Title	The two quartos of Hamlet : a linguistic note on their textual differences
Sub Title	
Author	小屋, 逸樹(Koya, Itsuki)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1997
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.73, (1997. 12) ,p.479- 493
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	安藤伸介, 岩崎春雄両教授退任記念論文集
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0479

The Two Quartos of *Hamlet* : A Linguistic Note on Their Textual Differences

Itsuki Koya

0. *Introduction*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* exists in three basic printed texts: the first Quarto (Q1), the second Quarto (Q2) and the first Folio (F1). Among these texts Q1 is widely known as a 'bad' Quarto, while Q2 and F1 are regarded as key texts. The latter two in fact play a more important role in the scrutiny of individual words and phrases of the text. Q1 seems to be utilized as a reference point when Q2 and F1 disagree on a particular reading.

In opposition to conventional usage, we shall be concerned with textual differences between Q1 and Q2. Our comments do not therefore constitute suggestions as to the philological validity of the text. Our aim is to compare semantic units in both Quartos which could affect literary interpretations. In what follows we will briefly introduce the publicational background of Q1 and Q2 and then look at three monologues in *Hamlet* in both texts.

1. *Q1 and Q2*

Q1 is the first printed text of *Hamlet* and was published in 1603. Its title page reads:

The Tragicall Historie of HAMLET Prince of Denmarke By

William Shake-speare. As it hath been diuerse times acted his Highness seruants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where At London printed for N.L. and Iohn Trundell. 1603.

The title page provides information on where and by whom the play was acted. *His Highness seruants* means the Lord Chamberlain's servants of 1602, to which Shakespeare belonged (cf. Dowden, 1899: xv). The initial letters *N.L.* stand for Nicholas Ling who was also involved in the publication of Q2. Q1 is said to be an abridged version of Shakespeare's play and contains only 2154 lines.(1) It is commonly regarded as a 'reported' text that was constructed with the help of the memory of one or more of the actors. The actor(s) responsible for the piracy is(are) assumed to have doubled the parts of Marcellus and Lucianus. This 'pirated' text was compiled without authority and was printed without the approval of the theatrical company.

Q2, which was subsequently published in 1604-5, has the same title, but its printer claims that the text is:

Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie.

It was "printed by I.R. for N.L.", where these initials respectively stand for James Roberts and Nicholas Ling. The text has 3674 lines, but it was carelessly printed. There are, according to Wilson (1934b: 88), many strange spellings, missing letters and omitted words. Nevertheless, the manuscript used by the printer is regarded nowadays as Shakespeare's own 'foul-papers'.

Pollard (1909) made a detailed comparison between Q1 and Q2

and named them 'bad' and 'good' Quartos. He demonstrates the 'badness' of Q1 by pointing to the clumsy headpiece at the beginning of the text and the lack of printer's name on the title page. In addition, passages written from memory as well as blunders coming from different reports suggest that Q1 should be regarded as a 'bad' text. Pollard (1909 : 74) states :

> Ling and Trundell brought out the Hamlet of 1603 in the teeth of Roberts's entry in the Stationer's Register and without making any entry of the book on their own account.

As for Q2, a 'good' Quarto, Pollard refers to the words on the title page and claims that "improvements were both authorial and editorial". He also assumes that Shakespeare rewrote his play in its present form when the London theatres were closed from July 1603 to March 1604.

Besides the length of the text, the two Quartos differ in some substantial points. Edwards (1985:25) observes the following four major departures in Q1 : (1) Polonius is called Corambis, (2) the 'to be or not to be' soliloquy and the 'nunnery' dialogue with Ophelia are placed earlier, (3) Gertrude asserts in the closet scene that she was ignorant of the murder and promises Hamlet to assist him in revenge and (4) the news of Hamlet's return from the voyage to England is drastically reworked.

In the following sections we will turn to a textual comparison of Q1 and Q2.

