

Hamlet Journal

Throughout the book thus far, we see that Shakespeare likes to show us how strong dual natures are amongst humans. The first instance that he shows us in *Hamlet* is when Hamlet is speaking to Gertrude alone in the first act. During their conversation, he acts like a depressed "Mommy's boy" when he agrees to all of the things she asks of him to do for her. However after she has left, he begins to go on about how much he hates that she married Claudius so soon after his father's death. He even goes as far as to say that the food from the funeral was also used at the wedding. Another character who shows us a strong dual nature is Claudius. We find out early in the book that he is responsible for the King's death through murder. Despite him doing such a horrible deed, he acts like a kind and noble king towards his subjects and Gertrude. Not until later on do we get see Claudius acting guilty for killing his own brother to steal his wife and take the throne, but it appears that he is more afraid of going to Hell for it than the actual act of murder. I have seen this idea of dual natures outside of Shakespeare's works as well. In a story I read called *Tamed*, modern America has been infested with a small group of mutated creatures that are terrorizing the country. A man named Dr. White whom owns a weapons company is very formal and determined to use his resources to stop the creatures and protect the citizens. Later on it shows that Dr. White is the one who created the creatures in the first place, and also that he is truly a twisted and evil man who is only using his resources for his own benefit.

Journal Entry Assessment

In the beginning of Hamlet, William Shakespeare uses dramatic irony to allow Hamlet to appear crazy to the others in the play, however, we know it is only an act. When Hamlet is talking to his friends after talking to the ghost of his father "As I perchance hereafter shall think meet To put an antic disposition on"(119). This prior knowledge makes us feel sympathetic for Hamlet throughout the play, giving him more leeway so the reader is able to forgive Hamlet for acting insane or making reckless decisions. This reminds me of in Oedipus how we knew he was a victim of prophecy, when Oedipus himself along with everyone else didn't know about the bad fortune. This made us feel bad for Oedipus and be more sympathetic and forgiving towards his actions because we know he will be put in a bad position later on in the book as a result of prophecy. The irony helps the audience create a sympathy for characters or a hatred towards them depending on what we know about the character. I like when authors use dramatic irony because I believe it makes a book more interesting when the reader is in a big brother position and knows things about certain characters that other characters do not know. It adds an element to the book which when not tapped into, I feel is a major downfall in a book's readability.

Hamlet Journal

Love, something you can find in Shakespears Romeo and Juliet, but can it be found in Hamlet? Does Hamlet really love anybody? Depending how you interpret each line of hamlet, you could say either he hates everybody, or he absolutely loves people. I believe that hamlet is a fairly hateful person. Does he love his mother? I think at one point he did, but now that Claudius has the throne Gertrude has become less important to Hamlet. During the scene where Gertrude is in here chambers, and Polonius is stabbed, depending how you view it, the use of the word "Fool" can give a variety of meanings. As I saw in the movie, the director chose a more sympathetic role for Hamlet where he is kind of apologizing for killing Polonius. Where as just reading the play, the class had came up with the idea that he had no sympathy for Polonius, and fool was used as a more harsh term. For us to know what idea was true, we would have to ask Shakespeare himself. Personally, I think Hamlet could care less who he kills at this point, he is no longer playing mad. Then there is Ophelia, Hamlets love until all the sudden he turns it off. This change comes out of nowhere, does he do this to emphasize his madness? Or is it just in spite of Polonius? Which could lead to why he may not care if he killed him. However, as Hamlets best friend, Horatio never left his side. Horatio has seen the ghost, so maybe Hamlet has to continue to enjoy his company so Horatio is on his side when the time comes. Honestly, the ghost is the real problem is this play, if the ghost were never to have appeared Hamlet would not have started acting mad, he also wouldn't destroy the relationship between him and Ophelia. He would continue to belive his father died without being murdered, and continue to pove his mother. He wouldn't care that Claudius ruled, and as a result Polonius wouldn't have been killed. Ophelia would still be alive and acting normal, and Hamlet would've never been sent to England. So if Hamlet should hate anyone, it should be King Hamlets ghost, he has destroyed everything that once was to ensure that he gats his revenge. Was it worth it? No, of course not. We will have to see what happens in the final act, what will change? What will be similar? Will the truth come out? I'll just have to wait.