

HAMLET, PARENTS AND DEATH: FAMILY CARTOGRAPHY ON SHAKESPEARE’S STAGE

Georgiana BOGDAN
Ovidius University of Constanța

Abstract: *This essay explores why the combination of cartography and drama is so important on the early modern English stage in the age of the “new geography” that emerged in this period. Using poststructuralist theories that conceptualize maps as performances rather than passive representations, I argue for a more dynamic understanding of mapmaking and maps as they are represented in the theatrical reconfiguration of families in Shakespeare’s Hamlet. I contend that characters attempt to “map” their immediate surroundings by leading influential social actors in a series of ritualized performances, similar to mapmaking practices. In so doing, they aim to reduce the complexities of their lived experiences to a cartographic canvas that reflects their authority and power. My argument subscribes to the notion that family mappings in Hamlet can alter perceptions of power and space. I argue that by staging mapmaking as a performative process subject to the changes of influential social actors, Shakespeare’s play challenges the idea of authenticity that was increasingly attributed to the new geography in the early modern period. Theatrical maps that outline family dynamics in Hamlet are similar to—yet different from—the popular cartography extant in early modern England. While maps are visual abstractions of landscape, the tragedy’s cartographic coordinates of familial relationships are not only schematic reductions of family dynamics, but also distinctive performative moments in which Hamlet’s dysfunctional family acquires self-reflexive and meta-theatrical proportions.*

Keywords: *Hamlet, family cartography, mappings, spaces, dysfunctional family*

Early modern English playwrights eagerly took up maps in order to engage the creative power in emerging ideas about cartographic authenticity. In doing this, they reinforced the popularity of mapmaking and reading maps in the period. Yet, as a self-consciously representational art form, drama challenges those truth claims referring to mapping authenticity by vividly exposing the map’s cultural authority as a possibility, depending on the specific dramatic circumstances outlined in a particular play. I trace the affinities between a particular dramatic genre—tragedy—and the emergent cartographic tradition, represented at the level of family in *Hamlet*, to demonstrate drama’s more diffusive and self-reflexive engagement with cartographic theory in this age of the “new geography” than has been previously recognized. My argument rests

on the premise that maps make spaces in cartography, as spaces make maps of family dynamics in *Hamlet*.

Maps and spaces in the early modern period have been associated from the perspective of cartography in recent criticism. Vincent J. Casino and Stephen P. Hanna argue in their ground-breaking essay “Beyond the ‘Binaries’: A Methodological Intervention for Interrogating Maps as Representational Practices” that maps and spaces emerge simultaneously out of a spiralling socio-spatial matrix that comprises a myriad number of discourses and practices (Casino and Hanna 42). These discourses and practices are not limited to what are commonly construed as traditional mapmaking procedures, like drawing lines of latitude and longitude on a sheet of paper. Drawing upon actor-network theory, Casino and Hanna define mapmaking as a collaborative process that temporarily seals traces of relationships among a group of social actors—people, institutions, and artifacts—to establish a common ground, which they call a “map space” (Casino and Hanna 41). Because maps cannot be extricated from spaces, these can include such seemingly un-cartographic practices as people walking, touching, and gazing their way through a territory, which are as informed by maps as the maps are informed by experiential practices (Casino and Hanna 44). Casino and Hanna’s theorization of map spaces blurs the line between mapmaking and map consumption, as it interprets the reiterative process of consuming maps as actively constitutive of the map space. Such mapmaking practices are performative, as they temporarily naturalize map spaces as “somehow fixed in their meaning” (Casino and Hanna 41). Yet this naturalized effect is only provisionally supported by the arbitrary relation among the performed actions.

Although the mapmaking practices of any historical epoch propel and reflect the mores of the culture within which they operate, the early modern period is a particularly rich period for investigation. The maps of the so-called “new geography”¹ that were circulating throughout Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries acquired an authenticity effect that was unique to the history of western cartography. The playwrights’ relation to space in their

¹ John Gillies provides a thorough definition of the “new geography” in the sixteenth century in his essay “Tamburlaine and Renaissance Geography” (2006). He writes that sixteenth century maps based on the pioneering projections of cartographers like Gerardus Mercator were new in two crucial senses. First, unlike the medieval, religiously themed schematic tripartite diagrams and the Ptolemaic world maps, which divided the world into the triple region of Europe, Asia, and Africa, the maps originating from the presses of Mercator and Ortelius depicted America and the Antarctic continent, regions that were “undreamed of by the ancients” (Gillies 38). Second, the novel projections based on latitude and longitude were open to political manipulation in a way their medieval precursors were not. As Gillies writes, “Precisely because no place was privileged by the grid, any place might be given an entirely factitious importance by being made to coincide with key grid coordinates” (38).

