

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ



Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi
The Journal of International Social Sciences

Cilt: 28, Sayı: 2, Sayfa: 97-107, TEMMUZ – 2018

Makale Gönderme Tarihi: 03.05.2018 Kabul Tarihi: 24.07.2018

FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE STATE IN *MUSTAPHA* AND *MACBETH*: A HEGELIAN APPROACH

Mustapha ve Macbeth' de Kadının Devlet İşlerine Katılması: Hegelci Bir Yaklaşım

Işıl ŞAHİN GÜLTER¹

Abstract

Queen Elizabeth's reign informs dramatists to deal with the themes of power and politics in this era, since the sovereign's gender is one of the fundamental social and political considerations of Elizabethan period. The English display an ambivalent reaction to the idea of woman ruler, as a ruler is always identified with masculinity. Queen Elizabeth's reign arouses a vague anxiety among the English people who perceive an inherent danger within female rule. In this context, this study aims to analyze perception of inherent danger within female rule in Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* (1594) and W. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1606) by focusing on the representation of female participation in state affairs in the light of Hegel's construction of the state. According to Hegel, nature assigns man to the state, and woman to the family; man maintains his power in public affairs while the woman is expected to fulfill the responsibility of training children to be citizens of the state rather than participating in public affairs. In *Mustapha*, Greville sets his play in the Ottoman state and depicts Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) as an ambitious, manipulative, and intriguing character. Similarly in *Macbeth*, Shakespeare stages Lady Macbeth as a power-hungry and intriguing character. Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) and Lady Macbeth's preference of political to familial is depicted as unnatural by their nature that results in disorder for the state. This study aims to demonstrate that Greville and Shakespeare represent female participation in the state as a disruptive force in the light of Hegel's construction of the state.

Key Words: Elizabethan Drama, Hegel, Hurrem Sultan, Lady Macbeth, State.

Öz

Kraliçe Elizabeth hükümdarlığı, dönemin oyun yazarlarını güç ve politika temalarına değinmeleri konusunda yönlendirir; çünkü hükümdarın cinsiyeti Elizabeth döneminin önde gelen sosyal ve politik hususlarından biridir. İngilizler kadın hükümdar fikrine çelişkili bir tutum sergiler, çünkü hükümdarlık erkeklik ile özdeşleştirilir. Kraliçe Elizabeth hükümdarlığı, kadın yönetiminde mevcut bir tehlike sezen İngilizler arasında tanımlanamayan bir endişeye yol açar. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma Hegel'in devlet inşası ışığında, kadının devlet işlerine katılmasına odaklanarak, Fulke Greville'nin *Mustapha* (1594) ve W. Shakespeare'in *Macbeth* (1606) oyunlarında kadın yönetimindeki mevcut tehlike algısını incelemeyi amaçlar. Hegel'e göre, doğa erkeği devlete, kadını ise aileye tayin eder; erkek gücünü kamu işlerinde idame ettirirken, kadının kamu işlerine katılmak yerine, kamuya vatandaş yetiştirme sorumluluğunu üstlenmesi beklenir. *Mustapha* oyununda, Greville Osmanlı Devleti'ni konu alır, ve Hürrem Sultan'ı hırslı, manipülatif ve entrikacı karakter olarak resmeder. Benzer bir şekilde, *Macbeth* oyununda Shakespeare Lady Macbeth'i gözünü iktidar hırsı bürümüş entrikacı karakter olarak sahneler. Hürrem Sultan ve Lady Macbeth'in politik olanı ailevi olana tercih etmeleri cinsiyetlerinin doğasına aykırı olarak resmedilir ki, bu da devlet düzeninin bozulmasına neden olur. Bu çalışma, Hegel'in devlet inşası ışığında, Greville ve Shakespeare'in kadının devlet işlerine katılmasını yıkıcı güç olarak resmettiklerini göstermeyi amaçlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Elizabeth Dönemi Tiyatrosu, Hegel, Hürrem Sultan, Lady Macbeth, Devlet

Introduction

Hegel's interpretation of Sophocles' play *Antigone* is vital to understand woman's role in the Hegelian system. Hegel utilizes *Antigone* both in *Phenomenology* and the *Philosophy of Right* in

*Öğr. Gör., Fırat Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu. ELAZIĞ e-posta: igulter@firat.edu.tr

order to assert that nature assigns man to the state and woman to the family. In Hegelian system, man is granted with the right of participating in political life, while the familial ethical life is woman's unique responsibility. This article aims to apply Hegel's construction of the state to the plays of Elizabethan period in which we can find an outlet to deal with the separation of the familial/political nexus. Queen Elizabeth's reign (1558-1603) inspired many dramatists to deal with the separation of the particular and universal, family and community, divine law and human law, woman and man. The concern about the ruler's gender formed one of the primary social and political considerations of Elizabethan period, so the dramatists could hardly separate themselves from the social and political concerns. As seemingly, "the poet is an imitator of nature; he produces what he sees in the world, and it is only his preoccupation with that world which renders him a poet" (Bloom, Jaffa, 1964: 8). Inevitably, social and political paradigms of this period informed the works of Fulke Greville and W. Shakespeare whose subjects and themes often revolve around issues of power and politics as will be analyzed in this article.

