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**Abstract**  
*Hamlet* is the most famous work in English literature. In which, Shakespeare’s brilliance takes the reader to another level of analyzing literary texts. The themes Shakespeare deals with in *Hamlet* are not new, but it is the first literary work that tries to explore the nature of death. Through Hamlet’s character, Shakespeare mentions different views of death. *Hamlet* is a tragic play that is full of bloodsheds, not only because it tries to define the nature of death, but also there is already the death of social values in Hamlet’s society. This study aims at analyzing the concept of death for Hamlet taking into consideration the different views and doubts about death. It also analyzes the metaphorical death of social and moral values in Elsinore society. These physical and figurative deaths lead to make *Hamlet* one of the most tragic works in human history. What the reader concludes at the end of this study is that death is something abstracting, and it is inevitable for everyone. However, only one character survives the bloodbath at the end of the play because of his moral attitude.
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دراسة في الموت الجسدي والتصويري في هاملت

أ.د. أوز أوكتم
جامعة آيدن إسطنبول
معهد الدراسات العليا، قسم اللغة والأدب الإنجليزي

الخلاصة: مسرحية هاملت هي العمل الأكثر شهرة في الأدب الإنجليزي. وفيها يأخذ تألق شكسبير القارئ إلى مستوى آخر من تحليل النصوص الأدبية، الموضوعات التي يتناولها شكسبير في هاملت ليست جديدة، لكنها أول عمل أديبي يحاول استكشاف طبيعة الموت. من خلال شخصية هاملت، يذكر شكسبير وجهات نظر مختلفة عن الموت. هاملت هي مسرحية مأساوية مليئة بإرقة الدماء، ليس فقط لأنها تحاول تحديد طبيعة الموت، ولكن هناك أيضًا موت للقيم الاجتماعية في مجتمع هاملت.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل مفهوم الموت عند هاملت مع الأخذ بعين الاعتبار الآراء والشكوك المختلفة حول الموت. كما يتم تحليل الموت المجازى للقيم الاجتماعية والأخلاقية في مجتمع السينور. أدت هذه الوفيات الجسدية والمجازية إلى جعل هاملت واحدة من أكثر الأعمال المأساوية في تاريخ البشرية. ما يستنتجه القارئ في نهاية هذه الدراسة أن الموت شيء ذو طبيعة تجريدية وحتمية للجميع. ومع ذلك، نجت شخصية واحدة فقط من حمام الدم في نهاية المسرحية بسبب موقفها الأخلاقي.
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Thesis Statement

As in life, death in Hamlet is what dominates the entire drama. Without death, can there be life? If Claudius does not kill King Hamlet, there is no play. Also, death is shown as a chain that surrounds and controls everything around. It is attached to Hamlet’s obsession of truth or it itself is the obsession that everyone wonders about since it seems as a one-way journey from which no traveler returns. However, before the death of most of the characters there is already death of some values in the society that make Hamlet the most tragic play in English literature not only in the sense of ‘many dead people, but also in the sense of morality.

Research Question

What do the many deaths of most of the characters and the figurative death of values in a society add to Hamlet?

Main Objective

This essay aims at analyzing and studying death in Hamlet closely with a reference to Shakespeare’s personal experiences with death and people’s concepts of death in Renaissance England. However, the essay also takes a close look at the figurative death in Hamlet.

Introduction

Death’ is a noun, but it hides a language in its ethnicity. It is the language that fate uses to address people at their ends. Sometimes, this language is not understandable, but it is always strong and undoubtable. People may doubt God and religion, but they cannot doubt death. It is certain as long as man exists. However, the relation between life and death is like the relation between happiness and sadness or good and evil. One cannot exist without the other; or they get their meanings through the existence of the opposite. Life gets its meaning or its importance by death; death tends to marry human soul, but it takes life as a mistress. In life, man is a tourist who at the end of the journey returns to his/her home country which is death.

