

The Influence of Late Eighteenth-Century Criticism on Modern Representations of Hamlet's Character

Hirohisa Igarashi

Introduction

This paper traces the history of how Hamlet became a psychologically complex character, and explains how his revengeful motive became a major concern in modern criticism. This paper contends that the mystery has to do with the rise of a new paradigm in medical thinking which happened in English history around the end of Samuel Johnson's time. The mystery is not so much a reflection of 'Shakespeare's deep and accurate science in mental philosophy' as S. T. Coleridge speculated, but of the new fashion of criticism which became current with the rise of new medical thinking. Hamlet was devoid of psychological mystery through the Restoration period until the late eighteenth century.

Hamlet in modern productions is not a superhuman, but an interiorized individual portrayed like a real human person. Just like our psychological mechanism is a mystery, Hamlet's psychology remains unknowable, too. The mystery of Hamlet's interiority is the key to the success of *Hamlet* productions in the modern world (in Japan and in English-speaking worlds alike), where human psychology can be an object of intellectual quest. One tends to believe that Hamlet's problem has a universal appeal. While this testifies to Ben Jonson's famous

encomium of Shakespeare, 'He was not of an age, but for all time!', modern Hamlets are not the restored images of Shakespeare's original Hamlet which Richard Burbage played for Jacobean audiences, but they are representations.

Modern Hamlets *versus* Traditional Hamlets

Let us begin by figuring the stereotypical image of Hamlet created in our culture of mass production. Major current Japanese dictionaries gloss the word *Hamuretto-Gata*, which literally translates into English as 'Hamlet-type'. *Koujien*, for example, explains it to be 'the type of person who, like Hamlet, tends to be deeply speculative and sceptical, but not decisive to act'. The definitions in other dictionaries are all similar to this with very little variation in wording. The *Koujien* gives the additional information that the word came into use 'after Turgenev's categorizing of human types'. In Ivan Turgenev's (1818–83) *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (1860), whose English translation appeared in 1907, and which was first translated in Japanese in 1949,¹⁾ Hamlet is contrasted with Don Quixote, the type of person easily aroused to action without much consideration. Turgenev observes that 'To-day Hamlets outnumber Don Quixotes, though Don Quixotes are still to be found' (R. Nichol tr. 11). It is curious that the 'Hamlet-type' is not a common expression in English-speaking worlds. (Although *The Oxford English Dictionary* introduces an adjective 'Hamletish' which means 'resembling Hamlet' in any way, this adjective is not synonymous with '*Hamuretto-Gata*'). As it appears, Turgenev's view of Hamlet has been received with more zeal in Japan than in English-speaking worlds, because it was associated with the modern philosophy of *Self*, which the Japanese were directed to pursue in their intellectual life in the period of Japan's movement to democracy

after the World Wars. Turgenev's view of Hamlet did not bring an influence to Japan alone, but with Lawrence Olivier's then very topical film adaptation of *Hamlet* (1943), which starred the very image of Turgenev's Hamlet, a 'man' who, deeply absorbed in existential questioning, 'could not make up his mind'.²⁾ Thus, of necessity the stereotypical image of *Hamuretto-Gata* took shape in Japan as a symbol of modern *ego* in the existential world.

At work behind Olivier's film, as we should be reminded, is the dominant ideology at work: that there should be a rational explanation to Hamlet's melancholy. Olivier's strategy is to introduce Hamlet as suffering a mental illness caused by the excessive stress he experiences for having to represent the voice of Denmark. Hamlet is an anonymous *ego* in stark relief against the socio-political system of the modern world, and embodied in his *ego* is the repressed energy that awaits liberation. This is why Olivier's *Hamlet* is 'a tragedy of *the man* (the ego)', but not the tragedy of the Danish Prince. In this respect, all other popular Hamlets on screen that appeared after Olivier's are portrayed according to the same principle. My experience of teaching Japanese college students favouring English literature has taught me to surmise that the film productions of *Hamlet* widely viewed in Japan on video and DVD are: John Gielgud's (1964), Grigorii Kozintsev's (1964), Franco Zeffirelli's (1990), Kenneth Branagh's (1996), and Michael Almereyda's (2000).³⁾ In all of these, there are rationalizing forces operating behind their characterization of Hamlet, which fall roughly into two categories: one that expands upon the repression of Hamlet's sexuality, and the other, upon Hamlet's mental weakness by which he takes upon himself the terrorizing action. Although they all share some aspects of both categories by varying degrees, Zeffirelli's and Branagh's Hamlets are aligned with the former category, introducing scenes highly indicative of

Hamlet's erotic aggression towards Ophelia, and Gertrude, while Kozintsev's and Geilgud's Hamlets are of the weak romantic type not capable of executing a political action. Wherever the individual directors are casting their anchors, there is an unquestioned premise shared among them, that Hamlet is a deeply melancholic interiorized person in pursuit of his *Self*, or his *self-fashioning*.

The weakness of human beings is that they tend to let perception direct their imagination. The printed lines on the pages do not by themselves shape our imagination in the modern world. More than a substantial part of our insight into Shakespearian characters is by and large the product of what we have experienced in our perception. Therefore, we are tempted to compromise with postmodern theorists of literature who advocate that recovering an 'authorial intention' can be a vain, fruitless act. However, it is not completely fruitless to hypothetically regard the modern Hamlet icons as 'pseudo-representations', and observe them in contrast with the older icons which are closer to Richard Burbage's Hamlet in time, in attempt to clarify the element of our perception projected on the pseudo-representations. It is a great fortune that history has preserved for us the frontispiece (Fig. 1) to Nicholas Rowe's edition of *Hamlet* (1709) published a year before the death of Thomas Betterton (c.1635–1710), the first well-known actor in London who played Hamlet after the Restoration. Being a man of theatre himself, Rowe nurtured his imagination witnessing the contemporary performances of Shakespeare. He speaks highly of Betterton in his 'Preface' to his edition, by which it is possible to surmise that his imaginary world, and hence the frontispiece, too, are tinged with Betterton's influence.

In Betterton's lifetime, there should still have been theatre-goers who had remembered Richard Burbage (c.1567–1619), or his apprentice Joseph Taylor (1586–1652), playing Hamlet directed by Shakespeare

himself. William Davenant (1606–68), the playwright and theatre manager by whose direction Betterton played Hamlet, is known to have seen Joseph Taylor's Hamlet (Buell 6). There is also a tradition which he circulated himself that Davenant was related by blood to Shakespeare. Its truth is arguable, but it is sufficient to indicate that this gentleman had a keen interest in the Shakespearian tradition (a tradition which had nearly died out during the Civil Wars), no matter how harshly modern critics accuse this gentleman for the numerous alterations he made on Shakespeare's texts to please the Restoration audiences. Betterton played Hamlet until his death in 1710, bequeathing his role to James Quin (1693–1766) and Colley Cibber (1671–1757), of whose Hamlets the history is silent.

