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Lady Macbeth and Early Modern Dreaming

Lady Macbeth, the bloodthirsty queen of Scotland, wife of the butcher king Macbeth, is one of the most memorable female villains of English literature. Though William Shakespeare takes much of the content of Macbeth from Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Lady Macbeth is almost entirely his own creation. He takes a one-sentence character from his source and expands and elevates her to the infamous rank of Macbeth’s “dearest partner in greatness,” from which position she acts as the driving force behind his horrific deeds through much of the play (I.v.11). Perhaps the most famous of Shakespeare’s additions to Lady Macbeth’s role is the sleepwalking scene, which serves as the climax of her theatrical power.

Strangely, existing criticism does not fully explain Lady Macbeth’s power or the significance of the sleepwalking scene. When interpreted within the context of early modern humoral theory, the sleepwalking scene becomes not only proof of Lady Macbeth’s deteriorating mental health, but also a display of the way her disease extends well beyond the confines of her body. In fact, contemporary ideas about spirits, melancholy, sleep, and the interplay between mind, body, and environment govern the entirety of Lady Macbeth’s role and reveal the true impact she has on her husband and her surroundings, beginning with her deliberate manipulation of her own humors and spirits in her early speeches and reaching a crescendo with her sleepwalking scene.
Such an argument about the role of the humors in Lady Macbeth’s sleepwalking builds on important recent criticism on *Macbeth*, chiefly the work of Suparna Roychoudhury and Mary Floyd-Wilson. Roychoudhury has examined the workings of ecstasy, the imagination, and the disease of melancholy in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. In her brief discussion of Lady Macbeth, Roychoudhury suggests that melancholy enables her to project herself beyond the confines of her own body. Floyd-Wilson essentially suggests the reverse by demonstrating the importance of weather and climate to understanding the play. According to Floyd-Wilson, the Macbeths are the two characters in the play who are most susceptible to outside influence from the environment. Both these critics make important insights on how humoral theory is at work in the play, but their arguments do not sufficiently explain why Scotland itself descends into madness alongside Lady Macbeth. They do not fully apply Galenic concepts to Lady Macbeth’s transformation from cunning and articulate master manipulator into insane somnambulist who commits suicide offstage. The Galenic system of the four humors, which originated with Galen of Pergamum in second-century Greece and became the dominant medical philosophy of early modern Europe, permeated nearly every aspect of society, just as it permeates every step of Lady Macbeth’s transformation. When we look at *Macbeth* through this lens, we see a strong motif of disturbed sleep emerging throughout the play, with Lady Macbeth’s sleepwalking episode as the centerpiece.

Ultimately, looking at Lady Macbeth from a perspective grounded in humoral theory allows us to take our analysis of the character and her role deeper than criticism that applies gendered arguments to her behavior. Cristina Alfar, for example, argues that Lady Macbeth’s villainy is not driven by internal motivations, but by her efforts to
repress her own nature in service of her husband’s goals. To make this argument, Alfar ignores the implications of humoral theory in favor of comparing Lady Macbeth’s behavior exclusively to early modern behavioral tracts for women, which emphasize the importance of women’s subservience to their fathers and husbands. The humoral approach also allows us to add to the arguments of critics like David Bevington, who looks at the function of dreams in many of Shakespeare’s plays but ignores Macbeth entirely and even Gail Kerns Paster, whose pioneering work on the humors introduced early modern psychology to the study of Shakespeare. In one chapter of her groundbreaking book *Humoring the Body*, Paster examines the implications of the humors for several of Shakespeare’s heroines, but she leaves out Lady Macbeth.

Perhaps most importantly, a humoral approach allows us to reconsider the meaning of the sleepwalking scene. We can take this scene further than Aerol Arnold, who, unlike Bevington, does include it alongside Shakespeare’s other important dream sequences, but only to examine its function as a recapitulation to build tension for the play’s climax. There would certainly be other ways to achieve this effect if that was all Shakespeare was after. Why sleepwalking? What does it mean for Lady Macbeth, and what did it mean to an early modern audience? Stuart Clark notes that sleepwalking ranked higher than frightening dreams (but lower than lycanthropy) on the scale of afflictions of a diseased imagination (50), and Roychoudhury agrees, adding that somnambulism is “one of the possible side effects of melancholic disorder” (223). Lady Macbeth’s somnambulism, then, is far more significant than a mere symptom of guilt and fear or a recap of earlier events in the play, as most criticism has suggested. It is the final consequence of her rejection of nature—the culmination of the humoral imbalance and
melancholic disease she creates and nurtures in herself and Macbeth. Further, the sleepwalking scene shows that in the world of the play, the barriers that usually exist between the internal mind and the external body and environment have eroded away. In the sleepwalking scene, we see that fantasy and reality have intermingled to such an extreme that reality itself has become Lady Macbeth’s evil dreamscape.

Lady Macbeth begins to sow the seeds of the madness that will reduce Scotland to chaos and herself to an insane sleepwalker in her very first speech, where her phrasing immediately introduces the central issues of humoral psychology at work in the play. In the midst of willing her husband home, she establishes her habit of manipulating minds by manipulating bodily fluids, saying, “Hie thee hither, / That I may pour my spirits in thine ear” (I.v.21-22). She intends to change her husband by transferring her own spirits to him. An early modern understanding of “spirits” is crucial here, because the word had two meanings. The first is one we are still familiar with now: spirits are souls, ghosts, demons, or other incorporeal beings that cannot be detected by the senses. In Galenic physiology, spirits are also “subtle highly-refined substances or fluids”—distinct from the four humors—that flow through the body, promoting health (“Spirits” 16.a). Thomas Elyot, a sixteenth-century humanist, wrote, “Spirit is an airy substance subtle, stirring the powers of the body to perform their operations” (qtd. in “Spirits” 16.a). These fluid spirits come in three types: natural spirit, a mixture of air and blood in the veins; vital spirit, a mixture of air and blood in the organs; and animal spirit, an airy mixture found in the nervous system. Animal spirits seem to be the ones Lady Macbeth is most interested in; as Floyd-Wilson says, “at the intersection between the clogged humors and the potentially hampered soul were the animal spirits; within heavy or polluted flesh, the
spirits could become ‘dulled, quenched, and damnified,’” and even more importantly, “the condition of the animal spirits can affect how quickly or sluggishly one feels emotion, how fixedly one holds a belief, or whether one senses the pangs of conscience” (138). Macbeth’s actions prove that Lady Macbeth’s efforts to pour her own spirits into him are successful, but that success comes at a cost to herself. By parting with some of her spirits to alter Macbeth’s humoral makeup, she necessarily diminishes her own physical capacities. She literally weakens herself in order to control him, and the cost will eventually be her sanity.

