



Literary Enigma

The International Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture
(Peer-reviewed and Indexed)

Vol. 1, Special Issue: 6

June 2025

Article No 10

1. Faculty, Department of
English, Techno India
College

Page No: 51-56



Queering the Tragedy: Homoerotic Rivalries and Same-Sex Intimacies in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

Partha Pramanik¹

Abstract

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, one of the most renowned tragedies in the Western literary canon, is often admired for its complex analysis of revenge, insanity, death, and the subtleties of human awareness. Though the tragedy has long been studied through philosophical, psychoanalytic, and political lenses, the themes homoeroticism within its male relationships has remained unexplored. Drawing on foundational queer theorists such as Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Alan Bray, this paper attempts to situate *Hamlet* in early modern homosocial context and the evolving concepts of sexuality. Through a close analysis of Hamlet's relations with Horatio, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, and Laertes, the paper illustrates the affective relations that confuse friendship, desire, rivalry, and betrayal. Hamlet's close dependence on Horatio subverts traditional platonic friendship, quietly undermining hetero-normative assumptions. In contrast, the broken relationships with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and the sexually charged hostility towards Laertes demonstrate how male relationships shift between tenderness and brutality. By queering duty, subjectivity, and catharsis themes, *Hamlet* subverts normative gender and desire constructs, infusing the tragedy with queer melancholy and ambiguity. Striking a balance between historical context and critical innovation, the study illustrates how queer readings enhance our understanding of the play's psychological and emotional landscape.

Keywords: Shakespeare, Hamlet, Tragedy, Queer, Homoeroticism, Homosociality

This work is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). This journal and its contents may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Queering the Tragedy: Homoerotic Rivalries and Same-Sex Intimacies in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

Introduction

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, one of the most renowned tragedies in the Western literary canon, is often admired for its complex analysis of revenge, insanity, death, and the subtleties of human awareness. The drama focuses on Prince Hamlet of Denmark, who deals with the ghostly announcement of his father's assassination at the hands of his uncle, Claudius who is also the new husband to Hamlet's mother, Gertrude. Torn between action and indecision, Hamlet's pursuit of revenge disintegrates into a series of deadly consequences. Through the centuries, the play *Hamlet* has been largely celebrated as a rich and diverse critical heritage. Even though political, philosophical, and psychoanalytic analyses have become most prominent among critics, a salient absence can be found in the specific interrogation of homoerotic subtexts in *Hamlet*, specifically in terms of relationships such as Hamlet and Horatio, or Hamlet and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. This neglect has derived from the marginalization of queer voices within early modern literary scholarship and the interpretative privileging of heteronormative paradigms.

This research paper aims to analyze the homoerotic tensions inherent in *Hamlet* using queer theory. Through a detail interrogation of the text's subtle depictions of male intimacy, emotional entanglement and the destabilization of normative gender and sexual identities, this paper hopes to enhance our knowledge of Hamlet as a queer site of possibility. At the centre of *Hamlet*, there are certain relationships which are defined by strong emotional entwinement: the troubled friendship between Hamlet and Horatio, the coded closeness with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, and the shifting power relations between Hamlet and Claudius. These relationships tend to blur the lines of platonic male camaraderie and erotic attachment, raising questions of repressed desires and social performances of masculinity. The research pivots on three key questions:

- How do relationships in Hamlet reflect homoerotic tensions?
- What role does Elizabethan understanding of male friendship and sexuality play in interpreting these dynamics?
- How does queering Hamlet reshape our understanding of tragedy?

