loosened hair, the veil doubling as a shroud (Fig. 3). There is a graceful swoop to her body. One arm is bent and raised overhead; with the other outstretched hand, she drops flowers onto the black veil laid upon the ground. Her eyes are opened very wide, her mouth is closed. She appears self-absorbed, seemingly oblivious to her audience. The illustration cannot possibly indicate the specific symbolism of her song:

There's rosemary, that's for remembrance; pray you, love, remember: And there is pansies, that's for thoughts. . . .

There's fennel for you, and columbines: There's rue for you: And here's some for me. We may call it herb of grace o' Sundays: Oh, you must wear your rue with a difference. There's a daisy. I would give you some violets, but they withered all when my father died. They say he made a good end. . . . (4.5.175–77, 180–86)

Just as Smithson's movements and gestures deeply affected the audience, so, too, the artists would need to address their viewers through body language and its attributes. Ophelia's loosened hair becomes a primary signifier in the illustrations, associated both with sensuality and with mourning, and is regarded as emblematic of female madness, both on the Elizabethan stage and on stages since then. Maurice and Hanna Charney note: "Loose hair is an offense against decorum and therefore against the whole hierarchy of correspondences. It is so improper and so overtly sensual that it may conventionally be understood to indicate a loss of reason, either temporary or permanent."<sup>41</sup>

The flowers and herbs in the prints illustrate the text of the play, though the images do not always distinguish among the various kinds of flowers. (John Everett Millais's painting *Ophelia Drowning* [1851–1852] is exceptional in its detailed rendering of each flower mentioned in the text.) Ophelia is traditionally shown decked with "fantastical garlands" while she strews her flowers and herbs. Elaine Showalter notes: "Her flowers suggest the discordant double images of female sexuality as both innocent blossoming and whorish contamination; she is the 'green girl' of pastoral, the virginal 'Rose of May' and the sexually explicit madwoman who, in giving away her wild flowers and herbs, is symbolically deflowering herself."<sup>42</sup>

The line between nonsense and madness in Ophelia's words, their strange inconsequence, cannot be captured in images. What does or does not follow her



Figure 2.

A. de Valmont, Mlle. Smithson, Rôle d'Offélie dans Hamlet (1827).  
The Harvard Theatre Collection, the Houghton Library.



Figure 3.

Achille Devéria and Louis Boulanger, *Folie d'Ophélie: Souvenirs du Théâtre Anglais à Paris* (1827). Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.

words in the text suggests her madness, but it is hard to see a non sequitur in a medium in which time is frozen. Certainly, some of Ophelia's words defy illustration: "They say the owl was a baker's daughter. Lord, we know what we are, but know not what we may be. God be at your table!" (4.5.41–4). Though they did not understand the words, French audiences could hear that Ophelia's part is very verbal. Bereft of words, the artist/illustrator would have to use physiognomy, bearing, and gesture in the image to convey Ophelia's emotional state.

French illustrations in the 1820s and 1830s follow British precedents in representing Ophelia's madness, but they are less generic and more specific to Smithson; they attempt to evoke the pathos of *her* performance. There is a sense of stasis in the illustrations by Valmont and Devéria and Boulanger, however, and emotion is linked to motion. The fixity of the image of Ophelia in the illustrations is opposed to the fluidity of the madness conveyed in her punning and song.

Madness is expressed in the inability to contain, and Ophelia is contained by the picture. Consequently, the pictorial paralysis of these images pinions her.

The most successful illustrations of the period were done by Eugène Delacroix, who produced a series of thirteen lithographs of *Hamlet*, drawn between 1834 and 1843. Three additional prints made outside the series, including *Reproches d'Hamlet à Ophélie* and *Le Chant d'Ophélie* (1834), were included in a new edition (Fig. 4). *Hamlet* was a major theme to which Delacroix returned over the course of thirty years, in paintings and in lithographs. Jules Janin noted that Smithson "was the inspiration for Delacroix himself when he drew his touching image of Ophelia."<sup>43</sup> His paintings of Hamlet, and of Ophelia drowning, were shown at the Salon of 1846.

