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| Appendix | Abstract | Introduction | Materials & Methods | Results | Discussion |
| The Branches of an Act: Shakespeare's Hamlet Explains His Inaction\_Larry Weiss | Larry Weiss analyzes the reasons for Hamlet’s failure to kill Claudius in his article. Hamlet expresses his confusion about his lack of action in a significant soliloquy. Weiss analyzes Hamlet’s inaction based on philosophical views on action. The article also considers the soliloquy’s significance in the dramatic tradition and suggests that Hamlet’s fear of torment after death may be the reason for his inaction. The article mentions the relevance of the 16th-century legal case Hales v. Petit to understanding the gravedigger’s speech in the play. The author suggests that Shakespeare may have had deeper thematic intentions with the gravedigger’s speech. | The article analyzes the connection between the case of Hales v. Petit and Hamlet’s monologue. Larry Weiss suggests that Hamlet’s inaction is due to his fear of post-mortem torture. By examining Hamlet’s soliloquy and incorporating philosophy, psychology, legal cases, and theater tradition, the paper aims to explain why Hamlet fails to kill Claudius. Weiss explores the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of the monologue and applies philosophical theories to propose a multi-dimensional interpretative framework for understanding Hamlet’s psychological motivations and behavior. | The author conducts a detailed textual analysis of Hamlet’s monologues, applying a philosophical theory of action to explain his actions. They also use legal analysis to explore the connection between a specific legal case and Hamlet’s monologue. Additionally, the author analyzes the rhetorical and linguistic features of the monologues and references psychology and neuroscience research to understand Hamlet’s behavior. | The author applies the philosophical concept of action to analyze Hamlet's inaction and comes to the conclusion that Hamlet's inaction is due to his fear of torture after death. Through a detailed analysis of Hamlet's soliloquy, the author reveals the contradictions and struggles in Hamlet's heart, as well as the reasons why he fails to fulfill his promise of revenge. | The author provides an explanation for Hamlet’s inaction, including his fear of post-mortem torture and internal struggles. They outline rules based on philosophical concepts of action, aligning them with early modern monologue traditions and existing research in psychology and neuroscience. The article acknowledges limitations, such as the potential impact of different versions of the script on character interpretation. It suggests that future research should explore different interpretations of texts, differences in theater practice, and further studies on the influence of psychology and neuroscience on understanding character behavior in literature. |
| Pyrrhonist uncertainty in Shakespeare’s sonnets\_Amanda Ogden Kellogg | Amanda Ogden Kellogg’s article examines the impact of Pyrrhonist skepticism on Shakespeare’s sonnets, suggesting that Shakespeare embraces ambiguity and multiple interpretations, viewing uncertainty not as an impediment but as a source of aesthetic pleasure. The paper challenges the traditional Petrarchan pursuit of certainty through metaphor, proposing a new perspective on Shakespeare's use of language to evoke a sublime sense of the unknown. | The introduction section sets the stage for the discussion on how Shakespeare’s sonnets reflect Pyrrhonist skepticism. It challenges the view that skepticism in early modern literature is merely a source of anxiety or instability. The author suggests that Shakespeare’s use of ambiguity allows for a multiplicity of perspectives and interpretations, offering a different viewpoint on the use of metaphors for epistemological certainty. | This section does not detail a scientific methodology but provides historical context on Pyrrhonist skepticism, referencing Sextus Empiricus and its revival during the Renaissance. It also addresses scholarly debates on early modern epistemology and skepticism as they relate to Shakespeare's works. | The results are presented through an analysis of Shakespeare’s sonnets, showing how they incorporate Pyrrhonist skepticism. The article examines the use of metaphors in creating uncertainty and a sublime experience of the unknown, contrasting Shakespeare's approach with the Petrarchan tradition that aimed for certainty through metaphors. | The discussion delves into the implications of Shakespeare's use of Pyrrhonist skepticism in his sonnets. It posits that acknowledging the limitations of human expression and interpretation can lead to creativity, intimacy, and pleasure. The paper argues that epistemological uncertainty in the sonnets is not a problem but rather the foundation for meaning-making. It critiques scholarly interpretations that emphasize certainty and advocates for recognizing the diverse perspectives and identities within the sonnets. |
