Hey there bennett, sorry my phones dead so i haven’t messaged you but i realised my hamlet essay was 1300 words so im going to try and cut it down and fix up the changes the other teacher said to make too, then was wondering if you could read over it for me?

Is this it?
Yea
Actually check ur emails pls i sent u the essay, this is the older version

Shakespeare portrays the noble protagonist (Hamlet) tormented by shifting epistemological frameworks, as his Medieval and New Renaissance paradigms offer conflicting revenge trajectories. Medieval notions therein emphasise instantaneous action to restore conservative hierarchies, in this case the Great Chain of Being. This perspective is underpinned by Old Testament theology, specifically Lex Talionis, which advocated equal punishment for crimes (in this case murder for murder). However, the purpose of this doctrine was actually to protect society against a culture of vendetta, limiting retribution to proportionate equitability. Hamlet’s script for “The Murder of Gonzago” reads, “Full thirty times hath Phoebus’ cart gone round … and Tellus’ orbed ground … moons with borrowed sheen…. Twelve thirties been” (Act 3.2.145). The formal and laboured conceits as well as archaic diction inscribed by a monotonous rhythm of rhyming couplets, amplify medieval notions of a revenge hero. By contrast, Hamlet’s language appears vibrant and modern in, “What would he do, Had he… cue for passion, That I have? He would drown the stage with tears” (Act 2.2.520) propelling the character and his nuanced thought, beyond this time. Hamlet compares his actions to the traditional ‘revenge hero’ alluded to through the hyperbole “drown the stage with tears”, explicating that his nuanced renaissance character, comprising moral contemplation and emotion, provokes him to feel unsuccessful and uncomfortable with his duty, delaying its fulfillment. Hamlet deliberating and deciphering the right course of action to avenge his father amplifies his emergence as a new renaissance “revenge hero”, who challenges philosophy in situations to ensure its effectiveness and understands that theory does not neatly transfer into reality and that there are moral implications of one’s actions both on earth and in the spiritual dimension. Hence, Hamlet’s psychological fragmentation is caused by existential struggle and inability to synthesise renaissance ideology with medieval action, to produce an autonomous solution to his duty as “filial avenger”. Renaissance pragmatism comprising morality and religious consequence forbid Hamlet from ‘medieval’ revenge, while his soliloquy via the lines “to be or not to be” (Act 3.1.54) elucidates a manifestation of psychological stagnation which, along with his filial duty, has evoked frustration and uncertainty in his mind, as he even questions whether he still wishes to live. Shakespeare affords the responder the learning that one’s failure to adhere to and subordinate the influence of varying epistemologies, destroy their peace of mind, fostering psychological fragmentation as their mind oscillates between paradigms, and this oscillation causes more confusion and dangerous uncertainty.

Shakespeare portrays the form of insanity faced by a noble protagonist (Hamlet) when ulterior contextual influences, more specifically, shifting epistemological frameworks, derived from medieval and renaissance paradigms, offer conflicting courses of action on revenge. Medieval notions of revenge emphasise instantaneous action to restore systems like the Great Britain Chain of Being, and are based on the old testament theology, Lex Talionis, to protect society against a vendetta culture by limiting the scope of revenge. Hamlet’s script for “The Murder of Gonzago” reads, “Full thirty times hath Phoebus’ cart gone round … and Tellus’ orbed ground … moons with borrowed sheen…. Twelve thirties been” (Act 3.2.145).
The formal and laboured conceits as well as archaic diction inscribed by a monotonous rhythm of rhyming couplets, amplify medieval notions of a revenge hero. By contrast, Hamlet’s language appears vibrant and modern in, “What would he do, Had he… cue for passion, That I have? He would drown the stage with tears” (Act 2.2.520) propelling the character and his nuanced thought, beyond this time. Hamlet compares his actions to the traditional ‘revenge hero’ alluded to through the hyperbole “drown the stage with tears”, explicating that his nuanced renaissance character, comprising moral contemplation and emotion, provokes him to feel unsuccessful and uncomfortable with his duty, delaying its fulfillment. Hamlet deliberating and deciphering the right course of action to avenge his father amplifies his emergence as a new renaissance “revenge hero”, who challenges philosophy in situations to ensure its effectiveness and understands that theory does not neatly transfer into reality and that there are moral implications of one’s actions both on earth and in the spiritual dimension. Hence, Hamlet’s psychological fragmentation is caused by existential struggle and inability to synthesise renaissance ideology with medieval action, to produce an autonomous solution to his duty as “filial avenger”. Renaissance pragmatism comprising morality and religious consequence forbid Hamlet from ‘medieval’ revenge, while his soliloquy via the lines “to be or not to be” (Act 3.1.54) elucidates a manifestation of psychological stagnation which, along with his filial duty, has evoked frustration and uncertainty in his mind, as he even questions whether he still wishes to live. Shakespeare affords the responder the learning that one’s failure to adhere to and subordinate the influence of varying epistemologies, destroy their peace of mind, fostering psychological fragmentation as their mind oscillates between paradigms, and this oscillation causes more confusion and dangerous uncertainty.

