

CRITICAL ESSAY SAMPLE



CUSTOM ESSAY
WRITING SERVICES.COM

ANALYSIS OF SHAKESPEARES' HAMLET

Here we will try to analyze Hamlet through different philosophies, perceptions and experiences of the world, which are indicated in the article, more or less explicitly. The reader's reading and his skills of reconstruction, which will be put on standby, is minimized - and where necessary, everything has been done to make his postulates and hypotheses more veritable and more pliable than the whole. There is a certain risk that the momentum of interpreting is too far away from the text, which is why it is necessary to provide a solid starting point, guided by some of the characteristic and common terms that appear in the text closely close to the motifs of the leitmotif, at least in view of their loose connection with the tale. One should not miss their mistrust, as there is no need to leave at the level of illustration what could be expressed in more precise terminology. This has already been met by one of the often repeated structuralism demands, expressed in the basic mourning of the thematic critique: not to go to the right depth structures, but to retain themselves in the pictorial substitutes of the same, not to get expressed; and we hope to meet the other, more importantly - that the elements we choose for the cornerstone of our interpretation are extracted from the text itself, and from the whole literature as a haze, not from some of the extra-disciplinary disciplines and the part of the external classifications. Such an approach, through ontological, anthropological and existential settings, is particularly remarkable to Hamlet, as a small part of classical acts: intellectual discussion, questions about the nature of the world and man, the meaning and the notion of "human condition", make a significant and at first glance the content aspect of the text. "Big issues" are not only firmly embedded in motivation, but seem to have their own work and breakthrough - they could even go so far as to claim that the basic work of Hamlet served only as a skeleton, as a scaffold for all existential doubts, antinomies and apories, which Shakespeare succeeded in her masterful to overtake. The high meaningfulness of the text, its symbolism and polysemy, the symphonic composition of essential inner motifs, the engagement of objects from various sides and from different perspectives are also introduced, without the exclusive focus of one particular. Thus, the mentioned doubts will be searched directly and indirectly, through various characters, only as the echo of one word, somehow as an open discussion, but only as a far-reaching and blurry analogy, which will only be solved at the symbolic level. Given the view of the world, or, to be better expressed, the view of the being, what we are primarily interested in Hamlet, we will not cease to point at each of these forms and interpret it in accordance with our need to attain. The word-definitions we have outlined in the text have been chosen by their symbolic charge - they are like accumulators of vitality, because they contain the potential necessary for every serious view of the world, and on the other hand, their meaning as well as the value sign is varied, and of them, like a stack of dice, can compose the most numerous figures. These are the material through which the perspective has been made, just as the same material of the world plays through the removal of philosophical concepts. However, the special and essential part of Hamlet's structure is their literary role: they maintain the unity of the text in the way the rhythm maintains the unity of the song - they are fit for clear and fairly pronounced interpretations, which will have different meanings, but in an environment in which the meaning reads from them, while their nearly constant persistence, repetition and sled appear in them form the elements of a latent sentence that is independent of each interpretation and has its own specific logic. Such a literary sentence is a prerequisite of every literary part in general, it is the basic form and the basic form / planar (4) / literary opinion (philosophical thinking is different from the fact that it deals with images rather than concepts, the one with its logical essentially different, constructionist use of language fundamentals and literature as a whole, as a separate linguistic phenomenon). It also represents one of those over-allotted structural frameworks, open to successive interpretative interventions of standard thinking, but only in their separate segments; since, in the final line, such a sentence is, as a whole, non-transferable to the methodological environment of standard thinking, since it cannot form one type of whole in the whole of another type (where this impossibility is given as general principle of interpretation, even principle of knowledge) without scattering and scattering their "potential" meanings. If for any other reason, at least for this reason, such literary "sentences" should be dealt with, as in Hamlet, and in every other part, which is based on them.



