

2003

An Africanist-Orientalist discourse: the other in Shakespeare and Hellenistic tragedy

Haegap Jeoung

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, hjeoun1@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jeoung, Haegap, "An Africanist-Orientalist discourse: the other in Shakespeare and Hellenistic tragedy" (2003). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 1532.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/1532

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

AN AFRICANIST-ORIENTALIST DISCOURSE:
THE OTHER IN SHAKESPEARE AND HELLENISTIC TRAGEDY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Interdepartmental Program in Comparative Literature

By
Haegap Jeoung
B.A., Busan National University, 1988
December 2003

Acknowledgements

Above all, I thank God, my Lord. Glory be to Jesus Christ! I owe my greatest academic debt to Dr. Jefferson Humphries for the theoretical ideas of my dissertation. The seminars he offered, such as “French Orientalism,” “Oriental Philosophy and Literary Theory,” gave me the inspiration for my research. And I would like to thank Dr. Greg Stone, who inspired a lot of my interest in Mediaeval and Renaissance literature as well as classical and modern literary theory. I will never forget Dr. John Protevi’s Foucault seminar, which taught me a lot in terms of methodology of discursive analysis of literary texts. I appreciate the careful readings and useful comments by Dr. John Lowe and Dr. Maribel Dietz, regarding the relationships between Venice and Shakespeare and the historiographical approaches to Antiquity and the Renaissance respectively. And I will always keep in mind my classmates—Mr. Clany Soileau and Mr. Luis Moreno, who were academic helpers and friends. Finally, I wish to express my particular appreciation to my wife, Hyangmee Yoon, whose exceptional love and prayer saved me. I am very grateful to all who prayed for my doctoral defense and helped me. God bless all of them forever in the name of Jesus Christ.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> and <i>Περσῶν</i> (<i>The Persians</i>) —The Ambivalence of the Female Body: Desirable but Inferior	36
Chapter 2. <i>Othello</i> and <i>Ἰκέτιδες</i> (<i>The Suppliant Women</i>) —The Discourse of Madness and Castration: 'Tupping Your White Ewe'	64
Chapter 3. <i>Titus Andronicus</i> and <i>Medea</i> —Lethal Gods' Sad Rites: 'A Coffin Covered with Black'	91
Chapter 4. <i>The Tempest</i> and <i>Ἐλένη</i> —The Anxiety of Disorder: 'This Thing of Darkness'	116
Chapter 5. <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> and <i>Ἐκάβη</i> — Discourse of Impiety (ἀθεότης) : 'Noble Savage'	142
Conclusion	168
References	176
Vita	184

Abstract

The main aim of this dissertation is to show how the discourse of the psychoanalytical other—femininity, death, madness, disorder, and impiety—overlaps with colonial discourse in some plays from Shakespearean and Greek-Roman tragedy, and what difference or similarity there is between the two ages. The hypothesis is that foreigners are allegories of the psychoanalytical other. For this purpose, the research tries to grasp the concept of the other, from the viewpoint of psychoanalysis, and to analyze the core of colonial discourse on the basis of the concept of the psychoanalytical other.

The starting point of the dissertation is that the other is related to the “uncanny other” within ourselves, which is “the hidden face of our identity,” arising from the dialectic between desire and anxiety. The dissertation puts emphasis on the fact that colonial imagination relates the imagination of the colonial other to that of the “uncanny other” within. In relation to Greek tragedy, the psychological tendency is called “basic tendency” by Frank Snowden, which develops into “power relations” in Shakespeare’s plays, where the psychological other becomes the object of politics—that is, the politicization

of the other. For instance, the color black is psychologically related to death in some of Hellenistic tragedy, which is as natural as even Africans equate blackness with evil. But since the Mediaeval Ages, the black-evil equation was established as a frame of politics of a theatre-state. However, the dissertation doesn't ignore the possibility that Shakespeare debunks the colonial imagination of the Renaissance Europeans.

Introduction

The main aim of my dissertation is to show how the discourse of the psychoanalytical other—femininity, death, madness, etc.—overlaps with colonial discourse in some plays from Shakespearean and Greek-Roman tragedy, and what difference or similarity there is between the two ages. The hypothesis is that foreigners are allegories of the psychoanalytical other. For this purpose, I will try to grasp the concept of the other, from the viewpoint of psychoanalysis, and analyze the core of colonial discourse on the basis of the concept of the psychoanalytical other. I am definitely indebted to Jefferson Humphries and Julia Kristeva for my understanding of what kind of literary imagination the other is, and to Edward Said and Christopher Norris for their notions of Africanist-Orientalist discourse and colonial discourse.

In the process of inquiring into the ‘overlapping’ of the imagination of the other with the colonial imagination, I focus on the fact that the cultural, political other is the peripheral disclosure of the epistemological other ‘within.’ Also, throughout this analysis, I never forget Snowden’s assertion: “the Greek and Roman association of the color black with death ... had in origin nothing to do with skin color.... In the first place, the association seems to have been due primarily to the *basic tendency* of peoples, African Negroes included, to equate

blackness and evil”¹ (*Italics emphasized*). The attitude toward ‘skin color’ is one of the most conspicuous differences between Shakespeare and Greek-Roman tragedy. Generally speaking, the Shakespearean other is mostly associated with negative images of dark skin, whereas the Greek-Roman attitude toward dark skin is more or less favorable.²

Jefferson Humphries, in his book *The Otherness Within*, says, “art—whether language of words or of images—is the self-conscious experience of that differential otherness.”³ In “Gnostic” readings of Marcel Proust and other writers, he points out “the mediatedness of the language by which we know ourselves.”⁴ Fallen man “occluded by the dross of flesh”⁵ can conceive his own “self” only with the help of language. The other is the ‘lost’ self within “Anthropos;” we become the other to ourselves. Whenever we desire to get to the self, we are bound to experience the suffering of being lost. This process is epistemologically ironic, for the pursuit for the γνῶσις (the truth—lost knowledge, ourselves) is a figure of the Narcissus myth.⁶ The more he desires,

¹Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 83-84.

² *Ibid.*, p. 55.

³ Jefferson Humphries, *The Otherness Within: Gnostic Reading in Marcel Proust, Flanery O’Connor, and Francois Villon* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1983), p. 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

the more anxious he becomes. The other is the desired lost body and the object of anxiety at the same time.

Furthermore, when Julia Kristeva declares that “the other is my (own and proper) unconscious,”⁷ we are bound to think of the Freudian concept—“the uncanny strangeness (das Unheimliche)” arising from the tension between desire and anxiety. She continues, “uncanny, foreignness is within us: we are our own foreigners, we are divided.”⁸ The uncanny other is definitely our own repressed self within, neither unfamiliar nor exterior. To support her theory, Kristeva induces the suppliant Danaids from Aeschylus as citizens and foreigners at the same time. The Danaids work symbolically as both ‘we’ and ‘others,’ for they are Argive descendants and came from Egypt. “The foreigner lives within us: he is the hidden face of our identity.”⁹ Interestingly enough, the foreignness (otherness) was acceptable, insofar as it “was amenable to the rites and laws of the polis.”¹⁰ Even the madness of Io is to be redeemed, by her yielding to reason. This dialectic of madness and reason is closely related to the censorship working in our human psychology. “Our infantile desires and fears of the other—the other of death, the other of woman, the other of uncontrollable drive”¹¹ are a pretext for the uncanny strangeness. Between desire and anxiety we lose

⁷ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 183.

⁸ Ibid., p. 181.

⁹ Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 45.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 191.

ourselves, we become foreigners (others) to ourselves. "If I am a foreigner, there are no foreigners."¹² This consciousness of the unconscious otherness is the starting point of a 'new' cosmopolitanism or politics.¹³ Further, I find that Kristeva's notion of "the other within" overlaps with Said's "colonized other"—"the Oriental was linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor) having in common an identity best described as lamentably alien."¹⁴

In the same way, the Orient and Africa seem to be a pretext for this unconscious otherness. They are the images of our own 'forbidden' or 'lost' self—the mirror images of Europe. Edward Said might relate the images to "Europe's collective day-dream."¹⁵ He quotes from Lamartine, "un voyage en Orient [était] comme un grand acte de ma vie intérieure"... the Orient is the "patrie de mon imagination."¹⁶ An Orientalist brings a personal mythology to the Orient. Said's comment on Nerval's *Voyage en Orient* makes it more clear that the Orient is a pretext for the journey to his own lost self. "The Orient symbolizes Nerval's dreamquest and the fugitive woman central to it, both as desire and as loss. 'Vaisseau d'Orient'—vessel of the Orient—refers enigmatically either to the woman as the vessel carrying the Orient, or possibly, to Nerval's own vessel for

¹² Ibid., p.192.

¹³ Ibid., p.192.

¹⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 207.

¹⁵ Ibid., p.52.

¹⁶ Ibid., p.177.

the Orient, his prose *voyage*. In either case, the Orient is identified with commemorative *absence*.”¹⁷

Nerval is seeking for something that is by nature absent. The Orient for Nerval is a symbol of loss and desire, which is exposed through an allegory of a female body. Nerval’s voyage reflects not only his quest for the eternal female body, but also the endless quest for his own identity. His voyage is an allegory, through which we see human desire reach out for an unreachable object or an irretrievable myth. From the Lacanian viewpoint, this voyage carries a postmodern characteristic: imagination, like dreaming, is a phase of desire for the irretrievable real which is castrated by ‘absence’ and ‘differance.’ *Voyage en Orient* is an allegory of lost identity and castrated desire. Nerval’s Orientalism is a kind of Narcissism or self-consciousness based on the human desire for self-identification which is out of reach.¹⁸

In accordance with Said, Christopher Miller asserts on the basis of Freud, “like the figure of ‘Africa,’ dream is felt to be ‘something alien, arising from another world and contrasting with the remaining contents of the mind,’ ‘extraneous to our minds.’ Yet, paradoxically, dreams can only be a result of ‘the

¹⁷ Ibid., p.184.

¹⁸ Based on psychoanalytical linguistics, Lacan juxtaposes structuralism with 'imaginary (or mirror) stage', poststructuralism with 'symbolic stage'. In the imaginary stage, there's no distinction ('differance'), but self-identification. Moving on to the next symbolic stage, a child finds himself in terms of difference and absence. Hence he desires for the previous stage, which is an irretrievable myth.

arbitrary decision of the mind.' They are the closest object to the mind and the furthest from it."¹⁹ Africa, like the Orient, is also an allegory of the lost body fulfilled only in a dream. It can only be alive in the consciousness of the unconscious otherness. Like "soft wax," Africa is the object of desire. "So the nullity takes a concrete form, or rather any form that you wish, so that it reflects any desire."²⁰ The "soft wax" is likely to become "a sensuous woman." "Its black women and their insolent breasts,...their chest: superfluous under the heavy sky; the robust work [product] of their sensuality, born *as from the climate, overflowing the bodies like the voluptuousness of other heavens.*"²¹ Africa is an allegory of mystified eroticism.²² The writing of Africa is the process of 'textualization of desire.' Africa herself is a pretext for the lost body; therefore, it is blank like a dream. "The leap into the void—the blankness of 'Africa'—is marked by a movement from fact to hearsay, history to legend, positive to conditional mood, direct narration to a book within a book."²³ As dream is an allegory of desire unfulfilled and unfulfillable, so Africa becomes a discourse of desire and loss. As the Orient does, Africa also turns out to be the other of Europe, the lost self of Europe, or "Europe's collective day-dream."

¹⁹ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 62.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.49.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p.243.

²² *Ibid.*, p.242.

²³ *Ibid.*, p.59.

Whereas epistemological (including gnostic, psychoanalytical) approaches to the other are usually associated with an idea or literary imagination, the cultural, political concept of the other is more volatile, since it concerns 'hegemony.' Remarkably enough, "it would be wrong to conclude that the Orient was *essentially* an idea, or a creation with no corresponding reality."²⁴ For the other within becomes "they" in our everyday life—the feminine other, the inferior other, and the fearful other. The unconscious other such as the other of death, the other of woman, and the other of uncontrollable drive, appears as "they" living in reality. Accordingly, "they" become the allegory of otherness within. "We" live in "our" nation or state, and "they" in "theirs."

Said writes, "it is enough for 'us' to set up these arbitrary boundaries in our minds; 'they' become 'they' accordingly, and both their territory and their mentality are designated as different from 'ours.'²⁵ Where each of them bumps against each other, there may happen "uncanny strangeness," or conflict. Furthermore, "'they' were not like 'us,' and for that reason deserved to be ruled."²⁶ This is the very projection of human psychology onto reality—the distinction between "they" and "we" is, more than simply a matter of epistemology, likely to be one of the cultural, political projects. Said says,

²⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 5.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p.54.

²⁶ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (NY: Vintage Books, 1993), p. xi.

“culture ... almost always with some degree of xenophobia ... is a sort of theater where various political and ideological causes engage one another.”²⁷

Xenophobia is an allegory of the fear of the other. Furthermore, it is related to the cultural, political hegemony.

It is hegemony, or rather the result of cultural hegemony at work, that gives Orientalism the durability and the strength I have been speaking about so far. Orientalism is never far from what Denys Hay has called the idea of Europe, a collective notion identifying “us” Europeans as against all “those” non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures. There is in addition the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating European superiority over Oriental backwardness.²⁸

Orientalism, Said asserts, is “a cultural and a political fact”²⁹; therefore, it should be understood as a historical phenomenon. Also, he writes, “ideas, cultures, and histories cannot seriously be understood or studied without their force, or more precisely their configurations of power, also being studied.”³⁰ He continues that Orientalism is an aspect of historical phenomena related to colonialism, which justified governing subjugated races.³¹ In relation to colonialism, Said is not much different from Miller, who says that “Africa...is

²⁷ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (NY: Vintage Books, 1993), p. xiii.

²⁸ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 7.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.13.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.5.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p.36.

created as an allegory of inauthenticity, a tale of primordial colonialism, ‘bound to violence’.”³² Africanism or Orientalism is a discourse of the inferior, savage other. The distinction between Africanist and Orientalist discourses is not “based on any real difference in European knowledge of the two places.”³³ The discourses are based on European myths of the other. Pliny may be one of the most conspicuous myth-creators in the Greco-Roman tradition. *Naturalis Historia* reads:

The Atlas tribe is primitive and subhuman, if we believe what we hear; they do not call each other by names....Nor do they have dreams in their sleep like the rest of mankind. The Cave-dwellers...their food is snake meat. They have no voice but make a shrill noise, thus lacking any communication by speech. The Garamantes do not marry but live promiscuously with their women....The Blemmyae are reported as being without heads; their mouth and eyes are attached to their chest. The Satyrs have no human characteristics except their shape.³⁴

The Atlas tribe is the very allegory of the other. If “we” are human, “they” are non-human; if “we” have head, name, voice, wife, and dream, “they” have none of these. This story is obviously not based on facts, but on legends, as Pliny himself states—“if we believe what we hear (si credimus);” they “are reported

³² Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 13.

³³ *Ibid.*, p.20.

³⁴ Book V. 45-6. Atlantes degeneres sunt humani rituum, si credimus. Nam neque nominum ullorum inter ipsos appellatio est,...neque in somno visunt qualia reliqui mortales. Trogodytae specus excavant...victus serpentium carnes, stridorque, non vox. adeo sermonis commercio carent. Garamantes matrimoniorum exortes passim cum feminis degunt....Blemmyis traduntur capita abesse ore et oculis pectori adfixis. Satyris praeter figuram nihil moris humani.

(traduntur).” This is an example of μῦθος of the other. Regarding Ethiopians, Pliny writes, “there are certain reports from the interior, on the eastern side, of races without noses and with completely flat faces; in some cases tribes have no upper lip, in others, no tongue....One group has no mouth and no nostrils.”³⁵ In addition, he took advantage of scientific knowledge for the purpose of justification of his colonial μῦθος. “There is no doubt that the Ethiopians are burnt by the heat of the sun and are born with a burnt appearance and with curly beards and hair...In the middle of the earth, however,...the men [Romans] are of medium stature, with a very definite blending noticeable in their complexion; their behavior and manners are gentle; they are able to comprehend the whole of Nature.”³⁶ This verifies that scientifically, “we” are born superior to “them;” further, it is natural that “they” are ruled by “us.” In contrast to “us,” “they” have no moderate complexion, humanity, and intelligence enough to form a state. Pliny, under the name of science, explains the justification of “our” government of the other. This kind of myth-creation, Snowden asserts, is based on “somatic norm image,” that is, “the complex of physical characteristics which are accepted

³⁵ Book VI, 187-88. ferunt certe ab orientis parte intima gentes esse sine naribus, aequali totius oris planitie, alias superiore labro orbas, alias sine linguis. Pars etiam ore concreto et naribus carens...

³⁶ Book II, 189-90. Aethiopas vicini sideris vapore torreri adustisque similes gigni barba et capillo vibrato non est dubium,...medio vero terrae...modicos corporum habitus magna et in colore temperie, ritus molles, sensus liquidos, ingenia fecunda totiusque naturae capacia,...

by a group as its norm and ideal."³⁷ Also the complex may be easily connected with cultural, political hegemony.

It is ironic that an increase in knowledge of the other goes hand-in-hand with the increase of mystification, in terms of cultural, political hegemony. With Homer's writings, unlike Pliny's, it is not easy to find any specific evidence that he had cultural, political prejudices against the other,³⁸ even though he, first in European tradition, created the epistemological other. Homer writes, "Zeus went to the blameless Aithiopians at the Ocean / yesterday to feast,"³⁹ "the Aithiopians' land, where they are making grand sacrifice / to the immortals."⁴⁰ Homer's Ethiopia is epistemologically equivalent to Nerval's Orient. The places are not real, but imaginary. Whatever name it is called by Homer and Nerval, the place is an allegory of the other, which is far, remote, and unfulfilled, unfulfillable.

Miller accounts for the contrast between Homer and Pliny in terms of dream and nightmare, which is in the main based on the dialectic of desire and anxiety. He asserts, "the horror of monstrosity and the delight of fulfillment are counterparts in a single discourse, sharing the same condition of possibility:

³⁷ Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 75-76.

³⁸ cf. *Ibid.*, p. 55. Snowden writes, "Certain lines of the Greek and Roman profile of Ethiopians remained basically unchanged from Homer to the end of classical literature—and the image was essentially favorable."

³⁹ *Iliad* 1.423-24. Ζεὺς γὰρ ἐς Ὠχεανὸν μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας / χθιζὸς ἔβη κατὰ δαῖτα,

⁴⁰ *Iliad* 23.206-7. Αἰθιοπῶν ἐς γαῖαν, ὅθι ῥέζουσ' ἑκατόμβας / ἀθανάτοισ,

distance and difference. Dream and nightmare are both agencies of sleep...It would be wrong to ask which Ethiopia was the 'real' one...another logic is at work."⁴¹ This "another logic" may come with the mystification of the other, whether epistemological, cultural, or political. When, regarding anti-black sentiment, F. Snowden writes that "in the ancient association of Ethiopians with death and the Underworld...the association seems to have been due primarily to the basic tendency of peoples,"⁴² he seems to associate the term "basic tendency" with general human psychology, not with μῦθος of the other. This generalization by Snowden is likely to ignore the process of mystification of the other. Miller asserts as follows:

The significance of Snowden's accomplishment lies in showing the degree to which real-life black people were exempt from racial discrimination *de jure* and *de facto* in Antiquity. But based on readings of the same passages that Snowden quotes, I would hesitate to call the trope of color "inconsequential"; for there was always the other Ethiopia.⁴³

Whether Homer's attitude to the color 'black' is amicable or not, still the Ethiopians take their place as the other of the Greeks, regardless of their skin color. Remarkably, there are white Ethiopians. Not because the Ethiopians are black, but because they are the other, they become a matter of a discourse. A

⁴¹ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 28.

⁴² Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 75-76.

⁴³ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 25.

discourse of the other is not limited to the skin color or its prejudice, but it is related to a μῦθος of desire and anxiety surrounding the other.

The first paradigm of the other is femininity. In the first chapter of my dissertation—“*Antony and Cleopatra* and *Περσαι* –The Ambivalence of the Female Body: Desirable but Inferior,” I will try to show how the female body/femininity is related to the other (Orient or Africa), desirable but inferior, and how it gives rise to a colonial imagination. The chapter will focus on the fact that the imagination of the female body overlaps with the imagination of non-Europeans.

In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare creates a μῦθος of the other as desire unfulfilled. The Egyptian Queen comes to be an allegory of the lost body. The war between Rome and Egypt becomes an allegory of a struggle between desire and anxiety. Enobarbus, a Roman soldier narrates, in relation to the Orient (or Cleopatra), as follows:

The barge she sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
The water which they beat to follow faster,
As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
It beggar'd all description: she did lie
In her pavilion—cloth-of-gold of tissue—
O'er-picturing that Venus where we see
The fancy outwork nature: on each side her
Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids,
With divers-colour'd fans, whose wind did seem
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,

And what they undid did. (2.2.198-213)

Remarkably, most of the imagery is related to the sensuality of the female body. Especially, "the delicate cheeks," which are glowed and cooled repeatedly, are one of the most sensual symbols. The imaginary world is the representation of the lost paradise; Cleopatra is of the unreachable or forbidden body. The paradise is free from the anxiety of castration: there is no gap between desire and its fulfillment. There is no patriarchal censorship to control the desire for desire.

Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,
So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,
And made their bends adornings: at the helm
A seeming mermaid steers: the silken tackle
Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands,
That yarely frame the office. From the barge
A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
Of the adjacent wharfs. (2.2.214-221)

The world of Cleopatra is filled with female bodies, "mermaids," and even steering-woman. It is the open virgin land waiting for the ploughman, male hands. Agrippa, another Roman says, "he [Caesar] plough'd her, and she cropp'd" (2.2.236). It is a dreamland where desire is fulfilled, "cropp'd." The fancy world even "did make defect perfection" (2.2.239). This world is a wish-fulfillment dream. Consequently, Antony confesses, "i' the East my pleasure lies" (2.3.40). On the contrary, the Roman world of Octavia is based on reality following reason, order, and patriarchy, where female body and desire are censored. "Octavia is of a holy, cold, and still conversation" (2.6.130). "If beauty,

wisdom, modesty, can settle / The heart of Antony, Octavia is / A blessed lottery to him" (2.2.249-251).

Most importantly, the female body of Cleopatra is ambiguous: she is the desirable other and the inferior other at the same time. At this point, the object of desire transforms into the object of anxiety. She is not only a desirable body but also a fearful body. The patriarchal fear extends beyond desire fulfillment and is combined with the anxiety of heterogeneity. Remarkably, referring to the language of colonialism, Ania Loomba states that the stereotypes of femininity and non-Europeans are overlapping each other.⁴⁴ In terms of heterogeneity, females and non-Europeans belong to the same category—the inferior and fearful other. Furthermore, this colonial imagination is likely to put the other into the level of vice and immorality. In contrast to the Roman 'virtus,' Egypt is a feminized land, and we see that emasculation is equated with vice, which is subject to masculine conquerors.

Salt Cleopatra, soften thy waned lip!
Let witchcraft join with beauty, lust with both!
Tie up the libertine in a field of feasts,
Keep his brain fuming; Epicurean cooks
Sharpen with cloyless sauce his appetite;
That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honour
even till a Lethe'd dulness! (2.1. 21-27)

⁴⁴ Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1989), p.78.

Remarkably, in the court of Egypt, Cleopatra's attendants are also females or eunuchs. All in Egypt is symbolically castrated, which gives rise to the colonial imagination toward masculine dominance. Moreover, Cleopatra's images are often associated with witchcraft (2.1. 22). In the Actium battle, she, "like a cow in June, / [h]oists sails and flies" (3.8.24). Her inferior morality and lack of 'virtus' make her unsuitable for a ruler. This symbolic emasculation is associated with the castration of the Orient, and, at the same time, with male dominance over females, since she is a metonymy of an inferior other, sexually and racially. With the power relations between masculinity/superiority and femininity/inferiority, colonial imagination works.

This colonial imagination similarly works in Aeschylus' *Περσσαι* (*The Persians*). Aeschylus also uses the Orient as a metaphor of the lost female body. The Persian women in the play appear as the desirable body waiting for the hands of conquerors. Some of the imagery is strongly related to the sensuality of the female body.

Many with delicate hands
Rending their veils,
Drenching their breasts,
Swollen with tears,
Sharing their woe,
Ladies of Persia
Softly are weeping,
Desiring each
Him to behold
Wedded but lately,

Couches forsaking,
Soft as their coverlets
(Youth was voluptuous),
Their sorrows, insatiate woe. (537-545)⁴⁵

“Delicate (ἀπαλαῖς) hands,” soft, tender hands are waving to the desiring conqueror, who desires to disclose the forbidden “veils,” wherein “drenching (διαμυδαλέους),” wet bosoms are hidden. This gives us another of the most sensual symbols like “the delicate cheeks” of Cleopatra, glowed and cooled repeatedly. In the beds of “conjugal union (ἀνδρῶν ἀρτιζυγίαν)” there used to be the pleasure of voluptuous Persian youths. Now, the Persian beds are a κένανδρον dreamland—the lost paradise, where the conqueror desires to fulfill his desire. The Persian woman, like Cleopatra, is an allegory of the lost body. The paradise is free from anxiety of castration, the fear of patriarchal censorship to block desire for the female body. Like Cleopatra’s Egypt, the city of Sousa is a symbol of femininity. Remarkably, the Persian court is filled with only females and the chorus of old men. “Thus of the Persian land / of her men the flower is gone” (59-60).⁴⁶ “All the Bactrians destroyed, no youth remains” (732).⁴⁷ Now, the

⁴⁵ πολλὰ δ' ἀπαλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας
κατερεϊκόμενα
διαμυδαλέους δάκρυσι κόλπους
τεγγούς, ἄλγους μετέχουσαι.
αἱ δ' ἀβρόγιοι Περσίδες ἀνδρῶν
ποθέουσαι ἰδεῖν ἀρτιζυγίαν,
λέκτρων εὐνάς ἀβροχίτωνας,
χλιδανῆς ἥβης τέρψιν, ἀφείσαι,
πενθοῦσι γόοις ἀκορεστοτάτοις.
⁴⁶ τοιόνδ' ἄνθος Περσίδος αἴας

castrated country is waiting for the ruler-conqueror to plough, cultivate, and seed it.

On the other side, Persia is a country of the rushing, “impetuous (θούριος)” king Xerxes, whose role is analogous to Antony’s in relation to the feminized Egypt. Xerxes is irrational enough to listen to the counsels of the wicked men.

Wicked men counseled this, furious
Xerxes learned; saying you acquired wealth
By spear, while he, in cowardice, played
The warrior at home, and multiplied
By nothing his ancestral wealth. So often
These wicked men reproached him, until he
Did plot his martial way toward Greece. (753-758)⁴⁸

In addition, Xerxes is effeminate “in cowardice (ἀνανδρίας ὑπο).”⁴⁹ Like Antony or Cleopatra, the Persian king falls short of ‘virtus,’ or leadership. In contrast to the Greek manliness, Persia is a feminized land, which is to be subject to the superior masculinity. Furthermore, Xerxes is an allegory of ὕβρις (hybris), which is one of the causes of the war, and which is followed by the gods’ punishment (205-11). “Persian pride is judged by universal Heaven.”⁵⁰ In addition, to justify the Greek dominance, Aeschylus takes advantage of the rhetoric of dreams

οἴχεται ἀνδρῶν,

⁴⁷ Βακτρῶν δ’ ἔρρει πανώλης δημος οὐδέ τις γέρον.

⁴⁸ ταῦτά τοι κακοῖς ὀμιλῶν ἀνδράσιν διδασκεται
θούριος Ξέρξης· λέγουσι δ’ ὡς σὺ μὲν μέγαν τέκνοις
πλοῦτον ἐκτήσω ξὺν αἰχμῇ, τὸν δ’ ἀνανδρίας ὑπο
ἔνδον αἰχμάζειν, πατρῶν δ’ ὄλβον οὐδὲν αὐξάνειν.
τοιάδ’ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ὄνειδη πολλάκις κλύων κακῶν
τήνδ’ ἐβούλευσεν κέλευθον καὶ στρατεύμ’ ἐφ’ Ἑλλάδα.

⁴⁹ Literally, “because of non-manliness.” ἀνδρεία or ἀνδρία is equivalent to Latin *virtus*.

⁵⁰ John Fergusson, *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1972), p.44.

which function as prophecy under the name of divinities. In the allegory of two sisters in the Queen's dream, the Greek sister denies the yoke, but the Persian one is subject to it (181-99). The gods' providence doesn't allow the impious sack of the Hellespont by Xerxes, since the Greeks are born free by nature, unlike the servile Persians. Aeschylus, by utilizing the unconscious called dream, consolidates masculine Greek dominance over the feminized Persia. It is important that the Aeschylusian μῦθος, similar to that of Shakespeare, is based on the psychology of desire and anxiety around the uncanny other called woman or femininity. Woman is the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of the Greeks, fluctuating between desirable and inferior.

