Recent studies have argued that in nineteenth-century England and France, madness was constructed as a "female malady."¹ By the 1850s, when asylum statistics first confirmed the perception that female inmates were likely to outnumber their male counterparts, figures of madwomen, from Victorian lovestruck, melancholic maidens to the theatrically agitated inmates of the Salpêtrière, already dominated the cultural field in representations of madness. This situation denotes a clear shift in the understanding of madness as a gendered disorder, because the previous dominating constructs had been cast in male form.² Much has been written about the subsequent preoccupation with madwomen from early romanticism to the fin-de-siècle. But scholars have yet to investigate the enabling representational processes that gave this shift the status of a logical development.

By examining late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century visual and verbal representations of madness, this essay isolates the stages that culminated in this shift. I will focus first on two gender stereotypes associated with maniacal forms of disorder that derive from early modern visual typologies of madness and then trace developments in the relative significance and interdependence of these two stereotypes through the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century. My study concludes by showing how these stereotypes were recast in postrevolutionary Europe in relation to fears about women's political empowerment and tensions about the role of physical aggression and violence both in delineating masculine forms of madness and in figuring revolutionary change.

Among traditional early modern stereotypes of madness, two in particular, one male and one female, externalize mental disorder into a shocking spectacle of constant physical agitation; these distinguish the madman as an aggressive, potentially combative figure and the madwoman as a sexually provocative, primarily self-abusing one.³ The cus-
orary dishevelment and seminudity of these two figures, conceived as
effects of the ceaseless movement thought to characterize their condi-
tion, give the madman a gloss of uncivilized animality but set up the fe-
male figure as a site for sexual display. Each stereotype exhibits a similar
degree of expansiveness and extroverted theatricality, and together they
constitute a binary oppositional pairing maintained by gendered concep-
tions of madness and by the gendered premises of spectatorship. Both
structured from a masculine viewing position, the two constructions of-
fer distinctive responses to male concerns for domination and survival.
On the one hand, there is the violent madman who competes with the
male spectator for physical authority and control, and, on the other, the
sexually preoccupied madwoman who challenges the male viewer's de-
sire for sexual authority and domination. These apprehensions clarify the
distinctively gendered kind of threat which the maniacal form of mad-
ness was thought to represent.

The stereotype of a muscular, seminude raving male lunatic retained a
central position among masculine stereotypes of mental disorder until
the early eighteenth century, when it was supplanted by the Augustan
preference for defining madness as a defect in reasoning. This marginal-
ization of the raving figure was well established by 1735, when William
Hogarth's last scene of The Rake's Progress, the "Rake in Bedlam," set the
rake's death on the male ward of Bethlem Hospital (fig. 1). Only three of
the inmates display vestigial traces of the seminude, raving type of luna-
cy: the urinating king and the writhing religious fanatic, in cells along
the background wall, and the rake in the foreground. The latter two are
modeled after Caius Cibber's sculptures which had been placed above
Bethlem Hospital's gates around 1676. The fact that the rake is dying has
of necessity inflicted the traditional raving, muscular stereotype with a
note of vulnerability, subverting the threatening physical presence that
had been associated with the more regressive masculine form of the dis-
order. In a departure from earlier representations, which had stressed the
physical power ensuing from maniacal madness, Hogarth accentuates the
antiheroic and pathetic elements of weakness and defenselessness. This
tactic puts into greater relief the numerous inmates whose costumes and
accoutrements identify their more civilized disorders as intellectual and
occupational. Creative "geniuses," tailors swelled with pride, scheming
"projectors" and inventors—these are the busy hobbyists increasingly
identified with male forms of madness in the eighteenth century. This
proliferation of newly minted stereotypes displaces the traditional raving
lunatics as well as the lovelorn melancholic men of the seventeenth cen-
Fig. 1. William Hogarth, "Rake in Bedlam," *The Rake's Progress*, scene 8, engraving, 1735, British Museum. Courtesy, Trustees of the British Museum. Photo: Museum.
tury, thereby marginalizing the importance of excessive emotion and animality to definitions of masculine madness. In their stead, the new, or in some cases merely revived, prototypes relied more and more on madness defined as a flaw in reason and human agency. The significance of this displacement for the shift from male-dominant to female-dominant constructions of madness is that it disassociated from masculinity raving and melancholic, excessively emotional and regressive conditions, allowing these features to become available for gender adaptations of madness in women.