Wain remarks on Elizabethan playwrights' thematic concerns and argues that the sovereign stability was the priority: "The English scene, viewed from an Elizabethan standpoint, was dominated by one urgent need: the need for political stability, guaranteed by an undisputed monarchy" (1965: 24). The Tudor monarchy, afflicted with Henry's succession problems, Mary's failed marriage, and Queen Elizabeth's ambivalent attitudes towards matrimony perplexed people and created a desire for stable sovereignty. Especially, Queen Elizabeth's reign aroused an undefined distress among the English people who perceived an inherent danger within female rule. An Elizabethan historian, Carole Levin remarks that the English displayed an ambivalent reaction to the Queen's reign due to the conflict between rule and femininity since "womanly behaviour would ill-fit a queen for the rigors of rule" (1994: 3). Although Elizabeth asserted the title King as frequently as Queen and sought ways of transcending the gender issue, for the Queen it is difficult to meet the demands made on the monarch, since the characteristic qualities which a monarch is expected to display have been associated with masculinity (MacCaffrey, 1993: 358). In other words, perception of inherent danger within female rule posited Queen Elizabeth's reign as unstable for the Englishmen.

The undefined anxiety among the English is reflected, and responded to, in Elizabethan drama. In Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* and W. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* the anxiety of female participation in the state is personified in Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) and Lady Macbeth. Greville utilizes Ottoman state and characters in order to reflect his political vision of Queen's reign. Greville depicts Rossa's manipulation of the state affairs and her participation in political sphere as the intrigues that set the family and the state in opposition. Similarly, Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth is depicted as an intriguing character that prefers political life to familial one that disrupts the harmony between these two spheres. Greville's depiction of Rossa and Shakespeare's depiction of Lady Macbeth as a disruptive force in the state can be regarded as their discontentment of Queen Elizabeth's reign. In order to analyze representation of female participation in the state in the examples of Elizabethan drama, Hegel's construction of the state will be used as theoretical approach in this article.

Hegel's Construction of the State: Family/State and Woman/Man

Hegel begins his treatment of history with the ancient *polis* or city-state in his *Phenomenology* and furthers his argument in *Philosophy of Right* where he establishes a dialectic of particular and universal. In the ancient world, the *polis* only recognizes the universal aspect of human action and risk of life for welfare, while the particular is confined to the family. In the ancient world, man is necessarily a member of a family that represents particularity. Man's presence in the family circle represents "mere particularity" since this presence is lack of risk of life for recognition. In order to achieve self-consciousness and become a citizen, the male moves out of the family circle (Kojève, 1969: 59). Hegel remarks this phenomenon as follows:

The acquisition and maintenance of power and wealth is in part concerned only with needs and belongs to the sphere of appetite; in part, they become in their higher determination something that

is only mediated. This determination does not fall within the Family itself, but bears on what is truly universal, the community; it has, rather, a negative relation to the Family, and consists in expelling the individual from the Family, subduing the natural aspect and separateness of his existence, and training him to be virtuous, to a life in and for the universal (1977: 269).

As it can be inferred, the community separates man from the family “by training him to be virtuous.” This separation leads man to achieve “the manhood of the community” or universal individuality at the expense of his particularity which is possible only in death in the ancient world (Taylor, 1975: 172-177). In other words, in the ancient world, the particular is represented by the family; the universal is represented by the *polis*. The family is the sphere of life, while the *polis* is the risk of life. There is a constant tension between these two spheres that is inevitable; man cannot deny his particular existence in the family as well as the universality of his existence in and for the *polis*. Each institution preserves and produces the other, since each owes its very existence to the other (Kain, 2002: 6).

This tension between particular/universal and family/community brings out the tragic character of the ancient world and creates an opposition between particular family life and universal community in the *polis* (Kojève, 1969: 61, 298). According to Hegel, the conflict between *polis* and family, universal and particular, is also a conflict between human law and divine law as represented in conflict between man and woman. Hegel notes that man and woman differ from each other in natural characteristics: “the former is powerful and active, the latter passive and subjective” (2008: 168). In the section entitled “The Ethical Order,” Hegel prefigures the human law and the divine law that are the two fundamentals of the ancient world. The human law is “the *known* law, and the prevailing custom” in the form of universality; its truth is the authority (1977: 267). On the other hand, human law finds its antithesis in divine law that confronts human law’s openly accepted authority (1977: 268). Hegel points out that nature assigns man and his public affairs in the community to human law where man maintains his power and wealth. However, the nature assigns woman and her activity in the family to divine law. Thus, in the political sphere man can find an outlet where he asserts the manhood of the community, while the womanhood is confined to the family (2008: 169). In other words, the powerful and active man is assigned to the *polis* that represents community and state, while passive and subjective woman is assigned to the family in Hegel’s dialectic. According to Hegel, woman cannot attain “the ideal” due to her lack of artistic production. For this reason, woman cannot participate in state or government. Hegel remarks this phenomenon as follows:

