



A Deconstructive Analysis of William Shakespeares' *Hamlet*

Saman Yousef¹, Laraib Nawaz¹, Ayesha Naz¹, Ayesha Ejaz¹, Mehwish Rasheed¹, Summaya Khan¹, Hassan Bin Zubair^{2*}

¹BS English, Department of English, Superior College, Mian Channu, Pakistan

²Head of English Department, Superior College, Mian Channu. PhD Scholar, English Literature, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author

Hassan Bin Zubair

Head of English Department,
Superior College, Mian Channu. PhD
Scholar, English Literature,
Department of English, National
University of Modern Languages,
Islamabad, Pakistan

Article History

Received: 19.07.2022

Accepted: 12.08.2022

Published: 16.08.2022

Abstract: This study is based on a deconstructive analysis of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* using the theoretical model presented by Jacques Derrida. He has a strong belief and faith, which helped him in this challenging theory. His courage never let him down in his description of the issues of the world, more specifically the political and ethical ones. His electric deconstructive might provide an intellect to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has continuously been a centerpiece for researchers. It has been deliberated from many perspectives, but this paper tries to read the overbearing components of *Hamlet* from a deconstructive point of view Derrida. Through deconstruction, the investigators present an unused painting of the intellect channel of the personalities. It tries to show the convention of the transcendentalism of presence and its hopeless effect which has demonstrated to be the obstructive faltering squares on the mad streams of man's vulnerability to unused changes. In its concluding look, the ponder uncovers the tragic mental barrier of the characters in *Hamlet*, cleared out beyond by the ubiquitous and all-powerful signs of the metaphysics of presence.

Keywords: Deconstruction, Tragedy, Derrida, Religion, Symbols, Philosophy.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Hamlet has been the research focus of innumerable worldly scholars from all over the world. The story's intricacies and tough atmosphere have piqued the interest of several researchers. Sedinger examines *Hamlet*'s numerous concerns in the light of eighteenth-century critiques of "presentism using Jacques Derrida's work, Specters of Marx" (Maleki, 2012). He attempted to concentrate on the "polar notion" (Hooper, 2003). He emphasizes the puns and "hazardous duplicates" in *Hamlet* and *Claudius*. (Jackson & Marotti, 2011) investigate the play's religious components. Scholar-critics must now explore the underlying theological and philosophical difficulties appearing in modern period religious culture in the aftermath of postmodernism philosophy and theology.

"Derrida's theory of deconstruction was a type of mental and academic revolution from the

realm of structuralism, which had dominated man's mental texture from the mid-1960s" (Fry, 2009). He analyzes Deconstruct as follows: Deconstruction is precisely a type of elusive dance in which one does not settle for corresponding points, for any sort of concept that can be regarded as regulated, and that's what structure, symbol, and play are all about. Derrida's deconstruction is a challenge to structuralism, particularly the structuralism notions of Saussure and Claude Lévi-Strauss regarding text interpretation based on the metaphysics of presence. According to Derrida, a signification by association generates a later consecutive signification, which continues to trigger one signification after the other. Indeed, it is not an organizational pattern, but rather a signifying chain of constantly self-replicating and self-extending patterns that is irreducibly linear and progresses via a succession of temporal connections. Fry goes on to say that by using a multilingual Jacobian approach to

Citation: Saman Yousef, Laraib Nawaz, Ayesha Naz, Ayesha Ejaz, Mehwish Rasheed, Summaya Khan, Hassan Bin Zubair (2022). A Deconstructive Analysis of William Shakespeares' *Hamlet*. *Glob Acad J Linguist Lit*; Vol-4, Iss-4 pp-105-110.

the signifier and signified, we may begin to comprehend the compositional form of speaking or writing as one signifier leading to another.

Hamlet, one of William Shakespeare's most famous plays, has been subjected to several scholarly studies. The core premise of the play focuses on the unexplained murder of King Hamlet and Gertrude's quick marriage to Claudius, her late husband's brother. Serageldin claims that Hamlet will be the first protagonist to challenge the value system that demands him to act in a specific way. According to Derrida, the Western philosophical and historical tradition places a premium on presence. The metaphysics of existence defines the intellectual (but also practical) circumstances of possibility that give rise to this tradition's philosophy, texts, and histories. The term "presence" refers to a way of thinking that is involved in a being's self-identity, self-continuity, or self-sufficiency.