The second paradigm of the other is madness. In chapter 2, "*Othello* and *Ἰκέτιδες* (*The Suppliant Women*) – The discourse of Madness and Castration: 'Tupping Your White Ewe'," I will try to demonstrate how a stranger becomes a deviant other like social delinquents, and how the other comes to be accepted or denied under the canon of a society, based on Africanist-Orientalist discourse. The chapter will be mostly focused on the rhetoric of contrasts between madness/deviation and reason/order. The stranger who is like Othello or Aegyptus' sons is an allegory of madness or deviation condensed in human psychology, and he is bound to be excluded, castrated. However, it is significant

that the stranger who is, like the Danaids, subject to the canon of Greek society, is acceptable and no longer an alien to the society.

Othello is noble and valiant (2.2.1-2), modest and honest (1.3.76-85). When the Duke says to Brabantio in the court—"if virtue no delighted beauty lack, / your son-in-law is far more fair than black" (1.3.291-92), Othello is confirmed in public as a virtuous gentleman. While Othello is following the Venetian canon, and he is a useful instrument for the society as a warrior, he can keep his fame, although he is a Moor. However, it is remarkable that the Venetian canon forces him to live as a 'useful Moor' for the society, not as a 'Venetian.' Said states, "Orientals were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analyzed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined or...taken over."⁵¹ We need to pay attention to this statement: "Men should be what they seem; / Or those that be not, would they might seem none!" (3.3.126-27). It is a very ambivalent speech by Iago, who is setting a trap for Othello. One of the meanings may produce this rule: a Moor should be Moorish. He is not supposed to deviate from the norm. When Othello wifes Desdemona, Iago shouts to Brabantio that "an old black ram / Is tuppung your white ewe" (1.1.88-89). The violation of the Venetian canon by Othello is associated with madness. Othello turns out to be a madman. Desdemona says to Emilia:

⁵¹ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 207.

My mother had a maid call'd Barbara:
She was in love, and he she loved proved mad
And did forsake her: she had a song of 'willow;
An old thing 'twas, but it express'd her fortune,
And she died singing it: that song to-night
Will not go from my mind; (4.3.26-31)

This is the very premonition of Desdemona's fate and the inference of Othello's insanity. "Is this the noble Moor whom our full senate" / Call all in all sufficient?" (4.1.275-76), Desdemona shouts, "My lord is not my lord; nor should I know him, / Were he in favour as in humour alter'd" (3.4.123-24). He turns out to be a typical stage Moor; he is now what he seems. According to Said, madness is a metonymy of the other—"the Oriental was linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor) having in common an identity best described as lamentably alien."⁵² And Venetian society looks like a place of "tea-parties," where the directors and staff of the Retreat invite several madmen, who are "treated with all the attention of strangers."⁵³ Said continues, "the West is the actor, the Orient a passive reactor. The West is the spectator, the judge and jury, of every facet of Oriental behavior."⁵⁴ Consequently, as madness is bound under the control of reason, so the Other (Africa or Orient) is subject to Western hegemony. Othello the 'black ram,' who is a deviant in Venetian society, is driven to castration, if symbolically; finally, the black ram stabs himself.

⁵² Ibid., p. 207.

⁵³ Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1988), p.249.

⁵⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 109.

Similarly, in Aeschylus' *Ικέτιδες*, the strangers function as an allegory of madness. According to the Greek legend, Danaus' 50 daughters and Aegyptus' 50 sons are descendents of Zeus and Io. Io became a heifer through the jealousy of Hera, and, wandering in a half crazed state, went to the land of Egypt. Zeus recovered Io and she bore Epaphus, the great-grandfather of the 50 daughters and the 50 sons. Hera stands for the sacred marriage based on reason or law; Io symbolizes illegitimate passion, madness. The one is to Greek order what the other is to Egyptian disorder. Furthermore, Egypt comes to function as an allegory of madness.

When Kristeva, in accordance with Freud, says that "foreignness, an uncanny one, creeps into the tranquility of reason itself,"⁵⁵ we are to recall that the imagination of disorder/madness overlaps with the imagination of the other (a stranger). Accordingly, under the name of reason, Aegyptus' sons are driven to castration, as similarly Othello was. However, it is imperative that the Danaids are acceptable for Greek society. Kristeva explains, "the Greek mind condemned foreignness only when the latter tended to defy the common mean."⁵⁶ Foreigners are acceptable, so far as they are "amenable to the rites and laws of the polis."⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 170.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Foreigners and the madmen of the “tea-parties” in the Retreat have much in common, in terms of acceptability for a certain social norm.

The third paradigm of the other is death. In chapter 3, “*Titus Andronicus* and *Medea* – Lethal Gods’ Sad Rites: ‘A Coffin Covered with Black,’” I will try to show how a foreigner is related to death, and how the foreign other is excluded under the name of peace. In the two plays, the stranger like *Medea* or Aaron serves as an allegory of death or destruction, performing lethal rites. Then, it is remarkable that, unlike *Medea*, *Titus Andronicus* is very strongly associated with the imagery of color ‘black,’ which is beyond Snowden’s “basic tendency.” In Shakespeare’s play, the “basic tendency” of ancient color imagination develops into the ‘black-evil’ equation.⁵⁸

In *Titus*, the stage description of Titus’s triumph says, “two men bearing a coffin covered with black” (1.1.69-70). This black coffin is likely to be associated with the black Aaron. He is a coffin covered with black. He is a symbol of Death in black. At the end of the play, we see that Aaron is sentenced to be buried alive without a coffin—“set him breast-deep in earth” (5.3.179). He does not need a coffin, since he himself is a black coffin. This imagination results from the identification of “coal black Moor” (3.2.78) with Death. Furthermore, Aaron is actually enjoying his job as Death. Whatever he touches goes to death or

⁵⁸ Cf. Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 69.

destruction. Also, he is a symbol of the devil, who “rapes, mutilates, and murders simply for delight.”⁵⁹ Aaron’s last speech accounts well for his character as an allegory of evil.

Ten thousand worse than ever yet I did
Would I perform, if I might have my will;
If one good deed in all my life I did,
I do repent it from my very soul. (5.3.187-190)

For the characterization of Aaron, Shakespeare simply connects the color ‘black’ with Death. Death is the uncanny other in our own unconscious. The imagination of death overlaps with the imagination of the foreign other Aaron. The imaginative connection between the color ‘black’ and ‘death’ dates back to Homer. However, it is remarkable that the ‘black-evil equation’ has been trendy since the Medieval Ages of the Judeo-Christian tradition,⁶⁰ and it is in 16th Century England that the color prejudice is powerfully established.⁶¹ The color imagination in *Titus*, beyond being a ‘basic tendency,’ is strongly connected with English colonialism. As MacDonald states, we need to recall that “Elizabethan England was at war with Spain,” “and faced with the loss of its first New World colony.”⁶² They are experiencing the symptom of “cultural anxiety,”⁶³ and the

⁵⁹ Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 168.

⁶⁰ Eleanor Irwin, *Color Terms in Greek Poetry* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974), p.156.

⁶¹ Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 69.

⁶² Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p.168-69.

colonialist crisis. Consequently, *Titus* is likely to be read as a junction of desire and anxiety, which is allegorically depicted through Tamora and Aaron respectively. These two characters are ambivalent metaphors of the colonial imagination, as was shown in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Περσαι*.

Similarly, in Seneca's *Medea*, the stranger Medea functions as an allegory of Death. When she invokes the deadly gods, we are sure to associate Medea with Death.

I supplicate the silent throng, and you, the gods
Of death's sad rites, and groping chaos, and the home
Of Gloomy Pluto, and the black abyss of death
Girt by the banks of Tartarus!⁶⁴

Then, she prepares for the finale of a lethal ritual by cutting her own arm and letting the blood flow upon the altar.⁶⁵ This bloody libation is enough to remind us of demonic rites. All she touches goes to death. In addition, Seneca's depiction of Medea is mostly related to "barbarian," "monster," "deadly poison," "destruction," and "devil." Also, the choral ode before the bloody libation of Medea reminds us of Shakespeare's witches in *Macbeth*. Medea is the incarnation of death, and an allegory of the devil.

⁶³ Ibid., p.166.

⁶⁴ *Comprecor vulgus silentum vosque ferales deos
et Chaos caecum atque opacam Ditis umbrosi domum,
Tartari ripis ligatos squalidae Mortis specus.* (740-43)

⁶⁵ *Manet noster sanguis ad aras:
assuesce, manus, stringere ferrum
carosque pati posse cruores—
sacrum laticem percussa dedi.* (808-11)

It is important to note that, as Kabbani states,⁶⁶ Medea is one of the prototypes of the seductive Eastern woman, although she is different from other types like Dido or Cleopatra in terms of characterization. In relation to the lethal images of Medea, Kabbani continues to say that “Medea is violent too, carrying the extremes of passion in her which set her apart from the Attic, from the mean.”⁶⁷ However, it is remarkable that “Europe’s feelings about Oriental women were always ambivalent ones.”⁶⁸ Medea is an ambivalent character: she is an erotic victim and a scheming witch at the same time. The reading of *Medea* will show dialectic between desire and anxiety, as is often the case in the discourse of the other. Medea is the other, who is both desirable and lethal.

The fourth paradigm of the other is disorder. In chapter 4, “*The Tempest* and *Ἐλένη* — The Anxiety of Disorder: ‘This Thing of Darkness,’” I will try to show how a stranger stands for disorder, and how the colonial government is justified under the name of order. In *The Tempest*, Caliban is shown as a violator of “the honor of my [Prospero’s] child [Miranda]” (1.2.347). This is one of the rhetorical gestures or pretexts for Caliban’s castration and justification of it. Remarkably, the justification is based on the colonial imagination, which associates the other with disorder or violation. The imagination of the other overlaps with the

⁶⁶ Rana Kabbani, *Europe’s Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 22

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p.26

imagination of disorder. In relation to *The Tempest*, the colonial imagination mainly arises from Caliban's 'deformity' and 'strangeness,' which serve as pretexts for disorder. Furthermore, Caliban's image is mostly related to 'monster,' 'fish,'⁶⁹ and 'devil.' Gonzalo the most reliable nobleman repeats the Plinian μῦθος as follows:

Faith, sir, you need not fear. When we were boys,
Who would believe that there were mountaineers
Dew-lapp'd like bulls, whose throats had hanging at 'em
Wallets of flesh? or that there were such men
Whose *heads stood in their breasts?* which now we find
Each putter-out of five for one will bring us
Good warrant of. (Italics emphasized, 3.3.43-49)

Then, the audience of Renaissance England may relate Caliban to the Caribbean West Indies of the New World, who need the discipline of European civilization.⁷⁰ Here the imagination of deformity is linked with the lack of self-determination. Prospero as a ruler-god makes a diagnosis of Caliban, saying that "he is disproportioned in his manners / As in his shape" (5.1.291-92). The form of appearance becomes the main criteria of a human being. Different appearance makes up different humanities—superior or inferior in terms of self-determination. It is remarkable that the anxiety of disorder develops into the justification of the colonial government: a supervisor is indispensable to the

⁶⁹ Leslie Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (NY: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 234. According to Fiedler, fish is metaphorically similar to monster. Also MacDonald asserts that fish is a metaphor of femininity and impotence (*Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*, p. 113).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.233. Caliban and cannibal have the same etymological root--canib (carib).

disordered race. The colonial imagination of disorder is also applied to the delinquents of the lower classes like Trinculo and Stephano. Again, we need to recall Said's argument: the imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of delinquents in Western society.

Similarly, the colonial imagination of disorder works in Euripides' *Ἑλένη*. Like Caliban, the Egyptian king Theoclymenus serves as an allegory of disorder and violence. The barbarian other Theoclymenus who desires the 'virtuous' European Helen (equivalent to Caliban's Miranda) is mostly linked with violence and disorder, which gives birth to the European justification of colonial domination over the disordered other. In the barbarian country, violent despotism prevails against peace, and "all Barbary is slave except a single man."⁷¹ Furthermore, Euripides does not fail to put emphasis on the belief that the Egyptian palace is so extravagant as to validate the arrogance (ὑβρις) of the despotic king.

What master holds dominion in these fenced halls?
The scope of wall is royal, and the massive pile
Bespeaks possession by the Lord of Gold and Death.⁷²

⁷¹ Τὰ βαρβάρων γὰρ δοῦλα πάντα πλὴν ἑνός. (276)

⁷² τίς τῶνδ' ἐρυμνῶν δωμάτων ἔχει κράτος;

Πλούτῳ γὰρ οἶκος ἄξιος προσεικάσαι

Βασιλείᾳ τ' ἀμφιβλήματ' εὐθρυγκοί θ' ἔδραι. (68-70)

Remarkably, the extravagance of the palace parallels the portress coming out of the palace (437). Extravagance and femininity are significant features of the disordered Orient, as Aeschylus declared in *Agamemnon*.⁷³

It is noteworthy that Menelaus' first speech puts emphasis on Greek order and voluntarism in contrast to Egyptian violence.

We marshaled the greatest of armadas against Troy
Although we led them not as tyrants, not by force,
But the young men of Greece willingly served with us.⁷⁴

Egyptian barbarity is by nature subject to Greek order, for the Greeks pursue divine providence—Δίκη: "Our hopes for safety depend upon our doing right."⁷⁵

When, at the end of the play, Helen is appointed as Divinity by Zeus' will, Greek justice prevails throughout the disordered Egypt. Like Prospero's magic, Zeus' will endows the disordered other with justice and order. The belief that "Greeks are natural rulers of barbarians" forms the basis of the colonial imagination in

⁷³ And all this—do not try in woman's ways to make me delicate, nor, as if I were some Asiatic bow down to earth and with wide mouth cry out to me, nor cross my path with jealousy by strewing the ground with robes. Such state becomes the gods, and none beside.

Καὶ τὰλλα μὴ γυναικὸς ἐν τρόποις ἐμὲ
ἄβρυνε, μηδὲ βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην
χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοί
μηδ' εἴμασι στρώσας' ἐπίφθονον πόρον
τίθει· θεοὺς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεών· (918-22)

⁷⁴ στράτευμα κώπηι διορίσαι Τροίαν ἔπι,
τύραννος οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν στρατηλατῶν,
έκοῦσι δ' ἄρξας Ἑλλάδος νεανίας. (394-96)

⁷⁵ ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ δ' ἐλπίδες σωτηρίας. (1031)

the play, where the anxiety of disorder overlaps with the anxiety of the foreign other.⁷⁶

The fifth paradigm of the other is impiety. Chapter 5, “*The Merchant of Venice* and *Ἐκάβη* — Discourse of Impiety (ἄθεότης) : Noble Savage,” will explicate how a stranger becomes an allegory of impiety and immorality, and how the foreign other falls a victim to the ambivalence—noble and savage. It is remarkable that when they judge a stranger ἄθεος —“godless, without God, and denying the gods,” their criteria for the judgment are based on the jury’s own gods. Consequently, the strangers of other religious beliefs are technically apt to be named godless and immoral other.

In *The Merchant of Venice*, the Prince of Morocco and Shylock are in common the other of Venetian society, although the two strangers are different from each other in terms of race and religion. Interestingly enough, “what matters is not how a character is foreign, but that he is foreign.”⁷⁷ Because they are strangers, whether in race or in religion, they are godless and immoral, unless they are amenable to the Venetian canon. The Prince of Morocco is the first known non-villainous stage Moor, contrary to other typical stage Moors in the Renaissance drama. He is shown as a ‘noble’ tawny Moor. However, regardless of his noble character, Portia wants to exclude him from the list of her

⁷⁶ Helen Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961), p. 152.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p.155

suitors, for the reason that he is a Moor. As is the case with Caliban, the corporeal difference of a Moor from Venetians is simply juxtaposed with inferiority, deformity, and violence. Furthermore, the difference or foreignness, in terms of religion, is associated with impiety and immorality. Portia mocks the Moor's godlessness as follows:

if he have the condition
of a saint and the complexion of a devil, I had
rather he should shrive me than wive me. (1.2.140-42)

It is presumably impossible that a Moor can be a husband of the white wife, since he has the complexion of a devil. Also, when a devil is called a saint, we may be reminded of sacrilege. Then, the $\mu\tilde{\nu}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of skin color moves into the discourse of impiety. The Moor becomes an allegory of godlessness—impiety and immorality. The imagination of impiety overlaps with the imagination of the foreign other.

In addition, the Moor chooses the golden casket in the wooers' lottery, which stands for Oriental extravagance, a sort of $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ —one essential feature of godlessness. The casket lottery plays a crucial role in the practice of the exclusion of the impious other. Also it is remarkable that the Moor's language is bejeweled and eloquent, which accounts for his extravagant character. MacDonald remarks that "besides testifying to Shakespeare's multilevel control of plot, this reading of

Morocco's language often attempts to assign it a psychological or moral significance, confirming his unworthiness to win Portia."⁷⁸

Interestingly enough, Fiedler argues that James F. Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* is an American version of a Shakespearean 'noble savage;' the Prince of Morocco and Shylock are juxtaposed with the Mohicans. Through the Prince of Morocco, the best side of strangers—noble prince—is shown; through Shylock, the worst side—savage usurer—is shown.⁷⁹ The two characters are becoming one combined in terms of 'noble savage.' Anyway, they are in common allegories of impiety. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the rhetoric of 'noble savage' is related to the justification of colonial imagination. The foreign other might be characteristically noble; still, he is in need of discipline or civilization. Without the help of European culture and religion, the other would remain savage—godless and immoral. While Shylock worships God in his own way, he is supposed to be godless, merciless, and impious. Not until he accepts the Venetian ways of piety, does he metamorphose from a dog into a human being, if symbolically.

In Euripides' *Εκάβη*, a Trojan widow Hecuba is represented as a 'noble savage.' She is an ambivalent character—noble but savage, pitiful but

⁷⁸ Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 72.

⁷⁹ Leslie Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (NY: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 104.

contemptible. As Kabbani stated, the European feeling about Oriental women is always ambivalent: erotic victim and scheming witch, pity and contempt.⁸⁰ Hecuba is of noble character, “the queen of fabulous Troy /...the wife of Priam the great.”⁸¹ It is remarkable that Hecuba’s nobility is also reflected upon her daughter Polyxena, who is the mirror image of Hecuba. Polyxena’s noble death symbolizes Hecuba’s honor. Furthermore, like the American Indian Princess’ devotion to the Europeans in *Pocahontas*, Hecuba’s generous acquittal of Odysseus, who once became a captive of the Trojan army (249), can be named ‘a noble deed.’ Nevertheless, very soon her noble deeds are buried, when Odysseus makes a speech justifying his cruel rite—a living sacrifice, rather putting emphasis on the moral inferiority of the colonial other.

You foreigners who refuse your dead their rights
 And break your faith with friends? And then you wonder
 That Hellas should prosper while your countries suffer
 The fates they deserve!⁸²

It is also remarkable that Greek cruelty—the sacrifice of a virgin alive—is concealed underneath the encomium of the noble death of Polyxena. The encomium is the rhetoric of the colonial imagination: Polyxena’s sacrifice is noble,

⁸⁰ Rana Kabbani, *Europe’s Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 26.

⁸¹ οὐχ ἦδ’ ἀνασσα τῶν πολυχρόσων Φρυγῶν,
 οὐχ ἦδε Πριάμου τοῦ μέγ’ ὀλβίου δάμαρ; (492-93)

⁸² οἱ βάρβαροι δὲ μήτε τοὺς φίλους φίλους
 ἠγείσθε μήτε τοὺς καλῶς τεθνηκότας
 θαυμάζεθ’, ὡς ἂν ἡ μὲν Ἑλλάς εὐτυχηῇ,
 ὑμεῖς δ’ ἔχηθ’ ὅμοια τοῖς βουλευμασιν. (327-30)

for she is a symbol of the moldering other, not of the threatening other. Colonialists conceal their own guilt, by decorating the savage other.⁸³ Furthermore, they pretend to be sympathetic rulers over the inferior. Consequently, it is not by chance that the focus of the play is turned to the Thracian King's godlessness and Hecuba's barbarous revenge. The pity of the noble Hecuba changes into the contempt of her godless barbarity. She transforms into one of the "murderous hags of Troy...bitches of Troy."⁸⁴ As a colonial other, Hecuba's ambivalent character is always fluctuating between noble and savage. This ambivalence is the core of the colonial imagination of impiety in *Εκάβη*. What is most important is, as Kabbani said above, that Hecuba's character is godless, because she is a colonial other, a stranger—whether in race or in religion, not because she is of no god. Psychoanalytically, the anxiety of godlessness overlaps with the anxiety of the foreign other.

As I suggested at the very beginning of this chapter, one of the main aims is to determine what difference or similarity there is between the two ages—Shakespearean and Classical Antiquity—in relation to the psychoanalytical other. To do this, I tried to find some material concerning the topic, especially based on comparative studies, only to find out that there has been very little such research.

⁸³ cf. Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 5.

⁸⁴ ἀνδροφόνους ... Ἰλιάδας,

...

τάλαιναι κόραι τάλαιναι Φρυγῶν,
ὦ καταρατοί, (1061-64)

Although I collected some helpful articles related to Shakespeare and postcolonialism, most of them are not concerned with the psychoanalytical other. To make matters worse, fewer studies of the other in classical tragedy were found. Therefore, my research presented me with a challenge. I tried to research the other from the synthetic viewpoint of psychoanalysis and Africanist-Orientalist discourse, which would multiply the hermeneutic meanings of Shakespeare and Hellenistic drama. Hopefully, my thesis may encourage scholars in comparative studies to pay more attention to the epistemological genealogy of the literary legacy surrounding the other.

Chapter 1

Antony and Cleopatra and *Περσῶν* (*The Persians*)

—The Ambivalence of the Female Body: Desirable but Inferior

Antony and Cleopatra, well known for presenting romantic love between a Roman soldier and an Egyptian queen, drew my attention on account of its psychoanalytical meaning and the issue of gender. In the play, masculine power governs a female body, and Roman imperialism conquers the inferior Egypt. It is interesting that the relationship between Rome and Egypt is that between male and female, let alone that between the colonizer and the colonized. In other words, *Antony and Cleopatra* is a representation of the colonial other based on patriarchy. As Kristeva argues, femininity is our unconscious based on patriarchal anxiety. Furthermore, the imagination of the female body overlaps with the imagination of non-Europeans. Cleopatra is at once a metaphor of a female body and that of the feminized Orient, which is supposedly subject to imperial masculinity. Through Cleopatra, remarkably, Shakespeare creates a *μῦθος* of the other as desire unfulfilled. This reminds me of Said's assertion: "Woven . . . is an almost uniform association between the Orient and sex."¹ It is notable that the assertion is linked with 'power relations' in the discourse of sexuality and colonialism. Consequently, Cleopatra is doubly colonized as a

¹ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 188

woman, and an Oriental as well. Furthermore, the queen becomes an allegory of the ambivalent body, desirable but inferior.

According to Said, Orientalism is based on Western ideas about the Orient, which are created or Orientalized by Westerners—"the Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences."² That is, the Orient has been a $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of the other, and a European backdrop. Furthermore, the imaginative meanings of Orientalism, Said continues, associate the Orient with exotic sensuality and curiosity—"the Orient seems still to suggest not only fecundity but sexual promise (and threat), untiring sensuality, unlimited desire, deep generative energies."³ It is interesting that this argument is not so far from Miller's Africanist discourse: Africa herself is a sensuous woman, and a metaphor of mystified eroticism.⁴ Also, in relation to Oriental sensuality, we need to pay attention to French Orientalist writers like Nerval, whose ideas were based on the principles of Romanticism, using the Orient as a metaphor of exotic sensuality. Said explains that the Orient for Nerval is a symbol of loss and desire, which is exposed through an allegory of a female body.

² Ibid., p. 1

³ Ibid., p.188

⁴ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 242-43

The Orient symbolizes Nerval's dream quest and the fugitive woman central to it, both as desire and as loss. "Vaisseau d'Orient"-vessel of the Orient--refers enigmatically either to the woman as the vessel carrying the Orient, or possibly, to Nerval's own vessel for the Orient, his prose voyage. In either case, the Orient is identified with commemorative absence.⁵

Nerval's voyage reflects not only his quest for the female body of eternity, but also the endless quest for his own identity. His voyage is an allegory, through which we see human desire reach out for an unreachable object or an irretrievable myth.

Like Nerval's Orient, Shakespeare's Orient represented through Cleopatra is an allegory of desire unfulfilled, based on a $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of the other.⁶ However, it is remarkable that the Orient as a discursive object is a reality; Orientalism is a created body of information, not an "airy European fantasy" of the Orient. And further, "the relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power."⁷ The Oriental myth is a reality based on power relations. The term, 'power relations,' which is indebted to Foucault, leads us to the fact that Orientalism as the knowledge system is closely related to the 'effect of power,' or the 'cause of power.' Power, according to Foucault, is immanent in the social phenomena. Relationships of power are not exterior to the social types of

⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 184

⁶ cf. Introduction of this dissertation, p. 14-15.

⁷ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 5

relations—economy, politics, and gender.⁸ Remarkably, the former is the 'effect' of the latter; at the same time, the former is the 'cause' of the latter. That is, power is productive. Power has not merely a role of prohibition, but produces knowledge.⁹ In other words, power produces knowledge; knowledge produces power. And, knowledge production is the process of a 'discursive practice,' which enables a discourse like Orientalism to be exercised. Therefore, the process of analyzing an Africanist-Orientalist discourse leads to the discursive analysis of power relations.

Moreover, remarkably enough, a discourse in a social system may systemically eliminate what a society wants to exclude.¹⁰ What is most important is that power surrounding a social system not only excludes, but also the 'productive function' of power effectively makes individuals obey power. By the very immanent power, femininity is created, divided, and rejected in a male-dominant society. Consequently, those in such a society, unconsciously power-oriented, equate masculinity with superiority, femininity with inferiority, and masculinity with virtue, femininity with vice.

⁸ Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality I* (NY: Vintage Books, 1980), p. 94.

⁹ Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980), p. 119.

¹⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (NY: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 215-17. Foucault proposes three kinds of exclusion: 'prohibition,' 'division/rejection' and 'opposition between true and false.' Among these, 'division/rejection' is the most popular type of exclusion in Africanist-Orientalist discourse.

In accordance with Foucault, Greene asserts that, from Antiquity to now, gender ideology has been the basis of dominance and submission. In the Greco-Roman literature, especially elegiac poetry, we clearly see that gender ideology is not the problem of sexual difference, but that of power relations.¹¹ The traditional male roles in Roman society were associated with politics or military conquest. Therefore, since boyhood, males are supposed to and are trained to rule their household and 'res publica,' including familial and foreign affairs. In the true sense of the word, 'virtus' meant 'manliness,' which is the language of patriarchy. Accordingly, the female body is dehumanized as an inferior other. To put a person or a group in the 'other' side is to place them outside the main society, further, to exclude them by certain ideological mechanisms. Concerning this ideology of language, McConnell-Ginet says that "language . . . plays a crucial role in defining and maintaining a 'man's world' while delineating and enclosing 'women's place.'"¹² It is most remarkable that referring to the language of colonialism, Ania Loomba states that the stereotypes of femininity and non-Europeans overlap each other.

Cleopatra is the non-European, the outsider, the white man's ultimate 'other.'... colonialist, racist and sexist discourse are mutually dependent. Cleopatra embodies all the overlapping

¹¹ Ellen Greene, *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1998), p. xi-xiii.

¹² Sally McConnell-Ginet, *Women and Language in Literature and Society* (NY: Praeger, 1980), p. xi

stereotypes of femininity and non-Europeans common in the language of colonialism.¹³

As Eldred Jones asserts, "Egypt is Cleopatra and Cleopatra is Egypt."¹⁴ Cleopatra is associated with the effeminacy of Egypt, the conquered land. Cleopatra carries a metaphor of the inferior female body and, at the same time, the feminized Orient, which is the effect of power relations, based on colonial fetishization and masculine fantasy. As femininity is the inferior other to masculinity, so is the Orient inferior to the imperial Rome. This masculine fantasy is the Orientalist matrix "receiving these other cultures not as they are but as, for the benefit of the receiver, they ought to be."¹⁵ From the viewpoints of Roman 'virtus,' Egypt, which is extravagant and feminized, appears as a symbol of the fancy place for playing or carnal feast, which is well depicted by Enobarbus' narrative.

ENO. . . . we did sleep day out of countenance,
and made the night light with drinking.

MEC. Eight wild-boars roasted whole at a breakfast,
and but twelve persons there; is this true?

ENO. This was but as a fly by an eagle: we had much
more monstrous matter of feast, which worthily
deserved nothing. (2.2.183-192)

¹³ Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 78.

¹⁴ Eldred Jones, *Othello's Countrymen: The African in English Renaissance Drama* (London: Oxford U.P., 1965), p. 83.