Shakespeare promulgates a form of insanity within ‘Hamlet’ derived from societal and religious influences that confuse one’s morality and intellect, cultivating cognitive dissonance. Claudius is motivated by an old testament conception of guilt, a “primal eldest curse upon [him]” (Act 3.2.37) that stokes paranoia and irrationality, due to a fear of ‘karmic retribution’ of sorts. An aside “How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!” (Act 3.2.51) is dramatically utilised by Shakespeare providing direct insight into the guilt paranoia Claudius experiences, for his sin of regicide. The comparison of Claudius to a harlot being whipped through the street, metaphorically amplifies the paranoia associated with fear of his deserved punishment. This paranoia manifests Claudius’ irrationality via failing to comprehend the purpose of Hamlet’s antic disposition, within “Something have you heard of Hamlet’s transformation… to gather so much you may glean whether aught to us unknown afflicts him” (Act 2.2). The euphemism “transformation” utilised by Shakespeare is an attempt for Claudius to morally justify his suspicious request for commanding Hamlet to be spied upon, concealing his megalomaniac motive. However, this fails in effect because when Hamlet awakens to this scheme, it only narrows Hamlet’s suspicion of Claudius’ foul play. Claudius’ overreaction to the ‘Mouse Trap’ via “Give me some light. Away!” (Act3.2.54), heightens his irrationality as he too cannot subordinate Medieval and Renaissance epistemologies, mentally collapsing under Medieval superstition, affirming Hamlet’s Renaissance hypothesis. Claudius’ rhetorical questioning of Laertes, “was your father dear to you? Or are you like a painting of a sorrow…?” (Act4.7.105) provokes Laertes into emotional and honour-derived action which is a last and foolish resort to extreme violence, that has been brought upon by the manifestation of paranoia, portrayed through Claudius’ irrationality. Delusion and fear exacerbate religious paradigm and epistemologies fostering contemplation, cultivating more
paranoia. Claudius is incapable of thinking rationally for his own best interest, creating a dangerous and ultimately murderous atmosphere; a descending spiral of violence begetting violence. Hence, Shakespeare has effectively portrayed the timelessness of insanity through its close relation to ulterior influences that target one's moral compass and peace of mind, multiplying evil rather than diminishing it.

