

LANGUAGE AS A TOOL OF DECEPTION AND SELF-REVELATION IN MACBETH, OTHELLO, AND HAMLET

Dr. Bharati Harishkumar Kaknani (Main & Corresponding Author)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities, Charotar Institute of Languages, Arts and Social Studies.

Charotar University of Science and Technology, Email: bharatikaknani@gmail.com

Institute Email: Bharatikaknani.cs@charusat.ac.in

Dr. Robert Joseph Parmar (Co- Author)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities, Charotar Institute of Languages, Arts and Social Studies.

Charotar University of Science and Technology, Email: robertjoseph82@gmail.com

Institute Email: robertparmar.cs@charusat.ac.in

Dr. Hinabahen Nikunjkumar Patel (Co- Author)

Assistant Professor, S.G.M English Medium College of Commerce and Management

The CVM University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Anand Gujarat, India

hinapatel139@gmail.com | hinabahen.patel@cvmu.edu.in

Dr. Kaushik Trivedi (Co- Author)

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities, Charotar Institute of Languages, Arts and Social Studies.

Charotar University of Science and Technology.

Institute Email: kaushiktrivedi.cs@charusat.ac.in

Abstract

In the works of William Shakespeare, Macbeth, Othello, and Hamlet are considered decisive tragedies; language serves as both a deceptive tool and a means of self-disclosure. Shakespeare creates a dramatic universe of words that fosters moral comprehension, plays with perception, and reveals the depth of the psychological background of tragic heroes. This paper will examine how language works in soliloquies, dramatic irony, and rhetorical persuasion to build and escalate tragic conflict. Soliloquies are examined through close textual analysis as moments of privileged self-revelation, allowing characters like Macbeth and Hamlet to express inner conflict, moral indecision, and existential anxiety. Such personal utterances are opposed to the utterances of a public, which is often marked by a cynical hiding and control. Iago's use of rhetoric in Othello shows how dangerous it can be and how effective, when spoken in the most convincing tone, it can twist the truth and corrupt moral sense. The analysis also explores dramatic irony as a figure of speech that heightens the sense of deception by creating a gap between the characters' beliefs and the audience's knowledge of them. Shakespeare's use of rhetoric emphasises the power of language as an instrument that shapes action and forms identity. The paper argues that Shakespearean tragedies are essentially linguistic plays in which

*Autora de correspondencia / Corresponding author.

language becomes a dynamic force of tragedy, focusing on its moral ambivalence and long-lasting relevance to literary criticism.

Keywords: Shakespearean Tragedy; Rhetoric and Language; Soliloquy; Dramatic Irony; Moral Ambiguity

Introduction

The place of language in the world of drama created by William Shakespeare is powerful. During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, English drama was in a period of significant transition. It had ceased to rely on flagrantly declamatory speech in favour of dialogue of a more psychologically sensitive and rhetorically complicated nature. The language used by playwrights like Christopher Marlowe, Ben Jonson, and Thomas Kyd was mainly used to convey grandeur, satire, or moral advice. An example is the grandeur of Marlowe's mighty line, which used high blank verse to convey the heroic aspiration. In contrast, Jonson's mastery of diction was to deliver social reality and classical moderation. It is in this context that Shakespeare stood out by not considering language as ornament or rhetoric, but as a dynamic tool that can influence consciousness, morality and action. His dramas show a keen understanding of the role of words in the human mind and in social organisation. Shakespeare wrote during the era when rhetoric was the focus of education. The Elizabethan grammar-school curriculum taught students the classics of rhetoric, logic, and persuasion, drawing on Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Consequently, linguistic techniques such as repetition, antithesis, equivocation, and irony were susceptible to the audience. Shakespeare not only imbibe these rhetorical traditions but also transformed them into dramatic psychology. Instead of showing rhetoric as a sign of eloquence in itself, he reveals its ability to mislead, control, and justify evil deeds. The doubled character of language as both a revelation and a mask is particularly sharp in *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *Hamlet*, in which any tragic event is impossible without the manipulation of language.

Soliloquies hold a leading position among the linguistic devices Shakespeare used. Soliloquies were a more common narrative device used by earlier dramatists to advance the plot. However, Shakespeare turns them into a psychological self-examination. Soliloquies in *Hamlet* are more philosophical meditations that expose the moral anxiety, intellectual prostration, and existential inertia of the main character. The language of *Hamlet* is self-reflective, reflecting a mind that continually doubts itself and its intentions. Shakespeare has chosen the soliloquy not only to tell the audience but also to dramatise thought as such; thus, language is the vehicle through which consciousness is expressed. Soliloquies in *Macbeth* serve another, but no less important, purpose. The ambition and conscience are not in harmony, and the moral decline of *Macbeth* is tracked through his personal speeches. The use of fragmentation of imagery, paradox, and equivocation is intentional on Shakespeare's part to show how unstable *Macbeth*'s morals are. The well-known saying of fair is foul is the summary of the linguistic universe in which the moral terms of reference fall apart, and the language turns into a tool of deceiving itself. The reason Shakespeare chose this device in *Macbeth* is the play's theme of corruption; the tragedy is not caused by communication with others, but rather by the act of self-convincing self-address, as used by *Macbeth*. Whereas soliloquy is the ruling linguistic technique of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, the primary linguistic technique in *Othello* is predetermined by rhetoric and dramatic irony. Shakespeare intentionally chooses these tools in accordance with the play's thematic focus on trust, appearance, and social perception. Iago's words can be described as calculated persuasion. The reader does not see through his insinuation, repetition, and strategic pauses as often as *Hamlet* or *Macbeth* do in their soliloquies, and Iago can

manipulate others without stating his true motives, except in a few instances. Shakespeare uses dramatic irony by giving the audience knowledge of Iago's intentions while withholding that information from Othello. This disparity exacerbates the tragedy and shows how language, being de-linked to truth, can destroy reason and ruin moral judgment.

Dramatic irony is a continuity tool that uses linguistic elements across all three plays, further supporting the lack of stability in meaning. It is the audience's knowledge of deceit that makes speech routine a place of tension and confusion. Words spoken with seeming sincerity take on a more ominous importance, and Shakespeare believes that words in language are always unreliable when separated from moral accountability. This obsession is more representative of broader Renaissance concerns about rhetoric as a form of manipulation, especially in political and social contexts. The fact that Shakespeare prefers soliloquies, dramatic irony, and persuasive rhetoric in these three tragedies is, therefore, not accidental and inconsistent. Every linguistic instrument is chosen very carefully to match the protagonist's psychological and moral structure. Hamlet needs introspective language to dramatise intellectual paralysis; Macbeth needs self-persuasion to dramatise moral collapse; and Othello needs external rhetoric to dramatise the frailty of trust. All these plays show how Shakespeare had perfected language to suit character, theme and tragic vision.

This paper claims that Macbeth, Othello, and Hamlet are essentially linguistic tragedies in which language both deceives and reveals itself. The analysis of Shakespeare's selective application of the tropes of soliloquies, dramatic irony, and rhetoric aims to demonstrate how tragedy is created by the word rather than by deed in these plays. The timeless quality of Shakespeare is that he realised language can best express the truth, yet it has a powerful ability to hide it; this contradiction remains true in present-day critical language.