The foundation of this fundamental phonological framework of 'distinctive features' accomplishes an extreme division of a language's sound framework, and loans a modern meticulousness and weight to Structuralism's reliance on sets of contradicted terms, as of now adumbrated by Saussure. As Jakobson claims: the resistances of such differential qualities are genuine double resistances as characterized in rationale, i.e. they are such that each of the terms of the resistance essentially suggests its inverse (Struck, 2008).

DECONSTRUCTION

According to Saussure that signifier is an abstract concept because he says that our senses generate the concept of the signifier. Whatever Derrida represented was against the idea of structuralists like Saussure and Claude who gave the theory of structuralism the description of the text. Derrida states that "A structure it must be duplicated, is the essential article, plus subjective mental capacity of the structuralists" (Derrida 1997). The father and founder of anthropology Levi-Strauss talked about the necessity of binary opposition. According to him in the originality, the importance of Socio-Culture lies.

He states that "between the comparative and fruitful strainer, the true assessment of any omen can be clarified easily" (Derrida 1997). Derrida believes that violent hierarchy can be produced by binary opposition. It may reduce the importance of one thing and can increase the importance of another thing. The tradition of representing the supernatural elements was also challenged by Deconstruction. But it also questions Theocentric which beliefs in the supremacy of God and anthropocentric, which believes that man is the

center of the universe, strongly. But Derrida is of the view that language is the center of everything. It is the language that is a new and good center of everything. The theory of Deconstruction does not care about the other lawful centers of the universe, that other believed. Deconstruction theory stood against all the fossilized centers, each center has a history to which the future was bound. But now the future is bound with language. The structuralism theory is questioned by Deconstruction when the new term difference is introduced. McQUILLAN says:

"It is a play of difference within the historical meaning as a non-totalisable figure of autoimmunity which puts the historical, histories and idea of history itself into deconstruction. In today's circumstances, whatever changes happen to take place because of the pressure of the future. What is going to happen in the future and what can be happened in near future these are possibilities for the prediction of mutations". History is related to the future, it is not what happened in past. It is a question of the future and a thing of the future. The deconstruction of the future decides the future of a present deconstruction. " The future is dissimilarity that causes all creations, build practicable itself, and is the condition state of all and every importance one might say there is no future without future" (MiQUILLAN, 2007).

Research Question

1. How has Derrida's theory of Deconstruction helped to analyse and developed a deep understanding of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Derrida's theory of deconstruction helped this study in textual analysis. The Deconstruction theory of Derrida emerged in the 1970s and 80s. It is not only a kind of overnight academic revolution but a mental revolution as well. It was aroused as a response to Structuralism, a literary theory that gained its prominence in the mid-1960s. In simple words, Deconstruction is mental progress specifically a type of elusive dance in which anybody is not suitable for all positions. The main function of the structure, sign, and plays are to convey any type of idea. That can be understood by everyone. Derrida called it a supernatural signified. Derrida's way of writing prose a like a crosspatch skeptical movement around any argument.

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The whole play is about the death of King Hamlet, the marriage of his wife to his brother, and the different kinds of mental situation of his son Hamlet. No one knows what happened till the appearance of King Hamlet as a ghost after his mysterious death and tells about his murder which

is done by his brother. It becomes a puzzle for Hamlet which is become understandable by the play mousetrap. When Hamlet knows about his father's death he wants to take revenge for his father's murder which also causes of death of some other characters in the play like Polonius, Ophelia, Gertrude, Claudius, and also Hamlet himself. In literature, this play by William Shakespeare has been given great importance and studied in many academic institutes worldwide. According to Serageldin:

"Hamlet is the first hero to question the system of values that expects him to behave in a certain way. The Drama of Hamlet is incredibly more profound and akin to the modern condition where the modern hero, or antihero, is torn between internal and external forces and is not just confronting the classical dramatic choices. (Serageldin, 1998)"

Almost all the characters of the play show different attitudes toward slavery. All the characters are shaded by the darkness of slavery in their life. The modern study is trying to shed light on all the imaginative or dramatic aspects of the Play. The scholars who are researching the play give it a deconstructive aspect with all elements of deconstructing and struggling for the study of all the characters that what were their reactions to their surrounding environment. These elements are not randomly selected but all these are selected with the context of their text.