¹⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 67

Continuously, Enobarbus narrates the fancy Orient, which is really a stereotype of Orientalist representation, as follows. The fancy world is the representation of the lost paradise, unreachable or forbidden.¹⁶

The barge she sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver
.
So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,
.
A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
Of the adjacent wharfs. (2.2.199-221)

In relation to the fancy Orient, Said argues, "the Orientalist remains outside of the Orient.... This cultural, temporal, and geographical distance was expressed in metaphors of depth, secrecy, and sexual promise: phrases like 'the veils of an Eastern bride' or 'the inscrutable Orient' passed into the common language."¹⁷ The paradise is far from anxiety or censorship. There are simply exotic sensuality and its fulfillment.

However, it is important that the Orient, like the female body of Cleopatra, is ambivalent, desirable but threatening. Very soon, we see that Oriental femininity is associated with vice and emasculation. Loomba explains as follows:

All Egyptians, represented and symbolized by their queen, are associated with feminine and primitive attributes—they are

¹⁶ cf. Introduction of this dissertation, p. 14-15.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 222

irrational, sensuous, lazy and superstitious. ...The tension between Rome as masculine and imperial and Egypt as its threatening 'other'....The images that cluster around Cleopatra are specifically Orientalist in nature: her waywardness, emotionality, unreliability and exotic appeal are derived from the stereotypes that Said identifies as recurrent in that discourse.¹⁸

Beyond the discourse of the feminine other as desire unfulfilled, we begin to pay attention to the "threatening other." Cleopatra is an ambivalent body, desirable but threatening. From the very beginning of the play, we remark that Cleopatra is described as a whore or gipsy, other than Cleopatra herself, destroying the Roman 'virtus.'

The office and devotion of their view
Upon a tawny front: his captain's heart,
Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper,
And is become the bellows and the fan
To cool a gipsy's lust.

.
The tripe pillar of the world transform'd
Into a strumpet's fool: . . . (1.1.5-13)

In addition, Pompeius a Roman soldier asserts that Cleopatra is the witch seducing Antony into error, keeping "his brain fuming." The awful equation between femininity and witchcraft is the very starting point of the exclusion of the feminine other.

Salt Cleopatra, soften they waned lip!
Let witchcraft join with beauty, lust with both!

¹⁸ Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 79.

Tie up the libertine in a field of feasts,
Keep his brain fuming; Epicurean cooks
Sharpen with cloyless sauce his appetite;
That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honour
even till a Lethe'd dulness! (2.1.21-27)

As Kristeva implies, the psychology of woman-as-witch is associated with the representation of the 'uncanny other' called femininity in our own repressed self. The uncanny other is our own unconscious.¹⁹ Juxtaposing the patriarchal other with colonial imagination, Loomba states, "witches are both the projections of exaggerated patriarchal fears ... and also a colonial fantasy whereby the non-Christian outsider is connected to devilry."²⁰ Kabbani adds as follows:

The projection of evil onto marginal or powerless groups within a society has always been a convenient method of producing scapegoats. ...women were associated with the devil, and seen as enemies of the Church and civilization. This went to justify the witch-hunts that tried women for sexual rapaciousness, cannibalism, consorting with evil spirits, and being generally intractable and capricious.²¹

Anxiety of the other is the psychological foundation of exclusion of women and outsiders as well. Furthermore, interestingly enough, Cleopatra is colonized doubly both as a female body and as an outsider, since the imagination of femininity overlaps with the imagination of strangers.

¹⁹ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p.183.

²⁰ Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 79.

²¹ Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 5

It is remarkable that Egypt is a feminized land, as is allegorized through Cleopatra, where Antony undergoes becoming effeminate. Antony becomes a scapegoat corrupted in Oriental femininity, in contrast to the manly Roman 'virtus.' Roman adults are essentially required to have control over themselves and then to have control over public affairs. Besides, "any loss of vitality resulting from sickness, old age, or overindulgence in physical pleasure, any lapse of moral resolve were threats to the preservation of masculine identity."²² Pompeius' narrative implies that emasculation is equated with vice, which should be under the control of Roman masculinity.

Salt Cleopatra, soften they waned lip!
Let witchcraft join with beauty, lust with both!
Tie up the libertine in a field of feasts,
Keep his brain fuming; Epicurean cooks
Sharpen with cloyless sauce his appetite;
That sleep and feeding may prorogue his honour
even till a Lethe'd dulness! (2.1. 21-27)

Interestingly enough, in the court scene of Egypt, Cleopatra's attendants are females or eunuchs—"Enter ANTONY, CLEOPATRA, her Ladies, the Train, with Eunuchs fanning her" (1.1.10-11: stage description), which is a kind of emasculated parade, contrast to the military parade of the Romans. All in Egypt is symbolically castrated, which gives rise to the colonial imagination toward masculine dominance. Agrippa, a Roman soldier says,

²² Ellen Greene, *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1998), p. xii

Royal wench!
She made great Caesar lay his sword to bed;
He plough'd her, and she cropp'd. (2.2.234-36)

The Orient is the open virgin land waiting for the ploughman, masculine cultivation, as Caesar did. The fancy world is filled with even “mermaids,”— “Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides, / So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes, / And made their bends adornings” (2.2.214-16). Egypt is the very allegory of the emasculated other and this comes to include Antony. At the same time, it is remarkable that Egypt is the place for the ritual of purification. Like the god Osiris, Antony through death prepares the rebirth or male dominance of the Roman Empire purified from Egyptian femininity or corruption. Antony's death is a ritual for the Empire.

If Cleopatra is Isis, then Antony, as Bacchus, is her Osiris, a dying god whose destruction and display will purify Octavian's Rome of Egyptian corruption and prepare it for empire.²³

Then, we are forced to deal with Cleopatra's unwomanly aggressiveness. She is a sexually and politically 'indocile body,' which is allegorically dramatized in the scene of role exchange between Antony and Cleopatra, where emasculated Antony is juxtaposed with unwomanly Cleopatra.

I drunk him to his bed;
Then put my tires and mantles on him, whilst
I wore his sword Philippan. (2.5.21-23)

²³ Joyce MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p.156

She is not a subservient female body, nor a mere colonial captive. Rather, she, challengingly, plays a cunning trick on the imperial Rome—(Antony confesses) “She has robb’d me of my sword” (4.12.23). Now, in turn, a plot works to deprive Cleopatra of her kingdom, by rendering her a stigmatized other. Her political position as a female ruler is unacceptable to the Roman patriarchy. Especially for the English audience, who has experienced both female ruler and colonial expansionism, it is not so unusual to pay more attention to the Oriental queen. Consequently, for the purpose of differentiation between Cleopatra and Elizabeth, *Antony and Cleopatra* may be extraordinarily focused on Cleopatra's stigma, which symbolically leads her to political emasculation. Cleopatra's stigma is in contrast to the noble virginity of Elizabeth I, as is dramatized in *The Faerie Queene*. For the symbolic emasculation of Cleopatra, the play employs various animal symbols, in addition to the imagery of whore or gipsy stated previously.

LEP. You've *strange serpents* there.

ANT. Ay, Lepidus.

LEP. *Your serpent* of Egypt is bred now of your mud by
the operation of your sun: so is your crocodile.

(Italics emphasized, 2.7.27-30)

Then, Cleopatra repeats the discourse of the colonialists, imitating Antony's voice—“He's speaking now, / Or murmuring 'Where's *my serpent of old Nile?*' / For so he calls me: now I feed myself / With most delicious poison” (Italics

emphasized, 1.5.24-27). Her image is associated with that of a witch or witchcraft (2.1.22, 4.2.37, and 4.10.60), monster (4.10.49), salt [lecherous] seducer (2.1.21), lustful mare (3.7.7-9), and ribaudred [wanton] nag (3.8.20). In addition, Cleopatra is coward—in the Actium battle, she, “like a cow in June, / Hoists sails and flies” (3.8.24-25). It is important that her inferior morality and lack of ‘virtus’ make her unsuitable for a ruler. In other words, Romans are natural rulers for the inferior other. This political emasculation is associated with the castration of the Orient, since she is a metonymy of an inferior other, sexually and racially. And further, the power relations between masculinity/superiority/good and femininity/inferiority/evil is based on colonial imagination—the feminine other ‘ought to’ be dominated by the masculine superiority. It is remarkable that the imagination is psychoanalytically based on the patriarchal fears and anxiety arising from the uncanny other called femininity.

Aeschylus’ *Περσῶν* (*The Persians*) has a lot in common with Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* in relation to femininity and colonial imagination. The Persian women, like Cleopatra, are the colonized other in terms of both race and gender. Persia, like Egypt, is the feminized land. The colonial imagination of femininity as the other forms the main motif of the play justifying Greek dominance over Persian femininity. As Kristeva states, the feminine other is our

infantile desires and fears.²⁴ The female body is the object of patriarchal fear or anxiety as well as the object of desire. This ambivalence constructs a central axis of the play on the basis of colonial imagination.

From the beginning of the play, Persia is shown as a metaphor of desire, of the lost female body. The Orient is the censor-free zone of desire. As the first stage setting symbolically shows, there's no authority to control or censor desire. "In the background the palace of Xerxes at Sousa, in the center foreground the tomb of Darius." The palace is deprived of young males, and the old Darius is in the tomb. Between the two places there are only females and the chorus of old men. Like Cleopatra's Egypt, the city of Sousa is a symbol of femininity. Persia is metaphorically feminized, and further, castrated. The chorus of old men laments:

πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενῆς
οἴχωκε, νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει,
κοῦτε τις ἄγγελος οὔτε τις ἵππευς
ἄστυ τὸ Περσῶν ἀφικνεῖται (12-15)

(All Asia is gone:
To the city of Persians
Neither a herald nor horseman returns.)

τοιόνδ' ἄνθος Περσίδος αἴας
οἴχεται ἀνδρῶν, (59-60)
(Thus of the Persian land
Of her men the flower is gone,)

τοῦδε μὴ πόλις πύθηται,
κένανδρον μέγ' ἄστυ Σουσίδος (118-119)
(Lest the city hear, alas!

²⁴ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 191

That reft of men is Sousa;--)

Young men (ἄνθος ... ἀνδρῶν), the flowers of the Persian land are gone, and the πόλις is a great city (μέγ' ἄστν) 'empty of men (κένανδρον).' It is notable that the imagery of being 'empty of men (κένανδρον)' is associated with 'censor-freeness' in terms of colonial imagination. That is, the Oriental city is open to the conquerors' imagination. The city is formulated or created through the imagination. Furthermore, the imagination is closely related to Oriental sensuality, which again reminds us of Said's assertion—"this cultural, temporal, and geographical distance was expressed in metaphors of depth, secrecy, and sexual promise: phrases like 'the veils of an Eastern bride' or 'the inscrutable Orient' passed into the common language."²⁵.

πολλὰ δ' ἀπαλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας
κατερεικόμεναι
διαμυδαλέους δάκρυσιν κόλπους
τεγγούς', ἄλγους μετέχουσαι.
αἱ δ' ἀβρόγιοι Περσίδες ἀνδρῶν
ποθέουσαι ἰδεῖν ἀρτιζυγίαν,
λέκτρων εὐνάς ἀβροχίτωνας,
χλιδανῆς ἥβης τέρψιν, ἀφείσαι,
πενθοῦσι γόοις ἀκορεστοτάτοις. (537-545)
(Many with delicate hands
Rending their veils,
Drenching their breasts,
Swollen with tears,
Sharing their woe,
Ladies of Persia
Softly are weeping,

²⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 222

Desiring each
Him to behold
Wedded but lately,
Couches forsaking,
Soft as their coverlets
(Youth was voluptuous),
Their sorrows, insatiate woe.)

The Persian women with soft, tender, and “delicate (ἀπαλαῖς) hands,” are waiting for the conqueror, who desires to disclose the forbidden “veils,” wherein “drenching (διαμυδαλέους),” wet bosoms are hidden. The bosom under the veil is one of the most sensual symbols like “the delicate cheeks” of Cleopatra which are glowed and cooled repeatedly. And further, the Persian beds of “conjugal union (ἀνδρῶν ἀρτιζυγίαν)” are an imaginary dream-land, where the conqueror desires to fulfill his desire. The imaginary world is the lost paradise; the Persian women, like Cleopatra, are an allegory of the lost body. In the paradise, there is no anxiety of castration. There is no gap between desire and its fulfillment, since there is no fear of patriarchal censorship to block desire for the female body. The Oriental city is a censor-free, κένανδρον dreamland—“Thus of the Persian land / of her men the flower is gone” (59-60), “All the Bactrians destroyed, no youth remains (Βακτριῶν δ’ ἔρρει πανώλης δῆμος οὐδέ τις γέρων, 732).” Then, the castrated country is waiting for the ruler-conqueror like Caesar in *Antony and Cleopatra* to plough, cultivate, and seed it. Miller asserts, “If Africa ‘herself’ is a sensuous woman, African women have become allegorical figures as well;

landscape and humanity are metaphorically linked in their erotic appeal.”²⁶ In the same way, most of the imagery related to the Orient is associated with sensuality.

πᾱσα χθών Ἀσιῆτις
θρέψασα πόθῳ στένεται μαλερῶ,
τοκέης τ’ ἄλοχοί θ’ ἡμερολεγδὸν
τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέονται. (61-64)
(... all Asia
Laments, consumed by desire;
And parents and wives
Counting the days
Tremble at lengthening time.)

At line 62 θρέψασα πόθῳ ... μαλερῶ (fostered by fiery desire), πόθος, which is equivalent to the Latin word ‘desiderium,’ may not always be interpreted sexually. However, the context feels very sensual, since πᾱσα χθών Ἀσιῆτις (all the Asiatic earth) became feminized through colonial imagination. Besides, it is remarkable that the gender of the phrase πᾱσα χθών Ἀσιῆτις is feminine. Metaphorically, the Orient is a female body, which desires and is desired by the conquerors as well.

λέκτρα δ’ ἀνδρῶν πόθῳ
πίμπλαται δακρύμασιν,
Περσίδες δ’ ἀβροπενθεῖς ἐκάστα
πόθῳ φιλόνορι
τὸν αἰχμήεντα θοῦρον εὐνατῆρ
ἀποπεμψαμένα
λείπεται μονόζυξ. (133-139)

²⁶ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 243

(Beds with longing fill with tears,
Persian wives in softness weep;
Each her armed furious lord
Dismissed with gentle love and grief,
Left all alone in the yoke.)

Also, such words as 'beds,' 'longing,' 'yoke' are related to the very sensual imagery. λέκτρα ... ἀνδρῶν (beds of husbands) is now empty (κενανδρα). Women in πόθῳ (longing, desire) fill the beds with tears. Wrapped with πόθῳ φιλάνορι (conjugal desire), they became enslaved by desire. They long for the freedom-giver who is expected to set them free from the yoke of desire. No doubt, the sensual imagery is supposed to justify the conquerors' hands as they take control of the colony or colonial female body, since the conquerors appear as freedom-giver, and further, sower. As Roman Caesar does in the κένανδρον land of Cleopatra's Egypt, so do the Greeks desire to do in Persia.

Now, Persian women who rend veils with delicate hands (ἀπαλαῖς χερσὶ καλύπτρας κατερειακόμεναι, 537-38) also "rend their garb of mourning."

καὶ τὸ Κισσίων πόλισμ'
ἀντίδουπον ἄσεται,
ὀἶ, τοῦτ' ἔπος γυναικοπληθῆς
ὄμιλος ἀπύων,
βυσσίνοις δ' ἐν πέπλοις πέση λακίς. (120-125)
(And lest the city Kissa shall,
When the crowds of women cry,
Sing antiphonal, alas!
And rend their garb of mourning.)

While the crowds which are full of women (γυναικοπληθής ὄμιλος) are crying, they render fine-linen cloths of mourning. The fine-linen cloths (βυσσίνους ... πέπλους) symbolically work in the same way as the veils (καλύπτρας) do, hiding the desirable body, which is now open to the conquerors' hands by rendering (λακίς). The Orient allegorized through Persian women is a desirable body hidden. Then, it is most remarkable that where the Orient works as a metaphor of desire, the imagination of the sexes overlaps with the imagination of races.

The role of sex in Africanist writing has been a continual subtext in this study. On the one hand, there has been a close relationship between the opposition of races and the opposition of the sexes: "the Black seems to me the female race."²⁷

In the same way the black Africa looks like the female race, the Persians appear the female race. Persia becomes the land of females, featured by inferiority, irrationality, barbarity, etc., in addition to sensuality. Like a female body, the Orient is the feminine other, desirable but inferior. The logic of sexual differences also makes the basis of the logic of racial differences between Greece and Persia.²⁸ Accordingly, the imagery concerning the Orient is closely

²⁷ Christopher Miller, *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 244

²⁸ cf. Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 155

Referring to *Antony and Cleopatra*, MacDonald states that «the naturalization of racial as well as gender stereotypes is also at stake here; indeed, the play's production of racial difference between

associated with feminine inferiority, based on colonial imagination. On the contrary, Greece is the land of divinity, and Greeks are the symbol of male conquerors.

Xerxes, who works as an allegory of the feminized Orient, is brave and bold; but he is a furious and arrogant barbarian, an inferior other supposed to be subjugated to Greek masculinity and divinity. Similar to the Roman Antony, Xerxes featured by inferior femininity is rushing, impetuous, and irrational enough to listen to the counsels of the wicked men and to make a decision to wage war against divine Greece.

ταῦτά τοι κακοῖς ὀμιλῶν ἀνδράσιν διδασκεται
θούριος Ξέρξης· λέγουσι δ' ὡς σὺ μὲν μέγαν τέκνοις
πλοῦτον ἐκτήσω ξὺν αἰχμῇ, τὸν δ' ἀνανδρίας ὑπο
ἔνδον αἰχμάζειν, πατρῶον δ' ὄλβον οὐδὲν ἀξάνειν.
τοιὰδ' ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ὀνειδή πολλάκις κλύων κακῶν
τήνδ' ἐβούλευσεν κέλευθον καὶ στρατεύμ' ἐφ' Ἑλλάδα. (753-758)
(Wicked men counseled this, furious
Xerxes learned; saying you acquired wealth
By spear, while he, in cowardice, played
The warrior at home, and multiplied
By nothing his ancestral wealth. So often
These wicked men reproached him, until he
Did plot his martial way toward Greece.)

Cowardice, non-manliness (ἀνανδρία) of Xerxes is well linked with emasculated (κένανδρον) Persia, in contrast to masculine Greece. Like Antony or Cleopatra, the Persian king is in want of 'ανδρία' (equivalent to the Latin 'virtus'). As is

Roman and Egyptian is made available through the same tools it uses to produce sexual difference between male and female.»

shown in *Antony and Cleopatra*, 'ανδρία' or 'virtus' is directly associated with leadership. Therefore, Xerxes' ἀνανδρία is a remarkable feature to justify the Greek masculinity in ruling over Persia.

Another outstanding feature of Oriental inferiority is ὕβρις (pride or hybris), which is one of the causes of the war. The fatal punishment of Persia's ὕβρις is allegorized through the Queen's foreboding.

βωμὸν προσέστην...

ὄρῳ δὲ φεύγοντ' αἰετὸν πρὸς ἐσχάραν
Φοίβου, φόβῳ δ' ἄφθογγος ἐστάθην, φίλοι,
μεθύστερον δὲ κίρκον εἰσορῶ δρόμῳ
πτεροῖς ἐφορμαίνοντα καὶ χηλαῖς κάρα
τίλλονθ', ὁ δ' οὐδὲν ἄλλο γ' ἢ τρήξας δέμας
παρεῖχε. (203-210)
(I approached the altar...

Then to Phoebus' hearth I saw an eagle fleeing:
Dumb in dread I stood: a falcon swooped
Upon him, its wings in flight, its claws plucked
At his head: he did no more than cower, hare-like.)

The fleeing eagle (φεύγοντ' αἰετὸν) is supposedly to be a symbol of ὕβρις, which can be in contrast to the chasing falcon (μεθύστερον κίρκον) allegorizing 'virtus.' The former frightened does nothing other than give himself to the latter. Persian pride is defeated by Greek virtus. Remarkably, the foreboding is associated with the gods' providence including punishment. Barbarian ὕβρις, which "hoped to check the sacred waters of the Hellespont," is supposed to be punished by 'divine fate.'

παῖς δ' ἐμὸς τὰδ' οὐ κατειδῶς ἤνυσεν νέῳ θράσει,
 ὅστις Ἑλλάσποντον ἱρὸν δοῦλον ὡς δεσμώμασιν
 ἤλπισε σχήσειν ῥέοντα, Βόσπορον ῥόον θεοῦ,
 καὶ πόρον μετερρῦθμιζε, καὶ πέδαις σφυρηλάτοις
 περιβαλὼν πολλὴν κέλευθον ἤνυσεν πολλῶ στρατῶ.
 θνητὸς ὦν θεῶν τε πάντων ᾤετ', οὐκ εὐβουλία,
 καὶ Ποσειδῶνος κρατήσειν, (744-750)
 (My son in ignorance... by youthful pride; who hoped
 To check the sacred waters of the Hellespont
 By chains, just as if it were a slave. He smoothed
 His way, yoking Neptune's flowing Bosphorus
 With hammered shackles. Mortal though he was
 By folly thought to conquer all the gods
 And Neptune.)

Xerxes was so obsessed with young boldness (νέῳ θράσει) that he tried to check the sacred (ἱρὸν) Hellespont, the divine (θεοῦ) strait of Bosphoros and he changed the pathway of it. Most impiously, without prudence (οὐκ εὐβουλία) he dared to think that he would rule over (κρατήσειν) all the deities. This insolent ὕβρις of barbarians is to be defeated in accordance with the oracles of gods. John Fergusson states, "Persian pride is judged by universal Heaven."²⁹

εἴ τι πιστεῦσαι θεῶν
 χρῆ θεσφατοισιν,

 οὐ σφιν κακῶν ὑψιστ' ἐπαμμένει παθεῖν,
 ὕβρεως ἄποινα καθέων φρονημάτων, (800-808)
 (If the oracles of gods are credited:

 ...; here await them
 The lowest depths of woe to suffer, payment
 For his pride and godless arrogance.)

²⁹ John Fergusson, *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Austin: Texas, Univ. of Texas Press, 1972), p.44.

By the oracles of gods (θεῶν ... θεοσφαιτοισιν), there await the utmost of the bad, the price paid for ὕβρις, and the price paid for godless arrogance (κάθ' ἑῶν φρονημάτων). The ὕβρις and insolence against the gods shall give rise to the gods' punishment. Unlike the barbarian lands, Greece is the land of divinity; therefore, to invade Greece is directly associated with sinning against the gods. Accordingly, the jealousy of the gods starts the tricky plot to destroy the barbarian invaders.

ἤρξεν μὲν, ὦ δέσποινα, τοῦ παντὸς κακοῦ
φανεῖς ἀλάστωρ ἢ κακὸς δαίμων ποθέν.
ἀνήρ γὰρ Ἑλλήν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων στρατοῦ
ἐλθὼν ἔλεξε παιδὶ σῶ Ξέρξη τάδε,
ὡς εἰ μελαίνης νυκτὸς ἴξεται κνέφας,
Ἑλληνες οὐ μενοῖεν, ἀλλὰ σέλμασιν
ναῶν ἐπανθορόντες ἄλλος ἄλλοσε
δρασμῶ κρυφαίῳ βίσιον ἐκσωσοῖατο.
ὁ δ' εὐθύς ὡς ἤκουσεν, οὐ ξυνεῖς δόλον
Ἑλληνοσ ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθόνον,
πᾶσιν προφωνεῖ τόνδε ναυάρχου λόγον, (353-363)
(Either an avenger or a wicked
God, my Lady (whence it came I know not),
Began the whole disaster. From Athenian
Ranks a Greek approached, addressing Xerxes
Thus: "When the gloom of blackest night
Will fall, the Greeks will not remain, but leap
To rowing-bench, and each by secret course
Will save his life." And he your son, upon
His hearing this, in ignorance of Greek
Guile and the jealousy of gods,
Harangued his captains publicly)

An avenging deity (ἀλάστωρ) or a destructive god (κακὸς δαίμων) began the disaster of the barbarians. The deception was divine; therefore, Xerxes the

barbarian invader was not supposed to catch the Greek guile and the jealousy of the gods. At last, the barbarian ὕβρις is defeated by the divine jealousy (θεῶν φθόνον).

Remarkably, the Greek city is impregnable (ἀσφαλές, 349), since they are built on the basis of the gods' providence. The goddess Athena built the Greek city. Although the barbarians outnumbered the Greeks in warships and armament, "the gods saved the city of the goddess (θεοὶ πόλιν σφῶζουσι Παλλάδος θεᾶς, 347)." Furthermore, the Greek city is not allowed to be enslaved, which is allegorized through the two-sister story in the Queen's dream.

παῖς δ' ἐμὸς
... ἄρμασιν δ' ὑπο
ζεύγνυσιν αὐτῶ και λέπαδν' ὑπ' αὐχένων
τίθησι. χῆ μὲν τῆδ' ἐπυροῦτο στολῆ
ἐν ἡνίασι τ' εἶχεν σῦαρκτον στόμα,
ἢ δ' ἐσφάδαζε, και χεροῖν ἔντη δίφρου
διασπαράσσει, και ξυναρπάζει βία
ἄνευ χαλινῶν, και ζυγὸν θραύει μέσον.
πίπτει δ' ἐμὸς παῖς... (189-197)
(And my son...
... he yokes them to a chariot,
Bridles their necks: and one, so arrayed, towers
Proud, her mouth obedient to reins;
But the other stamps, annoyed, and rends apart
Her trapping in her hands; unbridled, seizes
The car and snaps its yoke in two;
My son falls...)

Xerxes tries to yoke two sisters who symbolize Persia and Greece respectively. Then, the former is proud of the yoking equipment (τῆδ')

ἐπυροῦτο στολῆ) and her mouth is subjugated to the bridles. On the contrary, the latter struggles, rends the harness in pieces, and, free from the bridles (ἄνευ χαλινῶν), cuts perforce the yoke in two. As a result, Xerxes is falling down to the ground. This foreboding episode in the Queen's dream distinguishes Persia from Greece in terms of freedom—the former is born to be a slave, but the latter is not. The discrimination forms the core of racial differentiation, and works for the justification of the government of Greek superiority over barbarian inferiority.

It is remarkable that the Greek wish-dream is envisioned through the queen, one of the colonial others. Psychoanalytically, the revelation by the colonial other makes the dream look like confessional confirmation, a confession that the inferior other is in nature subject to colonial government. Through pseudo-confession, colonial imagination implants its wish-dream into the psychology of the other. The colonial other speaks or imitates (μίμησις) the wish-dream of colonial conquerors through the language of the colonial imagination. That is, the reproduction of colonial imagination is based on the confessional or imitational language.³⁰ Interestingly enough, no Greek character is shown in the play, but the imitational language implanted by the playwright works in the psychology of the colonial other, through which the poet accomplishes his aim to give the

³⁰ Cf. Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 68-69. In relation to Shylock's inferiority based on imitational language, the author says, «repetition emphasizes material corporeality, 'making the word malleable, ready to take the imprint the poet wants to give it.'

imprint of colonial imagination to the other. All the Persian characters in the play repeat the language of colonial conquerors.

Furthermore, through the confessional report of the herald, the poet makes sure that the barbarians are noble but inferior.

Περσῶν ὅσοιπερ ἦσαν ἀκμαῖοι φύσιν,
ψυχὴν τ' ἄριστοι κεύγένειαν ἐκπρεπεῖς,
αὐτῶ τ' ἀνακτι πίστιν ἐν πρώτοις αἰεί,
τεθναῖσιν αἰσχροῶς δυσκλεεστάτῳ μόρῳ. (441-45)
(All the Persians, who were in nature's prime,
Excellent in soul, and nobly bred to grandeur,
Always first in trust, met their death
In infamy, dishonor, and in ugliness.)

The Persians are in the prime of life physically (φύσιν), best intellectually (ψυχὴν), and always utmost in loyalty (πίστιν) to their master. But, in relation to their infamous end they died most shamefully (αἰσχροῶς). This contrast of shameful death to proud life makes clear how just and how dreadful is the punishment for their sinning against the gods by plundering the sacred land. It is interesting that the barbarians are supposed to be called noble as long as they accept their inferiority obediently and do not touch the sacred Greek land.