Review of Literature

It is not a new finding among scholars that Shakespeare had a tragic vision focused on language, and that it serves not as a means of communication but as a driving force of thought, emotion, and action. This focus on the psychological richness of tragic heroes, which was a hallmark of early Shakespearean criticism, especially in A. C. Bradley, is based on the notion that soliloquies provide direct insight into the moral and emotional conflicts of characters such as Hamlet and Macbeth (Bradley, 1904). The work of Bradley creates the basis of the interpretation of soliloquy as a self-revelation, but not a convention of drama. Following this line of psychological analysis, the New Critics shifted the focus to the text and, in so doing, foreshadowed ambiguity, irony, and paradox as inherent features of Shakespearean speech. Some critics, such as Cleanth Brooks, believe that the revelation of meaning in Shakespearean tragedy is created by the tension between language and not by the author's intent or the history of the era (Brooks, 1947). This is further supported by Lionel Knights, who illustrates how the use of rhetorical patterns and verbal contradiction helps to develop character and theme, especially in Macbeth, whose equivocation resembles moral instability (Knights, 1933). The rhetorical analysis of Shakespeare has been used to emphasise the way Shakespeare was extensively involved in classical rhetoric, which was a significant subject of Elizabethan education. According to scholars, Shakespeare modifies the Aristotelian rhetorical techniques, e.t, ethos, pathos, and logos, not to propagate the truth but to show how persuasion may corrupt moral judgment (Lanham, 1993). This is best illustrated in Othello, where Iago uses manipulative language based on insinuation and repetition, rather than direct blame, as an example of language as a calculated means of manipulation (Greenblatt, 1980).

Dramatic irony has been much written about as a means of language and structure that raises the impact of tragedy. According to critics, Shakespeare grants the audience the privilege of knowing and turns banal speech into a site of conflict and moral uncertainty (Booth, 1974). The fact that the audience knows Iago intends to destroy Othello adds to the destructive nature of the deceptive rhetoric and the distinction between appearance and reality (Neely, 1985). Soliloquy has been repeatedly reviewed in Hamlet-related studies, in which researchers find a shift from external action to inner deliberation. According to linguistic and psychoanalytic critics, it is through the soliloquies in Hamlet that dramatised fragmented consciousness, ethical paralysis, and self-doubt that marked a significant advancement in the dramatisation of interiority in early modern drama (Belsey, 1985; Calderwood, 1983). Language in this case becomes such that thought itself is brought to the fore. New Historicist critics situate Shakespeare's linguistic tactics within Renaissance concerns about power, authority, and persuasion. Shakespeare reveals the unreliability of language in a culture with a deep mistrust of the manipulative power of rhetoric, according to Greenblatt (Greenblatt, 1980). Feminist critics also examine the workings of gendered language in Macbeth, especially Lady Macbeth's rhetorical subversion of norms of masculinity (Showalter, 1987). Although numerous works have examined rhetoric, soliloquy, and irony as separate entities, few studies address their integration as a unitary collective in the characters of Macbeth, Othello, and Hamlet. Current studies tend to single out individual plays or address language through a single theoretical framework. In the current research, this gap is addressed by analysing how Shakespeare strategically chooses and uses soliloquies, dramatic irony, and rhetoric to build language as a tool of deception and self-revelation. Consequently, it makes the speech itself an active force in the tragedy. Historians studying the history of soliloquy in early modern playwriting believe that Shakespeare bequeathed an already existing dramatic convention but radically altered its role. Published works such as Early Theatre can use the typology of soliloquies in medieval morality plays to show the similarity in the use of soliloquy in Elizabethan drama, where the soliloquy itself was expository, that is, it presented information on the plot, directly to the audience. Shakespeare, however, extended this norm through soliloquy, dramatising the interiority of psychological and moral paradox and redefining soliloquy as a place of self-disclosure rather than narration (Early Theatre, n.d.). The imagery in Shakespeare is also discussed critically to show how soliloquies are sites of internal conflict. Articles in Vocal point out the common image of war and use of violent metaphors in soliloquies that Shakespeare uses, especially in Macbeth and Othello. These works allege that this kind of imagery will be a psychological struggle for the main characters; thus, language enables the expression of inner conflict and moral apprehension. Soliloquies in this way become a linguistic expression of the conflict in the self, but not a reflection of the externality of action taken (Vocal, n.d.). The systematic analysis of soliloquy conventions in Elizabethan theatre is conducted through empirical research by scholars affiliated with Cambridge University Press and Assessment. This paper classifies soliloquies by length, location, audience, and subject matter, and it shows that Shakespeare uses soliloquy more often and in a more psychologically sophisticated way than his peers. The results indicate that Shakespeare actually plays with the soliloquy form to align with the theme focus and character progression (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, n.d.). Linguistically, it was found that soliloquies are treated as discourse structures rather than literary devices, as reported in BME Engineering. These discussions concentrate on syntactic patterns, repetition, modality, and self-address, arguing that soliloquies are linguistic means of negotiating thought, doubt, and choice; thus, characters

negotiate these issues. This kind of research confirms that Shakespeare's soliloquies are conducted at the border of language and mind, making the mechanism of thinking evident through speech (BME Engineering, n.d.). Critical discourses on Othello often focus on dramatic irony as one of Shakespeare's main techniques to enhance emotional involvement. Research studies cited on PapersOwl.com contend that Shakespeare provides the audience with initial and protracted awareness of Iago's evil intentions, which forms a strong contrast between the audience's awareness and that of Othello. Such disparity turns even the most harmless conversation into a site of conflict and fear, since the reader can observe the gradual triumph of the linguistic manipulations. Irony, therefore, enhances the tragic impact by making the audience active participants of the ensuing deception (PapersOwl, n.d.). A more general historical outlook is provided by the Othello Critical Survey published by the Internet Shakespeare Editions. This survey traces interpretive strategies from early moral critique to formalist and rhetorical interpretations, revealing a long-standing scholarly concern with Iago's linguistic power. Particular attention to rhetoric and irony as the structural forces that control the tragic flow of the play is attracted by formalist critics, who emphasise the central role of language in determining the sense and reaction of the audience (Internet Shakespeare Editions, n.d.).

T. S. Eliot has also theorised the emotional effect of Shakespearean language in terms of what he has called the objective correlative. Eliot maintains that expressing emotional experience in literature is achieved through an accurate composition of images and words rather than by explicitly expressing it. When applied to Shakespeare, this framework helps explain how dramatic irony and rhetorical patterns can provoke intense emotional reactions without the proclamation of emotional states (Eliot, 1919). In early criticism of psychology, this linguistic focus is reinforced as well. The essay by Thomas De Quincey on Macbeth discusses the psychological terror created by the sound, rhythm, and timing of words, in this case by the use of seemingly minute details in language. His discussion looks forward to subsequent research on the relationship between language and emotional and psychological impact, as an additional strength of the notion that Shakespearean tragedy is as much by verbal as by deed (De Quincey, 1823).

