The Traumatic Stress of Revenge and War in *Hamlet* and Stephan Wolfert's *Cry Havoc!*

Christine M. Gottlieb
California State University, East Bay

Introduction

In *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors—and Ours*, Alan Warren Friedman analyzes *Hamlet*'s paradoxical status as a play that both is and is not about a "returning warrior."[1] I argue this paradox is related to the play's dramatization of the alienation of traumatic stress in a context of suppressed collective trauma. In both *Hamlet* and contemporary America, trauma is both pervasive yet individualized; it is largely unrecognized at the cultural level, yet medicalized at the level of the subject. This dynamic is particularly relevant to America's treatment of veterans with posttraumatic stress. Stephan Wolfert's *Cry Havoc!*[2] excavates these paradoxes, bringing them to the surface to create cathartic theater that is both a one-man play and a communal experience. Wolfert shares his experience as an Army veteran and the work itself creates a community of Shakespeare's isolated veterans: Richard III shares the stage with Coriolanus and Macbeth. Wolfert goes beyond dramatizing trauma and explicitly aims to heal veterans' trauma; *Cry Havoc!* raises awareness about Wolfert's DE-CRUIT program, "which uses theatre to address traumatic stress and related problems encountered by veterans."[3]

By putting *Hamlet* into conversation with *Cry Havoc!*, I argue that both plays reveal the trauma of being recruited for war. *Hamlet*

intervenes in the genre of revenge tragedy by dramatizing how Hamlet's recruitment for revenge is a traumatizing experience. *Cry Havoc!* depicts the trauma of being recruited for war, but not "de-cruited" after completing military service, while the DE-CRUIT program offers a model for healing this trauma. Both *Hamlet* and *Cry Havoc!* explore traumatic stress as a "psychosocial disability," which is defined by Disability Studies scholar Margaret Price as a term that "bumps *psych* (soul) against social context."[4] Both plays illustrate the failure of medicalizing traumatic stress as a problem isolated in individuals and instead indict the social contexts that perpetuate trauma. By dramatizing the trauma of revenge and war, both plays interrogate social constructions that intertwine masculinity with violence.

Rather than pathologizing individuals, both plays show the "havoc" and trauma inherent in revenge and war. Charles Edelman notes: "Shakespeare's use of 'cry havoc' seems not to be within the confines of its original meaning, a signal, once victory is achieved, that spoil may taken, but is given as a threat of war's devastation."[5] Edelman describes the non-battlefield deaths at the conclusion of *Hamlet* as epitomizing the "'havoc' of war."[6] Both *Hamlet* and *Cry Havoc!* highlight the destructive physical and psychological effects of revenge, war, and recruitment—both on the battlefield and off.

The Trauma of Recruitment for Revenge in *Hamlet*

Hamlet consistently courts and baffles the medical model of mental illness. The play dramatizes the obsession with finding the "cause" of *Hamlet*'s "madness," as well as the futility of doing so. Criticism of the play has plumbed the question of Hamlet's madness and offered centuries of diagnoses for Hamlet and Ophelia. Bennet Simon traces the history of applying the medical model to *Hamlet*, writing:

> My fundamental thesis is that psychoanalytic interpretations, particularly those of individual characters in the play, rely on a long-standing "medical model." This is most prominent in regard to the question of Hamlet's insanity—whether it is real, feigned, or both. […] Much energy has gone into diagnosing the precise nature of Hamlet's melancholy and Ophelia's madness.[7]

Simon continues:

> Apart from illustrating the crossover between the medical and literary (or theatrical) realms, this kind of diagnostic effort is important for my purpose   because   it   tends to locate the problem within the individual. Hamlet, in other words, is thought to be a certain way because that is the way melancholics *are*. This kind of medical diagnosing shortcircuits literary and social questions, such as how much Hamlet is affected by the external rottenness in Denmark and how much is due to his innate disposition.[8]

In contrast to this, Simon offers a "psychodynamic analysis"[9] of the play's "traumatized environment."[10] He writes: "With reference to *Hamlet*, a better term for capturing the plight of the characters is 'complex traumatic stress syndrome' (Herman 1992), which signifies that the traumatic events are not entirely in the past."[11]