One interesting thing is that in the representation of the colonial imagination, Shakespeare mainly depends on the reproduction of μῦθος—mystification of the other; Aeschylus essentially takes advantage of confessional or imitational language. The difference of representational aspects is interrelated to the difference of chronological, historiographical aspects. Before the 16th century,

England, unlike Mediterranean countries, had rarely been in contact with colored people from Africa or Asia.³¹ Therefore, the audience of Renaissance England was apt to be shocked at the strange beings from non-Western lands, and to keep strongly in mind the strange images for a long time, although it is probable that the colonies of the New World may have let Englishmen to associate non-Westerners with the factual other.³²

By the end of the sixteenth century, the inquiring Englishman had access to a quiet impressive body of authentic information on Africa in the form of published accounts of actual sea voyages and land travels and fairly accurate maps, particularly of the coastal areas. This information did not, however, wholly displace the legendary ideas and fancies that had taken root in the popular imagination before these more authentic accounts became available. The result was a rich mixture of fact, myth, and fancy.³³

On the contrary, since Aeschylus as a contemporary of the Persian War is immediate in the representation of the other, he need not depend on Plinian $\mu\bar{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$. Instead, his stage looks like a legal court where only testament and confession work. It seems that as an immediate witness the poet presupposes the foreign other guilty of plundering the sacred land, and makes the other confess the fact or repeat the judgement.

³¹ Cf. Frank Snowden Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983), p. 68.

³² cf. Joyce G. MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 170.

³³ Eldred Jones, *The Elizabethan Image of Africa* (Charlottesville: The Univ. Press of Virginia, 1971), p. 1

Regardless of the representational differences, in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Περσαι*, the Orient serves as a metaphor of a female body. And the imagination of femininity overlaps with the imagination of the Orient. It is important that psychoanalytically the feminine other is the object of desire and the object of fear as well. This ambivalent psychology forms the core of the colonial imagination, setting the other in parallel with inferiority. In other words, patriarchal fear and anxiety of femininity become the prerequisite of colonial imagination, for the colonial other is the uncanny other in our unconscious.

Chapter 2

Othello and *Ἰκέτιδες* (The Suppliant Women)—The Discourse of Madness and Castration: ‘Tupping Your White Ewe’

Othello is a drama of a subversive marriage and its containment and punishment. In the play, Othello the Moor as a metaphor of madness and deviation gets symbolically castrated. Desdemona as an accomplice of the subversive marriage also falls a victim to the Venetian canon. Under the pretense of reason/order, Venetian society drives the two deviants to death. As Kristeva states, madness/deviation is our unconscious based on desire and fear.¹ Furthermore, madness/deviation is a metonymy of the colonial other, which should be subject to reason/order. Also, it functions as a pretext for the castration of the other. It is interesting that the imagination of madness/deviation overlaps with the imagination of non-Europeans. Said argues, “the Oriental was linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor) having in common an identity best described as lamentably alien.”² As for Othello, he is a non-European alien linked with madness/deviation, who is supposed to violate

¹ Cf. Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 191.

² Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 207.

the Venetian canon symbolizing reason/order. Othello the mad 'black ram' is the subversive intruder of Venetian society. Desdemona the 'white ewe' as an accomplice of the subversion is not so far from the accusation of madness/deviation.

Othello the Moor appears as a strange intruder in Venetian society, his black complexion making him something other than a human being. To the European eyes, his blackness is deformity, and a symbol of a strange invader. As Jones states—"in the symbolism of the age, they [Moors] were equated with devils,"³ blackness symbolizes monster or devil, deprived of God's grace. From the viewpoint of European Christianity, the Moor in the age of the Renaissance was in general terminology equivalent to "the person ... not a European Christian."⁴ The word 'Moor' originates from the Greek Μαῦρος, a proper noun that identifies the inhabitants of ancient Mauretania. During the Islamic control in Spain from the 8th to the 15th century, the meaning of the word 'Moor' came to be disgraceful. Accordingly, it is likely that European attitudes toward Islam

³ Eldred Jones, *Othello's Countrymen: The African in English Renaissance Drama* (London: Oxford U.P., 1965), p.48

⁴ Anthony Barthelemy, *Black Face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1987), p.7

equated non-Europeans with devils, by coloring them in black, whether their complexion is in fact white or not.⁵ As Barthelemy points out, while Leo Africanus, in 1550, describes some Africans as gentlemen of white complexion, the Latin translation of 1559 and the English translation of 1600 color them as brown or tawny.⁶ In short, the color black is a sign of European fear of the other. For madness is the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of Renaissance Europeans, which overlaps with the imagination of the foreign other.

Interestingly enough, the idea of colored races is associated with deformity, and further, with madness. When Othello tells Desdemona African stories—“of the Cannibals that each other eat, / The Anthropophagi and men whose heads / Do grow beneath their shoulders” (1.3.143-45), he is ironically describing his own features observed by the Elizabethans. Through more accurate reports by travelers Elizabethans had learned more about the African reality, enough to efface the Plinian $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, but they never forgot the old legends. Despite their

⁵ cf. Anthony Barthelemy, *Black Face Malignd Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1987), p. 8-11

⁶ cf. *Ibid.*, p 13. Leo’s original description—«nella quale sono le citta degli uomini bianchi»; Latin version—«hanc, homines subfusci coloris inhabitant»; English version—«the inhabitants whereof are of a browne or tawnie color.»

trade with Africans, there still remained plenty of room for imagination.⁷ One important thing in the play is that the black imagery of deformity, cannibalism, etc. leads to madness/deviation followed by castration. That is, the imagination of madness/deviation functions as a pretext for the castration of the colored race—Othello the ‘black ram.’

To begin with, the play contrasts Othello’s blackness to Desdemona’s whiteness, awakening the European fear of the foreign other.

Your [Brabantio’s] heart is burst, you have lost half your soul;
Even now, now, very now, an old black ram
Is tupping your white ewe. Arise, arise;
Awake the snorting citizens with the bell,
Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you: (1.1.87-91)

The black devil is attacking white Christendom, which is interrelated to the imagination of rape. It is remarkable that the opposition between ‘black ram’ and ‘white ewe’ works as the matrix of the play. Then, an interesting question arises—what if the black ram is replaced with a white ram, or the white ewe is replaced with a black ewe? Loomba points out, “whereas the rapes of black women by white men were seen as a sort of favour to the black race, the mating

⁷ Eldred Jones, *The Elizabethan Image of Africa* (Charlottesville: The Univ. Press of Virginia, 1971), p. 1

of white women with black men was regarded as fatal.”⁸ The fatal violation of the Venetian order in the play is likely to prove soon madness/deviation. Othello is judged to be a madman. Desdemona says to Emilia:

My mother had a maid call'd Barbara:
She was in love, and he she loved proved mad
And did forsake her: she had a song of 'willow;'
An old thing 'twas, but it express'd her fortune,
And she died singing it: that song to-night
Will not go from my mind; (4.3.26-31)

This is the very premonition of Desdemona's fate and the inference of Othello's madness. From a useful Moor—“the noble Moor whom our full senate / Call all in all sufficient” —to the dangerous madman he transforms into.

LODOVICO

Is this *the noble Moor* whom our full senate
Call all in all sufficient? Is this the nature
Whom passion could not shake? whose solid virtue
The shot of accident, nor dart of chance,
Could neither graze nor pierce?

IAGO

He is much changed.

LODOVICO

Are his wits safe? is he not light of brain?

IAGO

He's that he is: I may not breathe my censure.

What he might be: if what he might he is not,

I would to heaven he were! (*Italics emphasized*, 4.1.275-83)

⁸ Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 51.

Interestingly enough, what is “what he might be” supposed to be? Now, we are reminded of Iago’s declaration in the previous scene—“Men should be what they seem; / Or those that be not, would they might seem none!” (3.3.126-27). That is, a man’s character is supposed to match his appearance. Accordingly, it is probably meant by Iago that “what he might be” is a typical stage Moor. The difference of appearance or complexion determines the other’s character, based on power relations. Othello is now returning to his own ‘supposed’ personality—“he is much changed.” Desdemona shouts, “My lord is not my lord; nor should I know him, / Were he in favour as in humour alter'd” (3.4.123-24). Finally, his humour matches his appearance. He turns out to be a typical stage Moor—a ‘problem’ race.

Remarkably enough, Othello the other is “rarely seen or looked at,” but “seen through ... as problems to be solved or confined or ... taken over.”⁹ Like the inmates of a panopticon, Othello always recognizes himself through the eyes in the middle of the panoptic tower. A useful Moor or a dangerous invader? The judgement is always up to the Venetians. Said argues, “the West is the spectator,

⁹ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 207.

the judge and jury, of every facet of Oriental behavior."¹⁰ Venetian society looks like Foucauldian Retreat where 'tea-parties' are held, to which "the directors and staff of the Retreat thus regularly invited several patients [madmen]."¹¹

it is the organization around the madman of a world where everything would be like and near him, but in which he himself would remain a stranger, the Stranger *par excellence* who is judged not only by appearances but by all that they may betray and reveal in spite of themselves.

c'est l'organisation tout autour du fou d'un monde où tout lui serait semblable et prochain, mais où lui-même resterait étranger, l'Étranger par excellence qu'on ne juge pas seulement sur les apparences, mais sur tout ce qu'elles peuvent trahir et révéler malgré elles.

In the 'tea-parties' the directors and staff of the Retreat may judge the madman, based on "the observation that would spy out any incongruity, any disorder, any awkwardness where madness might betray itself (le regard qui épie toute incongruité, tout desordre, toute maladresse où se trahirait la folie)."¹²

It is notable that when Othello provokes a problem by his sexual relationship with a white woman, Venetian society doesn't punish Othello's madness/deviation physically; however, it drives him to feel guilty, and finally to

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 109.

¹¹ Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (NY: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 249.

¹² Ibid., p. 249

self-destruction, based on the psychology of self-consciousness—the inscription of self-defeatedness in the heart of the other. Besides, a self-conscious question—how he is perceived by whites—is always in the heart of his tragic fate. The self-conscious psychology is the very stratagem of the Venetian authority under the pretense of reason/order. Foucault says as follows, based on the scheme of power/knowledge:

“The keeper intervenes, without weapons, without instruments of constraint, with observation and language only; he advances upon madness....Now the combat was always decided beforehand, unreason’s defeat inscribed in advance in the concrete situation where madman and man of reason meet.”¹³

Le surveillant intervient, sans armes, sans instruments de contrainte, par le regard et le langage seulement; il avance vers la folie....Maintenant le combat est toujours déjà joué, la défaite de la déraison est inscrite par avance dans la situation concrète où s’affrontent le fou et le non-fou.

Even when he is expected to win Desdemona as a wife, through the judgment of the Venetian court—“your son-in-law is far more fair than black” (1.3.292), Othello is supposed to objectify himself as a black Moor, an alien. We need to pay attention to the fact that following the Duke’s statement a senator and Brabantio call Othello “brave Moor,” or “Moor,” not “Othello” or his title.

¹³ Ibid., p. 251-52.

Othello is always identified with a black Moor, not himself. Consequently, the sense of otherness drives him to confess self-defeatedly — “Haply, for I am black / And have not those soft parts of conversation / That chamberers have” (3.3.263-65). Furthermore, his self-consciousness of otherness is apt to be exploited by Iago, whose “plan is to make Othello a monster, to make him what the audience and the Venetians may have assured he has the moment they heard the name ... Othello the Moor”¹⁴ It is interesting that the character of Iago looks like a self-conscious mirror of Othello himself. Iago in a way reflects the self-consciousness of Othello as the other. In other words, Iago is the uncanny other living in the heart of Othello’s self-consciousness.

In addition, it is notable that Othello's jealousy is easily associated with madness. Africanist discourse in the Elizabethan Age usually juxtaposed a typical stage Moor with jealousy. Marjorie Raley, introducing two books about Africa published in the Elizabethan Age, states that “Tunis is a Barbarian city known for ... their jealousy of their wives 'beyond measure.’”¹⁵ Jealousy is a

¹⁴ Jack D'amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama* (Tampa: Univ. of South Florida Press, 1991), p.180

¹⁵ Joyce MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 109

racial feature around Othello the Moor, not an individual one. Accordingly, it is no wonder that Iago, who is uncomfortable with Cassio's promotion, plots to destroy Othello and Cassio together, by putting "the Moor / At last into a jealousy so strong / that judgement cannot cure" (2.1.312-14). In addition to Othello's suspicion about Desdemona, the fact that "Cassio's a proper man" (1.3.398) accelerates Othello obsessed with "his unbookish jealousy" (4.1.102) to "go mad" (4.1.101). Othello the "credulous fool" (4.1.46) "breaks out to savage madness" (4.1.56). At last, he kills his wife—"the white ewe," and stabs himself—"the black ram." The madness/deviation comes to an end, obeying the Venetian order. Othello apologizes as follows:

Soft you; a word or two before you go.
I have done the state some service, and they know't.
No more of that. I pray you, in your letters,
....
then must you speak
Of one that loved not wisely but too well;
Of one not easily jealous, but being wrought
Perplex'd in the extreme; of one whose hand,
Like the base Indian, threw a pearl away
Richer than all his tribe;
....
And say besides, that in Aleppo once,
Where a malignant and a turban'd Turk
Beat a Venetian and traduced the state,
I took by the throat the circumcised dog,
And smote him, thus. (5.2.338-56)

Othello was of great service to the state as a brave soldier. But, in his jealous madness he, like “the base Indian,” killed Desdemona like “a pearl.” Remarkably, Othello is paralleled with “the base Indian,” Desdemona with “a pearl.” In relation to colonial imagination, Othello is not so far from “the base Indian” and “a turban’d Turk” as the other of Europeans. And further, Desdemona a Venetian is “richer than all his [the other’s] tribe. The colonial imagination, at last, drives Othello to die like “a malignant and a turban’d Turk.” Then, it is an irony that Othello for the life of him tries to escape from the image of a stage Moor; however, in the end he turns out to be an equivalent to “a malignant and a turban’d Turk.” Remarkably, while Othello is following the Venetian canon and he is serving as a useful instrument for the society, he can keep his fame, although he is a Moor. The Venetian canon forces him to live as a useful ‘Moor’ for the society, not as a ‘Venetian.’ When he insists on being a citizen of Venice, Othello immediately falls a victim to the canon under the pretense of reason/order. The Venetian order in the play is maintained by identifying of the foreign other with madness. Othello is the uncanny other living in the Venetian unconscious in relation to madness.

As for Desdemona, at least in two aspects her subversive madness/deviation can be explained. First, she demolished the Venetian canon of race, by marrying a Moor—even without parental permission. Second, she transgressed the Christian doctrine over sexuality by excessive erotic submission. She blew up the racial canon of the Renaissance Italy, and she was a violator in terms of the sexual canon as well. These transgressions are easily associated with Othello's madness/deviation.

According to the Renaissance canon, she was not supposed to marry a man, let alone a Moor, who is not permitted by her father. But she betrayed her father's expectation—to marry "the wealthy curled darlings of our nation," by running "from her guardage to the sooty bosom," which is a subversive challenge to patriarchal authority.

O thou foul thief, where hast thou stow'd my daughter?

Damn'd as thou art, thou hast enchanted her;

....

So opposite to marriage that she shunned

The wealthy curled darlings of our nation,

Would ever have, to incur a general mock,

Run from her guardage to the sooty bosom

Of such a thing as thou, to fear, not to delight. (1.2.62-71)

In addition, from the viewpoint of Renaissance sexuality, she was not to indulge herself in sexuality. Her erotic submission is contrary to Renaissance belief,

which taught people moderate love rather than erotic intensity. This indulgence is supposed to be madness/deviation.¹⁶ Remarkably enough, their erotic submission and scandals culminate in Cyprus, an island of the East, since “the East was a place of lascivious sensuality.”¹⁷ In relation to Oriental sensuality, Antony’s confession still echoes—“i’ the East my pleasure lies” (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 2.3.40).

DESDEMONA

The heavens forbid
But that our loves and comforts should increase,
Even as our days do grow!

OTHELLO

Amen to that, sweet powers!
I cannot speak enough of this content;
It stops me here; *it is too much of joy*: (Italics emphasized, 2.1.196-200)

Desdemona is shown as a pursuer of desire, a deceiver, and a violator of patriarchal order. Also as an accomplice of Othello the madman, she is a subversive other, who is to be contained by Venetian authority. Brabantio shouts:

I am glad at soul I have no other child:
For thy escape would teach me *tyranny*,
To hang clogs on them. (Italics emphasized, 1.3.196-98)

Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see:
She has deceived her father, and may thee.

¹⁶ Aram Veesser, ed., *The New Historicism: Reader* (NY: Routledge, 1994), p. 62-63.

¹⁷ Kabbani, p. 6.

(Italics emphasized, 1.3.294-95)

It is notable that through a theatre-state, Elizabethan power tries to justify its tyrannical surveillance and punishment over sexual transgression including Othello's violence featured by madness. Greenblatt argues that Othello's "insupportable sexual experience has been, as it were, displaced and absorbed by the act of revenge....Such is the achievement of Iago's improvisation on the religious sexual doctrine."¹⁸ This is the Elizabethan politics of sexuality, arising from patriarchal fear and anxiety. Othello and Desdemona, the deviants, try to challenge the Renaissance canon; however, as a "master improviser" in the service of the Elizabethan power, Shakespeare "reproduces the relations of power,"¹⁹ containing the subversive other. As females are subject to Venetian patriarchy, so strangers are subject to Venetian authority. Still we remember that the imagination of the feminine other overlaps with the imagination of the foreign other. In terms of colonial imagination, Othello and Desdemona have a lot in common as the inferior other. The subversive other in the play, whether it is a female or a foreigner, who is associated with inferiority, serves as an allegory of madness, which is supposed to be subject to Venetian order. And further, it is

¹⁸ *The New Historicism: Reader*, p. 71.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

remarkable that the subversive other is the uncanny other in the psychology of the Elizabethans, in relation to madness.

In Aeschylus' *Ικέτιδες*, also jealousy is followed by madness. One difference is that the psychological aspect of the other in *Othello* is extended to the mythological phase in *Ικέτιδες*. According to Greek mythology, Danaus' 50 daughters and Aegyptus' 50 sons are products of madness and jealousy, since Io went mad through the jealousy of Hera. Io is the mother of Epaphus, the great-grandfather of the 100 foreigners. While Hera stands for the sacred marriage following reason or law, Io symbolizes passion or madness. The contrast between madness and reason forms a matrix of the play. In the play, "foreignness, an uncanny one, creeps into the tranquility of reason itself."²⁰ However, it is remarkable that foreigners are acceptable, so far as they are "amenable to the rites and laws of the polis."²¹ The Danaids are acceptable foreigners; on the contrary, the Aegyptiads are mad ravishers, who are supposed to be castrated. It is essential in the play that the imagination of disorder/madness overlaps with

²⁰ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 170.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

the imagination of the foreign other. Like Othello, the foreigners are the uncanny other within Greeks themselves, in relation to madness.

The Danaids are strangers, and desirable virgins in veils, who came from Egypt to Argos the Greek land. And like doves pursued by hawks, like a wolf-pursed (λυκοδίωκτον) calf on steep rocks, they are desperate to supplicate Zeus to spare their lives.

τοιαῦτα πάθεα μέλεα θροομένα λέγω
λιγέα βαρέα δακρυοπετῆ,
ἰὴ ἰὴ,
ἠλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῆ,
ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ.
ἰλεῶμαι μὲν Ἀπίαν βουῖνιν,
καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδὰν εὖ, γᾶ, κοννεῖς.
πολλάκι δ' ἐμπίτνω λακίδι σὺν λινοσινεῖ
Σιδονία καλύπτρα. (112-21)
(I sing suffering, shrieking,
Shrill and sad am weeping,
My life is dirges
And rich in lamentations,
Mine honor weeping.
I invoke your Apian land,
You know my foreign tongue.
Often I tear my Sidonian veils.)

First of all, the image of veil (καλύπτρα) is associated with exotic sensuality.²² In general, the atmosphere surrounding the Danaids is not so far from that of the

²² Edward Said, *Orientalism* (N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979), p. 222

Persian women in *Περσai*.²³ As observed in the previous chapter, the Orient is a metaphor of a sensuous woman. The Danaids are a desirable body waiting for the hands of the Argives, like Io who was blessed by the touch of Zeus. The virgin body is the very locus where κένανδρον wish-dream of the Greeks takes root. As for the κένανδρον virginity, Aeschylus puts emphasis on the vulnerability and purity of the Danaids as suppliants.

ἐν ἀγνῶ δ' ἔσμος ὡς πελειάδων
ἴζεσθε κίρκων τῶν ὀμοπτέρων φόβῳ,
ἐχθρῶν ὀμαίμων καὶ μαινότων γένος. (223-25)
(Settle on the sacred ground like doves
Clustering together, fearing the winged hawks,
Who hatefully pollute their very blood.)

ἴδε με τὰν ἰκέτιν φυγάδα περιδρομον,
λυκοδίωκτον ὡς δάμαλιν ἄμ πέτραις
ἠλιβάτοις, ἴν' ἀλκᾶ πίσυνος μέμυκε
φράζουσα βοτῆρι μόχθους. (350-53)
(Protector, behold an exile surrounded :
A calf, wolf-pursed, on steep rocks,
Confides in the herdsman's strength,
And bleats her pains.)

Here we see two kinds of imagery contrasted: a hostile pursuer and a helpless fugitive. The Aegyptiads look like hawks, who are hateful brethren (ἐχθρῶν ὀμαίμων) polluting their race (μαινότων γένος). In contrast, the Danaids are a

²³ Cf. *Περσai* (Lines 537-45).

swarm of doves supplicating on the sacred altar, in fear of those hateful hawks.

Also the virgins look like a heifer (ὡς δάμαλιν) pursued by wolves on steep rocks.

Like Io, who became a heifer and was recovered by Zeus, they are waiting for the omnipotent hands. The goddess of virginity may save the virgin suppliants.

παντὶ δὲ σθένει
διωγμοῖσι δ' ἀσφαλέας
ἀδμῆτος ἀδμήτα
ῥύσιος γενέσθω.
σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς
ἀνδρῶν, ἔ ἔ,
ἄγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν. (147-53)
(May virgin, rescuing virgins,
In all her power come, that
Seeds mighty of solemn mother
Escape, alas,
Unwed, virgin to the bed of man.)

Remarkably, although the Danaids appear to be vulnerable supplicants to the Argive gods, they are, no doubt, strangers to the Argive eyes. They are swarthy (μελανθές) and of sun-burnt (ἡλιόκτυπον) race (154-55), and look like Oriental barbarians in appearance.

ποδαπὸν ὄμιλον τόνδ' ἀνελληνόστολον
πέπλοισι βαρβάροισι καὶ πυκώμασι
χλίοντα προσφωνοῦμεν ; οὐ γὰρ Ἀργολίς
ἔσθης γυναικῶν οὐδ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος τόπων. (234-37)
(Whence come these barbarians?
What shall we call you? So outlandishly
Arrayed in the barbaric luxury
Of robes and crowns, and not in Argive fashion

Nor in Greek?)

Λιβυστικάϊς γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐμφερέστεραι
γυναιξίν ἐστε κούδαμῶς ἐγχωρίαις.
Καὶ Νεῖλος ἂν θρέψειε τοιοῦτον φυτόν,
Κύπριος χαρακτήρ ...

...

Ἰνδὰς τ' ἀκούω νομάδας ἵπποβάμοσιν
εἶναι καμηλοῖς ἀστραβιζούσας χθόνα,
Παρ' Αἰθίοψιν ἀστυγειτονουμένας.
καὶ τὰς ἀνάνδρους κρεοβόρους Ἀμαζόνας, (279-87)
(More like Libyans you seem
Than like to women native here; or the Nile may foster
Such a likeness; or the images
Of Cyprus, ...
And of the camel-backed nomads I've heard,
Neighbours to the Ethiopian;
... the unwed
Barbarous Amazons...)

The Danaids are occupying a part of Oriental μῦθος in the Argive imagination.

As Othello represents to the Venetians, the Orientals are barbarians in proud array with luxury (πυκνῶμασι χλίοντα), and they are man-eating (κρεοβόρους) Anthropophagi like Amazons.

Now, the wonder is that both the Danaids and the Aegyptiads are strangers to the Greek society; nevertheless, the former is accepted by the Greeks, while the latter is discarded. The probable solution is that the Danaids are following the

Greek norm by worshiping Greek gods, while the Aegyptiads revere their own gods. The Aegyptian herald argues,

οὐτοι φοβοῦμαι δάμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε·
οὐ γὰρ μ' ἔθρεψαν, οὐδ' ἐγήρασαν τροφῇ. (893-94)
(I do not fear these gods before me: they
Did not nurse me, their nursing did not age me.)

τοὺς ἀμγί Νεῖλον δαίμονας σεβίζομαι. (922)
(The Nile deities I revere.)

The argument seems reasonable on his part, but it challenges the Greek superiority over the barbarian other. Although the Aegyptiads have rights to wed the Danaids, according to their own laws or customs (νόμῳ πόλεως, κατὰ νόμους τοὺς οἴκοθεν, 388-90), the Greek imagination tries to find out some pretexts for castration of the uncanny other, by contrasting the virgin Danaids to the ravishing Aegyptiads. Now, we need to keep in mind the Argive king's statement:

εἴ τοι κρατοῦσα παῖδες Αἰγύπτου σέθεν
νόμῳ πόλεως, φάσκοντες ἐγγύτατα γένους
εἶναι, τίς ἂν τοῖσδ' ἀντιωθῆναι θέλοι;
δεῖ τοι σε φεύγειν κατὰ νόμους τοὺς οἴκοθεν,
ὥς οὐκ ἔχουσι κῦρος οὐδὲν ἀμφὶ σοῦ. (387-91)
(If Aegyptus' sons rule you by customs
Native to your city, claiming nearest
Of kin, who would wish in that to oppose them?
According to laws at home you must plead,
How over you they lack authority.)

The Aegyptiads may legitimately wed the Danaids, according to their own customs. However, Aeschylus continues to put emphasis on the similarity of the Danaids to the Argives, in addition to the vulnerable virginity of the Danaids. Consequently, the playwright drives the audience to regard the attack on the Danaids by the Aegyptiads as a challenge to the peace of the Argives. The Danaids argue for their Argive blood, as follows:

Ζεὺς δὲ γεννήτωρ ἴδοι. (206)
(May Zeus, my ancestor, look on us.)

βραχὺς τορὸς θ' ὁ μῦθος· Ἀργεῖαι γένος
ἐξευχόμεσθα, σπέρματ' εὐτέκνου βοός· (274-75)
(Brief and clear is my tale: by race we claim
Argos, the offspring of a fruitful cow.)

When the Danaids argues that they are the descendents of Io, and of the Argive race as well, the Argive king agrees to it—“You <really> seem to share of old this land (δοκεῖτε <δή> μοι τῆσδε κοινωνεῖν χθονὸς τὰρχαῖον, 325).” Curiously enough, if from the beginning (το ἀρχαῖον), the Danaids have shared their blood and land with the Argives, the Aegyptiads also have the same racial origins with the Argives. However, in contrast to the assimilation of the Danaids, the Argive imagination drives the Aegyptiads to the accusation of madness, by associating them with ravishers. One possible solution for the contrast is that, as implied

above, the Danaids are an acceptable other; but the Aegyptiads are a threatening other. The Aegyptiads are the uncanny other, whether their origin is Argive or not, since they are threatening. In other words, otherness in the play is determined by the levels of unacceptability, not simply by the racial difference.

Furthermore, it is no wonder that the madness of Io through Hera's jealousy is associated with the madness of the Aegyptiads. In relation to madness, the Aegyptiads are the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of the Argives, since the imagination of madness overlaps with the imagination of the foreign other. Also, from the viewpoint of role structure, we may interrelate Iago in *Othello* to the gadfly in *Ἰκέτιδες*, and we may link up Io "in a rich pasture eating flowers (ματέρος ἀνθονόμους ἐπωπάς, λειμῶνα βούχιλον, 539-40)," with Othello confessing "it is too much of joy" in the East. Io and Othello are driven to madness by the gadfly and Iago respectively, when they feel they are safe and content. Up to a point, we may interpret *Ἰκέτιδες* as a mythological prototype of *Othello* in terms of jealousy and madness. Like Othello, the Aegyptiads—descendants of Io—are the other of madness. Like Iago, the gadfly is the other's other.

It is remarkable that in the play madness is also associated with violation. And further, the Greek imagination puts emphasis on the Aegyptiads' ὕβρις²⁴ in order to connect the Aegyptiads with violation. The impious marriage (γάμον ἀσεβῆ, 10) which the Danaids escape from is based on ὕβρις, and the Aegyptiads pursuing the Danaids are accused as ravishers. The Argive king declares, "Never to rape of birds shall we expose you (οὔτοι πτερωτῶν ἀρπαγαῖς <ς> ἐκδώσομεν, 510). As is the case of *Othello*, in *Ικέτιδες* raping is a synonym of madness. Furthermore, the Aegyptiads' madness associated with ὕβρις is featured mainly by insolence and godlessness.