Shakespeare elucidates insanity as a mentally ill state, through the portrayal of Ophelia, as a persona dominated by paternal systems and contextual epistemologies. Ophelia’s lack of autonomy and character construction whose foundations are based on paternal desires, highlights the importance of true individualism to distinguish a rational, self-controlled mind. Polonius’ infantilising treatment of Ophelia is explicated via “You do not understand yourself so clearly… I will teach you” (Act 1.3.105), and the imperative euphemism “Think yourself a baby” (Act 1.3.105). Seen as an asset to Polonius, Ophelia is restricted from any autonomy, elucidating her full submission to the medieval, Great Chain of Being. Gender pressure and sexual manipulation are instilled by Hamlet towards Ophelia causing her psychological state to weaken when their relationship disintegrates. In the midst of Hamlet’s psychological mind games he dismisses her with the paradox “the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness… I did love you once” (Act3.1.10). Devaluing Ophelia in this manner, merely and objectively regarding her beauty as her sole purpose, removes her from subservience and honesty, and further destabilises her mental framework. Ophelia’s madness is conveyed dramatically, through a song by Shakespeare, emphasising the multitude of insanity’s expression and impact, such as through acting in an unusual matter, via singing in company. Symbolism is “bewept to the grave did not go, With true-love showers” (Act 4.5.30) with its predominant death and burial motif, indicates Ophelia’s preoccupation with Polonius’ death and over-hasty interment, explicating that when another pillar controlling Ophelia’s autonomy collapses, she too collapses, while being affected by the ulterior influence of death. Ophelia is in a position of female propriety she cannot fulfil due to her lack of individualism and her inability to decipher social influences and systems, causing her to passively succumb to insanity. She is the “helper”, as the meaning of her name suggests, condemned to martyrdom on the altar of fantasies and priorities. Shakespeare executes this portrayal to emphasise the impact of an externally defined psychic identity, social constructed and circumscribed by outside influences, reinstating the importance of existential struggle which is still prevalent today.

In essence, Shakespeare’s ability to transcend time through his oeuvre Hamlet is typified through the timeless learnings regarding existentialism in relation to insanity, afforded to Elizabethan and contemporary audiences. Shakespeare intricately reflects contextual, social and personal discourses to an Elizabethan audience to impart knowledge of the importance of ulterior influences that may engender one’s spiral into insanity. In contemporary society, we are made to question and challenge our ethical, moral and philosophical perceptions, based on knowledge imparted by Hamlet about the complexity of living in Elizabethan times as well as to explore existential struggles, to thus hopefully prevent this aforementioned ‘dystopia’.

New version:
Shakespeare’s portrayal of insanity is defined as extreme foolishness, irrationality or a mentally ill state. Ulterior influences cause psychological stagnation when individuals are unable to cope with unfamiliar circumstances derived from conflicting social and religious paradigms. In ‘Hamlet’ (1602) medieval and renaissance epistemologies clash, infecting characters with doubt, paranoia and stasia. The inability to synthesise opposing ideologies remain highly relevant, positioning the responder to perceive Shakespeare as a man of and beyond his time (textual integrity).

Cognitive dissonance and psychological stagnation abound when individuals unsuccessfully seek to incorporate conflicting social and religious paradigms. In William Shakespeare’s Hamlet (1602) Medieval and New Renaissance epistemologies clash, infecting characters with doubt, paranoia and stasia. The inability to synthesise opposing ideologies remains contemporaneously relevant, creating a perennially germane opus.