Granting that Rowe's frontispiece is a remnant of the earlier tradition, there are some telling aspects in the design of the picture. The most remarkable aspect is that the scene depicts one of the most surrealistic moments in the play: Hamlet's encounter with the Ghost. If Hamlet's main feature is his realistic interiority why is the most surrealistic moment so central to the play? Two other aspects are remarkable: 1) the Ghost is clearly revealed as the devil; and, 2) there is no air of sensuality or appearance of maternity about Gertrude, the normally assumed quality of her character that tends to complicate Hamlet's psychology in recent productions. The Ghost in the picture is the devil, because, in spite of Hamlet's description of it as, 'My Father, in his habit as he lived' (3.4.126),⁴⁾ its semblance appears markedly different from the former King's figure drawn in the painting on the wall. The picture portrays the very moment where 'the devil hath power to assume a pleasing shape'. As well, the Ghost is without the shadow that would signify its substantiality. These features will be more self-evident, when Fig. 1 is contrasted with Fig. 2, its variant redesigned by an anonymous artist for

Alexander Pope's edition published in 1728 during Cibber and Quin's period. According to Davenant's text (1676), Hamlet disparately calls out to the 'gracious fire', the candles burning on the wall in Fig. 1, invoking the *Power Divine* for help: 'How would your gracious fire' (Davenant 55).



Fig. 1 (left): The frontispiece to Rowe's edition (1709). Fig. 2 (right): Its variant seen in Pope's Edition (1728).

Regarding Gertrude in Fig. 1, she is portrayed like a 'boy actress' playing a female role than herself being feminine by stature as the Gertrude in Fig. 2.⁵⁾ There is no chamber-bed portrayed in Fig. 1, the stage property which tinges the scene with high sensuality of the Queen in Fig. 2. In fact, nowhere in the text of *Hamlet* is indicated the need of

such a stage property for the closet scene. The excessive sensuality often evoked for the scene in recent productions is an unnecessary annexation, which only became a commodity after the appearance of 'female players' in the eighteenth century.

Until Betterton's period, the scene was performed much in the manner of Act 2 Scene 2 of Christopher Marlow's *Doctor Faustus* (1592), a scene of the protagonist's dramatic realization of his own sinful nature. With the supernatural agents, 'Good Angel' and 'Bad Angel', entering on stage with Faustus, the dramatic moment reveals his inability to purge his sinfulness that impressed an indelible mark on his soul. Faustus here is reminiscent of Claudius in the penitence scene (*Ham.* 3. 3. 35–98):

My heart is harden'd, I cannot repent:

Scarce can I name salvation, faith, or heaven ... (Boas ed., *Fautus* 2. 19–20),

But in *Hamlet*, the penitence scene of Claudius is merely an index to what comes in the next more dramatic scene. Claudius is to be paralleled by Hamlet, who has rashly committed the sin of killing the State's Council, innocent Ophelia's father — 'a deed', as he states, 'almost as bad as kill a king' (3. 4. 28). Like the 'Bad Angel' in *Doctor Faustus*, the Ghost enters the stage at the moment when Hamlet frantically begins his vain act of penitence by appeasing the origin of his own sinful flesh, his incestuous mother. The Ghost tries to stop his attempts of penitence involving his mother: 'O, step between her and her fighting soul' (3. 4. 103); and, tries to make him indulge in the bloody overthrow of the monarch: 'This visitation / Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose', says the Ghost to Hamlet (100–01). Unlike *Doctor Faustus*, the 'Good Angel'

figure will not appear in the flesh of a player in *Hamlet*, but the ‘heavenly guards’ have their imaginary presence all through Hamlet’s intercourse with the Ghost:

HAMLET

Save me and hover o’er me with your wings,
You heavenly guards!’ (3. 4. 94–95).

Hamlet, like Claudius and Faustus, is here directed to foresee the teleological future, where he must ‘answer well’ the sinful act he has committed, and be a ‘scourge’ of heaven. Betterton’s acting of the scene is reported to have given such an impression:

[T]he Blood seemed to shudder in their [audiences’] Veins ... and they saw in some measure partook of the Astonishment and Horror, with which they saw this excellent actor [Betterton] affected.
(*Laureat* 31)

The scene would have lost its guilt, had it been performed without the show of ‘the Astonishment and Horror’ on Hamlet’s face, a sign of fear for being bedevilled himself.

Shakespeare’s dramatic world was not portrayed in compliance with the modern psychological principles. In Shakespeare’s England, theatrical events were more ritualistic in orientation than they can ever be today, much less emphasis being laid on the *reality* consisting of inter-psychological relations of the stage characters. The plays still maintained the ritual of celebrating the *Glory of Creation* and the *Power Divine* governing the old conceptual universe — something similar to the tradition of Japanese *Kagura*. We ought to be reminded that what we

now call dramatic 'character' was still called 'player', which means 'a reveller, a merrymaker (*obs.*)' (*O.E.D.* 2nd edition 2). Such an entity on stage could not have been of as uncannily a psychological type as '*Hamuretto-Gata*'. The 'characters', if Shakespeare described at all, must have been of an antique category: such as the 'stock characters' of a *commedia dell'arte*, or as the distinctively moral features of the 'players' in the earlier tradition of carnival plays. Indeed, there must have been a little hue of modernity about Hamlet, but it was not the main attraction for the earlier audience. We ought to bear in mind that psychology is only a hypothesis conceived by modern thinkers, and modern critics, in search of the little hue, have done over the character a bit too much.

