Indigested in the Scenes: *Hamlet*'s Dramatic Theory and Ours

DANIEL L. KEEGAN

A SIGNAL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE PAST HALF-CENTURY OF THEater and performance research has been the emancipation of performance from its supposed "subordinat[ion] to the primacy of the text" (Lehmann 21).[1] In this process, to borrow Diana Taylor's influential terms, the "repertoire" of "performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing" and "many other forms of repeatable behaviors" (20, 37) has been liberated from the domination of the "archive" (19), the privileged repository "of written culture defined by the fixity and stability of writing" (Worthen, *Drama* 65) where "documents" of authority and power are kept in a state of "house arrest" (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 3).[2] This liberation has taken various forms. Over the past half-century, performance studies and cognate discourses have drawn attention to a host of performances outside a text-based model (Taylor; Schechner; Lehmann; Harding and Rosenthal). At the same time, several critics have observed that even when performances are intended to be text-based, players can hold at bay, even explode, the supposed subordination of their repertoire (Goldman; Beckerman; Bennett; Weimann).[3] More recently, in a series of important studies, W. B. Worthen has insisted on the primacy of the repertoire not only in constituting all performances, both text-based and not, but also, through the repertoires of scribes, editors, printers, and others, in constituting the dramatic text—and the archive—itself.[4] As Worthen shows, it is the repertoire's "*technologies* of performance" that "instrumental[ize]" (*Drama* xvi) and put to "work"—that have always instrumentalized and put to work, even in times of the text's supposed primacy—the "tool" of dramatic writing (34, 1).[5]

If performance has recently been emancipated from the text, a homologous impulse has for centuries, if not millennia, sought to

DANIEL L. KEEGAN, assistant professor of English at the American University of Sharjah, is writing a monograph entitled "Is There a Shakespearean Theatre? Dramaturgy, Democracy, Mediation."

© 2018 DANIEL L. KEEGAN

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

liberate a "literary" dimension of dramatic writing from involvement in the practices and pleasures of performance. With a history traceable to Aristotle's claim that tragedy "reveals its power by mere reading," this impulse has had a special power in relation to Shakespeare.[6] Indeed, the impulse to liberate literature from performance is, in English drama, contemporaneous with Shakespeare. A "literary" English drama, with lines able to be "extracted from the dramatic situation and the character who speaks them" (Lesser and Stallybrass 415), emerged in the course of his career through the work of readers, authors, and printers who highlighted such "extract[able]" maxims, sentences, and commonplaces. Further, the sheer length of certain plays by Shakespeare might, as Lukas Erne argues, provide a window into the playwright's emerging literary ambitions and his care for "a future readership of his plays" (113). In the past two hundred years, the ethical thrust of this liberation of Shakespeare's "literariness" has intensified. Charles Lamb wrote in 1811 that to try to manifest Shakespeare's poetic richness on the stage, amid the theater's "juvenile pleasure[s]," is to go "in quest of an unattainable substance." More recently, Harry Berger, Jr., has written that drama—and writing in general—is "overwritten from the standpoint of performance and the playgoer's limited perceptual capacities" (*Imaginary Audition* 29–30), an evaluation that is part of his "intrepid defense of the primacy of page over stage" (de Grazia 545). The "overwrittenness" Berger diagnoses demands to be extracted from the theater and subjected to "decelerated reading" (*Imaginary Audition* 45), a practice that affords paging back and forth, lingering over evidence at one's own pace.[7] For all their variety, these versions of dramatic "literariness" all share the intuition that drama is "overwritten from the standpoint of performance," whether from the standpoint of the "dramatic situation," the "two hours' traffic of [the] stage" (Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, prologue, line 12), the "juvenile pleasure" of theater, or the "playgoer's . . . perceptual capacities."

These two narratives—performance's emancipation from the text and literature's emancipation from performance—have dominated conversations about the relation between writing and performance. In what follows, I would like to tell an alternative story about this relation, one that emerges in the course of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This story does not find "literature" escaping or being extracted from the theater. Instead, it finds "literature," as "overwrittenness,"[8] being crammed into the scene of performance. This "digest[ion]," to employ the play's jargon (2.2.377), of "overwrittenness" is not a smooth thing.[9] Rather, it is an *in*digestion, one that afflicts all participants in the event of dramatic performance. This indigestion challenges the playgoer's capacity to attend to the play's "necessary question[s]" (3.2.40). It disrupts the performer's ability to "speak the speech . . . trippingly on the tongue" (3.2.1–2) and to "give it"—dramatic performance—"smoothness" (3.2.8). It disables every theatrical participant's ability to control and to *put to work*, in Worthen's sense, writing as it goes on a "progress through the guts" of the theater (4.3.30). This indigestion, for all that it afflicts performance with writing, does not reinstitute the subordination of performance to the text. Instead, it highlights the fraught, uncertain interplay between writing and performance, not by insisting on the performer's capacity to hold at bay, even explode, the supposed subordination of their repertoire (Goldman; Beckerman; Bennett; Weimann) but rather by pointing out and elaborating the indigestive "overwrittenness" of writing and its effects on the repertoires of the theater's inhabitants.[10]

By (in)digesting writing—and, more, writing's overwritten literariness—into performance, *Hamlet* tells us a more rambunctious story about writing's participation in

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

performance and enriches our understanding and experience of writing's involvement there. But the payoff of this investigation is not only theatrical and aesthetic; it is also political. In the play, the (in)digestion of overwrittenness is staged as a redesign of drama's theatrical participation, a redesign that demotes it from something like an authoritative, "archival" position. This redesign democratizes the theatrical scene by debilitating the behaviors of playgoer, player, and indeed all theatrical participants and, thus, by insisting on the many repertoires with claims on any given theatrical moment. In its democratizing thrust, then, *Hamlet*'s "indigestive dramaturgy,"[11] as I would call it, dovetails neatly with the democratizing impulses that animated many of the emancipations and liberations of performance from writing and writing from performance, whether these sought to broaden the coalition of performances beyond a text-based minority (performance studies),[12] to insist on the freedom of the actor with respect to the text (Goldman; Beckerman; Weimann) and on Benjamin Bennett's claim that "all theatre is revolutionary theatre," or to rescue writing from performance and for the study where it can be perused, interpreted, and deliberated on in ways that challenge the "coercively timebound sequence of performance" (Berger, "Text" 100). In all these cases, however, it is writing in performance that represents the un- or antidemocratic scenario.[13] In *Hamlet*, by contrast, the (in)digestion of writing in performance democratizes the theatrical scene. As we turn to the text, we might put the matter thus: if, for Worthen, dramatic performance is in technical, economic terms the putting to work of the tools of writing—he calls these tools, as I will, "agencies" of writing (*Drama* 22–29)—*Hamlet* asks what happens if we take our metaphors for dramatic performance out of the office, out of the factory and to the party, the protest, and the debate.