Delacroix's images convey emotionally intense and charged scenes more insightfully and effectively than previous illustrators do.<sup>44</sup> Ophelia's song serves as caption: "White his shroud as the mountain snow . . . / Larded with sweet flowers" [Son linceul, blanc comme neige, était parsemé des fleurs]. Delacroix's Ophelia is more dramatic and less pretty than the Ophelia of Valmont or Devéria and Boulanger. She leans forward; her breasts spill out of her bodice as she spreads her black veil before her like a shroud. She looks as if she were in a trance or having an epileptic fit: her eyes roll up and her mouth drops open. (Epilepsy and hysteria were associated symptomatically in the psychology of the time.) The body of Delacroix's Ophelia is a body in torment. The traditional herbs and flowers are omitted; emphasis is placed on her swooning figure. Her flailing outstretched arms create a horizontal thrust that stretches her body to the limit and contrasts it with the figures of Laertes and the Queen in the background, erect and contained, looking aghast as they watch Ophelia's pathetic performance. She is more sexual than in the other French illustrations, and her anguish is uncontainable.

The power and effectiveness of Delacroix's image of Ophelia's madness lies in the disjunction of her body, which parallels the non sequiturs of her speech. By contrast with Delacroix's illustrations of Ophelia in the "mousetrap" and "get thee to a nunnery" scenes, in which she appears sad and perturbed but still very lovely, in the mad scene she is nearly grotesque, and the lack of coordination of her body suggests the extent of her derangement. Her pose and expression breach decorum and evoke her inner state. We have here a much more convincing display of the extreme emotion and suffering that were the particular appeal of Hamlet and Ophelia to Delacroix. Devéria and Boulanger provide an illustration, Delacroix a compelling image, disturbing in its excesses. The graceful swoon of Devéria and Boulanger is moderate compared to Delacroix's wracked figure.

Baudelaire was much taken with Delacroix's portrayal of Ophelia and hung Delacroix's *Hamlet* lithographs in his rooms. In his "Salon of 1846," Baudelaire writes of Delacroix's women:



**Figure 4.**

Eugène Delacroix, *Le Chant d'Ophélie* (1834).  
Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.

In general, he did not paint pretty women, from a worldly gentleman's point of view. Almost all are sick, resplendent with a certain interior beauty. He does not express their power by the size of their muscles but by the tension of their nerves. It is not just anguish which he best knows how to express, but above all their moral anguish.<sup>45</sup>

Others were critical of Delacroix's *Hamlet* series and found it less effective than his *Faust*. The negative reception may have been, in part, a reaction to the poor quality of the first edition of the prints.

Peripherally, but of the same moment, are two other works concerning Smithson. Vernet's image *La Folle pour l'amour* (1827) has the features of Smithson's Ophelia, and his poem by the same title may be an evocation of Ophelia as well.<sup>46</sup> In 1843, the sculptor Auguste Préault (who attended the première of *Hamlet* on 11 September 1827, with Hugo, Delacroix, Gautier, Sainte-Beuve, and de Vigny) made a plaster relief of Ophelia drowning, which was shown at the Salon of 1849, and fashioned a plaster medallion of Smithson in 1856, the year of her death. Préault remarked that Smithson's performance left a dazzling memory.<sup>47</sup>

Romantic artists were taken with the theme of madness: they illustrate Ophelia's pathos and indicate her disturbance through strained postures, gestures, and expressions. Photography and psychiatry will attempt to document madness more objectively, though, as we shall see, not without their own problematic.

