



NCS | THE NEW  
CAMBRIDGE  
SHAKESPEARE

Revised with a new introduction by Heather Hirschfeld  
Edited by Philip Edwards

# HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK

Third edition



## THE NEW CAMBRIDGE SHAKESPEARE

GENERAL EDITOR

Brian Gibbons

ASSOCIATE GENERAL EDITOR

A. R. Braunmuller, *University of California, Los Angeles*

From the publication of the first volumes in 1984 the General Editor of the New Cambridge Shakespeare was Philip Brockbank and the Associate General Editors were Brian Gibbons and Robin Hood. From 1990 to 1994 the General Editor was Brian Gibbons and the Associate General Editors were A. R. Braunmuller and Robin Hood.

### HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK

The third edition of *Hamlet* offers a completely new introduction to this rich, mysterious play, examining Shakespeare's transformation of an ancient Nordic legend into a drama whose philosophical, psychological, political, and spiritual complexities have captivated audiences world-wide for over 400 years. Focusing on the ways in which Shakespeare reimagined the revenge plot and its capacity to investigate the human experiences of love, grief, obligation, and memory, Heather Hirschfeld explores the play's cultural and theatrical contexts, its intricate textual issues, its vibrant critical traditions and controversies, and its history of performance and adaptation by celebrated directors, actors, and authors. Supplemented by an updated reading list, extensive illustrations, and helpful appendices, this edition also features revised commentary notes explicitly designed for the student reader, offering the very best in contemporary criticism of this great tragedy.

## THE NEW CAMBRIDGE SHAKESPEARE

- All's Well That Ends Well*, edited by Russell Fraser  
*Antony and Cleopatra*, edited by David Bevington  
*As You Like It*, edited by Michael Hattaway  
*The Comedy of Errors*, edited by T. S. Dorsch  
*Coriolanus*, edited by Lee Bliss  
*Cymbeline*, edited by Martin Butler  
*Hamlet*, edited by Philip Edwards  
*Julius Caesar*, edited by Marvin Spevack  
*King Edward III*, edited by Giorgio Melchiori  
*The First Part of King Henry IV*, edited by Herbert Weil and Judith Weil  
*The Second Part of King Henry IV*, edited by Giorgio Melchiori  
*King Henry V*, edited by Andrew Gurr  
*The First Part of King Henry VI*, edited by Michael Hattaway  
*The Second Part of King Henry VI*, edited by Michael Hattaway  
*The Third Part of King Henry VI*, edited by Michael Hattaway  
*King Henry VIII*, edited by John Margeson  
*King John*, edited by L. A. Beaurline  
*The Tragedy of King Lear*, edited by Jay L. Halio  
*King Richard II*, edited by Andrew Gurr  
*King Richard III*, edited by Janis Lull  
*Love's Labour's Lost*, edited by William C. Carroll  
*Macbeth*, edited by A. R. Braunmuller  
*Measure for Measure*, edited by Brian Gibbons  
*The Merchant of Venice*, edited by M. M. Mahood  
*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, edited by David Crane  
*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, edited by R. A. Foakes  
*Much Ado About Nothing*, edited by F. H. Mares  
*Othello*, edited by Norman Sanders  
*Pericles*, edited by Doreen DelVecchio and Antony Hammond  
*The Poems*, edited by John Roe  
*Romeo and Juliet*, edited by G. Blakemore Evans  
*The Sonnets*, edited by G. Blakemore Evans  
*The Taming of the Shrew*, edited by Ann Thompson  
*The Tempest*, edited by David Lindley  
*Timon of Athens*, edited by Karl Klein  
*Titus Andronicus*, edited by Alan Hughes  
*Troilus and Cressida*, edited by Anthony B. Dawson  
*Twelfth Night*, edited by Elizabeth Story Donno  
*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, edited by Kurt Schlueter  
*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, edited by Robert Kean Turner and Patricia Tatspaugh  
*The Winter's Tale*, edited by Susan Snyder and Deborah T. Curren-Aquino

### THE EARLY QUARTOS

- The First Quarto of Hamlet*, edited by Kathleen O. Irace  
*The First Quarto of King Henry V*, edited by Andrew Gurr  
*The First Quarto of King Lear*, edited by Jay L. Halio  
*The First Quarto of King Richard III*, edited by Peter Davison  
*The First Quarto of Othello*, edited by Scott McMillin  
*The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*, edited by Lukas Erne  
*The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto*, edited by Stephen Roy Miller

# HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK

Third Edition

Revised with a new introduction by  
HEATHER HIRSCHFELD

*Edited by*

PHILIP EDWARDS



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107152977](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107152977)

DOI: [10.1017/9781316594117](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316594117)

© Cambridge University Press, 1985, 2003, 2019

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1985

Tenth printing 2001

Updated edition 2003

Thirteenth printing 2012

Third edition 2019

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd. Padstow Cornwall

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

ISBN 978-1-107-15297-7 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-316-60673-5 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

# CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	<i>page</i> vi
Preface	ix
List of Abbreviations and Short Titles	x
Introduction	1
Welcoming the Stranger	1
Staging Revenge	2
Staging the Stage	6
Staging the Text	12
Critical Responses	18
The Play's the Thing	32
Stages and Screens	52
Note on the Text	76
List of Characters	78
The Play	81
Reading List	250
Appendices ( <i>Philip Edwards</i> )	
1 Textual Analysis	253
2 Names	278

## ILLUSTRATIONS

- 1 'Do you not come your tardy son to chide?' (3.4.106). Redrawn by Du Guernier for the 1714 edition of Rowe's Shakespeare (Folger Shakespeare Library) page 46
- 2 John Philip Kemble as Hamlet, after Sir Thomas Lawrence, early 1880s (Folger Shakespeare Library) 55
- 3 Edwin Booth as Hamlet *circa* 1870 (Library of Congress / Corbis / VCG via Getty Images) 56
- 4 Ellen Terry as Ophelia and Henry Irving as Hamlet (Time Life Pictures / Mansell / The LIFE Picture Collection / Getty Images) 57
- 5 'Go on, I'll follow thee' (1.4.86). Johnston Forbes-Robertson as Hamlet in a 1913 film (Mander and Mitchenson Theatre Collection) 58
- 6 John Gielgud as Hamlet (Hulton Archive / Getty Images), 1934, New Theatre 59
- 7 Laurence Olivier as Hamlet and Eileen Herlie as Gertrude, 1948 (ITV/Shutterstock) 60
- 8 Mark Rylance as Hamlet and Peter Wright as Claudius at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1989 (© John Bunting / ArenaPAL) 62
- 9 Kenneth Branagh as Hamlet, 1996 (Castle Rock Entertainment / Kobal / Shutterstock) 63
- 10 David Tennant as Hamlet and Patrick Stewart as Claudius in the 2008 Royal Shakespeare Company production directed by Gregory Doran (© Robbie Jack / Corbis / Getty Images) 64
- 11 Benedict Cumberbatch as Hamlet at the Barbican, London, 2015 (© Johann Persson / ArenaPAL) 65
- 12 Paapa Essiedu as Hamlet at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 2016 (courtesy of the Royal Shakespeare Company) 66
- 13 The Mousetrap scene, Berlin, 1926, directed by Leopold Jessner (courtesy of Theaterwissenschaftliche Sammlung, University of Cologne) 68
- 14 Sebastian Schwarz as Horatio/Gueldenstern, Lars Eidinger as Hamlet, and Robert Beyer as Polonius/Osrik in the 2008 Schaubuehne Berlin production directed by Thomas Ostermeier (Lieberenz / Ullstein Bild / Getty Images) 69



- 15 Innokenti Smoktunovsky as Hamlet in the 1964 film *Hamlet*, directed by Grigori Kozintsev (Sovfoto / Universal Images Group / Getty Images) 70
- 16 *Al-Hamlet Summit* – Sulayman Al Bassam as Hamlet, Mariam Ali as Ophelia, Nicolas Daniel as Claudius, 2005, Kronborg Castle, Elsinore/Helsingor, Denmark; director: Sulayman Al Bassam (courtesy of SABAB Theatre) 72
- 17 Sarah Bernhardt as Hamlet in the 1900 film directed by Clément Maurice (Bettmann / Getty Images) 74
- 18 Angela Winkler as Hamlet and Evia Mattes as Gertrude at the Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh, 2000 (© Clive Barda / ArenaPAL) 75



## PREFACE

One of the consequences of the enduring, and global, appeal of *Hamlet* is the nearly limitless commentary on the play. This edition thus cannot but be selective in its presentation of the play's critical tradition and performance history. Its new Introduction and revised commentary aim to provide robust accounts of influential early approaches to the play as well as persuasive recent treatments of it.