The Well-Digested Blurb

> I heard thee speak me a speech once—but it was never acted, or, if it was, not above once, for the play I remember pleased not the million, 'twas caviare to the general. But it was, as I received it, and others whose judgements in such matters cried in the top of mine, an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning. I remember one said there were no sallets in the lines to make the matter savoury nor no matter in the phrase that might indict the author of affection but called it an honest method.
> (*Hamlet* 2.2.372–81)

Let us begin by examining the metaphor that organizes the play's modeling of writing's—of literature's—participation in performance: digestion. Doing so will situate our discussion in relation to some of the play's well-known reflections on theater, including on the role of the clown, on Hamlet's show-passing within, and on the connection (or disconnection) between Hamlet's enunciations of performance theory and his and his play's performance practice. In relation to these widely studied issues,[14] my own claim can be simply stated: we ought to pay more attention to the specificity and independence of Hamlet's first and less famous statement on dramatic theory.[15]

I call this earlier statement Hamlet's blurb to acknowledge its resemblance to the promotional copy on book jackets and to distinguish it from his later, more famous monologue known as his "advice to the players." For Hamlet, as for most commentators, his two statements point toward a common goal: a judiciously composed and enacted scene that "hold[s] . . . the mirror up to Nature" and that, in doing so, will be well received by the judicious and the sophisticated (3.2.21–22). These two statements, however, sport crucial differences that have gone unremarked.[16] Unlike the advice, which concerns the behavior of actors, the blurb concerns the ethics of dramatic composition. As a consequence, the speeches' diagnoses of failure diverge.[17] For

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the advice, failure is sited in an overwrought repertoire that risks abandoning word, nature, and humanity (3.2.1–34). For the blurb, failure is in the script. While the advice provides vivid descriptions of an overwrought repertoire, the blurb is more circumspect in its account of writing's failures. I seek to unpack this account here.

It is also in this blurb, quoted in full above, that the digestive metaphor for dramaturgy is articulated. Hamlet describes an untitled "excellent play" as "well digested in the scenes." Such scenic digestion evidently refers to the work of "the author" in "set[ting] down" the "lines" and "phrase[s]" of the script. The author has skillfully "[d]isposed in or reduced to order" the matter of the script,[18] in both its form and its content. An *in*digested script, we can assume, would not be so disposed in or reduced to order. According to Hamlet—or, rather, according to "one" that Hamlet "remember[s]"—this indigested script would be afflicted by "sallets in the lines to make the matter savoury" and "matter in the phrase that might indict the author of affection." According to Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, the editors of the most recent Arden Shakespeare edition of *Hamlet*, "sallets" is "usually glossed as 'spicy bits'" (2.2.379–80n)—"ribaldries," according to their predecessor Harold Jenkins (2.2.437n)—but may indicate nothing more than "a variety of ingredients . . . in the dialogue to make it well seasoned" (2.2.379–80n). They gloss the prohibited "matter in the phrase that might indict the author of affection" as anything "in the manner of expression" that might "accuse" the author of "affectation," affectation that might include what Berowne in *Love's Labour's Lost* calls "[t]hree-piled hyperboles" and "[f]igures pedantical" (qtd. in Thompson and Taylor 2.2.381n).

An indigested script, on this account, would be afflicted with a species of overwrittenness, crammed with "ribaldries" and "a variety of ingredients" including hyperbolic and pedantic figures. I want to argue that, for the blurb, such a script is also afflicted with something like one of the types of overwrittenness we are interested in here: Berger's theater-defying, literary overwrittenness. At first glance, these two types of overwrittenness might seem to contrast: the sallet-ridden script is overwritten from the perspective of theatrical judiciousness, not "perceptual capacity." Moreover, it is implied that these "sallets" and this "matter in the phrase" would be designed to "please" "the million," not to entice Berger's "decelerated" reader. And yet, what if the sallet's "variety of ingredients" not only made "the matter savoury" and accused authorial judiciousness but also challenged the perceptual capacities of the playgoers? What if "sallets" distracted these playgoers from the "necessary question[s] . . . then to be considered" (3.2.40–41) confronting them with a variety of stimuli—"ingredients"—that forced them to negotiate, on the fly, between the relative necessity of various questions or, perhaps, to choose between the rigor of necessary questions and the savoriness of the sallets? This interpretation suggests a connection between the dramatic "sallet" and Hamlet's mighty opposite in authorship: the clown, who according to Hamlet's advice to the players diverts the audience with his inopportune laughter and, perhaps, some sallets—in the sense of "spicy bits," "ribaldries"—of his own.[19] Some link between indigestion and Hamlet's fantasy of theatrical clowns—who "will themselves laugh to set on some quantity of barren spectators to laugh too," thus distracting from the "necessary questions" (3.2.38–39, 40)—is historically plausible. Robert Weimann remarks that laughter, the clown's stock-in-trade, was understood to have a "strong visceral component" (*Author's Pen* 175),[20] which was part of its challenge to what Keith Thomas calls the "new cult of decorum" that Hamlet advocates even as he fails to embody it (qtd. in Weimann, *Author's Pen* 175).[21]

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Identifying the sallet with the clown does not, however, obviously imbue it with the sort of perceptual challenges that Berger diagnoses. Instead, it seems to do the opposite. For Berger, in what we might call his "paradox of dramatic poetry," the rich, overwritten signification of dramatic writing means that this semiotic richness must somehow fail in the theater (or that the theater must fail this richness). The clown, by contrast, is one of the early modern theater's key figures, and if the written sallet is, indeed, to be associated with the clown, it might well possess, like the clown, a "villainous" and even "pitiful ambition" (3.2.41, 42) to distract from the "necessary question[s]" under consideration, foisting on playgoers a choice between its antics and the necessary questions. Berger's overwrittenness hesitates at performance; the clown seeks to conquer it.

And yet, the savory sallet, even if it clowns, might demur at performance through its destined digestion. The metaphors of "caviare" and "savour[iness]" activate the gastronomical sense of "sallet," and, if it is digested in this sense, the sallet would be conducted into the play's paradigmatic zone of perceptual challenge: the mysterious "within" that Hamlet lays claim to when he first appears onstage and that, in his account, "passes show"—that fails, in other words, to register in outward signs (1.2.85). By plunging the clown into Hamlet's "within," the sallet would enact an inscrutable populism and doubly challenge playgoer perception: insofar as it is linked to the clown, it aspires to challenge playgoer perception through distracting antics; insofar as it is digested, it slips into a show-passing, interior space.

The sallet, on this account, splices together two of the play's most famous and most opposed theatrical figures: the show-interrupting clown and the show-passing "within." The blurb, I would argue, stages precisely this genetic recombination of clown and "within," and it does so through its own infiltration by overwrittenness. In the second of the blurb's prohibitions, Hamlet recounts the outlawing of "matter in the phrase to indict the author of affection." I have glossed this as a prohibition against "affectation" and affected language, but in this moment Hamlet indulges in—or stumbles into—a punning connection between *matter* and *mater*, the Latin for "mother." Hamlet thus warns playwrights against not only "affectation" but also "affection" manifested through "mother in the phrase." The *matter*/*mater* pun will be explicitly activated in act 3 when Hamlet declares, "[B]ut to the matter—my mother" (3.2.316), but its presence here is confirmed by the "sallet." We have seen this term name overwrittenness, but it is itself overwritten. The first definition of the term given in *The Oxford English Dictionary* is not the possibly "spicy" "variety of ingredients" suggested above but, in reference to "mediæval armor, a light globular headpiece" ("Sallet," def. 1.a); in the hands of Thomas Heywood, in 1599, the term was made to refer "*jocularly* . . . to . . . a measure for wine" (def. 1.b). Hamlet's prohibition against "sallets" is haunted by a prohibition against his father's poison- and wine-filled helmet.[22] Through overwrittenness, the "sallet" and "matter" coalesce into a furtive version of Hamlet's family tree.

