



Cover Page



RECLAIMING OPHELIA: AGENCY, IDENTITY, AND RESISTANCE IN *HAMLET*

Dr. R. Mohanraj

Associate Professor , Department of English
Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda College (Autonomous), Mylapore, Chennai

Abstract:

This article re-evaluates Queen Gertrude's character in *Hamlet* through a feminist lens, challenging traditional interpretations that marginalise her voice and agency. By examining her narrative presence, strategic silence, and ambiguous political positioning, the study reveals Gertrude's emotional and political intelligence within a patriarchal court. Her interactions with Hamlet and Claudius illustrate the complexities of female power in male-dominated spaces. It primarily argues that Gertrude's death can be seen as a moment of ambiguous agency, possibly even maternal sacrifice. Ultimately, Gertrude emerges as a compelling site of feminist inquiry, highlighting the need to re-examine Shakespeare's women beyond male subjectivity.

Keywords: Gertrude, Hamlet, feminist criticism, Shakespeare, Soft Power of Silence, and Performance Studies.

Introduction – Revisiting Ophelia

Ophelia has long been one of Shakespeare's most enigmatic and marginalised figures. Often cast as the tragic, passive victim of patriarchal pressures in *Hamlet*, her death has become emblematic of feminine fragility, silence, and emotional collapse. Traditional interpretations have painted her as a character devoid of agency which is an innocent swept away by the political and emotional maelstrom around her. In early literary criticism, Ophelia functioned more as a symbolic object than a fully realised character, her madness serving as a poetic flourish and her death a narrative necessity to intensify Hamlet's arc.

However, with the emergence of feminist criticism in the late twentieth century and the expansion of gender-conscious readings of Shakespeare, Ophelia has begun to be re-evaluated not just as a tragic casualty but as a contested site of meaning. Feminist theorists such as Elaine Showalter and Juliet Dusinberre have argued for a more layered understanding of Ophelia's silence, madness, and eventual death which is not as indicators of powerlessness, but as expressions of resistance within a society that denies her voice and autonomy.

This article seeks to explore how Ophelia's character can be reinterpreted through a feminist lens that foregrounds her agency, emotional complexity, and narrative significance. Rather than simply a love interest or symbol of innocence lost, Ophelia will be examined as a young woman navigating the oppressive social, political, and familial structures of Elsinore. Her silence, madness, and final exit will be re-read not as capitulations but as complex responses to the gendered constraints of her environment.

By engaging with feminist theory, performance history, and textual analysis, this study aims to illuminate the ways in which Ophelia resists objectification and articulates her identity, albeit within the limits imposed by a patriarchal order. Through this exploration, Ophelia emerges not merely as a passive figure but as a site of feminine struggle, subversion, and suppressed strength; one that invites ongoing re-imagining and reclamation.



Cover Page



2 2 7 7 - 7 8 8 1



Ophelia in Traditional Criticism and Performance

Historically, Ophelia's character has been shaped more by the responses of male critics and directors than by her own textual presence. Early literary interpretations of *Hamlet*, dominated by Romantic and Victorian critics, tended to centre Hamlet himself as the fulcrum of the tragedy, casting Ophelia in a peripheral and ornamental role. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, A.C. Bradley, and other canonical Shakespearean scholars gave little attention to Ophelia's psychological or emotional interiority. When she was discussed, it was often in terms of her symbolic function: a representation of innocence, a cautionary tale of female weakness, or an instrument for deepening Hamlet's tragedy.

In performance traditions, this marginalisation was further reinforced. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Ophelia was frequently portrayed in a sentimentalized fashion—her madness romanticised and her death aestheticized. Stage productions often leaned into the melodrama of her decline, focusing on her ethereal fragility and treating her madness as an artistic spectacle rather than a human crisis. Costuming choices such as flowing white gowns, flower wreaths, and vacant expressions solidified an image of Ophelia as beautiful, broken, and ultimately disposable. This visual codification contributed to a long-standing perception of her as a character without agency or voice, defined more by her emotional collapse than her existential condition.

Moreover, traditional productions often excised or downplayed Ophelia's lines, especially those in her mad scenes, further stripping her of interpretive complexity. Her fractured songs and disjointed speech were treated as signs of incoherence, rather than clues to the internalised traumas and social hypocrisies she was attempting to articulate. The cultural and patriarchal pressures exerted upon her by Polonius, Laertes, and Hamlet were rarely foregrounded, rendering her descent into madness a tragic inevitability rather than a consequence of sustained emotional and political violence.