Since the beginning of mankind, people had different concepts about death. In Renaissance England, the lack of knowledge in regard to various diseases resulted in constant increase of mortality rates. Thus, death was regarded as a leveller that eliminated social inequality, that is, both the poor and rich could die of an incurable illness or be murdered (Duddley 1999: 277-281). Executions and mutilations were usually conducted in public and were rather popular among certain groups of British population. As Michael Neill puts it, death and other funerary issues constitute a crucial part of any Elizabethan drama that is aimed at transforming individual death into a common recollection (Neill 1997: 12-17). During the Elizabethan age various funeral images and buildings were created in Britain, so that people could constantly think of their mortality (Gittins 1984:140). Death became an integral part of British existence; as Nigel Llewellyn claims, images reminding people about their own mortality were to be found in all kinds of public and private situations. In early Modern England, Death
always accompanied the individual on the streets or at home among the family (Llewellyn 1991: 25). Thus, Renaissance literature reflects this aesthetics of death, as Neill claims (Neill 1997: 356). In this regard, William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is the best presenter of death (ukessays.com).

However, Shakespeare himself had some experiences with death. At the period Shakespeare was born, Stratford had been struck by plague, or as it was called “Black Death” in the summer of 1564 (Smejkal 2012: 9). He was very lucky to survive in his childhood. Fortunately, the plague did not attack his house and he actually could survive from a tragic death very early. Samuel Schoenbaum in *William Shakespeare: A Compact Documentary Life* writes: “In plague the bell tolled most often for the very young and enfeebled old. Richard Symons, the town clerk, buried two sons and a daughter; in Henley Street, where the Shakespeares lived, Roger Green lost four children” (Schoenbaum 1975: 26).

One can imagine what would happen if Shakespeare could not survive, the world would have no Shakespeare and there would be no *Hamlet*. As far as *Hamlet* is concerned, there would be no play without death, but the situation is different for Shakespeare, he could get his coat of arms after he got away from death. So, *Hamlet* exists through death while Shakespeare exists through avoiding it.

While the lucky Shakespeare could escape an early death, most of his characters were not able to do so. Most of them have tragic ends and leave in behind some big questions unanswered. In most of Shakespeare’s tragedies, the issue is not about the death of a protagonist, but it is more about what that death reflects on the reader’s mind by making him/her ask the same questions the tragic characters ask. At the same time, they reflect Shakespeare’s ideas of death. In that regard, Hamlet is the most known character in English literature. He gets his great fame through his ideas of death as well as the questions he asks, these questions tend to be immortal and they are as immortal as Hamlet is.

**A Study of Death in Hamlet**

*Hamlet* starts with death omen that is his father’s spirit telling him the truth about his father’s death and the tone of the whole play is given through this scene. However, Hamlet at first is uncertain about the true cause of his father’s death as well as he is lost by the uncertainty of death in general. For Hamlet, is death like sleep? If it is “for in that sleep of death what dreams may come.” (Act III, Scene I). Hamlet also has horrible facts about that type of sleep, for instance when he tells Claudius about where Polonius is after Hamlet kills him. Hamlet tells Claudius that Polonius is “not where he eats, but where he is eaten...” (Act IV, Scene III). This emphasizes the idea of decay and rotting that happen to dead bodies after they are eaten by worms. Also, in the scene of the graveyard, Hamlet is greatly affected by Yorick’s skull as it brings back his childhood memories signifying the loss of happiness for Hamlet’s recent situation. Hamlet is very close to Yorick as a child, despite that he forgets him after his death and he would not remember him if he does not see his skull. This makes Hamlet recognize the idea that he may be forgotten after he dies and that is a bad situation for a man like Hamlet. Through Yorick’s skull, Hamlet sees the
ultimate physical change between life and death; what is once the alive head of someone like a politician or singer, is now rotted and decayed to be an empty skull:

That skull had a tongue in it, and could sing once:
how the knave jowls it to the ground, as if it were
Cain’s jaw-bone, that did the first murder! It
might be the pate of a politician, which this ass
now o’er-reaches; one that would circumvent God,
might it not? (Act V, Scene I)

Yorick’s skull is once a head of someone who is alive. An animated person who can sing. As the abstracting nature of death, through decay that person in no more than an empty skull now. Hamlet is frightened by this truth. However, death is inevitable as the end of everyone, even those as powerful as Julius Caesar or Alexander the Great.

No, faith, not a jot; but to follow him thither with
modesty enough, and likelihood to lead it: as
thus: Alexander died, Alexander was buried,
Alexander returneth into dust; the dust is earth; of
earth we make loam; and why of that loam, whereto he
was converted, might they not stop a beer-barrel?
Imperious Caesar, dead and turn’d to clay,
Might stop a hole to keep the wind away:
O, that that earth, which kept the world in awe,
Should patch a wall to expel the winter flaw!
But soft! but soft! aside: here comes the king.