A further critical factor in understanding the processes behind this representational shift is illustrated by the absence of madwomen in Hogarth's delineation of the gallery at Bethlem. Instead, there are only promiscuous women, in the form of touring female visitors, and Sarah, the maidservant seduced and abandoned by the rake at the series' beginning. Hogarth's exclusion of madwomen from his asylum scene was in effect an overdetermined outcome, the logical consequence of both circumstantial and representational considerations. The composition's spatial and institutional prototype, Bethlem Hospital in Moorfields, did segregate inmates on the wards by sex, and so the image can plausibly be said to recreate a view along a gallery in one of the male wards. But from the vantage point of representational practice, the absence of female inmates derives in part from the lack of any strong continuous visual tradition in depicting madwomen. This invisibility in the visual field continued until the 1780s and was not affected before then by well-known literary figures like Ophelia and the privately incarcerated comic nymphomaniacs of Jacobean drama.

Men easily held the field in representations of madness in both visual and verbal genres prior to the late eighteenth century. Swift's all-male complement in A Tale of a Tub (1704), Johnson's Rasselas (1759), and Smollett's Sir Launcelot Greaves (1762) all delineated similar obsessions associated with masculine endeavors, the latter suggesting that unscrupulous practices of confinement in private madhouses were largely a male concern in which men victimized each other. Reported cases of excessive religious enthusiasm from Alexander Cruden to Kit Smart were similarly dominated by men. And when madwomen were included, as in Ned Ward's journalistic account of touring Bethlem (The London Spy [1698-1709]) or in John Fletcher's The Pilgrim (1621), little was made of them; women were in effect upstaged by their more clever and entertaining male counterparts.

Against this backdrop of persistent absence and avoidance, the previ-
ously overlooked, paradigmatic instance of Ophelia was evoked in late-eighteenth-century British art and literature by the figure of young, lovestruck, melancholy women who occupied a pivotal position in the dynamics of sensibility. These women served as forlorn, unsalvageable objects designed to focalize male displays of proper feeling. Maria in Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* (1768) and Crazy Kate in Cowper's *The Task* (1785) are both of this type, but its clearest formulation is the confined madwoman of Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* (1771). Her distraught condition and disjointed speech, caused by the loss of a lover, organize Harley's tearful responsiveness and occasion the demonstration of his refined sensibility. Although there are no visual images of this particular nameless madwoman, depictions of Maria, Crazy Kate, and Ophelia appeared regularly throughout the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Their notable appearance at this moment can be explained in part by the provocative position they occupied in the dynamics of sensibility: they provide the emotionally unstable female object who actuates the self-enhancing, emotionally enabling experiences of sensibility experienced by the male spectator. The high visibility of these pathologically lovelorn women introduces the next stage in the shift away from male-dominant forms of madness.

From the late eighteenth through the early nineteenth centuries, Kate and Maria are commonly depicted as generalized objects of observation or contemplation, and they are shown with little variation as aimlessly wandering waifs or in the traditional seated posture of melancholia. However, depictions of the mad Ophelia, which appear for the first time in the 1780s, differ from those of Kate and Maria. Shakespeare's text and the play's performance tradition called not for the pliant, energy-depleted, lovelorn madwomen of sensibility, but for a more physically and verbally intrusive, even disruptive figure with a distinctly more sexualized delineation. These characteristics move the figure of Ophelia, as the least passive, most unruly among the lovelorn madwoman prototypes, closer to the gap left by the declining importance of the unruly male lunatic, and this proximity contributes to her introduction into visual culture at this moment. The claim that depictions of Ophelia simply reflect the restoration of the role in performance following years of Augustan censorship cannot be supported by the performance history of the play. When images of Ophelia's mad scene and drowning first appeared in the 1780s, performances of *Hamlet* were more frequent than they had been at any time earlier in the century: in London, the play was performed sixteen times in 1783, eleven times in 1784, and eight times in 1785.
Fig. 2. Robert Edge Pine, *Ophelia*, engraving, 1784, British Museum. Courtesy, Trustees of the British Museum. Photo: Museum.
Other factors which overdetermined the introduction of visual representations of Ophelia during this decade include the restoration in 1780 of Gertrude's account of Ophelia's drowning to the play in performance and the exertions of artists and entrepreneurs who hoped to create a market for British subjects in art by establishing "Shakespeare Galleries" which would exhibit only illustrated scenes from the plays.¹⁵