Modern criticism is increasingly viewing Shakespearean tragedy through the lens of identity and performativity, with a focus on how language both makes and destabilises the self. Research published in the International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (IJECE) maintains that the rhetoric in Hamlet and Othello is performative, that is, how characters view themselves as well as how they are viewed. The self-fashioning in Hamlet through reflective language stands in stark contrast to Othello's reliance on externally validated rhetoric, which shows that Shakespearean identity is not fixed but produced linguistically and subject to interference (IJECE, n.d.). The general overview of critical attitudes toward Hamlet further supports this linguistic stress. The dependence on rhetorical figures discussed by scholars in formalist, psychoanalytic, and linguistic traditions has been explored in Hamlet, including puns, hendiadys, paradox, and soliloquy. Such devices are not interpreted as flowering but as a manifestation of Hamlet's split consciousness. Language is therefore the primary tool with which Hamlet bargains selfhood, uncertainty and moral responsibility (Wikipedia, n.d.). Self-deception and interiority have also been used to give psychological accounts of the Shakespearean tragedies. Studies stored in scholarly archives, such as the Knowledge Bank, indicate that soliloquies offer insight into a state of psychological fragmentation, in which characters justify self-destructive urges or hide the presence of ethical dilemmas. Self-deceptive reasoning processes in Macbeth and Hamlet are

reflected in soliloquies, which show that language helps characters convince themselves and then persuade others (Knowledge Bank Repository, n.d.).

The richness of Shakespearean rhetoric is also further contextualised in historical linguistic studies. The article by Academy Publications has emphasised the unusual range of Shakespearean vocabulary and the flexibility of his syntax, and placed his linguistic innovativeness in the context of Elizabethan standards of education and rhetoric. According to these studies, Shakespeare manages linguistic resources so well that he can reflect even the slightest changes in thinking, feeling, and identity, underscoring the importance of language in the creation of psychology as the central issue (Academy Publication, n.d.). However, contemporary Shakespearean studies are placing greater emphasis on identity as a performance, constructed and destabilised by language. Articles in the International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (IJECE) suggest that rhetoric in Hamlet and Othello is performative, so that characters develop temporary identities, which are subject to linguistic interference. The self-reflexive speech reveals Hamlet's identity; therefore, Othello relies on rhetoric that is socially acknowledged as fact, and thus he is prone to manipulation (IJECE, n.d.).

Numerous critical approaches to Hamlet further support this linguistic focus. According to critical surveys on Wikipedia, it has long been believed among scholars that Hamlet uses rhetorical devices, including puns, hendiadys, paradox, and soliloquy, in relation to his broken consciousness. The interpretations of these rhetorical tools are perceived as manifestations of intellectual conflict rather than word play, which supports the notion that Hamlet's self-expression occurs through language (Wikipedia, n.d.). Multisubject Journal multidisciplinary views have situated Shakespeare within the broader historical, cultural, and linguistic frameworks. These surveys combine elements of social history, linguistics, and literary criticism, showing how Shakespeare's language reflects the Renaissance concerns about the sources of power, identity, and persuasion. These structures justify studying rhetoric as a culturally constituted practice rather than an aesthetic decision (Multisubject Journal, n.d.). The Internet Shakespeare Editions indicates that historical criticism of Othello is increasingly focused on rhetoric and language. The play was criticised early on by critics like Thomas Rymer as morally corrupt, and later critics, such as Samuel Johnson, acknowledged its realism of mind. The rhetoric and dramatic irony are structural forces that are increasingly recognised by contemporary criticism as the primary focus of the tragic construction, where language is at the centre (Internet Shakespeare Editions, n.d.). A psychological approach that directly linked language to thinking was introduced with Romantic criticism, especially in Samuel Taylor Coleridge's readings of Hamlet. The focus Coleridge gives to Hamlet's reflective speech stresses language as the mode of consciousness that persists in contemporary linguistic and psychoanalytic criticism (ecommons.luc.edu, n.d.). The arguments on whether Shakespeare is unique in his rhetoric also add to this debate. Articles by the Hill Publishing Group consider whether Shakespearean language is particularly rich in emotional and cognitive complexity compared with that of his age. These arguments support the view that Shakespeare's rhetorical depth allows it to present psychological interiority like never before (Hill Publishing Group, n.d.). Another dimension of the performative analysis of language is offered by feminist and gender-based criticism, which focuses on issues of power and identity. The Multisubject Journal of Research focuses on how characters such as Lady Macbeth and Desdemona negotiate gender norms through rhetoric, demonstrating that language is a site of resistance, compliance, and transgression (Multisubject Journal, n.d.).

The psychological interpretations stored in the Knowledge Bank's repository are dedicated to self-deception and interiority and hold that soliloquies offer a glimpse of rationalisation and moral conflict. These works indicate that language can be used to trick oneself first, before tricking others, adding further support for the idea that soliloquy contributes to psychological fragmentation (Knowledge Bank Repository, n.d.). Published works in historical linguistics contextualise the elaborate vocabulary and syntactic versatility of Shakespeare within Elizabethan educational standards. This type of research helps substantiate the claim that Shakespearean rhetorical richness is culturally rooted and artistically unique (Academy Publication, n.d.). Most recent computational and digital humanities methods, reported on bv-f.org, build on traditional criticism by quantifying it. The study of computational linguistics and machine learning examines sentiment, lexical density, and emotional patterns in Shakespeare's language, providing empirical evidence supporting the argument for rhetorical and emotional complexity (bv-f.org, n.d.). Lastly, the work on theatre history published in Early Theatre connects literary analysis to performance theory, thereby showing how soliloquies functioned in early modern theatrical practice. These works support the view that the soliloquy is a linguistic and performative tool that simultaneously addresses the audience's cognition and emotion (Early Theatre, n. d.).

Rhetoric as the Structural Foundation of Shakespearean Tragedy

This paper illustrates that the function of rhetoric in the Shakespearean great tragedies is not that of an ornamental stylistic element, but rather that of a structural apparatus in which the tragic action is produced, fostered, and brought to a climax. The tragedy in Macbeth, Othello and Hamlet does not take shape through the force of fate, chance, or even brute force; the tragedy is created by the process of speaking, listening, misinterpreting, interpreting, and internalising words. Shakespeare manages to create a dramatic universe where words are neither descriptions of action but rather generate. Speech is a causal phenomenon, and rhetorical dialogue becomes the driving force of tragic movement. All decisive action in these plays comes before or with or is explained by language, and this suggests that the very concept of tragedy has itself been thought of as a linguistic activity.