From the very beginning of the play, the Aegyptiads appear in the Argive society as a "thick swarm of insolent men (ἀρσενοπληθῆ δ' ἔσμὸν ὑβριστῆν Αἰγυπτογενῆ, 29-30)." They are "proud and heartless (ὕβριν):"

γένος γὰρ Αἰγύπτιον ὕβριν
 δύσφορον ἀρσενογενές
 μετὰ με δρόμοισι διόμενοι
 γυγάδα μάταισι πολυθρόοις
 βίαια δίζηνται λαβεῖν. (817-21)
 (Proud and heartless Egyptians--
 Men pursuing an exile,
 Intent on capturing me,

²⁴ Cf. *The Justice of Zeus*, p.88. In relation to the defeat of Xerxes as the punishment for Hybris by Zeus, Lloyd-Jones adds: "Persian valour, as well as Persian power, is given every emphasis; this serves to accentuate the consequences of Hybris."

With shouts many and wanton.)

They are “black in limb, their clothes white linen (μελαγχίμοις γυίοισι λευκῶν ἐκ πεπλωμάτων, 719-20).” The color ‘black (μελαγχίμοις)’ in contrast to ‘white (λευκῶν)’ may imply that the Aegyptiads are strong, manly, and able fighters.²⁵ And further, as Irwin argues, the Greek imaginations concerning ‘black’ are easily associated with ‘wickedness,’ ‘savageness,’ or ‘cruelty.’²⁶ Accordingly, virility is likely to be connected with fear.

δοριπαγεῖς δ’ ἔχοντες κυανώπιδας
νῆας ἔπλευσαν ὧδ’ ἐπιτυχεῖ κότῳ
πολεῖ μελαγχίμῳ σὺν στρατῶ. (743-45)
(Dark ships they have, and strongly built;
They sailed and so succeed in anger
With an army large and dark.)

“Dark ships (κυανώπιδας νῆας)” and “dark army (μελαγχίμῳ στρατῶ),” of which imagery is associated with virile fighters, easily become the object of fear, since the Aegyptiads are the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of the Argives. The Argive imagination connects the Aegyptiads with the other within, in relation to madness featured by ὕβρις. And further, the imagination interrelates the virility of the Aegyptiads to the godless savageness—the Aegyptiads are arrogant and dog-hearted monsters, and mad ravishers.

²⁵ Eleanor Irwin, *Color Terms in Greek poetry* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974), p.130-31.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p.153-54.

περίγρονες δ' ἄγαν ἀνιέρω μένει
μεμαργωμένοι κυνοθρασεῖς, θεῶν
οὐδεν ἐπαιοντες.

...

ὡς καὶ ματαίων ἀνοσίων τε κνωδάλων
ἔχοντας ὀργάς, (757-63)
(Arrogant with unholy rage,
Gluttonous, dog-hearted, obeying
In nothing the gods.

...

the rage
Of wanton men, monstrous and profane.)

ἐξῶλές ἐστι μάργον Αἰγύπτου γένος
μάχης τ' ἄπληστον· (741-42)
(Mad is the race Egyptian, cursed,
In war unsated)

ὄδε μάρπιτις νάιος γάιος· (826)
(Here, this ravisher from the ship!)

Remarkably enough, the Danaids who deny the mad ravishers are accepted by the Greeks under the pretense of Dike or order (δίκαια Διόθεν κράτη, 437), as Danaus predicts: “They [the Argives] shall fight for you [Danaids] (μαχοῦνται περὶ σέθεν, 740).” For Zeus is the order and the justice, who expectantly stands by the Greeks and the suppliant women.

Ζεὺς ἄναξ ἀποστεροῖ
γάμον δυσάνορα
δάιον, ὅσπερ Ἰὼ
πηονᾶς ἐλύσατ' εὖ
χειρὶ παιωνίαι κατασχεθῶν,
εὐμενῇ βίαν κτίσας,

...
καὶ δίκαι δίκας ἔπεσθαι
ξὺν εὐχαῖς ἐμαῖς λυτηρίοισ
μηχαναῖς θεοῦ πάρα. (1062-73)
(Lord Zeus may he deprive us
Of an ill marriage
And a bad husband,
As Io was released from ill,
Protected by a healing hand,
Kind might did cure her.
...
And justly, with my prayers,
Beside the saving arts of god,
To follow justice.)

Lloyd-Jones states, the Greeks take advantage of Zeus— the champion of Dike, the order of the universe,²⁷ by putting the barbarian other onto ὕβρις under the pretense of justice or order.²⁸ It is remarkable that the final vote to protect the Danaids—“προσπάτης δ’ ἐγὼ ἄστοί τε πάντες, (963-64)” —is just, because the Aegyptiads are the uncanny other accused as mad ravishers, not because they have no rights to wed the Danaids. Therefore, although the herald’s assertion—“the Nile deities I revere (τοὺς ἀμγὶ Νεῖλον δαίμονας σεβίζομαι, 922)” —seems reasonable, the colonial imagination tries to accuse the foreign other as ravishers, by connecting them with ὕβρις accompanied by madness. For

²⁷ Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus*, p.87.

²⁸ cf. *Ibid.*, p.87-88

the Aegyptiads are the uncanny other creeping into Greek psychology, in relation to madness—the imagination of madness overlaps with the imagination of the Aegyptiads. Finally, like Othello, the Aegyptiads—the dangerous other—is castrated by the colonial imagination.

Chapter 3

Titus Andronicus and *Medea*

—Lethal Gods' Sad Rites: 'A Coffin Covered with Black'

In *Titus Andronicus* the black Aaron appears as an allegory of Death. In the play there are two kinds of lethal rites—Roman rites and Barbarian rites. It is remarkable that the former is, more or less, justified, but the latter is totally rejected. For the barbarian rites are connected with the colonial other overlapping with the uncanny other in the psychology of Renaissance Europeans, in relation to death. What is interesting is that the imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of Death. Psychoanalytically, as Kristeva declares, death is an uncanny other, which is our own unconscious based on the dialectics of desire and fear. The colonial other is the representation of our own repressed self within. Accordingly, the process of pursuing the black Aaron seems to be the process of analyzing our own unconscious in terms of death.

The play begins with Titus' triumph which "a coffin covered with black" accompanies. The coffin functions in various ways, one of which is that it is associated with the black Aaron, since he is an allegory of Death. Another is that it works as a foreboding of the tragic fall of the Andronici family. Ironically, it is

remarkable that the triumph finally turns out to be the way to the Andronici familial funerals, of which beginning is the bloody sacrifice “ad manes fratrum.”

Lucius:

Give us the proudest prisoner of thy Goths,
That we may hew his limbs, and on a pile
Ad manes fratrum sacrifice his flesh,
Before this earthy prison of their bones; (1.1.96-99)

This sacrificial ritual which offers the flesh of a Gothic prince to the dead is the beginning of the Andronici tragedy. For “ambitious Rome” does “the bloody wrongs upon her foes (1.1.141),” which is twice as “barbarous” as Scythia (1.1.131). Against the barbarous ritual, Tamora the Queen of Goths, now a captive woman, supplicates crying:

Stay, Roman brethren! Gracious conqueror,
Victorious Titus, rue the tears I shed,
A mother's tears in passion for her son:
And if thy sons were ever dear to thee,
O, think my son to be as dear to me!
Sufficeth not that we are brought to Rome,
To beautify thy triumphs and return,
Captive to thee and to thy Roman yoke,
But *must my sons be slaughter'd in the streets,*
For valiant doings in their country's cause? (Italics emphasized,
1.1.104-13)

The burning, maternal petition to the “Gracious conqueror” is rejected, and her “dear” eldest son Alarbus is “slaughter'd in the streets.” The “cruel, irreligious piety (1.1.130)” by the Romans, which is compared to the wrong-doings of the

Prince of Troy by the Thracian tyrant,¹ gives cause to bring “sharp revenge” to the Andronici family (1.1.136-38). The Roman sacrifice is the beginning of the play, which is supposed to be followed immediately by the development of “sharp revenge.” Now, it’s time for Death to perform the sequential lethal rites of revenge.

Aaron:

Now climbeth Tamora Olympus' top,
Safe out of fortune's shot; and sits aloft,
Secure of thunder's crack or lightning flash;

...

I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold.
To wait upon this new-made empress.
To wait, said I? to wanton with this queen,
This goddess, this Semiramis, this nymph,
This siren, that will charm Rome's Saturnine,
And see his shipwreck and his commonweal's. (*Italics emphasized*,
2.1.1-24)

With Tamora, who is now safe in “Olympus,” Aaron plots to “shipwreck” Rome.

Tamora is a charming siren, a desirable body; however, she is also associated with a witch. No wonder that a foreign woman is linked with a witch, as is the case of Caliban’s mother or Medea. Although Tamora is no Moor, she shares some qualities with the black Aaron as his accomplice, from the viewpoints of colonial imagination. Regardless of her nationality, she is the foreign other, who

¹ Cf. Euripides' *Εκάβη*. Also refer to chapter v of this dissertation.

is linked with the images of a foreign intruder or a violator. Accordingly, we may interpret the Tamora-Rome relationships as cultural anxiety arising from the tension between Roman nobility and Gothic barbarity.

Much of the colonial discourse of the late sixteenth century expresses this worry: what happens when we colonize the barbaric other? Fearing pollution by the enemies it conquered, Rome attempted to erase otherness by widening its boundaries and extending rights of citizenship. Still Rome fell, overcome by alien barbarians. What would become of Europe if it became intertwined with a new kind of barbarians, "savage" Indians from the New World or "black" strangers from Africa?²

As MacDonald says, Renaissance England in the 1590s was suffering the same fears as the Romans in the early Mediaeval ages experienced. Also "Elizabethan England was at war with Spain, governed by an aging queen who had no heir and faced with the loss of its first New World colony."³ Psychoanalytically, the anxiety arising from frustrated desire develops into xenophobia, which puts the strange foreigners in the position of the uncanny other within. The imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of the uncanny other in relation to heterogeneity. Tamora the other is the very product of cultural anxiety related to heterogeneity.

² Joyce MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p.166.

³ *Ibid.*, 168-69.

It is interesting that the barbarous Goths deny Tamora and declare Roman Lucius emperor around at the end of the play. Like the Danaids in Aeschylus' *Ἰκέτιδες*, the Goths are the acceptable other to the Roman rule, calling down a curse on Tamora their former Queen.

Goth:

We'll follow where thou [Lucius] lead'st,
Like stinging bees in hottest summer's day
Led by their master to the flowered fields,
And be avenged on cursed Tamora. (5.1.13-16)

Furthermore, the Goths help Rome to be reborn,⁴ by supporting Lucius “to heal Rome's harms, and wipe away her woe” (5.3.148). The barbarians, like Ariel in *The Tempest*, are so serviceable to Lucius that we may forget the fact that Lucius was the very “barbarian” who slaughtered a noble Goth for sacrificial rites, and that he made the beginning of the Andronici tragedy by the lethal rites. And further, when Lucius, giving a warm kiss to the dead body of Titus (5.3.153), became emperor, the “barbarous” rites are justified and Roman order seems to be restored. What makes the justification possible? By setting the Tamora-Aaron connection onto the axis of evil and disorder, and by the punishment of it, Shakespeare drives the audience to believe that divine justice is achieved. Since

⁴ Jack D'amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama* (Tampa: Univ. of South Florida Press, 1991), p.147.

both Tamora and Aaron are the other, always they are seen through as “problems to be solved.”⁵ D’amico argues that “Shakespeare uses the aliens as instruments of atrocities that shatter the myth of civic piety, plunging Rome into the darkness and self-consuming horror.”⁶ When the main “problems” are in action, it is likely that the audience easily forgets the lethal beginning of the play, transforming the Romans’ “violent aggression into the pious defense of honor and peace” against the axis of evil and disorder.⁷

Now, the discursive center of the other is moving to the black Aaron. First of all, it is remarkable that the black Moor, like Othello, is still a contemporary of the English Renaissance. He is the other as a present problem, not as a past one. In relation to death, he is the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of the Renaissance Englishmen. Whatever he touches goes to death or destruction, since he is Death, who “rapes, mutilates, and murders simply for delight.”⁸ It is important that the other is the unconscious of the Renaissance Englishmen in relation to death. Furthermore, the unconscious is linked with the values of a

⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p.207.

⁶ D’amico, p. 146.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁸ MacDonald, 168.

society. When the unconscious of a society links the imagination of an uncanny stranger with that of Death, the epistemological other develops into the cultural, political other. As a result of it, a theatrical type like the Moor Aaron is shown up upon the Elizabethan stage.

The Moor as alien is inescapably framed by the values of a society he, like Aaron, may struggle against and of which the dramatist and his theater are a part. The alien is represented to Western eyes in a work of art that is shaped by the poetic and dramatic traditions of the West.⁹

Aaron the Moor in the play appears as a plotter thinking to “charm Rome's Saturnine, / And see his shipwreck and his commonweal's” (2.1.1-24), coming across Tamora's sons braving each other to win Lavinia. Aaron gives a piece of fatal advice to them:

... be friends, and join for that you jar:
'Tis *policy and stratagem* must do
That you affect; and so you must resolve,
That what you cannot as you would achieve,
You must perforce accomplish as you may.
...
... our empress, with her *sacred wit*
To villainy and vengeance consecrate,
Will we acquaint with all that we intend;
And she shall file our engines with advice,
...
The woods are ruthless, dreadful, deaf, and dull;
There speak, and strike, brave boys, and take your turns;

⁹ Ibid., p. 168

There serve your lusts, shadow'd from heaven's eye,
And *revel in Lavinia's treasury*. (Italics emphasized, 2.1.103-131)

This is a deep “stratagem” of “sharp revenge,” in pursuit of “Lavinia’s treasury” by Death and his followers “Revenge,” “Rape,” and “Murder.”¹⁰ It is interesting that the revenge is called being “consecrate” (2.1.121), which may be the parody of the Roman ritual—“sacrifice of expiation” (1.1.37) “to appease their groaning shadows that are gone” (126). Anyway, the Roman sacrifice calls for revenge. Furthermore, the lethal stratagem is getting along well with Tamora’s pursuit of vengeance on the Andronici. Running parallel with Aaron’s advice to Tamora’s sons, Tamora also gives a Machiavellian word of advice to Saturninus, who is mad at Bassianus (and others including Titus and Lavinia). We need to keep in mind the conversation between Saturninus and Tamora.

Saturninus:

“What, madam! be dishonour'd openly,
And basely put it up without revenge?” (1.1.432-33).

Tamora:

(Aside to Sat.)

My lord, be ruled by me, be won at last;
Dissemble all your griefs and discontents:
You are but newly planted in your throne;
Lest, then, the people, and patricians too,
Upon a just survey, take Titus' part,
And so supplant you for ingratitude,

¹⁰ Cf. Act v, Sc. ii. Tamora and her sons are in disguise as “Revenge,” “Rape,” and “Murder.”

Which Rome reputes to be a heinous sin,
Yield at entreats; and then let me alone
I'll find a day to massacre them all
And raze their faction and their family,
The cruel father and his traitorous sons,
To whom I sued for my dear son's life,
And make them know what 'tis to let a queen
Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain. (Italics emphasized,
1.1.442-55)

Tamora looks like a Machiavellian fox, while Saturninus acts like a lion.¹¹

According to Machiavelli's maxims, Saturninus is a "stupid" prince, who, trapped in a cunning deceit and controlled by Tamora the fox, doesn't understand the status quo of degenerate Rome even at the time of his death.

Tamora the fox is planning to destroy the "cruel," "traitorous" Andronici in revenge for the barbarous Roman ritual, and to "make them know what 'tis to let a queen / Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain" (1.1.455).

It is ironical that when the sketch of the revenge comes to reality, first of all, we see Lavinia begging for mercy—"something pitiful" (2.3.156), which is paralleled with Tamora's previous hopeless supplication. Tamora reminds her sons of the merciless Andronici, for the purpose of justifying the revenge, by saying:

¹¹ Cf. *The Prince*, Ch. 18.

Hadst thou in person ne'er offended me,
Even for his sake am I pitiless.
Remember, boys, I pour'd forth *tears in vain*,
To save your brother from the sacrifice;
But fierce Andronicus would not relent; (2.3.161-165)

And further, Tamora swears to herself to seek her revenge on the Andronici "till all the Andronici be made away" (189). The revenge by Tamora, who lost her "eldest son" Alarbus without cause but "valiant doings in their country's cause" (1.1.113), goes through the rape and mutilations of Lavinia, up to the amputation of Titus' hand, the capital execution of two sons, and the banishment of Lucius.

In turn, the revenge by Titus is supposed to follow the revenge by Tamora.

Titus swears unto his "soul" to seek his revenge on Tamora's party.

Till all these mischiefs be return'd again
Even in their throats that have committed them.
Come, let me see what task I have to do.
You heavy people, circle me about,
That I may turn me to each one of you,
And *swear unto my soul to right your wrongs*.
The vow is made. (*Italics emphasized*, 3.1.273-79)

As a result of it, Titus kills Tamora's two sons, and makes "two pasties (5.2.190)" of them to be swallowed by Tamora—"that strumpet, unhallowed dam" (191).

The deadly rites performed by Titus continue on the cannibal banquet, where he first kills Lavinia his own daughter—"Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee / And, with thy shame, thy father's sorrow die!" (5.3.46-47). Titus reveals the

truth—"twas Chiron and Demetrius: / They ravish'd her, and cut away her tongue /...did her all this wrong" (5.3.56-58). Immediately, when the Emperor orders the ravishers to be fetched, Titus tells them the truth of the cannibal banquet.

Why, there they are both, *baked in that pie;*
Whereof *their mother daintily hath fed,*
Eating the flesh that she herself hath bred. (Italics emphasized,
5.3.60-63)

Then, Titus kills Tamora, Saturninus kills Titus, and Lucius kills Saturninus in a row. Interestingly enough, Lucius plays a role of the magistrate—"there's meed for meed, death for a deadly deed" (67), which predicts the restoration of Roman justice and order by Lucius. However, we remember that Lucius himself was one of the performers of the "barbarous" Roman ritual which was the cause of the Andronici tragedy. Now, as a deputy of Dike, Lucius the new Emperor punishes Aaron the black Moor—"Set him breast-deep in earth, and famish him" (179), and judges Tamora "the heinous tiger" (195)—"throw her forth to beasts and birds of prey" (198), while his sister Lavinia and his father Titus are enshrined in their "household's monument" (194). This dipolar judgement seems unfair, since only the foreign other's revenge on the "barbarous" Rome looks intolerable,

although all the performers of the lethal rites including the Andronici are the instruments of the deadly gods of revenge.

What is most remarkable is that Aaron the black Moor is the “chief architect and plotter of these woes” (5.3.122). Aaron confesses, “indeed, I was their *tutor* to instruct them [Tamora’s sons]... / That bloody mind, I think, they learn’d of me” (5.1.98-101). He is “the manipulator of the evil action, the specific author of Titus’ misfortunes.”¹²

Vengeance is in my heart, *death in my hand,*
Blood and revenge are hammering in my head. (Italics emphasized,
2.3.39-38)

Also he is the incarnate Death—“death in my hand”—plotting to drive all the Andronici and their followers to fatal ends, like an “adder” which is ready “to do some fatal execution” (2.3.35-36). And further, he is despised in various ways—the “incarnate devil” (5.1.40), “coal black Moor” (3.2.78), “fiend-like” (4.4.45), “inhuman dog! unhallow’d slave!” (5.3.14), “irreligious Moor” (121), and “misbelieving Moor” (143). It is remarkable that, similar to Othello, Aaron the other is created by the Elizabethan imagination with reference to the Moor. D’amico argues that “for those in Shakespeare’s audience who might have

¹² Irving Ribner, *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare* (Princeton: PUP, 1957), p.18.

identified Aaron with Islam, he and his child could represent a culture that had developed its own unique forms and that certainly challenged the West through its military *virtù*.”¹³ In colonial imagination, the imagery of the foreign other overlaps with the imagery of death, which is based on the unconscious within us arising from desire and anxiety. Accordingly, as shown in the previous chapter, European attitudes toward Islam equate non-Europeans with devils, by coloring them in black, whether their complexion is in fact white or not.¹⁴ It is no doubt that the audience never fails to associate the black Moor with Death, when Shakespeare makes Aaron confess the whole truth of his evil-doings. He was the plotter, teacher, and performer of the whole evil-doings against the Andronici. Above all, Aaron was enjoying the lethal rites—“laught’ d so heartily,” beholding the victim’s tears.

When, for his hand, he had his two sons' heads;
Beheld his tears, and laugh'd so heartily,
That both mine eyes were rainy like to his:
And when I told the empress of *this sport,*
She swooned almost at *my pleasing tale,*
And for my tidings gave me twenty kisses. (Italics emphasized,
5.1.115-121)

¹³ D’amico, p. 147.

¹⁴ cf. Anthony Barthelemy, *Black Face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1987), p. 8-11

And further, replying to Lucius's question—"Art thou not sorry for these heinous deeds?" Aaron says, "Ay, that I had not done a thousand more. /.../ And nothing grieves me heartily indeed / But that I cannot do ten thousand more" (5.1.123-144). With volition, he identifies himself with Death, who destroys whatever he touches.

Remarkably enough, Aaron the Moor never begs for forgiveness; instead, he shouts at the Elizabethans.

O, why should wrath be mute, and fury dumb?
I am no baby, I, that with base prayers
I should repent the evils I have done: (Italics emphasized, 5.3.184-86)

The "wrath" and "fury" may arise from the prejudice against blackness, which implies that Shakespeare on the other hand is aware of the voices of demystification of the other. The other's voice is no longer "mute," or "dumb." As the other of Europeans, the black Moor sarcastically argues that "coal-black is better than another hue" (4.2.99).

As for Aaron's little baby, a new-born Moor, the nurse calls it "a devil" (64), "a toad."

A joyless, dismal, *black*, and sorrowful issue:
Here is the babe, as loathsome as *a toad* (66-67)

It is interesting that the sinful relationship between Tamora and Aaron is revealed through the black skin of the baby. Tamora's confederates are afraid of the baby because its blackness, not the baby itself, betrays their sin.¹⁵ The black baby alive, an allegory of European anxiety of the other, still creeps into the psychology of the Renaissance Elizabethans.

As far as we know, Aaron's child is not destroyed. And we do not know whether he might receive the kind of training his father imagines; it is in the play as a potential that grows quite literally out of the very center of darkness and destruction.¹⁶

The imagery of "darkness and destruction" plays also an important role in Seneca's *Medea*, where Medea the Colchian witch appears as an allegory of Death preparing for the finale of lethal rites. In the play, again, we may observe the fact that the imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of Death. Medea is one of the prototypes of the seductive Eastern woman, similar to Dido or Cleopatra, who is an ambivalent character. She is an erotic victim and a scheming witch at the same time.¹⁷ The Western imagination of the Oriental woman, more or less, fluctuates between desire and anxiety. Medea is the desirable, but fearful other. She is a chanting-spell sorceress and an incarnate

¹⁵ Barthelemy, p. 94.

¹⁶ D'amico, p.146.

¹⁷ Kabbani, p. 26

Death. She invokes the deadly gods, making preparations for the lethal rites—the sacrifice of Jason’s two sons.

Comprecor vulgus silentum vosque ferales deos
et Chaos caecum atque opacam Ditis umbrosi domum,
Tartari ripis ligatos squalidae Mortis specus. (740-43)
(I supplicate the silent throng, and you, the gods
Of death’s sad rites, and groping chaos, and the home
Of Gloomy Pluto, and the black abyss of death
Girt by the banks of Tartarus!)

A series of lethal phrases—“vulgus silentum (silent swarm),” “ferales deos (funeral gods),” “Chaos caecum (blind Chaos),” “Ditis domum (Pluto’s home),” and “Mortis specus (Death’s abyss)” —are all associated with the imagery of Medea as Death. Then, after invocations, she first offers up bloody libation to the gods of death, by gashing her arm and letting the blood flow on the altar at which she is praying.

tibi nudato
pectore maenas sacro feriam
bracchia cultro. manet noster
sanguis ad aras:
...
... sacrum laticem
percussa dedi. (806-11)
(Calling on thy name, with gleaming shoulders bared,
Like Bacchus’ mad adorers, will I lash my arms
With sacrificial knife. Now let my lifeblood flow!
...
... self-stricken I poured the sacrifice!)

Like a priestess of Bacchus (“Maenas”), with shoulders bared, Medea, self-stricken (“percussa”), offered sacred liquid to the gods of death. Medea the mad Bacchante is a parody of the mother of Greek king Pentheus. In Euripides’ *Βάκχαι*, Pentheus—an allegory of Greek reason superior to Oriental unreason—falls a victim to the Maenads composed of *his mother* and Greek women.¹⁸ Consequently, reason—the basis of Greek superiority—is demolished by the mad women. In relation to the Orientalist discourse of madness, Said says, “there is the motif of the Orient as insinuating danger. Rationality is undermined by Eastern excesses, those mysteriously attractive opposites to what seem to be normal values.”¹⁹ Seneca may take advantage of the Pentheus story, by drawing a parallel between Medea and Pentheus’ mother in relation to madness and destruction. Forebodingly, we see a vision of the sacrificial ritual of Medea’s two sons. In addition, Medea’s madness in Bacchic fury is associated with her witchcraft followed by fatality. From the beginning of the play, she appears as a priestess of the gods.

¹⁸ “*His [Pentheus’] mother, picking up his head, / impaled it on her wand. She seems to think it is / some mountain lion’s head which she carries in triumph* (κρατα δ’ ἄθλιον, / ὅπερ λαβοῦσα τυγχάνει μήτηρ χερσῶν, / πήξασ’ ἐπ’ ἄκρον θύρσον ὡς ὄρεστέρου / φέρεϊ λέοντος” (1139-42).

¹⁹ Said, *Orientalism*, p.57.

quosque Medeae magis
fas est precari: noctis aeternae chaos,
aversa superis regna manesque impios
dominumque regni tristis et dominam fide
meliore raptam, voce non fausta precor.

...

effera ignota horrida,
tremenda caelo pariter ac terris mala
mens intus agitat: vulnera et caedem et vagum
funus per artus (8-48)

(Ye

Whose aid Medea may more boldly claim, thou world
Of endless night, th' antipodes of heavenly realms,
Ye damned ghosts, thou lord of hades' dark domain,

...

Before ye all this baleful prayer I bring:

...

Now with mad, unheard of, dreadful deeds,
Whereat high heaven and earth below shall pale and quake,
My pregnant soul is teeming; and my heart is full
Of pictured wounds and death and slaughter.)

With the aid of the deadly gods, and through her witchcraft, Medea girds herself to avenge Jason's betrayal. The whole imagery—"Chaos," "aversa regna (Hades)," "manes impios (impious ghosts)," "dominum regni tristis (king of Hades)," "dominam (queen of Hades)"—is linked with that in lines 740-43, in relation to death and destruction. Most of the imagery serves as a utility for divulging Medea's witchcraft followed by fatality—"vulnera et caedem et vagum

funus (wounds, massacre, and wandering funeral).” Seneca continuously focuses on Medea’s fatal witchcraft.

Quodcumque gramen flore mortifero uiret,
Dirusue tortis sucus in radicibus
Causas nocendi gignit, attrectat manu.

...

mortifera carpit gramina ac serpentium
saniem exprimit miscetque et obscenas aues
maestique cor bubonic et raucae strigis
exsecta uiuae uiscera. Haec scelerum artifex
discreta point: (717-35)

(Whatever flow’ring plant conceals
destructions in its bloom, or in its twisted roots
distills the *juice of death*, she gathers to her use.

...

These deadly, potent herbs she takes and sprinkles o’er
with *serpent venom*, mixing all; and in the broth
she mingles unclean birds: a wailing screech owl’s heart,
a ghastly *vampire’s vitals* torn from living flesh.
Her *magic poisons* all she ranges for her use.)

Similar to Shakespeare’s witches in *Macbeth*, Medea the witch prepares for the deadly rites with the aid of her witchcraft depending on deadly gods. The whole imagery—“flore mortifero (fatal flower),” “dirus sucus causas nocendi (dreadful juice causing death),” “serpentium saniem (serpents’s venom),” “scelerum artifex (evils’ artist)” —works for the characterization of Medea’s witchcraft and destructiveness.

It is interesting that until Jason and Medea fled to Corinth and Jason became betrothed to Creon's daughter, Medea was a faithful wife to Jason. Medea complains of Jason's betrayal against her faithful service and repents of her dedicated crimes as well.

hoc facere Iason potuit, erepto patre
patria atque regno sedibus solam exteris
deserere durus? merita contempsit mea
qui scelere flammam viderat vinci et mare?
adeone credit omne consumptum nefas?

...

scelera te hortentur tua
et cuncta redeant: inclitum regni decus
raptum et nefandae virginis parvus comes
divisus ense, funus ingestum patri
sparsumque ponto corpus et Peliae senis
decocta aeno membra: (118-34)

(Bereft of native land,

And home, and kingdom, could he [Jason] leave me alone
On foreign shores? Oh, cruel, could he quite reject
My sum of service, he who saw the fire and sea
With crime overcome for his dear sake?