All editions of *Hamlet* must grapple with the play's significant textual challenges. These challenges result from the existence of three distinct early editions of the play: the quarto of 1603 (Q1), the quarto of 1604/5 (Q2), and the text supplied in the 1623 First Folio (F). Q2 has over 200 lines not in F; F has over 80 lines not in Q2. Q1, half the size of the other two texts, has stage directions and an entire scene that appear neither in Q2 nor in F, as well as a linguistic sensibility that differs markedly in places from the others.

This state of affairs demands that editors have a coherent explanation for the existence of these distinct texts, the connections between them, and their relationships to what Shakespeare might have written and what his acting company might have performed. In the first edition of the *New Cambridge Shakespeare (NCS) Hamlet*, Philip Edwards provided such an explanation, offering a consistent theory of the three copies and clarifying how his theory determined the various choices he made for his text. His account remains seminal for other editors and scholars considering the textual problem.

Edwards's explanation, roughly twenty-five pages, was thoroughly integrated into his Introduction. This is not the case in the new Introduction. Instead, this Introduction outlines the play's complex textual status, the questions that arise from it, and the various answers, both old and recent, that scholars have formulated for it. Edwards's account, upon which the text of the revised *NCS Hamlet* remains almost entirely based, is preserved in the 'Textual Analysis' at the end of the volume, distinct from the rest of the Introduction.

I am grateful to A. R. Braunmuller and Brian Gibbons for asking me to undertake this revision and for their careful reading of the manuscript, and to Emily Hockley at Cambridge University Press for her advice and patience. I was greatly assisted by the enthusiasm of the talented students in my undergraduate honours seminar, 'Hamlet 24/7', at the University of Tennessee: Peter Cates, Savannah DeFreese, Emily Ferrell, Taylor Gray, Brenna Hosman, Noreen Premji, Bridget Sellers, Sophia Shelton, Logan Sutherland, Gage Taylor, and Courtney Whited. I am especially thankful for the support of Anthony Welch.

H. H.

*Knoxville, Tennessee*  
2018

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES

All quotations and line references to plays other than *Hamlet* are to G. Blakemore Evans (ed.), *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 1974.

Adams	<i>Hamlet</i> , ed. Joseph Quincy Adams, 1929
N. Alexander	<i>Hamlet</i> , ed. Nigel Alexander, 1973 (Macmillan Shakespeare)
P. Alexander	<i>William Shakespeare, The Complete Works</i> , ed. Peter Alexander, 1951
Bullough	Geoffrey Bullough (ed.), <i>Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare</i> , 8 vols., 1957–75
Cambridge	<i>The Works of William Shakespeare</i> , ed. William George Clark, J. Glover and William Aldis Wright, 1863–6, viii; 2nd edn, 1891–2, vii (Cambridge Shakespeare)
Capell	<i>Mr William Shakespeare, His Comedies, Histories and Tragedies</i> , ed. Edward Capell, 1767–8, x
Clark and Wright	<i>Hamlet Prince of Denmark</i> , ed. William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, 1872 (Clarendon Press Shakespeare)
Collier	<i>The Works of William Shakespeare</i> , ed. J. Payne Collier, 1842–4, vii
conj.	conjectured
CR	David Farley-Hills, <i>Critical Responses to ‘Hamlet’ 1600–1900</i> , 4 vols. (New York: AMS Press, 1996–2006)
Dowden	<i>The Tragedy of Hamlet</i> , ed. Edward Dowden, 1899 (Arden Shakespeare)
Duthie	George Ian Duthie, <i>The ‘Bad’ Quarto of ‘Hamlet’: A Critical Study</i> , 1941
Dyce	<i>The Works of William Shakespeare</i> , ed. Alexander Dyce, 1857, v
F	<i>Mr William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</i> , 1623 (First Folio)
F2	<i>Mr William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies</i> , 1632
Hanmer	<i>The Works of Shakespear</i> , ed. Sir Thomas Hanmer, 1743–4, vi
Hoy	<i>Hamlet</i> , ed. Cyrus Hoy, 1963 (Norton Critical Editions)
Jenkins	<i>Hamlet</i> , ed. Harold Jenkins, 1982 (Arden Shakespeare)
Johnson	<i>The Plays of William Shakespeare</i> , ed. Samuel Johnson, 1765, viii
Kittredge	<i>Hamlet</i> , ed. George Lyman Kittredge, 1939
Knight	<i>The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspeare</i> , ed. Charles Knight, 1838–43, 1, ‘Tragedies’
MacDonald	<i>The Tragedie of Hamlet</i> , ed. George MacDonald, 1885
Malone	<i>The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare</i> , ed. Edmond Malone, 1790, ix
MLN	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
MSH	J. Dover Wilson, <i>The Manuscript of Shakespeare’s ‘Hamlet’</i> , 2 vols., 1934; reprinted 1963
N & Q	<i>Notes and Queries</i>

- NV *Hamlet*, ed. Horace Howard Furness, 2 vols., 1877; reprinted 1963 (A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare)
- OED *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 1884–1928, reprinted 1933
- PMLA *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*
- Pope *The Works of Shakespear*, ed. Alexander Pope, 1723–5, VI
- Pope<sup>2</sup> *The Works of Shakespear*, ed. Alexander Pope, 2nd edn, 1728, VIII
- Q1 *The Tragickall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke*, by William Shakespeare, 1603 (first quarto)
- Q2 *The Tragickall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*, by William Shakespeare, 1604, 1605 (second quarto)
- Q 1611, Q 1676 Quarto editions of those dates
- RES *Review of English Studies*
- Ridley *Hamlet*, ed. M. R. Ridley, 1934 (New Temple Shakespeare)
- Rowe *The Works of Mr William Shakespear*, ed. Nicholas Rowe, 1709, v
- RQ *Renaissance Quarterly*
- Schmidt Alexander Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, 2 vols., 1874–5; 2nd edn, 1886
- SD stage direction
- SH speech heading
- Shakespeare's Words* David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion* (London: Penguin Books, 2002).
- Spencer *Hamlet*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer, 1980 (New Penguin Shakespeare)
- SQ *Shakespeare Quarterly*
- Staunton *The Plays of Shakespeare*, ed. Howard Staunton, 1858–60, reissued 1866, III
- Steevens *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, ed. Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 1773, x
- Steevens<sup>2</sup> *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, ed. Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 2nd edn, 1778, x
- Steevens<sup>3</sup> *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, ed. Samuel Johnson and George Steevens, 4th edn, 1793, xv
- Sternfeld F. W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1963
- Taylor, Jowett, Bourus, and Egan *The New Oxford Shakespeare*, ed. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan (Oxford University Press, 2016)
- Theobald Lewis Theobald, *Shakespeare Restored*, 1726
- Theobald<sup>2</sup> *The Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Lewis Theobald, 1733, VII
- Theobald<sup>3</sup> *The Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Lewis Theobald, 1740, VIII
- Thompson and Taylor *Hamlet*, ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, rev. edn (Bloomsbury Arden, 2016)
- Tilley Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1950 [references are to numbered proverbs]
- TLS *The Times Literary Supplement*
- Walker William Sydney Walker, *A Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare*, 3 vols., 1860
- Warburton *The Works of Shakespear*, ed. William Warburton, 1747, VIII
- White *The Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. Richard Grant White, 1857–66, XI
- Wilson *Hamlet*, ed. J. Dover Wilson, 1934; 2nd edn, 1936, reprinted 1968 (New Shakespeare)



# INTRODUCTION

## Welcoming the Stranger

‘And therefore as a stranger give it welcome’, Prince Hamlet instructs his friend Horatio at the close of the play’s first act. Hamlet is speaking of the ghost of his dead father, whose ‘wondrous strange’ appearance the men have just witnessed. The welcome, however, expands in the moment of delivery to invite into Hamlet’s story a wider audience. When Shakespeare’s play was first performed, that audience included the men and women assembled for an afternoon performance at the Globe Theatre on the south bank of the Thames. By now, in a tradition that extends over 400 years, the protagonist’s line beckons to actors, spectators, readers, and adapters around the world, bidding them to detect themselves in its address.