Shakespeare's advanced manipulation of rhetoric is the result of his education at an Elizabethan grammar school, where the study of classical rhetoric was central to intellectual training. The students were taught the rhetorical theories of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian strictly in terms of analysing an argument, manipulating emotion, and persuading either ethically or through deceit. Shakespeare assimilates such traditions and turns them into the practice of drama. Instead of treating rhetoric as an oratory art form not tied to character, he incorporates rhetorical tactics into the psychological depths of his heroes and villains. Both argument, persuasion, and verbal thinking take the form of inner conflict and moral struggle. Compared with the didactic rhetoric of the previous morality plays, in which speech was the tool to strengthen distinct moral lines of conduct, Shakespearean rhetoric is psychologically driven and morally perilous. Characters do not only convince others; it is more important that they convince themselves. This fatal decline, then, does not happen when an external force defeats a character, but when the language manages to reformulate his perception of reality, of rightness and wrongness, and of selfhood.

Rhetoric as Action: Othello and Cassio (Act 3, Scene 3).

The best measure of the fact that rhetoric is action is to be found in the long conversation between Iago and Othello in Act 3, Scene 3 of Othello. It is not so much that this scene is preparatory for the tragedy, but that it

is the tragedy itself in a linguistic form. In almost four hundred lines, Iago manages to lead Othello to his mental ruin without even accusing Desdemona directly. Suppose the following protracted conversation:

Iago: My lord, I know I love you.

Othello: I think thou dost;

Moreover, nothing know I I thou art full of love and honesty.

And weighst thy words, and weighst before thou breakest,

So much the more these halts of thine scare me.

Iago: For Michael Cassio,

I may swear I believe him to be honest.

Othello: Think, my lord?

Iago: Think, my lord?

This conversation shows the application of rhetoric as psychological engineering. The continual repetition of the word think by Iago disrupts epistemological assurance. He brings uncertainty not in what is being said, but in what his captor does; through hesitation, Othello must question the accuracy of his own senses. This rhetorical strength is a performative restraint. Meaning is brought to light in an implicative, not an assertive manner. At the moment the irony strikes, when Iago says, Men should be what they seem, the viewer is aware of the ethical emptiness behind the words. The tragedy arises not from the false information given to Othello, but from the reorganisation of his understanding of truth that rhetoric has brought about in him.

As the conversation proceeds, the language of Othello starts taking on the rhetorical patterns of Iago:

Othello: Why did I marry? This actual animal was without doubt.

He unfolds less than he sees and knows.

In this case, Othello acts on Iago's suggestions on his behalf. Rhetoric has reached the stage of complete internalisation. The long conversation indicates that speech is not prior to action; instead, it substitutes for it.

Persuasive Rhetoric and Power: Language as Action

One of the key conclusions made in this discussion is that rhetoric in Shakespearean tragedies is an action in itself. Words do not merely prefigure actions; words are the action. Moreover, nowhere is this principle more forcibly demonstrated than in Othello, where the manipulation which Iago pursues is almost entirely by the subtleties of rhetoric and quite independent of the accuser. The technique used by Iago is based on insinuation, calculated pauses, deliberate silences, and appositely seemingly casual comments, which invite interpretation but do not confirm it. His infamous line, "Ha! An example of that technique is I like that. The saying is grammatically fragmentary and semantically loose and diffuse, but its psychological effect is appalling. By refusing to explain, Iago compels Othello to add meaning of his own, thus making Othello guilty of his own disillusionment. This is very much in line with the concept of suggestio, which is a form of persuasion by implication, not by statement, as described by Quintilian. The paper indicates that such indirect rhetoric is much more destructive than direct slander, since it sows suspicion in the listener's reason. Persuasive rhetoric is more confrontational and coercive in Macbeth, especially in Lady Macbeth's words. She uses aggressive imperatives, violent metaphors, and gendered shame to shatter Macbeth's moral indecisiveness in her speech in Act 1, Scene 7. She rhetorically builds his self-image by doubting his manhood and redefining the concept of courage as cold-blooded behaviour. Her order to screw your courage to the sticking-place makes abstract

determination physical, turning psychological hesitation into body preparedness. The role of language in this context is one of domination; it exerts power over values, and it not only influences opinions.

In contrast, Hamlet portrays rhetoric as self-centred rather than enforced. Hammond of Hamlet is not manipulative but a philosophical self-interrogation. The famous meditation of man in his work *What a piece of work is a man* is arranged in the logical flow of admiration into disgust, and is organised as a rhetorical argument which destroys its own premises. This form of rhetoric does not force one to act; it creates existential paralysis. Rhetoric in Hamlet is more of an instrument of thought than of domination, and this depicts Shakespeare's ability to portray persuasion as a deadly and philosophical process.

In the first scene of the play, Act 1, Scene 7, Lady Macbeth vs. Macbeth illustrates rhetoric as the use of force. Macbeth enters the scene having already reasoned against murdering. The next thing that comes is a protracted rhetorical attack that throws his moral opposition down:

Macbeth: We shall have no more business of this nature.

He hath honoured me of late, and I have purchased.

All kinds of people, with golden opinions,

What now would be donned in their latest polish,

Not cast aside so soon.

Lady Macbeth: Was it the hope drunk?

Where are you dressed yourself! Hath it slept since?

Moreover, sleeps it up, to be so green and pale.

At what it did so freely?

The rhetoric of Lady Macbeth redefines moral indecision as cowardice and inconsistency. She uses rhetorical questions not to invite conversation but to dominate the interpretation. Her speech is inexhaustible:

Lady Macbeth: As long as you can durst it, then thou wast man;

Moreover, to be more than one you were, you would.

Be so much more the man.

Violence here is brought back through rhetoric to construct masculinity. The silence of Macbeth throughout much of this dialogue is an indication of a rhetorical failure. He only replies finally, and his language is reminiscent of Lady Macbeth:

Macbeth: I am composed, and bend up.

Every corporal agent has this dreadful strength.

The success of the persuasion lies in this change. The discussion demonstrates that the killing of Duncan is rhetorically accomplished prior to it being staged.

Rhetoric and Ethical Bamboozlement: To Woo without Speaking.

The Shakespearean tragedies go to great lengths to show that eloquence is not congruent with moral integrity. Rather, rhetoric is a tool that can refreeze reality, suspend moral absolutes and lie with conviction. In Othello, Macbeth, and Hamlet, the most rhetorically endowed characters use language to disrupt moral certainties, either through deception, equivocation, or, sometimes, philosophical relativism. Shakespeare, therefore, creates a tragic world in which words come first, then deeds, then words that eat away morals and then bloodshed.

Rhetoric as the Moral Emptiness and Strategic Deception of Othello.

Iago is the clearest division of rhetorical skill and moral content by Shakespeare. He does proclaim the ruin of the old relation between words and reality.

“I am not what I am.” (Othello, I.i.65)

This is a line that knowingly reverses the word of God in the book of Exodus-“I am that I am”-and it indicates that we were living in a world where words no longer carry moral legitimacy. Iago's rhetoric is not just a form of deception; it is strategically empty, meant to instil distrust without seeming so.

The constant emphasis of Iago on the truth serves as rhetoric camouflage:

“Men should be what they seem.” (III.iii.126)

This is a morally sound statement on its own, but it is ironic to the point of shattering, considering who is saying this. Shakespeare employs dramatic irony to demonstrate how moral speech can be turned into a weapon without *any intention of doing good*.

The Rhetoric of Suggestion (Not Assertion).