2. *1.2.129-159*[(2)]

This is the first monologue of Hamlet. We are informed of his

state of mind as well as the foregoing circumstances. Q2 provides 31 lines for this monologue, whereas Q1 has only 21 lines. Compare the beginning passages of the two texts:

(Q 1) O that this too much grieu'd and sallied flesh
Would melt to nothing, or that the vniuersall
Globe of heauen would turne al to a Chaos!

(Q 2) O that this too too sallied flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolue it selfe into a dewe,
Or that the euerlasting had not fixe
His cannon gainst sealeslaughter, ô God, God,

One of the most striking differences would be reference to the *sealeslaughter* in Q2. Here we understand that Hamlet's lament is so deep that he even thinks of *sealeslaughter*. This theme is further undertaken in the 'to be or not to be' monologue. Q1 does not mention this and provides no link with the later monologue. Instead, Q1 creates its peculiar effect by employing strong and direct expressions such as *melt to nothing* and *turne al to a Chaos!*. Hamlet in Q1 seems to be introduced as a quick-tempered person. The exclamation mark at the end of the passage shows his forceful emotion.

Another important point to notice is the sequence of *melt, thaw and resolue...dewe* in Q2, which constitutes a refined metaphorical image. Q1 does not represent such a semantic connection. As regards the subject of this predicate, *sallied flesh, The Cambridge Shakespeare* (edited by J.D. Wilson, 1934a) and *The Pelican Shakespeare* (edited by W. Farnham, 1969) emend *sallied* to *sullied*. The emendation is motivated by the misprint of *sallies* at 2.1.39 in Q2, where F1 reads

sulleyes. In addition, Wilson (1934b : 311-2) observes common mistakes found among the scribes at that time :

> Shakespeare, as we have just seen, was not the only scribe of that age whose "u" might be mistaken for an "a", and that the Q1 reporter was liable to the same graphical weakness is proved by the misprint "scalion" for "scullion" at 2.2.616.

After the emendation, the proponents of the *sullied* reading construe Hamlet's body as being *sullied* by the incestuous marriage of his mother.(3)

Q2 subsequently reads the following passages, which are entirely lacking in Q1 :

(Q 2) How wary, stale, flat, and vnprofitable
Seeme to me all the vses of this world!
Fie on't, ah fie, tis an vnweeded garden
That growes to seeds, things rancke and grose in nature,
Possesse it meerely that it should come thus.

These passages show Hamlet's complaint against *this world*. *Wary* and *come thus* should be interpreted as 'weary' and 'come to this', respectively (cf. Wilson, 1934b : 197). The phrase *vnweeded garden* is the central image in which other semantic contents are incorporated. We can here see a good example of 'cohesion', which enables a set of sentences to be a 'text'.(4) In general, such rhetorical technique is not found in Q1. This is probably because Q1 is a reported text of a certain actor whose memory could not cover sophisticated syntactic and semantic forms.

Let us examine the following passages where Hamlet laments his mother's marriage :

(Q 1) O God within two moneths; no not two : married,
Mine vncle : O let me not thinke of it,
My fathers brother : but no more like
My father, then I to Hercules.
Within two months, ere yet the salt of most
Vnrighteous teares had left their flushing
In her galled eyes: she married, O God, a beast
Deuoyd of reason would not haue made
Such speede : Frailtie, thy name is Woman,

(Q 2) But two months dead, nay not so much, not two,
So excellent a King, that was to this
Hiperion to a satire, so louing to my mother,
That he might not beteeme the winds of heauen
Visite her face too roughly, heauen and earth
Must I remember, why she should hang on him
As if increase of appetite had growne
By what it fed on, and yet within a month,
Let me not thinke on't ; frailty thy name is woman

Q1 refers to the speedy marriage and compares *mine vncle* with *my father*. Q2 offers additional information about the past relationship between the parents. Q2 devotes several lines to describing how *excellent* and *louing* the father was. The mother is on the other hand treated as a traitor. Further, we find in Q2 an interesting sequence *but two months - not two - within a month*, where time is becoming shorter

and shorter. This sequence is a response to Hamlet's rising emotion and introduces the assertion *frailty thy name is woman*. Q1 has the sequence *within two moneths - not two - within two months*, which leads to semantic contradiction.