As with so many aspects of the play, that address is a complicated one. Hamlet’s hospitality, with its echoes of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament,<sup>1</sup> gives way to hesitation; his tenderness towards the ghostly stranger, to suspicion. His attitude is informed, surely, by his own identification with the ‘outsider’: in the wake of the death of his royal father and the remarriage of his mother, Gertrude, to his uncle Claudius, who has assumed the throne, Hamlet understands himself as a kind of foreigner, an alien in his native Denmark and its court at Elsinore. But he also feels a stranger to himself, absorbed in the kinds of tortured self-reflection seen today as a model of modern consciousness.

Recipients of his welcome, then, face an interpretive challenge. Does Hamlet’s invitation summon them into the narrative in order for them to discover that they, like the Romantic poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge, ‘have a smack of Hamlet’ in themselves?<sup>2</sup> Or does it usher them into the world of the play only to remind them, as it does T. S. Eliot’s Prufrock (‘I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be’), that they are different and distant from him?<sup>3</sup> Or does it ask them to see the whole drama as something strange, and to welcome it into their lives with both interest and trepidation?

At the turn of the seventeenth century, when Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* was first played, it may have seemed as familiar as it did strange on the London stage. Its story was not new: a dramatic version – what scholars call the *Ur-Hamlet* – had been performed as early as the late 1580s, when it was mentioned by the prolific writer Thomas Nashe in

<sup>1</sup> Naseeb Shaheen gives the New Testament allusions (2 Heb. 13.2 and Matt. 25.35) in *Biblical References in Shakespeare’s Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), 545. Consider also Lev. 19.34, Deut. 10.17–19.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Table Talk*, ed. Carl Woodring (Princeton University Press, 1990), 14.2: 61.

<sup>3</sup> T. S. Eliot, ‘The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock’, in *Collected Poems, 1909–1962* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963), 7.

a scornful attack on contemporary dramatists. And its dramatic events and concerns were guaranteed to resonate for its audience with familiar, topical issues: the ageing of the female ruler, Queen Elizabeth I; the question of her successor; the declining fortunes of the charismatic figure of the Earl of Essex and with him a model of chivalric honour; the deep challenges to religious belief and practice as a result of Reformation religious change; and the revival of philosophical stoicism and its concerns with liberty and tyranny. In addition, viewers would have recognized in the play ancient themes and narratives of intimate violence, adultery, and retaliation. These include the biblical accounts of Adam and Eve, and Cain and Abel – Judaeo-Christian culture's primal scenes of marital betrayal, fraternal hatred, and death – as well as Greek and Roman drama and epic by Aeschylus, Euripides, Seneca, and Virgil.<sup>1</sup>

### Staging Revenge

#### WHAT DO REVENGERS WANT?

Perhaps most strikingly, the play – which takes shape around a son's pursuit of vengeance for his father – would have echoed for its audience the concerns and conventions of the popular dramatic genre of revenge tragedy. Although the term 'revenge tragedy' is a modern invention, plots of vengeance and vendetta – like Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (1588–90) and Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (1589–90) – captured the dramatic imagination in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. These plots were characterized by a flexible set of conventions. A protagonist discovers a fatal or destructive deed that wrecks his or her sense of justice and order. He or she wants the violation addressed – wants balance restored – but recognizes that social institutions are unable to deal with the outrage. Therefore, the protagonist, often urged by a ghost or other soliciting spirit, takes upon him- or herself the burden of personally and privately avenging the wrong. His or her efforts, pursued to the edge of the protagonist's sanity, involve tactics of delay, disguise, and theatrical display before they end in a final retaliation that exceeds the destructiveness of the original crime.<sup>2</sup>

Shakespeare had been interested in these tropes since early in his career: he used them in the abundantly gory *Titus Andronicus* (1592); he put issues of the vendetta and talionic justice at the core of mid-1590s plays like *Romeo and Juliet* (1595) and *The Merchant of Venice* (1595); and he haunted both *Richard III* (1592) and *Julius Caesar* (1599) with ghosts. Vengeance for Shakespeare and his audience was not novel, but its dramatic allure remained potent. Both the topic and structure of revenge offer, as John Kerrigan has noted, 'a compelling mix of ingredients: strong situations shaped by violence; ethical issues for debate; a volatile, emotive mixture of loss and agitated grievance'.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the biblical allusions, see Hannibal Hamlin, *The Bible in Shakespeare* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 154–61. For the classical allusions, see Robert Miola, *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), esp. 33–67; Colin Burrow, *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 173–6.

<sup>2</sup> Fredson Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy* (Princeton University Press, 1945).

<sup>3</sup> John Kerrigan, *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 3.



Early modern audiences would have appreciated the ways in which those ‘ingredients’ could be fashioned to speak to their own moment and investment in revenge scenarios. Past scholars such as Eleanor Prosser claimed that Shakespeare and his contemporaries condemned retaliation as barbaric and contrary to divine law (as in Deuteronomy 32.35 and Romans 12.19, ‘Vengeance is mine, sayeth the Lord’). Revenge plays, according to this reading, reinforced this message.<sup>1</sup> But more recent scholarship has challenged this conclusion, suggesting that the early modern drama offered more complex approaches to the morality and legality of revenge.<sup>2</sup> Revenge plays, that is, did not simply condemn vengeance; they dramatized the human desire to match crime with crime, exploring it in connection with classical, Christian, and Elizabethan principles of justice, honour, stoicism, obedience, resistance, and suffering.

Plots of revenge accommodated issues that fascinated contemporary dramatists and their audiences. Death, sexuality, and bodily violation lie at the heart of stories of vendetta, and when these involve murder or rape at the highest levels, they become political as well as personal challenges to honour and liberty. Similarly, the human capacities to mourn, remember, and repent are all scrutinized in relation to the pursuit of revenge. These were urgent topics for Shakespeare’s period, particularly as they were inflected by the social, cultural, and religious changes associated with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The genre’s concern with crime, punishment, and atonement provided a structure for exploring both developments in sixteenth-century jurisprudence and doctrinal changes associated with the English Reformation and its competing theologies of death, sin, the afterlife, and the sacraments. Some scholars have seen a special relationship between the blood and gore of revenge drama and Catholic–Protestant debates about the Eucharist.<sup>3</sup> Michael Neill has argued that revenge tragedy, with its extraordinary fixation on a dead loved one, functioned as a substitute for rejected (but longed-for) Catholic memorializing practices grounded in a belief in Purgatory. The genre, he writes, supplied ‘a fantasy response to the sense of despairing impotence produced by the Protestant displacement of the dead’.<sup>4</sup> And although religious belief and practice provided the ‘matrix for explorations of virtually every topic’ during this time, revenge tragedy trafficked in realms other than the strictly devotional.<sup>5</sup> Lorna Hutson has suggested that early modern revenge tragedy dramatized legal thought and practice by representing on stage ‘the protracted processes of detection, pre-trial

<sup>1</sup> Eleanor Prosser, *Hamlet and Revenge* (Stanford University Press, 1971).