There is a link between visual and performative representations of Ophelia's madness and the clinical interest in female hysteria documented in nineteenth-century illustrations and photographs. According to Sander Gilman, the changing representations of Ophelia indicate the shifting definitions of female insanity, from the erotomania of the Elizabethans and the hysteria of the nineteenth century to the unconscious incestuous conflicts of the Freudians and the schizophrenic double bind of the Laingians.<sup>48</sup> In "Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*," Jacques Lacan sees Ophelia merely as the object of Hamlet's desire, and asserts that the source of her name is "O-phallus." In Lacan's system, the phallus is the most important signifier.<sup>49</sup>

The Elizabethans regarded Ophelia as suffering from erotic melancholy (erotomania) and thought "the passive condition of womankind is subject unto more diseases and of other sorts and natures than men are." They recognized that "the diverse and violent perturbations which afflict the mind of the Passionate Lover, are the causes of greater mischiefs, than any other passion of the mind whatsoever."<sup>50</sup> As Carroll Camden observes, Ophelia shows many of the classic symptoms of *Passio hysterica* brought on by erotomania: "She is mad, cries 'hem' to clear her throat because of feeling of choking or suffocation, beats her heart to relieve the sensation of oppression around it, weeps, prattles

constantly, sings snatches of old songs, is distracted and has a depraved imagination and ends her life by drowning.”<sup>51</sup> In *A Study of Hamlet* (1863), Dr. John Conolly, a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, discusses what one might call the “Ophelia syndrome,” or hysteria. After describing Ophelia’s mad scene, he notes:

Physicians, however, still recognize these causalities, and in every rank, sometimes in words, but more frequently in their effects. . . . Our asylums for ruined minds now and then present remarkable illustrations of this fatal malady, so that even casual visitors recognize in the wards an Ophelia; the same young years, the same faded beauty, the same fantastic dress and interrupted song. An actress, ambitious of something beyond cold imitation, might find the contemplation of such cases a not unprofitable study.<sup>52</sup>

Conolly not only recommended, but urged actresses playing Ophelia to come to the asylum to study “real” madwomen:

It seems to be supposed that it is an easy task to play the part of a crazy girl, and that it is chiefly composed of singing and prettiness. The habitual courtesy, the partial rudeness of mental disorder, the diminished consciousness of what is present and real, and the glimpses of acute observation, the sudden transitions, the broken recollections mingled with painful and with lighter fancies, the vague purpose . . . are things to be witnessed.<sup>53</sup>

In the 1870s, the noted English actress Ellen Terry visited a London asylum in preparation for playing Ophelia, but found the madwomen “too theatrical” to teach her anything.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, the theatrical performance of madness is not the same as being mad, though they may inform one another. Victorian psychiatrists and superintendents of insane asylums were often enthusiastic readers of Shakespeare. They turned to his plays for models of mental aberration that could be applied to their clinical practice. As Maurice and Hanna Charney observe, “Ophelia is the prototype of a great many madwomen to follow, who scrupulously imitate her style.”<sup>55</sup> She set the Victorian style for female insanity. Medical textbooks sometimes illustrated their discussions of female patients with sketches of Ophelia-like young women. As Showalter observes, “When young women in lunatic asylums did not willingly throw themselves into Ophelia-like poses, asylum superintendents with cameras imposed the conventional Ophelia costume, gesture, props, and expression upon them.”<sup>56</sup>

The photographic documentation of madness in British asylums was first undertaken by Hugh Diamond: “[T]he Photographer secures with unerring accuracy the external phenomena of each passion, as the really certain indication of internal derangement, and exhibits to the eye the well known sympathy between the diseased brain and the organs and features of the body.”<sup>57</sup> Diamond

photographed a young woman with Ophelia’s attributes: a garland of wildflowers in her hair and a black shawl around her shoulders.

Changes in psychiatric diagnoses and practices occurred in the course of the nineteenth century, particularly in France under Dr. Jean-Martin Charcot, who, in 1872, was named professor of pathological anatomy and, in 1881, chair of nervous illnesses at the Salpêtrière hospital. Charcot rediscovered hysteria, distinguishing it from other mental illnesses. His image of hysteria may have been modeled on theatrical representations, encouraging patients to perform according to new artistic conventions. Indeed, Charcot was a Shakespeare enthusiast.