...

Now lash thy [Medea's] soul
With memory's scourge, and call thy dark deeds in review:
The glory of thy father's kingdom reft away;
Thy brother, guiltless comrade of thy guilt flight,
All hewn in pieces and his corpse strewn on the deep,
To break his royal father's heart; and, last of crimes,
Old Pelias by his daughters slain at thy command.)

To help Jason, Medea went so far as to betray her own father Aeetes and to contrive her brother Apsyrtus's murder. Medea looks like Pocahontas the Indian princess who converted to Christianity and became a faithful helper of European colonialists.²⁰ Without Medea's timely help, Medea explains to Creon, "then had the mighty [Greek] chieftains fall'n, and in their fate / All Greece had been o'erwhelmed; then this, thy son-in-law [Jason], / Had felt the bull's [Medea's brother's] consuming breath, and perished there (tota cum ducibus ruet / Pelasga tellus, hic tuus primum gener / tauri ferocis ore flammanti occident, 239-41)." Also, Medea's exclamation reminds us of Calibans' shout at Prospero—"then I loved thee / And show'd thee all the qualities o' the isle, / The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile: / Cursed be I did so.../ and here you sty me / In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me / The rest o' the island" (*The Tempest*, 1.2.336-44). Despite her serviceable sacrifice, Medea is now alone, nothing is left for her. Medea desperately cries out to Jason, "restore me what I lost for thee (redde supplici felix vicem, 482)."

penatibus profugere quam cogis tuis.
 at quo remittis? Phasin et Colchos petam
 patriumque regnum quaeque fraternus cruor

²⁰ cf. Kabbani, p. 5 and p.16. In the Medieval romance of *The Sowdone of Babylone*, a Saracen princess betrayed her father king and helped a Christian cavalier.

perfudit arva? quas peti terras iubes? (450-53)
(Whither dost thou send me whom thou driv'st
From out thy home? Shall I the Colchians seek again,
My royal father's realm, whose soil is steeped in blood
My brother shed? What country dost thou bid me seek?)

It is remarkable that, similar to Prospero, Jason appears as a prototype of Western imperialists. The Argonauts came to the East, plundering and conquering it. Consequently, the Golden Fleece and Medea are part of the booty, which symbolize Oriental wealth and eroticism respectively.

quod fuit huius
pretium cursus? aurea pellis
maiusque mari Medea malum,
merces prima digna carina.
...
quaelibet altum cumba pererrat;
terminus omnis motus et urbes
muros terra posuere nova,
nil qua fuerat sede reliquit
pervius orbis:
Indus gelidum potat Araxen,
Albin Persae Rhenumque bibunt
(Of this wild adventure what the prize,
That lured the daring bark with heroes laden?
The fleece of gold, and this mad Colchian maiden,
Well fit to be the first ship's merchandise.
...
Now, every bound removed, new cities rise
In lands remote, their ancient walls removing;
While men of Ind by Caspian shores are roving,
And Persia's face now greets the western skies.)

Under the hegemony of Hellenistic imperialism, the world is united, with Indus (Indian or Ethiopian)²¹ drinking Araxen (an Armenian river), and with Persians living on the rivers Elbe and Rhine. Accordingly, while Medea was faithful to Greek society, she was an acceptable stranger. However, as the sense of deprivation and betrayal drives her to seek her revenge on Jason and his party, she is immediately transformed into “the heinous Colchian (nefanda Colchis, 871).”

Now, whatever she touches ends in death. Through her magic poisons, which were brought to Creusa and Creon by Medea’s sons, “all is lost! the kingdom totters from its base! / The daughter and the father lie in common dust! (periere cuncta, concidit regni status; / nata atque genitor cinere permixto iacent, 879-880).” Her fatal desire, which is unquenchable, advances on Jason’s two sons (now, Medea thinks, no longer her own sons). However, there happens a moment of hesitation—“Let them die; / They are not mine. Nay, nay! They are my own, my sons / And with no spot of guilt (occidant, non sunt mei; /pereant, mei sunt. crimine et culpa carent, /sunt innocents, 934-36).” But, recalling her

²¹ Cf. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity*, p.11. In ancient times, «Indus» at times means Indian or African.

infant brother helplessly slain, immediately she declares that the two are not hers. “My children must be torn away with tears and cries. / Then let them die *to Jason* since they’re lost to me (iam iam meo rapiuntur avulsi e sinu, / flentes, gementes osculis - pereant patri, / periere matri, 949-951).” Furthermore, for the sake of her revenge’s wild joy, she wishes, “I would that I had borne twice seven sons (bisque septenos parens / natos tulissem!, 955-56).” Interestingly enough, Medea’s wish is very similar to Aaron’s in *Titus Andronicus*—“nothing grieves me heartily indeed / But that I cannot do ten thousand more” (143-144). Medea as Death, like Aaron, enjoys killing her enemies. After slaying the first son, she carries the second unto the palace roof to be seen to the public, especially Jason—the boy’s father. Before the last procedure of the ritual, she says to herself, “enjoy a slow revenge, / This day is in thy hands; its fertile hours employ (perfruere lento scelere, ne propera, dolor: / meus dies est; tempore accepto utimur, 1016-17).” Then, the fear of the mad Colchian as Death culminates.

Similar to Aaron, Medea appears as Death carrying such imagery as scourge, pestilence, devil, and witch. It is remarkable that Medea is an allegory of Hellenistic fears of the foreign other overlapping with the psychology of death. Also, Medea is a production of the dialectic of desire and anxiety in relation to

Oriental eroticism. Therefore, she is an ambivalent other—a desirable body and a witch as well. Furthermore, Like Cleopatra, Medea is a colonized other in two ways—racially and sexually. Medea is a foreign other, and the other of the Hellenistic patriarchy as well. She is a challenger against the patriarchal authority of Jason and the Hellenistic hegemony. According to Loomba's terminology, she is the "composite deviant."²²

²² Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. p.79

Chapter 4

The Tempest and *Ἐλένη*

—The Anxiety of Disorder: ‘This Thing of Darkness’

In *The Tempest*, Caliban is shown as both a violator of “the honor” of Miranda—“a cherubin” (1.2.152)—and resistant to Prospero’s “providence divine” (1.2.159). In addition, he is linked with social deviants or delinquents like Trinculo and Stephano. Caliban’s party including Trinculo and Stephano is an allegory of disorder and violence. They are the threatening other associated with subversion. We, again, need to recall Said’s argument that the imagination of the colonial other overlaps with the imagination of social deviants in Western society.¹ What is important in the play is that the colonial imagination creates the relationships of the tension between subversion and containment based on power relations. Besides, to justify their consolidation of colonial government, the colonialists always focus on the disorder and violence of the subversive other. The production of disorder in colonial imagination is the very precondition of colonial government over the other. Where there is disorder, there is power.

¹ Said, *Orientalism*, p.207

In relation to disorder in *The Tempest*, Paul Brown states, “Stephano the ‘drunken butler’ and the ‘jester’ Trinculo obviously represent such masterless men, whose alliance with the savage Caliban provides an antitype of order, issuing in a revolt requiring chastisement and ridicule.”² Those disordered others play a role of a counter-order, subversion, whereas Prospero as a consolidator of the dominant order is supposed to rule over and punish the subversive other. It is noteworthy that Prospero requires disorder as a precondition of power. And further, the human subject itself seems “the ideological product of the relations of power in a particular society,” and “unfree.”³ Foucault accounts for these relations of power based on a power/knowledge scheme. Power, according to him, is “a complex strategical situation in a particular society.”⁴ Power is productive—power produces knowledge; knowledge produces power. Knowledge production is the process of a discursive practice.⁵ This power/knowledge scheme also reminds us of Greenblatt’s argument—“a poetics of Elizabethan power...will prove inseparable,

² Jonathan Dollimore, and Alan Sinfield, eds. *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1985), p. 53.

³ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 256.

⁴ Foucault, *History of Sexuality I*, p. 93.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 93-95.

in crucial respects, from a poetics of the theatre.” With reference to the power/knowledge scheme, Foucault states, “where there is power, there is resistance.” Remarkably, this resistance is always ‘inside’ power, not exterior in relation to power.⁶ What is most important is that “the dominant order not only *containing* it [subversiveness] but, paradoxical as it may seem, actually *producing* it for its own ends.”⁷ The production of disorder and subversion is the very precondition of power.⁸

More fundamentally, disorder is the uncanny other within, as Kristeva argues. Also the imagination of the subversive other overlaps with the anxiety of disorder. The uncanny other of disorder is a stranger creeping into the psychology of the Renaissance Englishmen facing “cultural anxiety”⁹ in the New World. The anxiety of disorder in the play always tries to link Caliban’s resistance against Prospero with violation.

As for Caliban, above all, ‘deformity’ and ‘strangeness’ serve as the pretexts for containment concerning disorder. Such imagery of ‘deformity’ is immediately

⁶ Ibid., p. 95.

⁷ *Political Shakespeare*, p. 11.

⁸ Ibid., p. 45.

⁹ MacDonald, p. 166

connected with 'monster,' 'fish,'¹⁰ and 'devil.' Also, it is associated with the racial inferiority and the lack of self-determination, which gives rise to the colonial imagination justifying colonial government. The deformity/inferiority equation is the very beginning of the Plinian $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, which occupies an important part of the core of the Africanist-Orientalist discourse in the play. Gonzalo the nobleman recalls the $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ as follows:

Faith, sir, you need not fear. When we were boys,
Who would believe that there were mountaineers
Dew-lapp'd like bulls, whose throats had hanging at 'em
Wallets of flesh? or that there were such men
Whose *heads stood in their breasts?* which now we find
Each putter-out of five for one will bring us
Good warrant of. (Italics emphasized, 3.3.43-49)

The traditional $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of the other is now reproduced through Caliban—a deformed “monster” (2.2.30), “a strange fish” (27), a “devil” (4.1.188), a “hag-seed” (1.2.365), and “a freckled whelp hag-born” (283). It is important that the imagination of deformity and strangeness is linked with the discourse of disorder featured by violation and inferiority—“He is disproportioned in his manners / As in his shape” (5.1.291-92). Caliban is at once related to an “abhorred

¹⁰ Leslie Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (NY: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 234. According to Fiedler, fish is metaphorically similar to monster. Also MacDonald asserts that fish is a metaphor of femininity and impotence (*Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*, p. 113).

slave" (1.2.351), a "poisonous slave" (319), and "a villain" (309). He is a disordered other and a dangerous violator as well, who is to be subjugated to the 'just' hands of Prospero—the 'divine' ruler.

Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other:
...
But thy vile race,
Though thou didst learn, had that in 't which good natures
Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
Deservedly confined into this rock,
Who hadst deserved more than a prison. (1.2.351-62)

Prospero argues that Caliban deserves prison, because he is of a "vile race," and so ungrateful as to betray his gracious teaching and discipline. Prospero the conqueror continues to threaten, saying—"If thou neglect'st or dost unwillingly / What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps, / Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar / That beasts shall tremble at thy din" (368-71). Caliban, the disordered other lacking self-determination, may be related to the Caribbean West Indies of the New World, who need the discipline of European civilization.¹¹ Like the Caribbean West Indies, Caliban is the "thing of darkness"

¹¹ Fiedler, p. 233. Caliban and cannibal have the same etymological root—canib (carib).

(5.1.275), a “demi-devil” (272), which represents disorder and violence. Caliban is the uncanny other, arising from the anxiety of disorder, creeping into the psychology of the Renaissance Europeans.

It is notable that the subversive resistance is instigated by the conqueror. Before the colonial government of Prospero, the island belonged to Caliban, as Caliban argues—“This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou takest from me.../ I am all the subjects that you have, / Which first was mine own king” (1.2.331-42). Caliban, deprived of his property, complains:

I am subject to a tyrant,
A sorcerer, that by his cunning hath
cheated me of the island. (3.2.49-51)

For Caliban, who at first, loved Prospero and “show’d ... all the qualities o’ the isle” (1.2.337), Prospero is “a tyrant,” who cheated him of the island. If only symbolically, Prospero desexes Caliban—the incarnation of “unbridled lust”¹²—in order to keep “the honour” of his daughter. Caliban resists,

O ho, O ho! Would 't had been done!
Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else
This isle with Calibans. (1.2.349-51)

It is interesting that the castration represents a symptom of “cultural anxiety,” as is the case with *Titus Andronicus*. Both plays are examples of how in Renaissance

¹² Fiedler, p. 234.

England there was much anxiety caused by the cultural mixture of New World barbarity and European civilization. In relation to the anxiety, Ania Loomba argues that “the mating of white women with black men was regarded as fatal.”¹³ And further, the cultural anxiety arises from the anxiety of disorder, and Caliban is the psychoanalytical other of disorder. Here the imagination of the colonial other overlaps with the imagination of disorder.

Now, the colonial deprivation and castration are leading to resistance and subversion. In conspiracy with Trinculo and Stephano, Caliban plots to “revenge it on” Prospero, who got the isle from him “by sorcery.”

'tis a custom with him,
I' th' afternoon to sleep: there thou mayst brain him,
Having first seized his books, or with a log
Batter his skull, or paunch him with a stake,
Or cut his wezand with thy knife. Remember
First to possess his books; for without them
He's but a sot, as I am, nor hath not
One spirit to command: (3.2.98-105)

The whole imagery arising from those cruel expressions—“brain him,” “batter his skull,” “cut his wezand [windpipe],” and “knife”—is related to no other than savage violation. It is important that the revenge, whether with fair cause or not, is rather ridiculed. First of all, Caliban’s conspirators are delinquents of the lower

¹³ Loomba, p. 51.

classes in Western society. Caliban the colonial other is coupled with the delinquents. Contrary to the righteousness of Prospero, Caliban is shown as one of the thoughtless populace following vicious rebels like Trinculo and Stephano.

These be fine things, an if they be not sprites.
That's a brave god and bears celestial liquor.
I will kneel to him [Stephano]. (2.2.125-27)

Drunken with the “celestial liquor,” ridiculously enough, Caliban vows to be a servant to the new master Stephano—“a brave god”—who is supposed to give him “freedom” from Prospero. Also Caliban volunteers to become a pimp, saying that “Ay, lord; she [Miranda] will become thy bed, I warrant. / And bring thee forth brave brood” (3.2.115-16). While Caliban is singing a song of freedom and Trinculo and Stephano are drinking to success, the subversive mood comes to culmination.

No more dams I'll make for fish
Nor fetch in firing
At requiring;
Nor scrape trencher, nor wash dish
'Ban, 'Ban, Cacaliban
Has a new master: get a new man.
Freedom, hey-day! hey-day, freedom! freedom,
hey-day, freedom! (2.2.184-91)

Again we need to recall that subversion is the precondition of colonial containment. The subversive conspiracy immediately drives the Renaissance

audience to anxiety, which is the basis of the production of power. It is remarkable that at the very moment of a subversive conspiracy, the State power works as a form of “knowledge” in the brain of Trinculo.

Servant-monster! the folly of this island! They say there's but five upon this isle: we are three of them; if th' other two be brained like us, *the state totters*. (Italics emphasized, 3.2.5-8)

When the subversive mood brings about anxiety, a poetics of the theatre immediately causes the subversive others to confess their own defects, and begins to justify the surveillance over the riot and the containment as well. Notably enough, a power/knowledge scheme of Renaissance England functions through the theatrical stage, not through an army-police force.¹⁴ Furthermore, the vision of a panopticon is completed in the stage. Ariel—an invisible agent of the “panopticon” and watchman—enters into espionage. Like “invisible bullets”—God’s providence, Ariel invisibly appears, saying that “I and my fellows are ministers of Fate” (3.3.60-61), which is in support of the divinity of Prospero.

In contrast to Prospero the ‘divine’ ruler, Caliban is so ungrateful as to curse his master, who taught him to speak language—his master’s language.

¹⁴ *Political Shakespeare*, p. 44

You taught me language; and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse. The red plague rid you
For learning me your language! (1.2.363-65)

By appropriating the very language taught by his colonial master, Caliban ironically begins to resist him, which implies the open possibility of subversion in a colonial discourse. Language is at once the indispensable instrument of colonial government and the resistant instrument of the colonial other. Caliban's resisting voice, making his master Prospero get angry and anxious, becomes a tool for challenge to his master's dominant discourse—mystification of authority and justification of it. The authority gives rise to the imagination of “a most majestic vision” and a vision of “Paradise”—“Harmonious charmingly.” The authority is a wonder land, where Ferdinand wishes to live forever.

FERD. This is a most majestic vision, and
Harmonious charmingly: May I be bold
To think these spirits?

PROS. Spirits, which by mine art
I have from their confines call'd to enact
My present fancies.

FERD. Let me live here ever:
So rare a wonder'd father and a wise,
Makes this place Paradise. (4.1.118-24)

Against the visionary authority—a colonialist's ‘fancy,’ Caliban resists. With the D-day of conspiracy by Caliban's party, the tension between the colonial conqueror and the colonial other comes to culmination with the betrothal

ceremony for Prospero's daughter and Ferdinand. Then, the anxiety of resistance drives Prospero to be so upset that he "starts suddenly, and speaks; after which, to a strange, hollow, and confused noise, they [Nymphs] heavily vanish."

Prospero cries out to himself.

[Aside] I had forgot that foul conspiracy
Of the beast Caliban and his confederates
Against my life: the minute of their plot
Is almost come. (4.1.139-42)

Caliban's revolt is a dangerous challenge to the colonial authority. Now, the dream of a wonder land disappears—"revels now are ended" (148)—and the colonial ruler's "old brain is troubled" (159). The uncanny other of disorder is creeping into the "old brain" of a colonialist, when the colonial imagination in the "old brain" looks faced with crisis.

Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. (Italics emphasized, 148-56)

However, immediately the crisis of colonial vision is passed, followed by the ridicule of the revolt and punishment, which is exercised under the name of discipline. For Caliban is “a devil,” “on whose nature / Nurture can never stick.”

A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains,
Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost;
And as with age his body uglier grows,
So his mind cankers. (188-92)

Consequently, Caliban’s party is driven out, hunted by the “divers Spirits, in the shape of dogs and hounds” (4.1.257). Driven in soon, Caliban in the “stolen apparel” is again ridiculed—“a plain fish, and, no doubt, marketable” (5.1.266). Here notably enough, the stolen apparel symbolizes the appropriated authority by the subversive, colonial other, which has challenged the colonial authority. Finally, Prospero the ruler-god declares Caliban to be a “thing of darkness” (275), an allegory of disorder.

It is interesting that the revolt by the lower classes—Caliban’s party—is severely treated; on the contrary, the transgression by the upper classes—Antonio’s party—is mildly reproached or easily forgiven. In other words, disorder in *The Tempest* is mainly focused on the symptoms of subversion of social hierarchy intrigued by the inferior other, hierarchy which is supposed to

be 'God-given.' In terms of hierarchy, superiority and inferiority, the imagination of the racial other overlaps with the imagination of the social other. Anyway, remarkably enough, the subversive challenge becomes a pretext for ruling power, the precondition of containment. Dollimore argues that "whatever subversive identity...is a construction put upon them by the authority which wants to control them."¹⁵ The subversive challenge tries to overthrow transcendental authority, but every time the challenge is contained and the subversive group is punished under the pretense of order. This is a colonial discourse happening on the Renaissance stage, which is completed through the spectators in the theatre. A theatre-state decks out the ruling authority through the imagination of the spectators.¹⁶ We may call this "appropriation." Therefore, Prospero's magic—a symbol of transcendental authority—is thrown away at the end of the play, but it is never given up. The magic is thrown into the mind of the spectators, and it is living there, forming a power/knowledge circuit. For Caliban is the uncanny other of disorder creeping, still alive, into the psychology of the Renaissance Englishmen.

¹⁵ *Political Shakespeare*, p. 73.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44

In Euripides' *Ελένη*, the Egyptian king Theoclymenus—a barbarian despot—serves as an allegory of disorder and violence. Like Caliban, he desires the virtuous body Helen, who is equivalent to Caliban's Miranda. Theoclymenus is a violator, a plunderer of Greek honor. In addition, like Xerxes in Aeschylus's *Περσάι*,¹⁷ he is a man of ὕβρις, which makes him an allegory of Oriental despotism. The lack of self-determination following disorder and ὕβρις is associated with the colonial imagination which justifies the belief that "Greeks are natural rulers of barbarians." As is the case in *The Tempest*, the imaginations of the foreign other and disorder overlap each other. Psychoanalytically, the anxiety of disorder is analogous to the anxiety of the foreign other. Disorder is the uncanny other in the form of the unconscious within ourselves. Like Caliban, Theoclymenus is the psychoanalytical other equivalent to disorder.

It is noteworthy that the play begins with an Oriental μῦθος, which is closely related to the European exoticism or wish-dreams. The Orient here is not of reality, but of fancy. The Orient in the play is filled with European imaginations—the Orient is orientalized, according to European desire.

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὅς ἀντι δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον

¹⁷ cf. Chapter I of this dissertation.

λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει γύας. (1-3)
(These are the waters of the Nile, stream of *sweet nymphs*.
The river, fed with melting of *pale snows*, and not
With rain, rises to flood the flats of Egypt.)

Regardless of the real geography, the Nile in European imaginations is “καλλιπάρθενοι (filled with sweet nymphs),” “λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος (fed by melting white snow).” As Marx wrote, the Orient “können sich nicht vertreten, sie müssen vertreten werden (cannot represent itself, but it must be represented).”¹⁸ Moreover, the Africanist-Orientalist discourse “resembles dream in Freud’s description. Both are made possible by a condition of blankness—of distance and ignorance, of sleep.”¹⁹ The Orient is a dream land where European wish-dream becomes a truth. According to the European imagination, the Orient is molded, “similar to soft wax, which can be made to take on any figure one wishes.”²⁰

Furthermore, it is essential that in the core of Africanist-Orientalist discourse does colonial imagination work: “The Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, ‘different’; thus the European is rational, virtuous, mature, ‘normal.’”²¹

¹⁸ cf. Said, *Orientalism*, p. 21.

¹⁹ Miller, p. 62.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

²¹ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 40.

The colonial imagination is linked with Western hegemony over the Orient. In the play *Ἑλένη*, Helen appears as a symbol of Greek virtue. On the contrary, Theoclymenus is the violator of it. The violence is immediately associated with the anxiety of disorder, which gives rise to the colonial imagination—the barbarian disorder is subject to the superior Greek order. In terms of colonial imagination, the inferiority of Theoclymenus means the lack of self-determination. The barbarian other is never suitable for the position of a ruler. Around at the end of the play, finally, Euripides drives Theoclymenus to confess: “Then I am no longer ruler, but am ruled (ἀρχόμεσθ’ ἄρ’, οὐ κρατοῦμεν, 1638).” This confession is replying to Helen’s declaration—“for god hates violence (μισεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὴν βίαν, 903).”

First of all, it is remarkable that Helen is a symbol of Greek honor, who is “uncontaminated (67)” and of all “beauty (304),” furthermore, “divine (1667).” She is to be untouchably far from the barbarian hands of Theoclymenus. She declares, “All my love is kept untouched for you [Menelaus] (ἄθικτον εὐνήν ἴσθι σοι σεσωμένην, 795).” For, according to Zeus’ will, Proteus—“most temperate of men”—“could guard the honor safe for Menelaus (πάντων

προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν, / ἀκέραιον ὡς σώσαιμι Μενέλεωι λέχος,

47-48).”

ἔως μὲν οὖν φῶς ἡλίου τόδ’ ἔβλεπεν
Πρωτεύς, ἄσυλος ἢ γάμων· ἐπεὶ δὲ γῆς
σκότῳ κέκρυπται, παῖς ὁ τοῦ τεθνηκότος
θηρᾶι γαμεῖν με. τὸν πάλαι δ’ ἐγὼ πόσιν
τιμῶσα Πρωτέως μνήμα προσπίτνω τόδε
ἰκέτις, ἴν’ ἀνδρὶ τὰμὰ διασώσῃ λέχη,
ὡς, εἰ καθ’ Ἑλλάδ’ ὄνομα δυσκλεῆς φέρω,
μή μοι τὸ σῶμά γ’ ἐνθάδ’ αἰσχύνῃν ὄφληι. (60-67)

(Here, while yet Proteus looked

Upon this sun we see, I was safe from marriage. Now

That he is dead and hidden in the dark, his son

Pursues me for my hand, but I, remembering

My first husband, cling a suppliant here upon

The grave of Proteus, for help to keep my love intact.

Thus, though I wear the name of guilt in Greece, yet here

I keep my body uncontaminated by disgrace.)

Similar to Darius the Great in Aeschylus’s *Περσῶν*, Proteus—the faithful guard of Greek honor—is an acceptable alien. On the contrary, his son Theoclymenus, who desires the Greek honor, is a ‘fatal’ aggressor. This kind of paradigm which contrasts a docile father to an aggressive son forms a model of colonial imagination in Hellenistic plays. Although, unlike Aeschylus’ Xerxes, Theoclymenus is mainly related to sexual desire, they have a lot in common as violators challenging Greek hegemony. First of all, Euripides puts emphasis on Theoclymenus’ violence by focusing continuously on Helen’s honor or purity. It

is interesting that Helen in fact is widely different from Helen in rumor—“You wear / the bodily shape of Helen, but you have a heart / that is not hers. Wide is the difference (Ἑλένηι δ’ ὅμοιον σῶμ’ ἔχουσ’ οὐ τὰς φρένας / ἔχεις ὁμοίας ἀλλὰ διαφόρους πολὺ, 160-61).” She argues that she was not subject to sexual desire but gods’ will—“It was the god who cast me away from my city, from you, / out of the land of my fathers.../ when I left my house, when I left my bed; but I left them not for any shameful love (ἐμὲ δὲ πατρίδος ἀπὸ .../ ἔβαλε θεὸς ἀπὸ πόλεος ἀπὸ τε σέθεν, / ὅτε μέλαθρα λέχεά τ’ ἔλιπον οὐ λιποῦς’ / ἐπ’ αἰσχροῖς γάμοις, 694-97).” Furthermore, she complains of her mistaken infamy, as follows:

πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ οὐς’ ἄδικός εἰμι δυσκλεής·
 καὶ τοῦτο μείζον τῆς ἀληθείας κακόν,
 ὅστις τὰ μὴ προσόντα κέκτηται κακά.
 ἔπειτα πατρίδος θεοί μ’ ἀφιδρύσαντο γῆς
 ἐς βάρβαρ’ ἦθη, (270-74)
 (I have done nothing wrong and yet my reputation
 Is bad, and worse than a true evil is it to bear
 The burden of faults that are not truly yours. Again,
 The gods have torn me from my father’s land and made
 Me live among barbarians.)

Then, Theoclymenus is represented as a violator of the pure Greek honor.

Again we need to recall this: “the mating of white women with black men was

regarded as fatal.”²² It is important that the unusual emphasis of Helen’s purity and honor is closely linked with the anxiety of disorder. For the imagination of disorder and violence is associated with the imagination of the colonial other, since a stranger is an allegory of disorder. Accordingly, the psychological anxiety drives Euripides to defend Greek honor from the disordered other. The emphasis on Greek honor is the defensive reaction to the barbarian disorder. Consequently, the more emphasis Euripides puts on Greek honor, the more anxiety of disorder the play shows.

In parallel with the unusual emphasis of Helen’s honor, great emphasis is put on Theoclymenus’ ὕβρις, which brings about the colonial imagination such as Oriental despotism, extravagance, femininity, etc. First of all, Theoclymenus is unwilling to obey the gods’ providence—he desires Helen’s ‘divine’ honor. As a result of his disobedience, he is betrayed by his own sister Theonoe—a prophetess, under the name of divine justice. Helen persuaded Theonoe to follow “the divine power,” as follows:

Ἐρμῆς ἔδωκε πατρὶ σῶι σώζειν πόσει
τῶιδ’ ὅς πάρεστι κάπολάζυσθαι θέλει.
πῶς οὖν θανῶν ἄν ἀπολάβοι; κείνος δὲ πῶς
τὰ ζῶντα τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἀποδοίη ποτ’ ἄν;

²² Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*, p. 51.

ἤδη τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς σκόπει
 πότερον ὁ δαίμων χῶ θανῶν τὰ τῶν πέλας
 βούλονται ἄν ἢ οὐ βούλονται ἄν ἀποδοῦναι πάλιν;
 δοκῶ μὲν. οὐκ οὖν χρή σε συγγόνῳ πλέον
 νέμειν ματαίῳ μᾶλλον ἢ χρηστῷ πατρί. (909-18)
 (That Hermes gave me to your father to keep safe
 For my husband, who is here and who would have me back.
 How can he take me back when he is dead? And how
 Could your father duly give the living to the dead?
 Consider now your father's case, *the case of God*.
 Would *the divine power*, and would the dead man, wish to see
 What belongs to another given back, or would they not?
 I think they would. You must not give a greater weight
 To a wild brother than to an honorable father.)