When women hold the helm of government, the state is at once in jeopardy, because women regulate their actions not by the demands of universality but by arbitrary inclinations and opinions. Women are educated -- who knows how? -- as it were by breathing in ideas, by living rather than by acquiring knowledge. The status of manhood, on the other hand is attained only by the stress of thought and much technical exertion (2008: 169).

According to Hegel, woman’s participation in the state is regarded as a threat since woman is lack of demands of universality on the contrary to man. Hegel asserts that woman behaves not by demands of universality but by demands of particularity that posits the state in a dangerous situation. In Hegelian state, woman is expected to fulfill responsibility of training children to be citizens of the state. Woman educates the children within family circle as free individuals who are “capable of holding free property of their own and founding families of their own, the sons as heads of new families, the daughters as wives” (2008: 175). However, in Hegelian state, woman is denied from political affairs and not granted with the right of participating in the state.

The point that triggers my attention for the theoretical approach of this article is Hegel’s perspective of Antigone² that he employs in order to deal with the ancient world. In the section

² Sophocles’s play *Antigone*, written in 411 BC, deals with the tragedy of Antigone who defends individual freedom in a world where the rules of human law and divine law are in conflict.

entitled “The Ethical Order”³ in *Phenomenology*, the human law that represents public affairs of the community is assigned to Antigone’s brothers. On the other hand, divine law that represents family, religion, and tradition is assigned to Antigone (Kain, 2002: 4). The young man raised in the family achieves virtue and public honor by risking his life in the ancient world as Hegel asserts “death is the fulfillment and the supreme ‘work’ which the individual as such undertakes on its behalf” (1977: 270). According to Hegel, the highest service that an individual could undertake for his community is “death.” On the other hand, the highest duty of the family is to provide a proper burial. In the case of Antigone, Eteocles and Polynices leave their home for the community, for politics and government, while Antigone remains within the family. Eteocles becomes the ruler of the city and Polynices attacks it that caused death of the brothers. The city recognizes Eteocles as their ruler but condemns Polynices as an enemy and a traitor. According to human law, Eteocles deserves to be buried in the proper way; however the burial is denied to Polynices who takes up arms against the community. The deprivation of burial rights for Polynices is not acceptable to divine law. As seemingly, the equilibrium between human law and divine law, community and family is dissolved; by honoring one brother and dishonoring the other, human law and divine law are set in opposition (1977: 555). For Antigone, the new ruler Creon’s action denies divine law and universal moral principle as a result she asserts that commitment to divine law is prior to human law of community. Antigone reacts to human law as the representative of divine law. Her reaction is suppressed by human law that results in Antigone’s transformation into an “internal enemy” (1977: 288).

Hegel’s perspective of *Antigone* reveals the way in which the tragic conflict between universal community and particular family results in “soulless and dead” universality (1977: 289). Hegel asserts that not only external forces but also “the rebellious principle of pure individuality” repressed by the community cause the destruction of the pagan world. Hegel remarks this phenomenon as follows:

Since the community only gets an existence through its interference with the happiness of the Family, and by dissolving [individual] self-consciousness into the universal, it creates for itself in what it suppresses and what is at the same time essential to it an internal enemy – womankind in general. Womankind – the everlasting irony [in the life] of the community – changes by intrigue the universal end of the government into a private end, transforms its universal activity into a work of some particular individual, and perverts the universal property of the state into a possession and ornament for the Family (1977: 288).

According to Hegel, repressed individualism of woman transforms her into an “internal enemy” who intrigues in order to change universal end of the government into a private end. This attempt brings about the end of communal life. In other words, the repression of woman’s individualism disrupts the communal life in the ancient world. In Hegelian state, the disruptive individualism of woman persuades the young man to exercise his power for the sake of family dynasty rather than for public welfare. That is, the woman conspires with their sons, brothers, or husbands in order to realize male domination for family dynasty that results in disorder within the state (Mills, 1986: 138, 139). In this article, Hegel’s construction of the state will be applied as the theoretical approach to the examples of Elizabethan drama in which female participation in the state is regarded as a disruptive force.

Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) in Fulke Greville’s *Mustapha*

Fulke Greville’s *Mustapha* (1594) was written in the social, political and literary context of the Elizabethan age and it was intended for the specific audience of the courtiers that were grouped

³ “The Ethical Order” or *Sittlichkeit* is the ethical behavior embedded in our customs, traditions, and practices of community. Hegel asserts that “the wisest men of antiquity have therefore declared that wisdom and virtue consist in living in accordance with the customs of one’s nation.” G. W. F. Hegel. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford UP. (1977): 142.

around the Earl of Essex (Rigali, 2000: 8). It is certain that Elizabethan social and political atmosphere influenced Greville's ideas on the issues of the familial/political perspective. Karen Raber argues that Greville's literary works reflect his own political vision. She remarks that his "plays draw consistently disastrous conclusions about the consequences of blending family and state structures in a hereditary monarchy, which reproduces itself through familial relations" (2001: 113). In order to represent the instabilities derived from blending family and state affairs, Greville repeatedly posits intriguing women at the heart of the familial/political nexus. In this fashion, monarchy's fragility is associated with gender issue (2001: 113).

In this respect, Greville's representation of Rossa⁴ derives from the tension between familial and political as also argued in Hegel's construction of the state. As seemingly, Rossa's interference in the political sphere by plotting and succeeding in the murder of Mustapha is regarded as a disruptive force in the play. Almas argues that Rossa is depicted as an immoral, hypocritical, ambitious and egocentric character in the play. Rossa's plotting not only the murder of the potential heir Mustapha, but also of her own daughter, Camena⁵, intensifies her wickedness in the course of the play (2009: 124). Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) is also depicted as an ambitious, hypocritical, cunning and intriguing character in many Turkish plays such as Yusuf Niyazi's *Mazlum Şehzadeler Yahud Hurrem Sultan* (1909), Orhan Asena's *Hurrem Sultan* (1959) and *Ya Devlet Başa Ya Kuzgun Leşe* (1989) (Doğan, 1999: 58). She is accused of plotting against Mustapha who was regarded as the potential heir to Solyman's throne. Mustapha is well-educated, moral and beloved son of Solyman who is also respected and admired by other statesmen and the janissaries. However, Hurrem Sultan reacts in order to eliminate Mustapha from succession to throne in favor of her own sons Selim and Bayazıd (Yücel, Sevim, 1991: 201). She plots against Mustapha with the support of Rustem Pasha who wrote a letter to Iran's Shah Tahmasb asking Shah to help him against his father by imitating Mustapha's signet (Unan, 1990: 9-16). They also spread rumor of Mustapha's attempts to succession to the throne with the help of Anatolian sipahis, Turkomans, and bandits. They succeed in convincing Solyman to murder his son Mustapha (Shaw, 1994: 160, 161). Rustem Pasha is accused of this plot that recorded in Ottoman history as "Mekr-i Rüstem" (Peçevi, 1999: 252). The murder of Mustapha is overreacted by society, and this reaction is reflected by Ottoman poets of the period in their epicedials. The most famous epicedial belongs to Taşlıcalı Yahya who lambasted Hurrem Sultan and Rustem Pasha in his work (Uzunçarşılı, 1995: 403). Greville stages a similar plotline as will be analyzed below.

In the play, Rossa appears on the stage and accuses Solyman's potential heir Mustapha of being too ambitious and possessing "a strange aspiring minde" (*Mustapha* 1. i. 31). She aims to raise Solyman's doubts of Mustapha about his impatient attempts to succeed his father: "But judge him with himself, and that by fact/ Persia our old imbrued enemy,/ Treates marriage with sonne without father" (*Mustapha* 1.i. 33-35). Rossa accuses Mustapha of making secret agreements with Persia, the Ottoman state's long time enemy, without Solyman's consent. She draws attention over Mustapha by referring "his untimely borne, strength strangely gathered" (*Mustapha* 1. i. 26). She expresses his fear of this threat and states that:

⁴ The name Hurrem was practically unknown in Europe probably until the nineteenth century, when it appeared in several multivolume histories of the Ottoman Empire (e.g., Khurrem or Churrem in Joseph von Hammer's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* and *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman*, respectively). Early modern western texts used the names Rossa, Roxolana, or their variants, which often reflected geographical and ethnic differences: e.g., Rossa (Italian); Rose (French), Rosa (English); Rosa Solimana, Roxa (Spanish); Reussin (German); Roxelane, Roxolane (French); Roxelana, Roxalana (English, German); Rosselane, Rosselana (Italian); Roksolana (Polish, Ukrainian), and Roksoliana (western Ukrainian). G. Yermolenko. *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*. Ashgate (2010): 271.

⁵ Roxolana's daughter Mihrimah is seldom mentioned by that name in early modern western historical and literary texts. In some early modern plays and chronicles, she is called Camena or Cameria. In the play, Rossa plotted the murder of Camena, however in Ottoman history Mihrimah Sultan died (1578) nearly twenty years after Hurrem Sultan's death (1558) G. Yermolenko. *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*. Ashgate (2010): 272.