Similarly, in his analysis of *Hamlet* in relation to veterans' experiences, Friedman writes:

> Yet it is impossible to determine the extent to which Hamlet's volatile mood swings result from Denmark's rottenness (and his being set aside as his father's heir and his mother's favorite) and how much from his innate disposition; and the two are not mutually exclusive. His emotional and erratic range and control, his wild lashing out at those around him, track those of many veterans.[12]

Medical model diagnoses that locate a "problem" in Hamlet's bodymind will always be insufficient. Hamlet's "problem" is inextricable from his social world: the corruption of Denmark, his uncle's murder of his father, his mother's remarriage, and the Ghost's command to revenge.

Arguably, all of the play's characters are experiencing trauma, yet they all do so acutely alone. The pervasive trauma of "rotten" Denmark is suppressed, yet persistently embodied by individual characters. Hamlet and Ophelia are both profoundly alienated in their traumatic stress. When this trauma becomes personalized and narrativized as disorder, it becomes, to use Mitchell and Snyder's influential Disability Studies concept, a "narrative prosthesis": something to be cured or killed at the level of the individual character.[13]

Hamlet's traumatic stress becomes something to be eliminated through revenge. Like other revenge tragedies, there is a fantasy that

revenge may "cure" the trauma, yet ultimately, there is only killing. Unlike other revenge tragedies, however, *Hamlet* explores the complex trauma of being tasked with revenge. The alienation that Hamlet experiences at the start of the play is exacerbated by being given the alienating role of the revenger, and further heightened by being unable to fulfill this role. The play's meditation on the ethics of revenge dovetails with its exploration of the trauma of being commanded to inflict violence.[14]

The Ghost, in "warlike form" (1.1.46), attempts to recruit Hamlet for combat.[15] Friedman writes: "The Ghost is, nonetheless, the figure in the play who most unequivocally enacts the role of returning warrior."[16] Rather than recruit Hamlet for the open warfare Fortinbras engages in, the Ghost recruits him for revenge: a hidden, alienated war of one against one. The Ghost commands: "Revenge his foul and most unnatural murder!" (1.5.25), yet continues: "But, howsomever thou pursues this act / Taint not thy mind nor let thy soul contrive / Against thy mother aught" (1.5.84-6). *Hamlet* shows these commands to be paradoxical. Hamlet cannot pursue the act of revenge without his mind being tainted; perhaps no one can.[17]

Friedman writes:

> Deborah Willis maintains that "Shakespeare's insight [is] that revenge can provide an emotional container for traumatic loss and humiliation" and that it "may even protect survivors from the many symptoms of PTSD." But Hamlet's narrowing of himself in response to the Ghost's charge provokes and exacerbates his symptoms.[18]

While, according to Willis, *Titus Andronicus* explores the (limited) healing potential of revenge,[19] I argue that *Hamlet* exposes the fantasy of revenge's healing potential, alongside the traumatizing psychic effects of being tasked with revenge. *Hamlet* is unique as a revenge tragedy because it shows explicitly how the revenger, although attempting to undo trauma by avenging it, becomes further traumatized by the process.

Hamlet's ambivalence about being recruited for revenge bespeaks his ambivalence about warrior culture generally. Robin Headlam Wells writes: "Paul Cantor has argued that Hamlet's ethical dilemma is expressed in the form of a conflict between two incompatible cultures: the heroic world of classical epic and Norse

saga, and the modern world of Christian-humanist values."[20] This temporal conflict can also be mapped onto competing early modern ideals of masculinity, types which Bruce R. Smith identifies as the "Herculean Hero" and the "Humanist Man of Moderation."[21] Disputing the Romantic notion that Hamlet is "a philosopher-prince trapped in a violent world that is alien to his true nature,"[22] Wells analyzes how Hamlet is drawn to warrior culture as embodied by Old Hamlet. Wells writes: "Hamlet's father typifies the exaggeratedly masculine world of heroic values that Saxo described in his chronicle; he was, says Hamlet with eloquent simplicity, 'a man' (1.2.186)."[23] Similarly, Fortinbras presents a view of masculinity that Hamlet admires: "Fascinated, as he is, with heroic violence, it is perhaps understandable that Hamlet should be drawn to the hot-blooded, and appropriately named, young neo-Viking warrior."[24] Sidestepping the critical debate about Hamlet's morality, Wells argues: "More to the point is to see what a powerful hold on the imagination the rhetoric of heroic masculinity can exercise, and to recognize its potential for creating political instability," which Wells contends that Hamlet's endorsement of Fortinbras will bring for Denmark.[25]