Under Zeus's will, Hermes brought Helen to Proteus—Theonoe's father—to save her for Menelaus. So, Helen suggests that Theonoe be subject to "divine power (τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ)," according to the case of her own father. Theonoe obeys the divinity, calling it justice—"My nature is to deal fairly; so is my wish (ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν καὶ βούλομαι, 998)." For Theonoe "was born (πέφυκά) to live piously and religiously (εὐσεβεῖν)." Contrasting divine justice to Theoclymenus' ὕβρις, Theonoe finally makes up her mind—"I shall / be quiet about your supplication, and shall not / let my good counsels help my brother toward his lust (σιγήσομαι / ἅ μου καθικετεύσατ' οὐδὲ μωρίαί / ξύμβουλος ἔσομαι τῆι κασιγνήτου ποτέ, 1017-19)." Also, Chorus makes it sure that Theonoe does justice to her brother.

οὐδείς ποτ' ἠτύδχησεν ἔκδικος γεγώς,
ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ δ' ἐλπίδες σωτηρίας. (1030-31)

The unrighteous are never really fortunate.

Our hopes for safety depend upon our *doing right*.

Theoclymenus, who is obsessed with ὕβρις and “unjust (ἔκδικος),” has no hopes for salvation, since salvation consists “in the just (ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ).” Moreover, by “the fate (τὸ χρεῶν, 1636)” or divine justice, Helen goes back to Greece with her husband, which makes Theoclymenus’ pursuit of the runaways unreasonable. So, the vengeance on her sister Theonoe who helped the runaways makes no sense, for “it was just betrayal—what she did was ‘right’ (καλήν γε προδοσίαν, δίκαια δρᾶν, 1634).” Finally, Castor, one of the Dioscuri—sons of Zeus—makes a declaration concerning Helen’s divinity and Theonoe’s righteousness, which is in contrast to Theoclymenus’ ὕβρις as a violator of divine justice.

ς' ἀδελφή Θεονόη, τὰ τῶν θεῶν
τιμῶσα πατρός τ' ἐνδίκους ἐπιστολάς.

...

θεὸς κεκλήσῃ καὶ Διοσκόρων μέτα
σπονδῶν μεθέξεις ξενία τ' ἀνθρώπων πάρα
ἔξεις μεθ' ἡμῶν· Ζεὺς γὰρ ὧδε βούλεται. (1648-69)

(Theonoe your sister, but she kept

The righteous orders of my father [Zeus] and the gods.

...

[Helen] you shall be called, with the two sons of Zeus, *divine*,
have your libations, and with us be entertained
as honored guests by mortals. *Zeus has willed it so.*)

Besides, Theoclymenus is a cruel Oriental despot, which is also associated with the lack of self-determination of the Orient. Despotism is a traditional way of representation of the Orient in relation to violence. And it is an aspect of Oriental disorder. In the play, Helen argues that “all Barbary is slave except a single man (τὰ βαρβάρων γὰρ δοῦλα πάντα πλὴν ενός, 276).” The argument is not so far from the representation of Theoclymenus’ ὕβρις. The cruel despot enjoys ‘killing,’ and ‘slaughtering.’ He is brutally hostile to strangers, especially Greeks. Helen tells Teucer of Theoclymenus’ cruelty as follows.

σὺ δ’ ἐκλιπῶν
 γῆν τήνδε γεῦγε, πρίν σε παῖδα Πρωτέως
 ἰδεῖν, ὃς ἄρχει τῆσδε γῆς· ἄπεστι δὲ
 κυσὶν πεποιθῶς ἐν φοναῖς θηροκτόνοις·
 κτείνει γὰρ Ἕλληνας ὅντιν’ ἂν λάβῃ ξένον.
 ὅτου δ’ ἕκατι μήτε σὺ ζήτει μαθεῖν (151-56)
 (you must leave
 this country and escape before you have been seen
 by the son of Proteus, ruler of this land. He now
 Has gone with hounds, hopeful of killing beasts of chase.
 He slaughters every Greek he lays his hands upon,
 But why he does this, you must not try to find out,)

His cruelty is not to be questioned; he seems a natural tyrant. Similar representation of Theoclymenus’ cruelty appears in the conversation between Portress and Menelaus. Portress says, “if my master catches / you, all the hospitality you will find is death (ἦν δὲ δεσπότης / λάβῃ σε, θάνατος ξένιά σοι

γενήσεται, 479-80).” It is horrible to hear that death is “ξένιά” (the friendly gifts for guests). In the Hellenistic world, the most terrible crime was thought to be the murder of guests. Accordingly, Theoclymenus is immediately linked with the most terrible criminal. The Portress adds, “I myself like the Greeks, in spite of those harsh words / I gave you. I was afraid of what the master might do (εὔνους γὰρ εἶμ’ Ἑλλησιν, οὐχ ὅσον πικρούς / λόγους ἔδωκα δεσπότην φοβουμένη, 481-82).” The last statement by the Portress recalls Helen’s: “all Barbary is slave except a single man.” Furthermore, the Egyptian despotism is in contrast to the Greek voluntarism. Menelaus is very proud of the Greek volunteers for the Trojan War.

στράτευμα κώπηι διορίσαι Τροίαν ἔπι,
τύραννος οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν στρατηλατῶν,
ἔκουσι δ’ ἄρξας Ἑλλάδος νεανίας. (394-96)
(We marshaled the greatest of armadas against Troy
Although we led them not *as tyrants, not by force,*
But the young men of Greece *willingly* served with us.)

The Greek soldiers are composed of “the willing youth (ἔκουσι νεανίας)”; they are not led by a tyrant “with force (πρὸς βίαν).” The Greek voluntarism in the play is meant to put emphasis on the Egyptian lack of self-determination, which gives birth to the colonial imagination that “Greeks are natural rulers over barbarians.”

Furthermore, Theoclymenus is extravagant, which is juxtaposed with Egyptian femininity. The extravagance is also associated with the Oriental despotic ὕβρις. In relation to Oriental extravagance associated with femininity, we need to recall the declaration in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.

Καὶ τᾶλλα μὴ γυναικὸς ἐν τρόποις ἐμὲ
ἄβρυνε, μηδὲ βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην
χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοί
μηδ' εἴμασι στρώσας' ἐπίφθονον πόρον
τίθει· θεοῦς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεῶν· (918-22)
(And all this—do not try in *woman's ways* to make
me delicate, nor, as if I were some *Asiatic*
bow down to earth and with wide mouth cry out to me,
nor cross my path with jealousy by *strewing the ground*
with robes. Such state becomes the gods, and none beside.)

The “woman’s ways (γυναικὸς τρόποις)” of barbarian Egypt is allegorized through the Portress. She is conspicuously paralleled with the rich extravagant palace. The Portress and the extravagant palace symbolize the femininity of the Egyptian king Theoclymenus, which is contrasted to the Greek masculinity. As is the case of *Agamemnon*, masculinity is another name of the Greek *virtus*. Furthermore, femininity and extravagance are associated with disorder or unreason. Femininity is the inferior other; extravagance is the unreasonable other.

Teucer says, as follows:

τίς τῶνδ' ἐρυμνῶν δωμάτων ἔχει κράτος;
Πλούτῳ γὰρ οἶκος ἄξιος προσεικάσαι

Βασιλεία τ' ἀμφιβλήματ' εὐθρυγκοί θ' ἔδραι. (68-70)
(What master holds dominion in these fenced halls?
The scope of wall is royal, and the massive pile
Bespeaks possession by the Lord of Gold and Death.)

The barbarian extravagance is allegorized through Pluto's house with majestic walls and grand buildings. A similar description is made by Menelaus—"I saw this house with its expanse of masonry / and the grand gates as of some fortunate man (ιδὼν δὲ δῶμα περιφερὲς θρυγκοῖς τοδε / πύλας τε σεμνάς ἀνδρὸς ὀλβίου τινός, 430-31)." This kind of discourse concerning Oriental extravagance is handed down to Renaissance England, through Roman writers.²³ Oriental extravagance is an aspect of colonial imagination from Antiquity to Renaissance.

Like Caliban, Theoclymenus is a potential violator of European honor. Both are castigated under the name of divine providence—Δίκη. Obeying the Dioscuri appearing as *deus ex machina*, Theoclymenus confesses Helen to be "the best and the most faithful sister (ἀρίστης σωφρονεστάτης ἀδελφῆς, 1684-85)" in the world. Finally, Theoclymenus makes a vow—"I will forego / the quarrel I had with you for your sister's sake (τὰ μὲν πάρος / νείκη μεθήσω σφῶιν κασιγνήτης πέρι, 1680-81)." Theoclymenus' vow is very similar to Caliban's—"I'll be wise hereafter/ And seek for grace" (5.1.294-95). By the vows, order is

²³ Kabbani, p. 17

supposed to be restored; however, the order looks like "Pax Romana,"
manipulated according to colonial imagination based on European hegemony.

Chapter 5

The Merchant of Venice and *Εκάβη* —Discourse of Impiety (ἄθεότης) : ‘Noble Savage’

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shylock and the Prince of Morocco appear as the ‘godless (ἄθεος)’ other in Venetian society. They have a lot in common as allegories of godlessness or impiety (ἄθεότης), although they are different from each other in race or in religion. We need to recall that “what matters is not how a character is foreign, but that he is foreign.”¹ It is also interesting that they are supposed to be godless or impious, because they are the foreign other, not because they have no religion. Furthermore, the imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of impiety. For impiety is the uncanny other creeping into the psychology of Elizabethans, as Kristeva implies. In the play, what is structurally remarkable is that two characters—Shylock and the Prince of Morocco—are combined into one in relation to the ‘noble savage.’ The Prince of Morocco takes part in the “noblest savage”; Shylock takes part in the “most ignoble.” Fiedler argues, paralleling Shylock and the Prince of Morocco with the Mohicans in the New World, as follows:

¹ Helen Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961), p. 155.

James Fenimore Cooper, at least, realized the sense in which archetypally the black prince and the Jewish usurer are one, representing the best and worst side of the non-European stranger. And so in *The Last of the Mohicans*, he links them by identifying his noblest savage (Moor plus Jew becoming in his mythic arithmetic Indian) with the former, and his most ignoble with the latter, quoting the black prince's plea on his title page and vindictive tags from Shylock at the head of his bloodies chapters. Unlike Portia, however, Cooper was willing to treat his Morocco figure with pathos rather than contempt, clearly regretting his failed marriage with a white girl, though not finally permitting it. It is as if he sensed in Shakespeare certain reservations in this regard not shared by his heroine and wanted to make them manifest.²

Anyhow, it is important that whatever part they take, they are the other of Elizabethans. They are the impious other, who needs discipline or civilization, without which they would ever remain savage. Without the European hands of salvation, they would be godless, whether they have their own gods or not. As Miller says—"a key part of Europe's understanding of Black Africa was the notion of idolatry,"³ the colonialists, under the pretext of religion, exercise the colonial imagination. In relation to godless Africans, Jones quotes from an Elizabethan writer—Richard Eden, as follows:

It is to understand, that the people which now inhabit the regions of the coast of Guinea and the middle parts of Affrica...were in old time called Ethiopes and Nigrite, which we now call Moors, Moorens, or Negroes, a people of *bestly living, without a God, law,*

² Leslie Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (NY: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 104.

³ Miller, p. 39.

religion, or commonwealth, and so scorched and vexed with the heat of the sun that in many places they curse it when it riseth.⁴

The Prince of Morocco in the play is the first presented as a non-villainous stage Moor, contrary to other typical stage Moors in the Elizabethan drama. He is a noble tawny Moor; he describes himself as follows, “my complexion, / The shadow’d livery of the burnish’d sun, / To whom I am a neighbour and near bred” (2.1.1-3). In the Elizabethan Age, the Moors were popular in London and familiar enough to be accepted as a suitor, although being exotic and dark-complexioned. From the middle of the 16th century, there were plenty of opportunities for Englishmen in London to see Africans of various shades of color. Shakespeare might often have seen them. Jones says, at the “great number” of Africans in London, Queen Elizabeth was discontented and issued two edicts in order to return them to their native countries.⁵ In relation to informational resources, also there were a lot of popular digests telling of Africa and Africans. In 1555, even two books were published: *The Fardle of Fashion* by W. Waterman, and *Decades of the New World* by P. Martyr. Also the story of Leo Africanus, who

⁴ Jones, *The Elizabethan Image of Africa*, p. 12

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17

had been a North African Moor and was converted to Christianity, was well known to Elizabethans, and further, his biography was similar to Othello's life.⁶

Elizabethans were also familiar with the light-skinned Moors and the noble Africans. Nevertheless, it is interesting that in the minds of Elizabethans there still remained the monstrous images of the black Africans inherited from antiquity. They couldn't think of Africa without recalling anthropophagi and devils,⁷ which may be a result of the anxiety of godlessness creeping into the psychology of the Renaissance Europeans, in relation to colonial imagination. Here, the imagination of the foreign other overlaps with the imagination of godlessness. Furthermore, notably enough, as is the case of the Trojan woman—Hecuba, the Prince of Morocco is an ambivalent character fluctuating between noble and savage.

At the beginning of the play, Portia, following her dead father's will, is expected to marry one who chooses the right 'lead' casket among three. As soon as she hears that she would get another suitor—the Prince of Morocco, she

⁶ Ibid., p. 2

⁷ cf. Chapter 3 of this dissertation, where the etymological meaning of 'Moor' is given, explaining the equation between blackness and devils.

juxtaposes his complexion with the devil's. Portia mocks his godlessness as follows:

if he have the condition
of a saint and the complexion of a devil, I had
rather he should shrive me than wive me. (1.2.140-43)

A godless African cannot be a saint. Also, as a devil cannot be a saint, so a Moor cannot be a husband of a white wife. She is no doubt expecting her husband to be a 'godly' European, hopefully Bassanio (1.2.125-31), not a non-European, especially a 'godless' Moor. The color 'black' is no more than a symbol of impiety or godlessness. So, even before she looks at the Moor, she denies him. Regardless of his character and anything within him, she wants to exclude him from the list of her suitors, simply because he is a Moor—"what matters is not how a character is foreign." For, in the psychology of Elizabethans, 'blackness' is the uncanny other, in relation to impiety.

Generally speaking, Venetian society is supposed to be generous as to allow foreigners to do business and to accept aliens, while they are serving its profits. Harold Plumb refers to Venice as a "cosmopolitan" city.

Venice, however, was Janus-faced. Her commerce might be regimented, her aristocracy disciplined and controlled, her people subjected, yet she was *cosmopolitan* as no other city in Europe was. The crowded wharves of the Rialto and the Riva degli Schiavoni saw Gentile and Jew, Moslem and Greek, haggling over rich

cargoes from the Orient...the Turks, another [vast warehouse], which had been the palace of the Pesaro family...All the nations of Europe mingled with the races of the Near East.⁸

Renaissance Italy had a lot of foreign residents including Moors and Jews. And Venice became the center of world trade. Nevertheless, there were severe limits set to the political participation of aliens and the inter-racial fusion.

In the play, it is remarkable that in relation to the exclusion of the Moor, Venetian society seems to have no visible laws. However, it has a much stronger device to exclude him than written law. The device is a casket lottery, which is based on the principle of discontinuity or difference—'heterogeneity.' In the play, discontinuity and difference appear to be an aspect of Venice. Freud, in his article "The Theme of the Three Caskets," interprets the principle of heterogeneity as "die Wunschverkehrung (wishful reversal)"⁹—the worst turns out wishfully to be the best. The Moor, who is pursuing 'homogeneity,' associates undoubtedly 'gold' with a beautiful lady Portia. The reversal as heterogeneity is unbearable for the Moor, who shouts that "let us make incision for your love, / To prove whose blood is reddest, his or mine" (2.1.6-7). The

⁸ Plumb, *The Italian Renaissance*, p. 105.

⁹ Sigmund Freud, *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XII, (London: The Hogarth Press, 1958), p. 299.

alien, struggling to prove that he is the 'same' human being sharing the 'same' blood, easily falls a victim to the 'discontinuity' game—a casket lottery.

Venetian society excludes the Moor, based on the principle of heterogeneity defeating that of homogeneity. Furthermore, when the Moor chooses the golden casket, Elizabethans may call him a desirous Moor and if symbolically, castrate him. For gold implies desire—"who chooseth me shall gain what many men desire" (2.7.5). And it is remarkable that desire is a typical characteristic of stage Moors in the Elizabethan drama.¹⁰ According to the result of the lottery, the Moor is supposed "never to speak to lady afterward / In way of marriage, as pledged before his chance (2.1.40-42). This symbolic castration is the second exclusion following the first exclusion—Portia's pre-denial of the Moor. Through the two processes, the Moor is completely excluded, which is consequently supposed to secure Venetians. It is also important that the Moor has already been in the knowledge system which excludes him from Venetian society. Interestingly enough, he enters, saying—"Mislike me not for my complexion" (2.1.1). As if he had already heard of Portia's pre-denial, he distinguishes himself

¹⁰ Barthelemy, p. 151

from Venetians. As Foucault says, “the soul is the prison of the body.”¹¹ The knowledge system, which is imprinted on the unconscious of a human being, distinguishes the self from the other, forming power.

Another alien—the Jew Shylock—also falls a victim to the principle of heterogeneity, although at the end of the play a peaceful mood is formed. First of all, Shylock, like the Prince of Morocco, is the ‘godless’ other different from the ‘godly’ Europeans. As MacDonald says, “Shylock enters the play caught not only in the stage conventions associated with Jews but also in those associated with Moors.”¹² The Jew and the Moor similarly stand on the other side of Europeans. Also, they are impious resisters against the principle of heterogeneity—a characteristic aspect of Venetian society. “In this attempt to challenge their marginalization, then, Morocco and Shylock mobilize the very discourse that enforces the distinction between insider and outsider and which confers on them, Moor and Jew, the status of other.”¹³ Moreover, Venetians easily equate the Jew with a devil, because of the ancient curse following the crucifixion of Jesus—“his

¹¹ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p. 30

¹² MacDonald, p. 75

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 76

blood be on us, and on our children.”¹⁴ And “the accusation of deicide (the killing of Christ) spread widely and inflamed passions.”¹⁵ Agreeing with Stow, Michelson argues that

The Christians wanted God for themselves, so they slyly foisted the Devil on to the Jews, so much so that in the regular drama these two are synonymous...

The Devil is generally accompanied by the Vice, a fact which I do not want to be forgotten, for when Devil and Vice appear no longer on the stage in the regular drama, their places are taken by the Jew and his servant. The Vice belabours his master the Devil, the Jew is always poked fun at, or taken in by his servant.¹⁶

Shylock is shown as the enemy of Christians, saying that “I hate him [Antonio] for he is a Christian” (1.3.43). And Shylock’s servant Launcelot, calling his own master “the very devil incarnal” (2.2.29), decides to run away. In accordance with Launcelot, Jessica (Shylock’s daughter) curses the house of the Jew – the house she is now living in.

Our house is hell,

...

Alack, what heinous sin is it in me
To be ashamed to be my father's child!
But though I am a daughter to his blood,
I am not to his manners. O Lorenzo,

¹⁴ Matthew, 27:25. «τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν».

¹⁵ Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 3.

¹⁶ H. Michelson, *The Jew in Early English Literature* (NY: Hermon Press, 1972), p. 65-66.

If thou keep promise, I shall end this strife,
Become a Christian and thy loving wife. (Italics emphasized, 2.3.2-21)

It is remarkable that Jessica is a Pocahontasian character,¹⁷ an acceptable and serviceable alien becoming a 'Christian' and 'loving wife.' She declares, "I shall be saved by my husband; he hath made me a Christian" (3.5.21). This kind of marital union is indebted to the colonial imagination—a colonial conqueror's grace for a native girl.¹⁸

In contrast to the acceptable aliens in Venetian society, the godless Jew was treated as a 'dog,' a 'stranger cur,' which is ironically paralleled with the biblical fact that non-Jewish aliens were called godless curs.¹⁹ Shylock describes the 'oppositions' between himself and Venetians, arguing against the Venetian prejudice as follows:

You call me misbeliever, cut-throat dog,
...
And foot me as you spurn *a stranger cur*
Over your threshold: moneys is your suit
What should I say to you? Should I not say
'Hath a dog money? is it possible
A cur can lend three thousand ducats?' Or
Shall I bend low and in a bondman's key,

¹⁷ Cf. Kabbani, p. 5

¹⁸ Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*, p. 51.

¹⁹ Matthew, 15:26, «οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις (it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs). The Jews called non-Jewish aliens godless dogs.

With bated breath and whispering humbleness, Say this;
'Fair sir, you spit on me on Wednesday last;
You spurn'd me such a day; another time
You call'd me dog; and for these courtesies
I'll lend you thus much moneys'? (Italics emphasized, 1.3.112-30)

Against the Venetian division/rejection, Shylock argues in the similar way as the Prince of Morocco did—the principle of homogeneity. He continues, “I am a Jew. Hath / not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, / dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with / the same food, hurt with the same weapons, ... If you / prick us, do we not bleed?” (3.1.61-68). The argument by Shylock is a reversal of the colonial conqueror’s argument, which is associated with the inferiority of the colonial other—“a Jew has not eyes, has not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, and passions.” We need to pay attention to MacDonald’s assertion that “repetition emphasizes material corporeality, making the word malleable, ready to take the imprint the poet wants to give it.”²⁰ The colonial other is no more than “phonetic jelly.”²¹ In contrast, Shylock’s imitational language reminds us of the eloquent language of the Prince of Morocco. In relation to the bejeweled language, MacDonald remarks that

²⁰ MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997), p. 69.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69. This term is very similar to Christopher Miller’s, «soft wax» in *Blank Darkness* (p. 48).

“besides testifying to Shakespeare’s multilevel control of plot, this reading of Morocco’s language often attempts to assign it a psychological or moral significance, confirming his unworthiness to win Portia.”²² Whether imitational or eloquent, the language of the colonial other is subject to the colonial discourse.

In relation to naming Shylock, it is remarkable that Venetians usually call Shylock ‘a Jew,’ not ‘Shylock.’

I pray you, think you question with *the Jew*:
You may as well go stand upon the beach
And bid the main flood bate his usual height;
You may as well use question with *the wolf*
Why he hath made the ewe bleat for the lamb; (4.1.70-74)

Shylock appears as a representative of the Jews, not an individual, by which he is easily identified with the Jewish physician Lopez²³ who was sentenced to death in relation to an alleged conspiracy to poison Queen Elizabeth.²⁴ The μῦθος of the poisoning of Christians is in the continuum of the Medieval legend concerning the Black Death.²⁵ Interestingly enough, in the same year that Lopez was executed, the play *The Merchant of Venice* was first performed. It is no

²² Ibid., p. 72.

²³ Fiedler, p. 108. Probably the name ‘Lopez’ is etymologically related to the Latin ‘lupus,’ and the Italian ‘lupo.’

²⁴ Michelson, p. 85-86, and Friedlander, *Shakespeare and the Jew*, p. 8

²⁵ Michelson, p. 39-40, and Gross, *Shylock: A Legend and its Legacy*, p. 24-26.

wonder that the Jewish doctor is associated with Shylock in the psychology of Elizabethans.

Furthermore, when Shylock says that “If you prick us, do we not bleed?” we are reminded of the argument by the Prince of Morocco—“let us make incision.” It is notable that the Elizabethan audience may relate those arguments to violence, which is also associated with the impiety of aliens. This imaginative anxiety comes from their disciplined soul or the unconscious based on the fear of godlessness. Impiety or godlessness is the uncanny other within, overlapping with the imagination of the foreign other. The unconscious, which Foucault may call the disciplined soul, is the effect of power. The soul coexists with the body, and with power. The soul is the relationship between power and knowledge; it is “a group of hierarchized and related faculties.”²⁶ Consequently, based on the power/knowledge scheme, the European imagination or soul struggles to reject the other, with the legendary accounts of the monsters and strange beings that peopled the pages of the classical historians in relation to violence and impiety.

And further, Shakespeare exposes the opposition between the Jew and Venetians as ‘a lodged hate’: “As there is no firm reason to be render’d, / Why he

²⁶ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 42

cannot abide a gaping pig; / Why he, a harmless necessary cat; / Why he, a woollen bagpipe;.../ So can I give no reason, nor I will not, / More than a lodged hate and a certain loathing / I bear Antonio" (4.1.53-61). From the very beginning of the play, Shakespeare foreshadows this kind of opposition between the aliens and Venetians as follows:

I hate him for he is a Christian,
But more for that in low simplicity
He lends out money gratis and brings down
The rate of usance here with us in Venice.
If I can catch him once upon the hip,
I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him.
He hates our sacred nation, and he rails,
Even there where merchants most do congregate,
On me, my bargains and my well-won thrift,
Which he calls interest. (1.3.43-52)

In addition to the difference of their religious beliefs, the 'misbeliever' Jew is also accused as an 'impious' usurer. Remarkably enough, in the Mediaeval period, usury was another name of godlessness. The Christian countries banned usury.

Therefore, the business was left for the aliens, especially the Jews.

The Canon Law forbids the loan of money on interest by any under its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, a law which practically yields the monopoly of doing so to the Jews, not from any economical motive but from a religious one. Usury was a sin and the Christian had to be kept free from it. But usury was the capitalism of that period and without capitalism there could be no progress, so this lucrative sin

was grudgingly left to the hated Jew, who was thus able to maintain his ground.²⁷

Consequently, no wonder that Venetians plot to castrate Shylock by depriving him of money, the “precious stones (2.8.20)” which is the symbol of Jewish power and evil. The loss of his money is a symbolic castration making him impotent.²⁸ And further, an alien offender’s life seeking the life of a Venetian is handed over to the Venetian authority.

It is enacted in *the laws of Venice*,
If it be proved *against an alien*
That by direct or indirect attempts
He seek the life of any citizen,
The party 'gainst the which he doth contrive
Shall seize one half his goods; the other half
Comes to the privy coffer of the state;
And the offender's life lies in the mercy
Of the duke only, 'gainst all other voice. (4.1.349-57)

In addition to the monetary defeat of the Jew, by putting the alien into the Venetian hands, the Venetian court tries to control him completely and secure the life of Venetians—“if thou dost shed / One drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods / Are, by the laws of Venice, confiscate” (4.1.310-12). Lastly, Antonio makes sure the security, by ordering the Jew that “he presently become a Christian; / ... that he do record a gift, / Here in the court, of all he dies possess'd,

²⁷ Michelson, *The Jew in Early English Literature*, p. 29.

²⁸ MacDonald, p. 76

/ Unto his son Lorenzo and his daughter” (4.1.388-91). It is also significant that the exclusion of the Jew is never far from the psychological freedom from the anxiety of godlessness.

However, the solution seems unreasonable, for flesh cannot be discriminated from blood. The solution means that Venetian society is based on ‘heterogeneity,’ as is mentioned above—as aliens are different from Venetians, so flesh is different from blood. It is remarkable that the Venetian court asks mercy from Shylock—a godless dog, by saying that “the quality of mercy is not strain’d,
/ It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven / Upon the place beneath” (4.1.184-86). Venetians fall into a dilemma—it is inconsistent that they should expect a so-called dog to show mercy, since they had felt the alien was not being a human being. In other words, in relation to mercy, they use the principle of continuity (homogeneity); on the contrary, in relation to blood, they take advantage of discontinuity (heterogeneity). Anyway, the Jew, like the Prince of Morocco who followed the principle of ‘homogeneity,’ is defeated. Hence, the Jew is taken off stage, and then is heard no more. In Act V, the mood becomes peaceful, and everyone now secured from the invasion of aliens and surrounded with soft music. In the play, interestingly enough, the public test (judgement)—the casket

lottery or the court—serves to justify exclusion by revealing an unacceptable state of mind—the uncanny other within, in relation to impiety.²⁹ Whether the strangers are noble or savage, what matters is that they are the other of Europeans.

In Euripides' *Ἐκάβη*, the Trojan Hecuba is a prototype of Oriental woman of nobility—an ambivalent character: noble but savage, pitiful but contemptible. Characteristically, she is very close to Shakespeare's the Prince of Morocco; the Thracian king Polymestor is similar to Shylock. Structurally, the play is divided into two parts. In the former, more or less, Hecuba's noble character is emphasized, especially through Polyxena who is Hecuba's mirror image. In the latter, on the contrary, emphasis is laid on Polymestor's godlessness and Hecuba's cruelty. Hecuba was "the queen of fabulous Troy / ... the wife of Priam the great (ἦδ' ἄνασσα τῶν πολυχρύσων Φρυγῶν, / ... ἦδε Πριάμου τοῦ μέγ' ὀλβίου δάμαρ, 492-93)." She, who is of the noble blood, recalls her past pride and wealth as follows:

ὦ σχήματ' οἴκων, ὦ ποτ' εὐτυχεῖς δόμοι,
ὦ πλειστ' ἔχων μάλιστά τ' εὐτεκνώτατε
Πρίαμε, γεραία θ' ἦδ' ἐγὼ μήτηρ τέκνων,
ὡς ἐς τὸ μηδὲν ἦκομεν, φρονήματος

²⁹ D'amico, p. 174

τοῦ πρὶν στερέντες. (619-23)
(Where is greatness gone?
Where is it now, that stately house, home
Where I was happy once? King Priam,
Blessed with children once, in your pride of wealth?
And what am I of all I used to be,
Mother of sons, mother of princes?
Gone, all gone, and nothing left.)