Solyman; feare is broke loose within my spirits;
What will or may be, seems already happens:
His power thus great, well fixt, occasion ready,
Shadowes of ruine to my heart deliuer.
Confused noise within my eares doth thunder,
Of multitudes, that with obeying threaten.
Solyman, feare of thee makes me wish for death,
And feare again to leaue thee, feareth death (*Mustapha* 1.i. 65-72).

As it can be inferred Rossa tries to raise Solyman's doubts of Mustapha about his impatient attempts to succeed his father drawing attention to Mustapha's increasing power. She offers her counsel to Solyman and states that the only safe policy is to kill Mustapha. By the way, Rossa reminds Solyman Baiazeth's overthrown by his own son⁶:

Old age is natures pouerty, and scorne:
Desires riches liues in Princes children,
Their youths are Comets, within whose corruption,
Men prophecy new hope of better fortune.
Baiazeth shows no man turnes from a Kingdome,
For humblenes to aske his fathers blessing:
Nature corrupted is; and wit preferreth
The wisdom that for self-advantage erreth (*Mustapha* 1.i. 106-13).

By reminding Baiazeth's overthrown by his own son, Rossa succeeds in convincing Solyman that Mustapha is a menace to the state, and it is clear that her interference in the state brings a disorder by shaking Solyman's personal insecurity. Rossa's counsel incites Solyman's fear of losing the control of the state. Rossa attempts to persuade Solyman to exercise his power for the sake of family dynasty rather than for public welfare. That is, Rossa conspires with her husband in order to realize male domination for family dynasty that results in disorder within the Ottoman state. In Hegelian terms, Rossa puts her individual subjective needs not only before the welfare of the universal, but in place of state itself that set the state and family in opposition.

In Act 2, Beglerbie's honest account of Mustapha's court confirms Mustapha's innocence and reassures Solyman's confidence in his son eliminating his fears temporarily. Camena also affirms Mustapha's innocence: "I *Mustapha* haue warned/That Innocence is not enough to saue/...For dreadful is that State; which all may doe/ Yet they that all men feare, are fearful too" (*Mustapha* 2. i. 70-77). In the following scene, Camena tries to assure his father Solyman of Mustapha's innocence: "Sweet *Mustapha* doth Nature lie in you?/ Sir, these be Greatness mists; be not deceiued/ For Kings hate in their fearefull waining state/And easily doubt, and what they doubt, they hate" (*Mustapha* 2. ii. 53-56). In Act 2, scene iv, we witness that intriguing Rossa decides to murder Camena when she learns from Beglerbie that her daughter warns Mustapha as well as softens Solyman's heart towards his son:

And they do erre that others erruor cherish;
Camena, then since thy desires would make
Thy mothers harme examples of thy glory,
Since thou do'st leaue me for a brothers sake,
Since thy heart feels not what makes others sorry,
Thy triumphe shall be death, thy glory shame,
For so die they that wrong a mothers name;

⁶ In *Selimus, Emperor of the Turks* (1594), English playwright Robert Greene presents the actions of Selimus, the Ottoman prince who poisons and dethrones his father Baiazeth on his way to attain sultanate of the Ottoman state. Although this play departs markedly from historical context, Ottoman succession is repeatedly displayed and referred by Elizabethan playwrights.

Thy treasures with thine owne arts are discarded;
I will do something not to be forgotten,
The giuers of examples are regarded (*Mustapha* 2. iv. 99-108).

As seemingly, after Rossa learns that Camena discovers the danger for Mustapha and warns him, she decides to victimize her own daughter. The slaughter of Camena by her own mother, convinces Solyman that Camena and Mustapha conspired against him and Solyman decides that: “What hills hath nature rais'd above the fier?/ What state beyond them is, that will conspire?/ I swear by all the Saints, my sonne shall die,/ Revenge is justice and no cruelty” (*Mustapha* 4.iii. 120-23). The murder of Camena and Solyman’s decision to murder Mustapha foreshadow disorder that grips the state. This disorder reveals that the familial interference in political sphere disrupts the harmony between the two by disregarding separation of powers (Raber, 2001: 136). Greville’s depiction of the familial participation in the state dissolves internal coherence of the political and familial sphere. On behalf of the family, Rossa reacts to divine law by murdering her own daughter; on the contrary Solyman reacts to human law by denying legal punishment of Rossa for killing Camena. By familial participation in the state the human law and divine law are set in opposition similar to Antigone’s case. That is, Greville posits Rossa as the “internal enemy” who intrigues with male authority and “perverts the universal property of the state into a possession and ornament for the Family” (Hegel, 1977: 288). Furthermore, Rossa sacrifices her motherly instinct for the sake of political power that disrupts the harmony between familial and political.

