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It is relatively known that the First Quarto of Hamlet (1603), the first text ever printed in which the tragical history of the Prince of Denmark is related to the playwright William Shakespeare, presents a version notably different from the one commonly known, from the standard version which is reflected in the texts of the Second Quarto (1604/5) and the First Folio (1623).

Among its most striking differences we could point out the following. It is a much shorter version, 2,220 lines, just over half as long as the Second Quarto (the longest textual version) or any modern critical edition. Variation in dialogue ranges from passages of total similitude, paraphrases, to fragments unique to the First Quarto (about 130 lines), together with a number of transpositions and echoes. Some characters bear different names, for instance, Corambis for Polonius, Montano for Reynaldo1, or Rosencraft and Gilderstone for Rosencrantz2 and Guilderstern. There are important structural differences, especially at two points where the line of action is markedly altered: 1) the soliloquy “To be, or not to be” and the subsequent nunnery episode occur immediatly after Corambis plans to “loose” his daughter to Hamlet3, and 2) after Ofelia has become mad, Horatio informs the queen of Hamlet’s return in a scene which is unique to the First Quarto. And finally, characterizations are different, especially the queen who in the closet scene unambiguously denies any complicity with the murder of Hamlet’s father and vows to assist his son in his revenge.

Textual critics have provided various explanations for the origin of this different Hamlet, narratives which could be grouped into the following two basic ideas:

a) It reflects a first conception of the play (so that the version we have in the Second Quarto is a revision of this first version)4, either a full play, a sketch, or a partial revision by Shakespeare of the so called Ur-Hamlet. This first conception could be either genuine as it stands, or adapted, shortened and degenerated during its transmission.

b) It is posterior to the Second Quarto version, being the result of short-hand report, of memorial reconstruction, or of revision, adaptation and abridgement5 (a

1 Corambus is the name in the german play Der bestrafte Brudermord oder Prinz Hamlet. Reynaldo is the name in the Second Quarto, in the First Folio it is Reynoldo.
2 Rosencrantz is a standardization of Q2 Rosencraus and F1 Rosincrance (sometimes Rosincrane).
3 This peculiar arrangement of scenes is also present in Der bestrafte Brudermord, and has been adopted by theatre productions such as Laurence Olivier’s at the Old Vic in 1963 (with Peter O’Toole as Hamlet), Ron Daniel’s with the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1989, or by the film version directed by Tony Richardson.
4 Among the most important contributions to this view, we should name Furnivall, 1879; Hubbard, 1920; De Groot, 1923; Parrot & Craig, 1938; Craig, 1961; Weiner, 1962; Urrkowitz, 1986, Sams, 1988.
5 Beside names cited in next note, see Collier (1843) and Tanger (1880-2) for short-hand report theory; Poel (1922) and Burkhart (1975) for adaptation and abridgement theory, and Nosworthy (1965) and Melchiori (1992) who maintain that the First Quarto is a memorial reconstruction of an official stage version, resulting from authorial revision and abridgement of the full play reflected in the Second Quarto and the First Folio texts.
process that, on the one hand, could be Shakespearian, collaborative or entirely non-Shakespearian, official or unauthorized, and on the other hand, could be previous to the performance, synchronic to the reporting, or the job of a hack poet after the reporting.

Other arguments deal with the legitimacy of its publication, whether the First Quarto is an unduly published text or was authorized for printing.

A general consensus of the majority of critics\(^1\) sentences this first published Shakespearian *Hamlet* as a “bad quarto”, a reported, pirated, garbled and corrupted text, concocted from memory in order to provide a version for some provincial tour, by an actor or group of actors who performed either in the full play or in some stage abridgement.

Whatever the case, it certainly reflects, or is, a version of the play, a version for the stage, whose dramatic qualities deserve our appreciation. It is then the purpose of this paper to assess the dramaturgy, the art of dramatic composition, of the acting version that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* represents. First I will sum up some of the most significant contributions dealing with different aspects of dramaturgy such as construction of plot and of structure, and characterization; and secondly I will concentrate on one aspect of dramatic composition which is dialogue writing or dialogue adaptation.