Lady Macbeth’s fascination with spirits is all the more significant because, though she is not the only character who speaks of them, she is the only one whose usage of the word evokes both meanings. Ross talks of Macbeth’s “lavish spirit” (I.ii.58), and Macbeth tells the murderers “your spirits shine through you” (III.ii.129), both of which seem to refer to internal spirits rather than external forces. Macbeth later uses the word twice more, once when comparing the apparitions of future kings to Banquo’s ghost, once in reference to the witches. Spirits make their second appearance in Lady Macbeth’s phrasing at the very beginning of her most famous speech. When she cries, “Come, you spirits / That tend on mortal thoughts,” she takes advantage of both definitions: the animal spirits that flow through the nervous system (fluid spirits that literally swirl around the brain, thus tending on mortal thoughts), and demonic agents that tempt and torment human minds (I.v.36-37). She unites external evil forces with internal bodily functions by harnessing both with a single word.

While contemplating Macbeth’s inadequacy, Lady Macbeth uses another double-entendre that foreshadows the dangerous consequences her manipulation of spirits still
will have: she introduces the idea that malevolent intent is the same as malignant disease. Macbeth, she says, is “not without ambition, but without / The illness should attend it” (I.v.15-16). In context, “illness” means “evil,” not “disease,” but that word choice links the two meanings together. If evil is a disease, then it can be contagious—like an airborne plague. Evil is the melancholic disease creeping across Scotland under the influence of the witches and their foul winds, and now Lady Macbeth plans to infect her husband with it. She reinforces this metaphor when she calls on the spirits to fill her “from the crown to the toe top-full of direst cruelty” (I.v.38-39). As something that she can be filled with from head to toe, cruelty has become a liquid that can trickle down inside her, saturating her body. With this line, she has distilled cruelty into the form of a fluid that can be administered like a medicine—or, more accurately, a poison—in order to change a person’s body and mind, like the spirits she already plans to pour into her husband’s ear.

Lady Macbeth pushes the boundaries of internal and external once more with her request that there be no division between her “fell purpose” and “the effect” of it. She has already sought to fuse external demons and internal spirits; with this line, she casts aside any remaining boundary between external and internal by fusing evil intent with evil action—and it may even constitute temporal manipulation, fusing present and future. Internal versus external is particularly important in Galenic theory, where the five external senses are completely separate from the components of the mind, or the “internal senses of the organic soul.” These internal senses are housed in the anterior, middle, and posterior ventricles of the brain and are comprised of imagination, which was sometimes further divided into common sense, imagination, and fantasy (the portion of the mind responsible for conjuring up images not based on real objects); reason; and memory
Stuart Clark notes that by the time Shakespeare began writing his plays, the imagination had gained prominence among those interested in the workings of the mind, viewed no longer as merely an auxiliary power of the soul but as the dominant influence, to the point where “it became the single mediator between the incorporeal soul and the corporeal human body” (43). Roychoudhury explores the significance of the “fantasy” portion of the imagination to our understanding of Lady Macbeth: the early moderns, she writes, viewed the fantasy as “a creature somehow separate from the rest of one’s person, a wayward and uncontrollable beast” (225). Lady Macbeth’s repeated efforts to force internal and external to become one constitute an assault on the imagination.

Lady Macbeth’s violations of her humoral nature also take the form, as is often noted by critics interested in how gender operates in the play, of a denial of her natural womanliness. Her request to be filled with cruelty is also paired with the plea, “unsex me here,” which is not the first time she has expressed her contempt for womanly “weaknesses” like remorse (I.v.37-39). A few lines earlier, she frets that Macbeth is “too full o’ the milk of human kindness” to do what is necessary to become king, a strong claim to make of a man who is famous for his ruthlessness on the battlefield (I.v.13). She equates unwillingness to kill one’s king with kindness, she equates kindness with weakness, and her reference to milk suggests that this particular brand of weakness is an affliction that plagues women more than men. Lady Macbeth’s desire to purge herself of womanly weakness reflects early modern ideas about the gendering of the humors. Paster devotes a significant portion of *Humoring the Body* to this issue; under the Galenic system, “men’s bodies were thought to be hotter and drier, women’s bodies colder and
Spongier bodies meant that women were thought to be more susceptible to outside or environmental influence than men, and colder bodies meant women were thought to lack the heat that is, in the words of Claude Bernard (a nineteenth-century biologist Paster cites), “essential to the manifestation of the phenomena of life. The heat which has its source in the interior of the organism, in man and in warm-blooded animals, explains how their vital activities remain free and independent, within limits, of external climatic variation” (qtd. in Paster 78). These assumptions meant that women had little opportunity to be seen as autonomous individuals who, like men, vary widely in personality and preferences. This philosophy accepted that women have passions, but unlike passion in men, passion in women was merely “temperamental inconstancy” rather than a symptom of individuality (Paster 80). As such, Lady Macbeth’s boldness and ambition would be culturally cast in a negative—even unhealthy—light.

