

Review

Hesitancy as an innate flaw in Hamlet's character: Reading through a psychoanalytic lens

Abdul Mahmood Idrees Ibrahim

Department of English Language, Thadiq College, Shaqra University, Saudi Arabia.

Received 29 January, 2020; Accepted 18 March, 2020

This paper concentrated on hesitancy as a character's flaw from the Freudian psychoanalysis focal point. Hamlet's uncertainty is especially identified with his natural complex which frames his oblivious love for his mom and his lethal abhor for his dad. Freud's ideas of man's concealed want for annihilation and eradication may shape the reason for understanding Hamlet's craving for death and suicide as demonstrated by his popular monologs. Ridiculousness and agnosticism in Hamlet's activities mirror the intrinsic human conduct and flaw. The paper suggests that Hamlet's play ought to be remembered for cutting edge writing courses for its lavishness in examples of general human conduct, for example, the recurrence that is natural to human activities on different events. Educators should expand under study's attention to the nearness of hesitancy and uncertainty as a flaw that can prompt pulverization as Hamlet does.

Key words: Character, critics, flaw, Freudian psychoanalysis, Hamlet play, hesitancy, tragedy.

INTRODUCTION

Hamlet is one of the most astounding and awesome plays. It is the tragedy of a man and an activity constantly frustrated by knowledge. Hamlet is a circumstance of anguish since; he finds the path hard to the demonstration of retribution. For what reason does it take him such a long time to follow up on the apparition's solicitation for retribution? In spite of the fact that hesitancy in Hamlet is one of the most questionable topics, it is a critical and predominant state. Without hesitancy, there is no play; consequently, it requires a comprehensive investigation to concentrate on, since it

bolsters the idea of the flaw of Hamlet's character and the impact of this hesitancy on the structure of the play. Numerous focal points would be utilized to condemn Hamlet's play; in any case, the present investigation would be considered from the psychoanalytic focal point.

The present investigation is constrained to certain imaginative ideas created in Freud's (1965) "Translation of Dreams". These, normally, incorporate the duality of the oblivious and the cognizant; the charismas of Oedipus and Electra complex. Extraordinary consideration will be paid to those pieces of the play showing Hamlet's

E-mail: a-ibrahim@su.edu.sa Tel: +966533414890.

Author(s) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

hesitancy, particularly the popular speeches, focusing on this subject will be inspected in the light of Freud's wording and origination of the human mind. The paper attempts to discover how far psychoanalysis offers a valuable instrument in featuring Hamlet's hesitancy when contrasted with before hypotheses. Hamlet's reluctance and procrastination to avenge his father's death has been attributed to the concept of rivalry or opposition towards the father in the theory. Hamlet is a victim of Oedipus complex due to his hesitancy to take revenge. The subject of "hesitancy" is the predominant issue in the play. Hamlet, from a Freudian viewpoint, demonstrates the philosophical impact of the inward mental states and their contention basic wants on outward activities.

PSYCHOANALYSIS AS A LITERARY APPROACH

Psychoanalysis as system owes especially to Freud who is viewed as the most influential and authoritative thinker of the twentieth century in the field of brain research. Most psychoanalysts acknowledge human conduct in any event somewhat in Freudian terms; notwithstanding the conflict with a large number of his ways of thinking. Freud portrays the human personality as cooperation of id, conscience, and super-self-image. Together they make up the character. Freud's model of the mind expresses that the id is the instinctual part of the mind that contains sexual and dangerous thought processes and concealed recollections, the super-inner self works as a controller, and the sense of self goes about as an arbiter between the wants of the id and the super-conscience. The inner self is the outside of the character, the part of the character that is seen by the others. Cognizant mindfulness exists in the self-image, yet not the entireties of the sense of self activities are cognizant.

Hamlet suffers from innatetrait of Oedipus complex which reflects his desire to replace his father. The inner voice is the commonplace illustration of the heavenly attendant and demon on each shoulder. The still, small voice chooses what game-plan one should take. The sense of self perfect is a glorified perspective on one's self. Evaluations are made for both the inner self perfect and one's real conduct, and it is seen that the two create through understanding and social associations. As per Freud, a solid super-sense of self functions as a controller for the organic impulses of the id, while a powerless super-personality prompts the id's persuasions. In this way, the degrees of blame in the two cases above will be high and low.