Shakespeare portrays the form of insanity faced by a noble protagonist (Hamlet) when ulterior contextual influences, more specifically, shifting epistemological frameworks, derived from medieval and renaissance paradigms, offer conflicting courses of action on revenge. Medieval notions of revenge emphasise instantaneous action to restore systems like the Great Britain Chain of Being, and are based on the old testament philosophy, Lex Talionis, to protect society against a vendetta culture by limiting the scope of revenge. Hamlet’s script for “The Murder of Gonzago” reads, “Full thirty times hath Phoebus’ cart gone round … and Tellus’ orbed ground … moons with borrowed sheen…. Twelve thirties been” (Act 3.2.145). The formal and laboured conceits as well as archaic diction inscribed by a monotonous rhythm of rhyming couplets, amplify medieval notions of a revenge hero. By contrast, Hamlet’s language appears vibrant and modern in, “What would he do, Had he… cue for passion, That I have? He would drown the stage with tears” (Act 2.2.520) propelling the character beyond this time. Hamlet compares his actions to the traditional ‘revenge hero’ alluded to through the hyperbole “drown the stage with tears”, explicating that his nuanced renaissance character, comprising moral contemplation and emotion, provokes him to feel unsuccessful and uncomfortable with his duty, delaying its fulfillment. Hamlet deliberating and deciphering the right course of action to avenge his father amplifies his emergence as a new renaissance “revenge hero”, who challenges philosophy in situations to ensure its effectiveness and understands that theory does not neatly transfer into reality and that there are moral implications of one’s actions both on earth and in the spiritual dimension. Hence, Hamlet’s psychological fragmentation is caused by existential struggle and inability to synthesise renaissance ideology with medieval action, to produce an autonomous solution to his duty as “filial avenger”. Renaissance pragmatism comprising morality and religious consequence forbid Hamlet from ‘medieval’ revenge, while his soliloquy via the lines “to be or not to be” (Act 3.1.54) elucidates a manifestation of psychological stagnation which, along with his filial duty, has evoked frustration and uncertainty in his mind, as he even questions whether he still wishes to live. Shakespeare affords the responder the learning that one’s failure to adhere to and subordinate the influence of varying epistemologies, destroy their peace of mind, fostering psychological fragmentation as their mind oscillates between paradigms, and this oscillation causes more confusion and dangerous uncertainty.

Shakespeare promulgates a form of insanity within ‘Hamlet’ derived from societal and religious influences that confuse one’s morality and intellect, cultivating cognitive
dissonance. Claudius is motivated by an old testament conception of guilt, a “primal eldest curse upon [him]” (Act 3.2.37) that stokes paranoia and irrationality, due to a fear of ‘karmic retribution’ of sorts. An aside “How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!” (Act 3.2.51) is dramatically utilised by Shakespeare providing direct insight into the guilt paranoia Claudius experiences, for his sin of regicide. The comparison of Claudius to a harlot being whipped through the street, metaphorically amplifies the paranoia associated with fear of his deserved punishment. This paranoia manifests Claudius’ irrationality via failing to comprehend the purpose of Hamlet’s antic disposition, within “Something have you heard of Hamlet’s antic disposition, within “Something have you heard of Hamlet’s transformation… to gather so much you may glean whether aught to us unknown afflicts him” (Act 2.2). The euphemism “transformation” utilised by Shakespeare is an attempt for Claudius to morally justify his suspicious request for commanding Hamlet to be spied upon, concealing his megalomaniac motive. However, this fails because when Hamlet awakens to this scheme, it only narrows Hamlet’s suspicion of Claudius’ foul play. Claudius’ overreaction to the ‘Mouse Trap’ via “Give me some light. Away!” (Act3.2.54), heightens his irrationality as he too cannot subordinate Medieval and Renaissance epistemologies, mentally collapsing under Medieval superstition, affirming Hamlet’s Renaissance hypothesis. Claudius’ rhetorical questioning of Laertes, “was your father dear to you? Or are you like a painting of a sorrow…?” (Act4.7.105) provokes Laertes into emotional and honour-derived action which is a last and foolish resort to extreme violence, that has been brought upon by the manifestation of paranoia, portrayed through Claudius’ irrationality. Delusion and fear exacerbate religious paradigm and epistemologies fostering contemplation, cultivating more paranoia. Claudius is incapable of thinking rationally for his own best interest, creating a dangerous and ultimately murderous atmosphere; a descending spiral of violence begetting violence. Hence, Shakespeare has effectively portrayed the timelessness of insanity through its close relation to ulterior influences that target one’s moral compass and peace of mind, multiplying evil rather than diminishing it.

