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Academically Shakespearehas created some of the most well-known works, literature and characters in ourfield, one such example of a character whose existence resembles that of adouble-edged sword to critics is Hamlet and his famous verse “ To Be or not toBe: That is The Question”.

This lead toresearch delving into the idea of Shakespeare’s characters being considered asso ‘ human’ that they also communicate with their conscience through theirsoliloquies. Therefore how does one distinguish between a character’s personaamong other characters and the character’s inner persona often labelled as theConscience?                                     In the opening part of his book Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human, Harold Bloom, who had taught the subject of Shakespeare and ShakespeareanLiterature and Performance at Yale for a long time, recommends that beforeShakespeare, the characters in plays would unravel however not really expandand grow. On the off chance that a character simply expands, we already guessthat we definitely know everything there is to know about them when theyinitially are showcased in front of an audience on stage or in the pages of abook. Their creators have denied them of the one element that would make themintriguing: the limit with regards to self-analysing that may uncover somethingsurprising to us readers as well as to the characters themselves. They show uslittle since they can’t bewilder us in any way, basically on the grounds thatthey can’t amaze themselves. This might be the present reality similar to thescholar who leaves an information session and thinks to himself, “ Nothing Ihaven’t heard before,” and afterward says to themselves, “ I figure Iam what I am!” or “ I have my way of doing things, and some  people like it and some people don’t.”                                     Shakespeare does not let us freeso easily though.

He insinuates to us that we are not just who we say we are, but rather are comprised of many clashing and obscuring parts. As Bloom claims, Shakespeare’s characters grow due to the fact that they can hear themselvestalk, either to themselves or to other characters, and are in this way ready tore-examine themselves. By supplying his characters with elaborate inner worlds, Shakespeare treats us, 400 years ahead of Freud, to expert presentations ofwhat to the academic ear sounds especially like self-revelation.

There isn’t justone single Hamlet yet numerous. Subsequent to learning of his Father’s suddendeath, he finds (in Soliloquies) that he can’t stand to stay as he is at thatmoment in time. He is so torn by his internal struggles of conscience that heconsiders, in maybe the most well-known discourse in all writing, theadvantages and disadvantages of suicide (“ To Be or not To Be: THAT is theQuestion.”).

Shakespeare indicates to usthrough Hamlet and numerous other characters not just the sine qua non of humangrowth — that with a specific end goal to change ourselves we should firstdiscover our true selves — yet also what that improvement sounds like, resembles, and feels like. He demonstrates to us that it is the moment whenHamlet is so close to falling into despair and spiralling out of control thathe finally finds himself. In similar ways, the young Prince Hal, in Henry IV, Part 2, on getting the Throne, neglects his then friends (“ Presume not that I am the thing I was”) and starts hisIncredible change from degenerate ruler to King Henry V, Hero of Agincourt.

\*                                              \*                                              \*                                                In order to explorethe theme of Consciousness in Shakespearean characters, one must first delveinto the idea of what Consciousness is. Kant speaks of his Theory of Mind andConsciousness with regards to the concept of Apperception: “ The most central and specifically Kantianconcept of consciousness is that of apperception. It is argued that’apperception’ is not to be understood as self-consciousness or self-awareness. Rather, apperception is a capacity to be aware of one’s spontaneous activities, and it can be further analysed as the ability to respond to rules and norms.” 1 Therefore, ‘ apperception’ assumes afocal part in Kant’s hypothetical reasoning as well as in his hypothesis.’Inward sense’ is another focal idea for Kant. In the primary studies and laterworks, Kant distinguishes the differences between apperception and inwardsense: inward sense is the awareness of what happens inside the brain insteadof apperception, which is the awareness of one’s exercises.

These two ideas ofawareness, ‘ inward sense’ and ‘ apperception’, produce two altogether differentquestions concerning the connection between cognizance and nature. From oneviewpoint, there is the subject of how inward or mental nature is identifiedwith physical nature; then again, there is the topic of how suddenness isidentified with the entire of nature, internal nature and in addition external. So how does this apply itself to works such as Hamlet?                                                Hamlet is riddledwith inward and outward conflicts, which ultimately forges his path to his end. The internal clash experienced in Hamletlies in the mental disgruntlement of the play’s main character, Hamlet himself. At an inside level, Hamlet is by all accounts postponing his vengeance since heis ‘ divided’ by his mother’s treachery of his deceased father and her marriageto Claudius, which is a constant distraction to him. This inward distraction isinconsistent with the apparition’s request for retaliation. Tabassum Javed in” Perfect Idealism in Shakespeare’sPrince Hamlet” attributes Hamlet’s internal struggles to a conflictbetween his own despondency and the ghost’s insistence for retribution. Javedstates, “ He can save himself andDenmark by killing Claudius, but to kill Claudius is to act out his father’swish and the disaster for Hamlet is that this course of action perfectlycoincides with the solution of his own problem.

Hamlet is torn between twocourses of action, both equally painful” 2 (327).                                                 To this reality, Hamlet’sinward distraction lies mainly with the connection between his mother anduncle. The principal line he expresses is, “ a little more kin and less than kind” (Shakespeare I. 2. 65). Hamletbattles with the idea that his mother Gertrude could double-cross his father. The double-crossing of his father weighs heavily on Hamlet’s mind since hedoesn’t know how to manage his subdued emotions about his mother and his ownparticular oedipal bitterness towards his father. Likewise, the mental stun oflosing his father is expanded by an apparent disloyalty to the sacredness ofmarriage and family ties.