The Oedipus complex in Hamlet

In the field of brain research, Freud (1856-1939) is

viewed as perhaps the best personality of the nineteenth and twentieth hundreds of years. Psychoanalysis as order owes particularly to him. Most psychoanalysts acknowledge human conduct in any event in part in Freudian terms; in spite of the conflict with a considerable lot of his ways of thinking. Freud depicts the human personality as a connection of id, inner self, and super-sense of self. Together they make up the character. Freud's model of the mind guarantees that the id is instinctual since it contains sexual and damaging drives and concealed recollections, the super-inner self works as an ethical soul, and the conscience goes about as an arbiter between the wants of the id and the super-personality. The sense of self is the recognizable part of the conduct, the immediate conduct that is seen by others.

The psychoanalytic concept Oedipus complex refers to the sentiments and psychosexual desires during the phallic phase in the human natural process, which a youngster child owns towards his mother creating a parallel sense of rivalry towards the father (Liu and Chencheng, 2018). The psychological complex as Freud expresses is extracted from Oedipus complex, who unintentionally slew his father and subsequently married his mother. As indicated by Freud, a solid super-self-image serves to oblige the natural impulses of the id, while a feeble super-inner self yields to the id's persuasions. Further, the degrees of blame in the two cases above will be high and low, separately.

O you not come to tardy son to chide.
That, lapsed in time and passion, let's go by
The important acting of your dread command?
O say! (3.4.107-110)

In response to Hamlet, the Ghost replies:
Do not forget: this visitation
Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose (3.4.111-112).

Hamlet's superego gains control of his id, thus enabling him to take revenge to the Ghost's death. In Act 5, Scene 3, Hamlet kills Claudius. Finally, Hamlet kills Claudius after so long hesitancy, because Gertrude now dies. Gertrude indicates the object of Hamlet's desire. Hamlet's desire for his mother has also died. Since Hamlet no longer has to suppress his desire, his missed power returns to him consequently enables him to kill Claudius twice: injures Claudius with his rapier, then forces him to drink the poisoned wine. Respectively of Claudius' "deaths" represents different things to Hamlet. One death embodies the death of King Hamlet, and the other embodies the death of Hamlet's id. Now, Hamlet can rest when he has finished his business by taking revenge for his father's death. He might not find an answer for the reason behind his hesitancy in avenging his father's death since the presence of the Ghost. According to Lesser (1977), "He is troubled first and last by the

mysterious force within him which keeps him from executing it."

I don't know
Why yet I live to say, ' This things ' to do,
Sith I have cause, and will, and strength, and means
To don't. (4.4.43-46)

Hamlet is revealing that he does not even know why he hesitates in killing Claudius. And if Hamlet does not know why he is hesitating, any impression that Hamlet is hesitating out of fear is invalid. Hamlet also may have many chances to kill Claudius if the reason is that he is in prayers, so any explanation that includes Hamlet's fears for Claudius' eternal life is also worthless. Both of these interpretations rely on Hamlet being conscious of his actions.

Hamlet as a neurotic character

Depression and psychosis are utilized to depict the conditions or ailment that influences emotional well-being. Both mental issues and psychosis result from restraint, yet the last is the created outrageous phase of the first. The moxie of the sexual sense and unsuitable components and thoughts are not very still in the oblivious. They generally endeavor to attack the cognizant. The Ego consistently attempts to stop the moxie or the sexual intuition and unsuitable components that prompt extreme constraint. Freud guarantees that despondency can be brought about by suppression and injury. The outcome of this contention is the contention among Ego and Id – it is a mental issue. Hamlet's Oedipus complex demonstrates the presence of his suppression. Hamlet's hypochondria are likewise a result of his injury. The unnatural demise of his dad, the rushed marriage of his mom and his dad's Ghost request for retribution make a horrible encounter for him. He experiences tension and melancholy. In the interim, his two chest companions Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are being contracted to spy upon him. Along these lines, he falls into despondency.

Visualization is an impact of anxiety and this is seen in his second gathering with the Ghost as just he, not his mom can see its nearness. His hesitancy ascribes to his horrible disarray which brings about his anguish and situation. So, one might say that uncertainty goes to the depression and flaw of his character. Subsequently, he chooses to end it all as communicated through his discourse "Regarding life, what to think about it". This discourse demonstrates that he has lost his fearlessness. Just a masochist mind loads with despairing can communicate this kind of skepticism.