In *Invention de l’hystérie*, an examination of photographic practices at the Salpêtrière during Charcot’s directorship, Georges Didi-Huberman considers the spectacle of hysteria and the postures of delirium, and concludes that doctors had an insatiable appetite for images of hysteria in the presentation of the “theatricality of the body.”<sup>58</sup> Charcot made use of photography to document the seizures of women hysterics. From 1876 to 1880, Paul Rognard, one of Charcot’s assistants, documented female patients suffering from hysteria in the three-volume *Iconographie photographique de la Salpêtrière*, written with D-M Bourneville. The exaggerated gestures in its photographs suggest French classical acting style and poses from nineteenth-century academic art. A few of the patients, like Augustine, became stars, enacting hysteria in Charcot’s weekly lecture-demonstrations that were attended not only by doctors throughout Europe, including Freud, but also by writers, journalists, actors, and the demimonde. It is reported that Charcot’s assistants coached patients on the performance of their hysterical acts and surrounded them with images of female hysteria. Indeed, as Gilles de la Tourette noted, hysteria could be considered “‘a complete art.’ an art and manner of theatricality.”<sup>59</sup>

The Romantic interest in madness leads to a new appreciation of Shakespeare in France and particularly of the character of Ophelia. Harriet Smithson’s performance simulated hysteria by appearing both engaged and distracted, and evoked a remarkably sympathetic and emotional response, upon which her success hinged. Theatrical performance triggered a cultural response, even to the point of simulating madness in others. French women’s fashions in the late 1820s, for example, exhibited a passion for the English theatre by adopting Smithson’s messed hair strewn with straw and her long black veil: “One sees already a hairstyle in the manner of Miss Smithson, called the madwoman’s style. It consists of a black veil, with straw artistically woven in her hair.”<sup>60</sup>

We cannot know either Smithson’s intentions and the details of her performance or the full range of audience responses. Many questions remain, among them whether women indeed identified with Ophelia’s madness when they dressed *à la folle*, and whether theatre prompted a cultural response that

wanted to induce a psychological malady. Did male writers and visual artists respond to Ophelia as a human condition or as a specifically female one? If hysteria was read as a symptom of general alienation in a time of fundamental change, why were most of the patients categorized as hysterical during the nineteenth century female?

If Ophelia became a symbol of the age, Harriet Smithson's performance mobilized the attention of writers, artists, and composers of the Romantic generation in France both to the role and to herself. Given that process, performance, illustration, and illness intersected; life influenced art, and art, life. In a curious dance of cause and effect, the diagnosis of hysteria looked back to a performance that encoded it *avant la lettre*. In the process, there is a reversibility in which *a* both causes and is the effect of *b*. The forms different disciplines take in their expressions of interest in Ophelia and the translations between them indicate how intertwined they are. What links them all is the idea that the outer can be expressive of the inner: indeed, that is the grand idea that joins the discourses of the nineteenth century.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Erwin Panofsky, "Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art," in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955), 29.
2. *Ibid.*, 32.
3. The subject of Smithson's Ophelia was suggested to me by Rachel Brownstein, who also offered valuable criticism, as did Christopher Ricks. In preparing this essay, I have consulted the collections of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cabinet des Estampes, the Bibliothèque et Musée de la Comédie-Française, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Harvard University Theatre Collection, the New York Public Library at Lincoln Center, the Theatre Museum (London), the Musée Carnavalet, and the archives of the Hôpital Sainte-Anne (Paris).
4. "Les pièces du théâtre, comme disent les Allemands, sont faites pour être vues et non pour être lues." Alexandre Dumas, *Mes Mémoires*, 4th ed. (Paris: M. Levy Frères, 1868–1883), 279–80.
5. "Mais le jeu des acteurs, celui de l'actrice surtout . . . la pantomime et l'accent des voix, signifiaient pour moi davantage et m'imprégnaient des idées et des passions shakespeariennes mille fois plus que les mots de ma pâle et infidèle traduction." Hector Berlioz, *Mémoires*, 2 vols. (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1969), vol. 1, 128.
6. "Miss Smithson a un abandon de manières, un désordre de mouvement, une irrégularité et pour ainsi dire un décousu de geste et de paroles. . . . On a craint qu'elle ne finisse pas des convulsions." Quoted in James M. Vest, *The French Face of Ophelia from Belleforest to Baudelaire* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989), 125–26.
7. "Comme on ne représente que des comédies dont les finesses de détail échappent quand la langue dans laquelle elles sont écrites ne nous est pas très familière, le public ne fut préoccupé que par la pantomime des acteurs. . . . Ce qui a le plus frappé dans le jeu de Mademoiselle Smithson est sa pantomime et le son de sa voix." E.[-J.] Delécluze, *Souvenirs de soixante années* (Paris: M. Levy, 1862), 339 and 242.
8. Fanny Kemble, *Records of a Girlhood* (London: Henry Holt & Company, 1879), 115.
9. *Ibid.*, 115–16.
10. See Allan Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 36–38.