Iago does not accuse Desdemona explicitly very often. *Instead*, he depends on innuendo and calculated pauses, leaving Othello to build the moral breakdown himself:

Iago: “O, beware, my lord, of jealousy;

Moreover, the green-eyed monster that doth mock.

The meat it feeds on.” (III.iii.165–167)

Iago seems to be morally responsible for faking that he is telling Othello that he should be cautious of jealousy, and in fact, he is the one who causes him to feel it even more. False statements do not create ethical ambiguity; factual statements do, when put in a corrupt rhetorical frame.

Language as Moral Infection Othello digests the rhetoric of Iago:

This plain living being doubtless.

He unfolds less than he sees and knows more, much more. (III.iii.248–249)

In this case, faith comes before facts. Shakespeare demonstrates that rhetoric replaces moral judgment and that truth is irrelevant when perception is distorted.

Macbeth: Perversion and the disintegration of the moral dualism.

Ethical ambiguity in Macbeth does not begin in the human form, but rather in the form of linguistic ambiguity, as represented by the witches.

The morality itself is destroyed in the chant of the witches:

“Fair is foul, and foul is fair.” (I.i.11)

This paradox is not a hoax; instead, it restructures moral perception. Good and evil are not opposite but rather tend to be exchanged. Importantly, this formulation is reiterated in the first line of Macbeth:

So nasty and cruel a day I never saw. (I.iii.38)

This repetition reveals that exposure to rhetoric comes before moral corruption. Before committing any crime, Macbeth is ethically disturbed. Language is what you are correct in terming a mental virus- subtle, ubiquitous and transformative.

The prophesies of the witches are technically correct but morally false:

Hail, Macbeth, here we say that thou beest King of this world! (I.iii.50)

They are not telling Macbeth to kill, but the words they use are open to interpretation rather than criticism. Macbeth, on his part, knows the risk: whose murder still is fanciful, my thought.

The thing is, the crime is conceived through language and imagination rather than action.

Lady Macbeth: Ethical Reprogramming in Rhetoric.

Lady Macbeth is aware of the rhetorical techniques to destroy the moral opposition:

Appear like the simple blossom,
However, be the serpent under't." (I.v.65–66)

This recommendation actually separates appearance from ethical reality, thus strengthening Shakespeare's theme that rhetoric can be used to commit morally wrong deeds.

Hamlet: Rhetoric as a Relativism Philosophy.

Hamlet does not bring out rhetoric in the way Othello and Macbeth do, but in the form of interpretive instability. Language will never tell lies — it challenges absolutes. The noted statement of Hamlet discredits moral objectivity:

Nothing is good or bad; it is only thinking that makes it so. (II.ii.249–250)

In this case, Rhetoric is a mirror of Renaissance scepticism and humanism, which holds that morality is not predetermined but constructed through thought and words. The soliloquies of Hamlet display moral stasis that has been caused by overthinking:

Conscience, therefore, does make us all cowards.

And so the natural colour of determination.

Is sicklied by the coldness of the cast of thought. (III.i.83–85)

The rhetoric of Hamlet is not manipulative, unlike that of Iago, and this destabilises ethics by postponing action and clouding moral judgment. Hamlet actually distinguishes between talking and doing something morally:

“Words, words, words.” (II.ii.192)

This sentence represents the inadequacy of language and, at the same time, proves its superiority to action.

Self-Persuasion and Interior Rhetoric

Another major dramatic innovation that Shakespeare accomplished, as this paper reveals, is the concept of interior rhetoric, in which characters convince themselves through systematic linguistic arguments. In Macbeth, soliloquies can be viewed as forensic debates in which Macbeth considers motives, consequences, and morality. The well-known "If it were done when'tis done" soliloquy is built using conditional clauses, repetition, and logical sequence, imitating the form of a legal argument. Macbeth's mind is rhetorically grounded, and it proves that even thinking is influenced by the rules of persuasion.

The preceding soliloquy by Macbeth is also another confirmation that action is a result of rhetorical thought: However, he that should have done it when thou should do, then should that be well.

It was done quickly. If the assassination

Should plough up the aftermath, and seize.

With his surcease success...

The soliloquy is designed in the form of a formal argument with conditional clauses, repetition, and causality. Macbeth is a weigher of premises and consequences. The language imitates legal deliberation, and it proves that even thought has a rhetorically structured format. His downfall is not stupidity but the eventual oratory triumph of morals over ambition.

In Hamlet, interior rhetoric is self-obsessive and self-generative. The To be or not to be soliloquy establishes a cause-and-effect scenario between conscience, imagination and inaction. What is tragic about Hamlet is not his indecision but his surrogate rhetorical awareness, in which all possible actions are taken and discussed to death. The thinking is a hindrance to thought.

The best-known soliloquy by Hamlet is an example of rhetoric in the form of philosophical paralysis:

Now to be or not to be, That is the question:

Whether nobler in the head to bear.

The darts and strokes of maddening fate,

Alternatively, fight against a sea of woes...

The speech is presented as a balanced rhetorical argument, with all the sides brought forward with equal eloquence. Hamlet creates hypothetical consequences, objections and moral credentials:

Conscience, therefore, makes us all cowards.

And so the natural colour of determination.

Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought...

In this case, it is not the rhetoric that is a trick, but it overpowers action. The tragedy is that there is too much articulation; language proliferates so much that decisiveness is lost.

On the contrary, Othello is characterised by a lack of long-term interior rhetoric. Othello is not involved in monologues, spearheading his thoughts; instead, his language experiences a gyratory emotional fluctuation at the hands of the external. Even his invocation of black vengeance is a rhetorical failure to reach emotional absolutism. Lacking internal rhetorical struggle, Othello becomes language-dependent on Iago, giving up any interpretive control of his own life.

Rhetoric, Feeling, and Psychological Control.

The paper also confirms that Shakespearean rhetoric makes emotion the main aim, rather than reason. The language used by Iago in Othello is full of animal metaphors and racialised imagery that do not rely on logic and elicit an immediate reaction. The picture of the old black ram does not serve as an argument but as an emotional attack; it creates fear, disgust, and anxiety that overwhelm all logical thinking.

Later on, when the rhetoric of Iago hits its peak, the words of Othello become disjointed:

O, blood, blood, blood!

Black vengeance, rise, out of thy hollow cell!

This is not a rational discourse; this is rhetoric property. Psychological breakdown manifests as a loss of syntactic balance. Language is no longer the thought mediator; it is pure emotion.

Emotional rhetoric in Macbeth tends to take the supernatural form. The call Lady Macbeth makes on the spirits is not a literal spell but a rhetorical act that calls for psychological change. The discourse of ownership and unsexing shows how rhetoric can redefine identity using emotional intensity.

The rhetoric presented by the witches creates ethical ambiguity with the help of the choral language:

Fair is foul, and foul is fair:

Fly in the fog and cloudy air.

Macbeth repeats this syntax later when he says-

So nasty and iusne jour I have not seen--

The repetition of language is an indication of rhetorical pollution. The long prophetic monologue that ensues is not educative but a semantic destabilisation, an invitation to Macbeth to commit an action without being told how to behave morally.

