

William Shakespeare's Hamlet: A Deconstructive Study

Noorbakhsh Hooti¹

1. Associate professor, Razi University, Faculty of Arts, English Department, Post code: 6714967346
Kermanshah, Iran.

Corresponding Author email: nhooti@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: Jacques Derrida is the pioneer of Deconstruction. His firm faith and belief in this challenging and thought provoking theory never let him refute his interpretations on the world issues, especially the ethical and political ones. His galvanizing deconstructive stand may give a new soul to Shakespeare's Hamlet. Shakespeare's Hamlet has always been a focal point for the world researchers. It has been studied from various standpoints, but this paper tries to pore over the domineering elements of Hamlet from a Derridean deconstructive outlook. Through deconstruction, the researcher introduces a new portrait of the mind stream of the characters. It tries to display the tradition of the metaphysics of presence and its irretrievable repercussions, which have proved to be the preventive stumbling blocks on the mental flow of man's susceptibility to new changes. In its concluding mode, the study divulges the tragic mental blockages of the characters in Hamlet, left behind by the omnipresent and omnipotent logos of the metaphysics of presence.

Keywords: Derrida, deconstruction, metaphysics of presence, logos, messianic, binary opposition,

INTRODUCTION

Shakespeare's Hamlet has been undoubtedly the research target of the countless world researchers from the different corners of the Globe. The complexities and challenging mood of the play have drawn multifarious research attentions. Van Niekerk (2003) has given a general deconstructive look at Hamlet, where he has tried to show the overall deconstructive mood of the play, while the present study brings the play within scrutiny of a variety of Derridian deconstructive elements.

Sedinger analyzes the various issues of Hamlet through Jacques Derrida's book, Specters of Marx, in the context of historicist critiques of "presentism". As he believes that "It argues that historicity cannot be relegated to a finished past, and that ethics is the primary reason for embracing the historicity of both past and present." (Sedinger, 2007)

Maleki (2012) has tried to focus on the polar concept. He believes one may reach a much deeper understanding and a far joyful enjoyment of Hamlet's world through heirarchizing the different opposing concepts. Hooper (2003) highlights the puns and the dangerous doubles as he calls them in the characters of Hamlet and Claudius. Jackson and Marotti (2011) scrutinize the religious aspects of the play. They try to bring the characters to a religious bedrock from both historically specific and transhistorical points of view, where their religious beliefs, religious culture, and religious conflicts are under close scrutiny. Jackson and Marotti believe:

Now, in the wake of postmodern philosophy and theology, it is inevitable that scholar-critics consider, within a variety of historical frames, the deep religious and philosophical issues surfacing in early modern religious culture at a time of religiocultural conflict many find relevant to contemporary religious struggles and awareness. (Jackson and Marotti, 2011)

Deconstruction

Derrida's uprising theory of Deconstruction of 1970s and early 80s was a kind of overnight mental and academic revolution from the world of structuralism of mid 1960s, which had preoccupied man's mental texture. Fry (2009) in his lecture at the Yale University interprets Deconstruction as follows:

Deconstruction is as a thought process precisely a kind of evasive dance whereby one doesn't settle for distinct positions, for any sort of idea that can be understood as governed and this is what structure, sign and plays

are all about; they can be understood by a governed blanket term, what Derrida often calls a transcendental signified, but Derrida's prose style is a crab like sideways movement around an argument, is meant as regressively as a can to avoid seeming to derive itself from a definite concept.

Saussure believes that to some sense the concept generates the signifier, which means the signifier is considered a metaphysical concept or a transcendental signifier.

Fry further asserts that If we try to have a metalingual Jakobsonian look at the signifier and the signified, then the signified does not play the role of a signified but simply acts as an independent signifier, so the binarism of the relationship is broken down, so we begin to understand the combinatory structure of speech or writing as one signifier leading to one another. Derrida says a signifier by association triggers a subsequent successive signifier, which keeps on triggering one signifier after the other. Indeed, it is not an organizational pattern, as in the language of deconstruction it is a signifying chain of ever self-replicating and self extending pattern irreducibly linear and forward progressing through a sequence of temporal associations. If we demystify the relationship between a concept and a signifier or a sound image, we will demystify the relationship between the whole set of associations, which exist somehow in space; it exists in an unfolding space and time.

