4   I have used the form *North & South* to designate the 2004 BBC mini-series, dir. Brian Percival based on Elizabeth Gaskell's novel *North and South* (1855). The ampersand in the title may have been nothing more than a design feature, but it is retained for instance by the authoritative Internet Movie Database (imdb.com).

5   It is worth pointing out that, from the first word, Sandy Welch has indicated that in this film romance is implicated in a wider world than that of the traditional 'love story'. 'What a business this wedding has been', Margaret's aunt tells her in the opening moment—an apt epigraph for a tale that will end as much in a merger as a marriage. 'So you see, it is only a business matter', Margaret explains to Thornton after putting to him her proposal at the conclusion, 'You would not be obliged to me in any way. It is you who would be doing me the service'.

Davɪᴅ Kᴇʟʟʏ teaches literature and cinema in The Department of English, University of Sydney.

A Proximate Prince:
The Gooey Business of *Hamlet* Criticism

L. E. Sᴇᴍʟᴇʀ

> Now could I drink hot goo,
> And do such gooey, gooey business as the day
> Would quake to look on.
> Soft, now to my blue goo.[1]

Imagine the opening scene of *Hamlet* as a metaphor for interpretation. The darkened battlement stands for the conceptual domain in which the reader, any reader, encounters a text: it is a hermeneutic space. The Ghost signifies the shimmering appearance of a text in this space of interpretation, which is to say, not an actual printed text itself, but a text as it is conceptually encountered by a reader. The sentries, then, resemble interpreters who feel compelled to force the majestic text to speak intelligibly to them and their context, but who in the end can only cry, 'Stay, illusion!' as the Ghost dissolves, invulnerable as air.[2]

Let's move among the sentries. They are abuzz with what they've seen. They agree the figure resembles the late King Hamlet, and suspect the encounter has a bearing on their present as much as anyone's past, but greater clarity is hard to resolve. Whatever their differences, the sentries agree that a single question requires urgent attention: what is the Ghost about? Soon this imperative transfers to Prince Hamlet and before long he finds himself circling around a cognate problem: what am *I* about? By the middle of the play, all his relatives and acquaintances have been drawn into a similarly persistent inquiry: what is Hamlet about? Little wonder then that from Shakespeare's time to ours readers and viewers of the play have been caught up in contentious agreement that the primary question to be resolved is, what is *Hamlet* about?, a question inseparable from the three questions I have just represented as preceding it.

It is the thesis of this article that the primary concern of *Hamlet* is 'aboutness'. It may be true that people always respond to any cultural or artistic product with the question, what is it about? And further, that this is more a symptom of human nature than aesthetic form. Yet how many aesthetic products before Hamlet make aboutness inhere within the artefact as its vibrant, and profoundly unresolved, concern? And how many do so after *Hamlet*? All too few, one suspects, and then all too many.

The *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2005) reveals that a key semantic component of the definition of 'about' is vagueness, approximation, indefiniteness. For example, *About*, A.I.2: 'Less definitely: on any side; near, in the neighbourhood, without defining the exact direction'; or A.I.3: 'Nearly, approximately … '. Aboutness tends to assume a reference point that is relatively discrete—be it numerical, geographical, subjective or conceptual—against which one may conceive something(s) located relatively more nebulously. This nebulosity (the aboutness characterising that which is 'about') is understood as *in imprecise proximity* to the reference point. This means that as we consider aboutness in a positional sense we are talking about something that is within reach and out of reach. This is one way of describing a fundamental quality of *Hamlet*. The nature of the Ghost, the clashing ethical imperatives, the deed still requiring to be done, the psychic state and self-knowledge of the protagonist, all are seemingly within reach and yet actually somehow out of reach, perceptible in nebulous terms but unable to be apprehended satisfactorily or finally. They are positionally, and perhaps eternally, 'about'.

'About' also functions in many verbal constructions relating to motion; specifically, rotation and orientation, revolution and succession, circuitousness and endeavour. For example, *About*, A.II.5a: 'Round, in rotation or revolution. Hence, fig. *to come about*: … to come to pass, turn out, or happen. *to bring about*'. Claudius, Polonius, Hamlet, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern (to name the most obvious) conduct themselves via relentless circuitousness, their words and deeds seek to bring things about by turning about one another's words and deeds as if nebulous quarries may be surprised by indirect approaches. Yet, as these characters exemplify, stalking a vapour tends to produce paranoia in the stalker rather than a bagged prey.

Hamlet is slung between the *about of position* and the *about of motion*. This accounts for the fundamentally sceptical character of the play, in which very little is directly perceived, approached, understood, or effected. The out-of-jointness of time in Denmark is, in fact, an essential aboutness. It is a curse indeed to be the one to set it right (1.5.196-7), because this can mean no more than to be the one who cannot abide the inescapable aboutness of the cosmos. Any attempt to escape aboutness (by ingenuity, endeavour, action) is only going to extend it; the more desperately and energetically one struggles against it, the more fully one embodies it. The more Hamlet tries to resolve his story the more he complicates it: he persistently seeks 'grounds more relative' (2.2.599-600), that is, evidence more concrete, but in so doing he actually demonstrates the relativity of all grounds. A plot such as this cannot end, for it is essentially not a diachronic narrative with a soluble teleology; it can only lead to exhaustion, resignation and a formally imposed conclusion, which is how this longest of all Shakespearean plays at last calls off the hunt. It is as if Shakespeare finally declares we have talked enough about Hamlet—he has Laertes state the plain truth: 'the King's to blame' (5.2.326)—but then cannot resist cursing subsequent generations with a royal commission from the dying King Hamlet: 'tell my story' (5.2.354).

At this point I do not want to pursue (at least not directly!) what *Hamlet* is about, because I am more interested in what is about *Hamlet*. I take it to be self-evident or easily demonstrable via examples from the text that the *about of position* typifies the interest of many of the characters (as they pursue certain indefinables and unplaceables) and the *about of motion* characterises their *modus operandi* (as they indefatigably weave plots and counter-plots). However, to understand the present conversation 'about *Hamlet*' one must mingle with the 'sentries', which means nothing less that to plunge into the buzzing space of interpretation. When Hamlet insists that Horatio put off suicide to 'Report me and my cause aright' (5.2.344) he effectively passes on a revised version of the impossible commission he himself received: 'Remember me' (1.5.91). We have been reporting ever since.

About the turn of the millennium Shakespeare's play turned 400 years old. Age seems not to have wearied *Hamlet*, or at least not its readers, who

in the last five years have produced innumerable critical responses to the play and thereby confirmed it as the second most written-about text after the Bible. In response to Hamlet's plea to Horatio, 'there has been much throwing about of brains' (to echo Guildenstern, 2.2.356). What is the nature of this talk about *Hamlet*? Does it have anything new to say about such a worked-over play? Consideration of these questions is significant for understanding the ways we comprehend this play in the new millennium, which involves reflection upon the present character of English Renaissance studies and on our own imaginations more generally.