Feigned madness as a defense strategy

In spite of the fact that Hamlet's imagined frantiness never turns into an issue concerning Claudius' demise, it comes in very convenient when he erroneously murders Polonius. Gertrude backs up Hamlet's misrepresentation of frantiness by revealing to Claudius that Hamlet when murdering Polonius was "distracted as the ocean and wind when both battle which is the mightier." (4.1.7-8). Claudius acknowledges the fiction and passes it when he tells Rosencrantz and Guildenstern that "Hamlet's in frenzy hath Polonius killed" (4.1.34).

Lacan (1982) offers us another understanding of obsessional depression, especially with the investigation of Hamlet's tragedy, during his workshop on Desire and its Interpretation" in (1958:59). He called Hamlet "the tragedy of want" and one of which the conundrum and secret distracted creators and examiners the same. Lacan chooses for comparing the structure of want in Hamlet to the craving of the obsessional. The side effect of obsessional gets a name; it is delaying, leaving everything for tomorrow, liking to hold up as opposed to acknowledging something of want, and this occurs in Hamlet with the demonstration which is anticipated from him. A systematic clarification is that it is Hamlet's oblivious want for his mom which makes this demonstration repulsive to him and makes him reluctant. His second thoughts, Hamlet's manifestations, in regards to the demonstration area to be comprehended with this craving, as its recollections, and of his oedipal wants to kill his dad, stirred by the dead dad's disclosures cause him to feel liable of the wrongdoing he needs to rebuff. This is placed corresponding with the tragedy of Oedipus by Freud in "The Interpretation of Dreams" and by Ernest Jones in an article (Jones, 1910), (in Journal of American Brain Research, The Oedipus complex, as a clarification of Hamlet's secret).

The play depends on Hamlet's hesitancy in achieving the errand of vengeance doled out to him. The content does not give the reason or the intention of this hesitancy, nor have the complex endeavors at understanding prevailing with regards to doing as such. Hamlet speaks to the sort of man who sees dynamic vitality is deadened by over the top scholarly action. As indicated by another origination, the artist has attempted to depict a dismal, indecisive character very nearly neurasthenia. The plot of the dramatization, notwithstanding, gives us that Hamlet is in no way, shape or form proposed to show up as a character entirely unequipped for activity. One might say that Hamlet Play is a play inside a play.

CRITICS AND HAMLET'S HESITANCY

The explanation behind Hamlet's hesitancy has frequented critics for four centuries. In this way, different

creators have displayed dissimilar explanations behind the hesitancy, which brings up another issue concerning this perplexing part of the play: Why does Shakespeare give such a great amount of noticeable quality to the hesitancy without unmistakably showing the purpose behind it? The appropriate response helps guide us to Shakespeare's explanation behind Hamlet's hesitancy. In the nineteenth century, the sentimental people Schlegel (1803) and Coleridge (1809) offered the arrangement that Hamlet is rendered unequipped for activity in light of his inclination to philosophize excessively. They recommended that Hamlet's "local tint of goals is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." According to Coleridge, Hamlet had "incredible, tremendous, scholarly movement, and a subsequent proportionate antipathy for genuine activity." Coleridge reasoned that "Shakespeare wished to put forth for our reality that activity is the main finish of presence."

Bradley (1985) contended that Hamlet's hesitancy is the aftereffect of a melancholic perspective, expedited by the demise of his dad and the rushed remarriage of his mom. Hamlet unquestionably gives a lot of proof of vitality in his sharp and clever sallies, to his greatest advantage in the specialty of the voyaging entertainers, in his astute course of action of the play scene to trap Claudius, and in the way, he plotted the finish of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.

For all intents and purposes, all critics, paying little mind to their clashing originations of Hamlet's character, concur about the significance of equivocalness in both the legend's style and in the play all in all. Bevington (1968, p.8) says that "Hamlet's language puts a lot of weight on the play on words and different types of wordplay." In perusing Empson's meanings of equivocalness, one is absolutely helped to remember Hamlet's character and character". Vagueness itself implies uncertainty with respect to what you mean, a goal to mean a few things, likelihood that either or both of two things have been implied, is the way that an announcement has a few implications (Empson: 1930, p.7). Regardless, Wilson (1962) is correct when he says that bandy in Hamlet is "too clear to be in any way disregarded.