Lady Macbeth’s ambition is even characterized as unhealthy in the play, when she links her desire to shut down the good, natural, and womanly parts of herself with her efforts to create an imbalance in her own humors. She asks the spirits to “make thick” her blood in order to “Stop up the access and passage to remorse” (I.v.39–40). The primary building blocks of the Galenic system are the four bodily humors and their associated heats and moistures: blood (hot and moist), choler or yellow bile (hot and dry), black bile (cold and dry), and phlegm (cold and moist). Predisposition towards one of the four determines an individual’s personality type, but only to a point, because balance between these four physical components within the body means health and sanity, while imbalance leads to a wide array of problems. According to Thomas Walkington, one of
Paster’s primary sources, the early moderns considered the sanguine personality to be “the prince of all temperatures, for blood is oil of the lamp of our life” (qtd. in Paster 230). Instead of this admirable humor, Lady Macbeth seeks increased portions of its opposite, black bile, which is evident from the many references to darkness in the last four lines of her speech: “Come, thick night, / And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell, / That my keen knife see not the wound it makes, / Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark” (I.v.36-39). These lines recall Macbeth’s from the previous scene, in which he bids the stars, “hide your fires; / Let not light see my black and deep desires” (I.iv.50-51). The important distinction between Macbeth’s reference to black bile and Lady Macbeth’s (besides that hers is more insistent) is that she is already thinking of actions, whereas Macbeth is only willing to contemplate desires.

The natural consequence of too much black bile is the disease of melancholy, the early moderns’ most feared disease of the imagination. The heart could suffer ill effects from melancholy, but it was primarily a disease of the brain. Melancholy afflicted the mind with “fear and despondency,” and could “induce a variety of hallucinatory derangements” (Gowland 56). Renaissance Europeans took melancholy very seriously, widely believing that those who suffered from it could be a dangerous threat to society, potentially to the extent of political upheaval, which is certainly the case in Macbeth. Stuart Clark mentions that witchcraft was one theoretical cause of melancholy. The color of black bile is significant as well. Early moderns believed that an excess of black bile formed a literal shroud of darkness over the minds and senses of those suffering from melancholy, exactly like the “thick night,” “dunnest smoke of hell,” and “blanket of dark” Lady Macbeth calls forth. The phrasing of these particular requests has far broader
consequences in the play than to Lady Macbeth’s own body, for she does not trouble to specify that she should be granted precisely enough black bile to make Macbeth kill Duncan or that the effects of melancholy be contained within her and Macbeth.

Even Lady Macbeth’s ambition serves as an early symptom of melancholy. The effects of melancholy are not limited to “troubled sleep, insomnia, and visual and auditory hallucinations” (Roychoudhury 218); the disease can also produce “rebellion, arrogance, murmuring, and insatiable desires” (de la Primaudaye qtd. in Roychoudhury 219). Lady Macbeth is aware that her behavior is unnatural for a woman; she references nature several times, but her attitude toward behaving naturally is contemptuous: in her “come you spirits” speech, nature is “compunctious” and prone to “mischief,” so she will continue to defy it by being unwomanly (I.v.41, 46). She makes her second reference to milk with “Come to my woman’s breasts, / And take my milk for gall” (I.v.43-44). If Macbeth is currently too full of the “milk” of human kindness, she will now be equipped to replace it with the gall, meaning poison, that fills her breasts. Like the spirits she will pour into his ear, this gall is a substance she can only use to change Macbeth by purging it from her own body, which will leave her emptier and weaker than before. Lady Macbeth’s third and final reference to milk two scenes later cements the role her twisted womanhood plays in infecting Macbeth with melancholy, when she speaks coldly of dashing the brains out of her own (hopefully hypothetical) child in the middle of breast-feeding him (I.vii.56-58). Scholars like Janet Adelman have placed this scene in an Oedipal context; Lady Macbeth’s previous mentions of milk in herself and Macbeth now cast Macbeth in the role of her infant son, and he bows to her wishes as if he were. Using her milk in this malevolent way also links her directly to witch folklore, because witches
were believed to influence their victims through tainted breast milk, and “worry that the nurse’s milk determined morals [of the one nursing] was, of course, common” (Adelman 112, 126). Thus, Lady Macbeth is not suppressing her own ambitions and interests for the sake of her husband, as Alfar argues; she is pouring those ambitions and interests into Macbeth, leaving little for herself. The end result may be the same (Lady Macbeth becoming weak and insane), but she is clearly doing this very much of her own volition, not as the result of society’s expectations for female behavior, which she blatantly flouts despite the risk of melancholy. Macbeth’s “womanish” reluctance to commit regicide and Lady Macbeth’s distaste for it contradicts Alfar’s argument that Lady Macbeth exists only to service Macbeth’s ambition. Lady Macbeth clearly has ambition of her own—in fact, it is the one trait she brings with her to Shakespeare from the single sentence in which she appears in Holinshed’s *Chronicles*.

The final ominous component of Lady Macbeth’s first speech are her “sightless substances,” which, when accompanied by two other references to hidden or invisible things, put to rest the question of whether or not Lady Macbeth’s words alone have the power to change anything. According to Donald Beecher in his essay on the relationship between witches and diseases of the imagination, “for members of the Christian world order, it was inadmissible to deny the imminent and active roles of demonic agents, yet dangerous to imagine or indulge them, for the imagination was the instrument within which they first moved and assumed their being and influence” (103). Lady Macbeth actively asks for intervention from demonic agents in that first speech, and if Beecher’s principle applies, the simple act of asking would have been all it took to invoke them. In early modern eyes, unlike modern understandings of psychology, “the psychological had
not yet become divorced from the physiological,” and “the mind, the body, and the world are always connected through what the philosopher Andy Clark describes as a network of ‘mutually modulatory influences’ in a dynamic action of ‘continuous reciprocal causation’” (Paster 7, 10). The mind and body were considered far more inextricably intertwined then than they are now. Ultimately, Lady Macbeth’s evil prayer, if answered, will do more damage to her own mind and body and to the surrounding atmosphere than anything the witches have done. The witches, with their manipulation of air and the mental faculty of fantasy (which conjures forth images that do not exist in the physical world), merely lay the groundwork for the idea that an individual can influence the humors of others; it is Lady Macbeth whose own willfully blighted psychology and physiology will spill out into the world.

