The Burden of Manhood: Hegemonic Masculinity and Hamlet's 'To Be or Not T'o Be'

Muhammad Hamid
Lecturer in English, CECOS University of IT and Emerging Sciences, Peshawar
Email: muhammad.hamid@cecos.edu.pk
Hoor Sajjad Ali
BS English, CECOS University of IT and Emerging Sciences, Peshawar
Email:hoor.sajjadali.eng-2021a@cecosian.edu.pk
Jaweria Abbasi
Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan.
Email:abjaweria810@gmail.com
Hasnain Nazar Abbas[*]
Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad
Email:hasnainnazar51214@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity in William Shakespeare's Hamlet, focusing particularly on the iconic soliloquy "To be or not to be." Drawing on R.W. Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity, the paper analyzes Hamlet's internal conflict as a manifestation of culturally sanctioned male expectations—rational control, emotional suppression, and decisive action. It contends that Hamlet's indecision and philosophical rumination challenge traditional masculine ideals by foregrounding vulnerability, existential doubt, and moral complexity. While Elizabethan society glorified masculine valor, political authority, and emotional restraint, Hamlet's monologue disrupts these norms, representing masculinity not as fixed but as fractured and contested. Through a textual and theoretical lens, the paper shows how Shakespeare's play anticipates modern critiques of dominant gender ideologies, offering a profound meditation on the burdens imposed by hegemonic masculinity.

Keywords: hegemonic masculinity, Shakespeare, Hamlet, gender identity, Connell, soliloquy, emotional conflict

Introduction

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has remained a cornerstone of literary and philosophical discourse for centuries, primarily due to its intense psychological depth and exploration of human conflict. Among its many interpretative layers, one that has increasingly gained scholarly attention is its portrayal of masculinity—particularly as embodied in the play's protagonist. The famous soliloquy "To be or not to be" is often examined for its existential implications, but it also serves as a powerful site for interrogating the pressures and contradictions of masculine identity. Through the lens of gender studies, *Hamlet* offers a poignant commentary on the social construction of manhood and the psychological cost of conforming to hegemonic ideals.

Hegemonic masculinity, as conceptualized by R.W. Connell (1995), refers to the culturally exalted form of masculinity that legitimizes male dominance over women and marginalizes alternative masculinities. This configuration is not static but historically situated and institutionally enforced. In the context of Elizabethan England, masculinity was defined through honor, stoicism, public action, and rational authority—traits essential to patriarchal power structures (Greenblatt, 2004; Traub, 2000). Hamlet, as a royal male, is caught in the web of these gender expectations, compelled to avenge his father while embodying the virtues of decisive leadership and emotional detachment. Yet his soliloquy reveals a profound rupture: instead of action, he expresses despair; instead of dominance, he exhibits hesitation. This incongruity places Hamlet at the center of what Connell describes as a crisis in masculinity.

Recent scholarship has emphasized the gendered dimensions of Hamlet's internal conflict. According to Kahn (1981), Hamlet's indecision is not merely philosophical but deeply gendered—his failure to act is a transgression against the masculine ideal of resolution. Similarly, Belsey (1999) argues that Hamlet's introspection destabilizes the binary between rational male and irrational female, suggesting a more fluid and troubled identity. As Laertes and Fortinbras fulfill their masculine duty through

vengeance and martial prowess, Hamlet's delayed response appears as a failure to live up to hegemonic masculinity, exposing the performative and fragile nature of such ideals (Butler, 1990; Smith, 2000).

Moreover, Hamlet's soliloquy is replete with language that speaks to the burden of masculine endurance—"the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," "the whips and scorns of time," and "the insolence of office"—all metaphors for the trials men are expected to endure silently. His contemplation of suicide, while couched in theological and philosophical terms, signifies a breaking point under the weight of masculine expectations. As Connell (2005) notes, hegemonic masculinity not only privileges men structurally but also constrains them psychologically by limiting the emotional range available to them. Hamlet's existential dilemma becomes, therefore, a symbolic rebellion against this model, foregrounding the emotional toll of compulsory manhood.