Queer Theory and Early Modern Sexuality

Queer Theory comes to the prominence in the latter part of the 20th century, offering a critical lexicon for disrupting settled ideas of gender, sexuality, identity and it can be considered as a powerful tool for the reassessment of the early modern texts such as Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Judith Butler's 'theory of gender performativity', as described in *Gender Trouble*, claims that gender is not a natural attribute, rather a set of repeated performances that create the appearance of a fixed identity. This theory disrupts the binary framework of masculine and feminine roles, which is essential to evaluate the characters such as Hamlet, whose behavior and interactions challenge traditional gender roles. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in her book *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, develops the concept of a 'homosocial continuum'—where friendships between men, from platonic to outright erotic, become threaded through structures within society designed to obscure or control desire. Michel Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* complicates further modern readings by showing that terms such as "homosexual" and "heterosexual" are 19th century constructs; during the Elizabethan era, same-sex activities were not yet attached to an individual's fixed sexual identity, rather were acts open to moral, legal, and religious discussion. Drawing on these theoretical framework, Alan Bray's historical work *The Friend* also sheds light on how intensely emotional and affectionate same-sex friendships in early modern England were not only common, but also socially accepted, frequently formalized in rituals and celebrated in literature.

In Shakespearean studies, such paradigms of same-sex friendship and intimacy have been used to excavate queer subtexts from plays such as *Twelfth Night* where gender fluidity and cross-dressing disrupt hetero-normative love and *Coriolanus*, in which fierce masculine martial bonds take the centre stage. Applying all these understandings to *Hamlet*, we can re-evaluate the relationship between Hamlet and Horatio, or Hamlet and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern—not merely as a platonic or pragmatic alignments, rather caught up in a matrix of homosocial desire and latent homoerotic tension. Reading *Hamlet* this way not only queers the tragedy, but also discloses how Shakespearean play enacts early modern obsessions and anxieties regarding the fluidities of male-male intimacy.

Hamlet and Horatio — The Sublimation of Desire

A close reading of Hamlet and Horatio's encounters discloses a layered intimacy that disrupts the fixed distinctions between platonic friendship and latent homoerotic desire. When Hamlet praises Horatio, declaring, "*thou art e'en as just a man / As e'er my conversation coped withal*" (Act 3, Scene 2), the rhetoric approaches a kind of idealized admiration that seems quite devotional. Hamlet's appreciation for Horatio is remarkably vehement — applauding Horatio's mix of "temperance" and "blood" as an unattainable and exceptional male ideal. Such public commendation highlights Horatio as uniquely reliable within an environment of political duplicity. However, beyond the moral admiration, Hamlet's rhetoric also demonstrates an intimacy and affective vulnerability that he denies the other characters, such as Ophelia. Their physical proximity can be carefully observed in a number of significant scenes such as Horatio's intimate presence at the battlements of Elsinore or in the graveyard and this reinforces a somatic closeness that exists beyond any social structures and conventions. The affective richness of their relationship thus points to an affective same-sex intimacy that is hard to contain within a 'friendship'. When Hamlet subsequently entrusts Horatio for keeping his 'narrative' as he is dying (Act 5, Scene 2), the act introduces us with an epitome of emotional association that has outlasted normative romantic or family relations.

Tha queer affect theory complicates this further. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's model of 'homosocial desire' — the boundary between male friendship and erotic attachment — is helpful here. Hamlet's intense confiding in Horatio and his emotional dependence can be interpreted as a sublimation of queer desire, made tragically inexplicable within the hetero-normative frameworks of the Renaissance court. Hamlet's indecision and procrastination which has been routinely addressed through psychological or philosophical lenses, may also result from an affective entwinement with Horatio that postpones the closure of action. As per Elizabeth Freeman's theory of 'queer temporality', Hamlet's unwillingness or inability to carry out revenge quickly is nothing but a resistance of the heteronormative process of action and resolution. The world of Hamlet narrows emotionally around Horatio, creating affectively charged temporality wherein duty and desire become indistinguishable from each other. The last act — asking Horatio to "*absent thee from felicity awhile*" and recount his tale — is not just practical; it is a last, intimate gesture that ties their lives and legacies together in a space outside hetero-normative structure, securing Horatio as Hamlet's most lasting emotional companion.

Hamlet and Rosencrantz & Guildenstern — Ambivalence and Betrayal

The complex dynamic between Hamlet and his former friends, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, is highly associated with certain intimacies that suggest a deeper homosocial and perhaps homoerotic undertone. Their playful teasing and references to shared experience build a picture of a trio whose ties are more than schoolboy friendship. When Hamlet greets them with, "*Were you not sent for?*", the question despite having a wounded suspicion apparently, it is actually underlaid by the pain of a violated intimacy — the betrayal of secrets once shared in hidden places. Shakespeare's play provides us with a possible interpretation in which Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's transformation from friends to mere tools of Claudius's evil plan performs more

than political treachery; it shatters that secured place of affection and emotion in a relationship wrapped up with unspoken longings and tenderness.