In Hamlet, emotional rhetoric is gloomy and reflective. Hamlet describes his hopelessness in a restrained way using metaphor, rhythm and repetition instead of explosivity. His melancholy is rhetorical and shows that his mind is expressed in language rather than action.

Lastly, this discussion shows the use of rhetoric in building and destroying authority. In Othello, the social and military authority relies on the verbal reputation and consistent self-presentation. The language of Othello fails him in times of emotional strain, and so does his power. Linguistically speaking, kingship is constituted in Macbeth: it is only constituted by being spoken and recognised. Macbeth is brought to the point where he begins to be Hail King of Scotland.

Political rhetoric takes centre stage in Hamlet, though characters like Claudius and Fortinbras feature prominently in the play, with their tactical speech markedly opposed to the philosophical rhetoric of Hamlet. Shakespeare thus compares the rhetoric of governance in society with the rhetoric of conscience and discovers that language is the site where power, legitimacy, and opposition are negotiated.

2. Soliloquy as a Self-Revelatory Device through Language

The dramatic irony and false language of Shakespearean tragedies interact intricately, powerfully driving the story towards tragedy, and at the same time revealing the weakness of human words. In contrast to the soliloquy, a transparent window into a character's soul, the deceptive language is a kind of verbal mask that characters use to alter their neighbours' minds. This establishes a continuity of dramatic irony in which the audience is placed in a god-like position, able to see the difference between the performance and the intent of a character's outer. Words in this linguistic paradigm are not used to express truth, but to create false worlds that the tragic heroes are compelled to live in.

In Othello, the falsity of deception is founded on the weaponisation of the idea of honesty. Iago is not just a liar; he is a master of a complicated kind of linguistic psychological warfare. He applies apophasis, the figurative device of saying nothing while making it seem as if he is going around it, to sow the seeds of suspicion in Othello's mind without even stating the allegation. Indicatively, his very offhand remark, Ha! I do not like that (3.3), when Cassio is seen leaving Desdemona, is a masterpiece in falsely brief lines. Since the audience has already listened to the soliloquy of Iago in the first Act when he says I am not what I am (1.1), each following line is saturated with dramatic irony. The viewer witnesses, with increasing horror, as Othello, a man of open and free nature, is gradually choked by a tangle of signifiers stripped of their original components. The trick that Iago employs is successful, since he fakes the plain-spoken tone of a soldier, which makes Othello believe that the words he displays are those of a righteous man, who is unable to utter such a harsh truth, instead of the pause of a hunter, who is calculating their next move. The tragedy ends as the physical object, the handkerchief, that is misconstrued to provide the physical proof that Othello requires, is the demonstration that, in the world of lying words, even physical things can be used to reinforce a lie. The art of lying in Macbeth develops into equivocation, a metaphysical power. This is the art of speaking in vague

terms to make a listener reach the wrong decision, even though he is technically speaking the literal truth. The Weird Sisters, who are the main culprits of this, establish the tone of the language by the paradox of foul being fair and fair being foul (1.1). This creates a particular form of dramatic irony, with Macbeth feeling bold because the prophecies the reader sees are a riddle. At the time when the apparitions assure Macbeth that none of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth (4.1), he takes this as a promise of immortality. The audience, however, feels the "two senses" of the words that they know the absolute truth will be revealed later that Macduff was a caesarean baby. The instability of this language reflects Macbeth's moral instability. When he and Lady Macbeth are trying to cover up their killing of King Duncan, they speak of borrowed robes and feign the nature of the innocent flower, but the serpent is under them. The dramatic irony has reached its climax towards the end of the play when Macbeth understands that the truth has been used against him by the juggling fiends. His ultimate conclusion that life is a story / Told by an idiot... meaning nothing (5.5) spells out utter failure of language; when words can mean anything by being equivocal, it ultimately means nothing.

In Hamlet, the element of deceitful words is not to gain predatory interests but to survive intellectually and to explore morals. The fact that Hamlet uses his dissimulation as a tactic in deceiving the court of Claudius: he uses puns, metaphors, and riddles, which further complicate the topic of his speech. This forms a special ironic dimension of drama: the characters on stage (Polonius, Gertrude, Claudius) examine Hamlet's speech to determine that the court may be suffering from clinical insanity, while the audience understands it as a brilliant illustration of how the court has gone awry.

The fact that Hamlet tells Polonius that he is being truthful, because, according to Hamlet, to be honest is to be one man among every ten thousand (2.2), is a fake facade of madness to be talking of the fact that there is no integrity within Elsinore. In dramatic irony, the most significant instance occurs when the play of Mousetrap is taking place. Hamlet manipulates an illusion (the play) to unveil a truth (Claudius's guilt), which is actually a technique of deception through art to disclose a concealed murder. Hamlet employs language as a scalpel with which to break down the deception of others, in contrast to Othello, who is a victim of language who simply repeats it, or Macbeth, who is enamoured of it. The irony, however, is that it is his devotion to linguistic complexity and his desire to think too exactly in the event that leads to his paralysis of mind; that is, although it is applied to the truth, lying language can alienate and ruin the speaker.

Dramatic Irony and Deceptive Language

The Othello is constructed in the architecture of tragedy based on linguistic simulation in which the difference between the signifier (word) and signified (truth) is capitalised to a fatal extent. The deceptive language used by Iago is not a simple set of lies but a complex psychological mechanism aimed at breaking down Othello's noble and epic identity. The dramatic irony is achieved as soon as Iago admits that he is not what he is (1.1), a blasphemical reversal of the biblical meaning of God, which immediately makes the audience omniscient spectators of a slow-motion execution. Iago employs the rhetorical device of apophysis -the act of feigning the absence of knowledge in order to make it appear more important-and, thus, compelling Othello into being the architect of his own misery, in instances where hesitation markers and cryptic interjections are applicable, such as Ha!, when Iago is the one saying them. I like not that (3.3), he leaves a gap in meaning that is filled by the insecurity that Othello suffers. The extreme elaboration of this trick is the repetition of the epithet Honest Iago, the linguistic figure of irony of a leitmotif. Whenever Othello speaks this line, the viewer gets a physical thrill

as they realise that Iago is, in fact, poisoning his ear. The magnificent, rhythmic verse of Othello is turned to the gibberish of Iago, the language used by the latter consisting of prose rather than verse, and this shows that the annihilation of his linguistic basis preceded the annihilation of the man.

In Macbeth, the false wording shifts into a metaphysical crisis through equivocation. This is the most Shakespearean kind of deception in which the speaker makes a statement that is, literally speaking, true but deliberately deceptive in context. These prophesies of the Weird Sisters serve as the linguistic loophole of the play; when they assure Macbeth that none of the women born would harm him, they are exploiting a linguistic loophole that Macbeth is too proud to recognise. The structural dramatic irony of this situation is that the audience knows that foul is fair, but Macbeth believes the words only seem fair. This is an effect of semiotic instability, in which the use of language is no longer a stable source of reality. This is also complicated by Lady Macbeth, who encourages a complete division between the eye and the hand, telling her husband to go out and beguile the time / Look like the time (1.5). This order to act a fake identity is what produces a permanent condition of drama irony in all courtly dealings, including when the Macbeths have King Duncan at their table. The audience sees the flower of innocence (hospitality) and is aware of the serpent's (the dagger's) presence. Finally, the play implies that when a character starts paltering in a twofold sense, he or she cannot find the significance in any language. In his very last nihilistic moment, Macbeth decides that life is nothing but a mere story, just a narrative told by an ass... that means nothing (5.5).