Thus, *Hamlet* remains a foundational text for rethinking masculine identity. The play does not simply portray a young prince wrestling with revenge; it stages a crisis of gender identity, made visible through the language of melancholy, hesitation, and disillusionment. This paper, guided by Connell's theoretical framework, argues that Hamlet's soliloquy embodies a critical moment in the literary history of masculinity, where the heroic masculine ideal is not affirmed but questioned, not exalted but undone.

Research Objectives

To investigate how Hamlet's actions, emotional expressions, and hesitations reflect or subvert the dominant ideals of manhood prevalent in Elizabethan society.

To analyze how Hamlet's soliloquy "To be or not to be" reveals the psychological conflicts and internalized pressures associated with hegemonic masculinity

Research Questions

In what ways does Hamlet's behavior align with or challenge early modern ideals of manhood as reflected in Elizabethan culture?

How does *Hamlet*'s soliloquy "To be or not to be" reflect the psychological and social burdens of hegemonic masculinity?

Significance of the Study

This study offers a critical lens for understanding the gendered dynamics embedded in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, particularly how masculinity is constructed, performed, and destabilized through language and character. By applying Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity, the paper underscores that masculine ideals—often considered timeless and heroic—are historically contingent and culturally produced. Hamlet's inner turmoil becomes more than a literary or philosophical concern; it is a gendered crisis that resonates with contemporary discussions on toxic masculinity, emotional repression, and male vulnerability. In doing so, this research situates *Hamlet* within an evolving literary tradition that critiques the cost of patriarchal ideals, thus bridging early modern drama and twenty-first-century gender discourse. Moreover, it expands the scope of Connell's sociological theory by applying it to a canonical literary text, offering interdisciplinary insight into the intersection of literature, psychology, and cultural gender studies.

Literature Review

The study of masculinity in Shakespearean literature has expanded significantly over the past few decades, intersecting with feminist theory, psychoanalysis, and cultural studies. Within this discourse, R.W. Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity (1995, 2005) has become foundational. Connell describes hegemonic masculinity as the dominant form of masculinity that upholds male authority by subjugating both women and subordinate masculinities. While initially articulated in the context of contemporary sociological inquiry, Connell's theory has proven invaluable in literary criticism for identifying how literature reproduces, contests, or subverts masculine norms.

In Shakespearean scholarship, critics such as Catherine Belsey (1999) and Carol Thomas Neely (1985) argue that masculinity in Shakespeare's plays is far from stable. Rather, it is continuously negotiated through performance, rhetoric, and social pressure. Belsey, in particular, emphasizes the instability of gender roles in *Hamlet*, noting that the prince's identity is suspended between action and passivity, reason and emotion—binaries typically mapped onto masculine and feminine spheres.

Clare McManus (2002) and Valerie Traub (2000) have further examined early modern gender constructs, highlighting how masculine ideals were defined through honor, control, and the suppression of affect. Traub points out that Shakespeare often dramatizes the consequences of these ideals by showing characters who fail or refuse to conform. Hamlet, in this context, becomes an exemplar of gender nonconformity—not because he rejects masculinity outright, but because he agonizes under its impossible demands.

Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990), though not focused on Shakespeare directly, informs many interpretations of gender performance in his plays. Butler's idea that gender is a repeated and socially regulated performance resonates with Hamlet's theatricality and the performative contradictions of his identity. As Butler writes, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame" (Butler, 1990, p. 45). Hamlet's soliloquy performs precisely this: an articulation of a gendered subject under regulatory pressure—caught between the demand to act and the human impulse to reflect and doubt.