Before Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are ever on the stage together, Lady Macbeth has begun the process of tampering with spirits both fluid and demonic, defying her natural womanliness, and manipulating her own humors to infect herself with melancholy. Her goal is to use the changes in herself to transform her husband, and while she is successful, changing Macbeth into a man who actually acts on his dark desires is not the only consequence. Now, at Macbeth’s entrance, we begin to see her transgress the boundary of her physical body, specifically in Galenic medical terms. She informs Macbeth gleefully, “Thy letters have transported me beyond / This ignorant present, and I feel now / The future in the instant” (I.v.52-54). If we interpret this as hyperbole, then it simply appears to be a prediction of what she wants to occur, but “transported” implies a sense of ecstasy, or the state of being outside oneself (Roychoudhury 221). Again, the Galenic interpretation adds new meaning to Lady Macbeth’s words. In Galenic theory,
the mechanism by which the body processes external stimuli for storage by the internal
senses is “species,” which are replicas of physical objects that travel to the eyes and into
the brain (Clark 2). Quite unlike modern understanding of the subjectivity and
suggestibility of memory, the concept of “species” implied the reliability of recall: when
we remember past events, we are reconstructing them perfectly by summoning the
species of the physical objects back into our minds. When Lady Macbeth feels “the future
in the instant,” it means she has conjured the “species” of things yet to exist in reality,
and her wish for present and future to become one has already been granted. Paster gives
an elegant summary of the Galenic system’s strong emphasis on the interplay between
the individual and his or her surroundings: “man’s flesh is earth and his passions are the
seas, because the body itself…is a vessel of liquids…. In an important sense, the passions
actually were liquid forces of nature, because…the stuff of the outside world and the stuff
of the body were composed of the same elements” (4). Macbeth declares that Lady
Macbeth’s “undaunted mettle,” will “bring forth men-children only,” and yet the couple
remains childless until their deaths (I.vii.74-75). That this is yet another very specific
consequence of Lady Macbeth’s unnatural tampering would be no mystery to a
contemporary audience; Lady Macbeth has allowed that wayward and uncontrollable
beast of fantasy to govern her mind, heedless of the fact that “it killeth and makes
abortive the fruit within the womb” (Charron qtd. in Roychoudhury 226).

We see that Lady Macbeth is successful in her efforts to imbue her husband with
her own ability to fuse external future action with internal present desire when she asks
him, mocking his phlegmatic (“green and pale”) appearance, “Art thou afeard / To be the
same in thine own act and valor / As thou art in desire?” (I.vii.40-42). However, Lady
Macbeth seems to have little control over the scope of the influence she wields or the negative consequences that result. Just as she wants, Macbeth grows more and more impulsive in his actions over the course of the play, but he does not stop with killing Duncan. He kills the grooms without consulting Lady Macbeth, and he eventually declares that “from this moment / The very firstlings of my heart shall be / The firstlings of my hand,” which results in his ordering the murder of the helpless (and unthreatening) Lady Macduff and all her children (IV.i.146-148). At the same time that the effects on Macbeth begin to spiral out of control, the more physically debilitating symptoms of melancholy begin to appear in Lady Macbeth. In the midst of the uproar over Duncan’s death and Macbeth’s “avenging” murder of the two grooms, Lady Macbeth faints. Macduff and Banquo both draw attention to her, one saying, “Look to the lady” when she first drops, the other saying it when she is carried away, effectively bracketing the fainting episode off (II.iii.112,118). The repeated line “Look to the lady” underscores Lady Macbeth’s significance in the play so far. While some productions represent her fainting as an attempt to draw attention away from her guilty husband, we must remember that Lady Macbeth is not just a cunning actress; she has summoned evil forces to tamper with her body, and she has siphoned off the fluids that make her strong into her husband. Given all that she has done to herself, it comes as no surprise that the news of Macbeth’s unnecessary slaughter of the grooms would cause her to faint, and she compromises the integrity of her mind and body even further by continuously wearing the mask of good and proper lady. She repeatedly reminds Macbeth of the importance of hiding one’s true motives when committing crimes. “Your face, my thane, is as a book where men / May read strange matters,” she warns, “Look like th’ innocent flower / But
be the serpent under ‘t” (I.v.57-60). And yet, she cannot simultaneously keep her insides
and outsides separate by wearing this mask while attempting to fuse internal and external
on so many levels. The paradox of Lady Macbeth’s two mutually exclusive goals puts her
at such extreme odds with herself that eventually something has to give way, which it
does in the sleepwalking scene. There, her façade crumbles, and because all of her
strength has transferred to Macbeth, nothing remains but guilt and fear of the awaiting
hell.