ANALYSIS OF SHAKESPEARES' HAMLET

In the Essais, Montaigne wrote: "I do not paint a being, I paint a prelude". If a single quotation could sum up Hamlet's broadest frame and meaning, if anything could be taken for his motto - without the rest - it would be this sentence. This transition is to be understood at least in two ways: in the original, Montaigne's sense, as the determining characteristic of the modern subject, its essence as an unbalanced and non-centered ego, and in another, indirect significance, as a transition from one to another complex of intuitions, observations, and reactions, which shape a coherent image of the world. To clarify who the Hamlet is and what this can be considered as a Montaignerian subject, we will first ask what Hamlet is, what characterizes it. In the fifth act, we learn that he was born on the day of the victory of the old Hamlet over the old Fortinbras, that is, at a time that perhaps more than any other symbolizes the establishment of a powerful figure of the father-king, the father as an abstract model, which young Hamlet will obsessively and unsuccessfully incarnates. This psychological function of the father is already pronounced by his name: he is what Hamlet should be, moral and character ideal, pattern and source of order; young Hamlet will spend a good portion of his strength to model his 'I' over this mold 'over,' however, his 'I' will use the same amount of power to withstand this transformation. On this mid-hamlet Hamlet, in the meantime, we get a series of controversial announcements: Ophelia calls it a "wonderful ghost," the moment after Hamlet speaks of himself in the darkest casings; from Claudia we learn of his envy to Laert because of the extraordinary skill of firing with which he has, according to the testimony of some Normandy nobleman, from the queen we are informed about the variation of Hamlet's mood, which in one leap exceeds the scale from the unleaded to the dullness; he likes and dislikes Ofelia, is curse and desperate for her, all by his own - even ambiguous - acknowledgment. Sometimes, even when he speaks of himself, when he explains himself, we are unsure whether he thinks it ironically or literally, since both could be taken as equally true and as a concrete example of a concrete situation. This figural indeterminacy, the likelihood of two opposite denotations of the same statement, is not only a striking curiosity of the style, an effective means of tanning and shading certain contents and highlighting the sarcastic tonality and intent - it induces the same, the expression of the analogue, 'content' indeterminacy of the very character, his psychological ambivalence, born and fashioned in language. On the other hand, independently of the information given to him by the characters, neither the reader is in a position to estimate Hamlet's true character: as opposed to a melancholy, sad and resigned hero, lamenting the destiny of the world, we have a cynical, obscene Hamlet, everyone who finds him in the way. His provocations addressed to Ophelia are overwhelming in moments, and leave us in no doubt as to his "pure" intentions. The bold exhibitionist shifts the appalling and distracted Hamlet, ready to stumble upon the sordid depiction of the dead father, then the ecstatic Hamlet, which melodiously calls the musicians, and decompresses some banal pop singer, while all of these overwhelm the Hamlet killer, the one whose conscience does not suffer anymore the executions of the Rosicrucian and the Guildenstern, an execution that was by no means inevitable - moreover, for which there is no other cause, except the disgust that such null creatures are causing by their existence on the globe of the earth. Even Hamlet's physical appearance is controversial: judging by his speech and behavior, we certainly would not imagine him as Gertrude describes him as a man of obeisance and a short breath-already as a slim, a figurative figure, ascetic lines, and somewhat overwhelming and disturbing in view. Of course, these variations in character could of course be explained as using a Claudia's syntagma, "the fruit of the circumstance": but they are also more than that - they are also the fruit of a different relationship to "circumstances", the result of a changed reception, he is going to the world. Even if we cannot find a bullet point to get all the variants of Hamlet's character, the common denominator of his character will still be revealed if we base him on the unity of the inner riot; and the change of that, principled, inner standpoint - which we will talk later - is easier to describe and determine than the change of Hamlet's already too heterogeneous character.



ANALYSIS OF SHAKESPEARES' HAMLET

The sword flick, in which Hamlet tries to discuss with Laert, best speaks in favor of our understanding-he does not even show that he is upset about the recent trap he has just managed to escape, not cynical or unsettled, although he clearly believes that the newcomer is a newcomer: Hamlet from the beginning of a drama in such a trap would not miss saying something poisonous or passionate, to start all the pathos that his position permits, or at least to punish his own killer irony - it does not happen, it is difficult to explain the circumstances. Hamlet's subject is structured in an extremely unusual way. His changes have a clear goal, at least in the beginning, but unclear and inexplicable starting point. The purpose that he strives to achieve in self-examination of his character can be defined as something final and specific; but the character that needs to go through this process of self-development, the material from which Hamlet begins to engage in a new form, and which is also what performs these "creative" actions on its own, has no final and specific definition. Thus, he always rides in the middle, between his purpose and his nature, between the known and the unknown. Ultimately paradoxically, what Hamlet is halfway between what he is and what he needs to be. So he is constantly emerging; In other words, Hamlet is an intentional subject, self / not yet, whose personality is attributed to the character of Father Hamlet, and the revenge is, as we see, the outmost consequence of this primary, inner achievement. For all the bitterness with which Hamlet's slowness is, it is articulated to testify before his dissatisfaction with his own character, but about the dissatisfaction of failure to fulfill a specific order. It seems to us that he desires himself more because he does not possess the steadfast instinct of the avenger, but because he has not yet done his own exalted, vengeful task, he is lamentable because he is not really crazy about this unreasonable delay, which obeys the archaic will revenge-like what could be said about Claudia that the scene of the "mousetrap", which follows immediately after the pantomime from the prologue, may perhaps react due to the lack of expected reaction to a much more explicit and more plausible pantomime than for the cumulative performance of the whole play. For Hamlet, the main problem is that the wretched son-avenger's wake does not appear in the form of a direct insight, as a self-confident surprise, but as a short-lived, moody affection, which can only be strengthened by recent intellectual evocations. Putting himself on the duty of revenge, he plunges the flame of "the righteous lament", which goes too fast, and is overwhelmed by the absence of anything more than justice to blame him. But the real reason for his longing for endurance, for the extension of his zeal, is in need for the establishment of his own subject, for his modeling (and formation) of the image of the father-in fact, to the meanings that this painting receives for him-and for fixing once so- ego. Vocation is the strategy of unifying its dispersive interior, the means of turning inner entropy. In other words, Hamlet will not revenge until he fully becomes a vigilante - this is his unspoken oath. But besides this method - enjoying one role, a mere initiation of feeling, a permanent consolidation of the subject - that does not give fruit, is imposed another method - readiness and habit. The latter will prove to be successful - at least in terms of revenge - and will completely suppress the first, virtually equivalent to that changed worldview, which we see clearly at Hamlet just after his return from England.