Metaphysics of Presence and Messianic

The famous historian and philosopher Derrida extremely focused on metaphysical happenings which were about written culture and rituals which come out as some area's reorganization. This emotion of happening or existence possibly could have some different ways of expression. In her context existence, God is finding oneself. Messianic is a gentle expression of metaphysics here it deals with the unfulfilled promises or politico-religious expression. Derrida always claims the politico-religious statements and her ideologies that:

"The affectivity or actuality of the democratic promises, like that of communist promises will always keep within it and it must do so, this undetermined messianic hope as its heart, this eschatological relation to the to-come of an event and a singularity, of an alternately that cannot be anticipated." (Ware, 2004)

Messianic thoughts are not only the source of old memories but it also recreates the thoughts of hurtful abuse that hurts memory" (Fritch, 2005).

The same is expressed in Shakespeare's Hamlet where communication exists between living ones and dead ones. The conversation between Barnardo, Horatio, and Marcellus is messianic. Horatio's comment over dead in Rome with seat covers and grave without possession and bloody things happened here were take his comment towards messianic. Because all as unsaid promises and whatever has happened in Rome shows his inheritance history.

MARCELLUS: "Peace, break thee off. Look where it comes again."

BARNARDO: "in the same figure, like the king that's dead".

MARCELLUS: "Thou art a scholar, speaks to it Horatio".

BARNARDO: "Look the not like king? Mark it Horatio".

HORATIO: "Most like. It harrows me with fear and wonder".

BARNARDO: "It would be spokes to."

MARCELLUS: "Question it Horatio".

HORATIO: "What art thou that usurp'st this time of night, Together with that fair and warlike form in which the majesty of buried Denmark did sometimes march? By heaven I charge the speak" (Edward, 2003, act I, scene I, henceforth-Hamlet)

As Hamlet can take his revenge when Claudius was in church but he didn't do that because he is supposed to be a divine spirit and wants him to face his doings just because messianic somewhere exists in his thoughts and mind. Hamlet doesn't and Claudius dies while praying as he might be gone in heaven and a villain who killed his father doesn't serve heaven, a messianic thought of unfulfilled promises and politico-religious thoughts have been dominated.

Binary Oppositions

Structuralism derived a term in the world named binary oppositions. The structuralists said that a just discernment of any social problem is simply attainable with the explanation of both distinctions. Sturrock suggests: "The establishment of this underlying phonological system of 'distinctive features' achieves an ultimate segmentation of a language's sound system, and lends a new rigor and weight to Structuralism's weakness on matching set of opposed against terms, already foreshadow by Saussure"(Sturrock, 2003). As Jakobson declares: "The oppositions of such differential qualities are real binary opposition necessarily implies its opposite." (Jakobson, 2011). Two major ideas of examining the importance of two things; it can be in written form, two problems or two individual. The structuralists' point of view binary oppositions are the most appropriate way of such an analysis. They

believe from end to end of the contrastive disclosure of two individuals, which is at the peak in their differences; one can have a true explanation of their values. On the other hand, deconstruction cannot accept combining and differentiating two individuals to announce one champion and the other one defeated. It cannot be declared that lowering someone and promoting the others get the chased justice and power. Balanced equations are such a needs that undo us to invite difference:

“At the point where the concept of difference intervenes . . . all the conceptual oppositions of metaphysics, to the extent that they have for ultimate references the presence of a present . . . (signifier/signified; sensible/intelligible; writing/ speech; [parole]! Language [langue]; diachronic/synchrony; space/time; passivity/activity, etc.) become non- pertinent.” (Derrida, 1997)

According to Derrida, “he is very specific about the consequences of binary oppositions given by structuralism” (Derrida, 1997). He said that a tragic sense of superiority and inferiority is created by binary oppositions. A melancholic rift among the people is created by the best instrument named binary oppositions. It is due to the segregation of that religions, castes, classes, races, communities, and colors are calculated, differentiated, and finally thrown into a different fanatic and uncompromising categories. The scale of Socio-political and religious-cultural keeps the world witnessing various social evils. Almond quotes Derrida very calmly:

“Derrida sees binary oppositions as illusions because of a certain semantic emptiness---signs forever need their opposites to negatively define themselves. 'Transcendence' and 'immanence' are semantics vacuities which can only pretend to mean through contrast with their opposites----- in other words, the immanent can only be understood as the nontranscendent, the transcendent as the non-immanent”. (Almond, 2005)

In various incidents, the characters of Hamlet are stuck in the galaxy of binary oppositions. The ones, that are depreciated, are used as highly applied lines of attack in polar concepts. When the characters reach an aporetic and insanely aggressive mode they resort to contrast and comparison. Compelling their addresses about the clarification of their asserts is considered the appropriate method. While in the communication with his mother Hamlet does his leading role to give a shocking image of Claudius combining with his dead father. To prove the infidelity of his mother he does so.