The main point to get hold of here is that Greville’s depiction of Rossa associates Elizabethan anxiety of female rule with Hegel’s consideration of familial participation in the state. According to Raber, Greville tries to reevaluate the jeopardy that Queen’s gender posits to England and “the internalized danger of femininity, the disruptive force within- the force that is the family, that creates family with all the consequent messy, unstable power relations between husbands and wives, parents and children” (2001: 137). In other words, Greville’s play exposes the perception of inherent danger within female rule due to the unstable power relations within the family. If we take Greville’s depiction of Rossa into consideration, it is clear that Hegel’s definition of woman as repressed “internal enemy” that disrupts community and public welfare can be applied to Elizabethan drama. Representation of Rossa as an intriguing character who plots against Mustapha conspiring with Solyman not only reveals Greville’s discontentment with Elizabethan reign within which Greville assumes an inherent danger but also complies with Hegel’s attitude to female participation in the state.

Lady Macbeth in W. Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*

W. Shakespeare draws the plot for *Macbeth* (1606) from historical sources, particularly Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1577). However, Shakespeare combines different versions of the story of Macbeth and Duncan in order to create his play. The *Chronicles* include an account of King Malcolm II (r. 1005-34), whose throne passed first to his grandson Duncan I (r. 1034-40) and then to Macbeth (r. 1040-57). For his portrayal of the murder through which Macbeth took Duncan's throne, Shakespeare includes another version of the *Chronicles*—King Duff's death at the hands of one of his retainers, Donwald. In combining the two stories, Shakespeare creates a specific tone for the tale of regicide (Stallybrass, 2003: 1). *Macbeth* was written after the accession of James I to the throne that gave England a monarch ruled again by a male. Critics discuss the correspondence between James I’s accession and Shakespeare’s composition of *Macbeth* and point out that Shakespeare aims to examine the political succession of a male ruler over a female one by dramatization and demonization of Lady Macbeth in the course of the play (Hadfield, 2004:2, Regan, 2000: 19). In other words, the discontentment of the familial participation in the state is personified in Lady Macbeth whose interference in the political sphere brings disorder to the state and set the familial and the political in opposition similar to the cases of *Antigone* and *Mustapha*. This tendency shows clear resemblance to Hegel’s dialectics of particular/universal, familial/political, divine law/human law, and woman/man. Through James I’s

succession to the throne, the family is no longer expected to participate in the political sphere rather to stay within familial sphere in order to train children to be citizens of the state.

Similar to Greville's depiction of Rossa, Shakespeare depicts Lady Macbeth as an ambitious, cunning and intriguing character who brings disorder to the state by her ambitious attempts which are highly unnatural by the familial side. She is so aware of her power over Macbeth that, she assumes that only her motivation will lead Macbeth actively to attain the kingly position of power and authority. When she summons Macbeth with the murmuring words of the witches in her soliloquy, she assumes "unholy, ungodly, and unnatural" spirit of the witches and she echoes their destructive evil spirits (McGuire, 1994: 111). She says that:

Glamis thou art, and Cawdor; and shalt be
What thou art promised: yet do I fear thy nature
It is too full o'the milk of human kindness...
Than wishest should be undone.
Hie thee hither, that I may pour my spirits in thine ear;
And chastise with valour of my tongue;
All that impedes thee from the golden round (*Macbeth* 1.v. 14-28).

Lady Macbeth participates in the state as a disruptive force that is confirmed by Macbeth's murdering current monarch Duncan in their home for his own family dynasty rather than public welfare. Macbeth's plotting against Duncan and murdering him set particular/universal, family/state, divine law/human law in opposition similar to the cases of *Antigone* and *Mustapha*. Shakespeare posits Lady Macbeth as the "internal enemy" who intrigues with male authority and "perverts the universal property of the state into a possession and ornament for the Family" (Hegel, 1977: 288). Shakespeare's depiction of Lady Macbeth as an intriguing and disruptive character reaffirms Hegel's depiction of woman as an "internal enemy." Thus, Macbeth's murdering current monarch Duncan on the order of Lady Macbeth disrupts not only natural order of monarchy, but also the equilibrium between human law and divine law, community and family. The consequences of disruption of the harmony between these spheres are most particularly clear in nature as Macbeth states: "It is the bloody business which informs/ Thus to mine eyes. Now o'er the one half-world/ Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse/ The curtain'd sleep..." (*Macbeth* 2.i. 49-52). In the second act, disruption of nature is displayed as follows:

The night has been unruly. Where we lay,
Our chimneys were blown down and, as they say,
Lamentings heard i' th' air, strange screams of death,
And prophesying with accents terrible
Of dire combustion and confused events
New hatch'd to the woeful time. The obscure bird
Clamour'd the livelong night. Some say the Earth
Was feverous and did shake (*Macbeth* 2.iii. 28-35).