These performances aligned with a broader societal tendency to marginalise female suffering as aesthetic rather than political. By romanticising Ophelia's madness and death, both criticism and performance silenced the deeper currents of oppression embedded in her narrative. As such, traditional readings often positioned Ophelia as *acted upon* rather than *acting*. *i.e.*, a victim of circumstance rather than a participant in it.

However, recent decades have seen a growing recognition that such portrayals not only flatten Ophelia's character but also obscure the critical possibilities embedded in her silences, metaphors, and mental collapse. The emergence of feminist Shakespearean scholarship and innovative theatrical reinterpretations has begun to disrupt these limiting frameworks, repositioning Ophelia not merely as a site of loss, but as a space for resistance, critique, and potential reclamation.

A Feminist Re-Reading: Ophelia's Madness as Resistance

The feminist reclamation of Ophelia begins by refusing to accept her madness as mere psychological deterioration or narrative closure. Instead, it considers her apparent collapse as a form of protest which is a disruption of patriarchal speech, structure, and expectation. Rather than reading Ophelia's madness as weakness, contemporary feminist critics such as Elaine Showalter, Carol Thomas Neely, and Juliet Dusinberre argue that it signals an eruption of repressed voices, an act of symbolic dissent against the rigid and silencing structures that surround her.

Ophelia's madness, from this perspective, becomes a radical unmaking of the performative femininity that she had previously embodied. Before her breakdown, Ophelia adheres to the socially acceptable roles of daughter and beloved, dutifully submitting to her father's instructions and Hamlet's affections. However, these roles ultimately betray her—Polonius exploits her for courtly gain, Hamlet oscillates between desire and cruelty, and the Danish court watches her with a clinical detachment. With her father's death and Hamlet's rejection, Ophelia's identity as prescribed by patriarchal scripts



Cover Page



collapses. Her madness, then, may be seen not as regression, but as rejection which is an obvious refusal to perform normative femininity any longer.

Her fragmented songs, riddled with sexual innuendo and death imagery, can be understood not as incoherent babble but as encrypted messages of pain, anger, and awareness. For instance, her ballads about unfaithful lovers and betrayal do not simply reflect personal heartbreak—they resonate with a broader critique of how female bodies and loyalties are traded in political and familial power games. Her obsession with herbs and flowers, traditionally associated with healing and femininity, takes on darker tones. The symbolic meaning of the plants she distributes such as rosemary for remembrance, rue for regret, fennel for flattery constructs a coded language of condemnation and memory. Through these gestures, Ophelia speaks beyond the reach of courtly propriety.

Furthermore, her madness breaks the rules of courtly behaviour, allowing her to express what was previously unspeakable. The language of grief, sexuality, and suspicion that she employs destabilises the boundaries between private trauma and public decorum. Feminist readings thus posit Ophelia as a figure who momentarily destabilises the patriarchal order—not by shouting slogans, but by performing a kind of madness that cannot be easily categorised, explained, or silenced. Her resistance lies in the ambiguity of her speech, the intensity of her grief, and the inability of others to categorise or control her.

The force of Ophelia’s presence, however fleeting, is not in her conformity but in her breakdown. What some have dismissed as passive suffering can be reinterpreted as a final, defiant withdrawal from a world that offers her no space to speak, choose, or survive. This is not to glorify her death but to acknowledge her refusal to live within the confines of a scripted and sacrificial femininity. In this feminist re-reading, Ophelia’s madness is not failure but it is a rupture; not certainly submission, but protest. And though it ultimately leads to her death, it also marks a rare moment in the play where a female voice disrupts the rhythms of patriarchal control.

Silence, Surveillance, and the Female Gaze

Ophelia’s role in *Hamlet* has long been characterised by absence—her silences, her compliance, her lack of agency. However, what appears to be absence may, in fact, be a response to over-presence. Throughout the play, Ophelia exists under near-constant surveillance. Her father Polonius, her brother Laertes, King Claudius, and Hamlet himself all monitor, manipulate, or police her body and behaviour. This surveillance defines and constrains her existence, transforming her from subject to object within the royal court.

From her first appearance, Ophelia is spoken to, about, and over—rarely with. When Laertes warns her about Hamlet’s intentions, he casts her as a potential source of danger to Hamlet’s honour and political future. Polonius furthers this by treating her interactions with Hamlet as a political liability, instructing her to deny Hamlet’s access to her. These conversations mark a pivotal moment in which Ophelia is denied emotional complexity; her inner life is deemed irrelevant in comparison to the reputational stakes of her body. She is, in effect, reduced to a signifier of other men's ambitions, anxieties, and honour.