<sup>2</sup> Linda Woodbridge offers the most thorough-going account in *English Revenge Drama: Money, Resistance, Equality* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). For discussions of the complementarity, rather than the opposition, between revenge and early modern law, see Ronald Broude, ‘Revenge and Revenge Tragedy in Renaissance England’, *RQ* 28 (1975), 38–58; and Derek Dunne, *Shakespeare, Revenge Tragedy and Early Modern Law: Vindictive Justice* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> Huston Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 94–123.

<sup>4</sup> Michael Neill, *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 244, 246.

<sup>5</sup> Debora Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (University of Toronto Press, 1997), 6.

examination, trial, and evidence evaluation'.<sup>1</sup> The genre also gave fictional shape to the sorts of real-life 'systemic unfairness' its audience might encounter at a time that 'witnessed severe disproportion between crime and punishment, between labor and its rewards'.<sup>2</sup> And, insofar as its plots were focused on the pursuit of justice in the face of political corruption by an individual called upon to strategize and plan, revenge tragedy gave dramatic space to a host of long-standing philosophical dilemmas around identity, intention, and agency.<sup>3</sup> Finally, revenge plays seized on ideological assumptions about women and uncontrolled violence to 'tap into fundamental fears about women . . . maternal power and female agency'.<sup>4</sup>

#### HAMLET AND THE RESOURCES OF REVENGE

*Hamlet* participates in these concerns and the revenge conventions to which they are attached. It relies for its core narrative on the Nordic legend of Amleth, the clever, as well as vengeful, son of a valiant father slain by his own brother. The story, set in pre-Christian Denmark, was chronicled in Saxo Grammaticus's late-twelfth-/early-thirteenth-century compendium *Gesta Danorum*, or 'Deeds of the Danes', which was printed for the first time in Paris in 1514 as *Historiae Danicae*. It was translated by François de Belleforest in the fifth volume of his collection *Histoires Tragiques* (1570); Shakespeare's play ultimately derives from this version.<sup>5</sup> (Belleforest's account was translated into English as the *Hystorie of Hamblet* in 1608, well after Shakespeare's play was in the repertory.) Saxo and Belleforest's accounts differ in important ways,<sup>6</sup> but they agree on most of the elements of the plot. In both, Amleth's uncle takes over as ruler of the province of Jutland and marries his widowed sister-in-law. Amleth, the betrayed son, feigns madness in order to protect himself from his spying, murderous uncle and to implement his revenge, which he accomplishes with great relish, teasing the court with seemingly nonsensical riddles and grotesque behaviour (including the murder of a councillor whom he feeds to pigs) before burning down the palace hall and decapitating his uncle. He then appeals to the startled populace with a powerful oration, defending his revenge as the only way to preserve the people's liberty against the deprivations of the tyrant.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lorna Hutson, *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Oxford University Press, 2008), 9.

<sup>2</sup> Woodbridge, *English Revenge Drama*, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Christopher Crosbie, *Revenge Tragedy and Classical Philosophy on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh University Press, 2018).

<sup>4</sup> Alison Findlay, *A Feminist Perspective on Renaissance Drama* (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1999), 49.

<sup>5</sup> Bullough, vii: 15; Margrethe Jolly, 'Hamlet and the French Connection: The Relationship of Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet* and the Evidence of Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*', *Parergon* 29.1 (2012), 83–105.

<sup>6</sup> Bullough, vii: 10–15. For the ideological use of Saxo by Belleforest during the religious conflicts of the sixteenth century, see Julie Maxwell, 'Counter-Reformation Versions of Saxo: A New Source for *Hamlet*?' *RQ* 57.2 (2004), 518–60.

<sup>7</sup> Bullough gives Oliver Elton's translation of Saxo in Bullough, vii: 60–79, and of *The Hystorie of Hamblet* in *ibid.*, 81–124. For a more contemporary translation of Saxo, with Latin on facing pages, see Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum: The History of the Danes*, ed. Karsten Friis-Jensen and trans. Peter Fisher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2015), i: 178–221.

*Hamlet* takes this ancient fable of the north, absorbs the warrior practices and ideals it represents, and transforms them ethically, psychologically, politically, and theatrically. There are three distinct texts of *Hamlet* – the first quarto (Q1, 1603), the second quarto (Q2, 1604/5), and the First Folio (F, 1623) – but they are all informed by this kind of global adaptation. (The different texts are discussed below, pp. 12–17, and in the Textual Analysis.) Shakespeare gives his play a cosmic frame, with frequent references to the heavens, earth, and the underworld. He portrays as an unsolved mystery the killing by Claudius of his brother Hamlet, making the play an early instance of detective fiction or even a ‘precursor’ of cinema.<sup>1</sup> He introduces the ghost of the murdered King Hamlet, a deliberately mysterious presence, who urges his namesake to avenge his death and who reappears when the demand has not been fulfilled. Shakespeare uses the conventional revenge delay – mistakenly cited by some critics as a sign of Hamlet’s failure as an avenger – to present the young Hamlet as a grief-stricken son who, in the play’s signature soliloquies, contemplates suicide and castigates himself for his own doubts and fears of death.

At the same time, Shakespeare develops in Hamlet Amleth’s wit, giving his protagonist extended opportunities to riddle and perform in ways that reflect the kind of philosophical scepticism associated with Michel de Montaigne, a favourite of the dramatist. Shakespeare introduces the characters of Laertes and young Fortinbras, who function as Hamlet’s foils, and he portrays a unique male friendship between Hamlet and Horatio. Shakespeare enlarges and complicates notions of the feminine and female sexuality in the role of Ophelia, whose conflicts and desires are given dramatic space for their own sake, and in the role of his mother Gertrude, whose own seemingly selfish need for erotic attachment gives way over the course of the play to concern for her son. He furnishes a troupe of travelling players who fuel Hamlet’s sense of humour and who provide a play-within-a-play that rehearses the original crime. And he complicates the end of the story in two significant ways. First, he brings Hamlet into a graveyard, where he faces death in its most literal form when he holds the skull of the dead jester Yorick. And then, in the play’s final scene, he brings Hamlet to a duel at court, where he kills his uncle only after his mother has been poisoned and he himself fatally injured by Laertes. (Is his revenge, then, for himself, his father, or his mother? Or some combination of the three? Are these even different?) Finally, Shakespeare substitutes for Saxo’s and Belleforest’s pre-Christian world a moment closer to his own, setting the play in a Renaissance Danish court coloured by humanist and Christian principles and alert to key symbols of the different Christian confessions (Hamlet returns to Elsinore from Wittenberg, seat of Lutheranism; his father’s Ghost seems to return from Purgatory, a distinctly Catholic otherworld).

With these kinds of changes, Shakespeare refashions the legendary source material into an early modern revenge tragedy. In so doing, his play ‘updates’ the form, reinvigorating his colleagues’ models according to his own interests and dramatic

<sup>1</sup> Courtney Lehmann, *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Post-Modern* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), 90.

priorities.<sup>1</sup> These priorities give the play what Maynard Mack calls its distinctly ‘interrogative mood’, its presentation of a ‘world where uncertainties are of the essence’.<sup>2</sup> Hamlet’s response to these uncertainties distinguishes him from his vengeful predecessors. He is certainly disgusted by Gertrude and Claudius, but he is a conflicted, resistant avenger – the opposite not only of the Nordic Amleth but also of single-minded Renaissance characters such as Kyd’s Hieronimo, Marlowe’s Barabas and even his own foils, Fortinbras and Laertes. Of course, some critics and performers have portrayed Hamlets who are keen on exacting revenge; their approaches are justified textually by Hamlet’s pledge to the Ghost to ‘sweep to [his] revenge’ and by his declaration that he ‘could . . . drink hot blood’ (1.5.31, 3.2.351). But at significant moments he also voices reluctance about his task, as it seems to him to require not only the talionic killing of his uncle but also the spiritual rescue of his mother and the restoring to health of his entire country, now an ‘unweeded garden / That grows to seed’ (1.2.135–6). We hear this reluctance in his lament, for instance, that ‘The time is out of joint: O cursed spite, / That ever I was born to set it right’ (1.5.189–90), and in the famous ‘To be or not to be’ soliloquy, where the problem of not being is woven through with the dilemma of not revenging.