11. Arthur Colby Sprague, *Shakespeare and the Actors: The Stage Business in His Plays, 1660–1905* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 171.
12. "Passant tout-à-coup de la plus déchirante douleur à une espèce de joie stupide et convulsive que ressemble au rire sardonique d'un mourant, elle offre des fleurs aux personnes qui l'entourent et qu'elle ne reconnaît pas, chante, sans se douter qu'elle chante, des paroles dont la frivolité forme avec sa situation le contraste le plus mélancolique et le plus théâtral, puis elle détache son voile. L'étend sur la scène et lui donne la forme du cercueil de Polonius: ses yeux n'ont plus de larmes, sa voix n'a plus de force." M. Moreau, *Souvenirs du théâtre Anglais à Paris* (Paris: Henri Gauguain, Lambert et Cie, 1827).
13. F. Deschamps, *Études Françaises et étrangères* (Paris: U. Canel, 1828), xlviii.
14. "Étaient dans l'expression de la souffrance, de la folie et de l'agonie de véritables modèles de jeu romantique." P. Moreau, *Le Classicisme des romantiques* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 932), 339.
15. See J. Q. Borgerhoff, *Le Théâtre Anglais à Paris sous la Restauration* (Paris: Hachette, 1928), 76–77.
16. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions* [1817], 2 vols., in vol. 7 of *Collected Works*, eds. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), vol. 7, 16–17.
17. See Borgerhoff, 78.
18. "Toutefois les gens de goût regrettent que cette actrice gâte l'expression de son visage par de fréquentes grimaces. On ne les toléreraient point à nos actrices françaises." Quoted in Borgerhoff, 154.
19. See *Le Corsaire*, 12 September 1827. Cited in Helen Phelps Bailey, *Hamlet in France: From Voltaire to Lafarge* (Geneva: Droz, 1964), 90.
20. See Borgerhoff, 92.
21. Maurice Charney and Hanna Charney, "The Language of Madwomen in Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists," *Signs* 3 (1977): 452.
22. See Jacques Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 85–86. Barzun attributes the eyewitness accounts to Sainte-Beuve, Delécluze, and Charles Jarrin (85, n. 3).
23. See Borgerhoff, 92–93.
24. See Peter Raby, *Fair Ophelia: A Life of Harriet Smithson Berlioz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 178.
25. Rachel Brownstein pointed this out to me.
26. "La manière d'étudier le monde au milieu duquel nous vivons." Stendhal, *Racine et Shakespeare*, préface et notes de Martino (Paris: A. Delpeuch, 1927), 51.
27. See Bailey, 61 and 68.
28. "C'est la première fois que je voyais au théâtre des passions réelles, animant des hommes et des femmes en chair et en os." Dumas, 280.
29. Quoted in Vest, 130–33.
30. *Ibid.*, 139–46.
31. See Sander L. Gilman, *Seeing the Insane* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982), 120–31. Gilman reproduces a few drawings of the insane, including John Brown's sketch of an insane woman from the 1770s, *Types of Insanity* from the Blake-Varey notebook of 1819; Rowlandson's *The Maniac and Doctor and Lunatic*; and drawings from Charles Aubry's 1823 *Album Comique de pathologie pittoresque*.
32. T. S. R. Boase, "Illustrations of Shakespeare's Plays in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 102. According to Boase, the first Shakespeare illustration appeared in 1633. Harvey gives the date 1709. Apart from Hogarth, painted Shakespearean scenes appear only after the 1740s. Foudrinier illustrated Pope's edition of Shakespeare in 1736. Gravelot (Hubert-François Bourguignon, 1699–1773), a student of Boucher who moved to London in 1732 and founded a school of drawing, illustrated the second edition of Theobald's Shakespeare (1740). Gravelot was the first and only Frenchman to illustrate a complete