plays is specific to this new form of understanding reality through the abstraction of mapmaking. Alternatively, as Shakespeare's image has become more popular in recent times, the specific settings of Shakespeare's plays have become real-life locations suggesting literary eminence, similar to a map of Shakespearean locations. As Balz Engler observes in "Local Habitations: Hamlet at Helsingør, Juliet at Verona," "literature may transform the perception of landscapes, and this change is usually closely intertwined with the tourism industry" (258). Engler discusses specifically the association between the Kronborg Castle at Helsingør and *Hamlet*, which seems to have developed in tandem with the rise of Shakespeare's international status. As Engler cogently observes about the site-specific performance of *Hamlet* at Helsingør, "[t]he location authenticates the theatrical performance, and the performance in turn authenticates the experience of the location" (Engler 261). As I argue, the space of family dynamics in *Hamlet* is like a performative map that enhances the authenticity of family relations in the early modern period through the authority of Shakespeare's play, which becomes a theatrical map of social relations. Rather than infringing on the early modern reconsiderations of space through cartography, the maps of family dynamics in *Hamlet* are diffusive—in the sense that they circulate throughout the play—and involve emotion and meta-theatricality.

Hamlet as "Map of Honour"?

In *Henry VI, Part 2*, King Henry VI expresses his grief at the emerging dissension in his extended Plantagenet family, generated by the Wars of the Roses. As Henry says to Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, the Lord Protector and the King's uncle, "Ah, uncle Humphrey, in thy face I see / The map of honour, truth, and loyalty" (*Henry VI, Part 2*, 3.1.202-203). The image of King Henry's notion of his uncle's devotion is transformed into a cartographic metaphor of space, in which honour, truth and loyalty are landmarks of the medieval subject's commitment to his king. These emotions, in the form of character traits, appear as abstract lines on a map and they configure the honest uncle's facial features, in an authentic manner. This appears to be an image of a united family, in which uncle and nephew go hand in hand for the country's advancement. However, the seeds of dissension are cropping up in the Plantagenet dynasty, as other demanding uncles of York rise against their Lancaster nephew and his French wife, Margaret, in the contest for power. Similarly, Hamlet's behaviour may seem to represent a "map of honour" in relation to his uncle, Claudius, suggesting that he is loyal to his royal uncle, until doubt comes to insinuate itself, in the figure of Old Hamlet's ghost, whose words shatter the prince's confidence in family affections.

Unlike the melancholy King Henry VI in Shakespeare's history play, Hamlet is not lured by family fondness and he tries to discern the telling lines

of remorse in Claudius' royal face. This is why Hamlet stages the Mousetrap, in order to trap his uncle's conscience² through the dramatic performance and make him reveal his guilt. As Hamlet says, "The play's the thing / Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King" (2.2.606-607). These are the last lines of Hamlet's soliloquy that starts with "Now I am alone. / O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" (2.2.551-552), which compares the emotions triggered by the actor's interpretations with real-life emotions. In this context, the play that Hamlet intends to direct is a "thing" (2.2.606)—a concrete object—that would force the guilty King Claudius to reveal himself. The map is also a material object, a "thing" that recreates, in an abstract manner, the reality of the terrain. Just as he would read a map, Hamlet intends to read, in the features on Claudius' face, the tell-tale emotions revealing his guilt. Hamlet intends to "observe his looks" (2.2.598) and "tent him to the quick" (2.2.599); if Hamlet observes a mere "blench" (2.2.599) or hesitation on Claudius' face, he would know what to do. In fact, what Hamlet intends to do through the dramatic performance of the Mousetrap is to read Claudius' emotions and interpret them as if he would read a map. However, this nephew, unlike Henry VI in Shakespeare's history play, does not expect to read in this uncle's features loyalty and trust, but treason and murder.