Hamlet's ambivalent admiration of "heroic masculinity" aligns with his view of wrathfulness. Catherine Belsey has examined Hamlet's soliloquies in relation to ethical dilemmas of morality plays, particularly dynamics of Conscience versus Wrath. Belsey writes: "Wrath is a vice-figure who consistently urges his victims to mindless and unhesitating belligerence. In *The Castle of Perseverance* he instructs Mankind, 'Be also wroth as Þou were wode' (as if you were mad, 1.1088); 'Be redy to spylle mans blod' (1.1092)."[26] Belsey analyzes allusions to Wrath in Hamlet's soliloquies:

> One part of his nature is committed, because he loved his father and because he is outraged by his mother's incest and his uncle's villainy, to passionate, mindless vengeance. … The language of these passionate, self-castigating soliloquies is often crude and blustering, and the values they express fall little short of those of Pyrrhus, drenched with blood, … Revenge entails the "lawless resolutes" of Fortinbras, the poisoned sword of Laertes, and above all Hamlet's refusal to kill Claudius while he is praying … It is crude, extravagant, and wildly in excess of justice.[27]

As Belsey and Spivack note, Wrath could be disguised as Manhood in morality plays.[28] Hamlet's ambivalence toward revenge, war, and wrath speak to his ambivalence about social constructions that align masculinity with excessive violence.

The beserker, which Wolfert explores in *Cry Havoc!*, is the battlefield embodiment of Wrath. While *Hamlet* probes the psychic and ethical dilemma of Wrath being at the heart of his recruitment for the seemingly "noble" and "sacred duty" of revenge,[29] *Cry Havoc!* plumbs the psychic consequences of the beserker-imperative implicit in being recruited for war.[30] In his highly influential *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character*, Jonathan Shay writes: "*Beserk* comes from the Norse word for the frenzied warriors who went into battle naked, or at least without armor, in a godlike or god-possessed—but also beastlike—fury."[31] Based on his psychiatric work with Vietnam veterans, Shay contends: "The beserk state is the most important and distinctive element of combat trauma."[32]

While the beserk state is inherently traumatizing, it is also a way of mourning the dead. Shay writes: "The beserker's manic obsession with revenge is not only destruction to gratify rage. At some deep cultural and psychological level, spilling enemy blood is an effort to bring the dead back to life."[33] Shay continues: "In addition to reviving the dead, revenge denies helplessness, keeps faith with the dead, and affirms that there is still justice in the world, even if this is manifested only in the survivor's random vengeance."[34] Hamlet deeply desires to be a beserker: he longs to imaginatively revive his father through infinite bloodshed. He fantasizes about unleashing carnage, soliloquizing about how he "should ha' fatted all the region kites / With this slave's offal" (2.2.514-15) and how he "could … drink hot blood" (3.2.380). He admires Fortinbras's military sacrifice of "twenty thousand men" (4.4.59), "Even for an eggshell" (4.4.52). He even fantasizes theater as a form of vengeance, desiring to inflict violence upon audiences' ears that mirrors Claudius's poisoning of Old Hamlet's ear:

> … He would drown the stage with tears
> And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
> Make mad the guilty and appall the free,
> Confound the ignorant and amaze indeed
> The very faculties of eyes and ears. (2.2.497-501)

Hamlet views the First Player's tears for Hecuba and Fortinbras's military action admiringly because he desires not only to consummate his revenge, but also to share his family's suppressed trauma. The actor's empathetic performance of a monologue and Fortinbras's commanding of an expendable army both represent strategies for sharing the emotional weight of his burden to revenge.

