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The article examines the nuanced representation of the rejection of motherhood in three postwar American novels to highlight the perspectives on maternal subjectivity. A close reading of the texts is utilized to analyze patterns of the rejection of motherhood displayed in abortion and infanticide or rejecting the traditional model of motherhood that is limited to females. This close analysis reveals the nuances in the representation of the rejection of motherhood. Although the novels highlight a feminine subjectivity that is independent from the maternal one, their representation reveals that these examples of the literary production of the seventies may not be completely independent from conservative approaches to feminine subjectivity.
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INTRODUCTION

The biologically deterministic approach adopted by patriarchal social systems is heavily reliant on the inevitability of a maternal subjectivity in which the feminine subjectivity will dissolve upon encountering the desire to have a child. This approach relegates the feminine subjectivity to the margins of the patterns of human normalcy. It ignores the patterns when females reject motherhood to maintain their sense of autonomous feminine subjectivity. Although resistance to this approach occurs as a consequence of Second Wave Feminism, it is not eradicated as a result of it.

Analysis of some examples of postwar literary production reveals that the clash between conservative and liberal perspectives on the rejection of motherhood produces nuanced versions of representing a feminine subjectivity that is independent from the maternal one. The rejections of motherhood is highlighted to question imposed patriarchal strains on motherhood and to promote the necessity to recognize a female subjectivity aside from maternal one. This article examines the representation of the feminine and maternal subjectivity in three postwar novels that illustrate patterns of the rejection of motherhood displayed in abortion and infanticide or the rejection of traditional motherhood that is limited to women.

Before proceeding to discuss the representation of
the rejection of motherhood to highlight patriarchal social constructs of maternity or female subjectivity, a definition of maternal subjectivity is necessary. Lisa Baraitser in *Maternal Encounters: The Ethics of Interruption* presents a definition of maternal subjectivity that distinguishes it from female subjectivity to break the association between femaleness and motherhood. Baraitser (2009) writes that maternal subjectivity is:

An experience that resides “otherwise” than, or is excessive to maternal identities... It involves relations with a particular and peculiar other whose rate of change is devastatingly rapid, who is always, by definition, “developing”, shifting, changing, and yet it is another to whom one is “linked” in an equally particular and peculiar way, a way that has something to do with larger issues of responsibility and care but played out in the most seemingly ridiculous forums; those of the daily “thinking” about feeding, sleeping, dressing, manners, routines, good stuff, bad stuff, schools, friendships, more stuff, influences, environments, time, responsibility, freedom, control and so on.

This definition distinguishes maternal subjectivity from a “subjectivity (a mother) can call her own” (Baraitser, 2009). It specifically refers to the mother’s perspective of social rules and regulations that define institutionalized mothering. The patriarchal aspect of the maternal role stems from the association between the maternal subjectivity and femaleness.

Homage must be paid to the feminist writing of the sixties and seventies because of its role in questioning institutionalized motherhood. These writings are especially important in their time as they mark the beginnings of resistance to patriarchal social constructs of motherhood. They expose the way they are designed and executed in order to negotiate strategies to resist it. The role of Adrienne Rich’s *Of Women Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* is especially important in drawing attention to the importance of the balance between female subjectivity and maternal subjectivity. Rich declares that the idealistic demands of motherhood place mothers in a state of bondage. The author describes her need to be “salvaged” from motherhood because she was trapped in the social expectations of mothering (Rich, 1991). Rich declares that the process of motherhood is supposed to flow from a mother’s connection with her child. In a touching delineation of the author’s attempt to break away from the social rules of motherhood, she spends a summer with her children away from her husband. The author frees herself from the typical rules about care for her kids and her husband. Her children enjoy a stress free mother. More importantly, she manages to find time to write her poetry celebrating a subjectivity that is independent from maternal subjectivity. She describes the experience as one of the most liberating experiences in her life as a mother (Rich, 1991). This experience highlights the strains put on mothers to perform according to particular rules. Also, Rich draws attention to the role of the “division of labor” in associating motherhood with females as this will relegate females to subservient position of service limiting their social role (Rich, 1991).

An important aspect of the patriarchal social systems that was criticized at this early stage, of postwar literary production, was the system of knowledge on which patriarchy relies, specifically Freudian psychoanalysis. Along with many other feminist writers, Nancy Chodorow’s writing is an example of the contribution of the feminist canon to exposing the tension between patriarchal social constructs defining maternal subjectivity and the females’ vision of a liberated maternal subject. Chodorow’s work is particularly important in analyzing the function of Freudian psychoanalysis in essentializing gender-specific roles in the reproduction of the maternal role. She does not limit the maternal process to a psychological function but highlights the role of social norms in which “[w]omen’s mothering as an institutionalized feature of family life and of the sexual division of labor reproduces itself cyclically” (Chodorow, 1979).

The process of female identification with the mother popularized by psychoanalysis is emphasized by many feminist writers as a part of a continuing process defining the division of labor in patriarchal social systems.

**Motherhood: A fusion of perspectives**

When reviewing evidence of the beginnings of resistance to patriarchal perceptions of motherhood located in representations of the rejection of motherhood in fiction, nuanced versions of these representations are revealed. These nuanced versions entwine both patriarchal and feminist influences on the issue of rejection of motherhood marking the meeting of the two tides, feminist and patriarchal social visions. Jeannette Eyrely’s *Bonnie Jo, Go Home* and William’s Styron’s *Sophie’s Choice* serve as excellent examples of the social nuances of the nineteen 1960s and 1970s. The specificity of the period is marked by the reactions to and against feminism that are clearly reflected in the model of rejection of motherhood in both novels. Both representations of the rejection of motherhood reflect examples of the birth of a genre that proves feminist influences in escapable.

*Bonnie Jo, Go Home* written by Jeanette Eyrely and published in 1972 is a young adult novel. The novel tells the story of a very shy girl who had sex with a man to make another jealous. To her misfortune the girl gets pregnant in the conservative state of Utah. She heads to New York to get an abortion before her conservative community discovers her indiscretions. In spite of its progressive attitude towards abortion, the novel is not free from conservative aspects that stand against the sexual revolution. The link between female sexuality and
reproduction is highlighted in the story as a threat if taking place out of wedlock. This patriarchal attitude towards female sexuality is highlighted in Germaine Greer's (1970) *The Female Eunuch* when she writes:

"Little girls only learn about the pleasure of sex as an implication of their discoveries about their reproductive function, as something merely incidental. Much more care is taken to inform them about the approaching trauma of menstruation and the awful possibility of childbirth if they should ‘lose control’ or ‘give in’ to sexual urges, than to see that they recognize and welcome these sexual urges in the first place. So the growing girl knows more about her womb than she does about her external genitalia, and not much of what she knows is good news."

The novel adopts a didactic mission towards extramarital relationships. It reveals it as leading to imminent disaster and distress. The main character is continuously threatened with the stress of the financial ruin of her father as she is constantly faced with an abortion fee that keeps increasing daily. This position is clearly revealed in the title of the novel encompassing the imperative of “Go Home”. The situation leading to this imperative sentence is clarified further in the novel when the same sentence appears in the novel in the form of an interior monologue of the main character, Bonnie Jo, before she had sex (Eyrely, 1972). This indicates a call for self-control and abstinence lest a girl falls into the same situation where she would resort to reject motherhood. This part of her interior monologue is so important, as a didactic message, that it is elected to be the title of the novel. Thus, it indicates one aspect of the ideology of the novel where the scale is tipped towards patriarchal social systems that associate female sexuality with reproduction and limit it into the domain of marital life.

Another aspect revealing the patriarchal attitudes in *Bonnie Jo, Go Home* is shown in the sexual passivity of the main character. This aspect of female sexual passivity is revealed in *Sexual Politics* by Kate Millet as part of the Freudian paradigm dictating the “position of women in patriarchy is such that they are expected to be passive, to suffer, and to be sexual objects” (Millet, 1977). Bonnie Jo’s sexual passivity is implied in her using sex not as an end but as a means to end. She resorts to sex to make her boyfriend jealous. She does not do it out of desire for that man. The objectification of Bonnie Jo takes place in the delineation of her sexual partner as a "wolf" which is typical of the sexual objectification of female as passive victims rather than active participants in sex (Eyrely, 1972).