Since 1823 when the First Quarto was rediscovered (Furness, 1877, vol.2, p.13), few scholars have unfavourably criticized its theatricality, although few studies have been devoted to analyzing the dramatic qualities of this version. It was praised by the eminent critic Granville-Barker (1930, p. 188-98), and even William Poel, the first modern producer that staged the First Quarto in 1881 (Hubbard, 1920, p. 32) believed that it was the text that represented most truly Shakespeare’s dramatic conception of the play, that possessed more dramatic coherence and was more stageworthy than the Second Quarto, even though this was a greater work of literature (Rosenberg, 1992, p. 242-1)\(^2\).

Indeed the First Quarto *Hamlet* (Q1) is a dynamic piece of theatre, agile, with a “strong, effective dramatic action” (Hubbard, 1920, p. 32) and brief in comparison with the accepted *Hamlet* represented by the Second Quarto and the First Folio texts. It exhibits a compact, tight structure centred around a turning or climatic point in the famous “play within the play” at almost two thirds of performing time, so that later events briskly roll on to the catastrophe in a vigorous revenge tragedy.

As Giorgio Melchiori (1992) shows, this dramatic agility and expediency —as compared with the structure of the standard *Hamlet*— is achieved by the way episodes follow one another. Schüking stated that the arrangement of scenes in Q1 was “incomparably more logical than in the second quarto” (1935, p. 181). If we look at the sequence of Hamlet’s monologues in the Second Quarto, Hamlet goes from

1.– a state of desperation in his soliloquy “O that this too too sallied flesh would melt” (I.i), to
2.– a moment of acceptance of vengance (I.v), then to
3.– a recrimination, “What a rogue and peasant slave am I”, and reinforcement of decision, “I’ll catch the conscience of the king” (II.ii), then
4.– back to desperation (III.i) “To be, or not to be”, and


5.– recrimination “How all occasions do inform against me” and final resolution (IV.iv) “From now on my thought be bloody or be nothing worth”.

This is a fluctuating, brusque movement that suits a complex puzzling character as is the prince of Denmark we all know. However in the First Quarto, episode 4 (“To be, or not to be”) is transposed before episode 3 (“I’ll catch the conscience of the king”): it is logical that after the shock of the ghost’s demand, Hamlet considers the possibility of suicide (even, I would add, when almost four hundred lines before, he said “I do not set my life at a pin’s fee”, I.iv.65 / TLN 654), then rejects it, and plans action (moment 3) “What a dunghill idiot slave am I?” After this line, moment 5 would be redundant for we had just left Hamlet in another moment of decision, and so it is eliminated.

The succession of events in Q1 then is more lineal, direct, and it has the benefit of condensing the story time from two days and two sequences into one single day and one sequence, thus providing the play with a speedy and agile running. As Melchiori (1992, 203-4) observed, the First Quarto, in referring to the performance of the murder of Gonzago, does not say “weele heare a play to morowewe” (II.ii.529 / TLN 1576) and “Weele hate to morowe night” (II.ii.534 / TLN 1580), so that the performance takes place at night on the very same day. From the beginning of the seventh scene, where plans are set up to find the cause of Hamlet’s transformation until he is sent to England, less than 24 hours have gone by. In this condensed space of time all the tests by which Hamlet’s madness is observed, follow one another without delay, within the same dramatic sequence: the interview with Ofelia (the nunnery episode), with Corambs (the fishmonger episode) and the interview with Rossincred and Gilderstone. The test of Ofelia is not postponed to the following day as it is in the standard version.

Another example of compression, of good dramatic economy, is the peculiar scene between the queen and Horatio. In 36 lines we find gathered up different motives that are scattered in three different places and amount to 125 lines in the standard version: the scene between Horatio and the sailors that includes Hamlet’s letter (IV.vi), the beginning of the scene between the king and Laertes (IV.vii) and the beginning the last with Hamlet’s direct account of the voyage to Horatio (V.ii).

The benefit of all this condensation is a more agile, logical and abridged version that solves the inconvenience of the excessive length of the standard Hamlet.