Therefore, Hamlet's face is not a "map of honour," nor does Claudius' expression delineate innocent feelings. Hamlet's fate is more similar to that of Laertes: both young men feel wronged because their father had been murdered and they intend to take revenge on the murderer. As Hamlet tells Horatio, "That for Laertes I forgot myself; / For by the image of my cause I see / The portraiture of his" (5.2.). The terms "image" and "portraiture" suggest representation, like an abstract image on a map. What Hamlet is able to know about Laertes' plight is only through indirect narrative, the image of an image, just as Laertes would know about Hamlet's predicament indirectly, through Claudius' biased narrative. Even if Hamlet's and Laertes' positions might seem similar, they both get different images from different people, and so they develop opposite opinions. Laertes may seem like a brother to Hamlet (or a potential brother-in-law), but he is not able to discern the truth from the agglomeration of appearances, so he is unable to interpret the map of Hamlet's situation. What Laertes thinks to be Hamlet's vile act of murdering his father Polonius and causing Ophelia's madness and subsequent death, to Hamlet does

² In the essay "The Case of Hamlet's Conscience" (1979), Catherine Belsey sees the reading of "conscience" as "consciousness" in the play as "a vestige of the Romantic view of the play" (129), according to which "This Hamlet toys in his melancholy with the notion of suicide, but he is incapable even of that, and the 'conscience' said to make a coward of him is the speculative tendency which continually supplies him with pretexts of inaction" (Belsey 129). Rather than looking at the play from this Romantic perspective, I see the concept of "conscience" as a form of mapping the space of the hero's consciousness.

not seem so. As Laertes cries to Hamlet in the graveyard scene, before Ophelia's dead body, "The devil take thy soul" (5.1.255), he is strongly convinced that Hamlet had been wrong in killing his father. Both sons, whose fathers have been murdered, feel that the other has committed an unpardonable sin. They draw their conclusions based on facts fed to them by intermediaries, and they decode these facts according to biased narratives. As a result, it is clear that both Laertes and Hamlet cannot read the maps of each other's psyche, which is their fatal flaw and leads to their death.

Ophelia as "Map of Woe"

In Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, the bereaved father Titus discerns in Lavinia's maimed body—her severed arms and cut tongue—the features of distress and sorrow. In the presence of the other members of the Andronici family (Marcus Andronicus, Lavinia's uncle, and the young boy Lucius, her nephew) during a banquet, Titus addresses his daughter as "Thou map of woe, that thus dost talk in signs, / When thy poor heart beats with outrageous beating / Thou canst not strike it thus to make it still!" (3.2.12-14). Titus deciphers the body language that Lavinia is not able to perform, because her hands are missing, or the words she is not able to utter, because her tongue has been cut. In the absence of articulate language and gestures, Lavinia is unable to express her emotions. Yet her father, who empathizes with her grief, can use body language to express his sorrow. As Titus beats his breast with his hands—in the theatrical gesture of showing that he is grieving at his daughter's plight—Lavinia is not able to do so because her hands are missing. For this reason, Titus reads her as a "map of woe" (3.2.12), a representation of the reality of emotion. However, the father mimics the gestures that his daughter should have done—beating her breast to show grief—as if he replicates the real emotion through theatrical performance. Lavinia is a "map of woe" because she cannot express her emotion through gestures—but only hint at it—while her father is able to theatrically interpret her grief, which is synchronized with his own. This is a metatheatrical gesture showing the empathetic relationship between actor and audience: while the actor uses body language and interpretation to express powerful feelings, he/she transmits these feelings to the audience who, though silent, can empathize with the actor's emotions expressed on stage.

Similarly, unable to communicate her grief, Ophelia, like Lavinia, is a victim of her family's inadequacy and manipulation. In *Titus Andronicus*, Lavinia is used by her father as a pawn in the contest for power—being promised to Bassianus and then to Saturninus, the next king, to fulfil the ambitions of the Andronici family. In the same manner, Ophelia is used by her father as an instrument to prove to the king and queen what Polonius thinks to be the cause of Hamlet's madness, while her brother gives her misinformation

about the prince's love. Even Gertrude uses Ophelia badly, when she tells at her grave, "I hoped thou shouldst have been my Hamlet's wife" (5.1.240), but it is clear that Gertrude did not mean it. If the queen had meant to have Hamlet marry Ophelia, nothing of the ensuing tragedy involving Ophelia would have happened, because the marriage between Hamlet and Ophelia would have been approved by the powerful queen. Therefore, Ophelia is not only a victim of circumstances, but also of her family. For this reason, Ophelia is associated with woe, as when Gertrude announces Ophelia's death as "One woe doth tread upon another's heel, / So fast they follow. Your sister's drowned, Laertes" (4.7.135-136); or when Laertes laments his sister's death with "O treble woe, / Fall ten times treble on that cursed head / Whose wicked deed thy most ingenious sense / Deprived thee of!" (5.1.242-245), implying that Hamlet was the cause of Ophelia's madness and possible subsequent suicide.