The situation where Bonne Jo resorts to rejecting motherhood by choosing to abort her child is indicative of the socially nuanced representation in the novel. The progressive attitude promotes female reclaim of the body and choices that have to do with that body. This attitude is clearly revealed in the end of the novel when the association between femaleness and reproduction is challenged. The notion of the craving for motherhood and transformation of the female subject into a maternal subject is revised. The novel implies that females do not have an identical position towards becoming mothers. When Bonnie Jo aborts her child she is criticized by a nurse who is sympathetic to another woman who lost her child in the same hospital. The mother, whose child is dead, suffered a lot to get pregnant and have a child.

The situation of the two females is juxtaposed in order to reveal the variety in females’ positions towards maternity. The nurse asks Bonnie Jo “[w]hose baby it is does make a difference, doesn’t it?” (Eyrely, 1972). The ‘difference’ here is the difference between the two women’s attitude towards motherhood and their readiness to transform their subjectivity into a maternal one. The delineation of Mrs. Crenshaw and her need for motherhood and Bonnie Jo in her rejection of motherhood challenges the association between femaleness and motherhood. It suggests that females vary in their attitude towards motherhood. This is an idea that is liberating for women from the shackles of motherhood.

Published in 1979, William Styron's *Sophie's Choice* consists of a fragmented telling of the story of a mother who sends her daughter to death in order to save her son during the Nazi occupation of Poland. The male narrator takes charge of relating Sophie’s story, her feelings, her actions and most importantly his perceptions of her. This plays a major part in the representation of patriarchal perceptions of motherhood in the novel.

On one level *Sophie's Choice* can be seen as a textbook example of patriarchal perceptions about females. Author Sue Vice in *Holocaust Fiction* describes the novel as misogynistic. She justifies her description by the characterization of Sophie as a beautiful woman. Thus, her story deserves to be recorded (Vice, 2000). However, the misogyny in the novel lies more in the female reaction to the male body in what can only be described as a male fantasy. Sophie’s maternal subjectivity in telling her story is interwoven with the sexualization of her character to emphasize her submissiveness. Sex is synonymous with gratitude in her dictionary. Stingo, the narrator, describes his attraction to “something that was obscurely, seductively maternal” about Sophie (Styron, 1979). In one instance, Sophie is ‘smearing [the narrator’s] frenzied spermatozoa across her cheeks as if she were using Pond’s cold cream’ and describes it as “filled with these wonderful vitamins” according to her previous boyfriend (Styron, 1979). The complete submissiveness and borderline masochism is clear when she literally entrenches herself in male sexual satisfaction.

Moreover, the novel adheres to traditional Freudian concepts illustrating the social domain in which it stands which contributes to what may be perceived as apatriarchal standpoint of the novel. For instance, it
emphasizes the paternal role and marginalizes the maternal one when it comes to Sophie’s personality. Sophie’s father has an unquestionable influence on Sophie that is crowned by marrying one of his disciples. This pattern applies to Freudian concepts of a daughter’s attraction to her father because she takes an identical figure as a husband.

The novel’s model of rejection of motherhood, however, represents a nuanced version that reveals motherhood as a strain on females in patriarchal social systems but never absolves the mother who rejects her child from guilt. This literary production is specific to its period that struggles between patriarchal systems of thought and reactionary Feminism. Sophie is asked by a Nazi officer/doctor to choose between sending either her daughter or son to the gas chambers. A Patriarchal perspective of the novel is represented by her devastating guilt that ends with suicide. A guilt that is well-deserved because she betrays her responsibility as a mother who should protect her children at all cost. Sophie admits her guilt which establishes this perspective when she accuses herself of being a “collaboratrice” and admits: “I done everything that was bad just to save myself” (Styron, 1979). Her maternal subjectivity in this case is dominant, engulfs her sense of self. Her attitude is congruent with institutionalized motherhood that stipulates that “maternal love is, and should be, quite literally selfless” (Rich, 1991). She should never accept the fact that she is lucky to have gotten away from punishment because choosing to save herself and her son, simply makes her an accomplice in the crime. It sets her as one of the victimizers instead of being a victim. Her sense of guilt accentuates her role as a victimizer because she gave up her daughter. And the fact that she committed suicide is proof of the extent of that sense of failed responsibility and damaged maternal subject.

The extent of the patriarchal perspective of motherhood goes beyond the self-punishment that Sophie inflicts on herself by her submissive attitude towards males and sexuality or her guilt and subsequent suicide. The failed maternal subject is externally punished by what is describes in the novel as a “golem”, an element that punishes Sophie for her sin (Styron, 1979). The ‘golem’ is in fact a name that Fink calls Nathan because of his erratic behavior and violence with Sophie. In Jewish mythology, the Golem “denotes an artificial man, blessed with supernatural powers, that runs out of control” (Gilbert, 2001). Lewis Glinert in his description of the myth of the Golem states that “what predominates is not a Frankenstein’s monster but a rather noble creature, undone by tragic circumstance” (Gilbert, 2001). This creature is violent yet noble. This connotes a sense of justice to his actions.

The choice of this Jewish mythological creature reflects specific points about the position in the novel about Sophie’s choice. First, it reflects that it should be punishable because it is unnatural for a mother to be an accomplice her daughter’s death. The unnaturalness of her behavior is punished by the unnatural behavior of her boyfriend who is supposedly inhibited by this creature. Her act of the rejection of her daughter is marked as unnatural by the unnaturalness of the creature sent to punish her and finally coerce her to kill herself.

The concept of the unnaturalness of infanticide discussed by Lorraine Daston in her lecture entitled “The Morality of Natural Orders: The Power of Medea”. Daston traces the history of the myth of Medea, who kills her children because of her jealousy of her husband’s new wife. She traces the representation of these mythic ancient and modern dramas only to conclude that the concept of the unnaturalness of the act of matricide is directly related to the conflation between reproduction as a part of nature and the institutionalization of reproduction rendering infanticide unnatural act because it opposes religious and civil laws. She writes:

Nowhere in Euripides’ Medea, nor in Seneca’s Latin reworking of the play (1st c. C.E.), is the act of infanticide described as “unnatural,” although a mother’s murder of her own children was later to become the very archetype of an unnatural act. In both plays, abuse is heaped upon Medea for her atrocious deed, but it is condemned as “unholy” [εργον ανοζιωηαηον], “horriŠc” [δεινον], and “savage” [αργιοω] in Euripides, and as “abominable” [nefas], impious [ιπιους], and a “horror” [horror] in Seneca—not as “against nature” [παρα θυζιν, contra naturam]... In contrast, later dramas based upon Euripides’ and Seneca’s plays almost all brand Medea’s act as “unnatural”

...only through a slow process of diffusion and amalgamation with Judeo-Christian elements did the moral category of the unnatural take root, applied above all to perceived threats to the family, whether from parricide, incest, or nonprocreative sexuality. Christian commentators identified the natural order with God’s creation and thus with divine sovereignty; hence to defy nature was to defy God, and by the tenth century C.E. the older Roman category of nefandum had converged with the newer category of crimes contra naturam in the arch-transgression of heresy. By this convoluted trajectory, nature (here understood as universal nature, the entirety of creation, but with special emphasis on reproduction) was equated with divine authority, and subversions of natural order with crimes against God. These damaging associations made crimes contra naturam the most abominable of all crimes (Daston, 2002).

Infanticide portrayed as an unnatural act because it collides with laws encouraging reproduction specifically, institutionalized concepts about childcare as part of the process of reproduction. Although Medea’s act is more deliberate than Sophie’s, the choice to reject the motherhood of a child is made by both. Their failure to
observe the socially acceptable task of mothering and protection of their children is made more prominent by the death of their children as a result of that choice. That failure brands their choice as unnatural because it defies institutionalized rules of the mother-child relationship, thus it is branded as such. A patriarchal attitude towards motherhood is clearly revealed when an unnatural act of the failing mother, Sophie, is punished by the harassment the Golem, Nathan. An unnatural punishment is only fitting for an unnatural crime.