As per the queer interpretation, their complicity is nothing but a disruption of the queer kinship, imbued with the intense pain of alienation and emotional abandonment. This betrayal can be described as a 'queer wound' that doubles Hamlet's melancholy as explained in Freud's *Mourning and Melancholia*. For Freud, melancholia is the result of an unconscious loss in which the object of love is internalized and aggression turned against the self. Reading Hamlet's abuse of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern through the lens of queer-theory considers the latter as the melancholic aftershock of abandoned homoerotic attachments, intensified by the political necessities that mobilize the male friendships to war. The homosocial network, once a site of solidarity and safety, devolves into a space of hostility, demonstrating the fragility of queer attachments in hetero-normative political ambience. Their betrayal has twofold valence — political betrayal and affective abandonment and this is something what leaves Hamlet trapped in a state of melancholy which is both personal and political. The devastation of such disrupted male attachments, when queered, exposes not merely Hamlet's existential loneliness but the fragility of queer attachment in a universe where fidelity to patriarchal power over intimacy is compelled.

Hamlet and Laertes — Eroticised Violence

In *Hamlet*, Hamlet's and Laertes' relationship is characterized by highly charged physical closeness and a latent erotic tension, especially in the graveyard and duel scenes. The graveyard scene, where Hamlet encounters the skull of Yorick, calls attention not only to the theme of death, but also to Hamlet's feeling of possessive closeness. His cryptic remark, "*I'll eat a crocodile for love*", directed toward Ophelia, reflects his deep confusion between desire and death. The graveyard, a liminal space between life and death, becomes a metaphor for the suppressed homoeroticism between Hamlet and Laertes, as they both navigate their emotions of grief, love, and rivalry within the context of a tragically masculine environment. This emotional turmoil further increases in the duel scene, as the physical proximity between Hamlet and Laertes becomes a platform for the performance of violence with erotic undertones. Their combative involvement in the duel is a reflection of the repressed sexual tension between them, transforming their confrontation into a performance of desire disguised as rivalry.

Sedgwick's 'triangulation of desire' provides us with an opportunity of primary interpretation through which the homoeroticism present within the relationship of Hamlet and Laertes may be understood. Within this context, Ophelia as the tragic woman figure serves to be the mediator of desire. Hamlet and Laertes' love for Ophelia can be interpreted as not only competitive behavior but also as the place where their own deeper, unconscious desires for one another are articulated. Ophelia's presence creates greater emotional and sexual tension between them, establishing her as the object of desire both deeply contested and ultimately inconsequential in the face of male conflict. This triangulation makes the concept of heterosexual love more complicated by adding a complexity of homoerotic yearning and unfulfilled passion between the two men, whose conflict serves as a mean to reveal their repressed desires.

The last duel, where Hamlet and Laertes eventually confront each other in the deadly combat, serves as a climax for this tangled mixing of Thanatos and Eros—desire and death. Their physical clash can be viewed as a queer intersection of eroticism and violence, wherein their suppressed love leads to fatality. The tragic ending of the play, with the deaths of Hamlet and Laertes, reinterpret the emotional conclusions of *Hamlet* as a queer tragedy, wherein death and love are inevitably bound together. Thus the culmination of the play can be queered, providing a reinterpretation of Hamlet's path not only as one of revenge but as a journey into repressed homosexual desire, leading to a tragic, ultimate embrace of death.