Freud specifies Hamlet on many occasions. It is advantageous to peruse the play for trailblazers of psychoanalytic ideas. Hamlet is a "sonnet boundless," as Bloom (2003) says, so it should be valuable for considering profundity brain science. Psychoanalysis is frequently observed as the subtext of writing, yet Felman (1987) says it is a lot of a different way: the unaware of psychoanalysis. The point is not such a great amount to utilize Freud to comprehend Shakespeare for what it is worth to reveal in Hamlet as the core of psychoanalysis. Freud says that one could nearly say, "All that I had to think about psychoanalysis I gained from Hamlet. Freud expressed "the artists were here before me" and, as

indicated by Bloom, this writer was Shakespeare. He guarantees that Freudian brain research is a Shakespearean development. Beginning from the age of eight, Freud read crafted by Shakespeare over and over. He is said to have appreciated Shakespeare's capacity of articulation, alongside his understanding of human instinct. Hamlet's hesitation affects Hamlet's levelheaded, the social talk wherein different characters watch him, the substantial impacts of his inactions that lead to the play's end result, and his novel individual account. In the Hamlet scenes of "The Literature of Crisis" by Martin Evans and Marsh McCall, Evans (1979) suggests that there are four rehashed speculations that record for Hamlet's hesitancy; there are the philosophical, good, mental and the stylish arrangements.

The religious arrangement manages the idea of the phantom in the play. Shakespeare's apparition, rather than past interpretations of the Hamlet story, worries about a philosophical concern. The phantom is portrayed in catholic terms despite the fact that Shakespearean England was for the most part protestant. Evans (1979) accommodates Hamlet's hesitancy as a tasteful arrangement. While the other three speculations save the creative respectability of the play, the tasteful hypothesis proposes that it does not have any. The tasteful hypothesis asserts that the incongruity and unpredictability of the playmaker make it too hard to even think about appreciating it as a gem. Eliot (1921) called the play "a creative disappointment" and Voltaire called it "obscene". This hypothesis would recommend that Shakespeare neglected to give Hamlet an adequate thought process in his conduct and that Hamlet's hesitancy is difficult to comprehend. The tasteful arrangement expects that craftsmanship ought to be understandable, fathomable, intelligent, and basic and Shakespeare challenges this supposition.

Adam (1929) characterizes Hamlet as a visionary who does not comprehend or acknowledge the weaknesses of mankind. Hamlet, in Adam's view, gets frustrated with the human condition and, subsequently, gets melancholic and accordingly incapable to act. Adams (1929), holds that "Shakespeare lays substantial accentuation on the coupling idea of retribution; it is an obligation, a sacrosanct commitment". He proceeds to characterize accurately what renders the play's saint powerless despite activity: "Hamlet is overwhelmed with an articulate infection of the spirit that puts forth all attempts unimaginable for him. At the end of the day, he is again sinking into despondency." It is Hamlet's psychological malady, with its general state of misery, which causes him extraordinary trouble settling on a choice and enticing the vitality to act to finish his errand. It tends to be seen that Bradley's hypothesis of despairing as the reason for Hamlet's hesitancy in Adams' work, yet Adams extends and refines Bradley's theory (1913). For Adams, the peak of the play comes in the wardrobe scene

denoting the start of Hamlet's recuperation from sadness. Despite the fact that his recuperation comes past the point where it is possible to spare his life, he kicks the bucket a trooper's passing in the quest for a respectable purpose.

Joseph, in his *Conscience and The King* (1953), sees the play as a particular result of its Renaissance setting. He endeavors to see the play from an Elizabethan stance and recommends that a playwright, of any period, "is frequently misconstrued except if his words, his circumstance and all they infer are deciphered per the importance which they can appear to have had for his counterparts". The Elizabethan crowd, in Joseph's view, would have thought about the lamenting of a lamenting child, undermined his position of royalty, and disrespected by a mother he beyond all doubt adored, an ordinary response and naturally melancholic.