Kawsar Uddin condenses Freudian investigations of Hamlet’sparental relationship expressing, “ Hamletin his unconscious had an incestuous desire for his mother and had a murderousdesire towards his father” (695). In the conversation that takes place inAct 1 Scene 2, where his mother, Gertrude, questions Hamlet’s despondency hispsychological state and inner conflict become very obvious and apparent; “ If it be, Whyseems it so particular with thee? ..

. Seems, madam? Nay, it is. I know not’seems’ … Together with all forms, moods, shapes of grief, … That can denote metruly… These indeed ‘ seem,’… For they are actions that a man might play… But Ihave that within which passeth show, These but the trappings and the suits ofwoe” (line 74– 85).

Hamlet communicates hisactual mental anguish to his mother and is by all accounts shocked at herindifference and lack of dejection for her deceased husband. Hamlet’s issueswith his mother turn into an internal whirlwind that pushes the story forward. Sandra Young discusses the idea of Hamlet suffering from a severe form of theOedipus Complex in her essay “ RecognisingHamlet.” Young contends, “” Oedipusoffers an explanation for this vigorous Hamlet’s indecision in the matter ofavenging his father’s death?—? he can’t kill the usurping Claudius because heunconsciously identifies with him3″(14). The possibility that Hamlet immediately detests his uncle for killing hisdad yet in the meantime is envious in an oedipal framework strikes at the heartof the internal anguish that Hamlet is experiencing from the absolute startingpoint of the play. After an encounter with his uncle and mom he states, “ Fie on ‘ t, ah fie! … Things rank and grossin nature possess it merely…  So lovingto my motherisit her face too roughly!” (Act I, Scene 2, Lines 135– 141).

He attests that thegarden (his family) isn’t being kept and growing rampant and wild. He doesn’texpress his discontent towards his mom however holds it inside enabling it torot and push aside all forms of logic from his mind. The topic of birth-rightto Hamlet isn’t just about taking his father’s place, but also the overthrow ofhis father’s powerful position on the throne with respect to his mother. It isthis internal battle characterised by Hamlet’s delay of his father’sretaliation that enlightens the gathering of people into his inward battle. Javed clarifies, “ Hamlet could be a manof decisive action, capable of anything?—? except the avenging of acts, hisconscience intuited, that were in keeping with his own repressed desires” (330)4.                                                This inward hesitancybetween his deep-seeded hatred for his uncle who killed his father yet at thesame time profound respect for doing what he may have wanted himself isindicated at in the content as he doubts the apparition of his father. At thepoint when the king’s ghost uncovers the killer, Hamlet asks, “ O my prophetic soul! Mine uncle?” (ActI, Scene 5, line 41).

Hamlet all of a sudden wavers to believe?—? and lateract?—? when a couple of minutes before he was excitedly expressing how eager hewas to exact his revenge in the name of the late king of Denmark. (Act I, Scene5, line 29– 31). The give and take occurring inside Hamlet’s mind is quitesubstantial.

His uncle and mother’s depraved relationship is despicable to him, as we have talked about beforehand and, yet, with regards to his uncle and exactinghis vengeance on him, Hamlet can’t force himself to act, even leading him tomuse over the idea of suicide in his epic soliloquy; “ To be or Not To be, thatis the Question…” (Act 3, Scene I, Line 57-92). The mental clash moves thepowers of Hamlet and this play along and gives a vehicle to the plot to come tofruition internally and also, as we will see, outwardly.                                                  Hamlet has theessential components to build up the anguish inside yet additionallydemonstrates that Shakespeare understands the many-sided quality of legitimateframeworks and the give and take of political power and position. At the coreof the play the external clash circles around the topic of the crown and succession. Michael Taylor in “ The Conflict in Hamlet” outlines this theory in anutshell; “ The essential conflict in Hamlet, I believe, is that betweenman as a victim of fate and as controller of his own destiny” (150)5. The topic of destiny identifieswith Hamlet in connection to the Political Position of King.

Driven by theghost’s thirst for revenge (as well as his own) Hamlet actually contemplatesescape along with Claudius’ banishment to England.                                                             In thisplay Shakespeare beautifully harmonises and balances internal and externalclash into his play. The major internal clash is set apart by Hamlet’s subduedwants and his refusal to trust his father’s apparition and later to rapidlyretaliate for him.

Hamlet, suffering from an almost debilitating oedipalcomplex, immediately is hollowed against a curbed want for his mother and envyof his uncle. He, who is engrossed continually by?—? what he describes?—? as theforbidden idea of his mother’s association with his uncle, harbours wants thathe can’t put into words and that at last lead him to delay his act ofvengeance. In the meantime, the inward associates with the external and thefight for the crown of Denmark turns into the concentration of the outwardclash. Dedication to the crown and the implications of who fairly merits thecrown can be felt when King Claudius tells Valtemand, “ Farewell, and letyour haste commend your duty” (Act I, Scene 2, Line 39). The politicalplay for the crown provides a perfect backdrop for the play, with the outwardclash the moves the plot along. In this way, Shakespeare makes a show utilizingboth internal and outward clash to connect with audiences that span thecenturies. 1  SaraHeina? maa and Martina Reuter, PsychologyAnd Philosophy (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2009).
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