

The Critical Hermeneutic Structure of Plot

1 – The king died and the queen died of grief. When the grief struck, the king became something of which whose death causes death-causing grief. The queen something of which the death of her king is a cause for death. A logical interpretation is that the life of the king was something that constitutes an *acute* utility for the queen.—Actual *predicative* modification of characters.

2 – What is the proximal critical inquiry as the upshot of interpretation of text? The proximity is determined by the context in which the inquiry is made. A prominent context is that in which the plot has been situated within a *text* as a literary device or form to forge aesthetic force.—Predication as a function of hypothetically imposed contexts— because interpretative inquiry that is directed at the author is inextricably bound up with counterfactual conditionals.

3 – There may a prominent context in which the critical inquiry is that whether had the queen died, the king would have *also* become something of which the death of his queen is a cause for his death. Prominent because it involves say a feminist discourse in which the reciprocity of acute utility constitution is rhetorically crucial.—power struggle for symmetry such that a queen is not to be less than a king in all respects.

4 – Or perhaps the critical inquiry is that whether there could have easily been other events that caused death-causing grief for the non-resilient queen. Prominent because it involves psychological, cognitive behavioral therapeutic or even social-psychological discourse in which the psychological resilience and (even collective) hyper-sensitivity to utility are rhetorically crucial.

5 – There is clearly psychological and social-psychological critique of the characters in textually-actual scenarios by default.—A case study: Dostoevsky in the preface to *The Brothers Karamazov* writes that Alexei Karamazov is his hero in the novel. Alexei Karamazov like any other character in a novel is subject to some criticism or other. This does not preclude the authorial intention. But we can inquire that what the prominent event in the plot is that attests most acutely to Alexei Karamazov's singular status. Is it the event that consist of him being tempted in his first meeting with Grushenka, because, as an icon of exotic beauty, she comes most closest to his temptation at the time of a most vulnerable circumstances? The *counterfactual* critique consist of whether she is in fact responsible to avert temptation by rectifying her original intention of propelling him to the temptation. The inquiry is whether Alexei Karamazov is actually about to be propelled but destined not to be so by external interventions.

6 – Psychological and social-psychological critique of the characters in the plot is a strand of literary criticism. How a depicted character does *actually* think despite appearances. How a depicted character would act or think under the siege of textually-*counterfactual* scenarios. Perhaps *contra* Derrida, one reason there is genre distinction between philosophy and literature is that a philosophical (or even literary-critical) text is not essentially subject to character psychology to which literary texts are contrastingly essentially subject.