Burkhart (1975) studied the processes of abridgement in the “bad quartos” especially in terms of economy of casting, speech-shortening and paraphrasing that involve compression of meaning and purging of rhetoric and discursive or ornamental passages.

As an acting version the First Quarto exhibits most of the features of other acting versions. Kathaleen Irace (1994) has compared the Shakespearian “bad quartos”, or what she pointedly calls “short” quartos, with modern stage and film versions, and she has concluded that they share mechanisms of adaptation and abridgment in plot structure, characterization and stage action. As she constantly shows, Kemble, Irving, Olivier, Zeffirelli have carried out analogous omissions, transpositions, changes in speech prefixes, loans from other plays, etc. so as to “shorten the plays in order to speed up performances, simplifying staging, or eliminate characters for casting or other practical reasons” (1994, p. 25).

Looking at characterizations, we find patterns that also prove to be as consistent and as effectively wrought as in other “good” texts. The distrust the queen bears to her second husband is not only constructed by her overt confessions to Horatio in that peculiar scene, but also by the way she

---

1 Line references are keyed both to the Alexander Text (1951), in its turn keyed to the second Cambridge edition of W.A. Wright and W. G. Clark (1891-5), and to the TLN (“through line numbering”) set up by Charlton Hinman (1968).

2 The 1676 quarto of Hamlet qualified the play as “being too long to be conveniently acted” (A3r), and a similar view is held by Chambers, 1930, p. 229; Greg, 1955, p. 318; Nosworthy, 1965, p. 164-5; Melchiori, 1992, p. 195-201.
is shown as submissive during the first part of the play by means of cutting out, in a seemingly coherent pattern, most of her interventions in the standard Hamlet.

The king is a more villainous character, less skillful in handling language rhetorically, a more medieval king rather than a Machiavellian Renaissance prince. Notice the omission in Q1 of five lines (III.i.50-4) that displayed a remorseful conscience in the king, or the fact that it is the king that devises the three stratagems to kill Hamlet: the unabated sword, the poisoned cup, and the poisoned point of the sword (which in the standard Hamlet was proposed by Laertes instead).

Other aspects of the dramaturgy of Q1 are expounded in contributions of scholars such as Burkhart (1975), Jones (1988), Urkowitz (1986, 1988), Irace (1994), or the ones collected in a seminar lead by Thomas Clayton (1992).

However, one negative quality should be pointed out after so many praises: if language is also part of the dramaturgy of a play, Q1 is indeed verbally deficient, clumsy, sometimes disturbing. Allowing for this important detrimental aspect of Q1, I would like to add arguments in favour of the theatricality of Q1 Hamlet by revealing the dramatic pertinancy of particular moments in the text which may also be explained as the result of a creative intention rather than of an accident, an intention that especially aims to abridge the dialogue.

Let us see the beginning of the seventh scene (II.ii. 1-167, line TLN 1019-1205), until the moment when Hamlet enters the stage “reading on a book”. The Second Quarto and Folio version have 180 lines approximately. The First Quarto has 110 lines. Nearly 40% is missing If we analyze the absent lines in Q1 we will observe that they may have been selected for cutting on various dramatic grounds, and similar reasons may account for paraphrased and new lines.

Let us examine the very first speech of scene II.ii (Second Quarto text in the left column; Q1 text in the right column):

Florish. Enter King and Queene, Rosencraus and Guyldensterne.

Rosencraus and Guyldensterne.

1 King, Welcome deere Rosencraus, and Guyldensterne, Moreouer, that we much did long to see you, The need we haue to vse you did prouoke

4 Our hastie sending, something haue you heard

Of Hamlets transformation, so call it.

Enter King and Queene, Rossencraft, and Guilderstone.

King Right noble friends, that our deere cosin Hamlet Hath lost the very heart of all his sence, It is most right, and we most sory for him:
6 Sith nor th’exterior, nor the inward man
Resembles that it was, what it should be,
More then his fathers death, that thus hath put him
So much from th’understanding of himselfe

10 I cannot dreame of: I entreate you both
That beeing of so young dayes brought vp with him,
And sith so nabored to his youth and hauior,
That you voutsafe your rest heere in our Court
Some little time, so by your companies
To draw him on to pleasures, and to gather
So much as from occasion you may gleane,
Whether ought to vs vnknowne afflicts him thus,
That opend lies within our remedie.