The inverse relationship between Macbeth’s increasing impulsiveness and Lady
Macbeth’s decreasing physical strength is one manifestation of the black bile soaking
their bodies spilling beyond its intended bounds; another is the deterioration of Macbeth’s
sense of sight, beginning with his hallucination of the dagger and worsening until he sees
Banquo’s ghost sitting in his own chair. As Stewart Clark says of Macbeth, “the entire
play seems to be preoccupied by the workings of human vision,” though I would amend
“workings” to “failings” (237). Sheer numbers seem to prove this claim; even though
Macbeth is the shortest of Shakespeare’s tragedies, it contains fourteen occurrences of the
word “sight,” twenty-three of “eye” twenty-nine of “look/looks/looked” and forty-one of
“see/seen/seeing/saw.” The early moderns were very concerned with diseases that could
distort visual perception, and melancholy was the most common. George Hakewill
published multiple editions (one in 1608, another in 1615) of a treatise on all the ways the
eyes could fail morally as well as physically, including presenting false images to the
inner senses, distortion by passion, influence by the devil and sorcerers, distemper of the
brain, and sins like covetousness and pride, all of which applies to the Macbeths. Where
Lady Macbeth previously conjured the “species” of future realities, Macbeth now sees a
bloody dagger, the species and symbol of his future actions, floating in the air in front of him. Roychoudhury dissects Macbeth’s hallucination of the dagger at length in her article, suggesting that his confident, repeated declarations that he sees the dagger bring the supernatural boldly to the stage for a slow, uncomfortable moment before he dismisses it with his line “There’s no such thing” (227; II.ii.47). Macbeth’s refusal to believe that the supernatural can be influencing him makes him that much more vulnerable to its effects, particularly as the parallels between the witches and his wife grow stronger. His shortsightedness on this matter is unsurprising; he believes in the same “single state of man” to which Galenic thinkers subscribed, for only women were so susceptible to external influence (I.iii.141).

Banquo’s ghost is the sequel of the voices that cried “sleep no more!” and the phantom dagger in Act II; Macbeth’s visions are evolving in complexity as his melancholy worsens. By the time Banquo’s ghost appears, Macbeth’s melancholy is much more advanced, and neither he nor Lady Macbeth can brush the symptoms aside so easily anymore. Lady Macbeth scolds him for his terror and his inability to keep face in front of their guests, but her power over him has waned. She cannot sway him from his fear this time. His vision of Banquo shows how far his melancholy has progressed and how deeply it has compromised his sense of sight. Unlike when Macbeth encountered the witches, who Banquo witnessed alongside him, none of the other people in the room can see Banquo’s ghost sitting in Macbeth’s chair (including Lady Macbeth, who is at least as melancholic as he is). When Macbeth heard the voices and saw the dagger, he was alone, so it is impossible to say for sure whether he was hallucinating, but now there are witnesses, and no one else can see the ghost. When he saw the dagger, he could reason it
away, but now he is utterly incapable of separating vision from reality, meaning that his melancholy has now reached the advanced stages of interfering with reason. The vision operates exactly as dreams caused by melancholy would, except that he cannot sleep, so it afflicts his waking mind instead.

Contemporary ideas about sleep and dreaming, which are closely connected to principles of humoral theory at work in the play, can help us understand how Macbeth’s waking hallucinations serve the same purpose as melancholic dreams. Renaissance Europeans believed dreams and melancholy were closely related, as the former is produced by the imagination and the latter is a disease of the imagination. Much of Renaissance understanding of dreaming was taken from Aristotle—or, at least, as much of Aristotle as could be comfortably reconciled with Christianity. A melancholy disposition would affect the imagination by creating horrible dreams and hallucinations, and once the black bile clogged the middle ventricle of the brain (reason), the sufferer would lose the ability to distinguish visions from reality, just as Macbeth does when Banquo’s ghost appears. Sixteenth-century French physician André du Laurens traced the frightening visions of sleeping melancholics to black bile, “and explained further that this was either because the dominant humour produced a corresponding species for the phantasy, which in turn triggered the memory to recall disturbing images; or else because the corrupt and blackened animal spirits, circulating in the brain and elevated to the eyes, presented dark objects to the phantasy” (Gowland 70). There was much debate on the subject of whether these dreams could ever be prophetic. Evidence from the Bible proved to many that prophetic dreams were entirely possible, though most hesitated to presume the dreams of an ordinary English citizen could be prophetic, and some scholars took
Aristotle’s entirely skeptical view on the subject. It was a topic of sufficient interest at the time for multiple authors to publish dream interpretation guides. The writings of Artemidorus Daldianus (a contemporary of Galen) on the subject were translated into many languages over the centuries, and finally into English in 1606, with multiple English editions emerging through the end of that century. Thomas Hill wrote at least two editions of his own oneiromancy guide, *The Moste pleasant Art of the Interpretation of Dreams*, in the late sixteenth century, and continued to publish shorter guides into the early decades of the seventeenth. Macbeth’s own dreams do not appear as scenes in the play, but thanks to Lady Macbeth’s machinations, the boundaries between internal and external are quickly eroding; therefore, outward hallucinations, visions from the witches, and even sleepwalking take the place of inward dreams.

Sleep played a crucial role to the health of the individual in early modern England. The balance of humors could be influenced by six “nonnulls”: passion, air, diet, fullness and emptiness, sleeping and waking, and exercise. In *Macbeth*, the most significant of the six nonnulls are passion, air, and sleeping and waking. Passion in an early modern context goes beyond mere emotion and drive; it comprises the “thoughts or states of the soul which represent things as good or evil for us, and are therefore seen as objects of inclination or aversion” (James qtd. in Paster 10). Lady Macbeth achieved the manipulation of her humors through the manipulation of her passions as well as her spirits, purging the good and opening herself up to evil. Air refers to the environment, which is significant in the play partly because of the difference between the Scottish environment and the English, and the witches immediately establish their connection to air in the play with their chant, “Hover through the fog and filthy air” (I.i.12).
disruption of the nonnaturals of passion and air, caused by Lady Macbeth tampering with humors and spirits and the witches tampering with the weather, seem to be where the problems in the play begin, and the consequences manifest through the disruption of the nonnatural of sleeping and waking.