It is clear that disruption of monarchy on the order of Lady Macbeth reverberates in the nature. Shakespeare displays disruption of nature following Macbeth's evil deeds on the order of Lady Macbeth through storms, earth shakes, animal shrieks. In Hegelian terms, Lady Macbeth puts her individual subjective needs not only before the welfare of the universal, but in place of state itself. Lady Macbeth's participation in the state also disrupts the equilibrium between the natures of sexes. On the disruption of the equilibrium between the familial and the state, femininity and masculinity, Adelman argues that *Macbeth* "gives us images of a masculinity and a femininity that are terribly disturbed" (1987: 93). In other words, Lady Macbeth's participation in the state and Duncan's affliction by feminine prevails such as "planting the children to his throne and making them grown" really disturbed the confines of the family and the state, femininity and masculinity. Shakespeare's discontent of this disturbance results in elimination of Duncan from the political

sphere (Adelman, 1987: 94). On the other hand, the perversion of the familial resulted in elimination of Lady Macbeth's motherly instinct. Since feminine desires for the state were seen unnatural and unacceptable, Lady Macbeth repudiates her femininity for the sake of political power:

The raven himself is hoarse
That croaks the fatal entrance of Duncan
Under my battlements. Come you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here;
And fill me, from the crown to the toe, top full
Of direst cruelty! Make thick my blood;
Stop up the access and passage to remorse,
That no compunctious visitings of nature
Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
The effect and it! Come to my woman's breasts,
And take my milk for gall, you murdering ministers,
Wherever in your sightless substances
You wait on nature's mischief! (*Macbeth* 1.v. 38- 50)

It is inferred that the tension between feminine nature and the political ambition leads Lady Macbeth to be "unsexed," since, as Hegel asserts above, "[man] is powerful and active, [woman] passive and subjective" (2008: 168). In order to attain power in political sphere, Lady Macbeth relinquishes her femininity. As Carolyn Asp argues in her article "Lady Macbeth openly attempts to reject her feminine traits and adopt a male mentality because she perceives that her society associates feminine qualities with weakness" and regards them as unsuitable for the political sphere (1981: 78). Similarly, Robert Kimbrough points out that "in Elizabethan literature, especially *Macbeth*, there is the idea that to be 'manly' is to be aggressive, daring, bold, resolute, and strong, especially in the face of death. And to be 'womanly' is to be gentle, fearful, pitying, wavering, and soft, a condition signified by tears" (1983: 178). Aware of her feminine confines, Lady Macbeth prefers to be "unsexed" in order not to feel any grief and remorse for the evil deeds she provokes. Manipulating her husband and intriguing within the political sphere Lady Macbeth breaks the harmony of Hegel's dialectics of particular/universal, family/state, divine law/human law and woman/man. Similar to Hegel's premises, Shakespeare represents Lady Macbeth as an "internal enemy" who disrupts state order by conspiring with male authority for the sake of family dynasty. Shakespeare's depiction of Lady Macbeth as an intriguing character not only reveals his discontentment with female participation in the state but also his contentment with James I's accession to the throne after the Queen. The main point to get hold of here is that Shakespeare's representation of Lady Macbeth as an intriguing woman who plots against the recent monarch conspiring with male authority not only reveals Shakespeare's discontentment with Elizabethan reign within which he assumes an inherent danger but also complies with Hegel's attitude to female participation in the state.

Conclusion

Fulke Greville and W. Shakespeare take into consideration the issues of power and politics of the Elizabethan period. Queen's reign inspires the dramatists to deal with familial/political concern of the period since Queen's reign is perceived as an unstable monarchy. The Englishmen show an ambivalent reaction to the idea of woman ruler since the monarch is always associated with masculinity. Both dramatists reflect this anxiety and fear of female participation in the state by utilizing different setting and characters; however depiction of their female protagonists, Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) and Lady Macbeth, reflects the same theme: inherent danger within female rule.

In Hegelian state, nature assigns woman to particular/family/divine law; and man to universal/state/human law. Woman is confined to particular family whose laws are embedded in religion and tradition. Woman is responsible of training children to be citizens of the state; however

woman is denied from the right of participating in the state. On the other hand, man is granted with universal community where he proves his manhood and maintains his power and wealth. He is also granted with the right of participating in the state. In other words, because of natural differences between two sexes, the political life of the city-state is the sphere of manhood while the family is the sphere of womanhood. The conflict between these two spheres is inevitable since each owes its very existence to the other; each preserves and produces the other. However, the tragic conflict between the particular family and universal community results in suppression of the divine law by the human law. When the human law suppresses and denies the divine law, this suppression creates “an internal enemy” who would disrupt the equilibrium between particular/family/woman and universal/community/man. Hegel’s “internal enemy” perverts the universal community for the sake of family dynasty rather than public welfare by participating in the state as a disruptive force. In Hegelian terms, female participation in the state is regarded as a threat, since woman’s regulation of actions is arbitrary and far away from universality.