Joseph (1953) says, "Here are no seeds of hesitancy, this is not the rearing ground of uncertainty and powerlessness to vindicate". He reasons that the more one thinks about and comprehends the frames of mind and estimations of the development out of which Shakespeare comes, the better the plausibility of getting Hamlet and the presence of hesitancy. Elliot (1951) goes considerably further observing Hamlet and Claudius are similarly reluctant. He proceeds to state that the basic thought processes in the two characters' aversions are a profane yet evident human blend of goal-oriented pride and darken still small voice". Hamlet's regard for the majesty is the reason for retribution deferral and along these lines one of the variables of his hesitancy. In spite of the fact that Hamlet's pride is the wellspring of his concern all through the play, he at long last accomplishes the attitude to slaughter the lord in 'immaculate still, small voice' as a demonstration of indifferent equity, taking his "discipline" as paradise's "scourge and priest." Elliot cannot help contradicting Bradley's idea that the play is a character study and asserted, rather, that it epitomizes.

HAMLET'S FLAW

Hamlet is an unpredictable character who displays various characteristics through the play's improvement. At the point when he is first presented in Act 1, Scene 2, we consider Hamlet to be a delicate youngster ruler who is grieving the passing of his dad and his mom's rushed union with his uncle. These occasions have left Hamlet in more noteworthy anguish. Hamlet's annoyance and melancholy come from his mom's union with Claudius and this makes him consider suicide, which just dies down because of being a human and strict sin. The way that he needs to end his own life shows a shortcoming in his character, a feeling of weakness. His choice not to ends it all as strict convictions shows that this flaw is offset with some feeling of morals. This observable riddle

is just a case of the inner clash and misperception that at long last leads to Hamlet's heartbreaking defeat.

Notwithstanding this interior battle, Hamlet feels he should depose Claudius and become the King of Denmark. This vengeance, he accepts, would dole out the retribution of his mom's forbidden relationship and would reestablish his family's respect. These contemplations were affirmed in Act1, Scene 5, when his dad's phantom shows up and discloses to Hamlet that it was Claudius who killed him and denied him" of life, of the crown, of Queen" (Line 75). Taking a gander at these occasions, Hamlet's discourse "To be, or not to be," shows him mulling over the possibility of steadfastness, following up on one's ethics and their connection to battling against the difficulties of malice. As a sad legend, one sees Hamlet's ceaseless devotion to keeping up a lot of good benchmarks which is in incredible complexity to the activity of different characters. Now in the play, Hamlet has gotten mindful of the way that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are keeping an eye on him for Claudius.

This information permits him to control the circumstance and give Claudius bogus data. He is additionally suspicious that Ophelia's enthusiasm for him is not certifiable. With respect to his mom, Hamlet is careful, yet he recollects his guarantee to the Ghost. As Act III Progresses, one sees Claudius' plot against Hamlet proceeds while Hamlet appears to delay looking for his retribution. This strengthens Hamlet's unfortunate character flaw, his common inward clashes about dependability, humankind, life, and passing both have taken as much time as is needed and shielded him from concentrating on what he vowed to do right off the bat in the opening demonstration. He realizes that nobody is genuinely on his side; in any case, he utilizes each opportunity to advance his "bogus" dysfunctional behavior as opposed to scanning for the quickest method to vindicate his dad's homicide and his mom's marriage. This reality is best outlined in Act III, Scene 3 when Hamlet sees Claudius praying, he says:-

Now might I do it pat. Now he is a-praying.
And now I'll do 't. And so he goes to heaven.
And so am I revenged.—That would be scanned.
A villain kills my father, and, for that,
I, his sole son, do this same villain send
To heaven.
Oh, this is hire and salary, not revenge.
He took my father grossly, full of bread,
With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May.

Moreover, Hamlet doubts that the ghost was real; he stages a plan to confirm his suspicions about Claudius: "The play's the thing wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King" (2.2.616-617).

Hamlet's main tragic flaw is his hesitancy to act, because of a conflict between action and consciousness that makes him anticipate both sides of the question. He is completely tentative during the course of the play. Frequently, Hamlet uses many justifications to hide his hesitancy as a result of his inner conflicts. The hesitancy reveals Hamlet suffering as a result of his innate psychological problems and character's flaw. Hamlet believes that killing Claudius during his prayers sends him to heaven; therefore his hesitancy makes him lose the opportunity to avenge for his late father.