If there is a single overarching preoccupation to be discerned in *Hamlet* criticism of the last five to ten years it is historical self-consciousness. Put another way, recent scholarly response to this play is largely characterised by explicit interest in the past, the present, and the relationship between the two. From one viewpoint this simply means that *Hamlet*, as the most canonical of western texts, is also the most sensitive barometer of the fact that Renaissance literature as a discipline is still in the grip of an overriding preoccupation with history that came to the fore in the early 1980s. The rise of history as the primary (but far from only) paradigm within which scholars within English Departments conduct their research into Renaissance literature is reflected in the widespread displacement of the term 'Renaissance' (with its long association with aesthetics) by 'early modern' (with its foregrounding of the historical continuum). In many ways the study of Renaissance literature has turned into Early Modern cultural studies. This means that 'early modern' literary texts seem to be interesting readers less for their inherent poetical, linguistic, and aesthetic qualities, and more for their involvement in politics, religion, gender relations, ideology, and material culture. At this stage, the intermittent cries of some scholars for a broad-scale return to core literary values, to aesthetics and/or to a 'new formalist' approach to Renaissance texts, are gaining mass, but have some way to go before being capable of destabilizing the present orthodoxy of the political/historical in university English Departments. A quick glance over the last few years of Shakespeare criticism, taking into account work that touches on *Hamlet*, reveals that one is far more likely to come across historicized discussions of Shakespeare's politics, religion, or gender ideology, than extended analyses of his poetics.[3]

After twenty-five years, 'history' is showing no sign of having been exhausted as an illuminating mode of enquiry into literary texts, but is showing signs of transmutation into a form more fully recognisable as postmodern. This postmodernizing of history within literary studies is readily apparent in recent *Hamlet* criticism. It is most obvious in the discipline's present contradictory obsession with the re-writing of history (an essentially conservative practice) and the fabrication of radically present-tense interpretations of old texts. On both sides of this equation ('historicist' and 'presentist') there exists in the literary criticism currently being published a vivid self-consciousness about the complex and inescapable relationship—indeed, entanglements—between the present and the past.

The remainder of this article will be concerned with giving some impression of the character of historicism and presentism in recent *Hamlet* criticism. It is not the task here to survey all recent approaches to *Hamlet*, because such a thing would fill a very large book. Yet, some concrete examples from each side of the critical equation will clarify not only the way our thinking about *Hamlet* is currently being shaped, but also the way each side of the equation is influenced by the other. We begin with bibliography and subjectivity as the most significant axes upon which historicist enquiry into *Hamlet* turns.

'Bibliography' is the venerable and technical discipline of assessing in fine detail the early versions of any single text with a view to producing a reliable modern edition for the buying public (be they scholars, students, or general readers). In the field of Renaissance drama generally and Shakespeare studies in particular, the basic methods and conventions of twentieth-century scholarly editing were developed by the innovative work of a cluster of brilliant early researchers including (to name three notables among many) A. W. Pollard (1859-1944), R. B. McKerrow (1872-1940) and W. W. Greg (1875-1959). The editorial approach of these men and their associates and successors in the first half of the twentieth century came to be known as the 'New Bibliography'. The most recent account of the New Bibliography reveals that it is in fact a continually evolving and self-revising methodology (now passing its centenary) for the understanding of Renaissance texts and the production of modern editions from them.[4] It is not the purpose

of this article to go into the intricate details of the New Bibliography, but a few comments on the textual editing of *Hamlet* are pertinent.

Hamlet is no longer considered a single play; or, at least not a single play in the customary sense. Scholars have long known that there are three significant and substantially differing early printings of the play: the First Quarto edition published in 1603 (known as Q1); the Second Quarto of 1604-5 (Q2); and the version of *Hamlet* printed in the first 'complete works' of Shakespeare, the First Folio of 1623 (F). Q1 was not discovered till 1823, is about half the length of Q2 and F, and has generally been typecast as a 'bad quarto' (a pejorative concept made famous by Pollard). The grounds for this classification are that it seems based on someone's (perhaps an actor's) fallible memory of a cut-down version of the play; that it simplifies the psychological profile of some characters (Claudius is more villainous, Gertrude sides with Hamlet); that it uses different names for some characters (for example, Polonius is called Corambis); that it turns some meaningful passages of text into nonsense; and that it puts the 'To be or not to be' and 'Get thee to a nunnery' scene (usually 3.1.56-163) into 2.2 rather than later in 3.1 (as in Q2 and F). Q2, the title page of which declares it to be a revision of a prior, faulty edition of half the length (presumably Q1), becomes established as the 'good quarto' because, although it relies on Q1 in places and omits 2.2.239-69 and 335-58 ('Denmark's a prison' and the boy actors section), it seems based upon Shakespeare's 'foul papers', that is, upon his own authorial manuscript including various revisions by him. Errors in Q2 suggest that the compositor was working from a messy manuscript and did not always understand which words or phrases constituted revisions rather than additions. Furthermore, there remains evidence in Q2 of some neatening up of the text of the manuscript by an editor within the playhouse. F shows some reliance on Q2, omits 4.4.32-66 ('How all occasions do inform against me'), but also relies on another manuscript source possibly connected with theatrical performance of the play because it involves various cuts.[5]

It used to be accepted as a given that the job of bibliographers is to 'conflate' the available source-texts into a convincing single text that can be presented to the public as 'Shakespeare's play'. To do this, editors have to make various decisions, choosing some words, lines, speeches, scenes, stage directions, and even character names over others where the sources offer alternatives, gaps, or apparent flaws. This process necessarily involves judgements about which bits of text are considered 'authorial', that is, written by Shakespeare himself, and which seem like 'corruptions' in the process of textual transmission or 'interventions' by other hands. Texts often end up longer rather than shorter because no editor wants to be the one who throws out words Shakespeare himself may have laboured over. It can come as quite a surprise to a general reader that the copy of *Hamlet* or whatever other Shakespearean text they happen to be reading is usually a fabrication by an editor who has based his or her edition on reproduction of a particular source-text, but with the substantial inclusion of words and lines from other source-texts (even supposedly unreliable ones) and even from the editor's own (supposedly reliable) imagination.