Like the clown, these overwritten terms challenge perception by shirking the necessary questions then to be considered: Hamlet's attempt to put them to work in blurbing an "excellent play." Unlike the clown, they do so quietly, not through gregarious laughter but through a Latin pun and a joke about armor. They do not stop the show; they sulk on its margins. And yet, the show-passing sulk of "matter" and "sallet" is belied by their invocation of the even more necessary questions of the play: Hamlet's poisoned father, his affection for his mother, his filched inheritance. These sallets challenge the repertoires of the theatrical scene's inhabitants. They challenge the playgoer, as well as Hamlet's interlocutors,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to perceive them and to interpret their relation to the current scene. They doubly vex Hamlet's behaviors: his repertoire of criticism and speech is deflected into this tacit family tree, and even if he has punning overwrittenness in mind, his repertoire of revenge is indicted by this reminder of the questions to which he ought to be, in this moment, attending.

The obscure clowning of these sallets reverberates through the repertoires of those not present for the performance. It is not only the repertoires of Hamlet and his audiences that are vexed; those of the play's original critic are too: the praise of the performance for its lack of "sallets" and affected "matter in the phrase" is, after all, something Hamlet "remember[s] one said." These terms have had their punning overwrittenness emerge (or, certainly, intensify) since their original enunciation, which predated the death of Hamlet's father. Since his mother's remarriage, Hamlet has had more serious *mater* issues; since his encounter with the ghost, he has more reasons to worry about a wine- and poison-filled "sallet." The blurb thus engages overwrittenness with respect not only to theatrical judiciousness, playgoer perception, and player's enunciation but also to dramatic situation: like the "funeral baked meats" that, as Hamlet complains, "[d]id coldly furnish forth the marriage tables" for Claudius and Gertrude (1.2.179–80), the blurb is "furnished forth" in a scenario that no longer suits.[23] Its "leftover" language is extracted from its dramatic situation and digested into one where the words no longer fit the actions—the *work*—that Hamlet and the original reviewer propose to accomplish with them.[24]

Does this multidimensional overwrittenness enforce an escape from the theater? Are we obliged to smuggle these sallets out of the theater and furnish them forth into the study? There is, of course, no shame in doing so, especially for a modern audience with small Latin and less knowledge of medieval armory, and the account that I have presented here is completely the product of "decelerated reading" practiced outside the flux of the theater. What, then, about an early modern audience? I think this is the wrong question. We do not need to estimate the aural bandwidth of an Elizabethan or to identify the segment of the audience that might have the educational attainment to follow these sallets or the disposable income to watch the play repeatedly and work out the jokes. Instead, we can observe that the blurb's sallets simultaneously insist on a theatrical habitation—through, especially, their affiliation with the clown and the play's most necessary questions—and intimate an escape from it. At the very moment that they distract from and disjoin the necessary, "timebound" questions of the scene, the sallets are thereby affiliated with the paradigmatically theatrical clown who, much to the dismay of both, is crammed into the showpassing guts of the prince, from where these sallets point toward the play's even more necessary questions, which, for the moment, seem to have been forgotten.

Writing, for the blurb, cannot easily be contained by the theater, but it also cannot quite escape from it. Its tangled topology emerges through the indigestion of the behaviors of the participants: neither clown nor critic, prince nor playgoer is able to well digest the duplicitous (or, rather, multiplicitous) agencies of writing. Such repertorial indigestion is, beyond the blurb, one of the dramas of *Hamlet* itself. Overwrittenness, as we shall see in the next section, deposes the claims to rhetorical (and, more broadly, aural) authority and efficacy that characterize the play's first act. By the end of the play, overwrittenness and the indigestions to which it gives rise will have progressed through the sociopolitical sphere not only of Denmark but also of the play's whole history, from its earliest sources to the players who performed it yesterday (or, as we shall see, in 1636). This indigestive progress opens a democratic space of collective response. If no one can well digest the scene,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

why should everyone not get a try? Why might not the reading of the blurb presented here have come to pass not (or not just) through laborious, decelerated reading but among a group of friends at an after-party, one of whom happened to have been apprenticed to an armorer, one of whom really enjoyed Latin jokes, and the last of whom had a few extra coins to see the show more than once?

From "Globe" to "Machine"

Hamlet's indigestive dramaturgy unfolds a democratizing redesign of writing's participation in performance. This redesign deposes an authoritarian model of rhetorical efficacy that evokes the textual "primacy" from which performance has been, in the last half-century, liberated. In *Hamlet*, however, the liberation is not complete. Instead, individual repertoires are afflicted by the agencies of writing; the affliction does not, however, subordinate the repertoire but opens up a democratic space of collective engagement. Attending to this indigestive affliction qualifies recent efforts to highlight *Hamlet*'s emancipation of performance from writing (Worthen, *Drama* 94–111; Trudell), bringing an important topic of *Hamlet* criticism—the play's habit of "*materializing* the word" (Ferguson 271) and letting it "act upon the body" (Pollard 135)—in contact with its modeling of dramaturgy and the repertoire.[25]

This indigestive redesign is inaugurated along the tract leading from one of the play's most famous dramatic agencies to another: from Hamlet's "globe" to his "machine." Along the way, it enacts the downfall of a cosmic, theatrical, and political paradigm. Hamlet's—and *Hamlet*'s—"globe" is famously overwritten, but in a way that does not challenge playgoer perception or scenic digestion. Indeed, it seeks to promote such digestion. The "globe" is enunciated immediately after Hamlet's interview with his father's ghost and as part of a promise to remember: "Remember thee?" Hamlet exclaims, "Ay, thou poor ghost, whiles memory holds a seat / In this distracted globe" (1.5.95–97). The "globe," however, is not content to refer simply to Hamlet's head; it ripples concentrically outward to implicate the inhabitants of the Globe Theatre and even of the world beyond it, the "great globe itself" (Shakespeare, *Tempest* 4.1.153). This concentric effect aims to reinforce, not disable, Hamlet's promise in two ways. First, it seeks to yoke the inhabitants of the Globe and the "great globe" into collaboration with Hamlet's promise: if he is ever at risk of forgetting his father, he can always ask the audience to help him remember! Second, it situates Hamlet's remembering globe in the sort of "privileged topology" that, for Jacques Derrida, characterizes the archive (3). Archivization is Hamlet's task in the ensuing lines: he claims the "book and volume of [his] brain" as the topology where his father's "commandment all alone shall live" "[u]nmixed with baser matter" (1.5.103, 102, 104). The "globe" and its concentric rings radically privilege this topology in turn by evoking a geocentric cosmos and the stability of its crystalline spheres. Hamlet's "globe" would in this scenario be cast in a cosmically central, proverbially immobile position, a position "defined," like the archive, by "fixity and stability" (Worthen, *Drama* 65).