Indeed, Derrida's deconstruction is a challenge against the structuralism, especially, the structuralist notions of Saussure and Claude Lévi-Strauss towards the interpretation of a text, which is leaned on the metaphysics of presence. As Derrida asserts "A structure, it must be repeated, is the natural object plus the subjective intelligence of the structuralist". (Derrida 1997)

Lévi-Strauss, who is regarded not only as the founder but the father of anthropology, triggers the importance of the binary oppositions. He believes that the significance of any socio-cultural issue lies in its originality. He asserts that through the comparative and contrastive filters, the right evaluation of any phenomenon can be justly possible. He avers:

As a matter of fact, differences are extremely fecund. It is only through difference that progress has been made. What threatens us right now is probably what we may call overcommunication—that is, the tendency to know exactly in one point of the world what is going on in all other parts of the world. In order for a culture to be really itself and to produce something, the culture and its members must be convinced of their originality and even, to some extent, of their superiority over the others; it is only under conditions of undercommunication that it can produce anything. We are now threatened with the prospect of our being only consumers, able to consume anything from any point in the world and from every culture, but of losing all originality. (Lévi-Strauss, 2005)

Derrida believes that binary oppositions create a violent hierarchy. They undermine one thing in order to give privilege to the other one. Indeed, binary oppositions propagate the significance of the existence of discrimination. Derrida warns us on the Freudian psychological aspects of these binary oppositions. He affirms:

Freud and the Scene of Writing" that, the institution of grammatology through the recognition of systematic "repression" of writing throughout the history of the West cannot be taken as a psychoanalytic endeavor on a macrocosmic scale. For Freud's need to describe the coexistence of the (at least) double text of the psyche in terms of latent and manifest contents, or, indeed, repression and sublimation, is itself caught within that suspect terminology of binary oppositions; and further, the very pattern of repression in an individual can only be possible because of his need to reject all that is recognized to be inhabited by the structure of writing . (Derrida,1997)

Deconstruction challenges the tradition of the metaphysics of the presence. It staunchly questions the legitimate authority of Theocentrism, which believes in the supremacy of divinity and religious notions over man's rationality and Anthropocentrism, which believes man's rationality makes him prior to nature and the prescribed religious doctrines. Anthropocentrism succeeds Theocentrism, while Derrida believes that the world is no longer anthropocentric but linguistic; Derrida agonizingly knows the fact that language has become a new god or a new centre.

Deconstruction defies all the fossilized centers, which are regarded as the legitimate sources of truth. Each centre acts as an independent history, which decides the nature of a future that it wants to give birth to. Deconstruction questions the totalizing mood of the structuralism by introducing the term *différance* . McQUILLAN comments that:

It is the play of *différance* within historical meaning as a non-totalisable figure of auto-immunity which puts the historical, histories and the idea of history itself into deconstruction. These mutations, these deconstructions, continue unabated (it is irreversible, after all). The mutation of the institutions and circumstances of today takes place under the incessant pressure of the future. The mutation is predicated upon the arrival of what comes and further still, the possibility of what might come after it. The future, having arrived, we must always ask, what comes after it. Thus, the open-ended anteriority of the future is what makes history possible. It is the very chance and motor of history as a ground without stability, where any meaning, experience or figure may make itself possible. History is not a thing of the past, it is always a question of the future. It is for this reason that we might offer a

couple of related propositions. Firstly, that the future of deconstruction will be guaranteed by the deconstruction of the future, that is, the figure of auto-immunity which makes itself legible as the future. Here, the future is différance, that which generates all generation, makes possible possibility itself, and is the condition of all and every significance. One might say that there can be no future without the future. (McQUILLAN, 2007)

Hamlet the Play

The central theme of the play revolves around the mysterious death of Hamlet the king and the hasty marriage of Gertrude to Claudius, who is the brother of her deceased husband. Indeed, Hamlet the prince undergoes different mental chaos by hearing his father's death and his mother's sudden marriage to his uncle. The whole scenario goes on like a puzzle till the ghost of Hamlet the king unravels the enigma of his own death, which at the end of the day leads to the death of Claudius, Polonius, Gertrude, Ophelia, Hamlet himself and some other characters.