Therefore we doe desire, euen as you tender
Our care to him, and our great loue to you
That you will labour but to wring from him
The cause and ground of his distemperacie.

The first speech by the Q1 king disposes of the basic information and dramatic motives in just 8 lines:

- statement of Hamlet’s lunacy: “Hamlet / Hath lost the very heart of all his sence”
- call for help to his school-fellows to find out the cause: “labour to wring from him / The cause and ground of his distemperacie”
- and due thanks: “the king of Denmarke shall be gratefull”.

There is no welcome and justification for a “hasty sending”: lines 1-4 in the Second Quarto version. Instead Q1 begins the scene “in medias res”, as if the group were already conversing off the stage: “Right noble friends”, says the king as if he were answering Rossencraft and Gilderstone. These characters have already been welcomed off stage, so there is no need to spend seconds in staging a court ceremony with a flourish of trumpets. In the First Quarto version, characters rush on to the stage in brisk action (with no flourish). A similar beginning “in medias res” exists in IV.v and IV.vii, as pointed out by Giorgio Melchiori (1992: 206-7).

Reasons for Hamlet’s transformation are not expounded by the Q1 king (lines 5-10 in the Second Quarto version), he just states that the prince has lost his sense. To an audience that now knows the king killed Hamlet’s father, these reasons display a subtle cynicism on his part. Their absence in Q1 and the plain style of the speech is in accordance with an alternative characterization of the Q1 king who is less subtle, less Machiavellian, a rather “pasteboard villain”, as Irae puts it (1992, p. 105).

The queen’s intervention in the standard Hamlet (lines 19-26) is almost completely absent:
Quee. Good gentlemen, he hath much
talkt of you,
And sure I am, two men there is not liv-
ing
To whom he more adheres, if it will
please you
To shew vs so much gentry and good
will,
As to expend your time with vs a while,
For the supply and profit of our hope,
Your visitation shall receive such thanks
Doë this, the king of Denmarke shal be
thankfull.

The Second Quarto fragment is only a reiteration of the idea of friendship between Hamlet and
his school-fellows, and of the call for help. This, along with the absence of 12 other interventions
by the queen in Q1, makes up a consistent pattern, observed by Kathleen Irace (1994, p. 50-1), of
shaping the queen as a “more pliable”, “more sympathetic” character, more “in the background”.
In our opinion this was deliberately altered with a view to give support to the queen’s overt
inclining towards Hamlet in opposition to the king in the second part of the play (especially in the
scene with Horatio, unique to Q1). By diminishing the queen’s presence and protagonism and
showing her as submissive to her second husband the king in the first part of the play, her change
to a stronger attitude in the second part can be better justified.

Note that two lines of thanks-giving (25-6)
“Your visitation shall receive such thanks
As fits a Kings remembrance.”
are reduced to one and attributed to the king:
“Doe this, the king of Denmarkeshal be thankefull.” (parallel to line 25)

After the two paraphrased speeches of Rossencraft and Gilderstone that contribute to
characterize them,

Ros. Both your Maiesties
Might by the soueraigne power you haue
of vs,
Put your dread pleasures more into com-
maund
Then to entreatie.

Gysl. But we both obey,
And heere giue vp our selues in the full
bent,
To lay our seruice freely at your feete
To be commaunded.

thanks are given again.

King. Thanks Rosencraus, and gentle
Gysldensterne.
King. Thankes Guilderstone, and gent
Rossencraft.
37 Quee. Thanks Guyldensterne, and gentle Rosencraus.
Quec. Thankes Rossencraft, and gentle Gilderstone.
And I beseech you instantly to visite
My too much changed sonne, goe some of you
And bring these gentlemen where Hamlet is.
Guyl. Heauen make our presence and our practices
Pleasant and helpfull to him.