The impact of his hesitation is only intensified by his ‘antic disposition’, the feigned madness that he assumes as a strategy for protection. But if Hamlet adopts his antic disposition as a cagey disguise, at times it actually seems to express – to be – his true, broken emotional state. This complication of appearance and reality, of exterior and interior, pervades the play so completely that even – perhaps especially – an audience familiar with revenge plays would see Shakespeare’s version as something ‘strange’.

### Staging the Stage

*Hamlet*’s revenge plot, in other words, opens onto a persistent conundrum of human experience: the problem of seeming and being. The conundrum has a long philosophical and theological history that predates *Hamlet* by two millennia. But, as Katherine Maus has explained, ‘in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England the sense of discrepancy between “inward disposition” and “outward appearance” seem[ed] unusually urgent and consequential for a very large number of people’.<sup>3</sup> Hamlet presents this dilemma at the play’s outset, when he announces to the Danish court that ‘I have that within which passes show’ (1.2.85). Hamlet testifies here to a personal crisis, the painful distance between his internal grief and the modes available for him to express it publicly. Hamlet’s lament thus presents his onstage and offstage audiences with an epistemological challenge, a reminder of how difficult it is to assess another person’s interior feelings or essence according to what they do or say. For the rest of the play, we will experience this predicament

<sup>1</sup> For the play’s ‘updating’ of the revenge genre, see Allison K. Deutermann, “‘Caviare to the general?’ Taste, Hearing, and Genre in *Hamlet*”, *SQ* 62.2 (2011), 230–55.

<sup>2</sup> Maynard Mack, ‘The World of *Hamlet*’, *The Yale Review* 41 (1951–2), 504.

<sup>3</sup> Katherine Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (University of Chicago Press, 1995), 13.

most powerfully during Hamlet's signature soliloquies, since they encourage us to believe, despite their obvious construction for performance, that they give us 'unimpeded contact with Hamlet's mind'.<sup>1</sup> But Hamlet's statement also refers to a political crisis, the radical fracture between appearance and reality at the now-corrupt Danish court. After Claudius's murder of King Hamlet and assumption of the throne, Elsinore 'seems' one way but 'is' another. Claudius can 'smile, and smile, and be a villain' (1.5.108).

#### METADRAMA

The theatre serves as a rich analogue for this kind of existential confusion. The theatre is all about appearances: on a purpose-built stage, actors perform pre-scripted narratives, playing characters other than themselves and pretending to do things they don't truly accomplish (falling in love, killing an enemy). At the same time, those appearances have a special relation to reality. They may voice truths that can be spoken only at a slant. They may inculcate behaviour on stage that becomes a model for activity off stage (this was a particular fear of the anti-theatricalists, civic and religious leaders opposed to the professional drama). Or they may remind spectators of the influential commonplace that 'all the world's a stage' – that earthly life itself is a fiction or performance in comparison to the reality of eternal life. Human beings, according to this notion, play roles for one another as well as for a divine audience.

The imaginative reach of the theatrical metaphor explains *Hamlet's* fascination with plays, players, and playing. *Hamlet* is full of metatheatrical moments, scenes that 'stage the stage'. These scenes remind audience members that they are watching a play, that they occupy the time-honoured role of spectator and thus are subject to both the rewards and dangers associated with playgoing. Such moments also highlight the disjunction between seeming and being, feigned action and genuine action, or feigned action and genuine effect. The supreme instances of this kind of metatheatre are the arrival of a travelling troupe of actors at Elsinore in the second act and their performance of an inset play in the third. In the first instance, the lead player delivers Aeneas' account of the fall of Troy in a speech that, to Hamlet's wonder, moves the player himself to tears. In the second instance, the group performs at court a fully realized play that recapitulates a royal marriage and the murder of the king by an interloper who seizes his crown. Both reflect, from different angles, recent events in Denmark, and both are meant to affect the audience ('The play's the thing', Hamlet says, 'Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king' (2.2.557–8)).

Additional gestures in these scenes also reflect recent events in Shakespeare's immediate theatrical landscape. For example, just before the play-within-the play in Act 3, Hamlet quizzes Polonius about his acting experience:

<sup>1</sup> Harley Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare: 'Hamlet'* (Princeton University Press, 1946), 53.

HAMLET . . . My lord, you played once i'th' university, you say.

POLONIUS That did I my lord, and was accounted a good actor.

HAMLET And what did you enact?

POLONIUS I did enact Julius Caesar. I was killed i'th' Capitol. Brutus killed me.

HAMLET It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there. (3.2.87–93)

This is a shout-out to Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, and alert audience members then and now are rewarded with the gratifying sense of being 'in the know' about Shakespeare's canon. But in Shakespeare's time, it was also a warning: if the same actor who played Caesar played Polonius, and the same actor who played Brutus played Hamlet, Polonius is setting himself up to die at Hamlet's hands, just as Caesar died at Brutus'.

#### THE POETS' WAR

There is a similar, though more complex, dynamic at work in the 'tragedians of the city' scene in Act 2 (present, though with significant variations, in all three early texts). It offers a fictionalized glimpse into early modern performance conditions, gesturing imaginatively to events and pressures within the entertainment industry. In **Q1**, Hamlet is told that the players visiting Elsinore have left their residence in the city because 'noveltie carries it away', and audiences are 'turned' 'to the humour of children'. In **F**, Rosencrantz elaborates a similar complaint (2.2.313–33), when he tells Hamlet (in lines often referred to as the 'little eyases' passage) that:

there is sir an eyrie of children, little eyases, that cry out on the top of question and are most tyrannically clapped for't. These are now the fashion, and so be-rattle the common stages (so they call them) that many wearing rapiers are afraid of goose-quills, and dare scarce come thither.

These moments in **Q1** and **F** have long been linked to developments in the theatre industry at the turn of the century, specifically the revival of two children's companies, Paul's Boys and the Children of the Chapel, in 1599–1600. According to the traditional narrative, a so-called 'War of the Theatres' pitted the boy players, who performed in smaller, indoor playhouses and dominated the market by exploiting the satiric and erotic potential of adolescent performers, against the adult troupes, which suffered financially. Rosencrantz seems to affirm this situation when he admits to Hamlet, who has asked if the boys 'carry it away', that indeed they do. 'Ay', says Rosencrantz, with an allusion to the Globe Theatre emblem, 'Hercules and his load too' (332–3).

Recent scholarship has challenged this adversarial scenario in various ways. James Bednarz has suggested that the 'Poetomachia', as one dramatist called it – or 'Poets' War' – was not a commercial battle between adult and boy companies but a theoretical, and perhaps mutually beneficial, debate between individual playwrights about the 'social function of drama'.<sup>1</sup> Dramatists such as Ben Jonson, John Marston, and

<sup>1</sup> James Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 7. Suspicion that the whole affair was a 'contrived situation' for publicity purposes is expressed by W. Reavley Gair, *The Children of Paul's: The Story of a Theatre Company, 1553–1608* (Cambridge University Press, 1982), 134.