Therefore, Ophelia's body, after death, is a "map of woe" by means of which others decipher the embedded grief in the form of theatrical gestures. At this point, family members, such as her brother Laertes, are able to decode the young woman's unhappiness, which led her to extreme grief and ultimate death. Even Gertrude, who was previously unaware of Ophelia's predicament, scatters flowers on her grave, in a belated gesture of compassion for Ophelia and empathy with her unhappiness. Yet none of these characters—including Hamlet—was able to read the map of Ophelia's vulnerability while she was alive, though she gave plenty of signals that things were not as they should be. Polonius misjudges Hamlet's approach to Ophelia as a kind of joking game meant to harm her: "I feared he did but trifle / And meant to wreck thee" (2.1.113-114). Hamlet abuses Ophelia horribly in the nunnery scene, when he tells her self-consciously that she should marry a fool: "Or if thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool, for wise men know well enough what monsters you make of them" (3.1.140-142). Hamlet's misogynistic discourse is not suitable for what he is expected to tell his lover, but it is understood that Hamlet is interpreting a role at this stage, being aware of the fact that Claudius and Polonius are spying on them, while he is talking to Ophelia. Even Gertrude expresses her disbelief in the fact that Hamlet's love for Ophelia would be the cause of Hamlet's madness, through the circuitous phrase, "And for your part, Ophelia, I do wish / That your good beauties be the happy cause / Of Hamlet's wildness" (3.1.40-42). This is a negative statement, implying that Gertrude thinks there is small chance that Hamlet's madness should be caused by his love for Ophelia.

All these statements are interpretations of performance, or readings of a performative map. When Ophelia describes Hamlet's behaviour towards her to her father, she draws a map of Hamlet's performance, as seen from her perspective. She describes how Hamlet held her hard by the wrist, then he went to the length of his arm, "And with his other hand thus o'er his brow / He falls

to such perusal of my face / As a would draw it” (2.1.90-92). This theatrical gesture encodes love sickness, suggested by a performing actor, but it may also imply that Hamlet was trying to decipher Ophelia’s feelings. Ophelia maps Hamlet’s feelings through his gestures, and she encodes these gestures in a map of love sickness, which shows that Hamlet is distressed because of unrequited love (2.1.90-101). In parallel, Polonius decodes Ophelia’s verbal description of Hamlet’s gesture as meaning “the very ecstasy of love” (2.1.103). However, this is only what Polonius thinks, by interpreting Ophelia’s encoding and decoding—or mapping and remapping—of Hamlet’s body language. Similarly, Claudius intends to decode Hamlet’s feelings for Ophelia by having her confront him, while Polonius and Claudius act as “lawful espials” (3.1.34) of this encounter. Each character feels entitled to use Ophelia: as his spy (Polonius and Claudius); as his intermediary between father and son (Laertes); as her innocent instrument to reveal Hamlet’s possible psychotic behaviour (Gertrude); or as an unknowing device for hiding his true feelings towards his uncle and enemy (Hamlet). In their selfish attempts to prove that they are right, all these characters use and abuse Ophelia, turning her finally into a map of woe—an innocent victim of their egocentric performance.

Gertrude as “Map of Death”

In Shakespeare’s poem *The Rape of Lucrece*, the wife of Collatine, is described while sleeping, being watched with evil intent by the rapist Tarquin. As she lies asleep, Lucrece is described as “Showing life’s triumph in the map of death” (*The Rape of Lucrece*, 402). Even if the image of Lucrece sleeping is a celebration of her beauty and liveliness, sleep is figured here as a metaphor of death, as an abstract representation of death, or “the map of death” (*The Rape of Lucrece*, 402). This metaphor foreshadows Lucrece’s own self-inflicted death—as a result of her being raped by Tarquin and losing her honour. When she faces her male relatives after the shameful dishonour—like a replica of Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*—Lucretia’s face is compared to a map bearing the profound mark of grief: “The face, that map which deep impression bears / Of hard misfortune, carved in it with tears” (*The Rape of Lucrece*, 1712-1713). It is as if the woman’s face speaks of her grief in dumb messages, through the intercession of her body language, which maps her emotions. This is a kind of performative map that the poem presents to the readers.