According to Shay, "healing from trauma depends upon communalization of the trauma—being able safely to tell the story to someone who is listening and who can be trusted to retell it truthfully to others in the community."[35] There is no healing in *Hamlet*; the only way in which Hamlet's trauma is shared is through the rampant deaths of the final scene. Hamlet desires posthumous communalization of his trauma, commanding Horatio: "tell my story" (5.2.333). Yet, as Friedman analyzes, Horatio's retelling will be inadequate: "Horatio will recount the kind of Senecan revenge tragedy plot that Eliot critiqued the play for failing to conform to. But he will not, perhaps because he cannot or perhaps because his auditors cannot hear or comprehend, say anything of Hamlet's appalled and traumatized response to the horrific ways of a social order corrupted by brute militarism."[36]

Fortinbras describes the carnage of the play's conclusion as the aftermath of "havoc" (5.2.348).[37] Although Hamlet is not a soldier and psychically resists being recruited for combat, Fortinbras honors him as a soldier in death:

> Let four captains
> Bear Hamlet like a soldier to the stage,
> For he was likely, had he been put on,
> To have proved most royal. And for his passage,
> The soldiers' music and the rite of war
> Speak loudly for him.
> Take up the bodies. Such a sight as this
> Becomes the field but here shows much amiss.
> Go, bid the soldiers shoot. (5.2.379-87)

Rather than acknowledging the complexity of collective trauma, Fortinbras attempts to contain it. Friedman writes: "So Hamlet who, like many returned warriors, undergoes 'the rite of war' after his death, but no healing or spiritual ceremony, kills and is killed in the domestic realm, bestrewing a court scene with corpses that suggest a battlefield, which even the militaristic Fortinbras deems

inappropriate."[38] Moreover, Friedman notes, "In his paragraph on 'havoc' in his *Shakespeare's Military Language: A Dictionary*, Charles Edelman maintains that 'Not all soldiers would agree' with Fortinbras that 'Such a sight as this…Becomes the field.'"[39] By imposing militaristic closure on the families' intertwined traumas and revenge tragedies, Fortinbras attempts to make the carnage of havoc "becoming," while disavowing the trauma of war. It is exactly this type of trauma that Wolfert's *Cry Havoc!* excavates and attempts to heal.

De-Medicalizing Posttraumatic Stress and Promoting Healing through De-Cruitment in Wolfert's *Cry Havoc!*

While *Hamlet*'s dramatization of the consequences of prizing overly militaristic views of masculinity is left ambiguous,[40] *Cry Havoc!* provides metatheatrical commentary on the relationship between the military, masculinity, and trauma through Wolfert's direct address to audiences. Wolfert explores the forces that transformed him from "a sensitive little boy that wanted to be a dancer"[41] into a soldier and details his journey from the Army to the theater.

Paul J. C. M. Franssen writes:

> Throughout, Wolfert stresses the importance of a masculine ethos to soldiers. For US soldiers, often from a working-class background, ballet or even theatre is an unmanly activity that interferes with their rugged, stiff-upper-lip manhood. […] Throughout *Cry Havoc!*, while reliving his experiences Wolfert's persona asks himself 'What is wrong with me?', until he realises that the answer does not necessarily lie in himself, in insufficient manliness or self-control, but in the way he was trained and programmed for war and in the traumatic experiences he has undergone. Healing, in this view, comes with an acceptance of what he and his peers used to look down on as effeminate behaviour: role-playing and acting, expressing his pain through almost ballet-like body movements, and talking about it.[42]

Discussing *Cry Havoc!* alongside adaptations of *Macbeth*, Franssen continues:

> Yet, what sets apart Kurzel's film, De Man's theatre adaptation, and in a different way Wolfert's *Cry Havoc!* is that they go

beyond a simple anti-war stance, by questioning the male ethos that they hold responsible for the world's conflicted state: what is called, in modern parlance, toxic masculinity. The epitome of the masculine ideal is the soldier: the powerful protector of women and children, the maker of his own fate. What these productions suggest, each in their own way, is that the soldier is at the mercy of his own self-doubt and the demons of PTSD; that he may be manipulated by forces beyond his control, such as indoctrination by army drills …; that rather than protecting children, he risks harming them, physically or psychologically;[43]

While Franssen analyzes how *Macbeth* is a central intertext for Wolfert's exploration of toxic masculinity, I will argue that *Hamlet* allusions give voice to Wolfert's excavation of the effects of trauma.