All this looks necessary in a polite courtly dialogue. But lines 37-41 are utterly dispensable:
And I beseech you instantly to visite
My too much changed sonne, goe some of you
And bring these gentlemen where Hamlet is.

that is, reiteration of their duty to see Hamlet, and
Guyl. Heauen make our presence and our practices
Pleasant and helpfull to him.

a reiteratively mannered and refined speech.
Then Corambis enters with his daughter, while in the standard version he enters on his own.

Enter Polonius. Enter Corambis and Ofelia

The presence of Ofelia is necessary to the development of the subsequent action: the Nunnery episode. This entry accords with Corambis’ words “Lets to the King” in the previous scene. Polonius in the standard version said “Come, goe with mee, I will goe seeke the King” (II.i.101 / TLN 998) and “come, goe we to the King” (II.i.117 / TLN 1015) but now he enters alone. This has been regarded as a typical Shakespearian inconsistency (Chambers, 1930, p.417), a minor petty fault that Q1 aptly corrects.

On the other hand, Ofelia’s presence in this moment when she will silently endure Hamlet’s love letter being read aloud and her father’s plans to “loose” her to the prince, looks rather awkward. But this awkwardness that Greg pointed out (1955, p. 303) may well emphasize Ophelia’s victimization and passivity throughout the play. She is indeed the most wretched of all characters in the tragedy, and the image of Ophelia standing up in silence for 100 lines in which she is treated as an instrument, as a mere decoy, is impressive for its pathos.
Pol. Haue I my Lord? I assure my good Liege I hold my dutie as I holde my soule,
Both to my God, and to my gracious King;
And I doe thinke, or els this braine of mine Hunts not the trayle of policie so sure
As it hath vsd to doe, that I haue found The very cause of Hamlets lunacie.

Cor. Haue I my Lord? I assure your grace, I holde my dutie as I holde my life,
Both to my God, and to my soueraigne King:
And I beleue, or else this braine of mine Hunts not the traine of policie so well
As it had wont to dow, but I haue found The very depth of Hamlets lunacie.

Queene. God graunt he hath.

It is interesting to note that Q1 gives a peculiar intervention to the queen “God graunt he hath” (parallel to line 52). On the one hand, these words prelude her later remark “Good my Lord be briefe” (corresponding to “More matter with lesse art” line 95, TLN 1123), and are a sarcastic succinct commentary on the churlish Corambis that pointedly gives expression to the way the audience receives this foolish busybody. On the other hand, the “addition” of this sentence balances the “cutting out” of the following lines 53 to 61:

King. O speake of that, that doe I long to heare.
Pol. Giue first admittance to th’embassadors, My newes shall be the fruite to that great feast.
King. Thy selfe doe grace to them, and bring them in.
He tells me my deere Gertrard he hath found
The head and source of all your sonnes distemper.
Queene. I doubt it is no other but the maine His fathers death, and our hastie marriage.

Enter Embassadors.

King. Well, we shall sift him, welcome my good friends,
Say Voltemand, what from our brother Norway?
Enter the Ambassadors.

King NowVoltemar, what from our brother Norway?

The motives in these lines are not only easily dispensable elements but details of characterization whose absence in Q1 is related to other characterizing touches. The “omission” of “O, speak of that! That do I long to hear.” (line 53) reveals a king in Q1 that is not really interested in Hamlet’s problem (something that we might suspect from his previous curt remark of sorrow for Hamlet’s distemper, parallel to l. 5). Nor seems he interested in partaking this concern with his wife (lines 57 and 58):

He tells me my deere Gertrard …
(By the way, the Q1 king very rarely addresses her as “dear Gertrard”, the Second Quarto reading, or “sweet queen”, the Folio reading). The Q1 king goes directly to the political affairs that the ambassadors bring:

NowVoltemar, what from our brother Norway? (parallel to line 62)
This “Now, Voltemar” is an efficient way to change the subject of conversation.
By means of the sudden entry of the ambassadors, briefly heralded by Corambis’ “the Ambassadors are joyfully Return’d” (lines 43-4), the idea of his discovery of Hamlet’s lunacy is forcefully kept in suspense.