In Hamlet, the use of deceptive language is turned into a defensive tool of intellectual protest through the so-called antic disposition. Hamlet does not resort to obtaining power; he employs the method of dissimulation, the concealment of his intentions, to live in a court characterised by espionage and hypocrisy. The irony in this play is dramatic, as Hamlet clearly informs the audience (and his friends) that he will assume an antic disposition (1.5). Therefore, all his outbursts of lunacy at Polonius or Claudius are deciphered to the audience as an intellectual act of high stakes. Hamlet makes use of stichomythia (fast speech) and puns to entrap his foes in their own stupidity. An example is when he refers to Polonius as a fishmonger; the viewer, realising that Polonius is actually being satirised, interprets it literally as a sign of psychosis. This linguistic play is inspired by the Mousetrap scene, in which Hamlet employs a mimetic lie (the play) to reveal a literal truth (Claudius's guilt). The irony is doubled: the court believes it is viewing a fiction when it is really witnessing the uncovering of a crime. The language of Hamlet is a trap to those who attempt to pluck out the heart of his mystery (3.2), and thus illustrates that, in a world where people are villains all wearing a smile, the language of the theatre is the only way to tell the truth.

Psychological and identity-based interpretations of Shakespearean tragedy show that the self is not a concrete entity, but a delicate construction that is maintained around the language a character employs and the language others employ to narrate about him/her. The linguistic self in such plays is the initial target of attack, and the main character's physical demise always follows its failure. Shakespeare employs words to trace the inner world and to progress through the so-called public self to a disjointed, so-called private chaos.

Othello: The Downfall of the Outwardized Self.

In Othello, identity solely relies on external language confirmation and reputation, the elements that the main character calls his parts, title, and perfect soul (1.2). The Othello Music, a grand, rhythmic, and heroic register, forms Othello's sense of self, emphasising his status as a warrior. However, since his identities are constructed from the narratives he narrates (his history of travel), they are always susceptible to linguistic re-coding.

Psychological warfare that Iago carries out consists of the systematic deconstruction of this epic language. Through animalistic imagery and lowbrow prose that Iago puts into Othello's mind, he pushes the character toward a dissociative state. It becomes apparent when Othello starts to echo Iago's disjointed syntax with barks of commands such as "Handkerchief!" Confessions! Goat and monkeys! (4.1)--his identity as a courteous and sensible general is destroyed. He loses both his social signifier and is transformed into this particular beast that was mentioned in the first act by Iago. The tragedy is that Othello cannot exist without a linguistic reflection; his identity is not internal but rather a useful fiction that is defended by the words of those around him; the language of his foreground is corrupted, and his perfect soul is lost in the emptiness of jealousy.

Macbeth: The Prey-like Character of Prophetic Identity.

In Macbeth, identity does not belong to a character, yet it is rather something that is inserted by the force of outside persuasion. The Weird Sisters employ language to form a futuristic identity for Macbeth before he has accomplished anything to merit it. The language, when they make him a king hereafter (1.3), is a psychological stimulus, making him a kind of suggestion that loosens his hair, and his heart knocks against his ribs. This is a drastic change: the speech is prior to the self; Macbeth starts to perceive the self he is carrying as present, as a stepping stone to the linguistically promised self. His identity is turned into a site of moral disintegration as he is torn between his nature (which Lady Macbeth calls "too full of the milk of human kindness") and the manhood as determined by the violent rhetoric of his wife. Lady Macbeth employs misleading words in order to unsex herself and to defy Macbeth as to his masculinity, which she practically humiliates him into a fresh identity as a murderer of his wife. At the conclusion of the play, the identity of Macbeth has been drained in by the "equivocation of the fiend" to the point that he no longer experiences fear or grief. This sense of self has been substituted by a battered out linguistic nihilism where he serves as a poor actor, / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage (5.5), a man who has turned into a ghost in his own existence.

Hamlet: Fission and the Prostrate Intellectual.

In Hamlet, the protagonist's character is defined by not being fixed by the court's language. Hamlet lives in an eternal linguistic estrangement, and he displays the same through linguistic puns, paradoxes and doublespeak. He makes his first appearance in the play with the line, more than kin, and less than kind (1.2), which clearly identifies him as an outsider who plays on words to help him build a separation between himself and the defiled state of Denmark. The distinction between Hamlet and Othello is that Hamlet has a shifting performance as opposed to the identity of Othello, who is a monument. His anti-disposition is a mental disguise to enable him to experiment with various incarnations of the self: madman, lover, scholar, and venger, without having to belong to any of them. This disintegration is also expressed in his constant use of the interrogative; his identity is a train of questions rather than statements. The notorious pun, too much in the sun (1.2), is a triple signifier, since he is too much in the sonship of Claudius, too in the sun of the court, and too much in the son-like needs his dead father. The tragedy of Hamlet is the paralysis of the mind; he knows too well how language creates false identities, and as a result, he cannot occupy one of his own, which causes him to experience a feeling of nothingness that can only be overcome upon realising that the readiness is all (5.2).

Bigger Shakespearean Criticism Applicable to Language.

The result of this combination of classical and modern criticism is to point out that Shakespeare's innovation is more a matter of spatialization of language, the conversion of the words spoken into the physicalized psychological space. Shakespeare not only transcends plot communication through language, but also exploits

the materiality of language (sound and rhythm, its ambiguity) to create internal states that would otherwise be impossible to express. This methodology is consistent with the development of the literary theory as it overcomes the essentialism of A.C. Bradley and the linguistic formalism of the New Critics.

In Othello, the mental disturbance is an object of the so-called objective correlative, which T.S. Eliot says. Instead of letting Othello merely tell his story of jealousy, Shakespeare gives us a collection of linguistic items and sensory images: the repetitive handkerchief, the low animal metaphors, the syntax that becomes increasingly fragmented and discontinuous, which is the algorithm of that very feeling. When Othello cries, "Pish! Noses, ears, and lips. Is't possible? Confess? Handkerchief! The very words are the correlative of his mental disintegration: O devil! (4.1). The viewers never watch his insanity; they feel it in the disintegration of his former "Othello Music," which was once good together. It confirms that Bradley focuses on the character's tragic flaw and bases it on the language structures peculiar to a given circumstance, which reveal the flaw to the viewer.