Richard III is perhaps the most central Shakespearean intertext in Wolfert's one-man play, with Richard serving as a physical mirror of Wolfert's physical disability in his teenage years due to injury, as well as a psychic mirror of the difficulty of transitioning from war to peace and the haunting of conscience. However, Hamlet's words underscore key moments of traumatic alienation in Wolfert's play. Although Hamlet is not a veteran, his expressions of trauma and alienation fit seamlessly into the fabric of *Cry Havoc!* The play's *Hamlet* allusions bespeak the fracturing of inner self from social world in the face of trauma.

Wolfert dramatizes the trauma of witnessing his friend Marcus's death during a training exercise. While re-enacting the scene of delivering the flag to Marcus's widow and young daughters, after reciting: "on behalf of the President of the United States of America and a grateful nation, I present you with this token of appreciation for your loved one's faithful and honorable service," Wolfert adds: "But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue."[44] Hamlet's soliloquized expression of inner anguish, not articulable in the social world he inhabits, highlights how Wolfert's inner world begins fracturing from military protocols.

Hamlet is also alluded to at the climax of Wolfert's performance, as he describes being on the brink of suicide after experiencing the profound psychic dislocation of experiencing a flashback—and restraining himself from a violent outburst—while catering a children's party. Miming pointing a sawed-off shotgun at his face, Wolfert performs the "To be or not to be" soliloquy.[45] Hamlet's

soliloquy gives voice to Wolfert's contemplation of suicide and memorializes the veterans lost to suicide. Wolfert asks, "But why, why did I want to kill myself?"[46] and continues: "I believe it's because we're wired for war, but not unwired from war, not rewired for society. You know, when I went into the military, I had a recruiter that helped prepare me for life in the military, but when I got out, where was my de-cruiter, to help me prepare for life after the military?"[47] He continues: "If I'm wrong about de-cruiting, then why are twenty-two veterans killing themselves every day?"[48] Wolfert describes the progression in his thinking from "What the hell is wrong with me?" to "what happened to me?"[49] He says: "Well, I believe what happened to me is what happened to all veterans in this country. We were recruited at a psychologically malleable age, then we were wired for war. But at the end of our military service, we were not un-wired from war. We were not re-wired for society."[50]

A key component of being "wired for war" that Wolfert describes is to "respond to a threat with violence."[51] This response can lead to wreaking havoc, especially in the context of combat trauma. Wolfert recites Antony's apostrophe to Caesar's corpse[52] and connects it to wartime experience. The desire to "Cry 'havoc!'" is intertwined with the desire to protect those one fights alongside and to avenge fallen comrades. He describes watching a comrade's death as something that will "unleash the beserker."[53] Wolfert alludes to *Henry V*'s St. Crispin's Day speech to show how the camaraderie of a "band of brothers—and sisters" motivates those who serve in combat,[54] while Henry's threat at Harfleur is described as the "order of havoc" and connected to wartime atrocities committed by service members who are driven beserk by the loss of comrades.[55]

The first time Wolfert uses the term "posttraumatic stress disorder," he pauses before and puts critical stress on the word "disorder," accompanying it with air quotes.[56] When he later repeats the term, he continues to insert a painful pause before "disorder."[57] Wolfert's intonation makes his unease with the medicalized term clear. Wolfert's performance aligns with veteran John M. Meyer's critique:

> while many people undoubtedly suffer from physical, psychological, or moral trauma due to their involvement in

> a war, our current instruments simplify the problem, and
> marginalize veteran behavior that, given the environmental
> inputs that veterans experience at home and abroad, are
> normal—and perhaps even healthy. Most of the time, Post
> Traumatic Stress should not be called a disorder.[58]

Wolfert's emphasis on de-cruitment highlights the need for social,
rather than medical, contexts for understanding and treating
veterans' posttraumatic stress.