And again in lines 59 and 60 we find another “excision” of a speech by the queen. The ambassador speaks out his news in a speech that is 99% the same as in the standard version. Some acting versions, such as Olivier’s, have suppressed the Fortinbras material, depriving the play of its political background. That is not the case with Q1 so the entire information of this speech is necessary and nothing is left out. Upon the exit of the ambassadors, Corambis insists in his discovery of Hamlet’s distemper. In the following interventions (lines 90-155) we can also see a pattern of economic abridgement of the dialogue.

89- […] Exeunt Ambassadors. […] exeunt Ambassadors.

90 Pol. This busines is well ended. Cor. This busines is very well dispatched.

91 My Liege and Maddam, to expostulate What maestie should be, what dutie is, Why day is day, night, night, and time is time, Were nothing but to wast night, day, and time, Therefore breuitie is the soule of wit,

96 And tediousnes the lymmes and outward florishes, Now my Lord, touching the yong Prince Hamlet,

97 I will be briefe, your noble sonne is mad: Mad call I it, for to define true madnes, What ist but to be nothing els but mad, But let that goe.

100 Certaine it is that hee is madde: mad let vs grant him then: Now to know the cause of this effect, Or else to say the cause of this defect, For this effect defectiue comes by cause.

101 Quee. More matter with lesse art. Queen. Good my Lord be briefe.

103 That hee’s mad tis true, tis true, tis pitty, Cor. Madam I will: my Lord, And pitty tis tis true, a foolish figure,

105 But farewell it, for I will vse no art. Mad let vs graunt him then, and now remains

106 That we find out the cause of this effect, Or rather say, the cause of this defect, For this effect defectiue comes by cause:

109 Thus it remainse, and the remainder thus Perpend,
I haue a daughter, haue while she is mine,
Who in her dutie and obedience, marke,
Hath giuen me this, now gather and surmise.

I haue a daughter, haue while shee’s mine: for that we thinke
Is surest, we often loose: now to the Prince.
My Lord, but note this letter,
The which my daughter in obedience Deliuer’d to my handes.

Continuing this transposition, lines 106-9 are located in an earlier place in Q1, a circumstance that has been explained as the result of the ineffective memory of the reporting actor. However this transposition could also be explained as a compensation for the cutting of the above mentioned six lines (91-96). Otherwise, Corambis’ speech would have been too short for the queen’s remark “Good my Lord be briefe” (parallel to line 101).

Three more lines that correspond to Polonius’ flourishes of verbiage are distilled into the assertive phrase that has already been transposed “Certain it is that hee is mad”. Corambis reduces his foolish figures, uses no art, in his “expostulation”, so perhaps that is why the queen’s remark is not “More matter with lesse art” but simply “Good my Lord be briefe”.

However since phrases such as “But let that goe” (line 100), “But farewell it” (line 105) in which Polonius corrects his own digressions, are very interesting from the viewpoint of characterization, and these two examples are eliminated, the First Quarto version seems to rescue this characterizing touch and incorporate it into the funny remark about Ophelia being his father’s property: “Haue while shee’s mine: for that we thinke / Is surest, we often loose: now to the Prince” (parallel to lines 113-4). Thus the remark “have while she is mine” becomes explained, at the same time a confusing verbal tangle such as “Thus it remaines, and the remainder thus” (line110) is removed. A more simpler speech in Q1 then remains.

Let us see now the motive of Hamlet’s letter to Ophelia (lines 115-27)

To the Celestiall and my soules Idol, the most bea-
tified Ophelia, that’s an ill phrase, a vile phrase,
beautified is a vile phrase, but you shall heare: thus in
her excellent white bosome, these &c.

Quee. Came this from Hamlet to her? Pol. Good Maddam stay awhile, I will be faithfull.

Doubt thou the starres are fire, Letter. Doubt that the Sunne doth moue,
Doubt truth to be a lyer, Doubt that the starres doe moue,
But neuer doubt I loe. But doe not doubt I loe.

O deere Ophelia, I am ill at these num-
ers, I haue not art to recken
my grones, but that I loe thee best, o most best belieue it, adew.

Thine euermore most deere Lady, whilst this machine is to him (Hamlet.

Thine euer the most vnhappy Prince Hamlet.
128  Pol. This in obedience hath my daughter shewne me,
And more about hath his solicitings
As they fell out by time, by means, and place,
All gien to mine eare.