The Character Criticism and Modern Hamlets

It is generally supposed after A. C. Bradley (1904) that the tradition of 'character criticism' appeared in the nineteenth century, when Hamlet was positively seen as an interiorized being by S. T. Coleridge and others. Modifying the nineteenth-century views, Bradley points to the 'melancholy' of Hamlet, and famously asserts that Hamlet's mental illness is the cause of his inaction: 'The direct cause was a state of mind quite abnormal and induced by special circumstances, — a state of profound melancholy'.⁶⁾ Bradley contends that the realness of Hamlet's character is so central to the play that even his ailment is not negligible. This is where character criticism converged with psychoanalysis which began with Sigmund Freud (1900). Freud associates Hamlet's mental disposition with what he believes to be the universal imprint on the human psyche: the *Oedipus complex*.⁷⁾ Bradley did not touch on Freudian theory, but his reading was to be incorporated by one of Freud's disciples, Ernest Jones, in *Hamlet and Oedipus* (1949).⁸⁾ Jones wrote his

book as a supplementary note to Freud's brief account of Hamlet's psyche, and he attempts to clarify how the peculiar state of Hamlet's unconscious explains his words and actions. Jones attributes the cause of Hamlet's melancholy to his unconscious reflection where Claudius stands as the personification of his own murderous and sexual motives arising from his *Oedipus complex*; Hamlet cannot kill Claudius because he mirrors Hamlet's unconscious desire to kill his father and marry his mother. This account would have sounded too eccentric to accept to Japanese readers, as no vernacular tale exists in Shinto and Buddhist traditions, which bears analogous elements to the Oedipus myth. Freudian reading gained its currency in Japan only because, I think, Olivier's *Hamlet* that induces psychological reading circulated in Japan before Ernest Jones's book, when the whole nation was directed to receive western philosophy. Nonetheless, the impact of psychoanalytic reading was received very slowly by Japanese people. Jones's book was not translated into Japanese nor received widely until 1988. While Shouhei Ooka (1909-88), who started writing his famous adaptation of *Hamlet* to the Japanese 'I novel', *Hamuretto Nikki* (or, *Hamlet Diary*, 1980) in 1955, was driven by Dover Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet* (1935), as well as Olivier's *Hamlet*, he did not seem to know the work of Ernest Jones at all.⁹⁾

In English-speaking worlds, the impact of psychoanalysis was very grave during the late twentieth century. That we see the name of the psychoanalyst W. I. D. Scott very often in the books and writings related to Hamlet's character attests to this fact. We are more likely to see Scott's name than that of Lawrence Babb, the author of *Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1582 to 1642* (1951). When Ernest Jones published *Hamlet and Oedipus* in 1949, Babb was studiously researching the historical process in which the

description of melancholy, or *melancholia*, was imported to the Elizabethan literature from Italy. In an attempt to delineate the Elizabethan representation of melancholy, he conducted a thorough survey of Elizabethan texts to see the contexts where the word 'melancholy' appears, or the idea is hinted at — a kind of research invaluable to scholarship of all ages. W. I. D. Scott published *Shakespeare's Melancholics* (1962), a psychoanalytic study of Shakespeare's characters, solely for the purpose of undermining Babb's laborious research by giving clinical diagnoses to some of Shakespeare's 'melancholic' characters that Babb examines closely in his book.¹⁰ Scott bluntly diagnoses Hamlet's melancholy as 'manic-depressive illness' — a failure in libidinal equilibrium in the psyche caused by the series of misfortunes that happened to him. There are no rational grounds, scientific or empirical, to fully support Scott's reading, except for the authority of Freudian theory of unconscious, and, perhaps, the already widespread image of Olivier's Hamlet.

The 1970s were the turning point in the history of character criticism. After deconstruction became a major critical methodology in English-speaking worlds, the diagnostic reading based on the interpretation of readers came under scrutiny. The deconstructive critics hold that the subject who interprets is by nature a construct of language as is the object she or he interprets, thus language speaks itself, as it were, and signifies itself the meaning (the *ti esti*) that is a semiotic construct, or an illusion. For the deconstructive readers, any diagnostic reading seems a thoughtless act. In 1977, psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan demonstrated a revised approach to the analysis of Hamlet's psyche in 'Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*'.¹¹ Lacan does not use Freud's Oedipus theory for a diagnostic ground, but uses it as a model to provide the economy of desire in the psyche, the structural pattern that

fashions subjectivity. Lacan attempts to trace a similar economy in Hamlet's psyche. At the start of the play, Hamlet's desire acquiesces to the masculine sexuality: His desire is the desire of the *Other* (in this case his mother Gertrude). Lacan argues that Gertrude desires the *Phallus* for she mourns for its irretrievable loss, while Hamlet desires the *Phallus* for fear of its loss, reminding us of his own famous theory of the 'mirror stage', which holds that the infant's desire is the desire of its mother.¹²⁾ As the play proceeds, as Lacan continues, the object of Hamlet's desire gradually turns from the *Phallus* to Ophelia, who is object of masculine desire. Hamlet's self-fashioning as a masculine subject does not complete its own process until he finds he has lost the object of his mature desire, Ophelia, at the grave scene. His obsession with the Ghost in the earlier part of the play (before Act 3 Scene 4), which implies his Phallic worship, stands as evidence of the economy of his desire. The vengeance is perceived by Lacan as a symbolic action which signals the integrity of the ego's self-fashioning process to be a masculine subject. Lacan thus leads us to the point where Hamlet's irresolution — Bradley's main conundrum — could be theoretically conceived in a manner distinct from the diagnostic methods of Ernest Jones' and W. I. D Scott's.

Whether Lacan's reading of Hamlet's psychology persuades readers is entirely contingent on their cultural backgrounds, to what extent readers feel western *phallocentrism* as an impeding problem of their own culture. But the pendulum has so far inclined to the western mode of thinking and Lacanian influence has brought about an upsurge of so-called 'performative readings' to English-speaking worlds, while in Japan the influence was minimal until only very recently. As early as 1980, Murray M. Schwartz wrote:

I hear Hamlet interrogating the sources of his own identity in an attempt to integrate words and sharable meanings, language and action, masculine and feminine ... The Hamlet I re-create meets his doubles everywhere, because his divided perceptions of the world seem to me to mirror his divided self. Within the *potential space* of the theatre, I find myself searching for uninterrupted relationships, and I fail, as Hamlet fails.¹³⁾

'[P]otential space' is a term invented by psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott in *Playing and Reality* (1971), which refers to the sacred distance the subjects normally keep from *Others* (e.g., parents, family members, the society etc.) to sustain the order of their beings.¹⁴⁾ Schwartz argues that there will be a rupture in the subject if its relations to *Others* are destabilized. Hamlet, at one moment, rails against his own identity, saying, '[I] [m]ust, like a whore, unpack my heart with words' (2.2. 563). According to Schwartz, this speech signals the moment where the rupture occurs in Hamlet's 'potential space', and his masculine gender crumbles.¹⁵⁾ It is apparent here that Schwartz is adopting a Lacanian mode of reading.

Recent deconstructive critics have a tendency to suspend disbelief in Hamlet's psychological mystery and instead theorize the process in which the mystery is posited in the dynamics of textuality signifying his character.¹⁶⁾ Their approach is merely reactionary to the tradition of character criticism. But, while continuing to produce a profusion of pseudo-representations of Hamlet, they do not seem to answer the most basic question, 'Why is there an enormous difference between Betterton's Hamlet and Olivier's Hamlet?' It only seems to me that recent criticism practiced in English-speaking worlds, however critical with the Romantic approach to character, is not anything more than another twig

of the same branch from which stemmed out Bradley's criticism in the early twentieth century.