Thomas Dekker put caricatures of one another on stage in order to showcase their different ideas about effective playwrighting and performance. The ‘little eyases’ passage, Bednarz explains, represents Shakespeare’s ‘distress over the vituperative tenor of the Poets’ War’, as well as his concern for the fates of both adult and boy companies as a result of the theatrical skirmishing.<sup>1</sup> Roslyn Knutson, in contrast, has argued that F’s ‘little eyases’ passage was a later addition to the manuscript, and that it does not comment on both boy companies at the turn of the century. Rather, it was added between 1606 and 1608, and it gestures to *Children of the Revels* (formerly the *Children of the Chapel*) and their politically charged Jacobean plays performed between 1604 and 1608.<sup>2</sup>

As we shall see, these distinct metatheatrical references can help us to date the composition of the play. But they also work thematically, showcasing Shakespeare’s ability to reinforce events happening in the fictional world of the play with the real world of the theatre. Here, he glances at the generational rivalries between contemporary London playing companies in order to illuminate the generational rivalries at the Danish court. Both sets of rivalries, Shakespeare makes clear, are intimately bound up with the issues of professional and political inheritance. In F, his Hamlet enquires of the children: ‘Will they not say afterwards, if they should grow themselves to common players – as it is most like if their means are no better, their writers do them wrong to make them exclaim against their own succession?’ (2.2.322–5).

In Q2, the corresponding passage lacks explicit references to boy actors, stressing instead the more general precariousness of theatrical success. When Hamlet asks why the players have left the city to tour, Rosencrantz submits in the second quarto that ‘their inhibition comes by means of the late innovation’. His response may invoke the popular novelty of the boy companies. Or it may refer to immediate political contexts: scholars have suggested the regulation by the Privy Council in June 1600 to limit the number of London playing companies, or the Essex rebellion of February 1601. Or it may refer to events a couple of years later: Elizabeth I’s death, the accession of James I, and the plague which shut down the theatres in 1603.<sup>3</sup> But the pleasingly alliterative line also makes sense entirely within the fiction itself: the players have left the city because of the ‘innovation’ that is King Hamlet’s death. The troupe, similar to Hamlet, has been displaced by Claudius. Hamlet himself, in fact, makes the comparison as he remarks upon the oddity of the new regime: ‘Is it not very strange, for my uncle is king of Denmark, and those that would make mouths at him while my father lived give twenty, forty, fifty, a hundred ducats apiece for his picture in little’ (2.2.334–6).

#### DATING HAMLET

Metadramatic scenes call attention to the play’s status as a play, inviting the audience to reflect on the relationship between the stage and the world. Metadramatic scenes

<sup>1</sup> Bednarz, *Poets’ War*, 30.

<sup>2</sup> Roslyn L. Knutson, ‘Falconer to the Little Eyases: A New Date and Commercial Agenda for the “Little Eyases” Passage in *Hamlet*’, *SQ* 46.1 (1995), 1–31.

<sup>3</sup> See Richard Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist* (Oxford University Press, 2016), 226–44.

that are as topical as the little eyases passage call attention to the play's immediate historical moment. They – along with other kinds of internal and external evidence – thus seem to give scholars interpretive access to *when* the play was composed and first performed. In other words, various elements of the play seem to give us access to the complex personal, social, political, and literary contexts that spoke to Shakespeare, and to which he spoke back in the *Hamlet* we know today. But, as with other strange or estranging aspects of the drama, the evidence is multivalent and scholarly interpretations complex, recursive, and often in conflict.

Given this caveat, however, we can locate other important signposts for dating the play. *Hamlet* is not included in the list of Shakespeare's tragedies mentioned in Francis Meres's famous catalogue in his *Palladis Tamia* (entered in the Stationers' Register in September 1598). Claims from omission are never conclusive, but the absence makes a date earlier than 1598 unlikely. So, although a marginal note about *Hamlet* by Gabriel Harvey in his copy of Speght's Chaucer, which was published and purchased by Harvey in 1598, has often been taken to suggest an early date, we should be more circumspect. The notation, which groups *Hamlet* with Shakespeare's narrative poems of 1593–4, is a compelling instance of early modern literary evaluation: 'The younger sort takes much delight in Shakespeares Venus, & Adonis, but his Lucrece, & his tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke, have it in them, to please the wiser sort.'<sup>1</sup>

But as a means of dating the composition and performance of the play, the note is inconclusive, as the date of the note itself is subject to debate. A recent study suggests that it is likely a series of five notes composed over a number of years after Harvey purchased the volume', and that the comment on *Hamlet* was probably 'written ... after the Second Quarto of the play was published in late 1604'.<sup>2</sup>

As opposed to the vagaries of the Harvey note, the play has a definitive entry for publication – 26 July 1602 – in the Stationers' Register, the official record book of the Stationers' Company that was essential for regulating the book trade. The entry documents the right of the printer James Roberts to print 'The Revenge of Hamlet Prince [of] Denmark as it was lately acted by the Lord Chamberlain his men'. It thus reinforces a date before the summer of 1602, suggesting that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* had been on the stage both recently ('lately') and for enough time to make the prospect of printing it (a significant investment for stationers) appear worthwhile.

The Poets' War has been used routinely to fix the date of *Hamlet*'s composition and performance. Since the children's troupes were revived in 1599–1600, and since the playwrights were staging barbs at one another well into 1601, the allusions discussed above suggest that the play was taking shape around the turn of the century, from roughly 1599 to 1601. But this evidence is neither transparent nor unequivocal. Bednarz, for instance, suggests that the 'little eyases' passage was added in 1601 to

<sup>1</sup> *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913), 232.

<sup>2</sup> Michael J. Hirrel, 'When Did Gabriel Harvey Write His Famous Note?' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75.2 (2012), 292. See also Jenkins, 3–6 and 573–4; E. A. J. Honigmann, 'The Date of *Hamlet*', *Shakespeare Survey* 9 (1956), 24–6.



a play that had been on the stage for some time.<sup>1</sup> Richard Dutton agrees with this dating of the ‘little eyases’ passage, but suggests, based on Q2’s ‘late innovation’, that the play was substantively revised – rewritten into the canonical version we know today – in mid- to late 1603 for court performance.<sup>2</sup>

Additional metatheatrical nods also orient the play to the turn of the century. In late 1599, Shakespeare’s company, the Chamberlain’s Men, had relocated from their previous home, the Theatre in Shoreditch, to the Globe Theatre, on the south side of the Thames. Hamlet’s lamentation on ‘this distracted globe’ (1.5.97) seems to glance at the new amphitheatre, a reference that makes the most dramatic sense if the play was scripted and performed in the immediate wake of the move. The same applies to his mention of ‘Hercules and his load’: the emblem of the new theatre was Hercules carrying the celestial globe on his shoulders. And so too do many of the play’s thematic preoccupations, which resonate with the popular concerns of the end of the sixteenth century: the downfall of the Earl of Essex, fears about the ageing Queen Elizabeth and who would succeed her as monarch.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, the play has been seen to resonate more directly with topical events of mid- to late 1603, including the death of Elizabeth I and the accession to the English throne of King James I of Scotland. (James’s own father had been murdered and his mother, Mary Queen of Scots, had remarried the putative assassin. James’s queen, Anne, was Danish, the sister to the current King of Denmark, Christian IV.) Stylistic and linguistic evidence places it near *Henry V* (1599) and *Troilus and Cressida* (1600–1), but also near his major Jacobean tragedies: *Othello* (1603), *King Lear* (1606), and *Macbeth* (1606).<sup>4</sup>

Hamlet himself struggles with dates and temporality. In his first soliloquy, he accuses his mother of remarrying within two months of King Hamlet’s death; he then remeasures: ‘nay not so much, not two . . . within a month . . . A little month’ (1.2.138–47). At an equally critical juncture, the protagonist, having seen and spoken with the ghost of his father, realizes that ‘The time is out of joint’ (1.5.189). In the world Hamlet inhabits, that is, even the routine flow of days, months, and years has been rendered unstable and untrustworthy. That sense of instability seems most appropriate for a composition and performance date at the turn of the century: ‘later than mid 1599 . . . and . . . earlier than July 1602’.<sup>5</sup> *Fins de siècle*, Elaine Showalter has written, are particularly charged moments, when ‘crises . . . are more intensely experienced, more emotionally fraught, more weighted with symbolic and historical meaning, because we invest them with the metaphors of death and rebirth that we

<sup>1</sup> Bednarz, *Poets’ War*, 225–54.