Since all source texts have their problems and since Shakespeare failed to leave us handwritten copies of the plays just as he liked them, we shall always be at the mercy of, and indebted to, editors for turning less-than-perfect textual artefacts into workable, readable editions. The case of *Hamlet*, however, exemplifies a significant change in the orthodoxy of textual editing. Rather than, as before, prioritising conflation as the primary methodology for producing a single reliable text to be known henceforth as 'Shakespeare's play', and in the process relegating the so-called 'bad quarto' to the unvisited rare book vault, it is now widely recognised that there are at least two *Hamlet*s. There is a longer *Hamlet* (reflected in the more philosophical, psychologically complex, and rhetorically expansive texts preserved in Q2 and F), and a shorter *Hamlet* (reflected in the faster-paced, psychologically simpler, and rhetorically curter Q1). Additionally, one can easily distinguish between Q2 and F to establish them as distinct texts with quite specific origins and reasons for being. Along these lines, John Lee has argued for the existence of two distinct Prince Hamlets, the Folio prince being a more self-consciously interiorised character than the Q2 prince.[6]

To downplay Q1 as in some sense unreliable, and yet to conflate all three primary sources (Q1, Q2, F) into one long master-text based upon Q2 or F,

is increasingly seen as unfair to the sources, especially Q1, and perhaps also a misunderstanding of the fact that multiple versions of the one basic arte-fact circulated in different forums simultaneously. It is widely accepted that Shakespeare himself was involved in production of two different versions of *King Lear,* and it is increasingly accepted that Shakespeare's plays in general are simultaneously his own works and subject to ongoing modifica-tion and revision for various reasons by himself, his company of actors, and various early redactors and printers. This is to say that most Shakespearean texts are multiple, and Shakespeare himself as 'author' may also be consid-ered in some ways multiple. An authoritative text is no longer necessarily only the longest or least 'corrupted' version available. As Ernst Honigmann warns, it is time to admit that when we compare source-texts where they differ from one another it is often impossible to be objectively certain that any word or line is actually the author's own choice, or his own later revi-sion of something he wrote earlier, or someone else's intervention (such as an editor's or a copyist's error or choice).[7]

This change in our approach to bibliography is driven by revisionist his-toricist inquiry into sixteenth-century theatrical practices. We are a lot more accepting nowadays of the idea of Shakespeare as a co-author (for example, working with another individual such as George Peele in the writing of *Titus Andronicus*) and of the idea of the significant creative involvement of the acting company (which may also include the author) in the cutting and alter-ation of scenes and lines in any play. This has freed us to explore the mean-ings and qualities of each source-text, whether individually or in families, rather than limiting our thinking to the question of which single text can be produced that will preserve all the authorial words of the great Shakespeare. There is every possibility he was not seeking to produce a single rigid text in the first place and that he had a more fluid view of the written product, which allows far greater transformation of it by various people for various purposes (public playing, private playing, printing, …) than we first imagined.

Modern editions of *Hamlet* reveal this change in understanding. The prestigious series of editions of Shakespeare's works known as the Arden Shakespeare is now into its third edition. The first Arden edition of *Hamlet*, edited by Edward Dowden in 1899, considered F to be more reliable in its

readings than Q2, and this shaped its text. The second Arden edition of *Hamlet*, a superb work of scholarship edited by Harold Jenkins in 1982, considered Q2 to be more authoritative than F in determining the look of the play. The third Arden edition of *Hamlet*, currently a work-in-progress, edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, will be a two-volume triple-edition, providing the full texts of Q1 and F in one volume and a regular 'Arden style' annotated edition of Q2 in the other.[8] Given the current schol-arly climate, one should expect triple-editions of *Hamlet*, organised in various ways, to proliferate. Already in 1991, Bernice W. Kliman and Paul Bertram edited *The Three-Text Hamlet: Parallel Texts of the First and Second Quartos and First Folio*, which was successful enough to be revised and expanded in its 2003 edition. Dual editions of *Hamlet* are also available wherein one sees Q2 and F simultaneously, distinguished by superscript and subscript fonts or various forms of bracketing.[9] Separate hardcopies of Q1 and F are readily available.[10] One can view free online versions of Q1, Q2, and F (each in three forms) on Michael Best's Internet Shakespeare Edi-tions, and the subscription-only database, Early English Books Online, offers photographic facsimiles of Q1, Q2 and F as well as a fully searchable transcription of Q1 (and in due course of Q2 and F also).[11] Internet Shake-speare Editions reveals the exciting new prospects opening up for electronic editions. Best's e-article, 'Standing in Rich Place: Electrifying the Multiple-Text Edition, Or, Every Text is Multiple', shows how electronic editions can provide reader-friendly animated texts in which one variant reading alter-nates with another so the viewer can appreciate two versions of the one text almost simultaneously.[12]

Sonia Massai notes that within the electronic medium 'the end result of an editor's labours is not a critical *edition* but a critical *archive*. A critical edition is structured hierarchically and privileges the modern text over other textual alternatives, which are cryptically and partially summarized in the textual apparatus. The critical archive provides accurate and searchable digital versions of the editions from which those textual alternatives derive'.[13] This is a substantially more democratic and multivocal product than the traditional edition but, clearly, it does not make old hard-copy crit-ical editions obsolete, because general viewers often feel overwhelmed by vast jungles of relatively raw data (or, to refine the metaphor, jungles with

too many paths). Furthermore, no e-archive of source-texts is absolutely free of its compiler's biases, blind spots, and restrictive hierarchies, and typographical errors still plague electronic transcripts. Nonetheless, thanks to the internet and searching software, the product range and the possibilities for users of Shakespearean bibliography are expanding.

A significant aspect of the revisionary approach to the text of *Hamlet* is the morphing of Q1 from 'bad' to 'good'. Originally mocked for mangling the 'To be or not to be' speech (it begins: 'To be, or not to be, I there's the point'), Q1 has now been successfully played more than once in modern times, has received a collection of scholarly essays devoted to it, and has been the subject of a host of new theories regarding its origin, value, and purpose.[14] Lukas Erne's recent work on Shakespeare overturns various editing orthodoxies established by the New Bibliography and in the process postulates a Shakespeare who consciously writes sophisticated literary plays such as the long *Hamlet* (preserved in Q2 and F), which includes complex and profound philosophical and poetic passages that Shakespeare intends, not for performance, but for more private reading and consideration. Additionally, as a member of a playing company, Shakespeare is involved in the production of restructured versions of his works (such as that reflected in Q1) which speed up the action, condense philosophical sections, and flatten characters into types that function well on stage. Consequently, the idea of Hamlet as a delaying revenger which dominates so many interpretations of the play is seen to be really only suitable to the long *Hamlet* upon which our editions have tended to be based up till now. If the New Bibliography had not deemed Q1 'bad', but rather promoted it as a text worthy of appreciation, we would not have seen any delay in Hamlet's action and our understanding of the plot would be considerably different from what it is at present and perhaps closer to the way it was appreciated on stage in 1600-1.[15]

Thus, our understanding of the raw text of *Hamlet* has been dramatically altered by revisionist historical enquiry into the nature of the early editions, an enquiry moulded and accelerated by the co-option of electronic means. We feel we are getting closer to an accurate understanding of what a Shakespeare text is, or what *they are*, via a postmodern combination of historical excavation of previously occluded facts and electronic, mobile structures of knowledge and data. An analogous development has been occurring more or less simultaneously in the critical response to Hamlet as a character, to which we now turn.