Wolfert's DE-CRUIT program promotes communal healing
among veterans. Sonya Freeman Loftis cites the DE-CRUIT
program as a unique form of Shakespeare therapy because it is
informed by the social model, rather than the medical model, of
disability.[59] Loftis writes: "DE-CRUIT runs counter to the medical
model of disability. The medical model is based on a clear power
hierarchy: physicians and psychiatrists give treatment, and patients
receive treatment."[60] Loftis continues: "In DE-CRUIT, people
who have PTSD share their experiences and help other people who
have PTSD."[61] DE-CRUIT focuses on "a failure to reintegrate into
civilian society" rather than "a 'pathology' that resides within the
individual."[62]

The DE-CRUIT program is a veteran-led research model that
seeks to remedy the failures of the biomedical model to adequately
address "the effects of trauma and other social and environmental
factors on mental health challenges in veterans and others."[63] It
offers a model for community-based approaches to trauma work.[64]
Alisha Ali, Stephan Wolfert, and Bruce D. Homer write:

> The final stage of the DE-CRUIT program involves the
> veterans performing their own personal trauma monologue
> and their selected Shakespearian monologue for an   invited
> audience of veterans, family members, friends, and community
> members … This culminating performance emphasizes the
> *communalization of trauma*—a process that Shay (1995) has
> described as essential in helping veterans overcome the effects
> of moral injury and in fostering veterans' reintegration into
> civilian life.[65]

Shay writes: "Our culture has been notably deficient in providing
for reception of the Furies of war into community. For better or
worse, the health care system has been given this role—along with
the prisons, where a disproportionate number of men incarcerated

since the Vietnam War have been veterans."[66] Shay continues: "We must create our own new models of healing which emphasize communalization of the trauma. Combat veterans and American citizenry should meet together face to face in daylight, and listen, and watch, and weep, just as citizen-soldiers of ancient Athens did in the theater at the foot of the Acropolis."[67]

This description evokes the mood of the live performance of *Cry Havoc!* that I attended in 2016.[68] The following semester, streaming a recorded performance of *Cry Havoc!* for my "Shakespearean Disability Studies" class,[69] I tried to let students know about this communal container: the questions and resources shared in the post-show Q&A; the space created for veterans in the audience to connect with each other; and the opportunity for non-veterans to bear witness. Can the Shakespeare classroom be one of the places where communal healing happens? Can it happen even if the veteran appears virtually, in recorded video?

Wolfert's performance ends with the pointed and repeated question: "Now what? Now what?"[70] The question, "Now what?" is so pressing that Wolfert considered including it in the title of the play.[71] The same question he used earlier in the play to describe his crisis of identity after leaving the Army is now posed directly to the audience: what will they do? What will *we* do, as a society and as Shakespeare scholars, to better support veterans? How will we participate in communalizing and healing trauma?

Notes

1. Alan W. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors—and Ours* (New York: Routledge, 2022), 101-116, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003203834.

2. Unless otherwise noted, all *Cry Havoc!* citations refer to *Cry Havoc!*, written and performed by Stephan Wolfert, directed by Eric Tucker, *Vimeo*, December 6, 2017, https://vimeo.com/ondemand/cryhavoc.

3. Alisha Ali, Stephan Wolfert, and Bruce D. Homer, "In the Service of Science: Veteran-Led Research in the Investigation of a Theatre-Based Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Treatment," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* (2019): 1.

4. Margaret Price, *Mad at School: Rhetorics of Mental Disability and Academic Life* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011), 18.

5. Charles Edelman, *Shakespeare's Military Language* (New Brunswick, NJ: Athlone Press, 2000), 167.

6. Edelman, *Shakespeare's Military Language*, 167.

7. Bennett Simon, "*Hamlet* and the Trauma Doctors: An Essay at Interpretation," *American Imago*, 58.3 (2001), 707.

8. Simon, "*Hamlet* and the Trauma Doctors," 708.

9. Simon, "*Hamlet* and the Trauma Doctors," 708.

10. Simon, "*Hamlet* and the Trauma Doctors," 717.

11. Simon, "*Hamlet* and the Trauma Doctors," 713.

12. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 108.

13. David T. Mitchell and Sharon L. Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). Mitchell and Snyder's highly influential concept, "narrative prosthesis," highlights the centrality of disability to the construction of narratives; while disability propels literary narratives, it is ultimately eliminated—usually when the disabled character is "cured" or dies (Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 53-54).