The "globe" and its overwrittenness participate in an effort to digest Hamlet's behaviors, subordinating his repertoire to his promise and his father's commandment; they also seek to digest—dispose in or reduce to order—his audience's attention. By implicating the audience members—and all humanity—in his promise, Hamlet aims to dispose and order them according to the necessary questions of remembrance and promise that, for him, are now under consideration. This overwritten effort to digest the audience aligns with a broader model of reception characteristic of the play's first act, a model that finds sound seizing on and subordinating the repertoire of its auditors in a way that, as Allison K.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Deutermann writes, was at the turn of the seventeenth century "becoming associated with certain kinds of plays—revenge tragedies, heroic romances, and other older but still popular forms" (233). To wit: a rooster seizes the repertoire of the ghost, obliging him to "fade" "on the crowing of the cock" (1.1.156). The ghost demands from Hamlet a revenge "as swift / As meditation or the thoughts of love" (1.5.29–30) and, later, requires a remembrance (91). The "poisonous audition" (Pollard 123–43) of Claudius's "hebona in a vial" (Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 1.5.62), poured in the "porches" of Old Hamlet's ears, seizes immediately "all [Old Hamlet's] smooth body" (63, 73). Claudius's political technologies, from assassination on, feature such compelling sounds, whether he is dropping poison in Old Hamlet's ear or insisting that the "King's rouse" be accompanied by a burst of "cannon to the clouds" (1.2.127, 126). Claudius's politics—including his domineering appeal to the "better wisdoms" that "have freely gone / With this affair along" (1.2.15–16)—might, to Hamlet's dismay, be a sort of model for the rhetorical and aural strategy of the "globe."

Through its overwrittenness, the globe and its concentric spheres provide a diagram for this model of well-digested theatrical reception, mapping its vintage—"older but still popular"—theatrical sound onto a legacy cosmic system. Like Hamlet's dramatic theory, the globe imagines a well-suited relation between "action" and "word"; unlike Hamlet's theory, this relation is characterized less by judicious writing and acting than by authoritarian, repertoire-seizing speeches and sounds. With the advent of the "machine," things change. Action is emancipated from its subordination to the word, and the word becomes unsuitable to the actions undertaken with it. This unsuiting of the word—*machine*—to its actions arises through the intervention of writing and, with it, of language's capacity to be furnished forth and redigested, or indigested, in new scenarios.

Let us consider the contrasting overwrittenness of the machine. Like the globe, the machine functions in Hamlet's repertoire of promising, engaging his body or part of it in what seems the characteristic form for his protestations of faith and constancy. Unlike the globe, the machine appears in writing. In a letter to Ophelia that invites her to "Doubt that the stars are fire / Doubt that the sun doth move / Doubt truth to be a liar" as long as she "never doubt I love" (2.2.114–17), Hamlet declares that he is "[t]hine evermore, most dear lady, whilst *this machine* is to him" (120–21; emphasis added). By the time the letter appears in the play, however, Hamlet's "machine"—which both Thompson and Taylor (2.2.121n) and Jenkins (2.2.122–23n) gloss as Hamlet's body—has taken leave of the qualities that would allow it to support the action of his promise. This promise was predicated on his possession of his body, but his body now seems possessed and ready to go to pieces, emitting, according to Ophelia's report on his behavior, at least one sigh "so piteous and profound / As it did seem to shatter all his bulk / And end his being" (2.1.91–93). Hamlet's sighs and "afright[ing]" (72) appearance are the reason the letter is furnished forth at this moment and put to work in Polonius's repertoire of investigation, providing the key evidence of Hamlet's love "lunacy" (2.2.49) to Claudius and Gertrude. Just as it exceeded Hamlet's dramatic situation and amorous promise, Hamlet's body-machine resists Polonius's actions. The shattered repertoire of which Polonius is aware points playgoers beyond the encounter with Ophelia and reminds them that this body has been shivering in the "shrewdly" "bit[ing]" wind (1.4.1) and has been encountering ghosts that "shake our disposition / With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls" (55–56).

Hamlet's body-machine balks at the actions that Hamlet and Polonius seek to perform with the letter. The "machine," as a piece of writing, similarly unsuits itself to these

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proposed actions. Once perhaps a wholesome, well-digested word, *machine* has been afflicted with leftovers and converted to an indigestible sallet by the events of the play. It possesses the following recalcitrant meanings: dating back to 1545, a "material or immaterial structure, *esp. the fabric of the world or of the universe*; a construction or edifice" ("Machine," def. 1.a; emphasis added); to 1595–96, a "scheme or plot" (def. 1.b); and, to 1583, a "military engine or siege-tower" (def. 3). Except for the sense of the cosmic machine, which chimes with Hamlet's rhyme about the sun and the stars, these senses are not well enough digested by the questions of the play to be resolved either through Hamlet's promise to Ophelia or through Polonius's inquiry into Hamlet's love madness. Instead, these leftover senses are activated and gobbled up by the even more necessary questions of the play. The sense of *machine* as a cosmic structure, besides its tinny chime in the letter, recalls the dialect and stakes of the meetings with the ghost, when eyes might "start from their spheres" (1.5.17) and "heaven and earth" are crammed with "more things . . . / Than are dreamt of in . . . philosophy" (165–66). The sense of *machine* as a scheme recalls the plots that were revealed and hatched on the platform where Hamlet and the watch saw the ghost, and the sense of the term as a siege weapon (def. 3) evokes the armored ghost who so recently besieged the battlements and the watch.[26]

Hamlet's "globe," for all that it was "distracted," optimistically envisioned consonance between the questions of the play and the attention of the audience. The "machine," by contrast, is entirely distracting. Like the "sallet" and "matter" of the blurb, it challenges the playgoer's perceptual capacity to negotiate between the questions to be considered and the more necessary questions it raises. It also highlights the somatic dimension of the (in)digestive metaphor by staging the digestion of its leftover agencies into Hamlet's show-passing "within." We can begin to track this staging by noting a sense of *machine* not recorded in *The Oxford English Dictionary*: in an anonymous poem from *Tottel's Miscelleny* (1557) we hear of "[t]he *machine huge* Troyans suspected not" ("Of the Troubled Common Welth"; emphasis added), and in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs, and Sonets* (1567), George Turberville writes of "the *Machin huge* . . . [b]y Grecian guile so falsely wrought" (106; emphasis added). Hamlet's machine is linked to the paradigmatic siege machine, fashioned as a hollow, secretive animal body that could at any moment open and unleash its contents. Although the Trojan machine highlights the possibility of violence (exactly what Claudius must fear from Hamlet), Ophelia's report suggests that Hamlet's machine is just as likely to unleash bulk-shattering sighs. This potentiality is confirmed in the 1592 translation of Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (*The Strife of Love in a Dream*), whose narrator, having descended into a hollow, man-shaped colossus, cries for love so that "the whole Colose and *Machine of brasse* did resound, striking me into a horrible feare" (14; emphasis added). He feared, perhaps, the shattering of his bulk and the ending of his being.