Hamlet, one of the highly acclaimed plays of William Shakespeare has undergone different academic analyses. The protagonist of the play, Hamlet and his mind provoking rhetoric has always been a moot point in the world of literature. According to Serageldin:

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

The different characters of Hamlet show various entanglements in the web of the slavery of the metaphysics of presence. All the characters, one way or the other, are imprisoned within the dark dungeon of the logos of life. Therefore, the current study tries to shed light on the Logocentric incarceration of this highly debate raging play.

A Deconstructive Study of Hamlet

The researcher tries to push Hamlet within a deconstructive ambience, and based on the related elements of deconstruction, strives to scrutinize the characters and their reactions to their surroundings. The selection of the following elements of deconstruction is not a random one, but is simply based on their relevance to the demand of the text itself.

Metaphysics of Presence and Messianic

Metaphysics of presence For Derrida, the Western tradition in its philosophical and historical form gives paramount importance to presence. The metaphysics of presence, thus, describes the conceptual (but also practical) conditions of possibility within which the thought, texts and histories of this tradition emerge. For such a metaphysical tradition, presence comes up in a number of ways: the presence of the subject to itself in thought or speech (but also through its vision or sense of touch); the determination of a being or entity in terms of its presence in time and space; the notion of the original presence of a transcendental signified or ultimate source of meaning, such as God. In Derrida's writing, then, presence is the catchphrase for a thinking which remains invested in the idea of the self-identity, self-continuity, or self-sufficiency of a being.

Messianic is one of the elements of the Metaphysics of Presence, which may survive under the shelter of both theocentrism and anthropocentrism. Indeed, any politico-religious or philosophic promise, which enjoys the authorized legitimacy, may be considered messianic. Ware very aptly argues:

Justice participates in the paradoxical structure of a promise that never reaches completion. We find this undetermined promise, Derrida argues, in every politico-religious ideology: "The effectivity or actuality of the democratic promise, like that of the communist promise, will always keep within it, and it must do so, this absolutely undetermined messianic hope at its heart, this eschatological relation to the to-come of an event, and of a singularity, of an alterity that cannot be anticipated." (Ware, 2004)

In the following dialogues of Shakespeare's Hamlet, we see the messianic logocentric notions of the return of the ghosts suffering from some worldly issues. This shows the attachment of man to such notions, which have religious roots. Indeed, detaching from such beliefs may lead to one's excommunication. And another anthropocentric messianic logocentrism, which may be noted is, the privilege given to Horatio as a scholar. He is considered a medium between the common people and the ghost. He is well thought of as a gifted scholar, who is able to be a link between a ghost and the living people:

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

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

MARCELLUS: Thou art a scholar, speak to it Horatio.

BARNARDO: Looks a not like the king? Mark it Horatio.

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

BARNARDO: It would be spoke to.

MARCELLUS: Question it Horatio.

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

The following words of Horatio also indicate the Messianic centrism dominating over even scholarly people like Horatio, let alone the common people.