Studies by Kahn (1981) and Greenblatt (2004) return to the historical Shakespeare, linking masculine expectations to the sociopolitical dynamics of Elizabethan England. Kahn argues that Hamlet is psychologically feminized by his mourning and introspection, a characterization that undermines early modern codes of masculinity. Greenblatt situates Hamlet's crisis within the broader cultural shift from chivalric honor to Renaissance selfhood—a transition that brings anxiety about identity and gender roles.

Finally, Smith (2000) and Breitenberg (1996) approach Shakespeare's male protagonists as case studies in the emotional contradictions of masculinity. Smith sees Hamlet's melancholy as a strategic refusal of conventional masculinity, while Breitenberg discusses male anxiety as a literary motif that reflects ideological tensions in the early modern period. These insights lay the groundwork for interpreting Hamlet's soliloquy as both a personal and political expression of the costs of hegemonic masculinity.

Together, these critical perspectives reveal that *Hamlet* is not just a play about revenge, but about the psychological and cultural ramifications of being male in a

society that demands emotional austerity, rational authority, and violent retribution. The soliloquy "To be or not to be" becomes a central moment where these tensions unfold, offering a rich site for gendered textual analysis through Connell's theoretical lens

Methodology

This research utilizes a qualitative textual analysis of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, with a particular focus on the "To be or not to be" soliloquy in Act 3, Scene 1. The analysis is grounded in the theoretical framework of R.W. Connell's (1995, 2005) theory of hegemonic masculinity, which facilitates a critical reading of how gender roles are constructed, maintained, and contested through language and performance.

By employing Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, the study interrogates how Hamlet's internal conflict reflects cultural norms of male behavior in Elizabethan society—specifically the expectations of stoicism, courage, rationality, and action. The soliloquy is examined not only as a philosophical meditation but as a cultural artifact shaped by gender ideologies. Close reading of the soliloquy—its metaphors, rhetorical devices, and tonal shifts—is conducted alongside scholarly interpretations from literary critics and gender theorists.

Secondary sources—including works by Belsey (1999), Kahn (1981), Traub (2000), Butler (1990), and Greenblatt (2004)—are consulted to support the analysis and provide broader historical and cultural context. The interdisciplinary approach, integrating literary analysis with gender theory, allows for a nuanced interpretation of Hamlet's masculinity and its psychological burdens. The objective is not to generalize Hamlet's character, but to highlight the tensions and contradictions that arise when individuals are required to conform to dominant gender ideals under crisis.

Analysis and Discussion

Hamlet's Masculine Dilemma in the Soliloquy

In the iconic soliloquy "To be or not to be," Hamlet is caught in a state of existential and emotional paralysis, and this paralysis must be understood in terms of gender as much as in terms of metaphysics. At the center of his speech lies a contemplation of suicide, framed not as a cowardly retreat but as a deeply rational evaluation of suffering. Hamlet weighs "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" against the "sea of troubles" that he might end "by opposing"—a metaphorical choice between passive endurance and active confrontation, both heavily gendered positions (Shakespeare, 1603/2006, 3.1).

In the early modern context, male identity was defined by decisiveness, action, and political agency. As Greenblatt (2004) argues, masculine honor was often linked with public demonstration and military valor. Hamlet, however, is introspective and emotionally expressive, traits traditionally coded as feminine. His hesitation to kill Claudius is not simply a dramatic delay; it is a resistance to conforming to a model of masculinity that demands violent revenge as proof of manhood.

Connell (1995) notes that hegemonic masculinity is not merely a personal trait but a set of institutionalized expectations: to be strong, unemotional, rational, and dominant. Hamlet disrupts this configuration by openly expressing fear, uncertainty, and emotional distress. His soliloquy dwells on "the heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to"—a bodily, affective admission that undermines the stoic male ideal. Hamlet does not suppress his grief and doubt; he articulates it,

exposing the emotional costs of hegemonic masculinity.