Shakespeare elucidates insanity as a mentally ill state, through the portrayal of Ophelia, as a persona dominated by paternal systems and contextual epistemologies. Ophelia’s lack of autonomy and character construction whose foundations are based on paternal desires, highlights the importance of true individualism to distinguish a rational, self-controlled mind. Polonius’ infantilising treatment of Ophelia is explicated via the repetition of imperative euphemisms “You do not understand yourself so clearly… I will teach you… think yourself a baby” (Act 1.3.105). Seen as an asset to Polonius, Ophelia is restricted from any autonomy, elucidating her full submission to the medieval, Great Chain of Being. Gender pressure and sexual manipulation are instilled by Hamlet towards Ophelia causing her psychological state to weaken when their relationship disintegrates. In the midst of Hamlet’s psychological mind games he dismisses her with the paradox “the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what is is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness… I did love you once”(Act3.1.10). Devaluing Ophelia in this manner, merely and objectively regarding her beauty as her sole purpose, removes her from subservience and honesty, and further destabilises her mental framework. Ophelia’s madness is conveyed dramatically, through a song by Shakespeare, emphasising the multitude of insanity’s expression and impact, such as through acting in an unusual matter, via singing in company. Symbolism in “bewept to the grave did not go, With true love showers” (Act 4.5.30) with its predominant death and burial motif, indicates Ophelia’s preoccupation with Polonius’ death and over-hasty interment, explicating that when another pillar controlling Ophelia’s autonomy
collapses, she too collapses, while being affected by the ulterior influence of death. Ophelia is in a position of female propriety she cannot fulfil due to her lack of individualism and her inability to decipher social influences and systems, causing her to passively succumb to insanity. She is the “helper”, as the meaning of her name suggests, condemned to martyrdom on the altar of male priorities. Shakespeare executes this portrayal to emphasise the impact of an externally defined psychic identity, social constructed and circumscribed by outside influences, reinstating the importance of internal psychological existential struggle which is still prevalent today.

In essence, Shakespeare’s ability to transcend time through his oeuvre Hamlet is typified through the timeless learnings regarding existentialism in relation to insanity, afforded to Elizabethan and contemporary audiences. Shakespeare intricately reflects contextual, social and personal discourses to an Elizabethan audience to impart knowledge of the importance of ulterior influences that may engender one’s spiral into insanity. In contemporary society, we are made to question and challenge our ethical, moral and philosophical perceptions, based on knowledge imparted by Hamlet about the complexity of living in Elizabethan times as well as to explore existential struggles, to thus hopefully prevent this aforementioned ‘dystopia’. My shorter version: (938 words)

Cognitive dissonance and psychological stagnation abound when individuals unsuccessfully seek to incorporate conflicting social and religious paradigms. In William Shakespeare’s Hamlet (1602) Medieval and New Renaissance epistemologies clash, infecting characters with doubt, paranoia and stasia. The inability to synthesise opposing ideologies remains contemporaneously relevant, creating a perennially germane opus.

Shakespeare portrays the form of insanity faced by a noble protagonist (Hamlet) when ulterior contextual influences, more specifically, shifting epistemological frameworks, derived from medieval and renaissance paradigms, offer conflicting courses of action on revenge.
Shakespeare portrays the noble protagonist (Hamlet) tormented by shifting epistemological frameworks, as his Medieval and New Renaissance paradigms offer conflicting revenge trajectories. Medieval notions therein emphasise instantaneous action to restore conservative hierarchies, in this case the Great Chain of Being. This perspective is underpinned by Old Testament theology, specifically Lex Talionis, which advocated equal punishment for crimes (in this case murder for murder). Hamlet was, however, that the purpose of this doctrine was actually to protect society against a culture of vendetta, limiting retribution to proportionate equitability. Shakespeare illustrates his disdain for these primitive understandings using the formal and laboured conceits, the archaic diction and monstrous rhythm of the rhyming couplets in his script for “The Murder of Gonzago, which reads, “Full thirty times hath Phoebus’ cart gone round … and Tellus’ orbed ground … moons with borrowed sheen…. Twelve thirties been” (Act 3.2.145) amplifying the Medieval notions of the revenge hero. By contrast, Hamlet’s own language in this scene appears vibrant and modern in, “What would he do, Had he… cue for passion, That I have? He would drown the stage with tears” (Act 2.2.520) propelling the character, and his Renaissance thought, beyond this time.