(Act V, Scene I)

Death here is just as Duddley explains: “Thus, death was regarded as a leveller that eliminated social inequality, that is, both the poor and rich could die of an incurable illness or be murdered” (Duddley 1999: 277-281). Death is not like people, it does not care about the social class of the dead, but its is the ultimate identity of human beings, whatever the power someone may have, human fate is to die at the end. This is a certain truth about death that no one is immortal even death itself may not be. In spite of these facts, Hamlet wonders if death is worse than his living especially when he has nothing to lose and this leads Hamlet to the questions; how to exist, can death be a way of existence, but then rises the question, can the death of someone else make him exist. In other words, I revenge therefore I exist.

Dealing with death from another perspective, Hamlet thinks of killing Claudius and that may help ease him as an answer to all his questions, but then Hamlet finds himself lost again, because he now is confused between death and revenge as something may make him exist. Both of the choices force Hamlet to kill whether himself or the villain Claudius, so there must be death to solve this big issue.
So, whom to kill Hamlet asks, if he commits suicide he may end his sea of troubles

... To die, to sleep—
No more--and by a sleep to say we end
The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks

That flesh is heir to. (Act III, Scene I)

Hamlet here flirts with death, but death looks like a lady who is difficult to reach. Dying is like a sleep for Hamlet. By that sleep, Hamlet may find an end to his grief. There is only one thing preventing Hamlet from committing suicide, as it is believed in his time, Hamlet as a Christian may cause himself eternal damnation by committing suicide. This idea makes Hamlet unable to act.

However, Hamlet is certain about the nature of death. Death as an “undiscover’d country” baffles Hamlet and makes him confused as well as that makes him behave cowardly saying; “conscience does make cowards of us all” (Act III, Scene I). He seems unable to venture for the sake of afterlife truth, because he is not brave enough to do so. Moreover, what makes it worse for Hamlet is the death of his beloved Ophelia. Also, Ophelia has a skeptical death. She dies drowning in a river. It is most likely that she commits suicide, though there is no evidence of doing so. Such a plot may refer to the mysterious nature of death. People do not fear what they know, but death is powerful because it is mysterious. This mystery dominates the whole play and it is never revealed even when the play ends. In Renaissance England death was perceived as a mysterious phenomenon that aroused debates among Elizabethan philosophers, priests and writers (Cressy 1997: 465-468). Such a technique shows Shakespeare’s creativity in dealing with universal issues that are still skeptical till the present time and always will be.

Death seems justice at the bloody path scene at the end of the play, Laertes is killed by the sword he has poisoned, if he fights fairly he would only have a wound, but death is here addressing everyone saying: you may not get what you want, but certainly you get what you deserve. Claudius whoever likes poison dies of it. Hamlet dies in his sake for revenge embodying the Chinese proverb “he who seeks vengeance must dig two graves: one for his enemy and the other for himself” (pinterest.co.kr, Chinese Proverbs Quotes).

The Figurative Death in Hamlet

According to Oxford dictionary, death is defined “as the action or fact of dying or being killed; the end of the life of a person or organism”. This is the literal meaning of death while death can mean something else metaphorically.

In his essay of Definitions of Death, Kastenbaum writes:

The secondary usages are mostly figurative. Death serves as a dramatic intensifier of meaning; for example, the historian's judgment that the rise of commerce contributed to the death of feudalism, or the poet's complaint that life has become death since being spurned by a lover. There are also extended uses that can be considered either literal or figurative. (Kastenbaum 2017)

In Hamlet, Shakespeare deals with death not only by its physical form but also by taking its figurative one making the reader find many ways to define death essentially.
When someone hears the word ‘death’, the first thing which comes to the mind is the end of someone, but in Hamlet it can be the end of someone or – something- that is mostly embodied in the death of values in a society. These values are: honesty, trust and morality.

Death of Honesty

Death of honesty is shown through Claudius’ character and Hamlet himself. For Claudius the brother of King Hamlet who is an honest warrior, Claudius seems as a manipulative character who prefers poison more than the sword to solve his issues. It is like that honesty in Hamlet is killed with King Hamlet and the play starts lacking it. Claudius never tells the truth of his brother’s murder, but he sometimes shows his guilt when he is alone “Than is my deed to my most painted word: O heavy burthen!” (Act III, Scene I)

However, Claudius’ seductive language easily convinces the royal court to accept his hasty marriage with Gertrude and delays Hamlet’s revenge as well.