It is also reduced by omission of lines including Polonius’ indulgence in literary criticism (lines 116-7): “That’s an ill phrase, a vile phrase; ‘beautified’ is a vile phrase”. Only the love poem and closing signature is maintained, that is, the basic dramatic information for Corambis justification that love is the cause of Hamlet’s madness.

Other removals of dialogue are interesting and consistent with a pattern of dialogue abridgement and alternative characterization: Again another intervention by the queen is cut out (“Came this from Hamlet to her?” , line 119), as is another intervention by the king (“But how hath she receiu’d his loue?” , line 132),

132  King. But how hath she receiu’d his loue?
Pol. What doe you thinke of me?
King. As of a man faithfull and honorable.

My Lord, what doe you thinke of me?
I, or what might you thinke when I sawe this?
King. As of a true friend and a most louing subiect.

an omission in accordance with the lack of interest the Q1 king shows towards Hamlet’s malady.

In the narration by Corambis of Hamlet’s loss of reason (lines 135-55):

135  Pol. I would faine proue so, but what might you thinke
When I had seene this hote loue on the wing,
Cor. I would be glad to proue so.

As I perceive’d it (I must tell you that)
Before my daughter told me, what might you,
Or my deere Maiestie your Queene heere thinke,

137  If I had playd the Deske, or Table booke,
Or gien my hart a working mute and dumbe,
Or lookt upon this loue with idle sight,
Now when I saw this letter, thus I bespake maiden:
What might you thinke? no, I went round to worke,
And my young Mistris thus I did bespeake,
Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of thy star,  
This must not be: and then I prescripts  
gave her  
That she should locke her selfe from her  
resort,  
Admit no messengers, receive no tokens,  
Which done, she tooke the fruite of my  
aduise:  
And he repell’d, a short tale to make,  
Fell into a sadnes, then into a fast,  
Thence to a watch, thence into a weak-  
enes,  
Into the madnes wherein now he raues,  
And all we mourne for.

Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of your  
starre,  
And one that is unequall for your loue:  
Therefore I did commaund her refuse his  
letters,  
Deny his tokens, and to absent her selfe,  
Shoe as my childe obediently obey’d me.  
Now since which time, seeing his loue  
thus cross’d,  
Which I tooke to be idle, and but sport,  
He straitway grew into a melancholy,  
From that vnto a fast, then vnto distrac-  
tion,  
Then into a sadnesse, from that vnto a  
madnesse,  
And so by continuance, and weaknesse  
of the braine  
Into this frensie, which now possesseth  
him:  
And if this be not true, take this from this.

we observe 20 lines in the standard version that are compressed into 14. Then we find another  
transposition,

156 King. Doe you thinke this?  
King. Think you t’is so?  
157 Quee. It may be very like.  
Cor. How? so my Lord, I would  
faine know that,  
That I haue positively said, tis so,  
When it proou’d otherwise?  
That thing that I haue saide t’is so, posi-  
tuely,  
And it hath fallen out otherwise.

160 King. Not that I know.  
Cor. How? so my Lord, I would very  
faine know that,  
That I haue positively said, tis so,  
When it proou’d otherwise?  
That thing that I haue saide t’is so, posi-  
tuely,  
And it hath fallen out otherwise.

162 King. How may we trye it further?  
King. how should wee trie this same?  
Pol. You know sometimes he walkes  
quarters together  
Quee. So he dooes indeed.

To conclude with this part of the scene before Hamlet’s entrance,

166 King. How may we trye it further?  
King. how should wee trie this same?  
Pol. You know sometimes he walkes  
quarters together  
Quee. So he dooes indeed.

The Princes walke is here in the galery,
Pol. At such a time, I'll lose my daughter to him,
Be you and I behind an Arras then,
Mark the encounter, if he love her not,
And be not from his reason falne thereon
Let me be no assistant for a state
But keepe a farme and carters.

King. We will try it.

Enter Hamlet.

177 Quee. But looke where sadly the poore wretch comes reading.

King. See where hee comes poring vppon a booke.
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