We are naturally inclined to trace the root of the pseudo-Hamlet tradition in the criticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to illustrate how Hamlet's psychology became a mystery.

The Criticism of Hamlet's Character from the Eighteenth to Nineteenth Centuries

Nothing was written about the singularity of Hamlet's psychology until the latter part of the eighteenth century. The archetype of psychological criticism is found in Samuel Johnson's notes to his edition of *Shakespeare's Works* (1765), where he explains his method of editing textual cruces. Johnson's belief in the First Folio (1623) as rendering a superior text by comparison to the preceding Quartos and the other later editions was based on his two major accomplishments: one being the discovery of systematic rules in language he deduced from his extensive survey of Elizabethan English; and the other being the unprecedented observations he made on the dramatic figures from the standpoint that they are predicated on a universal human nature. Johnson writes in the 'Preface' that the Folio text makes more sense to him than any other because the language is more coherent to the systematic rules of Elizabethan English, and the dramatic characters more reasonably rendered. In Johnson's discourse, the word 'character', which in an early modern context could only mean 'a mark; a stamp; a representation' as already mentioned, seems to have begun taking on a variant meaning. Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) introduces the eighteenth-century use of 'character' meaning, '[p]ersonal qualities; particular constitution of the mind', which is rather close to its

modern usage.

However, we should not hasten to conclude that Johnson directly induced the tradition of modern character criticism. In his notes, Johnson dedicates a larger space to explaining the characterization of Polonius, but he does not write as much about Hamlet. To Johnson and his predecessors, Hamlet's behaviour was not a mystery and nothing about his character was worth analyzing in psychological terms. Johnson did motivate Maurice Morgann (1726–1802) to write the first book-length study of a Shakespearian character, *An Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff* (1777), but Morgann's approach was much different from what we will presently see as the methodology of Hamlet's character criticism.¹⁷⁾ Hamlet did not become an object of enquiry until the next phase in the history of literary criticism.

It was the clinical view of Hamlet which flourished towards the end of Johnson's life that made Hamlet the central focus of the play. In his edition of *Shakespeare's Works* (2nd edition, 1778), George Steevens (1736–1800) wrote a very curious sentence:

The late Dr Akinside once observed to me, that the conduct of Hamlet was every way unnatural and indefensible, unless he were to be regarded as a young man whose intellects were in some degree impaired by his own misfortunes: by the death of his father, the loss of expected sovereignty, and a sense of shame resulting from that hasty and incestuous marriage of his mother. (Furness ed. 147)

'Dr Akinside' is the poet we know by the name of Mark Akenside (1721-70), the author of *The Pleasures of Imagination* (1744) and *Epistle to Curio* (1744).¹⁸⁾ Steevens calls him 'Dr Akinside' because he was better known as a 'physician' during Steevens' time, publishing no poetical

works between 1746 and his death in 1770. In his youth, Akenside was matriculated at Edinburgh University to study theology, but there he changed his course to pursue a medical career. He became a surgeon in 1741, and, in 1744, he submitted a medical thesis, *De Ortu et Incremento Foetus Humani* (or, *The Originating of Human Fetus in Uterus*), for which he was admitted as M. D. at Leyden University, an institution then renowned in medical studies. Akenside developed his early medical career at St. Thomas Hospital where he was a dedicated surgeon, later to be qualified as M. D. by Cambridge University in 1753. He then enjoyed an illustrious career as a renowned medical practitioner and lecturer, publishing some of his clinical observations, including the well-known ‘Origin and Use of the Lymphathetic Vessels’ (1755). He acceded to the position of the principal physician at Christ’s Hospital in 1759, and soon became the physician to the Queen. When and how Akenside came across George Steevens, and ‘observed’ to him of Hamlet’s clinical problem is not clear to us, but their encounter must have taken place between 1765 and 1770, as Johnson’s 1765 edition of *Shakespeare’s Works* makes no reference to Akenside’s observation. And, as we shall presently see, we have every reason to believe that Akenside, being himself an insidious reader of Shakespeare,¹⁹⁾ made himself acquainted with the bluestockings in London.

Although none of his writings on Hamlet has survived, the repercussions in London’s literary circle of Akenside’s observation are recorded by Joseph Ritson (1752–1803):

Dr. Akenside was a very ingenious, sensible, and worthy man: but enough has been said to satisfy those who doubt, that the conduct of Hamlet is neither unnatural nor indefensible. That his intellects were really impaired by the circumstances enumerated by the above

learned physician, is very probable; and, indeed, Hamlet *hissself* [*sic*], more than once, plainly insinuates it. (223–24)

The passage indicates that Akenside's view was at first considered eccentric by many before it was assimilated into the intellectual climate. The idea that one's 'intellects were impaired ... by the circumstances' reflects the highly controversial debate which coloured the medical philosophy of the time. To use the word 'intellects' to mean the natural faculty of mind governing the psychic *status quo* was then sensational and heretical.²⁰⁾ To see a mind as an organic constitution of perceptions purely arising from natural senses was not possible when Alexander Pope (1688–1744) wrote his treatise on mind, *An Essay on Man* (1745), in the early eighteenth century under the influence of John Locke's (1632–1704) *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). The common belief of the time was:

[T]hat our perceptions have certain bounds ... which are fix'd by *the original nature and constitution of the mind*, and beyond which no influence of external objects on the senses is ever able to hasten or retard our thought. (Hume 28; emphasis added)

The idea of 'the original nature and constitution of the mind' is reflected in such a passage in Pope's *Essay*:

That never passion discompos'd the mind:
But ALL subsists by elemental strife;
And Passions are the elements of Life.
The gen'ral ORDER since the whole began,
Is kept in Nature, and is kept in Man. (36)

The history had to wait for the rise of the more rationally empirical philosophy of human psychology, which are associated with David Hume (1711–76), a friend of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78).