The idea of disturbed sleep first appears in the third scene of the play, still closely intertwined with the nonnatural of air. Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have yet to arrive onstage when the witches begin foreshadowing the restlessness that will soon plague Scotland:

I will drain him dry as hay:
Sleep shall neither night nor day
Hang upon his pent-house lid;
He shall live a man forbid:
Weary se’nnights nine times nine
Shall he dwindle, peak and pine. (I.iii.18-23)

With this curse of insomnia, Shakespeare links the disruption of the four humors with the disruption of sleep. The first witch says she will drain the man “dry as hay” in order to achieve her goal, which will tip the balance of his humors towards black bile and render him melancholic. Shakespeare also reinforces the witches’ connection to air in this passage, with one saying “I’ll give thee a wind” and the ensuing banter between them about trading and keeping winds (I.iii.11). Floyd-Wilson explains the significance of this banter in her essay; witches allegedly had power over the air and weather, and they could control the winds for the good or ill fortune of sailors, like the ones these witches mention (143). Macbeth observes the paradoxical “fairness” and “foulness” of the
weather, which suggests that the witches are as good as their word, and one of the six nonnaturals that can affect the bodily humors is indeed under their control.

The witches are the first ones in the play to disturb the sleep of others, but the Macbeths do so in a far more violent manner, and, just as Lady Macbeth inadvertently invites catastrophe when she manipulates forces beyond her control, the consequences will rebound to plague them as much as their victims. Unlike in Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, where Macbeth kills King Duncan in battle, Shakespeare’s Macbeth waits until King Duncan is a sleeping guest in his home before killing him—the ultimate act of disturbing another person’s sleep. Lady Macbeth plants the bloody daggers on the sleeping grooms to frame them for King Duncan’s murder. As Macbeth contemplates the crime he is about to commit, he says, “Now o’er the one half world / Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse / The curtain'd sleep” (II.ii.50-52). Nightmares (in the modern sense of the word) already abound throughout Scotland, though the king still lives, and Macbeth seems to be aware of them, even though he is walking alone in his castle. The widespread nightmares could be the doings of the witches, but Macbeth’s ability to sense them is another symptom of the melancholy with which Lady Macbeth infected him. He seems to be sensing the “species” of everyone else’s dreams, which should be contained safely inside their heads, and this also recalls Lady Macbeth “feeling the future in the instant” and the collapsing boundaries between interior and exterior.

The sleeping grooms’ reaction to Macbeth introduces a possible countermeasure to the evil of the melancholic disease. When Macbeth goes to kill Duncan, “one did laugh in’s sleep, and one cried ‘Murder!’,” which starts them both awake until they pray (II.ii.26). Prayer to counteract disturbed sleep further strengthens the idea of a
supernatural, evil cause for the disturbance (as opposed to something mundane, like the sound of Macbeth’s approaching footsteps). A few lines later, the “amen” sticks in Macbeth’s throat, reinforcing this subtle motif of divine protection as a shield against disturbed sleep (II.ii.37). The grooms could restore sleep with prayer, but now that he has killed the king, Macbeth can no longer pray. Shakespeare is using the relationship of disturbed sleep and prayer to show that the Macbeths’ descent into melancholic madness is intertwined with their descent into evil. Shortly after losing the ability to pray, Macbeth hears a disembodied voice cry, “Sleep no more! Macbeth does murder sleep” (II.iii.39-40). These words prove to be true; Macbeth does not sleep well for the rest of the play. Once on the throne, he suffers “the affliction of these terrible dreams / that shake [him] nightly” (III.ii.20-21) and laments enviously that “Duncan is in his grave; / After life’s fitful fever he sleeps well” while he, Macbeth, can get no sleep (III.ii.24-25). The fact that his insomnia is foretold by the disembodied voice indicates that his inability to sleep is because of melancholy, not guilt. It does not matter whether Macbeth is hallucinating or hearing an actual disembodied voice, because melancholy covers both alternatives, and Lady Macbeth conjured both demonic spirits and bodily fluids to assist her in manipulating him.

So far, we have seen Lady Macbeth’s efforts to manipulate internal fluids and external forces, deliberately infecting herself with melancholy in order to change Macbeth. We have seen many of the consequences of these efforts, both intended (when Macbeth kills Duncan) and unintended. The unintended consequences are far more numerous, ranging from Macbeth’s commission of additional, unplanned, and unnecessary murders, Lady Macbeth’s physical weakness, and Macbeth’s hallucinations.
Now, we arrive at the sleepwalking scene itself, the ultimate demonstration that Lady Macbeth is now at the mercy of the very forces she naïvely set out to control in her first speech. Even more than Macbeth’s hallucinations, the sleepwalking scene is the culmination of all Lady Macbeth has set in motion by manipulating spirits and humors and assaulting the divide between inside and outside. After spending much of the play chastising her husband for his weakness and “brainsickly” thinking, Lady Macbeth herself succumbs to the ill effects of disturbed sleep, though in a far more dramatic fashion than anyone else in the play. Her behavior here can be understood in terms of the definition of sleepwalking given by Thomas Hill in his dream interpretation guide. In response to the question “Why is it that certain sleeping [people] do exercise the works of persons waking?” he writes, “not simply they do sleep, nor properly be waking although the vapor in the time of sleep doth stop the organ of the common sense, and repel the heat and spirits toward the heart. Yet sometimes with that vapor does some…fear or boldness remain” (42). If we apply Hill’s description, Lady Macbeth is neither properly asleep nor awake as she sleepwalks, and her common sense no longer functions. She certainly seems to be moved by fear; while reenacting earlier scenes, she focuses on the evidence of her crimes—the blood on her hands and Macbeth’s suspicious behavior and hallucinations that almost ruined their plans. Without the addition of the doctor’s commentary, Lady Macbeth’s attitude about these reenactments might still not necessarily be clear, but he observes her sigh and remarks, “the heart is sorely charged,” much like the “heat and spirits” afflicting the heart in Hill’s analysis of sleepwalking (V.i.42).