'Subjectivity' has become the domain name for a now vast and complex field of enquiry into the structure, operations, and interactions of the human self. Shakespeare is a canonical inclusion in many discussions of subjectivity because of the vividness and range of his characters and the fact that the 'Renaissance' as a period has long been associated with the emergence of the (modern) individual.[16] The plays of Shakespeare have provided unsurpassed source-material for the recent scholarly exploration of subjectivity in the English Renaissance, and no play has attracted more interest in this regard than *Hamlet*. Readers nowadays tend to feel that it goes without saying that *Hamlet*—a play apparently so rich in self-interrogating soliloquies and agonised introspection—is all about subjectivity, that is to say, it is the defining drama of the dawn of modern self-consciousness. This view was made much of through the 1980s when the study of early modern English literature was strongly influenced by understandings of social power structures and individual powerlessness within them deriving from the work of Michel Foucault from the 1960s through to the early 1980s.[17] An orthodoxy was established in which Hamlet came to represent the emergence of the truly modern subject, a person self-consciously embedded in a world of complex power relations characterised by personal and public capitalist economies. This orthodox view can be readily summarised as follows. Hamlet feels trapped within and overwritten by numerous ideological discourses that seek to define and confine him, and yet he yearns to express a selfhood that is truly his own (to demonstrate his own liberty as a person, his own sovereign agency). He believes, like many of us today, that there is within him an essential self (distinct from surface appearances) of which he should be the master, but no matter how he contorts his mind to grapple with this inkling, the contours of his own inwardness remain mysteriously obscured from him. He is, so the orthodoxy continues, proto-Cartesian, believing in a fundamental split between inner reality (his essential self or soul) and outward seeming (his body). Shakespeare is thus seen to anticipate by a generation or two the 'dualism' of René Descartes which is such an essential part of modern understandings of the self. Hamlet tears himself

apart in a heroic struggle to find ways of conceiving that within which passes show (his true self) and of executing it convincingly via authentic action. He dies on the brink of modernity, strenuously fighting to enter it fully before it has been adequately theorised by Descartes or absorbed by Shakespeare's contemporaries: hence his failure to fit within or to accept generic character types thrust upon him by his circumstances such as Senecan revenger, dutiful son, courtly lover, or pragmatic prince.

In the 1980s, Jonathan Dollimore, Francis Barker, and Catherine Belsey produced exciting and influential books on the emergence of modern subjectivity in early modern English literature, books which served to consolidate in various ways the orthodoxy just described.[18] The emergent modern subject depicted in these works came to be referred to as the liberal humanist self, a bourgeois, masculinist self embedded in western capitalist ideology and obsessed with the illusion that one can and should be a free master of one's self, thoughts, rights, and actions.

The most recent and radical assertion of *Hamlet* as not merely a symptom of the historical emergence of the modern self, but indeed as Shakespeare's seminal creation of it, is Harold Bloom's *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (1998). Bloom goes so far as to claim that Hamlet is so modern that he is 'post-Shakespearean' and that western consciousness is still evolving towards him because no-one else has yet managed to be post-Shakespearean: a wonderful, exciting, and faintly insane concept.[19] Insane, and yet perhaps not far off the mark, when one considers how many postmodern artists use Hamlet's story as a way of telling their own. Just as the orthodoxies of the New Bibliography have been broken down in the interests of greater historical accuracy and enhanced plurality of sources, so too the orthodoxy of Hamlet as the epitome of the emerging modern individual (our psychological forerunner, as it were) has been undermined by recent research with the effect of producing numerous new, and more historically probable, ways of conceiving this enigmatic character. In fact, Claudius' comment on 'Hamlet's transformation' has been proved correct in the critical tradition: 'nor th'exterior nor the inward man / Resembles that it was' (2.2.6-7).

The critical history of *Hamlet* has been charted most recently by Margreta de Grazia and Huw Griffiths.[20] De Grazia's excellent account reveals that readers of *Hamlet* have not always been interested in subjectivity. In Shakespeare's lifetime the play may well have been considered out-of-date and its earliest critics seem more interested in Hamlet's bizarre 'antic disposition' (1.5.180) than any perceived interiority.[21] If we add this early impression of Hamlet as a stridently unpredictable character (as he feigns and perhaps teeters on the brink of madness) to the first quarto's fast-paced story and generally simplified support cast we end up with an Elizabethan play noteworthy for its swift plot and decidedly jumpy (at times even comically excessive) protagonist. This is a far cry from our view of *Hamlet* as a play which enshrines a very modern and serious sense of early-adult angst, or, put another way, a debilitating procrastination resulting from a bad case of pre-modern analysis paralysis.

De Grazia and Griffiths reveal that the eighteenth century saw much discussion of *Hamlet* and Shakespeare as uncivilized flouters of classical unities and plot schemas.[22] Critics of the late eighteenth century, including the German Romantics, show a growing interest in Hamlet's character and it is in Samuel Taylor Coleridge's lectures from 1800 onwards that we see a decided preference for issues of character over plot and the establishment of Hamlet as a psychological portrait akin to the modern man.[23] The interest in Hamlet's modern mind is consolidated in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century work on the play by G. W. F. Hegel, Sigmund Freud and A. C. Bradley, using terms like 'consciousness', 'unconscious', 'psychoanalysis', 'character', and 'pathology'.[24]

De Grazia and Griffiths supply us with a much-needed history for our idea of subjectivity as the imagined primary concern of *Hamlet*. Not only has subjectivity—or, put another way, Hamlet the character as opposed to *Hamlet* the plot—really only been a main theme of *Hamlet* criticism for two centuries, but the most recent scholarship is actually breaking down this idea of Hamlet as the forefather of modern individuality. Jacob Burckhardt's seminal notion of the emergence of the individual in the Renaissance, although not yet satisfactorily displaced, has certainly been criticized for its assumptions and blindspots.[25] Furthermore, the idea that the modern sense of

individuality within western, particularly English, culture first emerged in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and that this innovation is reflected in the literature of the period, has been critiqued on various fronts. A useful example is David Aers's 'Reflections on Current Histories of the Subject', in which he argues that the movement typified by Belsey and Barker relies on some outdated and anachronistic assumptions about medieval and later history. Aers urges scholars of early modernity to read not only the work of recent historians of the Middle Ages, but also medieval authors themselves (such as Chaucer, Langland, Kempe, and Hoccleve) so as not to overestimate the novelty of late Elizabethan literary explorations of the self.[26]