Similar to Lucrece, Gertrude is the “wretched Queen” (5.2.285), according to Hamlet, whose royal position made her vulnerable to being used by such an unscrupulous and ambitious man as Claudius. Just as Tarquin sought to satisfy his sexual lust by raping the helpless Lucrece, Gertrude is the victim of Claudius’ lust for power. Claudius uses Gertrude as an instrument to legitimize his unstable rule by marrying Old Hamlet’s widowed queen. For this

reason, Gertrude's character may be considered as a "map of death" even before she dies, at the end of the play, by drinking the poisoned cup prepared by Claudius for Hamlet. Like Lucrece, Gertrude is manipulated by Claudius, and later by her entire family, including her own son, Hamlet. Old Hamlet's ghost tells Hamlet to interpret his mother's emotions, written large on her face: "But look, amazement on thy mother sits. / O, step between her and her fighting soul" (3.4.102-103), inviting his son to "Speak to her" (3.4.105). Being closer to the spiritual world, the ghost is able to read the map of Gertrude's feelings, her amazement provoked by the thought that her son might be mad and her new husband, Claudius, might have killed Old Hamlet. In the closet scene, Gertrude remains a victim of her femininity and her position as a queen in a male world of power. In the closet scene, Hamlet emphasizes not only the family relationship, but also her royal position: "You are the Queen, your husband's brother's wife. / But—would you were not so—you are my mother" (3.4.15-16). Gertrude is defined by her rank as a queen even more than she is by being Hamlet's mother. Family dynamics in Hamlet are mapped in relation to social standing, while Hamlet tries to impose interiority and family feelings as a standard. Both Gertrude and Hamlet fail in interpreting the maps of each other's emotions—as inscribed on their faces—and they both die without having been able to clarify the misunderstanding they are victims of.

Gertrude is also a "map of death" because she is connected with Ophelia's death in one way or another. Without directly provoking Ophelia's death, Gertrude's inaction is one of the reasons for which Hamlet misunderstands Ophelia's feelings, as well as his mother's. While Hamlet firmly believes in what he sees during the closet scene (namely his father's ghost), Gertrude thinks "This is the very coinage of your brain. / This bodiless creation ecstasy / Is very cunning in" (3.4.128-130). What Hamlet takes as being the truth—even if conveyed by an imaginary ghost, which might be the result of hallucination—Gertrude takes as "ecstasy" (3.4.129), or an emotional trance-like state originally involving an experience of mystic self-transcendence. The etymology of the word is from Old French *estaise* (rapture), which comes from the Latin *ecstasis*, originating from the Ancient Greek *ἔκστασις* (*ékstasis*), suggesting displacement. By interpreting Hamlet's decomposed figure, as if delineated on a map, Gertrude understands that his inner self is displaced under the burden of extreme psychological pressure. Hamlet is unable to map into words his quasi-religious experience as a result of his encounter with his father's ghost, but his mother explicates her son's state in psychological and philosophical terms. This shows not only that Gertrude is a well-educated queen who can discern the mappings of emotion on a person's face, but also that she can articulate these emotions through well-learned language. Gertrude is also associated with death because she gets to announce Ophelia's death by drowning to Laertes, and she strews flowers at

Ophelia's grave. Thus, Gertrude is a “map of death” because she witnesses death (her husband's), describes death (Ophelia's), attends a funeral (Ophelia's), and finally she dies in uncertainty, unable to witness her son's and Claudius' deaths.

Claudius and “Mappery”

Mappery means the making and study of maps, or cartography. All these meanings are enclosed in Shakespeare's use of the term in *Troilus and Cressida*, plus another meaning, suggesting the volatility of judgement, when Ulysses debates the issue of opinion with the Greek party (Nestor, Agamemnon, and Menelaus). Ulysses explains that the impulsive young men, Achilles and Patroclus, call the elders' lenient policy towards the Trojans as “cowardice” (1.3.197) or, as Ulysses quotes them, “They call this ‘bed-work’, mapp'ry’, ‘closet war’” (1.3.205). Closet war means a strategy made away from the battlefield. It has the implication of sitting in a chair and plotting through maps, or armchair strategy. Closet war is similar to “mapp'ry” (1.3.197), in the sense that the elder generals are accused of perusing through maps and devising theoretical strategies, while Achilles and his people are men of action, who would rather fight the enemy up front. Each group in the debate uses theatrical technique derived from comical satire to attack the value system of the other. The symmetrical opposition of satirical views reveals both systems as local and contingent, lacking authority. This is how, in *Troilus and Cressida*, alternative and opposite views of waging war are set against each other, while none is considered to be valid in itself. Mappery, therefore, just like decoding and interpreting maps, depends on the decoder's personality, age, and education, as well as the intended course of action—to what end a mapping representation should be used.