GERTRUDE: “Aye me, what an action, that flash so loud and rumble in the index?”

HAMLET: "Look here upon this image, and on this, the forged presentation of two brothers. See what elegance was rested on this forehead; Hyperion's twine, the anterior of Zeus himself, an eye like Venus, to hazarded and order; a stage like a messenger Mercury, brighten on a heaven-kissing mountain; a comparison and a form indeed, where every good deed seems to set his seal to give the world confirmed of a man. This was your husband". Look you know what follows. "Here is your husband, like rotten dynamite his wholesome brother. Have your eyes? Could you on this fair hill leave to provide and board on his upland? Ha! Have your eyes?"(Hamlet, Act, 3. Scene, 4)

Aporia

Aporia is the stalemate of a connection, explicate and resolve but all in vain. The declaration of the death is the concluding logic of a decision, addiction, and divorce are various prowl decision in everyday life The aporia squarely declare the impracticality of justice and meaning that make a real familiarity of justice and morals In the unceasing effortful concentration numbering rules that call one to enlist vigorously for it is the lake of intrinsic for thinking and rethinking for morals what the text desire and what direct commitment Aporia shove us towards a such scenario where we may not spectator the birth of new decision, which are faced with indeterminacy show that how he is deluged in the world of numerous aporias.

“Hamlet: to be, or not to be, that is the question whether this nobler in the mind to suffer. The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, or to take arms against a sea of trouble and by opposing end them To die_ to sleep, No more; and by a sleep to say we end the heart_ache and the thousand natural shocks. That flesh is heir to is a consummation devoutly to be wished to die, to sleep; To sleep; perchance to dream ay, there's the rub: for in that sleep of death what dream may come, when we have shuffled off this mortal coil, Must give us pause_ there's the respect that makes calamity of so long life for who would bear the whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's wrong dread of something after death, the undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler return, puzzles the will, and makes us rather bear those I'll we have Than fly to others that we know not off?” (Hamlet, act3, scene 2).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Derrida's 'Difference' is a concept that refers to aporias and aporetic circumstances. It demonstrates the need of allowing each action to have a different meaning in all of life's unborn events. A transformed person is not a slave to an

unchangeable circumstance or the rigid totalitarian beliefs dictated by certain persons in the past. Moreover, The play of *différance* inside traditional connotations as a non-totalisable symbol of auto-immunity that deconstructs the history and the concept of history. The future's open-ended anteriority is what makes history feasible; it is the fundamental possibility and driver of history like a foundation without stability. One may argue that there is no future even without a future. Furthermore, The numerous Hamlet characters demonstrate varied interferences in the web of the servitude of the metaphysics of presence. All of the characters are imprisoned in some fashion within the dark cave of the logos of life. As a result, the current study aims to shed light on the Logocentric confinement of this much-debated drama.

The development of this fundamental phonological system of distinctive characteristics' achieves the ultimate fragmentation of a language's audio, and provides further rigor and depth to Structuralism's reliance on pairs of opposing words, which Saussure already alluded to. According to Jakobson, "the oppositions of such differential characteristics are actual binary oppositions as described in logic, i.e., each of the elements of the opposition inevitably entails its opposite" (Sturrock, 2008).

Several international reviewers have harshly criticized Hamlet. He has been labeled as a cautious individual who postpones vengeance. There are several conditions, and we may emphasize certain points of distinction. However, the researcher has chosen only one case that may provide a clear image of Hamlet's function. One of its key elements of difference is deferring, which tends to mean that meaning is not only a matter of synchronicity whereby all terms are fettered within a shuttered shell of a structure but also a diachrony in which things will be repeated but each repetition is free from any bonding to its past but apart from possessing a trace from of the past, which is an inevitable natural flow. Through Derridian deconstruction, the research attempted to open up a new horizon for the world of Shakespeare's Hamlet. It shed light on the heinous consequences of authoritarian dictatorship's theocentric and anthropocentric legitimacy, which have been stumbling blocks since the inception of the chaotic and tumultuous world. The research attempted to argue that man would not know tranquil serenity unless he challenges binary oppositions and shakes hands with binary conceptions.