The most recent wave of revision to our understanding of Hamlet's character is analogous to the transformation of the New Bibliography in being simultaneously historicist and postmodern. The scramble is well and truly on to produce new understandings of Hamlet's character which, as it were, predate Coleridge's interest in psychology and credit medieval understandings of human nature. The result has been a bewildering array of self-designated non-anachronistic possibilities for understanding Hamlet which do away with the need for post-Cartesian or post-Coleridgean terminology. Three examples will illustrate the point. In 2000, Paul Cefalu argued that Hamlet is closer to a radical behaviourist than a Cartesian dualist and reveals an Augustinian and Calvinistic sense of the self as an entity defined by function rather than essence, in particular by the insidious power of habits. In 2002, Conal Condren, although not specifically addressing *Hamlet*, articulated a theory of early modern office-holding as a way of understanding sixteenth-century selves which foregrounds the way Renaissance people define themselves according to the privileges and responsibilities of the various public and private offices they hold. In 2004, Gail Paster argued that Hamlet exemplifies 'the psychophysiological reciprocity of self and world' (p. 50), which is to say that early modern people understand their selves within a vast natural ecosystem so that their constitution, passions, and desires are all the result of ongoing psychophysical interactivity between what is in them and what is without.[27] These historically based options present new paradigms for understanding Hamlet's self which do not rely on reproducing the liberal humanist self of more recent times and do

not seek to explain Hamlet's dilemma in relation to him as a pioneering precursor of modern subjectivity. These understandings have knock-on effects in terms of how we define his primary dilemma. Following Cefalu: is Hamlet obsessed with habits of activity as the chief framework for understanding identity (hence his keen interest in his mother's lascivious habits, Claudius' action of kneeling in prayer, and Laertes' action of choleric revenge) and is he stalled in a non-character zone by his own failure effectively to appropriate moral habits of action in response to the ghost's commission? Following Condren: is Hamlet hamstrung by conflicting or problematised offices into which he cannot comfortably insert himself, such as princely heir, Christian son, and Senecan revenger? Following Paster: is Hamlet at the mercy of powerful spiritual and humoral flows that characterise both his self and his world, making him as 'out of joint' as 'time' and 'Denmark' themselves?

The recent revisionist approaches to *Hamlet*, in spite of their vigorous historicist rhetoric, may be deemed postmodern because they resonate with twenty-first-century views of the human self as utterly implicated socially, as constructed rather than essential, as potentially contradictory rather than essentially coherent, and as subject to ongoing processes of reconstruction or rearrangement. A malleable, postmodern subjectivity such as this is also being given an appropriately postmodern Renaissance to inhabit as the static, orderly images of the Renaissance presented by Burckhardt and E. M. W. Tillyard (for example) are challenged by books promoting a far more fluid and contradictory Renaissance, like Michel Jeanneret's *Perpetual Motion*.[28]

In sum, current historicist approaches to *Hamlet* the text and Hamlet the character are not only dismantling old orthodoxies in pursuit of greater historical accuracy, but are, paradoxically yet not surprisingly, resulting in the establishment of a noticeably postmodern 'Renaissance', characterised by constructivist selves, conflicting paradigms, and multiple texts. We are simultaneously closing in on Hamlet/*Hamlet* and ourselves. This is aboutness with a vengeance.

The vigorous postmodern *historicization* of *Hamlet* (in terms of bibliography and subjectivity) is balanced by an equally vigorous and postmodern

modernization of the text (in terms of theory and practical appropriations) which will occupy the remainder of this article. Throughout the 1990s it became obvious to even the most conservative literary critics that the 'educated' appreciation of Shakespeare within a 'high culture' context of university English Departments was only a tiny part of a much larger phenomenon. It was time to recognise head-on that Shakespeare's plots, characters, and overall *mythos* were being consumed by an extremely diverse public that showed, and still shows, an astonishing appetite for such material in the form of: filmic, animated, and TV-show adaptations and parodies; plays, poems, novels, and graphic novels; pornography; business management courses, and handbooks; and accessories and 'tourist' products. Cultural critics have been flat out inventing new terms to speak meaningfully about Shakespeare's cultural pervasiveness these days, from Richard Burt's 'Shakesploitation', 'unspeakable ShaXXXspeares' and 'Schlockspeare', through to Elizabeth Abele's 'Shakespop' and Don Hedrick's 'Shakespace'—the last term describing a conceptual space one can enter via the door of Shakespearean plots and characters and from which one can execute critical responses to dominant ideologies.[29]

Hamlet, being the most high profile of Shakespeare's plays, comes in for particularly strong representation in cultural forms outside academia from 1990 onward. A quick glance at some of the melancholy prince's turn-of-millennium cameos reveals that the distinction between 'high' and 'low' culture is routinely dissolved. Appropriately, Tom Stoppard's groundbreaking riff on Shakespeare's play, entitled *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* (1967), rises for a last Hurrah! in its 1990 film version. The following year, in the intertextually titled, *Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country* (1991), audiences discovered that Shakespeare was a Klingon and were treated to 'To be or not to be' in the original language. The speech is delivered by Christopher Plummer, aka Klingon Captain Chang, thereby affirming the already explicit links between Shakespearean actors generally and the *Star Trek* franchise. 1993 gave us the Arnie-Hamlet in the film, *Last Action Hero*, and critics are still savouring the ironies of an action film drawing on Shakespeare's supposedly inactive protagonist and driven by an actor who cannot act … but who does go on to seize the throne in California.[30] And, to give this film a little more space than it deserves, one

cannot but relish the line, 'Something is wrong in the state of Denmark and Hamlet's taking out the trash', and I admit to a certain long-awaited relief when the Arnie-Hamlet responds to the praying Claudius by throwing him out the chapel window. 1994 saw the re-release of the Pendulum Classics comic book version of *Hamlet* (1980), aimed at primary-school children and in which the world's most famous soliloquy becomes (in its entirety): 'Life is sad. If death is like sleep, it might be better to die'.[31] In the next year, 1995, Robert Wilson's *Hamlet: A Monologue* premiered in Texas, giving audiences a lushly abstract-formalist *Hamlet* in which the protagonist unfurls the play almost as a mental pantomime constituting his own death-bed therapy of reminiscence.[32] Then the following year, along came Kenneth Branagh's movie, a lushly realist-traditionalist *Hamlet* available in 242-minute and 150-minute versions. This catalogue could be continued to include, for example: Hamlet's spectral presence in *The X-Files*;[33] his exemplary role as an ineffective CEO in various Shakespeare business management manuals;[34] his presence in modern theatre generally;[35] and his modelling of teenage alienation and mediatization within the power networks of corporate America in Michael Almereyda's 2000 film.[36]

This pandemic of end-of-millennium *Hamlet*s is quite obviously postmodern in its interpretative diversity, its focus on pastiche and innovation, and its explicit engagement with technological, global, and capitalist paradigms. It is disparate and contradictory, exalting Shakespeare as high art while simultaneously returning him to the people, reverencing his words and yet hijacking them for all manner of purposes. As one of my undergraduate students at the University of Sydney remarked in 2005, we tend now to be more interested in seeing refreshingly individualised stylistic takes on *Hamlet* by particular auteurs, directors, artists, or entrepreneurs, rather than yet another 'faithful-to-the-text' *Hamlet* set in a castle. This may be so, and it seems to me we are living out some Shakespearean equivalent to the quantum physics experiment known as Schrödinger's Cat (in which the cat is alive and dead at once): Bardolatry and Bardicide co-exist in contemporary *Hamlet*s.