edition of Shakespeare. In 1743, there was still no complete translation of Shakespeare into French. Francis Hayman, an English painter who dealt extensively with Shakespearean subjects, produced illustrations at the same time, primarily frontispieces for Sir Thomas Hanmer's 1744 six-volume edition of Shakespeare's plays, published in folio. As John Harvey points out in "Shakespeare and the Ends of Time: The Illustrations," *Cambridge Review* 117 (May 1996): 29. Hayman's painting of the play scene was thematically new, as most earlier illustrators chose to depict the ghost scene. I could find no images of Ophelia by Hayman. See Brian Allen, *Francis Hayman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987). *The Picturesque Beauties of Shakespeare* (London: 1873–1878), illustrated by Robert Smirke and Thomas Stothard, included forty plates, four each from ten plays, including *Hamlet*. According to Esther Gordon Dotson's "English Shakespeare Illustration and Eugène Delacroix," in *Essays in Honor of Walter Friedlaender, Marsyas* 12, suppl. 2 (New York: Published by students of the Institute of Fine Arts, 1965), 40–61, many illustrations were published between 1770 and 1820 with stylistic aims similar to those of Smirke. Numerous illustrations were commissioned during 1780–1810 for new editions of the plays and for pictures for "Shakespeare Galleries." Dotson has seen almost 650 separate drawings, and notes that her account is not complete.

33. Two sets of engravings, large and small, based on the paintings were subsequently produced and published. It was hoped that subscriptions to the project would help offset the expense, but, ultimately the Gallery failed, the paintings were dispersed, and many were lost. We know the collection primarily through engravings.

34. See Winifred H. Friedman, *Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery* (New York: Garland, 1976) and *The Boydell Shakespeare Gallery*, eds. Walter Pape and Frederick Burwick (Bottrop, Essen: Verlag Peter Pomp, 1996).

35. Boase, 102.

36. Helmut von Erffa and Allen Staley, *The Paintings of Benjamin West* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 271.

37. Mowlwyn Merchant, *Shakespeare and the Artist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), 90.

38. I could not find references to it in catalogs of the artist's work, though the figure does resemble Romney's drawings of melancholy in a sketchbook study ca. 1780.

39. Folger Shakespeare Library, K29.6 no. 1. I could find no reference to this image in catalogs of Cruikshank's work.

40. See Raby, 72.

41. Charney and Charney, 452; see also E. R. Leach, "Magical Hair," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 88 (1958): 147–64.

42. Elaine Showalter, "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism," in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, eds. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Harman (New York: Methuen, 1985), 81.

43. Cited in Raby, 181, from *Journal des débats* (20 March 1854).

44. See Arlette Scruellaz and Yves Bonnefoy, *Delacroix & Hamlet* (Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1993), 7. Harvey (16–19) argues this point very well. Dotson (42) asserts that Delacroix made use of Smirke's illustrations in *The Picturesque Beauties*. While there are some similarities in the composition, I do not find her argument convincing.

45. "En général, il ne peint pas de jolies femmes, au point de vue de gens du monde toutefois. Presque toutes sont malades, et resplendent d'une certaine beauté intérieure. Il n'exprime point la force par la grosseur des muscles, mais par la tension des nerfs. C'est non seulement la douleur qu'il sait le mieux exprimer, mais surtout . . . la douleur morale." Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," *Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols., ed. Claude Pichois (Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, 1976), vol. 2, 440.

46. Nina Anthanassoglou Kallmyer pointed this out to me. The poem is published in E. de Jouy and A. Jay, *Salon d'Horace Vernet* (Paris: Ponthieu, 1822).