Hamlet decides to pause while he has the chance to slaughter Claudius since his dad was killed before purifying himself of his wrongdoings. He accepts that Claudius must bite the dust in a similar status as his late dad. During Hamlet's contentions of profound quality, and claiming to be intellectually sick, he is scanning for a reasonable opportunity to murder Claudius. Claudius has very much worked different characters on his side. The blend of Hamlet's deferment and Claudius' requirement for the capacity to rebuff Hamlet moves the play nearer and closer to its appalling consummation.

Hamlet approves Claudius's guilt, when Claudius stops the play after seeing the murder scene, but remains rejecting the idea. He thinks he should kill his mother, because she breaks her marriage vows to his late father, but he does not. He is paralyzing with grief over his father's death. He spends most of his time grieving and without any action; therefore his tragic flaw is his inability to act. He is unable to go through with suicide, killing his mother, or killing Claudius while he is praying, we see that Hamlet chooses not to take action. Therefore, the innate fear which causes his hesitancy stops him from taking action, because he cannot decide which would be better; so, he does neither.

Hamlet states that "Haste me to know't, that I, with wings as swift as meditation or the thoughts of love, may sweep to my revenge" (1.5.29-31)

Hamlet says, "Or that the Everlasting had not fixed his canon' gainst self-slaughter. O God, God! How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable seems to me all the uses of the world" (1.2, 131-134).

This quote is saying that Hamlet's life has lost all meaning, yet he cannot commit suicide because it is forbidden.

Act III, Scene 4 starts the tragedy of the play's fundamental characters. Polonius holes up behind a window ornament as Hamlet meets with his mom. Her dread makes her shout out for help. Hamlet responds and draws his sword and wounds it at the shade trusting it is Claudius yet he pulls the drapery back and finds that he is Polonius. In this way, the first of the ruler's supporters kick the bucket. Hamlet starts condemning Gertrude and he is out of nowhere hindered by the

Ghost's appearance. Hamlet recollects his vow not to hurt his mom and he advises her regarding Claudius' arrangement and he reveals to her that he will look for retribution. At the point when Claudius learns of Polonius' homicide, he intends to dispose of Hamlet. He intends to send Hamlet to England to be going. At the point when Hamlet knows this arrangement, he defines new directions requesting that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern be murdered. In the meantime, Ophelia is overwhelmed with misery over her dad's demise and has suffocated.

At the point when Claudius understands that Hamlet is coming back to Denmark, he builds up another arrangement for murdering Hamlet. He will organize a match between Hamlet and Laertes, Ophelia's sibling. Hamlet will either pass on by the unblunted tip on Laertes' sword or by the harmed wine he will be offered after the match. During the match, Hamlet and Laertes wound each other by the honed sword. Simultaneously, Gertrude tastes from the harmed cup. Just before she kicks the bucket, she reports that she has been harmed. Laertes at that point declares that both he and Hamlet are close to death from the sword cutting and that Claudius is the person who instrumented the entire circumstance. Hamlet at that point wounds Claudius, who kicks the bucket as his transgressions are declared to the entirety of the spectators. After Hamlet and Laertes bite the dust, Fortinbras enters from a fight and learns of every one of that has occurred. After hearing the entire story, he ensures that Hamlet gets full distinctions in death. This scene (Act v, Scene 2) speaks to the peak of the play and seals the destinies of all the rest of the characters, including Hamlet, an appalling legend. Along these lines, the character of Hamlet is away from Shakespeare's disastrous saint.

Bradley expresses that Hamlet's key issue is his mom's indecency. It is tormenting him more than everything else. Gertrude's corruption is the reason for her child's discouragement (Bradley). Carroll (2013) shares his conviction, expressing "a mother making a rushed and debasing remarriage [represents] [the corruption] in the passionate core shaped by the connection among mother and child"(Carroll). He accommodatingly focuses on this issue substantially more than Bradley. Gertrude's lack of still, small voice concerning her late spouse is tormenting Hamlet. The proof that is displayed above empowers one to infer that the sovereign is discouraged. Hamlet's melancholy has made him see passing as a shelter.