HORATIO :A mote it is to trouble the mind's eye. In the most high and palmy state of Rome, a little ere the mightiest Julius fell, the graves stood tenantless and the sheeted dead did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets; as stars with trains of fire, and dews of blood, disasters in the sun ; and the moist star, upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands, was sick almost to doomsday with eclipse. And even the like precurse of feared events, as harbingers preceding still the fates And prologue to the omen coming on, have heaven and earth together demonstrated Unto our climates and countrymen. (Hamlet, Act I, Scene I)

Here, Horatio gives the example of Mighty Julius Caesar. He says that in the most flourishing days of Rome, the graves were free from their occupants, and the dead, covered in sheets, screamed and shouted in the streets of Rome. Then, there were lots of bad omens as comets, accompanied by dews of blood, disasters in the sun, lunar eclipse which controls the tides of the sea. All these heralded the appalling happenings. They were the pioneers of our fate and appeared before any problems were to befall on us. Heaven as well as earth both exposed the disaster that was to fall on us.

Indeed, Horatio's justifications on all the happenings in Rome revolve around a messianic logocentrism; believing in such issues, shows believing in any similar concerns in an unknown and undetermined future as well. Fritsch gives the following comments on Derrida's messianic:

In fact, we will see Derrida argue that the messianic promise not only opens up the past for its inheritance and remembrance, but that it also institutes an 'originary violence' at the heart of all action and an originary forgetting at the heart of all memory. This is what Derrida names the double bind of all inheritance: Memory also effaces that which preserves itself only by way of memory (Fritsch,2005)

In the following words, we may see the very flamboyant messianic mental texture of Hamlet, where he finds Claudius saying his prayers in the church. Indeed, it is an apt opportunity for Hamlet to take revenge, but his attachment to the theocentric beliefs prevents him from taking such an action. He believes that Claudius' death in such a situation is simply a divine gift, which will send him to heaven. Therefore, he awaits a chance to face him alone, but other than a sacred place. The reasons that bring him to this point are that, the theocentric messianicity of the metaphysics of presence is buried deep in his conscious as well as subconscious.

HAMLET: Now might I do it pat, now a is a-praying, and now I'll do't - and so a 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. Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge. A took my father grossly, full of bread, with all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May, and how his audit stands who knows save heaven ? But in our circumstance and course of thought ' T i s heavy with him. And am I then revenged to take him in the purging of his soul, when he is fit and seasoned for his passage? No. Up sword, and know thou a more horrid hent, when he is drunk asleep, or in his rage, or in th'incestuous pleasure of his bed, at game a-swearing, or about some act that has no relish of salvation in't - then trip him that his heels may kick at heaven, and that his soul may be as damned and black as hell whereto it goes. My mother stays. This physic but prolongs thy sickly days.(Hamlet, Act 3, Scene 3)

Binary Oppositions

Binary opposition is a term introduced in the world of structuralism. The structuralists believe that a just judgment of any social issue is simply possible through the analysis of the pair differences. Sturrock (2003) opines: The establishment of this underlying phonological system of 'distinctive features' achieves an ultimate segmentation of a language's sound-system, and lends a new rigour and weight to Structuralism's dependence on pairs of opposed terms, already adumbrated by Saussure. As Jakobson claims: 'The oppositions of such differential qualities are real binary oppositions as defined in logic, i.e., they are such that each of the terms of the opposition necessarily implies its opposite.' (Sturrock,2003)

There are two ways of analyzing the significance of two things; it can be a text, two issues or two individuals. From the structuralists' point of view the most appropriate way of such an analysis is through binary oppositions. They believe through the contrastive exposure of two individuals, which is highlighting their differences; one can have a right analysis of their values. Indeed, they want to reach the values through putting the

differences on two sides of a scale. Derrida in his *Of Grammatology* gives the following comments on Saussurian binary oppositions:

We might simply say that Saussure was not a grammatologist because, having launched the binary sign, he did not proceed to put it under erasure. The binary opposition within the Saussurian sign is in a sense paradigmatic of the structure of structuralist methodology. 'We must doubtless resort to pairings like those of signifier/signified and synchronic/ diachronic in order to approach what distinguishes structuralism from other modes of thought'. (Derrida, 1997)