From this perspective, Claudius' personality in *Hamlet* is subject to scrutiny from various characters' points of view, as if interpreting various maps, by mapping and remapping this character from various perspectives. That is to say, Claudius' character emerges more completely from this interaction of opinions, coming especially from the members of his family, but also from his subordinates. Claudius is not the loyal uncle, Duke Humphrey, in *Henry VI, Part 2*, nor is Hamlet the despondent King Henry VI in this history play. By opposition, this nephew (Hamlet) considers he has been warned by Old Hamlet's ghost but, at the same time, he also doubts the spirit's words, because he thinks it “May be the devil” (2.2.600-601). As for Claudius, after watching the Murder of Gonzago as a play-within-the play, there are reactions from outside impartial observers concerning the King's feelings. As Guildenstern says, “The King, sir—”... “Is in his retirement marvellous distempered” (3.2.285; 287). It is as if Guildenstern is reading a map, interpreting Claudius' emotions through the features of his face. Hamlet wants

even more proof and he presses the point further, by asking “With drink, sir?” (3.2.289), to which Guildenstern responds, “No, my lord, rather with choler” (3.2.290). As Guildenstern testifies that Claudius looks angry after seeing the play, Hamlet concludes with a paradoxical statement: “Your wisdom should show itself more richer to signify this to his docto. For, for me to put him to his purgation would perhaps plunge him into far more choler” (3.2.291-295). Not only does Hamlet reveal his increasing suspicion towards Claudius through these words (expressed in verbose language), but he also discloses the King’s increasing resentment towards him. Therefore, Guildenstern interprets the map of Claudius’ anger, as shown on his face, from his own perspective, while Hamlet reinterprets this abstract representation, or map, with the instruments he has at his disposal, namely the knowledge that Claudius might have killed his father. In both cases, interpreting a map and interpreting facial features disclosing emotion (anger or fear) are not only the means for better understanding how people think and feel, but they are also a way into their soul, to decode their innermost feelings.

Conclusions

Family dynamics in *Hamlet* is like a performative map that reveals different perspectives and interpretations, with meta-theatrical implications. Characters attempt to “map” the play’s world by leading influential social actors in a series of ritualized performances, similar to mapmaking practices, or cartography. Through this performative process of staging family relations as mapmaking, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* challenges the idea of authenticity that was attributed to the new geography and maps in the early modern period. Nothing is as it seems to be in the dysfunctional family in the play. Hamlet seems to be a “map of honour” but he is in constant conflict and concealment in relation to Claudius; Ophelia is a “map of woe” because she is a victim of her family and the surrounding circumstances and she cannot express her feelings properly; Gertrude is a “map of death” because she is somehow connected with every death of the members of the family around her, but she is unable to prevent these tragic deaths. Finally, Claudius’ dissimulation can be associated with “mappery”—or the making and reading of maps—because he does not disclose his inner feelings and is constantly presenting different faces and strategies to his family: the loving and caring husband to Gertrude; the concerned step-father to Hamlet; the efficient king to Polonius; the impassive ruler to his subordinates. The performative map-making shown in this tragedy traces alternative stories about each character, so that nothing seems authentic, as maps were considered to be in the objective science of the new geography.

Works Cited

- Belsey, Catherine. "The Case of Hamlet's Conscience." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 76., no 2, Spring 1979, pp. 127-148.
- Del Casino Jr., Vincent J., and Stephen P. Hanna. "Beyond the 'Binaries': A Methodological Intervention for Interrogating Maps as Representational Practices." *ACME* vol. 4, no. 1, 2006, pp. 34-56.
- Engler, Balz. "Local Habitations: Hamlet at Helsingør, Juliet at Verona." *Shakespeare and Space: Theatrical Explorations of the Spatial Paradigm*. Edited by Ina Habermann and Michelle Witen, pp. 257-267.
- Gillies, John. "Tamburlaine and Renaissance Geography." *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*. Edited by Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., Patrick Cheney, and Andrew Hadfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Edited by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. The Oxford Shakespeare. 5th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.