One last point reflecting the patriarchal attitude towards the rejections motherhood in Sophie’s Choice is revealed in the particular choice of the gender of the rejected child. Sophie tells the officers “take my little girl!” (Styron, 1979). Her choice indicates a pattern that exists in patriarchal social systems that result in the internalization of femaleness as a weaker, inferior gender. This weakness is a consequence of the association between femaleness and motherhood that socially confine females to the darkness of the private realm. Mothers in patriarchal systems treat their daughters as “narcissistic physical and mental extension of themselves” (Chodorow, 1978). Rich refers to this process in the mother-daughter relationship as the passing of an “affliction” of motherhood from mother to daughter (Chodorow, 1991). Sophie’s choice in this case is necessary to prevent the continuity of her affliction. She makes the choice on the bases that she chooses the inferior child, the child that has less of a chance of survival, the child who will repeat the cycle of pain because she has a similar gender as her mother. Sophie’s choice is a sign of the tradition that perceives females as inferior with no glimpses of hope for a better future.

The historical significance of the writing and publication of Sophie’s Choice in the seventies is that it proves the far reaching influence of feminism on the literature of the period. Inspite of being branded as misogynist and the clear indications of patriarchal attitudes in Sophie’s Choice, the novel reveals influences of the Feminist movement active in the period. The model of the rejection of motherhood in Sophie’s choice indicates the impact of the feminist movement on the literature of the period. The officer who asks Sophie to choose between the death of her son or daughter is an officer/doctor in the SS brigade. Sophie discovers later that he “was a steadfast churchgoer and that he had always planned to enter the ministry” (Styron, 1979). The delineation of the multi-layered authority of the officer underscores the imbalance of powers between him and powerless Sophie.

The officer’s authority lies within the domains to which he belongs. The officer assumes a patriarchal authority because he is male. He assumes a political authority because he is an officer in the SS force. He represents the medical authority because he is a doctor. And lastly, he represents a religious authority because he planned to be a minister. The multiple layers of his authority against Sophie’s lack display the extent of social injustices against women and particularly mothers. All the authorities portrayed by the officer represent the institutions dominating motherhood and setting the rules for mothers to follow. The extremeness of what is asked of Sophie as a mother represents the extreme demands placed on motherhood. The image of the male/doctor/office/minister screams of the burdens placed on mothers to perform and outperform themselves.

The maleness of the officer brings to mind an authoritative aspect of patriarchy that exists to rule converging military power with male power. This complete domination is termed by Kate Millet in Sexual Politics as “interior colonization” where males despotically rule females and “patriarchy as an institution is a social constant” placed against femaleness (1977, p25). The image highlights what Millet calls an association between “patriarchy and force” (Millet, 1977). This force in Sophie’s situation is a force over life and death.

The choice of the officer as a doctor is influenced by feminist writings that expose the medical authority as a male domain monopolizing power over body and mind. The fact that the officer/doctor forced her to choose between the deaths of either her children connotes the power of the doctor over female reproduction. In her criticism of this monopoly of males in the medical field Rich insists that “men had gradually annexed the role of birth-attendant and thus assumed authority over the very sphere which had originally been one source of female power” (Rich, 1991). The specific choice of the profession of the officer in Sophie’s Choice implies the far-reaching power of the doctor on female reproduction and power over life and death. His authority is questioned when the knowledge he applies in his work is clearly flawed as it is based on racial purity. The sharp shift of his vocation from one of healing to one of death and “butchery” adds another layer to the irony of his authority as a doctor (Styron, 1979).

The representation of the officer as a religious man is of special importance. It adds its own set of implications on the questioned patriarchal authorities an injustice placed on Sophie and mothers in general. The doctor is reported to be passing through a crisis of faith because of the burden on his conscience brought on by the amount of killing he has to do. The doctor selfishly chooses to include Sophie the mother of one of his victims in his sin of killing the innocent.

Dr. Jemand von Niemand was undergoing the crisis of his life: cracking apart like bamboo, disintegrating at the very moment that he was reaching out for spiritual salvation… how could one believe in God after practicing one’s science for months in such a loathsome environment? Awaiting the arrival of countless trains from every corner of Europe, then winnowing out the fit and the healthy from the pathetic horde of cripples and the toothless and the blind, the feebleminded and the spastic and the unending droves of helpless aged and helpless little children, he surely knew that the slave enterprise he
served (itself a mammoth killing machine regurgitating once-human husks) was a mockery and a denial of God...Was it not supremely simple, then, to restore his belief in God, and at the same time to affirm his human capacity for evil, by committing the most intolerable sin that he was able to conceive? Goodness could come later. But first a great sin. One whose glory lay in its subtle magnanimity—a choice. After all, he had the power to take both. This is the only way I have been able to explain what Dr.Jemand von Niemand did to Sophie when she appeared with her two little children... (Styron, 1979). The doctor acknowledges the fact that he 'had the power to take both'. However, he chooses to use his force to include others in his guilt.

The fact that he chooses the mother of the child to share the guilt with him indicates the burdens of institutionalized motherhood. The rules placed on motherhood and the choices they have to make to insure the survival and best care for their child bordering on the unreasonable is implied in this choice offered to Sophie. Rich touches on this issue of the social burdens on motherhood in Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution. She describes these burdens as the 'manipulation of the relationship between mother and child' (Rich, 1991). Sophie’s motherhood is manipulated into taking a choice of killing her child just like every mother is manipulated into choices that deform their maternal experience.

The influence of feminism is also shown in Sophie’s Choice when the tested maternal subject, forced into rejecting motherhood, seeks to liberate itself from imposed guilt. Lisa Baraitser in Maternal Encounters: The Ethics of Interruption suggests a dynamic aspect of the maternal subject that marks it upon various experiences of motherhood. Baraitser writes “the self ‘never returns to itself from the Other’...From the mother’s perspective, we could say that as the infant destroys her, she is marked by the other, contending with self-loss, through which, according to Butler, an altered self may also emerge” (Baraitser, 2009). Baraitser relies on the philosophy of Levinas when she concludes that maternal ethics and sense of responsibility are a result of the redefined sense of the self that is exposed to the other. She quotes Levinas to draw conclusions about what she calls the ‘shift into the ethical domain...that is, the ways that the maternal subject tends to collapse in the face of the fragile and developing child’ (Baraitser, 2009). Levinas writes:

The moral subject arises in subjection, ‘despite itself,’ introjected deeper than its own synthetic activities, suffering an ‘immemorial past’ never contracted to the present, the trace of diachrony, to the point of obsession, substitution for the other, turning the self inside out, hostage to and for the other, for the other’s need, for the other’s life, to be sure, but also for the other’s responsibility (Baraitser, 2009).

The fact that this sense of responsibility is associated with the maternal subject and the maternal subject is associated with femaleness reveals that maternal responsibility is inescapable. It implies a constant sense of responsibility which will result in a constant feeling of guilt if this responsibility is not observed properly. This dynamic, yet burdened, maternal subject is revealed in Sophie’s Choice. It is revealed when it tries to adapt its self to the new changes and rid itself of the guilt. Sophie’s maternal subject at first tries to adapt itself to pressures imposed by motherhood. Sophie declares, “I am, you see, a very uncomplete person” (Styron,1979). She asserts that she is trying to supress a part of herself by hiding it from others and assuming a lack in that self, making it incomplete. This lack is shown in a supressed maternal subjectivity in order to expel her sense of failure as a mother in protecting her children. The guilt, however, is constant. Sophie, again, insists on her incompleteness inspired by the suppression of her maternal subject along with her supressed guilt when she asserts “

I have lived long with this very, very strong guilt which I can’t lose... I still have this strong guilt. Funny, Stingo, you know I have learned to cry again, and I think perhaps that means I am a human being again. Perhaps that at least.A piece of a human being, but yes, a human being (Styron,1979)

Scepticism is set as a catalyst for Sophie’s supressed maternal subject. It flushes it out, tests it, and tries to relieve it from its burdens. However, the altered maternal subject welds itself into a sense of responsibility and guilt. Sophie tells Stingo:

Often I cry alone when I listen to music, which remind me of Cracow and those years past. And you know, there is one piece of music that I cannot listen to, it makes me cry so much my nose stops up, I cannot breathe, my eyes run like streams. It is in these Handel records I got for Christmas, ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth,’ that make me cry because of all my guilt, and also because I know that my Redeemer don’t live and my body will be destroyed by worms and my eyes will never, never again see God...(Styron, 1979).