The representation of female participation in the state in Elizabethan drama provides an outlet to which Hegel’s dialectics can be applied. Both in *Mustapha* and *Macbeth*, the separation between particular/family/woman and universal/state/man is easily traced. However, we witness that this rigid separation disrupts internal coherence of each of them. The repression of these forces brings out an “internal enemy” who is personified as a disruptive force in Rossa (Hurrem Sultan) and Lady Macbeth. As seemingly, their desire to participate in the state affairs not only disrupts the state but also their feminine nature. Rossa murders her own daughter for the sake of family dynasty. Similarly, Lady Macbeth sacrifices her mother instinct for the sake of desired kingly position of power and authority. Consequently, although Greville and Shakespeare set their plays in different states, the period in which they write brings them together in common assumption of female as a disruptive force for the state. The ambitious and intriguing female characters who prefer political to familial ethic reflect the political vision of Elizabethan period and the anxiety of female rule.

References

- Adelman, Janet. (1987). “‘Born of Woman’: Fantasies of Maternal Power in *Macbeth*.” *Cannibals, Witches, and Divorce: Estranging the Renaissance*. Ed. Marjorie Garber. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, p. 90-121.
- Almas, Lamiya Mohamed. (2009). “The Woman of the Early Modern Turk and Moor Plays.” Ph. D. Thesis, University of Minnesota.
- Asp, Carolyn. (1981). “Be Bloody, Bold and Resolute”: Tragic Action and Sexual Stereotyping in *Macbeth*.” *Studies in Philology* 78. 2, p. 153-169.
- Bloom, Allan and Jaffa, V. (1964). *Shakespeare’s Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Doğan, Abide. (1999). “Türk Tiyatrosunda Hürrem Sultan.” *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. p. 57-64.
- Greville, Fulke. (1594). *The Tragedy of Mustapha*. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A02227.0001.001/1:2.3.2?rgn=div3;view=fulltext> (accessed 01, March 2018)
- Hadfield, Andrew. (2004). *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics*. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- ... (2008). *Philosophy of Right*. Trans. T. M. Knox. Ed. Stephen Houlgate. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Kain, P. J. (2002). “Hegel, Antigone, and Women,” *Owl of Minerva*, 33, p. 157-177.
- Kimbrough, Robert. (1983). “Macbeth: The Prisoner of Gender.” *Shakespeare Studies*, 16, p. 175
- Kojeve, Alexandre. (1969). *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*. Trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. New York: Basic Books.
- Levin, Carole. (1994). *The Heart and Stomach of a King*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- MacCaffrey, Wallace. (1993). *Elizabeth I*. London: Edward Arnold.
- McGuire, Philip C. (1994). *Shakespeare: The Jacobean Plays*. London: Macmillan.
- Mills, Patricia J. (1986). "Hegel's Antigone" *Owl of Minerva* 17. 2, p. 131-152.
- Peçevi, İbrahim. (1999). *Peçevi Tarihi*, Hz. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, C. I, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Raber, Karen. (2001). *Dramatic Difference: Gender, Class, and Genre in the Early Modern Closet Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Regan, Stephen. (2000). "Macbeth". *Shakespeare: Texts and Contexts* Ed. Kiernan Ryan. Basingstoke: Macmillan in association with the Open University.
- Rigali, Amanda. (2000). "The Plays of Fulke Greville in Context." Ph.D. Thesis, King's Colledge, London.
- Shakespeare, William. (1606). *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/macbeth/full.html> (accessed 15, March 2018).
- Shaw, Stanford. (1994). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Modern Türkiye*, Çev. Mehmet Harmancı, İstanbul: E Yayınları.
- Stallybrass, Peter. (2003). "Macbeth and Witchcraft." *Exploring Shakespeare*. Online ed. Detroit: Gale p. 1-10.
- Taylor, Charles. (1975). *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Unan, Fahri. (1990). "Kanuni Devri Şehzade Mücadeleleri ve Bunun Osmanlı Siyasi ve Sosyal Tarihi Bakımından Önemi", *Türk Yurdu*, X/35, Ankara. <http://yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr>
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. (1995). *Osmanlı Tarihi*, C.II, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Wain, John. (1965). *The Living World of Shakespeare: A Playgoer's Guide*. London: Macmillan.
- Yermolenko, Galina I. (2010). *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- Yücel, Yaşar and Sevim, Ali. (1991). *Klasik Dönemin Üç Hükümdarı: Fatih, Yavuz, Kanuni*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