| “DEAR MOTHER ENGLAND”: MOTHERHOOD  AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY CRITICISM OF  SHAKESPEARE | This study explores the intersection of motherhood and Shakespearean criticism in the nineteenth century, focusing on how the concept of "Dear Mother England" influenced literary interpretations of Shakespeare's works. It analyzes how critics employed the metaphor of motherhood to interpret Shakespeare's plays and poems, emphasizing the nationalistic and cultural significance of his works. The study also examines the ways in which this criticism reflected broader social and political debates about gender roles, family values, and national identity in the Victorian era. | The nineteenth century was a pivotal era in the history of Shakespearean criticism, marked by a resurgence of interest in the Bard's works and a proliferation of new interpretive frameworks. Among these frameworks, the concept of "Dear Mother England" emerged as a powerful metaphor that influenced how Shakespeare's plays and poems were understood and evaluated. This metaphor, which invoked the image of England as a nurturing mother, resonated deeply with the Victorian era's emphasis on family values, national pride, and cultural heritage. This study aims to explore the role of motherhood in nineteenth-century Shakespearean criticism, examining how critics employed this metaphor to interpret Shakespeare's works and how these interpretations reflected broader cultural and social trends. | The research methodology for this study involves a close textual analysis of nineteenth-century Shakespearean criticism, focusing on those works that explicitly invoke the metaphor of "Dear Mother England." Primary sources include critical essays, reviews, and books published during this period. Secondary sources, such as historical accounts and scholarly articles on Victorian culture and gender roles, provide contextual information and theoretical frameworks for interpreting the primary sources. The analysis will employ a qualitative approach, emphasizing the identification and interpretation of patterns, themes, and arguments within the critical texts. | The analysis of nineteenth-century Shakespearean criticism reveals a significant emphasis on motherhood as a critical trope. Critics often invoked the image of England as a nurturing mother to emphasize the nationalistic and cultural significance of Shakespeare's works. They saw Shakespeare's plays and poems as embodying the essence of Englishness, reflecting the values and virtues associated with motherhood and the domestic sphere. This interpretation was often used to justify Shakespeare's status as the national poet and to promote a particular vision of English cultural identity. | The study's findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the role of motherhood in nineteenth-century Shakespearean criticism. They highlight the ways in which this metaphor shaped critical interpretations of Shakespeare's works and reflected broader cultural and social debates about gender roles, family values, and national identity. The study also raises questions about the limitations of this approach and the need for a more nuanced and diverse range of interpretive frameworks in Shakespearean criticism. |
| Shakespeare’s Bookish Rulers: Philosophy and Nature Poetry in the Henry VI Trilogy and The Tempest | This paper discusses the reclusive and studious ruler portrayed by Shakespeare in Henry VI and The Tempest. Deposed by credulity and lack of interest in politics, these rulers shared a common interest in the Renaissance school of Platonic philosophy, but differed in their preference for specific Platonic authors and writings. The article argues that reading the two stories together reveals a stark contrast between the modes of being determined by different schools of philosophical thought. Despite the obvious differences between the contemplative life of Henry VI and the active life of Prospero in terms of worldly gains and losses, Shakespeare does not explicitly endorse which way of life is superior. | This paper introduces two rulers created by Shakespeare in the Henry VI trilogy and The Tempest: Henry VI and Prospero. They were both deposed by political indifference and credulity, but shared an interest in the Platonic philosophy of the Renaissance. Henry VI was inclined to a contemplative life, while Prospero was associated with an active life. Despite Henry's eventual murder, Prospero was able to regain power. Through these characters, Shakespeare explores the dialectical relationship between active and contemplative lifestyles, without explicitly favoring one or the other, but showing the pros and cons of both. Prospero eventually gave up magic and returned to the contemplative life, suggesting the superiority of the contemplative life. | Through a detailed analysis of the texts in Shakespeare's plays, and in particular an examination of the dialogue and behavior of the rulers' characters, the author explores their preferences for philosophical ideas and how these ideas influenced their way of life and the way they ruled. At the same time, the author also refers to the philosophical literature and historical background of the Renaissance to establish a deeper understanding of Shakespeare's works. | The article concludes that Shakespeare presents two different philosophical approaches to active living and contemplative living in his works, And points out that despite the advantages and disadvantages of both lifestyles, ultimately, Prospero's choice in The Tempest suggests that a contemplative life may be more desirable to pursue. | The author discusses how Shakespeare explored and contrasted different philosophies of life through the characters and plots in his plays, particularly through the characters of Henry VI and Prospero to show the characteristics of an active life and a contemplative life. The article also discusses how these philosophical ideas were reflected in the cultural transformation of the Renaissance, and Shakespeare's attitudes and views on this transformation. Through comparative analysis, the author points out that Shakespeare does not tend to simply support a certain way of life, but through the complex characterization and plot design, shows a more rich and multi-dimensional philosophical discussion. |