She does not think that she can redeem herself because she is forced by the same maternal subject to give up one child to protect another. Her faith is tested against motherhood. For her, faith represents the rules that stipulate her guilt. It is her dilemma. If she believes she believes in her guilt. If she denies faith she denies the materiality and reality of what happened to her.

Down with traditional motherhood

The socially nuanced representations in both Bonnie Jo, Go Home and Sophie’s Choice is contrasted with what Billie Maciunas describes in ‘Feminist Epistemology in Piercy’s Woman on the Edge of Time’ as “revolutionary
changes in Knowers, ways of knowing, and the world to be known™ represented in Marge Piercy’s Woman on the Edge of Time (MaciuNAS, 1992). Piercy’s novel is based on the envisioning of a radical Feminist social change proposed by Shulamith Firestone in The Dialectic of Sex. The revisionist views of Firestone target the social reality of women in patriarchal societies and set the association between femininity and reproduction as the source of women’s subordination. In her book, Firestone suggests “the freeing of Women from the tyranny of their reproductive biology”, “full self-determination” and “economic independence” for women and “the total integration of women...into all aspects of the larger society” (Firestone, 1970).

Piercy’s novel endeavours to refute theories that insist on the association of femaleness and mothering that were produced as a reaction for Firestone’s book. Kathy Rudy in “Ethics, Reproduction, Utopia: Gender and Childbearing in Woman on the Edge of Time and The Left Hand of Darkness’ reviews some of these reactionary writings to Firestone’s book. One of which is Renate Klein’s suggestion that as a result of eliminating the link between females and reproduction “women as a group might be obsolete” (Rudy, 1997). Firestone’s ideology, however, does not target the biological function of females as it targets the social mechanics behind that function that relegates women to a lower position. By readjusting that function Firestone envisions a social change in the reality of females that will eliminate gender roles. While the writings of Rich suggest that the reproductive function is a source of power that is overturned by patriarchal institutionalization Firestone’s suggests the elimination of this gender based power structure altogether (Rich, 1991). This can only be achieved, according to Firestone, with the harnessing of technology to perform the reproductive function for man (Firestone, 1970). Firestone’s proposal is not a rejection of motherhood as it is a rejection of its social reality.

This vision of the rejection of the social reality of motherhood displayed in Firestone’s theory is moulded into the plot of Piercy’s Woman on the Edge of Time. The novel revolves around Connie, a woman who suffers under the strains of institutionalized motherhood. The troubled social reality is related to the reader through the fragmented recollections of Connie. First, she marries an abusive husband because she is financially incapable of earning enough money to support herself and her child. Second, her child is taken away from her because she hit her as a result of Connie’s drug abuse. Finally, she is admitted into a mental hospital where she suffers from experimentations on her brain. Connie, however, resists her reality with envisioning a better future that revises a state of motherhood that failed her. Connie imagines a future where embryos grow outside of human bodies, where a gender classification does not exist and where science is invested in the service of all and not just the elite.

Connie’s rejection of motherhood is linked directly to her social reality. This reality is made unbearable due to two factors. The first is patriarchy where she is abused by her husband because of her financial dependence on him. Connie’s family life becomes so unbearable to the extent that she projects the abuses she receives on her child. She hits her child, which results in breaking her arm. Her child is subsequently taken away from her and she is admitted into a hospital for child abuse (Piercy, 1979). Her reality as a mother is ignored because of her gender and society’s perceptions of its weakness and its responsibilities. Connie is cornered by the requirement of her role into a depressed and abusive state resulting in hurting her child.

The second factor is science that deems her unfit to be a mother and uses her for experimentation. Her reality as a mother is not improved by science. Instead, it is made unbearable by it. Connie suffers from an involuntary hysterectomy because doctors at Metropolitan needed “practice” (Piercy, 1979). Her status a patient does not grant her the right to take decisions concerning her body. The power in this case is in the hands of scientists who forget the humanity of the patent which negatively affects their ethical judgement.

The ethical failures of society and science are rectified by Connie’s imagination by which traditional motherhood is rejected. Kathy Rudy in ‘Ethics, Reproduction, Utopia: Gender and Childbearing in Woman on the Edge of Time and The Left Hand of Darkness’ justifies Connie’s dream of an ethically improved world when she states that “ethical positions can be fashioned not in the realm of reason but rather on the site of imagination” (Rudy, 1997). Connie dreams that she is contacted by a character named Luciente from the future. Luciente shows her a future where women are liberated from their reproductive function which eliminates gender roles as is professed by Firestone. When a fetus is grown outside of a woman’s womb, the gender role that is associated with females is eliminated resulting in a gender neutral world. This adaptation of science for the sake of eliminating gender classes is taken further when males are injected with hormones to help with the task of breastfeeding (Piercy, 1979). This gender neutrality applies itself to language as well as the division of labour. On the level of language Rudy discusses how gender specific pronouns are eliminated in Luciente’s world because sex is no longer associated with reproduction (Rudy, 1997). On the economical level of the division of labour, both males and females are equally required to perform duties that typically belong to the private realm like mothering and duties that belong to the public sphere like fighting wars.

The novel suggests another adaptation to the state of motherhood which will better its social reality also suggested in The Female Eunuch. This adaptation suggests that mothering can be a community role where mothers will help each other especially economically in what she calls “household cooperatives” (Greer, 1970).
This revised version of community motherhood in Piercy’s novel stipulates that mothering is a task that should be taken by 3 mothers and not just one which releases mothers from the demands of mothering.

This revised version of mothering is incomprehensible to Connie because she is confined in her social reality. When she learns of this system of three mothers she applies it to her own frustration with mothering. The thought of having three mothers suffering from the frustrated institutionalized motherhood is painful to Connie. Her “t[ ]ears burned her lids. Angelina, Angelina, if you had three mothers like me, you’d be dead” (Piercy, 1979). This highlights the grip that the patriarchal system has on Connie that she, ironically, fails to navigate her revolutionary imagination.

Piercy’s feminists perspective in Woman on the Edge of Time resists institutionalized motherhood and encourages the rejection of its current state. It suggests the possibility of a maternal subjectivity that is not exclusive to females, nor is it exclusive to one person. This model of maternal subjectivity liberates the experience of motherhood from its burdens which poses this model of motherhood as a possibility in the future. The novel provides another variant of the post-war literary production that can be categorized as Feminist literature. The placement of the novel as a Feminist Utopia is due to its treatment of the issue of the “sexual construction of society” (Rudy, 1997).

Unlike Rudy who describes the novel as a utopia, Maciunas criticizes the perception of Woman on the Edge of Time as Utopian novel because she is optimistic of the possibility of such a future (Rudy, 1997). She insists on the possibility of this future “given the intentionality of people receptive of change” (Maciunas, 1992).

**Conclusion**

Judging by the examined texts that represent the rejection of motherhood the study can observe the nuances within their discourse that reflects both conservative and feminist approaches to the rejection of motherhood. However, the last text inspired by radical feminism is the least influenced by the conservative stance on the rejection of motherhood. Piercy’s work clearly challenges biological determinism by challenging traditional motherhood and reinventing it by introducing a maternal subjectivity that can be adopted by both males and females. The genre of Woman on the Edge of Time may have afforded the novel the space for this representation. Its genre as science-fiction provided a shift that can never be achieved in realistic novels like Bonnie Jo, Go Home and Sophie’s Choice. Both these novels have to represent the nuances reflected in the social and political discourse they convey. In spite of their nuanced representation of the rejection of motherhood, both novels represent a feminine subjectivity that is independent from the maternal one by suggesting the rejection of motherhood as a possibility for the feminine subject.
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The subject of the tragic plays may be extremely tragic, like Trojan War, and other wars fought by people like Alexander and Tamburlaine but they have a moral purpose as well. There are certain tragedies which are centered around a single character like Faustus, and other have many characters like hamlet. One of the the purpose of writing these dramas is to gain monetary benefits. But the people who wrote about sufferings have untied themselves in these dramas as well and have also given at certain places their autobiographical note. Some dramatists have propagated their ideologies in these dramas and some have restricted themselves to social phenomena. Those who have discussed their ideologies, and that also against the norms and values of society, have become the subject of controversial debate like Marlowe. The work of a man reveals himself especially in arts; therefore people somehow try to find out those things manifested in his work compulsorily. In certain cases it is true as in case of Marlowe and his Tamburlaine. The climax in a play or a drama arises from intense conflict and if conflict is of gigantic nature, it is true of Tamburlaine. The warriors, and wars have been the issues in literature for centuries, but their relevance is still presence as we are in this globe, today facing a worst war.