Portrayals of Ophelia as a sufferer from love melancholy include elements ranging from the naive to the knowledgeable—the innocent flower girl to the close-to-nature erotomaniac. The seemingly contradictory yet always sexualized elements within this range derive in part from the poetic imagery of the goddess Flora.¹⁶ Ophelia's singing, her ambiguous utterances, and her unspecified but clearly disconcerting appearance are in the play, but the stage directions from one extant playscript (the "bad" quartro) and subsequent performance tradition place a particular emphasis on her hair as the crowning mark of her derangement.¹⁷ Loose, tumbledown locks of hair, haphazardly "dressed" with flowers, weeds, and straw, serve as tropes for sexual availability, lapsed social decorum, vanity, and madness.¹⁸ Depictions of Ophelia exploited this aspect of her appearance in both the flower distribution scene (4.5) and in the off-stage finale of her final submersion (4.7). In a 1784 engraving by Robert Edge Pine of the distribution scene, for example, a bare-breasted Ophelia, her hair down and intermingled with bits of straw, lets her flowers fall on the steps of the royal dais (fig. 2). Not limiting himself to disordered hair as the sole effect of madness, Pine's innovation is to construct Ophelia from Elizabethan court masque and portraiture traditions in which English aristocratic women had adopted an unprecedented degree of breast-revealing décolletage under the guise of impersonating a range of mythological and allegorical figures.¹⁹ His figure of Ophelia combines the allegorical pretensions and sexualized aspects of the masquerade portrait convention with the dishabille associated with another portrait convention, that of depicting well-known courtesans as the goddess Flora. By so manipulating allusions to allegorical impersonation in general and to Flora in particular, Ophelia's sensationally disordered appearance is gauged to accentuate the explicitly sexual content within those idealizing representational traditions.²⁰ Showing Ophelia in this degree of allegorical undress seems to have been Pine's invention.²¹ His heightening of the focus on dishabille, along with the established trait of disordered hair, recurs in later depictions such as Delacroix's lithograph of 1843 which shows Ophelia's drowning as recounted by Gertrude. These are two of the most sexually explicit representations of Ophelia in either scene, but
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Fig. 3. Thomas Rowlandson and Augustus Pugin, *St. Luke's Hospital*, color etching, 1809.
more demure formulations, like Richard Westall's engraving of 1798 for John Boydell and the 1827 lithograph by Achille Devéria and Louis Boulanger of Harriet Smithson's performance, still emphasize sexuality as a critical aspect of her disorder.

Keying up the sexual charge in representations of Ophelia so as to construct a more aggressive madwoman than Maria or Crazy Kate marks another step toward replacing the ineffectual stereotype of raving male lunacy with a female prototype of distinctive but equivalent weight. It is only after this development in the 1780s that figures of a lovestruck Ophelia–like inmate enter visual representations of asylum interiors or courtyard scenes. These depictions introduce representational variations on the practice of institutional sexual segregation by showing female wards and asylum courtyards with both sexes present. They continue to evidence the waning significance of the physically threatening male inmate as well as the increasing preoccupation with the lovestruck female stereotype. Additional representational changes in these variants correspond to adjustments in therapeutic practice associated with the so-called moral treatment. In this new therapeutic orientation, introduced during the last decade of the eighteenth century, treatment was structured to reinforce the ideals of familial domesticity, with asylum staff functioning as the inmate's surrogate family. Those stereotypical conceptions of madness as defined by family relations seemed to validate the new domestic moral emphasis and so were repositioned in these asylum scenes alongside the seemingly innovative and realistic, documentary-like details of setting and staff.