14. Stevie Simkin, *Early Modern Tragedy and the Cinema of Violence* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 65-87 explores how Hamlet's deferred revenge relates to the moral problem of being "tainted" by vigilantism.

15. References to *Hamlet* are from William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Revised Edition, ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2016).

16. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 105.

17. Catherine Belsey, "The Case of Hamlet's Conscience," *Studies in Philology* 79.6 (1979): 147-148, states: "The Ghost's instructions cannot be obeyed. … The play as a whole suggests that Hamlet's mind is tainted—not in the sense that he is mad, but that he is inevitably corrupted by his mission."

18. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 109.

19. Deborah Willis, "'The gnawing vulture': Revenge, Trauma Theory, and *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53.1 (2002): 21-52.

20. Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 73.

21. Bruce R. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 48-49.

22. Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, 75.

23. Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, 75.

24. Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, 77.

25. Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, 85.

26. Belsey, "Hamlet's Conscience," 137.

27. Belsey, "Hamlet's Conscience," 139-140.

28. Belsey, "Hamlet's Conscience," 138; Bernard Spivack, *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to his Major Villains* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 155-159.

29. Belsey, "Hamlet's Conscience," 129.

30. Wolfert repeats that becoming a beserker is "what's expected of each and every one of us that signs the line" (*Cry Havoc!*, 0:35:23-0:35-28; 0:48:08-0:48:12).

31. Jonathan Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character* (New York: Scribner, 1994), 77.

32. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 75.

33. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 89.

34. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 90.

35. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 4.

36. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 114.

37. Andrew Foley, "Heaven or Havoc? The End of *Hamlet*," *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 24 (2012): 45-56, argues that the "havoc" and chaos of the play's conclusion undermines any sense of providence or justice.

38. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 113.

39. Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 116 n. 19.

40. Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, 84-85.

41. *Cry Havoc!*, 23:26-23:29.

42. Paul J. C. M. Franssen, "Flipping *Macbeth*: PTSD, Gender, and Generation in Adaptations by Wolfert, Kurzel, and De Man," *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, 104.1 (2021): 84, https://doi.org/10.1177/0184767820980765.

43. Franssen, "Flipping *Macbeth*," 92.

44. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:14:04-0:14:25.

45. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:12:20-1:13:40.

46. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:13:50-1:13:53.

47. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:14:14-1:14:30.

48. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:15:13-1:15:18.

49. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:23:23-0:23:53.

50. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:23:53-0:24:08.

51. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:28:14-0:28:16.

52. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:38:44-0:40:03.

53. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:40:06-0:40:08.

54. *Cry Havoc!*, 0:38:00-0:38:26.

55. *Cry Havoc!*, 41:45-44:57.

56. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:02:29-1:02:33.

57. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:08:10-1:08:13.

58. Meyer qtd. in Friedman, *Shakespeare's Returning Warriors*, 2.

59. Sonya Freeman Loftis, *Shakespeare and Disability Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021), 80.

60. Loftis, *Shakespeare and Disability Studies*, 79-80.

61. Loftis, *Shakespeare and Disability Studies*, 80.

62. Wiggins qtd. in Loftis, *Shakespeare and Disability Studies*, 80.

63. Ali, Wolfert, and Homer, "In the Service of Science," 2.

64. Ali, Wolfert, and Homer, "In the Service of Science," 3.

65. Ali, Wolfert, and Homer, "In the Service of Science," 8-9.

66. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 194.

67. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, 194.

68. *Cry Havoc!*, written and performed by Stephan Wolfert, Northwest Campus Auditorium, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, May 3, 2016.

69. Teaching *Cry Havoc!* in my "Shakespearean Disability Studies" class at UCLA was a rewarding experience, but it is crucial to provide supports when screening materials, such as this, that dramatize and explore trauma. I provided content notes that described the subjects covered in the performance and offered resources for students.

70. *Cry Havoc!*, 1:16:27-1:16:33.

71. Maddalena Pennacchia, "Theatre Strikes Back in the Digital Era: An Interview with Stephan Wolfert" *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* 20.35 (2019): 40, http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530.20.04.