Key words: Catharsis, renaissance, war.

INTRODUCTION

Marlowe was one of the most controversial figures of his times. The Oxford Classics of Marlowe’s plays opens with these remarks of its editors, “Robert Greene a playwright, thus speaks about him: of daring God out of heaven with that atheist Tamburlaine, and later repents the folly of having said in heart, like a certain ‘famous grocer of tragedians’ (that is, Marlowe) that “There is no God” [A Groatsworth of Wit (1592)]. (Bevington and Rasmussen, 1995; p.viii). The editors further point out “These and other testimonials need to be discounted for their exaggeration and for their having been produced under legal circumstances we would regard as a witch-hunt”. (Marlowe et al., 1995, p. ix)

With this background in his contemporary world, Marlowe persuasively wrote four plays. “Tamburlaine The Great” brought him immediate fame in 1587-88. The
Tamburlaine was written in two parts. It could be said that fervor of Renaissance had compelled Marlowe to write such plays. In Elizabethan England, stage drama prevailed not only to gain fame, but also to describe the courtly manners. The dramatic performance of Tamburlaine was done by Lord Admiral’s Men. The brilliance of Renaissance; as asserted in the realm of knowledge in many ways, to revive learning; people like Marlowe wrote not only to show their excellence in the field of literature, but also to bring forth in light the exuberance of thought, definitely attached with Renaissance.

Marlowe has been called an over-reacher and truly all his plays have lofty themes. From Tamburlaine and Faustus to Edward II, he has depicted the fall of over reacher. This is the sign of his tragic history and along with the tragic history of his dramatic heroes. All his characters are cruel and skeptic like him, and also they highlight his free thinking liberal attitude.

Citing this tendency Bevington writes in introduction to his plays in Compendium of Oxford like this, “still, there can be little doubt that Marlowe explored and even reveled in the intellectual skepticism articulated by the mathematician and astronomer Thomas Harriot, by Giordano Bruno (who visited England in (1583-5), and by others whom the age generally regarded as free thinkers and atheists. No one at any rate seems to have doubted that Marlowe was what Kyd had called him, “irreligious”, and “intemperate” and of a cruel heart. The reputation is a reality, even if we cannot be certain of the exact degree of Marlowe’s non conformity”. (Bevington and Rasmussen (ed), 1995, p. ix)

This makes clear about the personality of Marlowe and selection of his themes. The Tamburlaine is solely reflection of what has been called “intemperate” and “cruel hearted”.

As Marlowe’s life ended in a tragic incident of a street brawl, his Tamburlaine, his Faustus, are captivated with this kind of tragical episodes.

Professor Emile Legouis (Parisian) no less admirer of Kyd, writes about Tamburlaine of Marlowe in a way, that the spirit of defiance and revolt are its basic themes. (Legouis 1984, p. 124). He says that Marlowe had a little knowledge about the stage. Professor Legouis furthers his point as such, “Not for him to set forth the horror of crime and its punishment, but to claim admiration for the most sanguinely of men and exalt him as a demi god”. (Legouis. 1984, p. 124). This shows the inner power of Marlowe which was ruthless. He selected Tamburlaine as his hero because he himself was like him; a man with his exalted image in his mind.

Did Marlowe has a negative tendency? This is the only debate in the history of English Literature about Marlowe and or the recurrent one.

Michael Schmidt writes about Marlowe the poet as, “Christopher Marlowe the playwright achieves quite different effects from Christopher Marlowe the poet. The playwright explores ambition and power, but the poet is a younger man creating or translating a world of balance and proportion. The poems lack the exaggeration of language and action, the grandiloquence of the ‘mighty line’”. (Michael, 1979, p. 113)

Puttenham displeased Marlowe’s hyperbolic dramatic style; the over reacher, otherwise called the loud liar; (Michael, 1979, p. 113) and Nashe commented on the specious volubility of a drumming decasillabon. And the poet further says, “the poems are not implicated in these strictures. They neither over reach nor drum. They are not voluble nor specious but economical of language and serious in content even when the tone is light – hearted”. (Michael, 1979, p. 113).

In our daily life, even against an ordinary man if a controversy is fabricated that spreads throughout his life and after his death but the person who has become part of history in a controversial manner, he is despised somehow or the other by the successive generations.

There is a greater need to unveil that controversy that it should be evaluated from all sides. The historical person in question must not be hated on frivolous accounts and speculations. It is true, contemporaries of an author; admit his contribution to his field of knowledge very assiduously. And it is very strange phenomenon, that the poets and writers of an age use satirical remarks on each other, play puns and go so far as Thomas Kyd went to pronounce blasphemy against Marlowe which led to his murder. Every poet or a writer has a specific ideology and that must be respected, but in case of Marlowe, as Church directed and influenced the Queen Elizabeth and Elizabethan England, so Marlowe had to suffer. It is a question whether Pope Gregory is cited in history, respectfully, or Marlowe is considered as one of the finest men of Renaissance. History has given its verdict that Marlowe despite being accused by the Pope is still alive and could be seen peeping through the lines of Tamburlaine, Faustus and Jew of Malta.

Writing about his poetic brilliance i.e. of Marlowe, Michael Schmidt briefly points out his biographical sketch as follows: Marlowe was born in Canterbury in 1564. His father was a shoemaker. Christopher became a scholar at King’s school, Canterbury, and afterwards at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He took his B.A in 1584 and his MA in 1587, by that time he had probably completed Tamburlaine (Michael, 1979, p. 113).

The statements mentioned above about Marlowe need fresh critical analysis. It seems that Marlowe’s skepticism and his being prone towards atheism, has led since Kyd and Greene to minor critic like Hardin Craig; Emile Legouis and in modern times Andrew Sanders and Avaraham Oz, as an obsession. The above mentioned critics are few, and there are many who repudiate Marlowe for his alleged charge of blasphemy, as an
unredeemed off act. It reflects that it has been the greatest anomaly seen in a Briton, like Marlowe. This obsession is plaguing among critics of Marlowe up to the extent of mania, spanning over the last four hundred years and which is still unending.

This shows the sordid and narrow vision of British society which in its deep roots, is still feudal, as having a Queen sitting at the throne since 1951 i.e. Queen Elizabeth II. This narrow feudalism is still prevailing in England, who likes to be called as U.K., and is due to the non-division of property equitably. So much of the subject of Marlowe’s atheism has been cited time and again it seems these critics seem to be herbivores and have a plenty of time to chew this minor fodder. This could be inferred easily that Papal dynasty of Protestant church in England (U.K) has not forgiven Marlowe. This Protestant church is also in favour of Queens and Kings; a trite substance and symbol of feudalism and this dynasty of Pope is still being tickled by the words of Marlowe, which on the other hand in Indian subcontinent have relishing nature and has been the subject of austere mysticism, propagated by Sufis of this land. This is the difference between Western and Eastern logic. People like Sarmad, Shah Hussain, Bullah Shah, Averroes, Av-Nasar-Al Farabi, Khayyam, Ibn-e-Sabah, Mansoor, Ibne-Arab, to cite a few, were not only hostile to courts but also against the superstitious culture as well. The dance of Shah Hussain in ecstasy at one side and Mansoor’s slogan on the other side was not at all harmful deeds in East. They, that is, the saints and ascetics of East, have propagated more human side of religion. Even they went so far in admiring the humanity and have a respect for the human-self that they considered God to be set aside before the respect of man or human beings. An example of this is well elaborated by a Dohah of Baba Farid; a fine from of couplet as such:

Demolish the mosque, demolish the temple, demolish each and everything, Don’t demolish the heart of simple man as God has a place there (Dawoodi, 1987).