Hill goes on to emphasize the effect of the unnatural separation of mind and physical faculties during sleepwalking. Sleepwalkers can walk and talk, but these actions
are not governed as much by the common sense as waking speech and actions, so
sleepwalking more closely resembles the incoherent ramblings of someone suffering a
fever (43). Lady Macbeth’s doctor admits, “this disease is beyond my practice,” because,
as Hill suggests, it is not her body that is ill, but her mind (V.i.47). Hill also accounts for
the subjective experience of the sleepwalker: “they come unto the place [that was] in the
day time imagined,” reliving recent memories “not by sight in that the eyes are then shut
but of the inward fantasy by which they walk in the dark” (43). Lady Macbeth’s eyes are
open in the sleepwalking scene (although that may be more for the convenience of the
actor than for the sake of portraying realistic somnambulism), but the doctor and
gentlewoman observe that though “her eyes are open…their sense are shut,” which
mirrors the condition Hill describes (V.i.20-21). She sees the scenes and hears the sounds
of the past, and she smells blood on her hands even though it isn’t physically there. The
gentlewoman’s assessment is correct. The “sense” of her eyes refers to both her outer,
physical senses and her common sense, a mental faculty that shuts down during sleep,
leaving the unwieldy, suggestible imagination in charge. It is clear that she can no longer
distinguish vision from reality, so her reason is likely impaired as well, like Macbeth’s
when his melancholy reached its advanced stages in the scene with Banquo’s ghost. Hill
concludes his section on sleepwalking by acknowledging its darkest implications, which
fit Lady Macbeth’s experience perfectly. “Sometimes,” he writes, “they think to kill a
man, and sometimes that they themselves are dead, because the fantasy does again that
which either it conveys or fears” (44). In between fretting over the blood on her hands
and reliving Duncan’s murder, Lady Macbeth mutters, “hell is murky” (V.i.29). Her
thoughts are full of past murders committed and the future of her own impending death.
By the time the play arrives at the sleepwalking scene, all the damage Lady Macbeth has inflicted on her imagination by forcing the internal and external together has caused it to give way completely. In consequence, her internal senses have become so completely entangled with her external ones that she is able to walk, talk, and even write without perceiving her true surroundings. Her efforts to hide her true intentions behind the mask of the gentle hostess have failed at last. She may have succeeded in fooling the people around her at first, but the cost is the structural integrity of her mind. When the somnambulant Lady Macbeth makes her appearance with a candle, the gentlewoman notes, “she has light by her continually. ‘Tis her command,” which is a significant contrast to her earlier behavior. Throughout the play, Lady Macbeth has attempted to conduct her schemes under cover of darkness—she has in fact summoned darkness for this purpose—but with darkness comes melancholy, and now that the terrible deeds are done and her mind is drowning in black bile, she fears that darkness (V.i.18-19). As when Macbeth heard “Sleep no more,” the cause of Lady Macbeth’s trouble is not immediately apparent. By early modern understanding, the ventricles of her brain housing memory, imagination, and fantasy are bypassing common sense and controlling her body directly, so her affliction could merely be the result of her guilt-plagued mind. However, the doctor’s claim that “this disease is beyond my practice,” and Lady Macbeth’s line “hell is murky” both suggest that there may be a supernatural or spiritual layer as well (V.i.29, 47). It is significant that the character who makes this claim is a doctor, not a priest. A priest might be biased in favor of a supernatural explanation when the evidence is not sufficient, but the doctor, who should be biased in favor of medical explanations, admits that a physiological explanation wouldn’t be enough. The doctor’s uncertain diagnosis
reflects a significant debate amongst physicians in the decades before and after
Shakespeare wrote *Macbeth*. Carol Thomas Neely cites Richard Napier, a doctor,
minister, and astrologer who often covered all his bases when diagnosing patients by
prescribing a combination of physical, astrological, and spiritual cures for madness (47).
It seems quite logical, therefore, that Lady Macbeth’s doctor would avoid ruling out any
possible cause for her sleepwalking. When the doctor reports to Macbeth, he informs him
that she is “Not so sick… / As she is troubled with thick-coming fancies / That keep her
from her rest” (V.iii.39-41). He still avoids giving a definite medical or supernatural
diagnosis, even when Macbeth pushes for the former. The phrase “thick-coming fancies”
is a careful construction with multiple meanings: they could be fantasy images created by
her brain or visions riding on the air.

Lady Macbeth’s somnambulism is the epitome of disturbed sleep in the play
because it no longer resembles sleep. The sleeper has departed so far from what is natural
that she intrudes into the waking world, manipulating objects and instilling fear in those
who observe her. Lady Macbeth’s doctor departs the sleepwalking scene with the chilling
words, “Foul whisperings are abroad. Unnatural deeds / Do breed unnatural troubles”
(V.i.58-59). Lady Macbeth has certainly committed enough “unnatural deeds” to bring
such troubles down on her head. The sleepwalking episode shows the troubles she has
reaped, but they are by no means limited to her person. The boundaries between internal
and external have not only given way between her mind and body; they have given way
between her person and the environment. If people in early modern England believed that
the individual could be powerfully impacted by the environment, then *Macbeth* seems to
suggest that the reverse is also possible, and the environment can be impacted by the
actions of individuals. Referring back to Floyd-Wilson’s argument about the extreme passability (meaning susceptibility to humoral influence from the environment) of Scottish Highlanders, even compared to other Scottish people (and certainly compared to Englishmen), the Macbeths are perfect specimens for such a reciprocal relationship with the environment. Lady Macbeth, who as a woman is already more susceptible to outside influence than her husband, would therefore have even more power over her surroundings than Macbeth.