While deconstruction does not believe in comparing and contrasting two individuals in order to declare one winner and the other one loser. It does not suppose that by degrading someone, the upgrading of the other gets the embossed legitimacy and authority. Indeed, deconstruction yells that the structuralistically two opposition pairs, like black/white, east/west ... do not stand against each other but supplement each other. It believes that each individual should be dealt with independently. Deconstruction assumes that through independent analysis of the values, one may inevitably reach the differences. Derrida further opines:

We can go yet further and repeat that the structure of binary oppositions in general is questioned by grammatology. Difference invites us to undo the need for balanced equations, to see if each term in an opposition is not after all an accomplice of the other : " At the point where the concept of difference intervenes . . . all the conceptual oppositions of metaphysics, to the extent that they have for ultimate reference the presence of a present, . . . (signifier/signified; sensible/ intelligible; writing/speech; speech [parole] !language [langue] ; diachrony /synchrony; space/ time; passivity/activity etc.) become non-pertinent." Derrida, 1997)

Derrida is very particular about the importance of binary oppositions given by structuralism. Indeed, he finds this issue a kind of threat to individual's mental free swing of susceptibility to new interpretations of the world concerns. He believes that binary oppositions create a tragic sense of superiority and inferiority. It is the best instrument to create a melancholic rift among the people. It is through this segregation that religions, castes, classes, races, communities and colors are weighed and contrasted, and eventually thrown into the different fanatic and uncompromising categories. It is through this socio-political and religio-cultural scale that world keeps on witnessing various social evils.

Almond quotes Derrida very pertinently:

Derrida sees binary oppositions as illusions because of a certain semantic emptiness – signs forever need their opposites in order to negatively define themselves. For Derrida, then, to believe in a word like 'transcendence' is to believe in a certain absence. 'Transcendence' and 'immanence' are semantic vacuities which can only pretend to meaning through contrast with their opposites – in other words, the immanent can only be understood as the nontranscendent, the transcendent as the non-immanent. (Almond, 2005)

There are numerous occasions that the characters of Hamlet are stuck in the world of binary oppositions. These polar concepts are used as the highly applied lines of attack to the ones, who are depreciated. Most of the characters resort to contrast and comparison, whenever they reach an aporetic and maniacally offensive mode. It is assumed as the most pertinent method of convincing their addressees about the justification of their claims. Hamlet in his conversation with his mother does his best to give a disgraceful picture of Claudius contrasting him with his late father. He does so to prove the infidelity of his mother.

GERTRUDE: Ay me, what act, that roars so loud and thunders in the index?

HAMLET: Look here upon this picture, and on this, the counterfeit presentment of two brothers. See what a grace was seated on this brow; Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself, an eye like Mars, to threaten and command; a station like the herald Mercury, new-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill; a combination and a form indeed, where every god did seem to set his seal to give the world assurance of a man. This was your husband. Look you now what follows. Here is your husband, like a mildewed ear blasting his wholesome brother. Have you eyes? Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed and batten on this moor? Ha! Have you eyes? You cannot call it love, for at your age the heyday in the blood is tame, it's humble, and waits upon the judgment; and what judgment would step from this to this? (Hamlet, Act ,3, scene, 4)

Aporia

Aporia is a deadlock of a relationship, decision, interpretation, which one reaches after having exchanged the logical reasoning and justification, but all in vain. Indeed the concluding logic is the declaration of the death of the relationship or a decision, etc. we may witness various aporetic decisions in our everyday life, like divorce, drug addiction, the split of business partners, and deep fanatic socio-cultural and political fanaticism, which may lead to a kind of aporetic red lights.