We can track the infiltration of overwrittenness into this machinic "within" in some detail. The digestive process begins at the moment of the "globe," which cannot sustain the cosmic stability that it evokes. Even beyond the "distraction" that Hamlet diagnoses, the problems multiply. The "globe," like the "machine," is furnished forth into a new scenario that no longer suits: its privileged, geocentric topology refers to an "outmoded" belief (Thompson and Taylor 2.2.114–17n). This moment also introduces the unpredictable leftoverness of writing, not only in the "book and volume of [Hamlet's] brain" but also in the scribbled commonplaces he commits—or wants to commit—to his "tables," or notebook (1.5.107). The stately, concentric overwrittenness of the "globe"—linked to speech

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and hearing—is, perhaps as a consequence, infiltrated and disrupted by the clowning overwrittenness that seems linked to writing. For example, Hamlet probably should not have figured himself as the paradigmatically immobile "globe" only moments after he was so forcefully interpellated as a revenging "son," punningly invoking the "sun" that, in a geocentric cosmos, will doubtlessly move. It was also probably impolitic to give "memory"—another means of furnishing language forth—a "seat" in the Globe, a gesture that risks riling the groundlings, who, though allegedly capable of understanding "nothing but inexplicable dumb-shows and noise" (3.2.11–12), later seem to take up arms as part of Laertes's revolutionary "rabble" and, on his behalf, nearly convert their inexplicable "*noise*" (4.5.109SD) and "cr[ies]" (109) into the overthrow of "[a]ntiquity" and "custom" (103). And the staging does not help: at the moment that Hamlet enunciates the "globe," it seems unlikely that he is performing the stability of the globe: he is ranting, calling (maybe looking?) for his tables (demanding them from the audience?), or perhaps trying to write in them. He is reeling about the stage, emitting what Horatio will call "wild and whirling words" (1.5.132), looking for all the world like a celestial object about to come unstuck from its long-standing pride of place.

Hamlet's reeling body-machine enacts the demise of a cosmic system and, in the same moment, of the systems of political command and theatrical reception for which that cosmic system was a model. This collapsing system will find itself indigested in Hamlet's "within," his body-machine. We have already seen the "machine" enact a reconfigured overwrittenness. It also tracks this reconfiguration of overwrittenness from "global" extroversion to "machinic" introversion. One of its constituents—the cosmic machine—points us to the "globe," affiliating its overwrittenness with this calamity of planets and of theatrical reception. Things intensify as another of these leftover agencies enters the scene both to reinforce planetary dislocation and to inflict itself on Hamlet's repertoire. Old Hamlet and his armor machine, transformed into a "pioner[ing]" "old mole" (1.5.162, 161), lead Hamlet and his companions on a merry chase across the stage. After his interview with the ghost and once again attempting to secure a promise, Hamlet persuades his companions to swear themselves to secrecy about the night's events. Once they have sworn, Hamlet furnishes forth the demand that they swear again, this time by his sword (146, 148, 153–54). When they demur—"We have sworn my lord already" (147)—the commandment of the ghost issues up through the floor: "Swear" (149, 155, 160). After the second such "Swear" (155), Hamlet decides that they must "shift [their] ground" (156). He and his companions wheel across the stage as a little, scurrying planetary system in which there is no doubt that the "son"—he of the recently stable "globe"—doth move. Rather than assume the privileged topology of the "book and volume" of Hamlet's brain, moreover, the collapsing cosmos and the burrowing old mole inflict their energies on the "baser matter" of Hamlet's body, if only by forcing him to run across the stage. By the time Hamlet is able to say "[r]est, rest, perturbed spirit" (1.5.180), he is surely in need of a rest himself—all the more reason for leisurely colloquies with Reynaldo and Voltemand.

Through this staging, the leftover agencies of the machine indicate the material processes that inflict themselves on Hamlet's body, indigesting not only his rhetorical repertoire but also his physical behaviors. The machine dynamically stages this infliction as its leftover definitions leap out to associate with these processes, which then inflict themselves on the flesh, crashing back "within." Hamlet's flesh inherits the debased energies of these collapsing systems (cosmic, theatrical, political), as well as the clowning connotations of the machine. The cataclysm of

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this infliction of matter and of salleted words (and, for that matter, of his father's salleted-helmet) is pointed up by the equine valence of the siege machine. If the paradigm of this machine was the Grecian "machine huge," then the equine charge might transfer to the armor–siege machine of the father to cast the chase of the "old mole" as a furnishing forth of the story of Phaeton, the son of the sun who tangled with his father's horses—or, here, his father as horse.

What interaction between writing and the repertoire is modeled here? We have seen playgoer perception emancipated from the rhetorical claims of Hamlet's "globe" (and, earlier, Claudius's "affair") but then indigested by the multiplicity of overwritten agency. We have seen player behavior "given *un*smoothness," instead of the "smoothness" that Hamlet recommends (3.2.8), by the materiality with which this overwrittenness affiliates itself. Might we be watching the author disabling his competitors in authorship—players, playgoers—and subordinating their repertoires, even in their indigestive unsmoothness? I do not think so. Here, the "*domiciliation*" (Derrida 2) of overwrittenness in Hamlet's "within" is more anarchic than archival or authorial, more "house party" than "house arrest"; the author's control seems minimal even as the agencies of his writing indigest the repertoire. We might risk thinking about this relation through the old story that Shakespeare himself played the ghost to Richard Burbage's Hamlet:[27] then the planetary gambol across the stage allegorizes not only Hamlet's unmanageable inheritance but also the agency of the author in dramatic performance. Shakespeare here hardly determines Burbage's performance. Perhaps he determines Burbage's direction, but this is uncertain. We cannot be sure whether Hamlet moves toward or away from the sound. One imagines Burbage interacting virtuosically (or ineptly; no need for hero worship!) with the inciting energy of Shakespeare's "Swear!" The author, trapped under the stage, would have no way of knowing or directing what Burbage was doing, and the actor might not know where the burrowing author was going next.

But what of the Trojan dimension of this interaction? If Hamlet is, indeed, crammed with writing, should this writing not, according to antiquity's leftover story, at some point burst forth to endanger Denmark, the player, and the playgoer? Should this ingested writing not, according to the story, conquer and enslave the onlookers? That is how the story goes, but not how things play out. Instead of vomiting up a commandment to seize on the repertoire, the Trojan machine functions as the first generation in an equine dynasty tracing a developing relation between indigested writing and the repertoire. After Burbage-Hamlet's encounter with the Trojan–Phaeton machine, Hamlet, before the performance of *The Mousetrap* begins, laments the "hobby-horse" who "is forgot" (3.2.128). Finally, as Claudius is scheming with Laertes, they both reminisce about a Norman horseman named Lamord (4.7.80–100). If the Trojan machine packs dangerous potentiality, these other figures present different images and qualities of horsemanship: Phaeton presents it as a cosmic catastrophe; the "hobby-horse," consisting of the "figure of a horse fastened round the waist of a man" (qtd. in Jenkins 500) "worn by a morris dancer" (Thompson and Taylor 3.2.127n), manifests folksy amateurism; Lamord presents an incomparable, indescribable virtuosity.