Thomas Rowlandson's interior view of St. Luke's from 1809 exemplifies this combination of psychiatric contemporaneity and conventional domesticity (fig. 3). Rowlandson has filled the expansive gallery space with tiny figures of inmates and staff all under the warden's directorial gaze. The most distracted inmates roam freely around the ward, striking recognizable poses of disorder. There are poses of melancholia common to both female and male gender stereotypes; there are gestures of hair-pulling, and hair dressed with straw à la folle, which have long been associated with the female stereotype of madness. Traits from traditional male stereotypes newly gendered female include the fists clenched with straw, upraised arms of distress or exaltation, and haranguelike gesticulations. The five inmates in the left foreground further exemplify Rowlandson's tendency to merge traditional female stereotypes with newly crossed-over types. For example, two figures from the latter group, the less familiar visual figure of a religiously obsessed, praying woman and
noisy, frantically raving virago, intermingle with two of the more familiar love-struck types with their fashion-conscious, artfully arranged clothing and hair. In their midst stands a calm, slightly melancholic inmate, neatly dressed, self-contained, hair reined in and covered, whose obedient, conforming aspect signifies that she has been successfully domesticated by the moral treatment and is close to being discharged.

Another innovative feature of the etching is its pointedly gendered central activity, which brings staff and inmates together in the domestic therapeutic task of cleaning and making beds. Toward the right, a number of staff, assisted by a few inmates, scrub the bedmats that cover the mattress supports; another adjusts the stuffing of the straw-filled mattresses. Although the household activity as depicted does not, strictly speaking, represent a work therapy program, its proximity to the inmates does suggest a connection between them. The selection of washing and bedding provides a concentration on dishabille, straw, and bedclothes that adds another level to the sexually aggressive love-struck figure. These additional elements bring to the familiar love-struck features not only conventional notions of women's work but also an association with therapeutic activities that illustrates the contiguous relation between house and body cleanliness presented as an antidote for regressive behavior in women. In this way, the activities highlight both moral cleanliness and the sexual suggestiveness implied by the disordered bedding. Subsequent depictions of asylum inmates take themselves more seriously than the moralizing yet humorous commentaries proffered by images like Hogarth's and Rowlandson's. They purport to be didactic elaborations on the nature of mental illness, at the same time that they intensify the kind of moral, prescriptive premises common to the earlier works. These are mixed-sex courtyard views which introduce, because of the presence of both sexes, a more directly comparative index to gendered distinctions in representations of madness. An 1835 engraving based on the drawing by Wilhelm Kaulbach, which shows a keeper and fifteen inmates in an asylum courtyard, exemplifies the high seriousness with which medical innovation and moral conventionality could be combined to convey clearly gendered delusional systems (fig. 4). The composition and setting of the group demonstrate both that these inmates are not especially dangerous or violent, for in that case they would be in cells along an inside yard, and that the entire institution is not limited to one sex or the other, as was the situation in France's Salpêtrière or Bicêtre. Each inmate is given a dramatic gesture or a precise attribute which is supposed to facilitate our comprehension of the inmate's disorder. Some of these are easi-
Fig. 5. Bonaventura Genelli, "Glance in an Asylum," from the engraved series published in 1868, based on a drawing of c. 1850, The Life of the Artist, Kunsthalle, Hamburg. Photo: Museum.
er to decipher than others: there are the mad scholar with his books, the soldier with sword, a man who would be king, a dejected melancholic, and a religious fanatic with a cross. Among the women, one prays, her face hidden behind a veil of her own hair, while another cradles a bundle of sticks. There is a detached, observant knitter and two women, one shorn and one coiffed, who fight over an oblivious man in a tall hat.