It is precisely the aporias, which announce the impossibility of Justice, Ethics, Meaning, and so on (conceived in terms of a preprogrammed set of a priori rules), that make a genuine experience of justice, ethics, or meaning possible; for it is the lack inherent to thought-numbing rules that calls one to engage seriously in the never-ending, difficult, but liberating task of thinking and rethinking what makes for an ethos, what responsibility enjoins, what the text desires. (Hurst, 2008)

Aporias push us towards such situations, which we are faced with undecidability, where we may not witness the birth of new decisions. The following soliloquy by Hamlet shows that how he is drowned in the world of various aporias:

HAMLET: To be, or not to be, that is the question - whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings 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 the heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to - 'tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. To die, to sleep - To sleep, perchance to dream. Ay, there's the rub, for in that sleep of death what dreams may come, when we have shuffled off this mortal coil, must give us pause. There's the respect that makes calamity of so long life, For who would bear the whips and scorns of time, th'oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, The pangs of disprized love, the law's delay, the insolence of office, and the spurns that patient merit of th'unworthy takes, when he himself might his quietus make with a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear, to grunt and sweat under a weary life, but that the dread of something after death, the undiscovered country from whose bournno traveller returns, puzzles the will, and makes us rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of? (Hamlet, Act, 3, Scene, 2)

Differance

Differance is a term created by Jack Derrida, which challenges aporias and the aporetic situations. It breaks the shackles of the fossilized notions, which do not want to move an inch from their logocentric and aporetic attachments. It shows that we have to give a chance to any decision to have a new interpretation in all the unborn episodes of life. Derrida believes that a text is open to different interpretations. It demonstrates that under different given segments of time; we may have fresh and different views on life around us. A changed individual may not be the slave of an unchanged situation or the fixed dictatorial notions prescribed by some people in the expired moments, which are no more, but just are parts of our past memories, which may be simply browsed through, when one may feel so.

Alison and Garver assert:

within the metaphysics of presence, within philosophy as knowledge of the presence of the object, as the being-before-oneself of knowledge in consciousness, we believe, quite simply and literally, in absolute knowledge as the closure if not the end of history. And we believe that such a closure has taken place. The history of being as presence, as self-presence in absolute knowledge, as consciousness of self in the infinity of parousia—this history is closed. The history of presence is closed, for "history" has never meant anything but the presentation (Gegenwartigung) of Being, the production and recollection of beings in presence, as knowledge and mastery. Since absolute self-presence in con-sciousness is the infinite vocation of full presence, the achievement of absolute knowledge is the end of the infinite, which could only be the unity of the concept, logos, and consciousness in a voice without differance. The history of metaphysics therefore can be expressed as the unfolding of the structure or schema of an absolute will-to-hear-oneself-speak. This history is closed when this infinite absolute appears to itself as its own death. A voice without differance, a voice vnthout writing, is at once absolutely alive and absolutely dead. (Alison and Garver,1973)

Hamlet has been under severe criticism by lots of world critics. He has been condemned as a timid character, who keeps on putting off the revenge. Indeed, Hamlet tries to avoid any aporetic decision, which is based on doubts and suspicions. Even his father's ghost cannot convince him to reach a definite decision. Indeed, he is stuck in a world of decidability and undecidability. It shows that Hamlet as an educated person does not want to be the victim of his mere emotions and intuitions; that is why he keeps on postponing his judgment on his father's death. There are different circumstances, which we may highlight some points of differance. But the researcher has selected just one example, which may give a clear picture of the role of differance. In act 3, scene 2, in an arranged play acted by some outside actors, it is shown that Hamlet wants to be sure about the real nature of the ghost and the authenticity of his murder by the present king, Claudius. He asks his confidant, Horatio to take care of the reaction of the king during the play, which shows the reasons behind his procrastination.

There is a play tonight before the king: One scene of it comes near the circumstance which I have told thee of my father's death. I prithee when thou seest that act afoot, even with the very comment of thy soul observe my uncle. If his occulted guilt do not itself unkennel in one speech, It is a damned ghost that we have seen, and

my imaginations are as foul as Vulcan's stithy. Give him heedful note, for I mine eyes will rivet to his face, and after we will both our judgements join in censure of his seeming. (Hamlet,)

One of the key elements of difference is deferring, which means that meaning is not just a matter of synchrony where all the terms are shackled within a closed shell of a structure, but also a diachrony that things will be repeated but each repetition is free from any attachments to its past except having a trace from the past, which is an inevitable natural flow.