Instead of imagining the violent reflux of indigested dramatic agency, this equine inheritance appears to map a gradual accommodation of the repertoire to indigestion from the Phaeton calamity to the virtuosic Lamord. And yet, we cannot be certain of this accommodation. We are never granted complete, perceptual access to it, a point highlighted by the fact that each figure of horsemanship is somehow secret. The Phaeton-father is hidden under the stage, is

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only retrospectively named by the machine, and is the "wondrous strange" thing undreamt of by Horatio's "philosophy" (1.5.163, 166). The Trojan machine is a paradigm of secrecy, and our one encounter with it in the play is missed: when we join the action of Pyrrhus's revenge, already in progress, he has exited "th'ominous horse" (2.2.392). The "hobby-horse" is "forgot" and, as Jenkins writes, was the "type of what is forgotten" (3.2.132–33n); and Lamord "[s]o far . . . topped [Claudius's] thought" that the King "in forgery of shapes and tricks / Came short of what he did" (4.7.87, 88–89).[28]

This thought-topping secrecy evokes claims that, in the "coercively timebound sequence of performance" (Berger), we might "come short" (Claudius) of the "unattainable" (Lamb) relation between word and action, between (literary) overwrittenness and the necessary questions of a moment or of a play. We cannot be certain whether we are like the skillful Lamord or the calamitous Phaeton, the doomed Trojans pulling in the ominous horse (2.2.392) or the comical hobbyhorse, in our efforts to bring overwrittenness in relation to performance. We might think that our "prophetic soul[s]" are virtuosically seizing significance "as swift / As meditation or the thoughts of love" (1.5.40, 29–30), but we might just be performing a mockery morris dance of comprehension and interpretation amid the sheer bandwidth of dramatic performance. From this, however, we need not deduce the superiority of the "decelerated" reader. Instead, we ought to admit that although we may not be able to catch every overwritten agency before it achieves escape velocity past our emancipated ears—we may not even try! we might make a hash of it!—we will have the opportunity to seize on the "literariness" of the play before it gallops into the study. We will also have the chance to talk about these efforts (with our friends! at a party!). The uncertain, potentially infinite process of trying to calibrate a suitable relation between word and action produces, in the play's final scene and in its aftermath, the staging of a dramatic democracy, as writing indigests all the repertoires on—and, indeed, off—the scene.

"Anti[c]ke" Roman(s)

Claudius, through his appeal to "better wisdoms," and Hamlet, through the "globe," both aspire to well digest the behaviors of their political and theatrical audiences. By the time of the machine and the blurb, the fantasy of rhetorical authority that sustained their aspirations has been undone—indigested—by the duplicity of overwrittenness. The democratic possibility opened by this indigestion is staged, for example, in the critical response to the outmoded aurality of the supposedly "excellent play"—"This is too long," Polonius complains (2.2.436), and Hamlet, perhaps impatiently, urges the Player to "come to Hecuba" (439). The conclusion of this democratizing indigestion comes on the "anti[c]ke" tongue of Horatio.[29]

Horatio is supposed to give the play its final digestion, rescuing Hamlet's "wounded name" (5.2.328) and pacifying "men's minds" lest the opening moments of Fortinbras's regime be afflicted with "mischance" (378) arising from "plots and errors" (79). He should do so with the confidence of the "globe" and by translating the play into a founding epic-narration. His capacity to so translate theater is called into question as overwrittenness indigests his tongue. Horatio seeks to refuse his task of foundation by drinking the last dregs of the poisoned cup, declaring, "I am more an antique Roman than a Dane" (325). This attempt to plug into the theater's tragic machinery and to avoid "report[ing] [Hamlet] and [his] cause aright / To the unsatisfied" (5.2.323–24) is undercut by the affiliation of "antique" Romanness with narration and foundation. Although Horatio means to invoke the Romanness of heroic suicide, his

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

repertoire of self-slaughter is disabled by the connection between antique Romanness and epic-narration, a connection *Hamlet* manifests in the most antique Roman of them all: Aeneas, whose epic "talk to Dido" (2.2.384) is the speech that Hamlet—unlike, as we have seen, Polonius—"chiefly loved" (383) in the "excellent play." Horatio stumblingly invokes what he means to avoid.

If Horatio's repertoire of suicide is diverted into one of regime foundation by the duplicity of "antique" Romanness, his repertoires of suicide and of foundation are mocked in turn. Aeneas must share lingual real estate with another theatrical figure: the clown. In all modern editions, Horatio claims to be an "antique Roman," splitting himself between tragic suicide and epic foundation. In the earliest texts—and until the fifth quarto, printed in 1637—he was an "anti[c]ke Roman."[30] Horatio might be preparing to kill himself or to tell an epic tale, but he also might be preparing to play the fool (and, quite possibly, to play the fool in killing himself or telling his tale). This generic splicing recalls and reenacts the indecorous recombination of populist clown and elitist "within" staged in the blurb. It also activates the logic of inheritance and "furnishing forth" we observed above, and not only because Horatio is to crown Fortinbras. In the play, both Aeneas and the clown are marked as passé figures ripe for reform. Neither Polonius nor Hamlet, as mentioned above, would mind a shorter version of Aeneas's speech; the clown, of course, is a major topic of Hamlet's reforming advice. By indigestively speaking more than is set down for him, Horatio furnishes forth these two traditions, reanimating them and, finding himself at their confluence, inscrutably projecting them forward into his narration and the new regime. We may be disturbed that Horatio is experiencing this indecision at the moment he is supposed to found a regime. On the other hand, we might find pleasure in this hesitation and its "mingling [of] kings and clowns" (Sidney). Casting himself as an "anti[c]ke Roman" situates Horatio as the inheritor of both king (who delighted the judicious) and clown (who delighted the groundlings); it also makes him the joiner of a pair of "anti[c]ke" Romans who stood as indexes of theatrical quality: for the Players, it was said that "Seneca cannot be too heavy nor Plautus too light" (2.2.336–37). We might also delight at detecting in Horatio's ensuing performance a "variety of ingredients" commensurate with his tongue's inscrutable, "thought-topping" mingling of the antique and the antic Roman (or, then again, we might argue that Horatio pulls it together and does well by his classical namesake;[31] there is no need to subordinate his repertoire alone!).

Horatio's "anti[c]ke" enunciation situates him as the inheritor of the best the theater has had to offer and, in doing so, casts him as a new model of theatrical pleasure, one in which we cannot be certain which parent's traits are dominant and in which this uncertainty is the point. Horatio also convenes a kind of long dramaturgical parliament running not only from Plautus to Will Kempe but also from the author to the scribe to the actor to the playgoer to the editor to the printer to the reader, in which none of the participants has the repertorial competence to say exactly what work, in that moment, was supposed to be going on. Neither the most virtuosic actor's voice nor the most acute audience member's ear can precisely identify the genre of Horatio's intentions. But the blame falls too on author's pen, printer's press, and reader's eye. No one in the many stomachs of dramatic production has managed to well digest this "anti[c]ke" sallet, nor could they. Instead, it goes a progress through the guts of the study, the theater, and the printing house, disabling repertoires on its way and, in the same gesture, bringing them all into play.[32] This indigestive progress is anticipated in the blurb, where the task of "set[ting] down" a "well digested scene" seems like the author's,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but this task is figured as cookery—seasoning and not overseasoning lines—for the actor who will "mouth" it (3.2.2), even though it is the spectator who receives "a taste of . . . quality" (2.2.369). Horatio's anti[c]ke, indigested tongue radicalizes this dramaturgical democracy, inviting everyone to a feast they cannot hope to finish.

We live in a disciplinary moment characterized by, as Joseph Roach writes, a "widening gap between performance studies and literary studies" (1080) and, in Shakespeare studies, what Weimann calls an "alienation between textual and performance approaches" ("Performance" 4).[33] This gap and alienation have been notably conditioned by the twin gestures of emancipation—of performance from text, of literature from performance—that I identified above. *Hamlet*, by contrast, stages the indigestion of "literary" overwrittenness into the scene of performance, an indigestion that, at least until 1637, culminates on Horatio's "anti[c]ke" tongue. In *Hamlet*, this indigestive progress redesigns drama's participation in performance, from the authoritarian rhetorical fantasies of the first act to the collective pleasures of the last. Its dramaturgy refuses the coercions that allegedly arise at the intersection of writing and performance and, instead, highlights and even celebrates the parties, protests, and debates that flourish there.