The atmosphere of the psyche in Macbeth is the effect described by Thomas De Quincey and called the knocking at the gate effect: the passage of the supernatural into the human through sound and rhythm. Trochaic tetrameter of witches in Double, double toil and trouble;/ Fire burn and cauldron bubble (4.1) produces a hypnotic, chant-like tetrameter, which does not follow the beat of a human heart of iambic pentameter. This tonal tension serves as a transmitter of mental discomfort, suggesting a world in which the morality of things is reversed. The ambiguity, as the subject of New Critical interest here, is not a plot but a linguistic paradox that compels the reader to hold two mutually incompatible truths simultaneously. The feel of the language, those harsh plosives, the sibilant sounds of the "S" do create a sense of the air as being thick. The fog is foggy, reflecting what Macbeth is experiencing on the inside, as well as his fall into the realm where the function is smothered in surmise.

The linguistic interiority in Hamlet is pioneered by a series of intellectual paradoxes that indicate the main character's alienation. The puns in Hamlet are the final object of interest of the New Critics, as they dwell upon the multiplicity of meaning. In the same way that Hamlet employs the word common when he is responding to his mother, the commonness (vulgarity) of his mother remarrying, Hamlet is, at the same time, referring to the universality of death as well as the commonness (vulgarity) of her remarriage. This cloud of uncertainty enables Hamlet to maintain a secret identity while operating in an open environment. This confirms the contemporary interpretation of Hamlet as the first modern man, whose interiority is too big to fit in the exterior world. The objective correlative here is even the state of Denmark, itself, -unweeded garden / That grows to seed- (1.2) -which furnishes the physical correlate of the internal Hamlet feeling of rot. The patterns of Shakespeare make the tragedy experienced not directly by the event but by the sound and fury of the language describing it.

Conclusion

The synthesis in this study fulfils this statement; Shakespearean tragedy is essentially a crisis of language. The soliloquy, having been turned into the function of plot explanation, was turned by Shakespeare into a means of psychological self-disclosure, which is the characteristic feature of modern drama. The infinitives of being in Hamlet, of sleeping, are more than a choice and symbolise the inability of an identity to get out of a vortex of its own intellectual syntax. The language of the soliloquies is so full of metaphors in Macbeth that the decline of morals follows a chart in which the hero is conscious of his own vaulting ambition, but is verbally

bound to the wickedness that he opts to pursue. On the other hand, the very little introspective space in Othello exposes a personality that is completely externalised and, therefore, is a blank slate for the linguistic inscriptions of others. This study confirms that the soul in these plays is not a silent entity but a vocal one, and can only be real as long as the spoken word serves as the medium.

Moreover, the analysis confirms that the irony of drama and the use of deceptive language are the deteriorating factors that erode these created identities. The audience's superior knowledge is one of the catalysts, transforming routine speech into a site of intolerable tension. The manipulations of the term of honesty by Iago, the application of equivocation by the Weird Sisters, prove that the truth in Shakespeare can be a victim of circumstances. The study underscores that when characters such as Macbeth or Othello lose command of their personal linguistic resources, as they transcend majestic verse into piecemeal prose or even into base animal imagery, they are experiencing a psychological death before their physical one. This proves that a tragedy takes place when the character is overcome by the private truth within him or her, by the public lie, and that this operation is aided by the method of strategic silence in apophysis or the satiric disguise of the anti-disposition.

Lastly, the results are consistent with a hundred years of literary criticism that spans the diversity of character and psychological interpretations in Bradley, as well as the ambiguity and paradox that have been worried about by the New Critics. Using the idea of T.S. Eliot's concept of the objective correlative, this study will demonstrate how Shakespeare creates emotional resources by use of specific patterns of language- the weeds of Elsinor or the handkerchief of Venice- instead of the straightforward application of language. The monosyllabic, melodious, chant-like speech, which De Quincey recognises in Macbeth's speech, also helps bring to the fore the fact that even sound can be a source of psychological discomfort.

This study eventually concludes that Shakespearean tragedy is an architecture of motion of meaning. Identity is not the objective point but a state of language which is constantly being destabilised by the play of truth and deception. Shakespeare reminds his audience that the soliloquy provides insight into the ideal soul. However, the truth behind human existence is that we are left at the hands of the juggling fiends of language who are playing with us in a twofold manner and leaving the protagonist and the audience to traverse a world that is foul as fair and words that do not necessarily mean something.

References

Academy Publication. (n.d.). *Historical linguistics and Shakespeare's vocabulary range*. Academy Publication.

Belsey, C. (1985). *The subject of tragedy: Identity and difference in Renaissance drama*. Methuen.

Booth, W. C. (1974). *A rhetoric of irony*. University of Chicago Press.

Bradley, A. C. (1904). *Shakespearean tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*. Macmillan.

Brooks, C. (1947). *The well-wrought urn: Studies in the structure of poetry*. Harcourt Brace.

bv-f.org. (n.d.). *Computational linguistic studies on Shakespeare*.

bv-f.org. (n.d.). *Machine learning and sentiment analysis of Shakespeare's language*.

Calderwood, J. L. (1983). *To be and not to be: Negation and metaphor in Hamlet*. Columbia University Press.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment. (n.d.). *Shakespeare and the soliloquy in early modern English drama*. Cambridge University Press.

Coleridge, S. T. (1811–1812/1987). *Lectures and notes on Shakespeare*. Routledge.

De Quincey, T. (1823). *On the knocking at the gate in Macbeth*. Blackwood's Magazine.

Early Theatre. (n.d.). *Shakespeare and the history of soliloquies: Conventions and functions in early modern drama*. *Early Theatre Journal*.

Eliot, T. S. (1919). *Hamlet and his problems*. In *The Sacred Wood*. Methuen.

Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.

Hill Publishing Group. (n.d.). *Studies in Shakespeare's rhetorical complexity*. Hill Publishing Group.

IJECE. (n.d.). *Identity and performativity in Hamlet and Othello*. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*.

Internet ShShakespeare Editions. (n.d.). *Othello: A critical survey*. University of Victoria.

Knights, L. C. (1933). *How many children did Lady Macbeth have?* Gordon Fraser.

Knowledge Bank Repository. (n.d.). *Psychological interpretations of self-deception in Shakespearean soliloquy*.

Lanham, R. A. (1993). *The motives of eloquence: Literary rhetoric in the Renaissance*. Yale University Press.

Multisubject Journal. (n.d.). *Shakespeare: Historical and thematic surveys*.

Multisubject Journal. (n.d.). *Gender and rhetorical enactment in Shakespeare*.

Neely, C. T. (1985). *Women and men in Othello*. *Shakespeare Studies*, 17, 133–158.

PapersOwl. (n.d.). *Dramatic irony in Othello: Deception and audience engagement*.

Rymer, T. (1693/1956). *A short view of tragedy*. In *Critical essays of the seventeenth century*. Oxford University Press.

Showalter, E. (1987). *Feminist criticism in the wilderness*. Yale University Press.

Vocal. (n.d.). *Shakespeare's language of war and psychological imagery*.

Wikipedia. (n.d.). *Critical approaches to Hamlet*.

Wikipedia. (n.d.). *Objective correlative*.

Yubetsu Codex. (n.d.). *Stylistic variations in the depiction of deception in literary texts*.