The various texts published with the engraving provide elaborate case histories for the inmates, but in every instance the point is repeated that madness is a punishment for questionable judgments and moral misdemeanors. These misdeeds are specifically contextualized by gender considerations. The men's problems are expressed in familiar terms of occupations or professions, but the women's conflicts are largely construed in terms of relationships and domesticity. Although this results in some familiar gender constructions of madness, two of the gender stereotypes for madwomen depicted here are recent coinages that relocate traditional formulations to a more political and criminal plane. The knitting outsider, a threatening presence in her observant post at the edges of the group is reminiscent of the *tricoteuses* of the French Revolution and thus represents women who venture outside the domestic sphere; and the mother with her inanimate bundle evokes either postpartum psychosis or infanticide, two forms of dysfunctional maternal behavior.

Similar changes in the scale and treatment of the madwomen in a courtyard mixed-sex format are evident in "Glance in an Asylum" (c. 1850) from the series, *The Life of the Artist*, by Bonaventura Genelli (fig. 5). The general setting and mad figures with their various attributes are similar to Kaulbach's and a connection between them has always seemed likely. Among the most clearly marked madmen are a deluded treasure hunter, an orator wearing a jester's cap, a frustrated poetic genius, a religious fanatic, and a musician. Except for the androgynous huddled figure at the right, each madman is tricked out with accessories which in effect belittle his grandiose obsession. For example, the poet's laurel crown, stance, and buttress of tree and drapery recall the poet of classical theory and mimic antique statuary: these references reduce the classical pretensions, which had linked the divine creative frenzy of the poet to a temporary state of heroic, inspirational madness, to a prosaic level of banality.

The treatment of the women is different: monumental rather than frivolous, they are literally as well as figuratively on a different scale. Their sexual presence is enhanced through the revealing treatment of their clothing and the theatrical excess of their gestures. There are two apparently regressive young women with protective and protecting ges-
tures—a sprawled Ophelia-type with flowers and a pose of abandonment, and a woman covering one eye while cutting the air with embroidery scissors. The latter two women are mentioned in the artist's commentary on the picture in which he claimed that the prone woman suffered from love melancholy and refused to relinquish her infatuation for the unworthy, now departed lover. It is made clear that the attachment represented an error of judgment on her part, giving a slightly different construction of culpability to the usual love-melancholy scenario of seduction and abandonment as portrayed in the novels of sensibility. The artist described the other inmate as imagining herself continually guilty of an unspecified criminal deed, which is mysteriously and somewhat threateningly conveyed through the device of sewing scissors as potential weapon.

A significant aspect of the scene at large is its relegation of the madmen to a plane of almost cartoonish triviality, where they seem simply to have let their harmless foibles get out of hand, a tactic reminiscent of the British satirical format as defined by Hogarth. In contrast to this venerable comic tradition, the women evidence distinctly more disagreeable conditions that are both more serious and more intense. They are not at all funny and seem vaguely antisocial, even menacing. Although not precisely threatening in a physically violent way, the madwomen in effect have moved into the more aggressive representational position previously held by the raving madmen of the earlier period. At the same time, the remaining nonraving, masculine stereotypes have receded to a plane of entertaining and ineffectual eccentricity, further removing madmen from any centrally defining role in the construction of madness as a contemporary ailment.

Evidence of this new gender imbalance appeared to receive empirical support in medical illustrations produced for the staff of the asylums of Paris. Here the gender emphasis was a function both of the sexually defined institutions which comprised the Hôpitaux généraux, such as the Salpêtrière (women) and Bicêtre (men), and of the inclinations of the medical personnel who trained there. In particular, the famous alienist, Etienne Esquirol, commissioned artists to produce images of patients for his numerous publications, the major work of which was Des Maladies mentales of 1838 (fig. 6). Of its twenty-four illustrations, seventeen represent women inmates. Esquirol's interest in illustrated case histories was widely influential, and other physicians, like Alexander Morison in England, followed his example.