A further interesting difference is found in the use of referring expressions. In both texts (including the rest of the monologue), Hamlet mentions three persons: his father, his mother and his uncle. But, while Hamlet in Q2 once calls his mother *my mother*, he never uses the kinship term in Q1 to refer to his mother. Hamlet simply repeats the third person singular pronoun *she*. In this sense, Q1 does not provide any anaphoric chain between *my mother* and *she*. Considering that he does say *my father* in Q1, Hamlet here would appear to be keeping his distance from his mother by avoiding the relevant kinship term.

3. *1.5.92-112*

In this scene, Hamlet is told that his father was murdered by his uncle. The dialogue with the Ghost makes Hamlet feel a duty of revenge. Q2 has 21 lines for this monologue, whereas Q1 contains 15 lines. Let us consider the opening passages:

(Q 1) O all you hoste of heauen! O earth, what else?
And shall I couple hell; remember thee?

(Q 2) O all you host of heauen, ô earth, what els,
And shall I coupple hell, ô fie, hold, hold my hart,
And you my sinnowes, growe not instant old,
But beare me swiftly vp; remember thee,

The apparent difference between the texts is that Q1 turns directly to

the Ghost's words *remember thee* after mentioning *heauen, earth* and *hell*. Q2 gives a concrete description which shows how shocking the news was. Hamlet here must first encourage himself. After having learnt about the murder, Hamlet looks in on himself and tries to hold his ground. This process is totally lacking in Q1. Let us see how both texts subsequently read:

(Q 1) Yes thou poore Ghost; from the tables
Of my memorie, ile wipe away all sawes of Bookes,
All triuiall fond conceites
That euer youth, or else obseruance noted,
And thy remembrance, all shall sit.
Yes, yes, by heauen,

(Q 2) I thou poore Ghost whiles memory holds a seate
In this distracted globe, remember thee,
Yea, from the table of my memory
Ile wipe away all triuiall fond records,
All sawes of bookes, all formes, all pressures past
That youth and obseruation coppied there,
And thy commandement all alone shall liue,
Within the booke and volume of my braine
Vnmixt with baser matter, yes by heauen,

Q2 provides an excellent example of 'cohesion'. Lexical linkage among the words *table, memory, bookes, pressures, coppied* and *volume* offers a cohesive world of metaphorical relations. The meaning of each word hangs over another meaning, and they succeed in forming an effective expansion of semantic associations. Note that *bookes* and *the*

booke are used in a different way. The former is employed non-metaphorically, while the latter, together with *volume,* is used metaphorically in relation to *my braine*. The frequent occurrence of *all* increases Hamlet's resolution, which allows no turning back. Q1 lacks such textual diversity.

As regards *commandement* in Q2 and *remembrance* in Q1, Edwards (1985 : 45) states that the commandment refers to the Ghost's words *remember me*, and *remember* in this case means to maintain and to restore. If Hamlet thinks, as Edwards claims, that his revenge is a task of creative remembrance, then there seems to be no substantial difference between the two texts. Note also that Hamlet in both Quartos does not say *my father* to the Ghost but utters the phrase *thou poore Ghost*.

After having reacted to the words of the Ghost, Hamlet comes to refer to the present situation in Denmark. We are here faced with an interesting discrepancy between Q1 and Q2 :

(Q 1) ..... a damnd pernitious villaine,
Murderous, bawdly, smiling damned villaine,
(My tables) meet it is I set it downe,
That one may smile, and smile, and be a villayne ;
At least I am sure, it may be so in Denmarke.
So vncle, there you are, there you are.