David Hume challengingly criticizes Locke's 'original nature and constitution of the mind' by advocating, '[t]his order of things, abstractedly consider'd, is not necessary' (238). How mind is constituted independently of the higher faculty of the 'gen'ral ORDER' was to be the theme for later philosophers of human psychology after Hume. When Hamlet was first diagnosed by Akenside as suffering intellectual impairments because of such a worldly cause as 'his own misfortunes', David Hume's radical view of mental constitution was still appallingly new and not very much assimilated to the milieu of intellectual culture among London's bluestockings. Some researchers speculate that Akenside attended Hume's lectures while still at Edinburgh when Hume was writing his *Treatise of Human Nature* (1740), so that he was directly influenced by Hume's psychological theory (see Vallins 157; Sitter 101), which is likely. But, for the purpose of this essay, let us safely assume that it was the intellectual milieu of the Scottish Enlightenment, with much import of new medical philosophy from Layden and elsewhere, that incubated both Hume and Akenside alike. Akenside's life at Edinburgh was spent 'lay[ing] down principles in the constitution of the human mind which account for every species of pleasurable emotion caused by natural energy' (Gosse 789). As Richard C. Allen recently pointed out, Akenside publicly expressed his 'epigenetic theory of embryology', and put into question the traditional ontological theory in 1742 (Allen 464–65). The theme echoes throughout *The Pleasures of Imagination*, and the *De Ordu et Incremento Foetus Humani* (see Dix 215–18). That the human mind has an organic nature, as life itself is an organic embryo, was the imaginative philosophy that underscores Hume's *Treatise* and Akenside's

The Pleasures, both composed at Edinburgh around the same time.

It was not a pure accident that Akenside's view of Hamlet was echoed by William Richardson (1743–1814), another scholar of Scotland. When Richardson wrote *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of Shakespeare's Remarkable Characters* (1774) at the age of thirty five, published simultaneously in Edinburgh and in London, he was lecturing on humanity at Glasgow University with a sharp focus on the nature of human psychology. He states at the beginning of his 'Introduction':

The genuine and original Poet, peculiarly favoured by nature, and intimately acquainted with *the constitution of the human mind*, not by a long train of metaphysical deductions, but, as it were, by immediate intuition, displays the workings of every affection, detects the origin of every passion, traceth its progress, and delineates its character (Richardson (1780) 5; emphasis added).

Richardson quotes passages from Akenside's *The Pleasures* (*Ibid* 42–43) and from Hume's *History* (*Ibid* 57–58), but, as he was later to declare, he is more directly indebted to the Scottish critic Lord Henry Kames (1669–1782) (see Richardson (1784) 'Preface'), the first literary critic who combined literary criticism with the medical philosophies then current in Scotland. Now it is widely known that Hume's philosophy is functional in Kames' *Elements of Criticism* (1765),²¹ along with the medical ideas of Dr. Thomas Reid (1710–1790) (Jones xiv), the author of *An Inquiry into The Human Mind* (1764) and a colleague to William Richardson at Glasgow. Richardson's premise of reading Hamlet is inscribed in such a passage:

[I]f our soul is exceedingly moved, our thoughts will not arise in

their natural order, but will be entirely regulated by the present passion of the mind. It is a certain fact, confirmed by universal experience, and it may be laid down as an important axiom in the study of human nature, that our notions and opinions are ever influenced by our present temper. (Richardson (1780) 92)

Here, we see the pattern of discourse intrinsic to the writings of the Scottish Enlightenment.

William Richardson's *A Philosophical Analysis* came to enjoy great currency in London only after Mark Akenside, then a very influential figure in London society, expressed his clinical view of Hamlet's psychology. Richardson's book did not circulate well in London market when it was first published in 1774. However, it had a great run after its second edition was published in 1780 (several editions and reprints were published in 1784, in 1785 and onwards). The title page of the 1785 edition bears the amended title, *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters of Macbeth, Hamlet, Jaques and Imogen*, dispensing with the priggish outset of the former title, 'A Philosophical Analysis' — which indicates that the publisher (J. Murray at 32 Fleet St.) was targeting at a larger audience. The popularity of the book inspired J. Murray to sign the contract with Richardson to publish successively his *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters of Richard the Third, King Lear, Timon of Athens* (1784; rpt. 1785 and 1786), and *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff, and On His Imitation of Female Characters* (1788; rpt. 1789). The arguments in all of these books were current in London in the wake of the late Dr. Akenside's remarks on Hamlet's character.

Paralleling the great repercussions of Akenside's opinion in Hamlet criticism, theatre-goers in London were going to witness a major turn in

representations of Hamlet on stage. David Garrick (c.1717–79), who performed Hamlet since 1740s, was about to conclude his acting career when Hannah More (1745–1833) witnessed his performance in May 1776. More, in a passage that anticipates Coleridge and Hazlitt, writes, '[I]n him [Garrick] they [the audiences] were all united', and continues:

Hamlet experiences the conflict of many passions and affections, but filial love ever takes the lead; *that* is the great point from which he sets out, and to which he returns; the others are all contingent and subordinate to it, and are cherished and renounced, as they promote or obstruct the operation of this leading principle. (Roberts ed. 86)

There had not been a single reference to Hamlet performed on stage which focused on the interiority of Hamlet's mind as so central to the character before More's description of Garrick's Hamlet of 1776. The tradition bequeathed to Garrick from Thomas Betterton (1635–1710) was the sort of acting which invited the audiences to partake in 'the Astonishment and the Horror, with which they saw [Hamlet] affected' by the Ghost, but never did performances hint to the psychological view that Hamlet's 'filial love ever takes the lead of all the other passions and affections'. As already seen in this essay, the early Hamlet on stage (at least as played by Betterton) was a kind of vice figure destined to 'fall' like a sparrow for his inheritance of sinful nature. This is why painters, engravers, and editors of *Hamlet* before 1776 were all haunted by the Ghost scenes, as exemplified by Fig. 1, which without exceptions picture Hamlet as a haunted figure like Dr. Faustus or Macbeth. Garrick was taught Shakespeare by Samuel Johnson, who still held the traditional view of Hamlet, and was apprenticed to Betterton when he first played Hamlet in the 1740s. One report says that Garrick emphasized 'Strokes

of Passion' rather than the psychological movement when he acted Hamlet in 1746 (*The Museum* Feb 28, 1746). Taking into account that David Garrick was a central figure of London literary circle around the time when Akenside expressed his new reading of Hamlet, we can conceive of the corollary between Garrick's new acting style and the influence of Akenside's comment in London society.