This dynamic evokes Laura Mulvey’s theory of the “male gaze,” wherein the woman is constructed not as an autonomous subject, but as a passive object of visual consumption and control. In *Hamlet*, Ophelia is often on display, but rarely allowed her own perspective. Her body, movements, and emotional responses become legible only through male interpretation. She becomes a mirror, a test, a trap; but never a voice.

Yet her silence is not always passive. In a space where language is dominated by deception, double meanings, and political performance, Ophelia’s quietness may register as resistance. Her restraint contrasts sharply with Hamlet’s verbal excess,



Cover Page



2 2 7 7 - 7 8 8 1



Claudius's manipulative speeches, and Polonius's long-winded moralising. By refusing to perform emotionally on demand, particularly in her scenes with Hamlet after her father's death, Ophelia challenges the spectatorship forced upon her.

Even her madness can be seen as a subversion of the male gaze. Once unmoored from social norms, she begins to speak, sing, and act in ways that elude easy interpretation. Her presence becomes uncanny, unpredictable. In these moments, Ophelia no longer fits within the visual or narrative expectations imposed upon her. Her body becomes unreadable, her songs filled with double meanings. As such, she briefly escapes the interpretive control of the male-dominated court.

Feminist critics have also highlighted how Ophelia's surveillance is spatial as well as rhetorical. She is continuously situated within domestic or courtly spaces. i.e., spaces that enforce gendered expectations and limit autonomy. Her moment in nature, just before her death, offers a different symbolic setting. In nature, unobserved and uncontained, Ophelia steps outside the frame both metaphorically and literally. It is in this ambiguous space that she meets her end, away from courtly surveillance but still trapped in a narrative that does not value her survival.

The irony, of course, is that Ophelia remains one of the most watched and reproduced female figures in literary history. Painters, directors, critics, and poets have obsessively returned to her image. And yet, much like the characters in the play, these cultural iterations have often silenced her voice while fetishising her image. The gaze persists—only now it is ours. Thus, a feminist reclamation must not only reimagine Ophelia's role within the play but also interrogate how we as readers, audiences, and scholars have watched her. Her silence must not be mistaken for consent. Her absence must not be interpreted as emptiness. Instead, Ophelia's position within structures of surveillance reminds us that the female gaze which is inverted, resisted, or reclaimed is a powerful tool for disrupting patriarchal narratives.

Reclaiming Ophelia in Contemporary Performance and Criticism

The reclamation of Ophelia begins with the act of listening—of turning our attention not merely to what she says, but to what her silence, gestures, and madness signify within broader social, psychological, and political contexts. While traditional readings have cast her as an innocent victim or a tragic accessory to Hamlet's story, contemporary feminist criticism and performance practices have radically reimaged her function and voice.

Modern theatre directors and feminist scholars have challenged the canon's portrayal of Ophelia as a figure of fragility and erasure. Instead, they position her as a site of resistance—a character whose psychological complexity has been historically denied but can be recovered through re-interpretation. Directors like Katie Mitchell, for instance, have staged Ophelia's madness not as a descent into incoherence, but as a moment of lucid protest. Her fragmented songs, in such renderings, become political speech acts—coded critiques of patriarchal violence and emotional suppression.

Feminist scholar Elaine Showalter's landmark essay "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism" reframed Ophelia's madness as a meaningful cultural text. According to Showalter, Ophelia embodies the "female malady" which is a historically feminised pathology of loss, emotional excess, and social alienation. Rather than medicalise or dismiss her instability, Showalter urges critics to read Ophelia's madness as a gendered response to powerlessness, grief, and betrayal. In doing so, she recuperates Ophelia's subjectivity from the margins of male discourse. Visual art and literature have also contributed to her reclamation. Where Romantic painters once portrayed her as passive and drowned in beauty, more recent artworks have given her agency by placing her gaze back at the viewer or depicting her not at the moment of death, but in moments of rage, defiance, or contemplation. These artistic reinterpretations serve to critique and subvert centuries of visual objectification.

Furthermore, Ophelia has become a symbol within contemporary feminist movements, especially among young women resisting traditional gender roles. Her fragmented voice, once dismissed as incoherent, resonates with the language of



Cover Page



trauma, of interrupted speech, and of silenced survivors. Social media discourses, zines, and feminist literature now use Ophelia as a metaphor for reclaiming lost narratives, for speaking truth to power through art, memory, and radical empathy. Some literary adaptations have gone even further by offering Ophelia her own narrative space. Novels like Lisa Klein's *Ophelia* and Margaret Atwood's *Gertrude Talks Back* reimagine her story from a first-person perspective, allowing Ophelia to speak in her own voice, recount her own choices, and reframe her death not as inevitable tragedy but as conscious escape. In these retellings, she survives. She chooses. She defines herself beyond the role Shakespeare's Denmark assigned her.