Problematics and Possibilities — Limits of Queer Readings

The application of queer theory to interpret Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is indeed insightful but not without challenges. One of the significant challenge is the tension between anachronistic and historical readings. Shakespeare composed *Hamlet* during the late 16th century, when the contemporary understanding of queer identities did not exist as it does today. This culminates in a necessary controversy: is it right to overlay current conceptions of queerness upon a play composed in a cultural and temporal world far different from our own? The threat of anachronism arises when we read *Hamlet*'s relations with other male characters—particularly his problematic friendship with Horatio—under the auspices of modern queer identities. While such readings can be illuminating, they can also impose 21st century ideals upon the play, possibly distorting both the subtleties of Shakespeare's original work and the Elizabethan awareness of same-sex relationships. That is not entirely to disqualify queer readings but to signal the need to recognize the historical context alongside pursuing new interpretative horizons.

Hamlet's uncertainties and silences make a strong ground for queer interpretations, particularly as sites of resistance and multiplicity. *Hamlet*'s problematic relationship with his mother, Gertrude, and his lack of unambiguous romantic attachment to Ophelia leave a vacuum that has been filled in different ways throughout the centuries. These silences, especially those in *Hamlet*'s sexuality, permit multiple readings, wherein queer theorists can see the lack of a heterosexual relationship not as a deficiency but as a deliberate openness that resists conventional norms. *Hamlet*'s ambiguity, both as his emotional struggle and his uncertain romantic entanglements, may be interpreted as resistance to the fixed gender and sexual expectations of the day. Moreover, queer theory promotes an understanding of power dynamics, with *Hamlet*'s shift between passivity and aggression offering a possibility for questioning intersectionality where gender, class, and power converge. By taking all these considerations into account, queer interpretation of *Hamlet* moves beyond such things as sexual identity and opens up a wider critique of how power dynamics are secured or disrupted through relationships.

Lastly, queer reading of the tragedy provides an alternative perspective to rethink the dramatic structure of *Hamlet*. Traditional tragedy is based on an expectation of catharsis and dramatic resolution whereby the fall of the protagonist will yield a feeling of moral determination. Queer interpretations of *Hamlet* complicate this path because *Hamlet*'s death does not necessarily yield an unambiguous moral conclusion. Rather, it raises questions regarding the character of desire, identity, and the social order. This modification not only renegotiates the parameters of tragic form but also forces audiences to reconsider the place of closure in dramatic narratives.

Conclusion

The re-evaluation of Shakespeare's celebrated tragedy *Hamlet* through queer lens, unravels that homoerotic tensions are not peripheral to the play's emotional structure, rather central to its psychological richness. *Hamlet*'s relationship with Horatio, for instance, dissects conventional meanings of Renaissance male friendship, exhibiting a deeper and more intimate attachment. *Hamlet*'s confusing emotions towards Ophelia and his absurd equation with Gertrude also facilitate interpretations that describe unexpressed desires and latent emotional conflicts, thereby enriching the play thematically. Homosexual undertones in the drama between *Hamlet* and other masculine characters such as Claudius and Laertes, make the entire space explosive whereby loyalty, rivalry, and carnal tension meet, subverting traditional gender discourses and expectation.

The existence of such tensions compels the rethinking of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in the wider context of tragedy. Through an examination of the play's ambivalent desires and conflicts by a queer theoretical perspective, we are compelled to rethink that tragedy can be conceived in relation to not only fate or moral deficiency but also the ambiguities of sexual identity and emotional subjectivity. This play breaks all the conventional Shakespearean criticism to

provide new thoughts on how desire constructs the tragic experience. Hamlet's indecisiveness, for instance, is symptomatic of a repressed or silent same-sex desire, breaking the idea of tragic flaw as being merely moral or intellectual. Overall, Hamlet presents a strong argument for the centrality of homoerotic tension in the formation of not only its tragic action but also the emotional and psychological complexity that still engages contemporary audiences. By putting queer theory at the centre of Shakespearean criticism, in future we would be able to uncover multiple levels of new meaning that bridge historical and cultural divides, expanding our knowledge of the play's continued relevance.

References:

- 1) Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, Revised edition, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2016.
- 2) Bray, Alan. *The Friend*. University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- 3) Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990.
- 4) Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*. 3rd ed., Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- 5) Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1, Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.
- 6) McDonald, Russ. *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- 7) Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. Columbia University Press, 1985.
- 8) Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics*. University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- 9) Smith, Bruce R. *Shakespeare and Masculinity*. Oxford University Press, 2000.