Another example is of Bullah Shah as such:

To offer prayer before the God is like the vanity of women
And to keep fast is being thrifty in eating bread (Dawoodi, 1987)

This makes us question tragedy; and why Kings and Queens are chosen for this type of tragical dilemmas? F.L, Lucas writes about the master, Aristotle, in defining tragedy, “There is something Roman about Aristotle. He has not soared into immortality with the bright grace of the Greek; he has conquered it, province by the province, with the resolution, the monumental strength and the practical good sense of Rome. Long after the ancient world had fallen into ruin, the ways his thought had paved still guided the medieval mind amid thickets of its theology; just as the Roman roads across the wasted lands where the eagles had yielded place to the raven and the crow. And as, even today, when we whirl along our highways, we still cannot go far without following or crossing some undeviating vestige of the march of Rome, so beneath the lines of modern thought endure the foundations laid by the master of Alexander The Great. This is particularly true of the criticism of tragedy”. (Lucas, 1972, p. 11). This could then also fairly be said as Lucas says that Aristotle is Roman in his conquest of knowledge; he is rather essentially a Grecian, a Grecian who conquered Egypt and a Grecian whose pupil conquered the known world and established the second World Government in history of the world. The conquest of territories though rest on knowledge of warfare and knowledge in general; but the battlefield of knowledge is quite different. Here, you have to conquer history and immense amount of time and space. The millions of people and their minds have to be conquered by the words you leave behind. Even then you are not sure that you have been preserved in the pages of the history. As audience in the history changes from era to era, and as every era of the history is unique and modern from the previous era; it is next to improbability, that your words may survive. In case of certain Greek masters, it is felt that they are still holding classes in the Olive groves and Lyceums. It is likely Socrates has just ended his dialogues, and just Plato is writing about imitative concepts of art in his “Republic” based on the ideas of his master, the Socrates.

Plato in his metaphysical thoughts did not give place to poets in his state, but Aristotle describing the general theory of art went against Plato and considered tragedy as the highest form of literature. In the days of Aristotle drama was written in poetry and enacted on the theatre of Athens. The Aristotelian theory of arts and tragedy is mainly focused on Greek drama, its characteristics and parameters are still valuable. It would be justified to see the “Tamburlaine” in this context as well but at this stage, ready definition of tragedy is necessary to be seen and what affects tragedy, brings on the minds of the people.

Dante calls him “the Master of those who know” (Lucas, 1972, p. 21). Aristotle as said by Lucas considers that poetry must be verse literature that reflects life in creative fiction (Lucas, 1972, p. 21). Here Aristotle has made a Parthenon or rather captivated a Roman theatre in a single sentence. He has refuted the theory of his master, Plato and in affect wants to say that literature is the highest form of imaginative thinking, “Poetics” as the meanings given by Lucas, means (poien, ‘to make’). So, make means to create. Aristotle in opposition to Plato wants to emphasize poet doesn’t imitate; but creates, though thought is considered immaterial by Aristotel.

According to Lucas, “poetics” is concerned with serious
drama (the Greek tragoidia need not end unhappily) and rather perfunctorily with epic (Lucas, 1972, p. 21). The famous definition cited by Lucas; by Aristotle is, "tragedy", he says is a representation of an action, which is serious, complete in itself, and of a certain length, it is expressed in speech made beautiful in different ways in different parts of the play; it is acted, not narrated, and by exciting "pity" and fear it gives a healthy relief to such emotions (Lucas, 1972, p. 23).

The question raised in the early pages of the article, why Queens and Kings and Princes and Princesses are selected for tragedy is rightfully answered here in the definition of tragedy by Aristotle. He says that tragedy excites "pity and fear" and gives healthy relief to such emotions. Therefore, the unusual characters of courts are the heroes of tragedy; as their manners and follies are grand and their manners and follies led them to the lowest ditches of the earth. People derive pity and fear from their stories enacted on the stage and be relieved.

Lucas returns to Aristotle's definition of tragedy again and discusses in this manner, "tragedy is a representation of an action" (Lucas, 1972, p. 30). He further says that it is very simple. He is of the view; how much should there be? (Lucas, 1972, p. 31)

Elaborating and extending his idea to later critics; Lucas says, "Brunetiere's insistence on 'conflict' as the one essential, and Archer's 'crises': We see, looming in the future those revolts against tyranny of more action, as in Maeterlinck's Static Drama, Shaw's Discussion play. And we come to realize how surely and steadily during the centuries between Marlowe and Chekhov "the action" of tragedy has passed from outside the characters to within them, from the boards to the theatre of the soul, so that at last the whole frontier between action and passion tends to fade away. 20

The last line of Lucas is very important, that is, 'action' and 'passion' fade away. It is true as in Tamburlaine of Marlowe, Hamlet, Macbeth and Lear of Shakespeare, passion and action are dissolved. Tamburlaine as an over reacher, with lofty ambitions, Hamlet, irreconcililing towards the dilemma of death and in the end becoming impulsive, Macbeth's agony to attain power, and moving him to the cruel attempt of murder, and ultimately captive of severe guilt; Lear in his wrong perception of love to Cordelia, and destroying himself and his daughter; who is the victim of jealousy show all these characters destroyed by a certain hidden force inside them. It seems to be in these cases that action travelled from outside to inside, or within them in shape of agonized passion.

The discussion about what tragedy is very long and spanned over the centuries. For middle ages it was a drama with an unhappy ending. For Greek and ancient world it was a grave or serious drama and for modern mind, it is a drama with extreme tragic incidents and unhappy ending.

In the light of these inferences drawn by Lucas, it could be well said that Renaissance drama is serious and in this sense ancient; fulfilling the requirements of essentials told by Aristotle and modern, in the sense of being extremely tragic.

The two remarkable Renaissance dramatists are Marlowe and Shakespeare, of which first one is under study with his passionate drawings of "Tamburlaine The Great", the play completes every definition of tragedy; modern, ancient and medieval discussed above; specially with reference to Aristotelian concepts of tragedy. It was necessary to see the sublime concepts of tragedy, historically, in order to have an understanding of the play which is seen in ideas of a contrastive foregrounding figure again of Renaissance, that is, Machiavelli.

Highlighting the genius of Shakespeare, Emrys Jones quotes thus, “the only one of the wits with anything substantial to teach him was Marlowe (and Marlowe later returned the compliment by modeling Edward II on 2 Henry VI) (Jones, 1978, p. 4).

Emrys Jones considers the period from 1590 – 1690 as the most fertile period of England as the England was never so much educated before it. Tracing the history from Henry VIII and the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth 1, Charles I, Charles II are according to him quantitatively very ripe for England, regarding the education of English people. His point of view for giving this perception is actually to focus that English audience watching stage at that time was well versed in the art of drama and that appraisal from that audience was not a simple affair" (Jones, 1978, p. 7). The fantasy discussion whether Shakespeare existed or not, or whether the plays were written by Earl of Oxford, is trite now. It is proven that a person with the name of Shakespeare was present, though less of his biographical features even still are known. It is still difficult to write a biography of Shakespeare. But Shakespeare is admired throughout the world for his brevity and ingenuity of crafting phrases and sentences, which have become quotable quotes. And this also doesn’t mean that while comparing Shakespeare with Marlowe; Marlowe is at a lower stature. The only difference of genius lies in the fact that Shakespeare learned from the variety of experiences which he had in life and Marlowe learned from the university, but now it is clear that both were affected by Italian Renaissance. It is an established fact that the source of Shakespeare's history plays is "Plutarch". To compare Shakespeare and Marlowe is a difficult task as genius of both is unremarkable.

As Shakespearean biographies are rare, same is the case with Marlowe. Marlowe's life was also though very brief, but he has been ignored by many critics throughout the centuries. He has been denied place or given less space by writers of "History of English Literature" like David Daiches to quote one example.
Marlowe's life and works are briefly discussed so far. The reason seems to be his bohemian attitude towards religion and his temperament of being "reckless libertine". But even then as surveyed by Emrys Jones that; England had been and has never been so educated than 1590s to 1690s, it could be said that to attract that educated audience one had to be at a lofty pulpit (Jones, 1978, p. 7).

According to Emrys Jones, one had to be impressive before that audience and as the Renaissance was heralding its dawn in England the variety of knowledge flourished, as he further says that Elizabeth; along with James I, Charles I, and Charles II, was interested in intellectual pursuits of brilliant kind. This could be meant then the environment of the England of that time was very 'sombre' and flourishing for art and theater (Jones, 1978, p. 7).