CONCLUSION

The study tried to open a new horizon to the world of Shakespeare's Hamlet through Derridian deconstruction. It showed how the metaphysics of presence can be a mental burden upon the innovative knack of the characters. It divulged the atmosphere of structuralism that nurtured the polar concepts in reaching the importance of the values. Another important emphasis of the study was the mental blockage of the characters through their aporetic approach towards the issues around. It shed light on the appalling aftermath of the theocentric and anthropocentric legitimacy of authoritarian dictatorship, which have ceaselessly been the stumbling blocks since the birth of the chaotic and tumultuous globe.

The study made an attempt to claim that man may not enjoy the taste of peaceful peace which is free from apprehension until and unless, he challenges the binary oppositions and shake hands with the binary concepts. It is through binary concepts and difference that lots of untoward circumstances may be avoided.

Indeed, the focal point of the study was challenging the tradition of the metaphysics of the presence, which keeps on repeating a single present and aborting all the pregnant presents, which are to come to life.

REFERENCES

- Alison David B, Garver N.1973. Jacques Derrida: Speech and Phenomena and other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Almond I. 2005. Sufism and Deconstruction: A comparative study of Derrida and Ibn Arabi. Taylor & Francis e-Library. Available from- chrestomathy.cofc.edu/documents/vol2/hooper.pdf [Accessed: 10/04/2012]
- Available from- www.jcrt.org/archives/05.2/ware.pdf [Accessed:22/08/2012]
- Available from: <http://oyc.yale.edu> [Accessed: 10/11/2012]
- Available from: [themojotribe.org/.../Lévi-Strauss,%20Claude/.../Levi-Strauss%](http://themojotribe.org/.../Lévi-Strauss,%20Claude/.../Levi-Strauss%20Claude/) [Accessed:9/04/2012]
- Available from: wheretheclassroomends.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/historicism-hamlet1.pdf [Accessed:10/09/2012]
- Available from: upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-2011-06-00000/dissertation.pdf [accessed:10/06/2012]
- Derrida J. 1997. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards P. 2003. *Hamlet the Prince of Denmark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fritsch M. 2005. *The Promise of Memory : History and Politics in Marx, Benjamin, and Derrida*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hooper T. 2003. *Dangerous Doubles: Puns and Language in Shakespeare's Hamlet* *Chrestomathy: Annual Review of Undergraduate Research at the College of Charleston* Volume 2, pp. 120-134
- Hurst A. 2008. *Derrida Vis-à-vis Lacan: Interweaving Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Fordham University.
- Jackson K, Marotti. 2011. *Arthur F. Shakespeare and Religion: Early Modern and Postmodern Perspectives*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Lévi-Strauss C. 2005. *Myth and Meaning*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Maleki N. 2012. *The Paradigm Examples of Polar Concept In Shakespeare's Hamlet*. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, Volume 12, Issue 1, pp.19-23.
- McQuillan M. 2007. *The Politics of Deconstruction: Jacques Derrida and the Other of Philosophy*. London: Pluto Press.
- Merchant of the Venice, *The Tempest*, *Measure for Measure* and *Hamlet*. Dissertation for the Degree of Magister Artium (English) in the Faculties of Humanities, University of Pretoria.
- Owen W. 2004. *Dialectic of the Past/Disjuncture of the Future: Derrida and Benjamin on the Concept of Messianism*. *JCRT* 5(2). 99-114,
- Paul H, Fry. 2009. *Introduction to Theory of Literature*. Yale University: Open Yale.
- Sedinger T. 2007. *Theory Terminable and Interminable: On Presentism, Historicism, and the Problem of Hamlet*. *Exemplaria*, volume 19, Issue 3, 455 – 473
- Serageidin I. 1998. *The Modernity of Shakespeare*. Giza: Cairo University.
- Sturrock J. 2003. *Structuralism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Van Neikerk MC. 2003. *Shakespearean Play: deconstructive Readings of The*