There is no need to emphasize Coleridge's and Hazlitt's indebtedness to the milieu of the late-eighteenth century; this was already made clear by David Nichol Smith, Thomas M. Raysor, and R. W. Babcock in the early twentieth century.²²⁾ However, no one has pointed out that what is interwoven in Coleridge's and Hazlitt's criticism of the ongoing debate that was taking place in the field of medicine. We should call to our mind what Coleridge writes of Hamlet:

I believe the character of Hamlet may be traced to *Shakespeare's deep and accurate science in mental philosophy*. Indeed, that this character must have some connection with *the common fundamental laws of our nature* may be assumed from the fact, that Hamlet has been the darling of every country in which the literature of England has been fostered. In order to understand him, it is essential that we should reflect on *the constitution of our own minds*. (343; emphasis added)

This passage bespeaks Coleridge's medical and scientific interest. When the interiority of Hamlet was put under a critical focus in London by Akenside and his successors, Coleridge was studying natural science in England, and in Germany acquainting himself with such prominent figures of medicine and natural science as Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840) and Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802), from whose influence

Coleridge later propounded his famous 'organic theory' of literature. Coleridge was appointed as a lecturer at the Royal Institution not because he was a remarkable poet, but because of his pursuit and interest in natural philosophy. His friendship with Dr. Thomas Beddoes (1760–1808), the author of *Hygeia* (1802–3) and *The Manual of Health* (1806), acquainted him with the young chemist Humphry Davy (1778–1829), by whose invitation he gave a series of lectures at Royal Institution around 1807 and 1811–12. Coleridge's prospectus reads, 'a philosophic Analysis and Explanation of all the principal *Characters* of our Great dramatist' (see Fig. 3)

LONDON PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,
SCOT'S CORPORATION HALL,
CRANE COURT, FLEET STREET,
(ENTRANCE FROM FETTER LANE.)

MR. COLERIDGE
WILL COMMENCE
ON MONDAY, NOV. 18th,
A COURSE OF LECTURES ON SHAKESPEAR AND MILTON,
IN ILLUSTRATION OF
THE PRINCIPLES OF POETRY,
AND THEIR
*Application as Grounds of Criticism to the most popular Works of later
English Poets, those of the Living included.*

AFTER an introductory Lecture on False Criticism, (especially in Poetry,) and on its Causes: two thirds of the remaining course, will be assigned, 1st, to a philosophic Analysis and Explanation of all the principal *Characters* of our great Dramatist, as OTHELLO, FAUSTAFF, RICHARD 3d, IAGO, HAMLET, &c.: and 2nd, to a critical Comparison of SHAKESPEAR, in respect of Diction, Imagery, management of the Passions, Judgment in the construction of his Dramas, in short, of all that belongs to him as a Poet, and as a dramatic Poet, with his contemporaries, or immediate successors. JONSON, BEAUMONT and FLETCHER, FORD, MASSINGER, &c.

Fig. 3. The prospectus of Coleridge's lectures (*Seven Lectures* viii).

He calls the traditional method of literary appreciation ‘a false criticism’ (*Ibid* 1–12), while he follows the wake of William Richardson’s method of ‘philosophical’ analysis, making it close to recent psychological readings. Among the several hundred audiences that alleged to have listened to Coleridge’s lectures was John Payne Collier (1789–1883), who was later to be an influential figure in Shakespeare scholarship in the late nineteenth century.

An interesting episode ensued after Coleridge delivered his lectures at the Royal Institution. He was accused to have plagiarized the ideas of the German critic, Augustus William Schlegel (1769–1845), whose view on Hamlet we now regard as one of the archetypes of Romantic criticism of Hamlet along with Coleridge’s and Hazlitt’s.²³⁾ The accuser was William Hazlitt. Chronologically speaking, Schlegel’s lectures came after Coleridge’s: his lectures in Venice were given in 1809, whereas Coleridge’s lectures first took place around 1807. It is theoretically difficult to prove the truth of Hazlitt’s accusation. It is not even likely that Coleridge was able to refer to Schlegel, of whom he scarcely knew when he was lecturing in London. What is quite likely is that the trend of character criticism then current in England and Scotland had been imported to Germany, when Schlegel was writing his criticism on Shakespeare. The fact is that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1823) had been fully aware of the new British trend when he mockingly alluded to it in his *Wilhelm Meister’s Apprenticeship and Travels* (1796); he makes his fictitious character say for him:

I endeavoured as it were to take upon myself the load of deep melancholy ... and in this humour to pursue him [Hamlet] through the strange labyrinths of his caprices and his singularities. Thus learning, thus practicing, I doubted not but I should by and by become

one person with my hero.

But the farther I advanced, the more difficult did it become for me to form any image of the whole, in its general bearings; till at last it seemed as if impossible. (211–12)

It was the time in Europe after the French Revolution when there was an upsurge of interest in the philosophy of natural science. What is clear to us, at least in retrospect, is that Hazlitt's view of Hamlet is so curiously close to Schlegel's and Coleridge's in its orientation that we are almost tempted to believe that Hazlitt was employing an art of self-protection when he frivolously accused his friend of plagiarism. The episode is indicative of the rise of common interest of Shakespearian critics in the early nineteenth century: that is, to analyze Hamlet's mind philosophically.

There was nothing gained in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in 'character criticism', except, ironically, that the validity of the character-centered view of *Hamlet* was made subject to questioning in the twentieth century. It was T. S. Eliot (c.1919) who first threw a sceptical glance over the history of Hamlet's 'character criticism', pointing to the 'failure' in the structurality of the play to represent Hamlet's psychic *status quo*. 'Hamlet (the man) is dominated by an emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in *excess* of the facts as they appear', according to Eliot (48). The Oedipus theory is the newly-developed weapon for those who still believe there is a structure in Hamlet's psyche, and attempt to dispute against T. S. Eliot's provocative remark. The recent movement of psychoanalysis and self-fashioning theories occurring in English-speaking worlds is, as already mentioned, the second turn in the history of 'character criticism'. However, no major discovery concerning Hamlet's character has yet been pronounced since the late eighteenth century

which shakes Mark Akenside's diagnose that Hamlet is suffering a mental dysfunction caused by his experience of misfortunes, whether you call it the manic-depressive illness or the rupture in the ego-fashioning. Nothing was gained after Akenside because, I contend, the recent scholarship has not since deviated from the genealogical line of 'character criticism', whose purpose was to project pathological perspectives to the *uncanniness* of Hamlet's character. We have hitherto been too much inclined to the mode of thinking without seriously questioning its validity as method of understanding Shakespeare's design of Hamlet.

Notes

- 1) *Hamuretto to Don Kihôte*, trans. Toshio Watari, Tokyo: Monshoin, 1949. Several other translations appeared after this including the most widely read *Hamuretto to Don Kihôte*, trans. Yoichi Shibata and Shisaburo Shibata, Tokyo: Iwanami, 1955. David B. Modell's first English translation appeared in *Current Literature*, January-June, 1907, pp. 290–293; pp. 349–352. The widely circulated and often quoted translation was Robert Nichol's *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, London: Hendersons, 1930.
- 2) Olivier's *Hamlet* has an epigram spoken by Olivier himself in a melancholic tone, 'This is a tragedy of the man who could not make up his mind'.
- 3) I am deliberately excluding the popular stage productions of *Hamlet* some of which are broadcast on TV because they are not as widely viewed as the film productions which I am listing here. I should note, however, that when I use the term 'recent productions' in this essay, I implicitly refer to the numerous productions I have seen on stage or otherwise in Japan, England and elsewhere.
- 4) All quotations from *Hamlet* in this essay are, unless mentioned otherwise, taken from Stephen Greenblatt, *et. al.* eds. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, New York, London: W.W. Norton & Co, 1997.
- 5) Anne Shadwell (fl. 1661–1705), wife of the playwright Thomas Shadwell (c. 1604–92), played Gertrude in William Davenant's *Hamlet* (publ. 1676). In those days, it was a custom that theatre companies employed female relatives

of theatrical persons instead of professional actresses. Betterton's wife Mary (c.1637–1712) is known to have played Ophelia for Davenant's *Hamlet*. This was purely for economic reasons on the part of theatre companies. It is therefore presumed that those female players mimicked what they remembered about the characters as they had once seen on stage, rather than creating new styles of portrayal as professional actresses did in the later periods.