Lady Macbeth’s sleepwalking is the play’s most dramatic example of the effect on one individual of the inward transgression of the boundaries between the mind and the outside world, but Scotland bears the marks of the outward transgression of those same boundaries. Not long after Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have both asked for darkness to shroud their activities, an old man muses, “Threescore and ten I can remember well, / Within the volume of which time I have seen / Hours dreadful and things strange, but this sore night / Hath trifled former knowledge” (II.iv.1-4). That this night could be so terrible compared to his seventy years of nights is no surprise, for the king has just been murdered in his bed, but Ross reveals that it isn’t night at all:

By th’ clock ‘tis day,
And yet dark night strangles the traveling lamp.
Is ‘t night’s predominance or the day’s shame
That darkness does the face of earth entomb
When living light should kiss it? (II.iv.6-10).

With a wink to the fact that he is a character on a stage, Ross describes the pervasive effects of black bile, no longer limited to the Macbeths’ bodies. Their wish for darkness
has been granted to an extreme: Scotland itself has contracted the disease of melancholy. Black bile “strangles” and “entombs” the land. The wound the Macbeths created in Scotland by murdering the king has become infected. Other symptoms include an owl killing a falcon (a symbol of night’s triumph over day) and Duncan’s horses going mad and eating each other.

By Act IV, these ill omens have given way to utter chaos, and even though none of Scotland’s woes seem to be the direct result of the Macbeths’ leadership style, the Macbeths are clearly the cause. Ross reports to Malcolm in England that Scotland “cannot / Be called our mother, but our grave” (V.iii.166-167). The land, more a grave now than a mother, resembles the body of Lady Macbeth, the nursing mother with no child, who speaks of dashing out an infant’s brains. The voices Macbeth once heard alone have multiplied so that “sighs and groans and shrieks rend the air” (V.iii.168). The line “violent sorrow seems / A modern ecstasy” indicates that ecstasy is no longer an individual experience of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth; it is pandemic (V.iii.169-170). From the lines “The dead man’s knell / Is scarce asked for who, and good men’s lives / Expire before the flowers in their caps, / Dying or ere they sicken,” we see that men are dropping dead for no reason, like the victims Macbeth had no reason to kill (V.iii.170-173). To all this, Edward the Confessor serves as the perfect foil. Where disease and darkness spread in the Macbeths’ domain, King Edward possesses the literal healing touch to free England of illness. Where Scotland’s landscape is war-torn, England is peaceful. Malcolm’s description of Edward is littered with words like “miraculous,” “heaven,” “golden,” “holy,” “healing,” “virtue,” “blessings,” and “grace,” which could
not be farther from the “untitled tyrant bloody-sceptered” king of Scotland and his “fiend-like queen.”

If terrible dreams can plague both waking minds and the walking sleeper while Scotland descends into nightmarish conditions, then there is no longer much of a practical difference between dreams and reality. Bevington argues that Shakespeare uses dreams and visions in many of his plays as either meta-theatrical commentary or as prophecy. The entirety of *Taming of the Shrew*, for example, can be read as the dream of a drunk fool, and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* concludes with Puck suggesting the whole thing was nothing but a dream. There is no such frame around *Macbeth*, but Arnold notes that “the rapid shift from dream to hallucination helps to create the feeling that the play is a species of evil dream” (58). Macbeth himself states early in the play that “nothing is but what is not,” suggesting that fantasy is more real than reality (I.iii.143). Ross’s reference to the stage points to the same meta-theatricality characteristic of the dreams Bevington analyzes in other plays, and Macbeth adds to it when he learns of Lady Macbeth’s death, declaring “Life’s but a walking shadow, a poor player / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage” (V.vi.24-25). With these fourth wall straining moments and the prophecies of the witches, Shakespeare is using reality in *Macbeth* in the same two ways Bevington claims he uses dreams in his other plays, making the whole of *Macbeth* seem like a dream.

As the play itself begins to resemble a dream, it becomes subject to ideas of early modern dream interpretation. And indeed, the phrasing of the witches’ chorus of “fair is foul, and foul is fair / Hover through the fog and filthy air” (I.i.11-12) closely resembles Hill’s “air dark or darkish,” which portends sorrows and heaviness of mind when it
occurs in dreams, like the weather in Scotland and its effect on the populace (176).

Macbeth’s vision of Banquo’s ghost and the subsequent calamities in Scotland mirror Hill’s passage, “To dream that he sees those things which be wont to lie hid under the earth as bones, or carcasses of the dead, or monstrous forms, declareth that thereof shall succeed strangeness and troubles;” Macbeth sees someone who should be dead and buried (Banquo), and strangeness and troubles come when Birnam wood marches to Dunsinane (88). Dream interpretation was a popular enough subject that Shakespeare’s audiences would have been familiar with these dream tropes. A crucial distinction, however, is that these dark portents do not appear in dreams in the play; they appear in the forms of a ghost and foul weather caused by witches.

As popular as oneiromancy was in Shakespeare’s day and as pervasive as the humoral theory was in society, the motif of disturbed sleep in Macbeth—which, like Lady Macbeth herself, was largely absent from the source material—would have been clear to early modern audiences. For the most part, the play follows typical Galenic ideologies: changes in the Macbeths’ personalities are facilitated by literal changes in body composition; as a woman, Lady Macbeth is more susceptible to outside influence, but as Scottish Highlanders, the Macbeths are both at risk; and the disease of melancholy behaves precisely as contemporary physicians would expect. Where the play breaks the mold is with Lady Macbeth’s outward transgression of the boundary of her body, giving her as much if not greater influence over people and surroundings as the witches. Her illness is not merely the result of summoning dark forces to tamper with her bodily humors, but of siphoning off her own energies into Macbeth. This semi-parasitic, semi-Oedipal relationship leads to such dramatic disturbances in the Macbeths’ sleep that it
gives Macbeth waking visions and propels Lady Macbeth into chronic somnambulism.

The “unnatural troubles” bred of Lady Macbeth’s “unnatural deeds” within her own body spiral outward, first to Macbeth, persuading him to commit murder, after which they continue to spread and impact the rest of Scotland until the entire play resembles Lady Macbeth’s dark, bloody fever-dream.
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