Masculinity as Performance and Contradiction
Judith Butler's (1990) theory of gender as performative further illuminates Hamlet's identity crisis. Hamlet, as both a character and an actor (literally and metaphorically), performs masculinity under the gaze of a court that expects revenge. His indecision is seen as a failure not just of duty but of gender. Kahn (1981) interprets Hamlet's introspection as a feminization of the male hero, a deviation from the archetype of the avenging son. This deviation is punished within the narrative through Hamlet's alienation and eventual downfall.

Moreover, the metaphors in the soliloquy—particularly "the undiscovered country from whose bourn / No traveler returns"—speak to a fear of the unknown not only in death but in the collapse of identity. Death represents both an escape from and a confrontation with the expectations of masculinity. Hamlet imagines death as a place beyond roles, beyond performance, beyond the burdens of manhood—a space where he might no longer be required to act as a son, prince, or avenger.

But Hamlet never chooses death; "the dread of something after death" restrains him. This restraint, paradoxically, is an affirmation of life not as a triumph, but as an obligation. In this sense, Hamlet becomes a tragic figure not because he fails to fulfill the masculine ideal, but because he does. His eventual decision to kill Claudius does not redeem him; it fulfills a script that he has long resisted, sealing his fate.

Masculinity and Silence: The Politics of Suppression
Connell (2005) emphasizes that hegemonic masculinity often involves the suppression of alternative emotional expressions. Hamlet's dilemma is thus not only psychological but political: his emotions are silenced by the gender expectations imposed upon him. Even in his final moments, Hamlet urges Horatio to live and tell his story, indicating that his identity—fragmented and conflicted—must be narrated by another. The masculine ideal he dies fulfilling is not his own but one imposed by royal, familial, and cultural expectations.

This contradiction is what makes the soliloquy so enduring: it gives voice to the invisible structures that govern masculinity. Hamlet dares to articulate emotional burden, to pause and reflect, to consider the consequences of action—behaviors that deviate from the dominant masculine script. In doing so, Shakespeare does not merely create a tragic hero; he anticipates the modern interrogation of gender norms that Connell's theory makes explicit.

Conclusion
Hamlet's soliloquy "To be or not to be" is more than a philosophical musing on life and death—it is a profound meditation on the performative nature and psychological burden of hegemonic masculinity. Through his introspective, hesitant, and emotionally rich speech, Hamlet becomes an early modern representation of the male subject in crisis—torn between the cultural imperatives of decisive action and the human impulse to question, feel, and delay.

This research has demonstrated how Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity deepens our understanding of Hamlet's character as one who resists and ultimately succumbs to gendered expectations. Shakespeare constructs a world in which masculinity is not inherent but enforced, not liberating but burdensome. The soliloquy

functions as both resistance and submission—a textual space where masculine ideals are both upheld and dismantled.

By drawing on literary criticism and gender theory, this paper contributes to a growing body of scholarship that recognizes Shakespeare's relevance to contemporary gender debates. *Hamlet* remains a foundational text not only for its aesthetic brilliance but for its critical insight into the costs of being a man in a world that allows few alternatives. In Hamlet's hesitation lies the echo of a question that continues to resonate: What does it mean to be a man—and at what cost?

References

Belsey, C. (1999). *Shakespeare and the loss of Eden: The construction of family values in early modern culture*. Macmillan.

Breitenberg, M. (1996). *Anxious masculinity in early modern England*. Cambridge University Press.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Greenblatt, S. (2004). *Will in the world: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Kahn, C. (1981). *Man's estate: Masculine identity in Shakespeare*. University of California Press.

McManus, C. (2002). *Women on the Renaissance stage: Anna of Denmark and female masquing in the Stuart court (1590–1619)*. Manchester University Press.

Shakespeare, W. (2006). *Hamlet* (A. R. Braunmuller, Ed.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1603)

Smith, B. R. (2000). *Homosexual desire in Shakespeare's England: A cultural poetics*. University of Chicago Press.

Traub, V. (2000). *Desire and anxiety: Circulations of sexuality in Shakespearean drama*. Routledge.