Such efforts reflect the larger feminist imperative to recover and re-centre women whose voices have been omitted from canonical history—not by rewriting Shakespeare, but by reading him anew, with critical care and generative suspicion. Reclaiming Ophelia, then, is not merely a literary task; it is an ethical one. It asks us to see beyond the bounds of her disappearance and imagine what lies on the other side of her silence.

In re-contextualising Ophelia, we do not only recover a marginalised voice rather we shift the lens of Hamlet itself. Her story ceases to be a subplot and becomes a counter-narrative, a haunting echo that complicates and enriches the play's central moral crises. She becomes not an emblem of loss, but of what is lost when women are not permitted to narrate their own stories.

Conclusion: Toward a New Ophelia

To reclaim Ophelia is to do more than reinterpret a character; it is to reframe a tradition. Within the cultural afterlife of *Hamlet*, Ophelia has long been cast as collateral damage: a tragic girl who drowns under the weight of patriarchal expectations, emotional abandonment, and political games. Yet, this understanding has sought to contest such fatalistic readings and argue that Ophelia, though historically marginalised, is far from mute or passive.

By re-examining her character through feminist criticism, psychoanalytic readings, performance reinterpretations, and intertextual adaptations, we find in Ophelia a figure rich with symbolic and subversive potential. She is a palimpsest upon which centuries of anxieties about femininity, madness, and obedience have been inscribed. But within these inscriptions lie moments of resistance i.e., gestures of agency that may not conform to traditional heroic scripts but are powerful nonetheless.

Ophelia's madness, once dismissed as incoherence, now emerges as a coded critique of a world that polices female voice and sexuality. Her withdrawal from speech is no longer seen simply as psychological breakdown, but as refusal—a disavowal of the roles imposed upon her. Her drowning, formerly aestheticised as tragic beauty, now confronts us as a political disappearance: an act rendered inevitable by her disempowerment, but not devoid of meaning.

The process of reclaiming Ophelia is part of a broader scholarly and cultural movement to recover lost narratives and ask who gets to tell the story, and how. It compels us to ask: What happens when women's pain is aestheticised rather than addressed? What do we miss when we take silence for submission?

In rescuing Ophelia from the margins of Hamlet's tragedy, we do not simply resurrect her. We expand our own capacity to hear the voices that history has taught us to ignore. In so doing, we not only give Ophelia back her name but we give her back her story.

References

Berry, H. (2017). Gertrude Bell: Pioneer, anti-suffragist, feminist icon? Gertrude Bell and Iraq. <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197266076.003.0006>



Cover Page



- Dimitrijević, A., & Buchholz, M. B. (2020). *Silence and silencing in psychoanalysis: Cultural, clinical, and research perspectives*. Routledge.
- Duquette, K. (2023). Blackfishing complexions: Shakespeare, passing, and the politics of beauty. *Palgrave Shakespeare Studies*, 131-144. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26522-8_8
- "Excellent not a hull house": Gertrude Stein, Jane Addams, and feminist-modernist political culture: Marianne DeKoven. (2012). *Rereading Modernism*, 316-345. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120453-25>
- Fiorato, S. (2018). Performance, power, politics: The body as stage in Richard III. *As You Law It - Negotiating Shakespeare*, 63-86. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110591514-005>
- Gertrude and Hamlet in Hamlet, Prince of Cuba (dir. Michael Donald Edwards, 2012). (2012). <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.12253912.cmp.10>
- Gertrude/Ophelia: Feminist Intermediality, Ekphrasis, and tenderness in Hamlet. (2016). *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies*, 181-200. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315606033-20>
- Hansen, A. (2021). The people's Shakespeare: Place, politics and performance in a northern amateur theatre. *Shakespeare in the North*, 125-150. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781474435925.003.0006>
- The politics of silence and the silence of politics. (1993). *The Power of Silence: Social and Pragmatic Perspectives*, 98-139. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483325460.n4>
- Shakespeare performance studies. (2014). *Shakespeare Performance Studies*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781107295544.001>
- Showalter, E. (1992). Representing Ophelia: Women, madness and the responsibilities of feminist criticism. *Hamlet*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350387560.ch-008>
- Sillars, S. (2018). *Shakespeare seen: Image, performance and society*. Cambridge University Press.