Two new academic discourses are rising up to meet this challenge, one centred on the idea of 'presentism', the other seeking to redefine 'moder-

nity'. And just as the historicist approach to *Hamlet* was shown at the start of this article to be demonstrably postmodern, in like fashion, conversely, the presentist *Hamlet* is decidedly historicist. In the Introduction to his book, *Shakespeare in the Present* (2002), Terence Hawkes explicitly acknowledges the dominance of historicist readings of Shakespeare and it is against these he is reacting.[37] Yet, he is not interested in returning to any naïve sense of a Bardic Shakespeare who is above and beyond history. Rather, he is interested in present-tense functionalities of Shakespeare in various moments in history. He writes:

> The present ranks not as an obstacle to be avoided, nor as a prison to be escaped from. Quite the reverse: it's a factor actively to be sought out, grasped and perhaps, as a result, understood. If an intrusive, shaping awareness of ourselves, alive and active in our own world, defines us, then it deserves our closest attention. Paying the present that degree of respect might more profitably be judged, not a 'mistake,' egregious and insouciant, blandly imposing a tritely modern perspective on whatever texts confront it, but rather as the basis of a critical stance whose engagement with the text is of a particular character. A Shakespeare criticism that takes that on board will not yearn to speak with the dead. It will aim, in the end, to talk to the living. (pp. 3-4)

In his chapter on *Hamlet*, Hawkes explores the way Shakespeare (and metonymically, his play *Hamlet*) is deployed by those in power to assist the preservation and enhancement of their domineering objectives. Examples from 1607-8, 1945, and 1999 are used to suggest how the Shakespearean text and mythos have been used to 'police' people's thinking, and Hawkes links this functionality to the plot of the play in which monitoring and policing may be considered pervasive themes. This sort of cultural analysis shows up how profoundly functional Shakespeare is for the societal power-brokers of modern times. Hawkes's work is a form of left-wing cultural analysis which at times fails to execute convincing close-readings of the actual words of the text, but nonetheless does offer refreshing and variously contemporary approaches to Shakespeare. Hawkes is as able to interpret the diverse postmodern appropriations of *Hamlet* as Burt, Abele, and Hedrick, whose work is mentioned above.

Not unconnected to this sort of presentism (but perhaps not as able to reach out of the academy into pop culture) is the larger and more theoretically complex body of work that is currently re-evaluating Shakespeare and modernity.[38] Hugh Grady is a key figure in this project and the complexity of his work eludes adequate summation here.[39] Grady attempts to (re-)define difficult terms such as 'modern', 'modernity', 'modernist', and 'postmodern', and to place Shakespeare meaningfully in relation to these terms. He develops the old idea of the rise of the modern subject within Shakespeare's works, but in a way that self-consciously foregrounds modern and postmodern cultural theory as well as the historical influences upon Shakespeare himself. For example, Grady explores the conceptual possibilities available to writers in England in 1595-1600 particularly as a result of the popularity of European ideas promulgated by Michel de Montaigne and Niccolò Machiavelli. Hamlet's interiority is seen as expressive of an emerging modern self (in a development of Belsey's and Barker's theses) and it is made possible by Shakespeare's understanding of the then new ideas of secular rationality (from Machiavelli), and of the protean self living in a world without certainties but who nonetheless continues to act ethically (from Montaigne). Thus, Claudius epitomises the cruel efficiency of the Machiavellian prince, and while Hamlet does attempt his own version of Machiavellian pragmatism and scheming in response, he still remains alienated from this corrupted world of post-ethical rationality and ends up adopting a defensive and liberating, Montaignesque, fluid self. This self resembles the postmodern self because it manifests itself in many disparate forms and arises from a necessary interaction with the social sphere, yet it nonetheless seeks to act ethically according to a secular code of truth and rightness in a world of unprecedented religious and philosophical uncertainty.[40]

The most recent theoretical attempts to explicate *Hamlet*'s ongoing fascination for us in the new millennium, despite foregrounding such terms as 'presentism' and '(post)modernity', clearly do not deny the claims of history. This is mirrored on the other side of the critical equation where historicist approaches to *Hamlet* reveal themselves now to be inalienably postmodern. The past, the present, and the relation between the two, therefore dominate current responses to the play.

This then, is some of what the sentries have been saying about *Hamlet*, and they have also, of course, been saying such things in differing languages to different cultures.[41] Given the geographical, temporal, textual, and conceptual blancmange described in this article, we might with justice steal a phrase from David Morgan-Mar's Shakespeare-Dr Seuss hybrid, *Fox in Socks, Prince of Denmark*, to characterise this interpretive field as the 'gooey business' of Hamlet criticism.[42]

Whatever other attractions *Hamlet* may have for us, Shakespeare's unique foregrounding in it of a problem which lacks a name has been an irresistible lure to early modern, modern, and postmodern recipients of the text. When Hamlet taunts Guildenstern, he is directly challenging any reader from any century to be precise about something essentially indeterminate: 'You would play upon me … you would pluck out the heart of my mystery, you would sound me from my lowest note to the top of my compass; and there is much music, excellent voice, in this little organ, yet cannot you make it speak' (3.2.355-60). The declaration of both the significance and the indeterminability of the problem in *Hamlet*, and especially in Hamlet, draws its characters and then its extra-textual recipients into the vortex of aboutness. *Hamlet* is a fertile realm in which to get lost and to find versions of oneself because aboutness is a tease to humans, a devilish boast that there remains something about us that we cannot precisely comprehend or articulate. *Hamlet* thereby promotes art and self-reconceptualisation because aboutness manifests as an urge which drives the human imagination to produce. *Hamlet* consequently becomes a receptacle for the imagination, a garment of visibility the imagination may put on, or a pipe it may play, so that its actions take form. And since Shakespeare in *Hamlet* has delivered an acute or imperative form of aboutness, the imagination it arouses is vivid and urgent, with the result that we have much to say—of ourselves, about Hamlet.

NOTES

1   David Morgan-Mar, Fox in Socks, Prince of Denmark, Act 3, Scene 1. <URL: http://www.seuss.org/seuss/seuss.shakes.html> Accessed 31/1/06.