<sup>2</sup> Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*, 226–44.

<sup>3</sup> See Stuart M. Kurland, ‘Hamlet and the Scottish Succession?’ *Studies in English Literature* 34.2 (1994), 279–300.

<sup>4</sup> Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (repr. New York: Norton, 1997), 122. Taylor has more recently argued for a mid- to late 1603 date for the composition and first performances of the canonical *Hamlet*; see *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*, ed. Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan (Oxford University Press, 2016), 544.

<sup>5</sup> Philip Edwards, ‘Introduction’, in *Hamlet*, ed. Philip Edwards, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 7–8.

project onto [them]'.<sup>1</sup> *Hamlet* may challenge us to mistrust our instincts to give it any precise date; but there is a poetic justice in locating its 'questionable shape' in such a moment.

### Staging the Text

Towards the end of his interaction with the travelling players in Act 2, Hamlet asks whether, for their performance the following night, they could 'study a speech of some dozen or sixteen lines, which I would set down and insert in't' (2.2.493–5). The request offers a theatricalized rendition of textual practice in Shakespeare's theatre, where revisions of various kinds were routinely made to playscripts: older scripts were rewritten by different playwrights, working scripts were cut or supplemented for performance – sometimes by their original dramatists, sometimes by a new writer.<sup>2</sup> Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was fashioned in this environment. It helps to account for other aspects of the play's strangeness: its relation to an earlier Hamlet play and the shape of its earliest printed editions.

#### HANDFULS OF HAMLETS?

A reference by Thomas Nashe indicates that by the late 1580s there was on the London stage a pre-Shakespearean *Hamlet*, which we now refer to as the *Ur-Hamlet*. The reference is not complimentary. In a dedicatory epistle at the start of his friend Robert Greene's *Menaphon* (1589), Nashe complains about a group of ambitious, blustering playwrights for whom 'English *Seneca* read by candlelight yields many good sentences, as *Blood is a beggar*, and so forth, and if you entreat him fair in a frosty morning he will afford you whole Hamlets, I should say handfuls, of tragical speeches.'<sup>3</sup> Another reference to a play of *Hamlet* dates to 1594, from the account book (known now as *Henslowe's Diary*) of the theatrical entrepreneur Philip Henslowe. He records the performance (likely by Shakespeare's company, the Chamberlain's Men) of a play called *Hamlet* on 9 June 1594, at the Newington Butts playhouse on the south side of the Thames.<sup>4</sup> This reference may or may not be to the same play mentioned by Nashe. And in his 1596 *Wit's Misery*, the writer Thomas Lodge invoked the character of Hamlet to describe a type of slanderous devil who 'walks for the most part in black under cover of gravity, and looks as pale as the vizard of the ghost who cried so miserably at the Theatre like an oyster-wife, *Hamlet, revenge!*'<sup>5</sup> Lodge's description may point to the play recorded by Nashe or by Henslowe.

These references to a putative early *Hamlet* play (or plays) raise multiple questions. Some are questions about authorship: who wrote the *Ur-Hamlet*? Because Nashe's epistle of 1589 seems to include three swipes at the playwright Thomas Kyd, Kyd has

<sup>1</sup> Elaine Showalter, *Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin de Siecle* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), 2.

<sup>2</sup> Grace Ioppolo, *Revising Shakespeare* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Nashe, Preface to R. Greene's *Menaphon*, in *Works*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow (London: A. H. Bullen, 1905), III: 315, spelling modernized.

<sup>4</sup> *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, 2002), 21.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie* (London, 1596), h4v, spelling modernized.

been seen as a candidate for penning the play. Kyd is an attractive option since he is the author of another play preoccupied with revenge, *The Spanish Tragedy*, which features a ghost and a character named Horatio. But Nashe, whose references come in the form of puns and allusions, never explicitly states that Kyd is the ‘afforder’ of ‘whole Hamlets’. More cautious approaches, then, resist naming a specific writer, suggesting instead that the hand behind the early *Hamlet* be identified simply as one among a group of playwrights that had earned Nashe’s scorn. Shakespeare himself may be implied in Nashe’s critique, and some scholars have suggested that he was the author of an early *Hamlet* play that he subsequently revised around the turn of the century. A related, but not inevitable, position is that the first quarto (see p. 17) is what we now call the *Ur-Hamlet*.

Additional questions concern the relationship between an earlier version and Shakespeare’s drama. Grace Ioppolo has argued forcefully that Shakespeare was a dedicated reviser of his own work.<sup>1</sup> But how might he have refashioned an earlier play? Did he work from a manuscript, from memories of the other play, or from some combination of the two? To what extent did he follow the earlier play’s structural and linguistic patterns? A long line of criticism tended to accept the idea that Shakespeare rewrote his *Hamlet* in one fell swoop, making it into an entirely different text from the play Nashe and Lodge mocked. But more recent scholarship has challenged this model of ‘radical substitution’. Instead, some scholars have argued, Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* was the product of his ‘incremental’ revision over many years, rather than the result of the replacement of a primitive play by Shakespeare’s brilliant script.<sup>2</sup> Others have questioned the existence of an *Ur-Hamlet* altogether, seeing it as a scholarly invention or ‘phantom play’ to which textual bibliographers have attributed a ‘surprising corporeality’.<sup>3</sup>

All of these claims remain unsettled, subject to further debate. For now, the most reliable – though not indisputable – account may be summarized as follows: Kyd or one of his fellow-dramatists wrote an early version of *Hamlet* at the end of the 1580s; shortly after that, Kyd capitalized on its success in his revenge play *The Spanish Tragedy*; and Shakespeare had both earlier plays in mind when he pursued his own drama of a Danish prince. His pursuits, as we shall see, come to us in three distinct printed versions, yet another aspect of the play’s complexity or ‘strangeness’.

#### THE THREE TEXTS OF HAMLET

There exist three distinct early versions of the play: the first quarto, published in 1603; the second quarto, published in 1604/5; and the text in the Folio, published in 1623. Differences between them, both large and small, abound. Q2 has over 200 lines not in

<sup>1</sup> ‘Shakespeare’s authorial revisions in character, theme, plot, structure, and setting, made for changed theatrical or political conditions, censorship, publication, or private transcription (and for his own artistic demands) infuse the canon of his plays’ (Ioppolo, *Revising Shakespeare*, 133).

<sup>2</sup> James Marino, *Owning William Shakespeare: The King’s Men and Their Intellectual Property* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 79.

<sup>3</sup> Emma Smith, ‘Ghost Writing: *Hamlet* and the *Ur-Hamlet*’, in *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality*, ed. Andrew Murphy (Manchester University Press, 2000), 177, 179.

F (including Hamlet's soliloquy 'How all occasions do inform against me' in 4.4 and the dialogue with the Lord in 5.2), and F has over 80 lines not in Q2 (including the little eyases passage in 2.2).