Notes

This piece has developed over many years and has taken many forms. Special thanks to Ian Munro, Bryan Reynolds, Julia Reinhard Lupton, Donovan Sherman, Casey Caldwell, Sally Lindfors, David Keegan, Ellen MacKay, and *PMLA*'s anonymous reader.

1. This logocentric drama and its discontents have been discussed in relation to Greek philosophy (Weber 1–53; Bennett 13–26), the media ecology of the "Gutenberg galaxy" and its aftermaths (Lehmann 16; Weimann and Bruster; Worthen, *Drama* 1–138), colonial projects (Taylor 16–43), and the emergence of national literatures (Bennett).

2. Although the dominant critical move has been liberation of repertoire from archive, Taylor emphasizes that they are "in a constant state of interaction" (21). For critical appraisals of this interaction, see Taylor; Schneider 87–110; and Worthen, *Drama* 64–69.

3. Goldman observes the player's "'terrific' energy" (7), Beckerman the actor's "*self-generative* . . . spontaneity" (7). Bennett claims for performers a "semiotic explosive[ness]" in the face of textual subordination (180). Weimann and his collaborators have studied the highly flexible interplay between "actor's voice" and "author's pen" on the English Renaissance stage.

4. Schneider frames "the archive as *another kind of performance*" (108).

5. Worthen's *Drama* and *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance* treat these questions most directly.

6. Worthen discusses and critiques the recent resurgence of claims that Shakespeare is a "literary dramatist" (Erne's phrase) in *Shakespeare Performance Studies* 30–79.

7. For an assertion of the ethics of the page, see Berger, "Bodies and Texts" 99–128. Berger's modeling of performance as a form of reading has been criticized by performance-oriented critics (e.g., Garner 48–49; Worthen, *Authority* 175–78; and Ridout 72–77).

8. This is not to define *literature* as "overwrittenness" but to observe that drama's "literary" dimension has habitually been so defined in relation to performance, especially for Shakespeare. For an alternative perspective on "Shakespeare as literary dramatist," see van Es 56–75.

9. Citations from *Hamlet* are from Thompson and Taylor's Arden Shakespeare edition of the play.

10. Important gestures have been made in this direction. Worthen regularly notes the "conceptual . . . leverage" that the repertoire gains from "the friction of writing" (*Drama* 83; see also Weimann, "Performance" 25; Worthen, *Shakespeare Performance Studies* 19–20). Schneider's "chiasmic tangle of bodies with language and language with bodies" suspends an organizing principle (67); Phelan's "oversounds" disrupt protocols of interpretation. *Hamlet*'s indigestive dramaturgy, I would argue, affords a thoroughgoing investigation of these suggestions and the not only frictive but also disabling potentialities of writing in the repertoire.

11. I use *dramaturgy* to indicate the whole process of dramatic performance from composition through performance and reception.

12. Although Sack emphasizes the radical potentialities unleashed by unscripted performance, I would highlight similar potentialities arising through overwrittenness.

13. Jarcho highlights the utopian, if not democratic, dimension of writing on the modern stage. I plan to engage Sack's and Jarcho's arguments in a future essay entitled "Theater with a Tiger: Potentiality and Performance in Drama and in Theory."

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

14. On this voluminous criticism, see Worthen, *Drama* 94–111, and Weimann, "Mimesis."

15. This statement's lack of renown is attested by the fact that Hamlet's celebration of the "excellent play," in contrast to his "advice to the players" (3.2.1–43), has not until now had a name.

16. Weimann, the most dedicated commentator on this question, assimilates these two statements ("Mimesis" 282).

17. On "failure" in theater and performance, see Ridout; Bailes; and O'Gorman and Werry. *Hamlet* emphasizes the role of dramatic agency in such failure.

18. *The Oxford English Dictionary* dates this sense of *digested* to 1598 ("Digested," def. 1).

19. This connection between clown and writing arguably provides a more accurate picture of the clown's theatrical role than does Hamlet's advice. The clown was less the antiauthor that Hamlet and many critics depict him as than, as Preiss shows, an additional and often allied pole of authority in the "authorial competition[s]" of the playhouse with its "elemental clash of performer and spectator" (7, 15).

20. Clowns were generally "aligned with the lower bodily stratum," as they are in Marston's *Histriomastix; or, The Player Whipped*, in which "the 'common' actors" engaged in clowning are given "names such as 'Gutt,' 'Belch,' and 'Gulch'" (Hillman 46).

21. On the fraught relation between Hamlet's prescriptions and his performances, see Weimann, "Mimesis" and *Author's Pen* 18–28, 151–79.

22. Old Hamlet's sallet-helmet is filled with poison when Claudius pours the vial in his ear (1.5.61–64). It is, quite possibly, filled with wine in the course of Denmark's customary "heavy-headed revel" (1.4.17)—the regular drinking binges in which its elites, according to Hamlet, indulge.

23. On the play's queasy relation to food, especially meat, see Borlik.

24. The furnishing forth of the blurb recalls what Greenblatt has termed "the problem of the leftover" (Gallagher and Greenblatt 141)—the early modern anxiety provoked by the "recalcitrant, ineradicable" "material remainder" of the sign (144, 141), especially in Reformation Eucharistic theology. The disruptive vigor of these archival leftovers contrasts with Worthen's analysis of "doing things with (old) words," which privileges the agency of the repertoire in the digestion of "old words" (*Drama* 112–23).

25. On this materialized language, see also Sale. Ferguson emphasizes the materialization of overwritten text; both Sale and Pollard link materialization to digestion, in the context more of reception than of repertoire.

26. Although resonant with this discussion, the theatrical sense of *machine*—"A (usually movable) contrivance for the production of stage-effects"—is not attested until 1609 (def. 4.a).

27. Rowe claimed to have heard nothing else about Shakespeare's acting career "than that the top of his Performance was the Ghost in his own *Hamlet*."

28. The well-digested, calculable horses of *The Mousetrap* have drawn "Phoebus' cart" "[f]ull thirty times" around a geocentric sky (3.2.148) and hark back to the extroverted orderliness of the "globe" and its attendant cosmic and theatrical models.

29. Horatio has recently been claimed as a democratic hero by a range of critics (Deutermann; Lupton; Warley; Wong). In a dramaturgical sense, it is his incapacity, as much as his capacity, that makes him one.

30. The second quarto prints the word as "anticke," while the folio and the first quarto have "Antike." *Anticke*, *antike*, and *antique* could all be used to mean either "antic" or "antique."

31. As Jost points out, Horatio might evoke the Roman poet Horace. Although Jost emphasizes the resonances between Horace's and Shakespeare's interests in "posthumous literary survival," we might also point out that Horatio tickles Horace's famous insistence on decorum by "mingling kings and clowns."

32. This "progress" is an extended indigestion emblematized by the sallet-helmet, which, after all, not only would be difficult to digest but also could lead to all sorts of gastric problems if filled with wine, poison, or both.

33. On these and other disciplinary alienations, including the alienation of theater and performance studies from the digital humanities, see also Worthen, *Shakespeare Performance Studies*.

Works Cited

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Translated by S. H. Butcher. *Internet Classics Archive*, 1994–2009, classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.html.

Bailes, Sara J. *Performance Theatre and the Poetics of Failure: Forced Entertainment, Goat Island, Elevator Repair Service*. Routledge, 2011.