47. Charles Millard, *Auguste Préault: Sculpteur romantique, 1809–1879* (Paris: Gallimard and Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1997), 13.

48. Gilman, 121, and Showalter, "Representing Ophelia," 90–91.

49. In *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading Otherwise*, ed. by Shoshana Felman (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 11–52.

50. Cited in Carroll Camden, "On Ophelia's Madness," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15 (1964): 254. She is citing Edward Jorden, *A Brief Discourse of a Disease Called the Suffocation of the Mother* (London: John Windet, 1603), and James Ferrand, *Erotomania, or a Treatise Discouring of the Essence, Cause, Symptomes, Prognosticks, and Cure of Love, or Erotic Melancholy* (Oxford: L. Lichtfield, 1640).

51. *Ibid.*

52. John Conolly, *A Study of Hamlet* (London: E. Moxon & Company, 1863), 177. Conolly is also cited in Elaine Showalter, *Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830–1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), 90.

53. Conolly, 179–80.

54. Ellen Terry, *The Story of My Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 98.

55. Charney and Charney, 456.

56. Showalter, *Female Malady*: 92, and fig. 17.

57. Hugh W. Diamond, "On the Application of Photography to the Physiognomic and Mental Phenomena of Insanity," read before the Royal Society, 22 May 1856, in *The Face of Madness: Hugh W. Diamond and the Origin of Psychiatric Photography*, ed. Sander L. Gilman (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1976), 20.

Phillipe Pinel published *A Treatise on Insanity* in 1801. The book included the first illustrations of madness. Pinel was known for his reform of French asylums, removing chains and introducing humane treatment. His interest in facial expression was carried on by his student and colleague Dr. Jean Étienne Dominique Esquirol, who collaborated with artist Georges-François-Marie Gabriel between 1818 and 1823 in the publication of *Les Maladies mentales* (1838), which included two hundred drawings made at the Salpêtrière. The *Tête d'aliéné* (or *Les Aliénés*) of male and female madness include expressions of anguish, sadness, madness (*La Folie*), and crime. See Jean Adhémar, "Un Dessinateur passionné pour le visage humain—Georges-François-Marie Gabriel (1775–v. 1836)" in *Omagiu lui George Oprescu* (Romania: n.d., no pagination).

The notes for Gabriel's book of sketches, made in the 1920s and preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, explain, "L'étude de la physiognomie des aliénés n'est pas un objet de futile curiosité, cette étude aide à démêler le caractère des idées et des affections qui entretiennent le délire de ces malades." Most of the figures, however, do not look particularly deranged and only ten of the "faible" are women. Included in the category "Folie par amour," they look more anxious and hopeless than deranged.

Gabriel and Esquirol, like many of their contemporaries, admired the Swiss physiognomer Johann Caspar Lavater, whose *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe* had been published in 1775–1777, first in Germany and Switzerland, and then (by the beginning of the nineteenth century) in France and England. See Judith Wechsler, *A Human Comedy: Physiognomy and Caricature in Nineteenth Century Paris* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1983). Gabriel and Esquirol shared Lavater's belief that internal states are evident in a person's physiognomy. The editor of the French edition of Lavater, Dr. Moreau de la Sarthe, was himself a psychiatrist.

58. Georges Didi-Huberman, *Invention de l'hystérie: Charcot et l'iconographie photographique de la Salpêtrière* (Paris: Macula, 1982), 5.

59. "L'hystérie considérée comme 'tout un art,' l'art et la manière du théatralisme." *Ibid.*, 163. Didi-Huberman cites *Traité clinique et thérapeutique de l'hystérie, d'après l'enseignement de la Salpêtrière*, 3 vols. (Paris: Pref. Charcot, 1891–1895), vol. 1, 111.

60. "Déjà on a vu une coiffure à la miss Smithson, dite à la folle. Elle consiste en un voile noir et en un fêtu de paille artistement entremêlés aux cheveux." *Le Corsaire* (11 October 1827), cited in Borgerhoff, 172.