Q1 is a text substantially distinct from both Q2 and F; the latter two look much more similar in comparison to the first quarto. (The title page of Q2 announces this difference by proclaiming that it is 'Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie'.) Q1, at about 2,200 lines, has roughly half the number of lines of Q2 (around 3,800) and F (around 3,700).<sup>1</sup> Q1 has some different names (Polonius is Corambis) as well as detailed stage directions not in Q2 or F. Interestingly, Q1 gives more attention to Gertrude. In dialogue not in Q2 or F's closet scene (3.4), Hamlet tells his mother that her new husband murdered her former one, at which point she promises to assist Hamlet in his plans for revenge. Q1 also includes an entirely novel scene between Gertrude and Horatio in which Horatio delivers, in abbreviated form, the news of Hamlet's return to Denmark (4.6) and of Claudius's intent to kill him (5.2). Q1 also places the famous 'to be or not to be' speech significantly earlier than the other two texts: before the arrival of the players in Elsinore. Differences in language are also worth noting: Q1 is significantly less poetic and more garbled at numerous points than Q2 or F.<sup>2</sup> Finally, there are noticeable irregularities in the print history of the quartos. The 1602 entry of *Hamlet* in the Stationers' Register licenses the play to James Roberts. Roberts's name, however, does not appear on the title page of Q1, which was published the next year by Nicholas Ling and John Trundle and printed by Valentine Simmes. Roberts returns to the scene with the enlarged Q2, which he printed for Nicholas Ling.

*Hamlet's* complex textual situation has long been known to scholars. Although Shakespeare's eighteenth-century editors were unaware of the survival of the first quarto (it was not found until 1823), they grappled with the differences between the second quarto and the Folio. Such grappling, made thornier by the discovery of Q1 and its significant differences from Q2 and F,<sup>3</sup> still continues. It often takes the form of a transmission history, a bibliographical and editorial strategy founded by scholars in the early to mid-twentieth century in order to explain the process by which a play moved from script to stage to print. The job of a transmission history of *Hamlet* is to establish the temporal and substantive relationships between the three editions by determining the type of manuscript or copy-text 'behind' each of them. These types include Shakespeare's autograph draft; transcriptions or

<sup>1</sup> See Thomas Clayton, 'Introduction: Hamlet's Ghost', in *The 'Hamlet' First Published (Q1, 1603): Origins, Form, Intertextualities*, ed. Thomas Clayton (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992), 22.

<sup>2</sup> The differences between versions of 'to be or not to be' are often cited: Q1 reads 'To be, or not to be – ay, there's the point: / To die, to sleep – is that all? ay, all'; Q2/F: 'To be, or not to be, that is the question – / Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer / The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune'. The best way to observe the differences is with Paul Bertram and Bernice Kliman, *The Three-text Hamlet: Parallel Texts of the First and Second Quartos and the First Folio*, 2nd edn (New York: AMS Press, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> Zachary Lesser provides an important account of the 'uncanny' effects of the discovery of Q1. See *Hamlet After Q1: An Uncanny History of the Shakespearean Text* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015).

revisions of that draft – by Shakespeare or another scribe, in preparation for performance; and written recollections of performance. (It is important to note that no manuscript of a Shakespeare play survives – though some do for other Renaissance dramatists, and these inform bibliographers' categories.) Once the category of manuscript underlying the printed edition has been surmised and its connection to the others established, scholars can then advocate for that edition's status as the most 'authoritative' in relation to other versions. But in another twist, scholars do not necessarily agree on which kind of printer's copy represents the most 'authoritative' text. Some champion printed editions that derive from manuscripts closest to Shakespeare's own papers. Others champion texts that seem closest to the play as it was performed.

As might be anticipated when the evidence is both scarce and subject to multiple interpretations, scholars have proposed competing transmission theories for *Hamlet*. Philip Edwards's comprehensive Textual Analysis (pp. 253–77) provides such a theory, and it governs the text of the *New Cambridge Shakespeare Hamlet*. In brief, Edwards suggests printers set **Q2** from an early authorial copy ('foul papers'), perhaps with reference to **Q1**; **F** from a revision of those foul papers as they were readied for performance, perhaps with reference to **Q2**; and **Q1** from a memorial reconstruction, probably by an actor or actors, of the play in performance. In a nutshell, **Q2** is closer to the page and **F** is closer to the stage. In terms of a timeline of composition, the manuscript behind **Q2** was the first to be written, the manuscript behind the Folio the second, and the manuscript behind **Q1** the last. Edwards's persuasive account, from 1985, was published at roughly the same time as three other major editions: Harold Jenkins's for Arden 2, G. R. Hibbard's for Oxford, and Gary Taylor and Stanley Wells's for the Oxford *Complete Works*. All four editions from the 1980s concur, with qualifications, on the nature of the manuscripts behind the *Hamlet* editions. And they all agree that the complexity of the play's textual situation reverberates in the complexity, even ineffability, of its central character. But they disagree in crucial ways about how the status of the texts should influence the editing of the play. Their editions, then, reflect conflicting views on which version should be used as the basis (the 'copy-text') for an edition and on how to choose between variants. In general, Edwards's careful choices for the body of this *NCS* edition represent what he believes Shakespeare intended when composing *Hamlet*. (Variants are printed under the main text, so readers can see the alternative versions.) Often Edwards chooses Folio readings over **Q2** readings. Such choices may seem paradoxical for Edwards, since he maintains that **Q2** was printed from an authorial manuscript and thus putatively closer to Shakespeare's original intentions than **F**, which was printed from a transcript prepared for performance. But Edwards proposes that Shakespeare had made significant revisions to the manuscript behind **Q2**. These revisions, he explains, confused the printers of the second quarto. But they were accurately included in the transcription for performance that stands behind the Folio version. In those cases, then, the Folio represents the text closest to Shakespeare's designs.

## THE THREE TEXTS TODAY

Later 20th- and early 21st-century scholars have inherited these and other disagreements. In response, they have fashioned their own approaches to the three-text problem, challenging or correcting with fresh intellectual energy many of the suppositions of earlier bibliographical scholarship. One of the salient characteristics of this kind of work is its critical self-reflexivity. That is, it makes explicit not only its methodological principles, as previous scholarship does, but also the assumptions behind, and stakes of, those principles.<sup>1</sup> So, although these approaches often echo proposals from earlier decades, they reflect recent theoretical and practical developments in bibliography, editorial theory, theatre history, and performance studies. And, insofar as they are embedded in more comprehensive arguments about the structure and sociability of the early modern theatre, they put pressure on inherited assumptions about authorial intention, about strategies of revision, about the status of page versus stage, even about the definition of a Shakespeare play itself.

For instance, some scholars of *Hamlet*'s complex transmission history do not seek to establish Shakespeare's authorial aims and motives (they contest that very notion). Rather, they study the textual situation as an example of the collaborative nature of the early modern theatre, where actors, scribes, printers, and publishers all contributed to the shaping of the drama in its various forms. In contrast, other scholars see the three texts as a measure of Shakespeare's intentionality as well as his commitment to the revision and publication of his plays. Grace Ioppolo maintains that Shakespeare himself, and not his acting company, is responsible for variations between Q2 and F. And Lukas Erne has upended the commonplace that Shakespeare composed only for performance. He argues that Q2 was written specifically for print – that Shakespeare was thinking of readers as well as spectators for his plays. In Erne's account, Q1 represents a reconstructed version of an abridgement for the London stage; looked at together, the two texts offer 'access . . . to the difference between the writing practice of Shakespeare the dramatist, on the one hand, and the performance practice of Shakespeare and his fellows, on the other'.<sup>2</sup>

Erne's discussion hints at a significant tendency in recent studies of the textual problem: they often involve reassessments of Q1 as an object of literary, dramatic, and cultural interest. Since the 1930s, the orthodox (though not the only) explanation of Q1 was that it was the debased product of 'memorial reconstruction': the report by an actor or actors of recollected dialogue. Assumed to be a performance text, Q1 had usually been treated as an editorial afterthought, even an embarrassment to the cultural meaning of Shakespeare, and of interest only for the stage directions it supplied. But the new scholarly priorities of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have allowed Q1 to be evaluated according to criteria that privilege it as a record of playing conventions, and actors and directors, as well as scholars, have

<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Egan, *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 192.