- 6) *Shakespearean Tragedy*, London: Macmillan, 1941, p. 108.
- 7) See James Strachey ed., *The Standard Edition*, vol. 4 (1900), London: The Hogarth Press, 1991, pp.260–67.
- 8) Yutaka Kurihara, trans. *Hamuretto -to-Oidepusu*, Tokyo: Taishukan, 1988.
- 9) 'Postscript', *Nobi · Hamuretto Nikki*, Tokyo: Iwanami, 1988, pp. 356–360.
- 10) See *Shakespeare's Melancholics*, London: Mills & Boon, 1962, pp. 19–24.
- 11) *Yale French Studies*, No. 55–56 (1977), pp. 11–52.
- 12) For Lacan's theory of the 'mirror stage', see 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function', J. Lacan and B. Fink eds., *Ecrits: A Selection*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 2002, pp. 3–9.
- 13) 'Shakespeare through Contemporary Psychoanalysis', *Representing Shakespeare*, eds. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppelia Kahn, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980, pp. 21–32, p.26.
- 14) For more details, see *Playing and Reality*, New York, Basic Books, 1971, p. 103.
- 15) 'Shakespeare through Contemporary Psychoanalysis', p. 27.
- 16) In critical theory, we see, for instance, Judith Butler (1997) modifying the Lacanian model of psyche from a rather Foucauldian, non-gendered perspective: In critical practice, Marshall Grossman (2003) attempts to revise Lacan's reading of Hamlet from a perspective aligned to Butler's, which I do not find it necessary to summarize for our present purposes. In productions, we see the shadow of the critical movement in Branagh's and Almereyda's portrayal of their Hamlets. Branagh's Hamlet recites the 'To be, or not to be' soliloquy in a space walled by one-way mirrors reflecting his own narcissistic image, and the scene gives us the impression that Hamlet fails to contextualize his 'being' within the 'potential space' with *Others* who stay just on the other side of the mirrors eavesdropping on him. Branagh's Hamlet cannot *perform* his 'being', or self-fashioning. Almereyda's Hamlet makes himself an object of his own gaze by video-recording himself reciting the 'To be, or not to be'

soliloquy to his portable camera. Later he watches the recording himself, but he turns it off in a neurotic manner on finding his own image overlap uncannily with that of the Buddhist monk preaching the philosophy of being and non-being, whom he saw a while ago on the same pixel-screen. As is clear to us, Buddhist philosophy holds the principle that 'to be' is to achieve the state of being *anatman*, a cipher without fashioning an *ego* which motivates a person to act.

- 17) Morgann's point in *Essay* was to argue that Falstaff is not singularly a piece of Cowardice, a view given by his contemporary critics. He tries to point out that there are glimpses where courage issues from Falstaff independently of his outward moral character, which is a vice, and makes his character more humanistic and more appealing to the audiences. As Morgann implies in the "Preface," the essay was written earlier, presumably, shortly after Samuel Johnson made his account of Falstaff's appeals in his edition in 1765. For Johnson's account, see Johnson's edition (1765), vol. 4, p. 356ff.
- 18) The most detailed biography of Mark Akenside is Charles Theodore Houpt, *Mark Akenside: A Biographical and Critical Study*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1944. The account of Akenside's career which follows here is mostly based on the authority of this book, although I made some modification according to the new findings of the recent scholarship.
- 19) Akenside quotes Shakespeare in many places of his poetical works.
- 20) 'Intellects' in plural form sounds already archaic in current English.
- 21) Kames is not only related to Hume by blood, but he cooperated with Hume to publish a journal titled *Literary and Political Periodical* in the early 1730s.
- 22) See 'Introduction' to Nichol Smith, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare*, Glasgow: J. MacLehose, 1903, pp. xxxii-xxxviii; Thomas M. Raysor, 'The Study of Shakespeare's Characters in the Eighteenth Century', *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 42, no. 8 (December 1927), pp. 495-500; R.W. Babcock, 'The Influence of Late Eighteenth Century Shakespeare Criticism on Hazlitt and Coleridge', *Modern Language Notes*, vol.45, no.6 (June 1930), pp. 377-87.
- 23) Schlegel's reading on Hamlet can be referred to at *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, trans. John Black, London: George Bell & Sons, 1879, pp. 404-07; Schlegel observes that Hamlet is 'the tragedy of thought' and is 'calculated to call forth the very same meditation in the minds of the spectators' (p. 404).

Bibliography

- Akenside, Mark. *The Poetical Works of Mark Akenside*. Ed. Alexander Dyce. 1845. New York: AMS Press, 1969.
- Allen, Richard C. 'A Philosophical Essay by Mark Akenside'. *Notes and Queries*. Vol. CCXLIII (1998). 464–65.
- Ashe, T. 'Introduction'. S. T. Coleridge. *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare*. Ed. T. Ashe. London: George Bell and Sons, 1897. 31–32.
- Babb, Lawrence. *The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951.
- Babcock, R.W. 'The Influence of Late Eighteenth Century Shakespeare Criticism on Hazlitt and Coleridge'. *Modern Language Notes*. Vol. 45. No.6 (June 1930). 377–87.
- Bowers, Fredson Thayer. *Hamlet as Minister and Scourge and Other Studies in Shakespeare and Milton*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989.
- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan, 1941.
- Buell, William Ackerman. *The Hamlets of the Theatre*. New York: Astor-Honor, 1968.
- Butler, Judith. 'Melancholy Gender/ Refused Identification'. *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997. 132–66.
- . 'Psychic Inception'. *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997. 167–98.
- Coleridge, S. T. *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets*. Ed. T. Ashe. London: George Bell and Sons, 1897.
- . *Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton: By the Late S. T. Coleridge*. Ed. J. Payne Collier. (1856). New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.
- Davenant, William. Ed. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark as it is now acted at His Highness the Duke of York's Theatre*. London: Printed by Andr. Clark, for J. Martyn, and H. Herringman, 1676.
- Dix, R. 'Organic Theories of Art: The Importance of Embryology'. *Notes and Queries*. Vol. CCXXX (1985). 215–18.
- Eliot, T. S. *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.