Beckerman, Bernard. *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience, and Act*. Edited by Gloria Brim Beckerman and William Coco, Routledge, 1990.

Bennett, Benjamin. *All Theater Is Revolutionary Theater*. Cornell UP, 2005.

Berger, Harry, Jr. "Bodies and Texts." *Situated Utterances: Texts, Bodies, and Cultural Representations*. Fordham UP, 2005, pp. 99–128.

———. *Imaginary Audition: Shakespeare on Stage and Page*. U of California P, 1990.

———. "Text against Performance: The Example of *Macbeth*." *Making Trifles of Terrors: Redistributing*

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Complicities in Shakespeare, edited by Peter Erickson, Stanford UP, 1997, pp. 98–125.

Borlik, Todd. "'The Chameleon's Dish': Shakespeare and the Omnivore's Dilemma." *Early English Studies*, vol. 2, 2009, pp. 1–29.

Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnerotomachia. = The Strife of Loue in a Dreame*. Translated by Robert Dallington, Simon Waterson, 1592. *Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership*, quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A19165.0001.001/1:6?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

de Grazia, Margreta. "Harry Berger Jr. and the Tree of Acknowledgment." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4, 2011, pp. 541–54.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Translated by Eric Prenowitz, U of Chicago P, 1995.

Deutermann, Allison K. "'Caviare to the General'? Taste, Hearing, and Genre in *Hamlet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 2, 2011, pp. 230–55.

"Digested, *Adj.*" *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, 2017, www.oed.com/view/Entry/52579.

Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. 2003. 2nd ed., Cambridge UP, 2013.

Ferguson, Margaret W. "*Hamlet*: Letters and Spirits." *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. Methuen, 1985, pp. 291–307.

Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. U of Chicago P, 2000.

Garner, Stanton B. *Bodied Spaces: Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama*. Cornell UP, 1994.

Goldman, Michael. *The Actor's Freedom: Toward a Theory of Drama*. Viking Press, 1975.

Harding, James M., and Cindy Rosenthal, editors. *The Rise of Performance Studies: Rethinking Richard Schechner's Broad Spectrum*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Hillman, David. *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Skepticism, and the Interior of the Body*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Jarcho, Julia. *Writing and the Modern Stage: Theater beyond Drama*. Cambridge UP, 2017.

Jenkins, Harold, editor. *Hamlet*. By William Shakespeare, Methuen, 1982.

Jost, Jacob Sider. "*Hamlet*'s Horatio as an Allusion to Horace's *Odes*." *Notes and Queries*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 76–77.

Lamb, Charles. "On the Tragedies of Shakespeare Considered with Reference to Their Fitness for Stage Representation." *Bartleby.com*, 1993–2015, www.bartleby.com/27/21.html.

Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*. 1999. Translated by Karen Jürs-Munby, Routledge, 2006.

Lesser, Zachary, and Peter Stallybrass. "The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2008, pp. 371–420.

Lupton, Julia Reinhard. "Hamlet, Prince: Tragedy, Citizenship, and Political Theology." *Alternative Shakespeares*, vol. 3, edited by Diana E. Henderson, Routledge, 2008, pp. 181–203.

"Machine, *N.*" *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, 2017, www.oed.com/view/Entry/111850.

"Of the Troubled Comon Welth Restored to Quiet by the Mighty Power of God." *Songes and Sonnetes,* by Henry Howard et al., Richard Tottel, 1557, pp. 93–94. *Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership*, quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A03742.0001.001/1:141.92?rgn=div2;view=fulltext.

O'Gorman, Róisín, and Margaret Werry, editors. *On Failure*. Special issue of *Performance Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–134.

Phelan, Peggy. "'Just Want to Say': Performance and Literature, Jackson and Poirier." *PMLA*, vol. 125, no. 4, Oct. 2010, pp. 942–47.

Pollard, Tanya. *Drugs and Theatre in Early Modern England*. Oxford UP, 2005.

Preiss, Richard. *Clowning and Authorship in Early Modern Theatre*. Cambridge UP, 2014.

Ridout, Nick. *Stage Fright, Animals, and Other Theatrical Problems*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Roach, Joseph. "Performance: The Blunders of Orpheus." *PMLA*, vol. 125, no. 4, Oct. 2010, pp. 1078–86.

Rowe, Nicholas. *Some Account of the Life, &c. of Mr. William Shakespear*. London, 1709. *Project Gutenberg*, 12 July 2012, www.gutenberg.org/files/16275/16275-h/16275-h.htm.

Sack, Daniel. *After Live: Possibility, Potentiality, and the Future of Performance*. U of Michigan P, 2015.

Sale, Carolyn. "Eating Air, Feeling Smells: Hamlet's Theory of Performance." *Renaissance Drama*, vol. 35, 2006, pp. 145–68.

"Sallet, Salade, *N.*" *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, 2017, www.oed.com/view/Entry/170061.

Schechner, Richard. "A New Paradigm for Theatre in the Academy." *TDR: The Drama Review*, vol. 36, no. 4, 1992, pp. 7–10.

Schneider, Rebecca. *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*. Routledge, 2011.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 3rd ed., W. W. Norton, 2015, pp. 967–1035.

———. *The Tempest*. *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 3rd ed., W. W. Norton, 2015, pp. 3215–66.

Sidney, Phillip. A Defence of Poesie *and Poems*. London, 1891. *Project Gutenberg*, 8 Oct. 2014, www.gutenberg.org/files/1962/1962-h/1962-h.htm.

Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Duke UP, 2003.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thompson, Ann, and Neil Taylor, editors. *Hamlet*. By William Shakespeare, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

Trudell, Scott A. "The Mediation of Poesie: Ophelia's Orphic Song." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 1, 2012, pp. 46–76.

Turberville, George. "To *Cupid* for Revenge of his Unkind and Cruell Love. Declaring His Faithfull Service and True Hart Both to the God of Love and His Ladie." *Epitaphes, Epigrames, Songs and Sonets with a Discourse of the Friendly Affections of Tymetes to Pyndara His Ladie*, Henry Denham, 1567, pp. 106–07. *Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership*, quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A14019.0001.001/1:123?rgn=div1;view=fulltext.

van Es, Bart. *Shakespeare in Company*. Oxford UP, 2013.

Warley, Christopher. "Specters of Horatio." *ELH*, vol. 75, 2008, pp. 1023–50.

Weber, Samuel. *Theatricality as Medium*. Fordham UP, 2004.

Weimann, Robert. *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Edited by Helen Higbee and William N. West, Cambridge UP, 2000.

———. "Mimesis in *Hamlet*." *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman, Methuen, 1985, pp. 275–90.

———. "Performance in Shakespeare's Theatre: Ministerial and/or Magisterial?" *The Achievement of Robert Weimann*, edited by David Schalkwyk, Routledge, 2008, pp. 3–29. Vol. 10 of *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*.

Weimann, Robert, and Douglas Bruster. *Shakespeare and the Power of Performance: Stage and Page in the Elizabethan Theatre*. Cambridge UP, 2008.

Wong, Timothy. "Steward of the Dying Voice: The Intrusion of Horatio into Sovereignty and Representation." *Telos*, vol. 153, 2010, pp. 1–19.

Worthen, W. B. *Drama: Between Poetry and Performance*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2018.133.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press