J.B. Priestley in his book "(Literature and Western Man) and in its part one (The Golden Globe) writes about the Italian Renaissance, and Renaissance in general, like this: "The New Age flowered first in Italy. All that was necessary was there: classical and other learning; the prosperous cities, with their new kinds of men, that were now independent republics or principalities; the changing papacy itself, still unchallenged as a political power, still far from the reformation and counter reformation; the arts that could flourish under ruling patrons who understood them and could reflect sumptuous new style of life; and the idea of Man the inheritor of the golden globe, no longer a humble creature of God on trial there for a brief season, no longer fixed in the medieval hierarchy, but free to reach the heights or plunge into the depths and by his own abilities, choices, actions, to triumph or to ruin himself" (Priestley, 1960, p. 10).

In such a rapturous and sonorous flow, Priestley has talked about Renaissance, or revival of learning of arts and sciences, or in essential every field of knowledge. He considers that it is not the discovery of human soul and his inner self. It seems as Man himself was carving out himself from his inside. Even the rulers of the new republics and principalities were patronizing the new fashion and function of arts and sciences. One of the towering personalities of Arts, Angelo, said, "the man who knows him, knows his work" (Rolland, 1962, p. 125).

The scene of Priestley is set with the most gianly of the men of politics and literature, the Machiavelli. The opening of the book of Priestley is with its first chapter as "The Italian Scene and Machiavelli". Without any doubt Machiavelli has not only affected his age through his poetry and his remarkable treatise "The Prince", but still his thought has a relevance today, in order to understand the nature of war, peace, function of republics and principalities, rulers of past and present and function and duties of the rulers and the ruled.

Priestley sees in Machiavelli the whole cult of Renaissance and aptly. He describes the features of his work and personality like this: A far less brilliant but far more renowned contemporary of Piccolo’s - the Florentine political theorist and historian, Nicolo Machiavelli who also wrote one of the best Italian comedies of the fifteenth century ‘La Mandrogala, and was the official and diplomat in the service of the Florentine Republic, who took to writing only when the Medici family dissolved the republic and had him placed under house arrest may appear a rather humdrum literary figure when compared with an Ariosto or a Tasso; but, after all, he is one of that very small group of authors whose names have contributed an adjective to all the languages of western man. Millions of people who have never read a word, he wrote, know that ‘Machiavellian means, though, ironically enough, it does not mean what Machiavelli meant. He was not a conspicuously successful diplomat, but his various missions to Rome, France, Germany, enabled him to take a close view of ruling princes in action, notably Cesare Borgia, whom he knew at the height of Cesare’s swift and dazzling triumph. He was also a thoughtful student of Roman ancient history. The combined result of these studies and his immediate experiences is to be discovered, though he wrote other historical and political works, in his most famous book “The Prince” (Priestley, 1960, p. 15).

The Editor of Oxford World’s Classics of “The Prince” writes about the book: it provides an analysis of the usually violent means by which men seize, retain and lose political power (Bondanella, 1998).

So, often Machiavelli has been termed a villain, and as Bertrand Russell calls that since him world has become ‘Machiavellian’ (Priestley, 1960, p. 16). It is relevant to discuss him by correlating Marlowe’s Tamburlaine, with the text of ‘The Prince’, and highlight how the world today needs to reassemble its motives of power politics.

Machiavelli present this book in honour of respectable Lorenzo de’ Medici in such a way: Those who strive to obtain the good graces of a prince are accustomed to come before him with such things as they hold most precious, or in which they see him take most delight: where one often sees horses, arms, cloth of gold, precious stones, and similar ornaments presented to princes, worthy of their greatness (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 1).

‘The Prince’ unfurls like this as a precious ornament to history. If we see ironically, King of Persia, Mycetes just placed his kingdom before Tamburlaine as a precious gift, though he fought with him but he didn’t manage to wage the war properly. “Tamburlaine of Marlowe” also unfolds in this manner as already Mycetes has acknowledged the loss of Kingdom. Look at this statement, “Brother Cosroe, I find myself aggrieved,
Yet insufficient to express the same,  
For it requires a great and thundering speech.  
Good brother, tell the cause unto my lords:  
I know you have a better wit than I.  
(1 Tamburlaine 1.11-5) (Marlowe et al., 1995, p. 4)

The person, the Mycetes, so ignorant of the grave  
situation of war, is making a speech to his fellow and  
asking him to determine the cause of his grief, shows  
how much he is prepared with the duty of war, which is  
the day and night occupation of a Prince or a King. This  
shows that he has lost the war as he has lost the vigor  
within him. This also refers that he has been the king of  
Persia for a long time, enjoying luxury of being a king,  
and shutting his eyes from the essential duty of war. This  
statement also refers that mighty 'Tamburlaine' is  
marching like a growling lion and howling wolf. See what  
is the notion of Machiavelli about the essentiality of being  
prepared for a war always by a prince, "A Prince ought to  
have no other aim, or thought, nor select anything else  
for his study, than war and its rules and discipline; for this  
is the sole art that belongs to him who rules, and it is of  
such force that it not only upholds those who are born  
princes, but it often enables men to rise from a private  
station to that rank. And, on the contrary, it is seen that  
when princes have thought more of ease than of arms  
they have lost their states. And the first cause of your  
losing it is to neglect this art; and what enables you to  
acquire a state is to be master of the art" (Machiavelli,  
1990, p. 21). Machiavelli cites an example that  
FrancescoSforza, through being martial from a private  
person became Duke of Milan; and the sons, through  
avoiding the hardships and troubles of arms, from dukes  
became private persons (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 21).  

Mycetes, the King of Persia, realizes at a very later  
stage the conspiracy of Cosroe and laments as such:

Embosed with silk as best beseesoms my state,  
To be revenged for these contemptuous words  
O, where is duty and allegiance now?  
Fled to the Caspian or the Ocean main?  
What, Shall I call thee brother? No, a foe,  
Monster of Nature shame unto the thy stock,  
That dar'st presume thy sovereign to mock,  
Meander, come. I am abused, Meander (Bevington and  
Rasmussen, 1995; p6)

Being a shepherd in origin, Tamburlaine had a tricky  
affair with Zenocrate. She after arriving in Scythia,  
speaks so about him, "Ah, shepherd, pity my distressed  
plight,  

If, as Thou seen'st, thou art so mean a man,  
And seek not to enrich thy followers  

By lawless rapine from silly maid who,  
Travelling with these Median lords  
To Memphis, from my uncle's country of Media,  
Where all my youth I have been governed,  
Have passed the army of the mighty Turk,  
Bearing his privy signet and his hand  
To safe conduct us thorough Africa  
(1 Tamburlaine 1.2, 7-16) (Marlowe et al.,  
1995; p9)

The subject of being hated and despised of a prince or a  
king, is very well discussed by Machiavelli, and of which  
is hinted out in the above dialogues of Zenocrate as well,  
that is avoidance of being rapacious. Machiavelli, so  
cites, "It makes him hated above all things, as I have  
said, to be rapacious, and to be a violator of the property  
and women of his subjects from both of which he must  
abstain. And when neither their property nor honour is  
touched the majority of men live content, and he has only  
to contend with the ambition of few, whom he can curb  
with ease in many ways". 36

Tamburlaine fulfills Machiavellian criterion in this regard  
also. Though he has risen from a lower parentage, but he  
did not dishonor any woman, he even honored  
Zenocrate, and is in effeminate as well. In the play his  
affair with Zenocrate could be seen as a digression and a  
suitable one and in elaboration worthy of his stature as a  
mighty King. His affair and love with Zenocrate is just like  
a jest to woman. He talks about her beauty to the extent  
of flattering her and appeasing her at the loss of her own  
kingdom.

Tamburlaine of Marlowe and Machiavelli join hands on  
the matter of fate and fortune. Tamburlaine says to  
Therimadas, 'In thee, thou valiant man of Persia, I see  
the folly of thy emperor.  