2   Quotations from *Hamlet* are from the Arden2 edition, ed. Harold Jenkins (1982; rpt. London: Thomson, 2000).

3   For a mere taste see the following. On politics: Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005); idem, *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics,* Arden Critical Companions (London: Thomson, 2004); Adrian A. Husain, *Politics and Genre in* Hamlet (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004); Anthony DiMatteo, 'Shakespeare and the Public Discourse of Sovereignty: "Reason of State" in *Hamlet*', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 10.2 (2004), 2.1-54. On religion: Elizabeth S. Watson, 'Old King, New King, Eclipsed Sons, and Abandoned Altars in *Hamlet*', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35 (2004): 475-91; Gerard Kilroy, 'Requiem for a Prince: Rites of Memory in *Hamlet*', in *Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare,* ed. Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003), pp. 143-60. On gender: Phyllis Rackin, *Shakespeare and Women* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005); Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000). Some thought-provoking works that address *Hamlet* and foreground poetical and textual issues over political are: Simon Palfrey, *Doing Shakespeare* (London: Thomson, 2005); Tom McAlindon, *Shakespeare Minus 'Theory'* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Neil Rhodes, *Shakespeare and the Origins of English* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004); and A. D. Cousins, 'Shakespeare's *Hamlet* 1.2.153', *The Explicator* 62 (2003): 5-7.

4   Ernst Honigmann, 'The New Bibliography and its Critics', in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), pp. 77-93.

5   I have given here nothing more than an extremely simplified sketch of the complex and much-debated relationships between Q1, Q2, and F. The best account is in Jenkins, ed., *Hamlet*, pp. 18-74, upon which I have relied. A brief account is Eric Rasmussen, 'The Texts of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and their Origins', in *The Three-Text Hamlet: Parallel Texts of the First and Second Quartos and First Folio,* ed. Bernice W. Kliman and Paul Bertram (1991; rev. New York: AMS Press, 2003), pp. ix-xxiii.

6   John Lee, *Shakespeare's* Hamlet *and the Controversies of Self* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

7   Honigmann, 'The New Bibliography and its Critics', p. 84.

8   See: *Hamlet*, ed. Edward Dowden (Arden1, 1899); *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (Arden2, 1982); and for Arden3, see Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, '"Your sum of parts": Doubling in *Hamlet*', in Erne and Kidnie,

Textual Performances, pp. 111-26, and idem, 'Variable Texts: Stage Directions in Arden3 *Hamlet*', in *Stage Directions in* Hamlet: *New Essays and New Directions*, ed. Hardin L. Aasand (Madison NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2003), pp. 19-32.

9   See: Jesús Tronch-Pérez, *A Synoptic Hamlet: A Critical-Synoptic Edition of the Second Quarto and First Folio Texts of* Hamlet (Valencia: SEDERI, Universitat de València, 2002), and the book review of *A Synoptic Hamlet* by Steve Roth in Early Modern Literary Studies 8.3 (2003): 13.1-11. <URL: http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/08-3/rothrev.htm#fig1>. See also the online and searchable, *Enfolded Hamlet,* edited by Bernice Kliman: <URL: http://www.global-language.com/enfolded.html>. For Kliman's introduction to the *Enfolded Hamlet* see: <URL: *http://www.global-language.com/enfolded.intro.html*>. All accessed 12/9/05.

10   See, for example, *The First Quarto of Hamlet,* ed. Kathleen O. Irace, The New Cambridge Shakespeare, The Early Quartos (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999); and *Hamlet: The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke: The First Folio of 1623 and a Parallel Modern Edition,* ed. Nick de Somogyi, The Shakespeare Folios (London: Nick Hern, 2001).

11   Internet Shakespeare Editions (1996-2003). <URL: http://ise.uvic.ca/>. Accessed 12/9/05; *EEBO: Early English Books Online.* <URL: http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>. Accessed 20/9/05.

12   Michael Best, 'Standing in Rich Place: Electrifying the Multiple-Text Edition, Or, Every Text is Multiple', <URL: http://ise.uvic.ca/Annex/Articles/SAA2002/index.html>. Accessed 12/9/05. For an explanation of 'dynamic texts' and 'hypertextual editions', including useful web-links, see R. G. Siemens, 'Disparate Structures, Electronic and Otherwise: Conceptions of Textual Organisation in the Electronic Medium, with Reference to Electronic Editions of Shakespeare and the Internet', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 3.3 (January 1998): 6.1-29. <URL: http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/03-3/siemshak.html>. Accessed 13/9/05. *Early Modern Literary Studies* publishes regular inquiries into the electronic medium and Shakespeare: see especially issues 3.3 (1998) ('The Internet Shakespeare: Opportunities in a New Medium') and 9.3 (2004) ('Monitoring Electronic Shakespeares').

13   Sonia Massai, 'Scholarly Editing and the Shift from Print to Electronic Cultures', in Erne and Kidnie, eds., *Textual Performances*, pp. 94-108, at p. 103.

14   See: Edna Zwick Boris, 'To Soliloquize or Not to Soliloquize—Hamlet's "To be" Speech in Q1 and Q2/F', in Aasand, ed., *Stage Directions in*

Hamlet, pp. 115-33; Stephen Urkowitz, '"I there's the point" in Context: Theatricality and Authorship', in Aasand, ed., *Stage Directions in* Hamlet, pp. 134-9; *The* Hamlet *First Published (Q1, 1603): Origins, Form, Intertextualities*, ed. Thomas Clayton (Newark: University of Delaware P, 1992); Leah S. Marcus, 'Bad Taste and Bad *Hamlet*', in her *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 132-76; Roslyn Lander Knutson, '*Hamlet* and Company Commerce', in her *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), pp. 103-26; and Donald Foster, 'A Romance of Electronic Scholarship; with the True and Lamentable Tragedies of *Hamlet*, Prince of Denmark. Part 1: The Words', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 3.3 (January 1998): 5.1-42. <URL: http://www.shu.ac.uk/ emls/03-3/fostshak.html>. Accessed 13/9/05.

15   See Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), pp. 192-244.

16   See: Donald E. Hall, *Subjectivity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004); Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860), tr. S. G. C. Middlemore (1878; London: Phaidon, 1965), pp. 81-103; and Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1980).

17   See, for example: Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980); *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1961; trans. Richard Howard, 1967; rpt. London: Tavistock, 1985); and *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975; tr. Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage, 1979).

18   Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (1984; rev. edn, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989); Francis Barker, *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection* (London and New York: Methuen, 1984); Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama* (London and New York: Methuen, 1985).

19   Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Putnam, 1998), p. 385.