The world of Shakespeare Hamlet through Derridian segmentation opens a new horizon. The imagination of faculty character appeared how the

metaphysics of residence can be a cognitive haul the opposite concept in extending ethics the usefulness of the values discover the atmosphere of structuralism. The investigation was the cognitive impediment of characters by their historic attitude to the matter surrounding it. It put light on the dreadful result of the theocentric and upwardly authority of autocratic tyranny, which have constantly been the slip cube since the birth of the confused and thunderous glob. The man may not like the flavors of calmness and serenity which is free from nervousness; he agitates hands with binary concept and dares the binary opposition lots of unexpected coincidences may be fending off through binary concept. The long-established metaphysics of the presence was energetic, which conduct on repetition of individual presence and cut off all the pregnant attendance, which are to arrive to life.

The famous historian and philosopher Derrida extremely focused on metaphysical happenings which were about written culture and rituals which come out as some areas recognize. This emotion of happening or existence possibly could have some different ways of expression. In her context of existence, God is finding oneself. Messianic is a gentle expression of metaphysics here it deals with the unfulfilled promises or political co-religious expression. Derrida always claims the political co-religious statements and her ideologies that "The affectivity or actuality of the democratic promises, like that of communist promises, will always keep within it and it must do so, this undetermined messianic hope as its heart, this eschatological relation to the to-come of an event and a singularity, of an alternative that cannot be anticipated" (Ware, 2004).

CONCLUSION

Derrida discussed that messianic thoughts are not only the source of old memories but "it also recreates the thoughts of hurtful abuse that hurts memory" (Fritch, 2005). The same is expressed in Shakespeare's Hamlet where communication exists between living ones and dead ones. The conversation between Brando, Horatio, and Marcellus is messianic. Horatio's comment over deeds in Rome with sheet covers and grave without possession and bloody things happened here were take his comment towards messianic. Because all as unsaid promises and whatever has happened in Rome shows his inheritance history. As Hamlet can take his revenge when Claudius was in church but he didn't do that because he is supposed to be a divine spirit and wants him to face his doings just because messianic is somewhere exist in his thoughts and mind. Hamlet doesn't want Claudius to die while praying as he might be gone in heaven and a villain who killed his father doesn't serve heaven, a

messianic thought of unfulfilled promises and political co-religious thoughts have been dominated.

REFERENCES

- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore and London: *The Johns Hopkins University Press*.
- Edwards, P. (2003). *Hamlet the Prince of Denmark*. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Fritsch, M. (2005). *The Promise of Memory: History and Politics in Marx, Benjamin, and Derrida*. Albany: *State University of New York Press*.
- Fry, Paul. (2009). *Introduction to Theory of Literature*. *Yale University: Open Yale*.
- Hooper, T. (2003). Dangerous Doubles: Puns and Language in Shakespeare's Hamlet Chrestomathy: *Annual Review of Undergraduate Research at the College of Charleston*, 2, 120-134.
- Hurst, A. (2008). Derrida Vis-à-vis Lacan: Interweaving Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis. *New York: Fordham University*.
- Jackson, K. S., & Marotti, A. F. (2011). *Shakespeare and Religion: Early Modern and Postmodern Perspectives: University of Notre Dame Press*.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (2005). *Myth and Meaning*. *Taylor & Francis e-Library*.
- Maleki, N. (2012). The Paradigm Examples of Polar Concept In Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 12(1), 19-23.
- McQuillan, M. (2007). *The Politics of Deconstruction: Jacques Derrida and the Other of Philosophy*. *London: Pluto Press*.
- Owen, W. (2004). Dialectic of the Past/Disjuncture of the Future: Derrida and Benjamin on the Concept of Messianism. *JCRT*, 5(2), 99-114.
- Sedinger, T. (2007). Theory Terminable and Interminable: On Presentism, Historicism, and the Problem of Hamlet. *Exemplaria*, 19(3), 455-473.
- Serageidin, I. (1998). *The Modernity of Shakespeare*. Giza: *Cairo University*.
- Sturrock, J. (2008). *Structuralism: John Wiley & Sons*. Available from: upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd.../00dissertation.pdf [accessed:10/06/2012]
- Van Niekerk, MC. (2003). *Shakespearean Play: deconstructive Readings*.