O that this too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew,
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. O, God! God!
How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world!
Fie on't, ah fie! 'tis an unweeded garden

That grows to seed things rank and gross in nature. (1.2. 129-136)

The soliloquy is highly relevant for two reasons. First, the initial two lines above show that Hamlet is highly depressed. Second, they indicate that the general immorality of Denmark is another reason why Hamlet would rather prefer death than life. There is nothing attractive about this life. Furthermore, the futility of the world is plaguing Hamlet as the soliloquy shows. The events in Denmark arouse nothing but despair. Forced to endure this problem, Hamlet wishes to "resolve himself into dew!" (1.2.130). Hamlet's first soliloquy in Act I, Scene 2, reveals that Hamlet is depressed to such an extent that he does not wish to live. He wished to die by committing suicide but he feared the punishment of the Creator because God has put his cannons against self-slaughter. These feelings emerge following the death of his father and his mother's hasty marriage to his uncle, the new king, Claudius. Through this soliloquy, we discover the innermost thoughts of Hamlet.

O, that this too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew,
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed
His cannon ' against self-slaughter.
(1.11. 129-132)

O God: A beast, that wants discourse of reason,
Would have mourned longer – married with my uncle,
My father's brother, but no more like my father
Than I to Hercules. Within a month,
Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous rears
Had left the flushing in her galled eyes,
She married.(1.11. 150-156)

Hamlet's fourth soliloquy in Act 3, Scene1, is the most famous speech in the English language. It reveals that Hamlet is intelligent and he is thinking through his problems. The opening line of this soliloquy shows that Hamlet is again thinking of suicide.

To be, or not to be – that is the question:
Whether tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The sling and arrows of outrageous fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles
And by opposing end them. To die – to sleep,
No more; and by a sleep to say we end. (3.1.56-61)

This soliloquy is very much related to the first one; in it, Hamlet raises the idea of self-slaughter He talks about the idea of suicide, but he refuses to commit suicide because of his fears of the unknown. He cannot know if life after death is better or not. He then decides that the uncertainty of the afterlife is essentially what prevents all of humanity from committing suicide to end the pain of

life.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Human beings are characterized by a scope of all-inclusive mental attributes. These incorporate dread, satisfaction, aspiration, voracity, love, disdain, envy, and so forth... Utilizing Jung's (1950) popular term, we can see these as "model" human sentiments, on a similar level as fundamental, recurrent unavoidable truths that apply to everyone that, for Jung, included such dualities as adoration versus despise murkiness versus light, great versus malevolent, past versus future, to give some examples. One might say that hesitancy, as a prevailing subject of Hamlet, mirrors the human mind. All things considered, there are numerous circumstances in life when individuals are in an issue, persevering through the anguish of picking the correct choice. Subsequently, the confounding of what moves oneself to make can demolish one's estimation of life, prompts shortcoming and unavoidably be the starting point of the saint's grievous fall.

These facts are existentially reflected in an awareness of the absurdity and meaninglessness so strongly reflected in Hamlet's preoccupation with notions of dreary life and death-wish. Thus, puzzling over what course of action to take can destroy one's quality of life, leading to paralysis and can, ultimately, be the origin of the hero's tragic fall. Again, if anxiety (for students and people, in general, can be either "positive" or "debilitating", so can a sense of doubt. On one hand, doubt and anxiety must accompany any serious attempt to resolve one's inner dilemmas, coming to terms with life's many inexplicable events and the endeavor for success.

Hamlet was probably the best tragedy at any point composed. It is reasonably viewed as the zenith of Shakespeare's grievous vision and it gives an encapsulation of flawlessness to the origination of western tragedy figured by Aristotle. While Aristotle took as his model Oedipus Rex by Sophocles, Shakespeare's work is significantly more advanced and offers the soul of Renaissance independence. However, the two works are comparative in the work of a lamentable legend experiencing a lethal hamartia and brought about the torment of both saints.

It is highly recommended that Hamlet be included in any course on Shakespearean drama due to its versatility and ambiguity, facts that explain the popularity of the play as testified by the choice of Hamlet as a world-tour play to commemorate Shakespeare's 400th death. Teachers are urged to go beyond theme-based superficial interpretations of Hamlet in the light of outmoded new criticism to stress the authorial.