This new branch of medical illustration subsequently influenced the works of academic painters like Genelli and Amand Gautier, whose
Fig. 7. Amand Gautier, Madwomen of the Salpêtrière: Courtyard of Agitated Inmates, lithograph of painting c. 1855, salon of 1859, Wellcome Institute Library, London. Photo: Wellcome Institute.
painting, *Madwomen of the Salpêtrière: Courtyard of Agitated Inmates* (fig. 7), was exhibited in the salon of 1859. The eight women in Gautier's composition can be divided into two distinct groups. One group appears to be clinically accurate, because it is made up of inmates constrained by straitjackets. The reliance on this device indicates that the artist is apprised of contemporary practices in the specialized domain of psychiatry and familiar with French alienists' insistence on the empirical observation of mental states. The other group consists of flamboyant figures, whose gestures and deportment are the familiar devices associated with the literary figure of the madwoman, and include an Ophelia discarding greenery, a gloomy Medea with half-shadowed face, and a simpering, pathetically lovelorn woman. One of the straitjacketed women has the traditional pose of melancholia, but the other two seem to illustrate phases of a physically uncontrollable, perhaps manic, condition. By deploying these straitjacketed figures, whose resemblance to Esquirol's illustration is striking, as replacements for the traditional figures with attributes of delusional symptoms, such as the crosses, crowns, and dolls, Gautier's image might well be assessed as marking medical progress by objectively depicting psychiatric innovations. But the larger, more imposing group of inmates, and especially the Medea and Ophelia figures, project a stylized, monumental theatricality reminiscent of the literary and dramatic tradition of stereotypically love-crazed madwomen. Gautier's combination of motifs derived from recent medical illustration with literary variants of the prototypical lovestruck madwomen has the effect of according a new status of documentary, empirical validity to the spectacular theatricality of that gender stereotype of madness. This theatricality may lend something of a more dramatic air to the straitjacketed figures, but this does not detract from the credibility of the entire image as a representation of the psychiatric actualities of the period. The transvaluation from a literary representation to a psychiatric one is reinforced, from Rowlandson to Gautier, by consistently relocating the stereotype to the notable asylums of the nineteenth century. Figures of sexually aggressive madwomen with pronounced décolletage will now stand out from the inmate group, receiving additional attention after the 1870s when the type is fortified by the pseudodocumentation of the hysterics in Jean-Martin Charcot's clinic at the Salpêtrière.

The timing of these changes in the representation of madness, the ascendency of the sexually aggressive madwoman and the disappearance of the physically aggressive male lunatic, was overdetermined by the conjunction of a complex series of events and developments in the last
decades of the eighteenth century. Mary Poovey has analyzed some of these, in particular the increasing tendency throughout the eighteenth century to position sexuality at the core of the formulations of femininity that were promulgated in conduct books. Two paradoxes fundamental to the ideology of ladylike behavior presented in these books are especially critical to the female gender stereotype for madness. First, the only negotiable social identities for women had to accommodate the paradoxical relation of sexuality to chastity, and this can be extended to suggest that available antisocial identities were similarly restricted. This paradoxical insistence on the fundamental sexuality of even the most proper lady can be found in the moralizing case histories of madwomen published during the period, which repeatedly emphasize the etiological significance of women's sexual disposition. Second, even though sexuality is the defining quality of women's nature, propriety demands that it be hidden; but if it is essential and definitive, some traces of it must be perceptible. Such a failure to achieve a one-to-one correspondence between interior content and outer appearance is a stumbling block for the truth claims of representations. This breach in correspondence is a visual dilemma shared by the construction of femininity and the female stereotype of madness. Both rely upon the same contradictory representational dynamic: the premises upon which they are constructed must be present and visible, yet at the same time inaccessible, absent, or inscrutable, thus making the construct of femininity as Poovey has defined it and the stereotype of madness coextensive misrepresentations. The sharing of this visually and ideologically contradictory dynamic is critical to the high visibility given to female stereotypes of madness at this juncture.