Art thou but a captain of a thousand horse,  
That by characters graven in thy brows  
And by thy martial face and stout aspect  
Deserv'stto have the leading of an host?  
Forsake thy King, and do but join with me,  
And we will triumph over all the world,  
I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains  
And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about,  
And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere  
Than Tamburlaine be slain or overcome  
(1 Tamburlaine. 2 166-177) (Bevington and  
Rasmussen, 1995; p13)

And what Machiavelli says about fortune well matches  
the speech of Tamburlaine as such, "I compare her to  
one of those raging rivers, which when in flood overflows  
the plains, sweeping away the soil from place to place;  
everything flies before it, all yield to its violence, without
being able in any to withstand it; and yet, though its nature be such it does not follow therefore that men, when the weather becomes fair, shall not make provision, both with defenses and barriers, in such a manner that, rising again, the waters may pass away by a canal, and their force be neither so unrestrained nor so dangerous. So it happens with fortune, who shows her power where valour has not prepared to resist her, and thither she turns her forces where she knows that barriers and defences have not been raised to constrain her (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 35). These poetic remarks about fortune also look same like the famous soliloquy of Hamlet,

“To be or not to be”.  
That is the question  
Whether it is nobler in mind  
To suffer the slings and  
Arrows of an outrageous Fortune,  
Or to take arms against  
Sea of troubles” (Wright, 1958)

The Persian king and other kings were unprepared against the outrageous Fortune carried by Tamburlaine, on the other hand, Tamburlaine was so well planned in warfare and arms and armors that he turned the wheel of Fortune. This is true Machiavellian spirit that a prince must get hold of all the affairs and also as said by him, Fortune plays a significant role and becomes a deciding factor in the matters of Kingdoms, but if a prince is well designed and crafted in the study of war; as he also points out that ‘fate’ doesn’t mean to neglect the affairs, he can’t lose or mismanage the kingdom. In case of Tamburlaine the fate herself has bowed on his feet, though he is well trained, courageous, valorous and also like fox and lion alike.

This aptly shows that Tamburlaine has plied the strings of Cosroe, and which are kept in secrecy before Mycetes. Mycetes does not know this as he has assumed everything overwhelmingly that he could face Tamburlaine. The Mycetes, the King of Persia again if seen in Machiavellian perspective is unable to visualize the trap laid before him, and Tamburlaine excels him in this regard, by playing tactfully. See what Machiavelli has got to say about such situation. “A Prince, therefore, being compelled knowingly to adopt the beast, ought to choose the fox and the lion; because the lion cannot defend himself against snares and the fox cannot defend himself against wolves. Therefore, it is necessary to be a fox to discover the snares and a lion to terrify the wolves” (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 25).

Tamburlaine befits this statement as he has created a snare in the form of the conspiracy of Cosroe. This shows that he is like a fox. And by threatening, Mycetes, he is a lion; as Meander says’: Oft have I heard your majesty complain

Of Tamburlaine, that sturdy Scythian thief,  
That robs your merchants of Persepolis  
Trading by land into the Western Isles,  
And in your confines with his lawless train  
Daily commits in civil outrages,  
Hoping misled by dreaming prophecies,  
To reign in Asia and with barbarous arms  
To make himself the monarch of the East. (Bevington and Rasmussen,1995, p. 5)

These lines are very important. In these lines Meander has talked about very significant issues that lead to war and those are still relevant. In his speech to Mycetes he says that Tamburlaine and his men are committing daily the crimes of looting the tradesmen of Persia. This poses a serious question to him as this issue is the basis of the one of oldest conflicts in prevailing war between and among warring factions. This shows that war had and has an economic basis. The modern war is like this. Why? Because, not only the revenue brought by the traders is of high value to any kingdom, but the traders’ route must be safe, or that they may easily trade across the different countries. Though Marlowe hasn’t delineated the ancient art of war, but he has very aptly described the nature and basis of war. Though war is loathsome, but it is inevitable as it is today. In the modern warfare one of the reasons is economic, because in the recent scenario, war is not only being fought on multiple factors, but it has also become a kind of business across the globe. The ancient war was also very lethal and based on economy. It can well be inferred from, Tamburlaine, “The warlike soldier and the gentleman

That here to fore have filled Persepolis  
With Africa Captains tak’n the field  
Whose ransom made them  
March in coats of gold  
With costly jewels hanging at their ears  
And shining stones upon their lofty crests,  
Now living idle in the walled towns,  
Wanting both pay and martial discipline,  
Begin in troops to threaten to civil war  
And openly exclaim against the king  
Therefore to stay all sudden mutinies,  
We will invest your highness  
Whereat the soldiers will conceive the more joy.

Then did the Macedonians at the spoil of Great Darius  
and his wealthy host.  
(1 Tamburlaine 1.1 (140-153) (Marlowe et al., 1995 p. 7)

The specific case of Darius has also been cited by
Machiavelli has clearly demarcated the rule about the governing of principalities in the chapter where he had discussed the case of Darius which was conquered by Alexander and where after the Great Alexander mutiny or rebel didn't occur. It's a shining rule still having a validity for those who have a tendency like Alexander the Great and Tamburlaine the Great. Alexander and Tamburlaine didn't make colonies as done by British Imperial Kingdom, which had a basis in the Queen Elizabeth’s I age, and the fervor of such dramatic heroes for portrayal in that times is clearly related to the fervor to conquer the world. The revival of learning in arts and sciences in the sixteenth century England, though has a background in Renaissance, but these intellectual efforts have a significance to add the power of imperialism. Alexander and Tamburlaine subdued the whole kingdoms and didn’t make colonies, but as rightly put by Machiavelli, they followed one of the two rules proposed by him to govern the principalities.

He that is, Machiavelli says, in the discussion regarding Darius, that, “I answer that principalities of which one has record are found to be governed in two different ways; either by a prince, with a body of servants, who assign him to govern the kingdom as ministers by his favor and permission; or by a prince and barons, who hold that dignity by antiquity of blood and not by the grace of the prince. Such barons have states and their own subjects, who recognize them as lords and hold them in natural affection. Those states that are governed by a prince and his servants hold their prince in more consideration, because in all the country there is no one who is recognized as superior to him, and if they yield obedience to another they do it as to a minister and official and they do not bear him any particular affection” (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 7).

He further takes example of his time and says, “The example of these two governments in our times is the Turk and the King of France. The Turkish monarchy is governed by a single sultan and in France the King is surrounded by lords and barons” (Machiavelli, 1990, p. 7). The cause of rebel not occurring in Darius after Alexander was simple that he after conquering it established the government like Turks.

It seems now clear that Persia as depicted in the play, wasn’t governed by a single monarch, but barons and lords were there. This made a bit ease for Tamburlaine to conquer Persia; Egypt Turkey and Syria. This aptly makes him the ‘Hero of Machiavelli’, for the above mentioned reasons, as Tamburlaine ravaging the ravens of Persia and conquering one Kingdom of the East after the other, did not leave a single or a slight discrepancy in controlling all the kingdoms by him, and this was justly done by Alexander the great after Cyrus the Great, and thereby he that is., Tamburlaine falls in the paradigm of the rule set by Machiavelli as the best form of government and administration of different principalities, first by uniting them and then ruling them under one majesty, like the example given by him of Turk of histories.

The play rightfully depicts the genius of Marlowe as a Cambridge graduate. It also embodies, whereby the cult of Renaissance, thereby the megalomaniac self of Marlowe himself in the flesh of ‘Tamburlaine’. If the play is viewed from the modern feminist perspective, it shows an interesting note that Zenocrate, or sweet Zenocrate is just a jestful instrument in the hands of Tamburlaine, and he only considers her worthy of coronation, after his mighty deeds of conquests. If Zenocrate is equated with Elizabeth 1, it would give a more interesting result, that Elizabeth I, surrounded by handsome courtiers and suitors like Sir Philip Sydney and Marlowe, only was a plied tool. The play can also cater the attention of modern youth (or youthful leaders of the world) in this transnational world, where the youth aspires to rise in a single flight to major offices of different trans-national companies. Why? Because in their view as ‘Tamburlaine’ acquired one principality after another, same is their case as fruitful offices are the principalities to be acquired by the young generation, and that also one after another. But the play has an opposite side as well. If the sword and spear-stucken breasts, and blood stained hearts of soldiers and mercenaries are shown at the stage, that might find way in the heart of our young generation, to really hate the war and as the title of Hemingway suggests, “Can we or Shall we say ‘Farewell to Arms’ forever”.
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