- Freud Sigmund, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. 4. Ed. James Strachey. (1900). London: The Hogarth Press, 1991.
- Furness, Horace Howard. Ed. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Hamlet*. Vol. 2. London, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1877.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Goethe's Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship and Travels Translated by Thomas Carlyle*. Ed. Clement King Shorter. Vol. 1. Chicago, A. C. McClurg & Co., 1890.
- Gosse, Edmund. 'Mark Akenside, Poet and Physician'. *The Living Age*. December 24, 1921. 787–791.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. et. al. Eds. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Co, 1997.
- Grossman, Michael. 'Hamlet and the Gendered Grief'. *Grief and Gender, 700–1700*. Ed. C. Vaught. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997. 177–193.
- Hamuretto to Don Kihôte*. Trans. Toshio Watari, Tokyo: Monshoin, 1949.
- Hamuretto to Don Kihôte*, Trans. Yoichi Kohno and Jisaburo Shibata, Tokyo: Iwanami, 1955.
- Hazlitt, William. 'Hamlet'. *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays & Lectures on The English Poets*. (1817–18). London: Macmillan and Co., 1925. 63–70.
- Haupt, Charles Theodore. *Mark Akenside: A Biographical and Critical Study*. New York: Russel & Russel, 1944.
- Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Johnson, Samuel. Ed. *The Plays of William Shakespeare*. Vol. 8. (This volume contains *Rom, Ham* and *Oth*). Printed for J. and R. Tonson, 1765.
- _____. *The Plays of William Shakespeare*. Vol. 4. (This volume contains the second tetralogy and *1H6*). Printed for J. and R. Tonson, 1765.
- _____. *A Dictionary of The English Language*. Vols. 1–2. London: Printed for J. Knapton and others, 1756.
- Jones, Ernest. *Hamlet and Oedipus*. London: V. Gollancz, 1949.
- Jones, Ernest. *Hamuretto-to-Oidepusu*. Trans. Yutaka Kurihara. Tokyo: Taishukan, 1988.
- Jones, Peter. 'Introduction'. *Elements of Criticism*. Vol. 1. Indianapolis: Library fund, 2005. ix–xxi.
- Katritzky, Linde. 'Coleridge's Link with Leading Men of Science'. *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*. Vol. 49. No.2 (July 1995). 261–276.

- Koujien*. The 6th edition. Eds. Izuru Shinmura *et. al.* Tokyo: Iwanami, 2008.
- Lacan, Jacques. 'Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in *Hamlet*'. *Yale French Studies*, No. 55–56 (1977). 11–52.
- . 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function'. *Ecrits: A Selection*. Eds. J. Lacan and B. Fink. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 2002. 3–9.
- Laureat; or the Right Side of Colly Cibber*. Anonymous. London: Printed for J. Roberts, 1740.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Ed. Peter H. Nidditch, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. *On Hamlet*. London: Hollis & Carter, 1948.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. New York: Gordian Press, 1932.
- Mills, John A. *Hamlets on Stage: The Great Tradition*. Westport, London: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- More, Hannah. *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*. Ed. William Roberts, (2nd ed.). Vol. 2. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1786.
- Morgann, Mourice. *An Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff*. 1777. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- The Museum: or the Library and Historical Register*, February 28, 1746.
- Ooka, Shouhei. 'Postscript'. *Nobi • Hamuretto Nikki*. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1988. 356–60.
- Pope, Alexander. *An Essay on Man*. Ed. Maynard Mack. London: Methuen & Co., 1950.
- . (and Dr. Sewell). Eds. *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear (sic.)*. Vol. 8. London: J. and J. Knapton and others, 1728.
- Raysor, Thomas M. 'The Study of Shakespeare's Characters in the Eighteenth Century'. *Modern Language Notes*. Vol. 42. No. 8 (December 1927). 495–500.
- Richardson, William. *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of the Remarkable Characters*. Edinburgh: Printed for W. Creech, 1774.
- . *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of the Remarkable Characters*. London: Printed for J. Murray, 1774.
- . *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of the Remarkable Characters*. (A New Edition, Corrected). London: Printed for J. Murray,

- 1780.
- _____. Also reprint of the above. New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- _____. *A Philosophical Analysis and Illustration of Some of the Remarkable Characters*. (The Third Edition, Corrected). London: J. Murray, 1784.
- _____. *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters of Macbeth, Hamlet, Jaques, and Imogen*. (The Fourth Edition of the above). London: J. Murray, 1785.
- _____. *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters of Richard the Third, King Lear, and Timon of Athens*. London: J. Murray, 1784.
- _____. *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff, and on his Imitation of Female Characters*. London: J. Murray, 1788.
- Ritson, Joseph. *Remarks, Critical and Illustrative on the Last Edition of Shakspeare [sic.]*. London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1783.
- Rowe, Nicolas. Ed. *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear (sic.)*. Vol. 5. London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1709.
- Schlegel, Augustus William. *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*. Trans. John Black. London: George Bell & Sons, 1879.
- Schwartz, Murray M. 'Shakespeare through Contemporary Psychoanalysis', *Representing Shakespeare*. Eds. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppelia Kahn, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. 21–32.
- Scott, W. I. D. *Shakespeare's Melancholics*. London: Mills & Boon, 1962.
- Sitter, John E. 'Theodicy at Mid-century: Young, Akenside, and Hume'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. Vol. 12 (1978–1979). 90–106.
- Smith, Nichol. 'Introduction'. Nichol Smith. Ed. *Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare*, Glasgow: J. MacLehose, 1903. xxxii–xxxviii.
- Stanislavski, Constantin. *Building a Character*. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1949.
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar. *Hamlet, an Historical and Comparative Study*. New York: Gordian Press, 1919.
- _____. *Hamlet the Man*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Turgenev, Ivan. 'Hamlet and Don Quixote — The Two Eternal Human Types'. Trans. David B. Modell's. *Current Literature*, January–June, 1907, pp. 290–293; pp. 349–52.
- Turgenev, Ivan. *Hamlet and Don Quixote*. Trans. Robert Nichol. London: Hendersons, 1930.

Vallins, David. 'Akinside, 'Coleridge, and the Pleasures of Transcendence'.

Mark Akenside: A Reassessment. Ed. Robin Dix. London: Associated University Press, 2000. 156–82.

Winnicott, D. W. *Playing and Reality*. New York, Basic Books, 1971.