Anxiety about a related field of inner-to-outer equivalence in representation was expressed repeatedly during the French Revolution in debates over defining appropriate, reliable exteriorizations of political allegiance. The hectic designing and redesigning of female allegorical figures to stand for the new republic are a major index of anxieties about women in representations and about the relation of these images to reality. The more radical, even militant, pursuit of women's rights advocated by some feminists and republicans reinforced for the increasingly socially conservative male revolutionaries the idea that chaos and disorder were fundamental to women's nature, justifying even more rigorous containment in the private, domestic sphere. Hostile responses in which it was claimed that groups of women epitomized unruliness, viciousness, and insanity were associated with the women participants of the October marches, the women in revolutionary clubs, and the tricoteuses. Among
individuals, Mary Wollstonecraft and Théroigne de Méricourt, two of the more radical among feminist revolutionaries, were the representative figures in Britain and France around whom issues of disorder were constructed and with whom representations of revolutionary women were often associated. In varying degrees, these two women's writings, activities, personal conduct, questionable morals, and vulnerability to charges of emotional instability were exploited for their representational value and notoriety, with the result that the previously established gender poetics of madness in women were infused with a newly constructed gender politics of madness.\(^3\)

A further dimension to this infusion of the poetic with the political is linked to certain revolutionary debates which turned upon popular assumptions about violence and male behavior. Arguments over whether a propensity for physical violence was essential to masculinity or symptomatic of insanity, and whether this tendency to violence was an unavoidable element in revolution can be found, for example, in the writings of Edmund Burke and Thomas Paine.\(^4\) The attention focused on the capacity for physical violence in men as essential either to masculinity or to disorder drew the raving male lunatic stereotype into an inadvertently decisive role in revolutionary discourse and into a position of constructed masculinity uncomfortably similar to that which the female stereotype of madness shared with constructed femininity. The cumulative effect of this repositioning necessitated the eventual displacement of aggressive, threatening behavior from one gender stereotype to the other. The confined, raving, physically threatening madman, was retired; Caius Cibber's statues for Bethlem, one of which typified the raving lunatic, were removed from sight by 1815. The raving lunatic type as a credibly insane, incarcerated figure was further invalidated by images of mad, wandering fathers, and sane, imprisoned sons which gained political resonance briefly during the 1790s. Depictions of Nebuchadnezzar and Lear show mentally and physically diminished patriarchs who were associated through hindsight to the fate of Louis XVI and the illness of George III.\(^5\) Representations of sane young men enchained in solitary confinement seemed redolent of a heartless government's attitude toward its citizens. But the more enduring effect created by the invalidation of the lunatic stereotype was achieved when that figure's characteristic of physical aggression was added to the lovestruck stereotype, resulting in a new paradigm with inescapable political connotations, the sexually and physically aggressive madwomen of the revolution.

The obsolescence of the one raving stereotype and corresponding
strengthening of the female version of it can be demonstrated by a comparison of representations of male asylum inmates (figs. 8 and 9). In 1806, Sir Charles Bell illustrated the verbal description of a madman in Essays on the Anatomy of Expression in Painting with one of his own drawings (fig. 8). About the madman, Bell said: "You see him lying in his cell, regardless of everything, with a deathlike gloom, I mean a heaviness of the features, without knitting of the brows or action of the muscles."42 But he went on to caution that "the error into which the painter may naturally fall is to represent this expression by the swelling features of passion and the frowning eyebrow." Bell seems not to have followed his own advice, for he, too, depicted the madman with knitted brows and swelling musculature. But Bell's verbal dismissal suggests some awareness that current medical thinking no longer regarded those features as valid signs of madness. He further reduces their validity by claiming that they were really only errors of depiction anyway, a case of misrepresentation among artists rather than a scientific misrepresentation advanced by medical men. Bell emphasized instead that it was an absence of energy, itself a kind of feminized passivity, that defined the main characteristic of abnormal conditions. The falseness of the stereotype of raving physicality for men was argued further by a subsequent writer on the subject, Lyttelton Forbes Winslow:

These descriptions of insanity apply to a state of maniacal furor only; but it is not right to take this as the common type of lunacy, for not infrequently the lunatic, instead of being a repulsive person inciting alarm and trepidation, proves to be a man of prepossessing appearance, fascinating manners, agreeable conversation, full of wit, learning, and anecdote.43

By contrast, the same writer noted, in describing the women involved in the Commune of 1871, that they were maniacal lunatics in the most extreme form.44

The stereotype of the confined, raving, physically awesome madman received a further blow in 1814, when a parliamentary committee touring Bethlem found one inmate, a James or William Norris, chained by a harness to an iron bar in a cell in the lower gallery. Engravings of Norris in this condition circulated in several versions (fig. 9).45 The harness, although intended as an improvement on chains and manacles, and the length of Norris's confinement which was estimated to be about ten years, created a scandal that ended in the dismissal of the head physician at Bethlem. The engraving was conceived as an indictment of psychiatric malpractice; an important feature of the image is its contradiction of madness as awesome masculine physical power. Norris couldn't ap-
Fig. 9. George Arnauld, *James (or William) Norris*, 1814, Wellcome Institute Library, London. Photo: Wellcome Institute.
Fig. 10. Engraving after the painting by Tony Robert-Fleury. *Pinel Delivering the Inmates*, 1876, the Salpêtrière, Paris. Clements C. Fry Collection, Yale Medical Library. Photo: Library.
pear weaker, more pathetic, or ineffectual. This representation of madness not only shows a treatment practice to be inhumane, but it also shows it to be so groundless as to be totally absurd. The groundlessness of the stereotype is reiterated by the benevolent claims of the new moral treatments and the advocates of nonrestraint: physically threatening behavior is simply no longer credible as a component of mental disorder in men.46

The effect of these developments is to transform the madman from a threatening bully into a harmless gentleman, and yet a parallel transformation is absent from representations of madwomen because the female inmates never receive the corresponding treatment of a more ladylike portrayal.47 This is evident in Tony Robert-Fleury’s painting of 1876 which shows Philippe Pinel ordering the removal of chains from the inmates of the Salpêtrière, a dramatic event of liberation which was alleged to have taken place in 1795 (fig. 10).48 Only one of the inmates being released from her chains is shown with a calm and submissive demeanor; the majority evidence enough agitation and threatening behavior to justify the restraint of madwomen as therapeutically necessary, even appropriate. Ironically, although the painting’s primary message was a celebration of Pinel’s brave and humane act in releasing the inmates from their chains, the opposite ideological message, that they need to be contained, is most emphatically conveyed by the chorus of madwomen around him. Here the stereotype of the sexually aggressive madwoman who is now viewed as also physically threatening and agitated is most in evidence. Representing female disorder in the form of a physically aggressive sexuality that threatens positions of masculine authority had a powerful validity for the male spectator that can be measured by its subsequent effect: depictions of madness in women were increasingly indistinguishable from and hence reinforceable by the sexualized, predatory femme fatale figures of the fin-de-siècle.

The shift from male-dominant to female-dominant constructions of madness was thus accomplished in discrete stages from the 1780s through the first half of the nineteenth century. During this period, the figure of the sexually aggressive madwoman effectively displaced the previously more common figure of the raving male lunatic. A critical aspect of the displacement operation involved grafting the physically threatening features of the male lunatic, where they could on occasion have a somewhat positive charge, on to the gender stereotype for madness in women, where the features were given an entirely negative connotation. The gender shift achieved further credibility through a change in representational context following the revolutionary decade when the female
stereotype was transposed from a primarily poetic visual and literary field to an increasingly contemporary, politicized position. This transposition from gender poetics to gender politics supports the multiple nineteenth-century ideologies that functioned to control or contain women's sexuality and to constrain or thwart their public ambitions. Antisocial, violent, unruly, and oversexed, these figures of madwomen are represented as specimens for observation configured within the asylum's precincts, where they focalize the new medical arts of psychiatric diagnosis and treatment. Subsequent visual representations of madness in women bear the imprint of this transformation into the overexposed, mutinous hysterics of the Salpêtrière.
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