He never tends to be honest. Instead, he weaves plots behind the curtains under the help of Polonius. “The masks of Polonius and Claudius to demonstrate that not only is there “something rotten in the state of Denmark”, but there is also something rotten in human nature” (Ding 2014: 2).

For Hamlet, Hamlet’s deception is shown through his pretending of madness “to put such an antic disposition on” (Act I, Scene V) Hamlet is sane when he is in Horatio’s company, but he does not seem sane for Claudius or Polonius at the same time. He deceives them and makes them wonder whether he is mad or not in order to achieve his plan of revenge. Even the reader is taken by this deception and asks one of the most controversial questions about Hamlet: is Hamlet mad or not?

Shakespeare’s masterfully written tragedy, Hamlet, is wrought with tragedy and themes of revenge, but it is equally notable for the deception and lies that the players have towards each other. Throughout the play, characters hatch plans and spy on each other, creating a high tension mood. Shakespeare does this in order to add dramatic tension, but also to convey the human truth that everyone lies. (Ding 2014: 2)

Death of Trust

Death of trust in Hamlet is embodied through most of the characters like Claudius, Polonius, Gertrude, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. The play starts with Claudius’ betrayal to his brother, so the reader feels the lack of trust from the very beginning of the play. After betraying his brother by killing him, Claudius betrays Gertrude twice.

First, in the sense that he weaves a plot to get rid of her loved son, then in the consequences he aims to pretend that Hamlet is killed by an unwitting accident.

“…If he be now return’d… Under the which he shall not choose but fall: And for his death no wind of blame shall breathe, But even his mother shall uncharged the practice, And call it accident.” (Act IV, Scene VII)
Second, despite the fact that his love to her seems genuine, Claudius betrays Gertrude when she drinks from the poisoned cup, he does not tell her not to drink. Moreover, he just continues acting normally. Claudius’ many betrayals are the ultimate signs of mistrust in Hamlet.

However, death of trust is also felt through Polonius’ relation with his son Laertes. For Laertes, he is a noble knight who trusts his father, but Polonius breaks this trust when he sends a servant (Reynaldo) to spy on his son when he is in France.

**Polonius**

You shall do marvellous wisely, good Reynaldo,
Before You visit him, to make inquiry
Of his behaviour.

**Reynaldo**

My lord, I did intend it. (Act II, Scene I)

Gertrude’s deal with trust can be expressed in two ways, one in her look to Hamlet and the other in Hamlet’s look to her. Though she loves her son; Gertrude does not trust Hamlet while her trust to Claudius seems sincere. She does not trust Hamlet’s behavior and she thinks that he is mad “Alas, he’s mad!” (Act III, Scene IV) especially after the scene when the ghost visits Hamlet while he is in her chamber. She cannot see the ghost and thinks that Hamlet is mad because he talks to nobody.

**Gertrude**

To whom do you speak this?

**Hamlet**

Do you see nothing there?
Gertrude
Nothing at all; yet all that is I see.
Hamlet
Nor did you nothing hear?
Gertrude
No, nothing but ourselves. (Act III, Scene IV)

For Hamlet, He thinks that his mother betrays him by her hasty marriage to Claudius. Actually, this marriage is one of the most notable reasons of Hamlet’s “antic disposition”.

Moreover, this marriage seems incestuous to Hamlet.
O most wicked speed, to post
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets! (Act I, Scene II)

However, Hamlet also thinks that Gertrude by her marriage betrays and insults her old husband King Hamlet.

“Mother, you have my father much offended …
No, by the rood, not so
You are the queen, your husband’s wife …” (Act III, Scene IV)
It is impossible for both Hamlet and Gertrude to trust each other. The impression the two characters have for each other tends to make them always suspicious of their relationship.

All these characters’ dealings with trust show a society in which untrusted family relationships widely exist where the brother betrays his brother, the father does not trust his son, and the mother and the son do not trust each other. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern show the mistrust of friends or people out the circle of family, as Wilhelm Meister quotes Goethe to present that society:

“What these two persons are and do, it is impossible to represent by one. In such small matters, we discover Shakespeare's greatness... this legal knavery, this ineptitude and insipidity, -- how can they be expressed by a single man? There ought to be at least a dozen of these people, if they could be had: for it is only in society that they are anything; they are society itself...” -- Goethe.