| “To be, or not to be”: Shakespeare Against  Philosophy | This paper offers a fresh interpretation of Shakespeare’s renowned line “To be, or not to be” from Hamlet, suggesting it serves as a satire on philosophy and highlights the theatricality of life. Through an analysis of the context, the essay aims to present a Shakespearean perspective on philosophical inquiry. | The paper delves into the discussion of the iconic phrase “To be, or not to be” from Shakespeare’s “Hamlet.” Hamlet’s contemplation of life and death is presented as a pivotal point, often viewed through the lens of philosophical inquiry. However, the author contends that Shakespeare employs this passage as a tool to mock philosophical discourse and illuminate the theatrical nature of human existence. | Utilizing a meticulous textual analysis approach, the author deconstructs the context and meaning of the passage “To be, or not to be,” unveiling its underlying satirical elements. The paper explores Hamlet’s intellectual backdrop and potential philosophical references employed by Shakespeare, ultimately suggesting a sense of futility and absurdity inherent in philosophical contemplation. | Following a thorough examination and interpretation, the author concludes that Hamlet’s monologue functions as Shakespeare’s critical commentary on philosophy. By exposing the dramatic and satirical undertones of the text, Shakespeare articulates a unique perspective on life, death, and existence. | The paper further investigates how this satirical portrayal of philosophy reflects the intellectual climate and cultural milieu of Shakespeare’s time. It scrutinizes how Shakespeare, as a literary master, navigates philosophical themes within his works and prompts contemporary readers to engage in reflective interpretation and introspection. |
| Homicide and moral insanity in Richard III by Shakespeare: An historical essay  ---Michel Bénézech | This paper examines murderous behavior and moral insanity in Shakespeare's historical play Richard III. By analyzing Shakespeare's portrayal of his characters, particularly Richard III's criminal behavior, the author explores the theory that humans are naturally violent and cites philosopher Albert Camus' views on individual and collective criminality, as well as Dr. DeGraff's theories on the neurobiological basis of killing behavior. The article also discusses how classical French psychiatric research is reflected in Shakespeare's works, particularly in the madness and killing behavior of Richard III. Finally, the author concludes that only through the moral education of children and the fear of criminal oppression can human beings be protected from their innate violent tendencies. | In the introductory section, the author begins by noting that the human species is unique in the animal world for the ability of its members to commit willful violence. He reviews Albert Camus's philosophical reflections on individual and collective criminality, as well as Dr. DeGraff's theoretical position on the neurobiological basis of killing behavior. The author then provides some general comments on Shakespeare and his playwriting, and then briefly describes how classic French psychiatric research is reflected in the work of this distinguished English playwright. In addition, the article briefly describes the historical portrayal of Richard III. | The Materials and Methods section describes how the authors based their research on Shakespeare's works. Specifically, the authors analyzed material from two plays, Henry VI and Richard III, and coded and categorized this material based on modern psychological knowledge. This process included identifying the behavioral characteristics of the violent acts, the victims, and the performers in the plays. Through this systematic approach, the authors were able to characterize the psychology and behavior of Richard III in detail. | The results section presents a psychological portrait of Richard III's criminal mind, including his physical and psychopathic traits. These traits cover psychological disorders ranging from physical deformities to antisocial, narcissistic and paranoid disorders. By analyzing the events of the play, the authors reveal that Richard III's murderous behavior was driven by his political ambitions and that he displayed callousness and calculating precision in his crimes. In addition, the author proposes a series of hypotheses regarding the moral insanity that Richard III may have suffered from | In the discussion section, the author analyzes Richard III's criminal behavior within a broader cultural and biological context. He explores the conflict between culture and nature and discusses how education and punishment can help prevent the occurrence of criminal behavior. The final conclusion emphasizes that moral education and fear of society are key factors in preventing humans from committing violent crimes. |