(Q 2) O most pernicious woman.
O villaine, villaine, smiling damned villaine,
My tables, meet it is I set it downe
That one may smile, and smile, and be a villaine,
At least I am sure it may be so in Denmarke.

So Vncle, there you are,

The crucial difference lies in the first line, in which Q2 refers to *pernicious woman*, while Q1 mentions *pernitious villaine*. In the subsequent passage in Q2, *pernicious woman* is followed by *smiling damned villaine*. It is clear that not only his uncle but his mother is the target of Hamlet's anger. Further, the phrase *pernicious woman* in Q2 suggests a connection with *frailty thy name is woman* in the first monologue. Even if his eyes are directed at the murderer, Hamlet does not forget the *pernicious woman*. In Q1, on the other hand, we understand that Hamlet is only thinking of the murderer. His phrase *murderous, bawdly, smiling damned villaine* is used in apposition to *a damned pernitious villaine*. This departure in Q1 is significant for our interpretation, since the breakdown of order in Denmark has been brought by the *most foul* murder and the incestuous marriage. Q1 is apparently insufficient for this association.

Apart from the above point we find no substantial differences between the two texts. As we have mentioned, the actor who played Marcellus was responsible for the Q1 text. And now Marcellus appears on the stage after Hamlet's monologue. Perhaps he had a vivid recollection of Hamlet's words, especially the latter half of them.

4. *3.1.56-89*

We will now turn to the 'to be or not to be' monologue, which Clemen (1964: 23) calls "one of the very few soliloquies" of Shakespeare. Leaving aside the immediate problem of revenge, Hamlet contemplates the meaning of life. Q1 has 23 lines for this monologue, while Q2 contains 35 lines. Let us examine the beginning passages of both Quartos:

(Q 1) To be, or not to be, I there's the point,
To Die, to sleepe, is that all? I all:

(Q 2) To be, or not to be, that is the question,
Whether tis nobler in the minde to suffer
The slings and arrowes of outragious fortune,
Or to take Armes against a sea of troubles,
And by opposing, end them, to die to sleepe

The question for Hamlet in Q2 is, as Edwards (1985: 48) puts it, which of the two alternatives is nobler. *To be* means *to suffer the slings and arrowes of outragious fortune*. The murder carried out by Claudius, the incestuous marriage and the lament of the Ghost have now captured Hamlet's mind, and there is no mending the 'outrage' in the past. *Not to be* means *to take Armes against a sea of troubles*. The metaphor underlying these passages is that of a battle (cf. Dowden, 1899: 99). It is ironical that to take arms means to take one's life (cf. Edwards, 1985: 48,146) and not to kill Claudius with arms. Q1 does not describe what *to be* and *not to be* are like. Hamlet in Q1 has nothing to do with nobleness. Moreover, his rough way of questioning is expressed with two occurrences of *I* (=Ay).

In the subsequent lines of Q2, Hamlet continues to ask himself about death. He firstly gives a positive evaluation to death and regards it as the end of physical and mental distress. However, he soon finds *the rub* in the *sleepe of death*. Anxiety about *what dreames may come* troubles Hamlet.

Concerning the world after death, Q1 reads:

(Q 1) For in that dreame of death, when wee awake,
And borne before an euerlasting Iudge,
From whence no passanger euer retur'nd,
The vndiscouered country, at whose sight
The happy smile, and the accursed damn'd.

Q1 presents us with considerably different passages and contains two new lines (the second and fifth lines). In this description, the after-life is the world where *the happy smile, and the accursed damn'd.* In the forewords to Q2 (p. xiii), Furnivall quotes Herford's words and states:

> (to Hamlet) the future lies, in truth, in the uncertain light of dreams: his predecessor imagines it with the greater realism of the waking world.