Hamlet can be held up as a model in interdisciplinary examinations and, accordingly, joint tasks between

Departments of English and Brain Research can be organized to overcome any issues among writing and different teaches, for example, history, human sciences, and governmental issues. Utilizing psychoanalysis as a reason for additional comprehension of Hamlet's predicaments, Lacan (1982) endeavor's to join psychoanalysis and Marxism and Kristeva's (1986) adjustment of psychoanalysis to her women's activist way of thinking. Subsequently, an all-inclusive psycho-political or gendered valuation for Hamlet can be picked up. Psychoanalysis is a settled and fruitful ground for contemplating the riddles of Hamlet. However, there are similarly encouraging territories for exploring that future analysts can take part in. These include the following:

- i) How religious conception of death, sexuality, and revenge in the 16th century are reflected in Hamlet's conceptions of himself and the world at large.
- ii) A comparison of our ideas of women empowerment and the behavior of the female characters in the play, including Gertrude and Ophelia.
- iii) An attempt can be made to analyze the problems of Hamlet from the perspective of political corruption and the degenerating political system rendering the individual helpless and leading to the intellectual paralysis typical of Hamlet's case.
- iv) Contemporary critical schools emphasizing the instability of both language and the process of signification that can be attempted. Such deconstructive reading would attempt to show Hamlet as a play trying to articulate meanings that are negated by contradictory points of view.
- v) Finally, a comparative study can be held to give more insights of hamlet and Oedipus who is the better tragic hero from the modern psychanalysts perspective.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Adams JQ (1929). Ed. Hamlet. By William Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bevington D (1968). "Introduction" Twentieth Century Interpretations of Hamlet. Ed. by David Bevington. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp.1-12.
- Bloom H (2003).Hamlet: Poem unlimited –New York, e-Riverhead Books.
- Bradley AC (1985). First published (1904). Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear and Macbeth. pp. 1-480.
- Bradley AC (1913).Shakespearean Tragedy, Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth. Gutenberg, 30 October 2005, p 498.<Http: //www.gutenberg.org /files/16966/16966-h/16966.htm>.
- Carroll J (2013).Intentional Meaning in Hamlet: An Evolutionary Perspective. Style 44:1/2(2010):230-260, 282-288. MLA. Web.
- Coleridge ST (1809). The Character of Hamlet. Enter Critic. pp.40-43.
- Eliot TS (1921).Hamlet and His Problems. The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Elliot GR (1951). Scourge and Minister: A Study of Hamlet as Tragedy of Revengefulness and Justice. Duke UP.
- Empson W (1930). Seven Types of Ambiguity. London.
- Evans M (1979).The Literature of Crisis. Writ. Marsh McCall and Dir. Stanford on iTunes U, Web. 10.Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/res/article-abstract/XXXIII/129/76/1589654?redirectedFrom=PDF>
- Felman S (1987). The case of Poe: applications/implications of psychoanalysis. With section introduction by editor. In Essential papers on psychoanalysis and literature, E Berman Ed. New York, New York University, pp.300-322, 263-269.
- Freud S (1915). 'Reflections upon War and Death'. Available in P. Rieff (ed.), Character and Culture, New York, 1963, Chapter IX, pp. 130-301.
- Freud S (1940). An Outline of Psycho-Analysis. International Journal of Psychoanalysis 21:27-84.
- Freud S (1965). The Interpretations of Dreams. Trans and ed. by James Strachey. New York: Avon.
- Jones E (1910).Freud's Theory of Dreams. The American Journal of Psychology 21(2):283-308. Published by: University of Illinois Press Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1413004> Accessed: 15-12-2019 07:01 UTC
- Joseph B (1953).Conscience and the King. London: Chattoand Windus.
- Jung CG (1950). (Carl Gustav). The integration of the personality. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Kristeva J (1986).The System and the Speaking Subject." The Kristeva Reader, Ed. TorilMoi. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.pp.24-33.
- Lacan J (1982). Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in Hamlet." Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading Otherwise. Ed. Shoshana Felman. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP.pp.11-52.
- Lesser SO (1977).Freud and Hamlet Again. The Whispered Meanings. Ed, Robert Sprich and Richard W. Noland. Amherst: UP of Massachusetts, pp.21-31.
- Liu Y, Chencheng W (2018). "Oedipus Complex in Literature Works." Journal of Language Teaching and Research II(6):1420-1424.
- Wilson JD(1962). What Happens in Hamlet. Cambridge.