(shakespeare-online.com)

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern first are sent by Claudius to spy on Hamlet and try to get some information from him. For instance, when they try to discover where, Polonius’s corpse is. “What have you done, my lord, with the dead body?” (Act IV, Scene II). Then, those old friends of Hamlet do something worse than spying when they engage in the supposed plot of executing Hamlet in England, but Hamlet also does not trust them and this leads them to their end.

For Hamlet, there is only one person to trust who is Horatio while most of other people are untrusted. It is obvious that Hamlet’s society is ruined where people cannot trust each other and this is applied even for those who are the closest to him (mother or friend). Actually, they are the first to be untrusted.

**Death of Morality**

Since Hamlet lives in a society where there are no honesty and truth, certainly there would be no morality. The issue of morality is the biggest amount of *Hamlet*. Hamlet mourns morality as well as his father’s death. Most of Hamlet’s existential questions are derived from the lack of this issue. For him, revenge for his father’s murder may not ease him, because it is not the main issue since everything around him tends to make him disappointed. Then, is suicide better than living in such a society?

However, it is not moral for Hamlet that his mother has a hasty marriage after his father’s death. She then shows no loyalty to him but taken by her lust and passion.

```
But to live
In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed,
Stew'd in corruption, honeying and making love
Over the nasty sty,-- (Act III, Scene IV)
```

In *Hamlet*, even good people’s morals are badly affected by other people’s amount of morality. For instance, in the early scenes Laertes is a noble and honest knight, but he ends up with a shame when he joins Claudius in his plot of killing Hamlet. At his end, he tries to have an honorable death and tells Hamlet the truth. The reason of this extreme transition in Laertes’ morals is Hamlet’s killing of his father. The paradox is that Hamlet’s morals dilate his revenge because killing someone is difficult to coexist with, but he kills Polonius in a rage of anger. So even Hamlet is not innocent in the sense of
morals. Moreover, when he is asked about Polonius’ body, he answers “At supper… not where he eats, but where he is eaten…” (Act IV, Scene III) Hamlet here mocks a dead person and this is morally unaccepted. This shows that Hamlet does not regret killing Polonius while the villain Claudius sometimes regrets his crime.

**Conclusion**

*Hamlet* is a play of questions, most of them tend to be existential and universal. It is Shakespeare’s masterpiece that deals with the nature of death. In which Shakespeare gives death the best form that other writers could not give. However, what the many deaths add to the play is that it is the best choice to end such a tragedy. What satisfies the reader is the poetic justice at the end of the play. For most of the characters’ death is deserved and works as a soldier of Karma. In the play, only Horatio survives, actually it is a fair end for him since he is the only character who does not have a flaw in character. The play shows his nobility when he tries to kill himself when Hamlet is dying, but Hamlet asks him to stay alive to tell his story. For Hamlet, he may find all his answers in his death and his situation would not be better if he survives since he could not bear his father’s death, so what his situation would be if he lives after his mother dies?! He would like more to commit suicide, but he would suffer again because of his impression of suicide as a Christian. Through that end, he gets an honorable death and maybe an ultimate silence that means the rest for him. At his death, Hamlet’s last word “the rest is silence …” (Act V, Scene II), it costs his life to recognize that and he dies with his questions unanswered. These questions seem never to be answered since death is an undiscovered country from which no one returns.

In the sense of morality, *Hamlet* shows the consequences that occur when morality does not exist in society. This issue is as universal as Hamlet’s questions. It emphasizes the idea that what would happen when people lose their morals for the sake of avarice (as in Claudius’ case) or pride (as in Hamlet’s case). Hamlet wants to exist to achieve something inside him “to be or not to be? That’s the question...” (Act III, Scene I). It is as certain as death that even if he is put unwillingly to face his fate, Hamlet commits moral mistakes that may make him lose a lot before he dies. For other characters, they would not like to die because their life is not as complicated as Hamlet’s. On the contrary, they want to live a life of joy, like when Gertrude cares for her passion and lust more than morality and in Claudius’ lust for the throne and Gertrude as well. So, for all the characters, their messing with morality causes their downfall. This lesson should be taken into consideration in any society, when there are no honesty, trust and morality, there would be a lot of Claudius and a lot of friends like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and for the good men, they should be careful of Laertes’ end.
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