But around at the end of the play, she transforms into a godless murderer, prophetically a “bitch” (1265). Hecuba’s barbarous murder is paralleled with the Thracian king’s godless murder. It is notable that Hecuba imitates the godless way that the barbarous Polymestor murdered Hecuba’s son Polydorus—killing a friend-guest (ξενοκτονεῖν). And what is important is that her character fluctuates between noble and savage.

The play begins with the ghost of Polydorus, which is telling of the Trojan War and foretelling of Polyxena’s sacrifice and his own fate. In accordance with the prediction, Hecuba dreams a terrible dream—Achilles’ ghost seeks the virgin sacrifice of Polyxena.

εἶδον γὰρ βαλιὰν ἔλαφον λύκου αἴμονι χαλαῖ
σφαζομένην, ἀπ’ ἐμῶν γονάτων σπασθειῖσαν ἀνοίκτως.
καὶ τόδε δεῖμά μοι
ἦλθ’ ὑπὲρ ἄκρας τύμβου κορυφᾶς
φάντασμά Ἀχιλέως· ἦτιτι δὲ γέρας
τῶν πολυμόχθων τινὰ Τρωιάδων. (90-95)
(I saw a little doe, a dappled doe, torn from between my knees,
Cruelly ripped away, mangled by a wolf with blood-red nails!

And then fresh terror rose:
I saw Achilles' ghost
Stalk upon his tomb, howling,
Demanding a prize
From the wretched women of Troy.)

Soon, Hecuba hears that the sacrificial ritual was designed by the 'demagogue' Odysseus (δημοχαραριστῆς Λαερτιάδης, 132-33). Then, Odysseus shows up in order to inform Hecuba of the result of the vote for the sacrifice of Polyxena.

ἀλλ' ὅμως φράσω.
ἔδοξ' Ἀχαιοῖς παῖδα σὴν Πολυξένην
σφάξαι πρὸς ὀρθὸν χῶμ' Ἀχιλλεῖου τάφου. (219-21)
(But let me review the facts.
By majority vote the Greeks have decreed as follows:
Your daughter, Polyxena, must die as a victim
And prize of honor for the grave of Achilles.)

Against the vote and Odysseus's argument, Hecuba argues, by recalling that one day she saved his life, when he became a captive as a spy in beggar's disguise (239-41). She accuses him as a man of "ἀχάριστον ὑμῶν σπέριμ' (a thankless breed, 249)." The leader of the chorus continues to blame him for heartless cruelty.

οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτω στερορὸς ἀνθρώπου φύσις
ἥτις γόων σῶν καὶ μακρῶν ὀδυρμάτων
κλύουσα θρήνους οὐκ ἂν ἐκβάλοι δάκρυ. (296-98)
(Surely, no man could be so callous or so hard of heart
He could hear this mother's heartbroken cry
And not be touched.)

However, Odysseus continues to defend himself, by saying that he is honoring his debt by saving Hecuba's life and his promise was not related to Polyxena's life (302-304). Furthermore, he says that he is as good as his word, by putting emphasis on a promise that when the Greeks capture Troy, Hecuba's daughter should be given to the best soldier as a prize upon request (305-7). Also he argues that the conflict concerning the present issue arises from the difference between barbarian custom and Greek custom—unlike the barbarians, Greeks pay respect to the deserved rights of the dead.

οἱ βάρβαροι δὲ μήτε τοὺς φίλους φίλους
ἠγγεῖσθε μήτε τοὺς καλῶς τεθνηκότας
θαυμάζεθ', ὡς ἂν ἡ μὲν Ἑλλὰς εὐτυχῆι,
ὕμεις δ' ἔχηθ' ὅμοια τοῖς βουλεύμασιν. (328-31)
(But what of you, *you foreigners who refuse your dead their rights*
And break your faith with friends? And then you wonder that
Hellas should prosper while your countries suffer the fates they
deserve!)

Hence, it is remarkable that the Greek ritual of a living sacrifice, which looks most barbarous and godless, is more or less justified or forgotten. Besides, the Greek sympathy with the noble virgin of sacrifice seems to dilute the Greek cruelty. Polyxena is shown as a 'goddess' in front of the sacrificial rites with her own 'free will.' She is an allegory of the noblest savage, representing the Trojan honor of Hecuba.

έκοῦσα θνήσκω· μή τις ἄψηται χρῶς
τοῦμοῦ·

...

λαοὶ δ' ἐπερρόθησαν Ἀγαμεμνων τ' ἄναξ
εἶπεν μεθεῖναι παρθένον νεανίας.
κάπεὶ τόδ' εἰσήκουσε δεσποτῶν ἔπος,
λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος
ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλὸν
μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος
κάλλιστα, (548-561)

*("Of my own free will I die.
Let no man touch me.")*

...

"Free her!" the army roared,
and Agamemnon ordered his men to let her go.
The instant they released their hold, she grasped her robes
At the shoulder and ripped them open down the sides
As far as the waist, *exposing her naked breast,
Bare and lovely like a sculptured goddess.*)

In mourning for the noble virgin, Talthybius the Greek herald says that the Greek soldiers scattered leaves upon her corpse, and heaped her pyre with branches of pine, blaming the empty hands of loafers (571-80). Talthybius continues to say that Hecuba, through her daughter Polyxena, became the most blessed mother in the world and the unhappiest mother as well (580-82). Under the encomium of the virgin sacrifice, strange to say, the mourning mother feels 'comfort' instead of seeking revenge on the cruel conquerors, for Polyxena died very nobly, which was suitable for her blood (γενναῖος).

τὸ δ' αὖ λίαν παρεῖλες ἀγγελθεῖσά μοι
γενναῖος. οὐκ οὖν δεινόν, (591-92)
(And yet a kind of comfort comes in knowing how well you died.
But how strange it seems.)

Then, immediately, the focus of the play shifts from Greek barbarity to barbarian godlessness, when the dead body of Polydorus is found on the seashore. It is noteworthy that there's no more argument concerning the cruel human sacrifice by the Greeks. That is, Greek cruelty—the sacrifice of a virgin alive—is concealed underneath the encomium of the noble death of Polyxena. Under the rhetoric of the colonial imagination, Polyxena is decorated for the noble death. What is important is that she is a symbol of the moldering other, not of the threatening other; and further, colonialists conceal their own guilt, by decorating the savage other.³⁰ They feel pity for the dying other, who is no longer a dangerous resistant. And the rhetoric of the encomium accounts for the fact that the colonial conquerors pretend to be sympathetic rulers over the colonized. Then, immediately the focus of the play is turned to the Thracian King's godlessness and Hecuba's barbarous revenge. Hecuba's rage blows into revenge on the 'treacherous' friend—the Thracian king Polymestor, who was believed to be a 'noble' friend.

³⁰ cf. Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 5.

Hecuba implores Agamemnon to give her revenge on that treacherous friend, who was her frequent guest at her table and was counted first among her friends.

τυχῶν δ' ὅσων δεῖ καὶ λαβῶν προμηθίαν
ἔκτεινέ' τύμβου δ', εἰ κτανεῖν ἐβούλετο,
οὐκ ἠξίωσεν ἀλλ' ἀφῆκε πόντιον. (795-97)
Receiving every kindness that a man could meet—
And then, in cold deliberation, killed my son.
Murder may have its reasons, its motives,
But this—to refuse my son a grave, to throw him
To the sea, unbried!)

Then, Agamemnon is in dilemma, for the Greeks believe the treacherous murderer is their friend. Cleverly enough, Hecuba suggests that he be her confidant, the silent partner of her plot to kill her son's murderer (870-71). Presently, using jewels as bait (1012), she tempts Polymestor and his two sons to a tent where Hecuba's women attack them. Polymestor becomes blind and his sons are murdered (1023-84). Finally, Hecuba declares, "His debt is paid and I have my revenge (δίκην δέ μοι / δέδωκε, 1052-53)." However, it is notable that the barbarian 'shameful (αἰσχρὸν)' way—'to kill a friend-guest (ξενοκτονεῖν)'—is repeated, by imitating the previous crime committed by Polymestor. Although Hecuba and Polymestor argue against each other, by showing their own righteous causes, we need to pay attention to Agamemnon's judgment, which

recalls Odysseus's argument concerning the sacrificial rites: "the difference between barbarian custom and Greek custom—unlike the barbarians, Greeks pay respect to the deserved rights of the dead."³¹

τάχ' οὖν παρ' ὑμῖν ῥάιδιον ξενοκτονεῖν
ἡμῖν δέ γ' αἰσχρὸν τοῖσιν Ἕλλησιν τόδε. (1247-48)
(Perhaps you think it a trifling matter to kill a guest.
We Greeks call it murder.)

'We' Greeks are different from 'you' barbarians—'you' godless barbarians may kill guest-friends, but 'we' godly Greeks may not. The judgment implies that barbarians including Hecuba are godless and inferior.

Furthermore, in relation to colonial language, it is remarkable that Hecuba imitates the conqueror Agamemnon's assertion. She accuses Polymestor as a godless barbarian who insists that he did what he did out of friendship for the Greeks, by saying that "you liar / First, what possible friendship could there be / between civilized Greeks and half-savages like you? Certainly none. (ἀλλ', ὦ κάκιστε, πρῶτον οὐποτ' ἄν φίλον / τὸ βάρβαρον γένοιτ' ἄν Ἕλλησιν γένος / οὐδ' ἄν δύναιτο, 1199-1201)." Hecuba's accusation, based on racial discrimination, sounds very similar to the conqueror's voice. In relation to the rhetoric of repetition or imitation, as shown above, again we need to recall that

³¹ See above in this chapter.

“repetition emphasizes material corporeality, making the word malleable, ready to take the imprint the poet wants to give it.”³²

Like Hecuba, Polymestor repeats the colonial conqueror’s discourse in relation to the godlessness of the colonial other. He accuses Hecuba as one of “those murderous hags of Troy (ἀνδροφόνους Ἰλιάδας, 1061),” “those bitches of Troy (τάλαιναι κόραι τάλαιναι Φρυγῶν / ὧ κατάρατοι, 1063-64),” and “savage bitches (Βάκχαις Ἄιδα, κυσίν, 1075-76),” which is similar to the way that Venetians called Shylock a godless cur. Furthermore, he declares that Hecuba belongs to the most monstrous race in the history of the world.

εἴ τις γυναικάς τῶν πρὶν εἶρηκεν κακῶσ
ἢ νῦν λέγων ἔστιν τις ἢ μέλλει λέγειν,
ἅπαντα ταῦτα συντεμῶν ἐγὼ φράσω·
γένος γὰρ οὔτε πόντος οὔτε γῆ τρέφει
τοιόνδ’· (1178-82)

(On behalf of all those dead
Who learned their hatred of women long ago,
For those who hate them now, for those unborn
Who shall live to hate them yet, I now declare
My firm conviction: *neither earth nor ocean*
Produces a creature as savage and monstrous as [such a] woman.)

This declaration is followed by a series of dismal prophecies of Dionysus, through the mouth of Polymestor, one of which is the cyno-transformation of

³² MacDonald, p. 69.

Hecuba—“changed to a dog, a bitch with blazing eyes (κύων γενήσῃ πύρρ’ ἔχουσα δέργματα, 1265)” and buried in “the bitch’s grave, a landmark to sailors (κυνὸς ταλαίνης σῆμα, ναυτίλοις τέκμαρ, 1273).” Also Hecuba’s daughter Cassandra will be the cause of the fall of Agamemnon’s family (1275-79). Then, being mad at the impudence of Polymestor, Agamemnon orders that he be abandoned on some desert island (1285).

Apparently, the play ends with a ‘righteous’ conclusion, with the punishment of the godless savages—“condemned for what you did. Justly condemned (οὐκ οὖν δικαίως, εἴπερ εἰργάσω κακὰ, 1254).” Still we remember that the godlessness of the Greeks’ is concealed or overlooked—two cases of human sacrifice: one is related to Polyxena, the other is to Iphigenia. It is notable that Agamemnon sacrificed his own daughter Iphigenia, for the safe trip to Troy. Interestingly enough, in contrast to the Greek piety or honor, aliens are godless since they are the colonial other—what matters is that they are the other of Europeans. It is also remarkable that the anxiety of godlessness overlaps with the anxiety of the foreign other, for godlessness is the uncanny other within our psychology. Accordingly, the colonial other is unreliably fluctuating between noble and savage—an ambivalent other.

Conclusion

The psychoanalytical other is “the hidden face of our identity”¹ based on our desire and anxiety, which is the “uncanny other” in relation to femininity, madness, death, disorder, impiety, etc. Therefore, as Humphries argues, “art—whether language of words or of images—is the self-conscious experience of that differential otherness.”² In relation to literary hermeneutics, the way to the other is not quite other than the way to the self—the way to the γνῶσις (the truth—lost knowledge, ourselves). Accordingly, it is interesting that the imagination of foreigners overlaps with the imagination of the uncanny other within ‘ourselves.’ That is, in the colonial imagination, the psychoanalytical other is allegorized through the foreign other—strangers.

Furthermore, the colonial imagination is not so far from the dialectic between desire and anxiety in human psychology. The psychoanalytical approach to the colonial imagination is the process of analyzing the unconscious

¹ Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (NY: Columbia U.P., 1991), p. 1.

² Jefferson Humphries, *The otherness Within: Gnostic Reading in Marcel Proust, Flanery O’Connor, and Francois Villon* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1983), p. 8.

(including “basic tendency”³) toward the colonial other, and further, the politics of colonization as the unconscious. In other words, the research in an Africanist-Orientalist discourse is a discursive analysis of our unconscious in relation to the uncanny other like death.

One of the paradigms of the psychoanalytical other is femininity. Femininity, as my dissertation has tried to show throughout, is an aspect of the repressed self within, which is represented mainly through Cleopatra and Persian women. Femininity is another name for the inferior other, which is subject to male dominance. On the other hand, the female body is an object of desire, which is waiting for the conqueror to plough it. And further, the female body is an allegory of the lost paradise, which is unreachable or forbidden. Remarkably, femininity is ambivalent—desirable but inferior, which forms the main axis of the Africanist-Orientalist discourse. Therefore, it is not by chance that all the characters in the Orient, including Antony and Xerxes, are represented as the feminine others in relation to the colonial imagination. It is important that the feminine other is associated with colonial fantasy and patriarchal fears as well. Accordingly, Cleopatra, as Oriental woman, is doubly colonized both racially

³ Snowden, *Before Color Prejudice*, p. 84.

and sexually. Also, it is no wonder that the feminine other is associated with devilry or witchcraft, evil or vice.

In relation to madness, Othello and the Aegyptiads look like patients in the tea-parties held by the staff of the Retreat. They are “rarely seen or looked at,” but “seen through...as problems to be solved or confined.”⁴ On the contrary, aliens like the Danaids are accepted by Greek society, for they are “amenable to the rites and laws of the polis.”⁵ In relation to the colonial imagination madness is a pretext for castration under the name of reason. What is most important is that the foreign others are mad or insane, simply because they are the other, not because they are really insane delinquents. Also, in *Ἰκέτιδες*, it is notable that Aeschylus uses dark skin as a symbol of virile fighters, in contrast to Shakespeare, who links black skin with madness.

Aaron and Medea serve as allegories of death. Aaron “rapes, mutilates, and murders simply for delight.”⁶ Medea prepares for the deadly finale—the sacrifice of her own sons—by cutting her own arm and letting the blood flow upon the altar. Whatever they touch leads to death or destruction. It is notable

⁴ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 207.

⁵ Kristeva, p. 45.

⁶ MacDonald, p. 168.

that for the characterization of Aaron the Moor, Shakespeare simply connects Aaron's black skin with Death. Shakespeare repeats the Medieval equation between black color and devil. As for Medea, she is represented as one of the seductive Eastern women, who is an ambivalent character fluctuating between an erotic victim and a scheming witch. Similar to Cleopatra, Medea is a prototype of the indocile body colonized doubly, resisting the male dominance and the colonial government as well.

Disorder is allegorized mainly through Caliban and Theoclymenus. Above all, the disordered other is associated with the violator of European honor. Caliban desires Miranda; Theoclymenus pursues Helen's honor. What is remarkable is that Caliban's deformity or different appearance accounts for the lack of self-determination, which justifies the colonial government. And further, Caliban is linked with the lower classes in Western society like Trinculo and Stephano—a subversive other. Notably enough, "where there is power, there is resistance,"⁷ and further, disorder is the precondition of power. That is, the dominant order paradoxically produces subversion for its own ends. In contrast to Caliban's deformity or complexion, Euripides attributes the lack of self-

⁷ Foucault, *History of Sexuality I*, p. 95.

determination of Theoclymenus to ethnic characteristics like Oriental extravagance and ὕβρις, to justify the colonial imagination's idea that "Greeks are natural rulers over barbarians." In short, Euripides's characters are not politicized as much as Shakespeare's characters are. Further, it is important that Shakespeare treats the foreign other as a "thing of darkness" – "blank darkness," while Euripides recognizes the other as reality.

In relation to the discourse of impiety, it is remarkable that foreigners are godless, simply because they are the foreign other, not because they have no gods. "What matters is not how a character is foreign, but that he is foreign."⁸ Impiety is a pretext for the exclusion of the foreign other. The strangers in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Εκάβη* are ambivalent characters fluctuating between noble and savage, which is one of the typical aspects concerning Africanist-Orientalist discourse. The foreign others may be noble, while they are serviceable or faithful; otherwise, they are threatening others.

In Shakespeare's plays used in this dissertation, notably, the characterization is mostly related to skin color or appearance, of which representation is far beyond Snowden's "basic tendency," which is closely connected with

⁸ Helen Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961), p. 155.

historiographical aspects. Aeschylus had been a contemporary of the Mediterranean world and its mix of human types, while those living in England had rare contacts with colored people. Although England was influenced by the colonies of the New World and by the Mediterranean trade, Englishmen kept well in mind the strange images of non-Westerners based on Plinian $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$. In addition, we need to recall MacDonald's assertion—"the Moor as alien is inescapably framed by the values of a society he, like Aaron, may struggle against and of which the dramatist and his theatre are a part."⁹ That is, Shakespeare's characterization is mostly based on the politics of colonization arising from "the values of a society."

In contrast, as Snowden asserts, Hellenistic tragedy is mostly based on a "basic tendency" toward the other, although Seneca's representation of Medea is comparatively similar to Shakespeare's representation of the witches in *Macbeth*. It is remarkable that Seneca was a contemporary of Pliny, which may explain that Seneca and Pliny share a common tradition, even though they presumably have very different philosophical backgrounds.¹⁰ Furthermore, unlike Greek

⁹ MacDonald, p. 168.

¹⁰ Cf. Miriam T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976), p. 436.

playwrights, the Roman Seneca, who used to be an *amicus* or an adviser of Nero,¹¹ was supposed to be under the influence of Roman imperialism, which may account for the fact that Seneca's representation of Medea focused more on the demonic characteristics than Euripides's representation did.

In the relationship of Seneca's disdainful representation of Medea with Shakespeare's politics of colonization, it is notable that colonial expansionism is not so far from the politicization of the other. Notably enough, as is more often the case with Shakespeare's plays mentioned in this dissertation, the psychoanalytical other develops into cultural, political other, concerning which Said says that "ideas, cultures, and histories cannot seriously be understood or studied without their force, or more precisely their configurations of power, also being studied."¹² In terms of politicization of the other, a matter of epistemology develops into the relationships of power, which is also associated with cultural and political hegemony in relation to the discourse of Africa and Orient. It is outstanding that Hellenistic tragedy doesn't depend on the politicization of the other as much as Shakespeare does. In addition, we cannot ignore that

¹¹ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 67-128.

¹² Said, *Orientalism*, p.5.

Shakespeare appropriates literature for political improvisation—politics of a theatre-state, reproducing the relations of power.¹³

¹³ *The New Historicism: Reader*, p. 73.

References

- Anderson, M. J., ed. *Classical Drama and Its Influence*. NY: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1965.
- Anderson, William. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Bacon, Helen. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961.
- Banton, Michael. *The Idea of Race*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1978.
- Barker, Francis, et al. *Literature, Politics and Theory*. London and NY: Methuen, 1986.
- Barnett, Lionel. *The Greek Drama*. London: Folcroft Libray Editions, 1972.
- Barthelemy, G. Anthony. *Black Face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1987.
- Bash, David. *The Hidden Shakespeare: A Rosetta Stone*. West Hartford: Revelatory Press, 1994.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Beare, W. *The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1950.
- Belli, Angela. *Ancient Greek Myths and Modern Drama: A Study in Continuity*. London: Univ. of London Press Ltd., 1969.
- Benedict, Ruth. *Race: Science and Politics*. NY: The Viking Press, 1970.
- Boyle, James. *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical tradition*. London and NY: Routledge Press, 1997.
- Brooke, Iris. *Costume in Greek Classic Drama*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1962.

- Burkert, Walter. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, trans. Margaret Pinder and Walter Burkert. London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1992.
- Burnett, Mark, and Ramona Wray, eds. *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*. London and NY: Macmillan, 1997.
- Cesaire, Aime. *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham. NY: Monthly Review Press, 1972.
- Coolidge, Archibald Jr. *Beyond the Fatal Flaw: A Study of Neglected Forms of Greek Drama*. Lake Macbridge: The Maecenas Press, 1980.
- Coon, H. Raymond. *The Foreigner in Hellenistic Comedy*, Diss. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Libraries, 1920.
- Cropp, Martin, et al., eds. *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*. Calgary: Univ. of Calgary Press, 1986.
- D'amico, Jack. *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*. Tampa: Univ. of South Florida Press, 1991.
- Davies M. Wyn, et al. *Barbaric Others: A Manifesto on Western Racism*. London and Boulder: Pluto Press, 1993.
- De Almeida, Manoel. *Some Records of Ethiopia: 1593-1646*, trans. and ed. C.F.Beckingham, and G.W.Huntingford. London: The Hakluyt Society, 1954.
- Dirks, Nicholas, ed. *Colonialism and Culture*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1992.
- Dobrov, Gregory. *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, and Alan Sinfield, eds. *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1985.
- Driver, Tom F., *The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama*. NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960.

- Dunbain, Thomas. *Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours*. London: The Society for the Promotion of Hellenistic Studies, 1957.
- Eagleton, Terry, et al. *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Edinger, Edward. *The Eternal Drama: The Inner Meaning of Greek Mythology*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1994.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Markmann. NY: Grove Weidenfeld Press, 1967.
- Felperin, Howard. *The Uses of the Canon: Elizabethan Literature and Contemporary Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990
- Ferguson, John. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1972.
- Friedlander, Gerald. *Shakespeare and the Jew*. NY: AMS Press, 1974.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *The Stranger in Shakespeare*. NY: Stein and Day, 1972.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. NY: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- , *Discipline and Punish*. NY: Pantheon Books, 1977.
- , *History of Sexuality I*. NY: Vintage Books, 1980.
- , *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. NY: Vintage Books, 1965.
- , *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. NY: Vintage Books, 1970.
- , *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980.
- Fryer, Peter. *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*. London: Pluto Press, 1984.

- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1998.
- Gates, Henry Jr., ed. *"Race," Writing, and Difference*. Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Grant, Michael. *The Jews in the Roman World*. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons Press, 1973.
- Gilman, Sander. *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.
- Gollancz, Sir Israel. *Allegory and Mysticism in Shakespeare: A Medievalist on 'The Merchant of Venice'*. NY: Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1973.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, and Catherine Gallagher. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000.
- . *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Greene, Ellen. *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1998.
- Gross, John. *Shylock: Four Hundred Years in the Life of a Legend*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1992.
- Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self- through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Hartog, Francois. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, trans. Janet Lloyd. Berkely and London: Univ. of California Press, 1988.
- Hendricks, Margo, and Patricia Parker, eds. *Women, 'Race,' and writing in the Early Modern Period*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Hengel, Martin. *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians*, trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortres Press, 1980.
- Humphries, Jefferson. *The Otherness Within: Gnostic Reading in Marcel Proust, Flanery O'Connor, and Francois Villon*. Baton Rouge and London:

Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1983.

Irwin, Eleanor. *Color Terms in Greek Poetry*. Toronto: Hakkert, 1974.

Jardin, Lisa. *Reading Shakespeare Historically*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Jepsen, Laura. *Ethical aspects of tragedy; a comparison of certain tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Seneca, and Shakespeare*. NY: AMS Press, 1971.

Johnson, Lemuel. *The Devil, The Gargoyle, and The Buffoon: The Negro as Metaphor in Western Literature*. London and Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1969.

----- . *Shakespeare in Africa (and Other Venues): Import and the Appropriation of Culture*. Trenton and Asmara: Africa World Press, 1998.

Jones, Eldred. *Othello's Countrymen: The African in English Renaissance Drama*. London: Oxford U.P., 1965.

----- . *The Elizabethan Image of Africa*. Charlottesville: The Univ. Press of Virginia, 1971.

Kabbani, Rana. *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule*. London: Macmillan, 1986.

Knight, Wilson. *The Shakespearian Tempest*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932.

Konstan, David. *Roman Comedy*. NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1983.

Kristeva, Julia. *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez. NY: Columbia U.P., 1991.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays*. London and NY: Routledge, 1988.

Lewis, Reina. *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity and Representation*. London and NY: Routledge, 1996.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1983.

- Long, Timothy. *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1986.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London and NY: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.
- , and Martin Orkin, eds. *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. London and NY: Routledge, 1998.
- McConnel-Ginet, Sally, *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. NY: Praeger, 1980.
- MacDonald, G. Joyce. *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*. London: Associated Univ. Presses, 1997.
- Michelson, H. *The Jew in Early English Literature*. NY: Hermon Press, 1972.
- Miller, Christopher. *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Miola, Robert. *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- . *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy: The Influence of Plautus and Terence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practice, Politics*. London and NY: Verso, 1997.
- Patai, Raphael, and Jennifer Patai Wing. *The Myth of the Jewish Race*. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Plumb, Harold. *The Italian Renaissance*. NY: American Heritage, 1961.
- Pratt, Norman. *Seneca's Drama*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1983.
- Radin, Max. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915.

- Reynolds, Vernon, et al. *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism*. Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1989.
- Roth, Cecil. *A History of the Jews in England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. NY: Vintage Books, 1993.
- . *Orientalism*. N.Y: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Shapiro, James. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1996.
- Silk, M. S., ed. *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1992.
- Snowden, Frank Jr. *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks*. London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983.
- . *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience*. London and Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970.
- Snyder, Louis. *The Idea of Racialism: Its Meaning and History*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co. Press, 1962.
- Springborg, Patricia. *Western Republicanism and the Oriental Prince*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1992.
- Stow, Kenneth. *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Tokson, Elliot. *The Popular Image of the Black Man in English Drama, 1550-1688*. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1982.

- Trachtenberg, Joshua. *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1983.
- Traub, Valerie. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. NY: Routledge, 1992.
- Tudeau-Clayton, Margaret. *Jonson, Shakespeare and Early Modern Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
- Tyrrell, Blake. *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*. London and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1984.
- Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1991.
- Veeser, H. Aram, *The New Historicism: Reader*. NY: Routledge, 1994.
- Vickers, Brian. *Towards Greek Tragedy: Drama, Myth, Society*. London: Longman Ltd., 1973.
- Walcot, Peter. *Greek Drama in Its Theatrical and Social Context*. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 1976.
- Warner, Rex. *Greeks and Trojans*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1953.
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1994.
- Wilson, Scott. *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1995.
- Winkler, John J., and Froma I. Zeitlin, eds. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?: Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1990.
- Wiseman, T. P. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter: Short Run Press Ltd., 1998.
- Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London and NY: Routledge Press, 1995.

Vita

The author was born in a small countryside village near Busan, the Republic of Korea, to his parents Mr. Dongjin Jeoung, Mrs. Doorri Jang. He was educated in Busan until he earned bachelor of arts degree in English from Busan National University, then moved to Seoul, where he continued his graduate studies in English at Yonsei University, and taught English in various schools and institutes for many years. In 1997, he came to the United States to continue his doctoral studies at Louisiana State University, where he earned doctoral degree in comparative literature (English and classical studies). Since 2002, he has been teaching at Busan National University in Korea.