The traditional ‘revenge hero’ is alluded to in the hyperbole “drown the stage with tears”, explicating his nuanced Renaissance moral contemplation and emotion which provokes his discomfort with his perceived duty, delaying its fulfilment. The process of deciphering how to avenge his father amplifies his emergence as a New Renaissance ‘revenge hero’, challenging outdated philosophies and understanding the difficulties in matching theory to reality, with uncertain moral implications both on Earth and the afterlife. His Act three soliloquy elucidates a manifestation of psychological stagnation which, along with his filial duty, evokes frustration and uncertainty as he questions his will to live. Shakespeare affords the responder the learning that failure to adhere to and subordinate the influence of varying epistemologies destroy equanimity and foster cognitive dissonance during psychic oscillation between conflicting paradigms.

Medieval conceptions of Old Testament guilt conflict with Claudius’ egotistic desires inspired by Renaissance agency, with the “primal eldest curse” (Act 3.2.37) stoking Claudius’ spiralling paranoia. The aside “How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!” (Act 3.2.51) is dramatically utilised by Shakespeare to provide direct insight into Claudius’ response to his act of regicide. Being compared to a harlot whipped through the street metaphorically amplifies the association of guilt and deserved paranoia imparted from medieval religious paradigm. Furthermore, his mental deterioration leaves him incapable of comprehending “Hamlet’s transformation” begging others “glean whether aught to us unknown afflicts him” (Act 2.2). With the euphemism “transformation”, Claudius endeavours to justify his suspicious demands, dramatically concealing his megalomania. The consequence however only heightens Hamlet’s inference as to Claudius’ role in the regicide. His overreaction to the “Mouse Trap” via “Give me some light. Away!” (Act 3.2.54) expedites his mental collapse under Medieval superstition, affirming Hamlet’s Renaissance hypothesis. Claudius’ rhetorical questioning of Laertes, “was your father dear to you? Or are you like a painting of a sorrow…?” (Act4.7.105) provokes an emotional, honour-derived response of extreme violence catalysed by overweening paranoia. Incapable of thinking in his own best interest, Claudius creates a dangerous and ultimately murderous atmosphere, a descending spiral of violence begetting violence, multiplying evil rather than diminishing it.
Ophelia is psychically subjugated by paternalist contextual epistemologies. Her lack of personal autonomy, reliant upon masculine validation, emphasises the importance of true individualism to distinguish a rational, self-controlled mind. Polonius’ infantilisation is explicated through the imperative repetition, “You do not understand yourself so clearly… I will teach you… think yourself a baby” (Act 1.3.105). Polonius’ pawn, Ophelia submits to Medieval gender pressure and sexual manipulation, instilled by the Great Chain of Being and furthered by Hamlet’s cruelty as their relationship disintegrates. Dismissed by the paradox “the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what is is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness… I did love you once” (Act3.1.10), Ophelia objectification is consummated. Her cognitive annihilation is henceforth conveyed dramatically through lyrics embedded with symbolism “bewept to the grave did not go, With true-love showers” (Act 4.5.30). The predominant death and burial motif both remembers and foreshadows the forthcoming violence. Derived from the Greek ophelos, meaning helper, her female propriety engenders inherent servitude to male protagonists, condemned to martyrdom on the altar of masculine imposition. Underpinning modern feminist theory, the importance of the existential struggle for individual identity remains a salient contemporary conception.

As Medieval superstition is displaced by New Renaissance science, ideological frameworks grounded in religion and custom are subverted. The psychological consequences of these juxtapositions are manifold, and manifested in the characterisation of Hamlet, Claudius and Ophelia. As cyphers for cognitive deterioration, their world becomes a “rotten” paragon: a tragic death spiral of a people and a nation. Responders must interrogate and confront our own moral and philosophical conceptions, reliant on Elizabethan context but also contemporary existential labour, perceiving the threat of fatalistic psychosis as a symptom of doctrinal metamorphosis.