With respect to the after-life, Q2 simply refers to it as *the dread of something after death*:

(Q 2) But that the dread of something after death,
The vndiscouer'd country, from whose borne
No trauiler returnes, puzzels the will,

The after-life is the *vndiscouer'd country* from where nobody returns. Such a country brings us the *dread* and *puzzels* our *will.* After several lines Q1 comes to this topic and reads:

(Q 1) But for a hope of something after death?
Which pusles the braine, and doth confound the sence.

Hamlet's concern here is whether there is *hope* in the after-life, and this awkward question *pusles the braine*. Although both texts mention in the following passage that *conscience makes cowardes* (Q1) / *conscience dooes make cowards* (Q2), there is a slight difference in the manner of reaching *conscience*.

A significant difference between the two texts is found in Hamlet's description of *whips and scornes* in this world. Compare the following passages:

(Q 1) The widow being oppressed, the orphan wrong'd,
The taste of hunger, or a tirants raigne,

(Q 2) Th'oppressors wrong, the proude mans contumely,
The pangs of despiz'd loue, the lawes delay,
The insolence of office,

Hamlet in Q2 explicitly claims that his despair has a political character. His words reflect his position as the Prince of Denmark, and these words are consistent with his foregoing monologues. The Q1 text does not make a sufficient statement in this respect. The expressions *widow, orphan* and *hunger* are not directly related to the doings of rulers. We could perhaps assume that the reporter of Q1 heard the words *oppress-* and *wrong*, but that he took them for verbs and attached new subjects to them.

5. *Concluding remarks*

We have briefly seen how the two Quartos include different passages and how these differences could affect our interpretations. Since our interest lies in linguistic aspects of Hamlet's words, we have

restricted ourselves to textual facts found in both Quartos. As opposed to Q2, Q1 dispenses with many crucial expressions for our understanding of Hamlet. Its language is in general short and unrefined. While Q2 provides complicated syntactic and semantic constructions, Q1 lacks such rhetorical diversity. On the basis of these linguistic differences we can therefore support Pollard's claim that Q1 and Q2 are respectively 'bad' and 'good' Quartos.

NOTES

(1) I am following Edwards(1985: 9) on the length of Q1 and Q2. Dowden (1899: xvii) states that Q1 contains 2143 lines.

(2) Hereafter I will refer to *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (edited by Ph. Edwards) in counting the number of lines.

(3) F1 reads *solid* instead of *sallied* in Q1 and Q2. *The Arden Shakespeare* (edited by E. Dowden, 1899) and *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (edited by Ph. Edwards) take the Folio reading. Linguists like Brown and Yule (1983: 6) evaluate Wilson's (1934b: 307-15) account of the *sullied* reading. Since the typical subject for *melt, thaw and resolue...dewe* would be something frozen, we could plausibly assume that in the *sullied* interpretation Hamlet's flesh is compared to 'snow' (cf. Wilson, 1934b: 313), while it is associated with 'ice' in the *solid* interpretation.

(4) For a detailed discussion of 'cohesion', see Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Brown and Yule (1983).

REFERENCES

Brown, G. and G. Yule (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge U.P.

Clemen, W. (1964) *Shakespeare's Soliloquies*. Cambridge U.P.

Dowden, E. (ed.) (1899) *Hamlet* (The Arden Shakespeare). London: Methuen and Co.

Edwards, Ph. (ed.) (1985) *Hamlet* (The New Cambridge Shakespeare). Cambridge U.P.

Farnham, W. (ed.) (1969) *Hamlet* (The Pelican Shakespeare). New York: The Viking Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman

Pollard, A. (1909) *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos.* London: Methuen and Co.

Schabert, I. (1972) *Shakespeare Handbuch.* Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag.

The first Quarto (1603) A Facsimile in photo-lithography by W. Griggs. Forewords by F. Furnivall.

The second Quarto (1604/5) A Facsimile in photo-lithography by W. Griggs. Forewords by F. Furnivall.

Wilson, J.D. (1934a) *Hamlet* (The Cambridge Shakespeare). Cambridge U.P.

Wilson, J.D. (1934b) *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet.* Cambridge U.P.