20   Margreta de Grazia, 'When did *Hamlet* become Modern?', *Textual Practice* 17 (2003): 485-503; Huw Griffiths, *Shakespeare*: Hamlet—*A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

21   De Grazia, 'When did *Hamlet* become Modern?', 485-7.

22   De Grazia, 'When did *Hamlet* become Modern?', 489; Griffiths, *Reader's Guide*, pp. 4-20.

23   De Grazia, 'When did *Hamlet* become Modern?', 489-94; Griffiths, *Reader's Guide*, pp. 21-46.

24   De Grazia, 'When did *Hamlet* become Modern?', 494-7; Griffiths, *Reader's Guide*, pp. 47-58, 81-6.

25   Jo Tollebeek, '"Renaissance," and "Fossilization": Michelet, Burckhardt, and Huizinga', *Renaissance Studies* 15 (2001): 354-66; Hans Baron, 'The Limits of the Notion of "Renaissance Individualism": Burckhardt After a Century' (1960), reprinted in his *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988), ii, 155-81; Wallace K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1948), pp. 179-252.

26   David Aers, 'Reflections on Current Histories of the Subject', *Literature and History*, 2nd series, 2 (1991): 20-34. But see also Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995); James Hirsh, *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2003).

27   See, respectively: Paul A. Cefalu, '"Damnéd Custom … Habits Devil": Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Anti-Dualism, and the Early Modern Philosophy of Mind', *ELH* 67 (2000): 399-431; Conal Condren, 'Historicism and the Problem of Renaissance "Self-Fashioning,"' in *The Touch of the Real: Essays in Early Modern Culture in Honour of Stephen Greenblatt,* ed. Philippa Kelly (Crawley: University of Western Australia Press, 2002), pp. 105-24; and Gail Kern Paster, 'Roasted in Wrath and Fire: The Ecology of the Passions in *Hamlet* and *Othello*', in her *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004), pp. 25-76.

28   See Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance*; E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1943); Michel Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from da Vinci to Montaigne*, trans. Nidra Poller (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001).

29   See Richard Burt, ed., *Shakespeare After the Mass Media* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); Richard Burt and Lynda E. Boose, eds, *Shakespeare the Movie II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, Video and DVD* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003); Elizabeth Abele, 'Introduction: Whither Shakespop? Taking Stock of Shakespeare in Popular Culture', *College Lit-*erature 31.4 (2004): 1-11; Donald Hedrick, 'The Bard of Enron: From Shakespace to Noir Humanism', *College Literature* 31.4 (2004): 19-43. See also: Michael D. Bristol, *Big-Time Shakespeare* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); and Charles Marowitz, *Recycling Shakespeare* (New York: Applause, 1991).

30   I rely here in part on Kay H. Smith's discussion of *Hamlet* films in '*Hamlet, Part Eight, The Revenge*; or Sampling Shakespeare in a Postmodern World', *College Literature* 31.4 (2004): 135-49. Arnold Schwarzenegger became Governor of California in 2003.

31   I quote Naunerle Farr's adaptation of *Hamlet* from Marion D. Perret, 'Not just Condensation: How Comic Books Interpret Shakespeare', *College Literature* 31.4 (2004): 72-93, at 75.

32   *The Making of a Monologue: Robert Wilson's* Hamlet (dir. Marion Kessel, 1995); Andy Lavender, *Hamlet in Pieces: Shakespeare Reworked: Peter Brook, Robert Lepage, Robert Wilson* (London: Nick Hern, 2001), pp. 153-94.

33   Sharon R. Yang, 'The Truth is Out There in Elsinore: Mulder and Scully as Hamlet and Horatio', *Literature Film Quarterly* 32.2 (2004): 97-107.

34   Norman Augustine and Kenneth Adelman, *Shakespeare in Charge: The Bard's Guide to Leading and Succeeding on the Business Stage* (New York: Hyperion, 1999); John O. Whitney and Tina Packer, *Power Plays: Shakespeare's Lessons in Leadership and Management* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Hedrick, 'The Bard of Enron'.

35   See Alan C. Dessen, *Rescripting Shakespeare: The Text, the Director and Modern Productions* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002); Robert Shaughnessy, *The Shakespeare Effect: A History of Twentieth-Century Performance* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 79-120; Michael Bristol, Kathleen McLuskie, and Christopher Holmes, eds, *Shakespeare and Modern Theatre: The Performance of Modernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001); John Golder and Richard Madeleine, eds, *O Brave New World: Two Centuries of Shakespeare on the Australian Stage* (Sydney: Currency Press, 2001).

36   Douglas M. Lanier, 'Shakescorp Noir', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53.2 (2002): 157-80; and Katherine Rowe, '"Remember Me": Technologies of Memory in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet*', in Burt and Boose, *Shakespeare the Movie II*, pp. 37-55.

37   Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 1-5.

38   See Richard Halpern, *Shakespeare Among the Moderns* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1997); John J. Joughin, ed., *Philosophical Shakespeares* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); Bristol, McLuskie, and Holmes, eds, *Shakespeare and Modern Theatre.*

39   Hugh Grady, *Shakespeare's Universal Wolf: Studies in Early Modern Reification* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); 'Renewing Modernity: Changing Contexts and Contents of a Nearly Invisible Concept', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999): 268-84; *Shakespeare, Machiavelli and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from* Richard II *to* Hamlet (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002).

40   See particularly, Grady, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli and Montaigne*, pp. 1-25, 27-57, 109-25, 243-65.

41   Ton Hoenselaars, ed., *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation* (London: Thomson, 2004); Yves Bonnefoy, *Shakespeare and the French Poet*, ed. John Naughton (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004); Sonia Massai, ed., *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005).

42   See the epigraph to this article, and n. 1.

L. E. SEMLER teaches early modern English literature at the University of Sydney. He is author of *The English Mannerist Poets and the Visual Arts* (1998), and editor of the anonymous seventeenth-century text, *Eliza's Babes.* He is completing a monograph on the early modern grotesque.

'Eke out our performance with your mind': Teaching Shakespeare in the New Millennium

DIANA DENLEY

R. E. Salome and J. E. Davis, eds, *Teaching Shakespeare into the Twenty-first Century* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1997).

Joseph Olivieri, *Shakespeare without Fear* (Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers, 2001).

Louis Fantasia, *Instant Shakespeare* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2002).

P. Skrebels and V. van der Hoeven (eds), *For All Time? Critical Issues in Teaching Shakespeare* (Kent Town, SA: Wakefield Press, 2002).

Lisa Hopkins, *Beginning Shakespeare* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

There are hundreds of How-to-Teach-Shakespeare books flooding the market, and more tomes pile up annually. Some are geared to elementary and high school teachers, others to teachers of literature and drama at tertiary level, and of course many too are aimed at current performers of Shakespeare. Having directed or performed about half of Shakespeare's canon, as well as having created many anthology plays based on his work, I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to bring life to Shakespeare. I have also been privileged to work at London's rebuilt Globe Theatre. Although the experience of playing Shakespeare outdoors is not new, that of playing in this reconstructed space is, and lessons from that experience cannot help but have affected all my subsequent work and readings. This article will examine five recent texts that, with varying levels of success, discuss varying approaches to opening up his works. The scope is wide and the authors aim to assist both teachers and students of Shakespeare, whether from a practical hands-on approach to the text or through an analytical theoretical approach.