

# Discussing Gender Political Climate with focus on Women and Family Relationships in Shakespeare's Plays

Vilas Ankushrao Nagpure

Research scholar, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology and Medical Sciences, Sehore MP (India)

---

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 10 December 2018

### Keywords

political participation, women and shakespeare

---

## ABSTRACT

Feminism has a tendency to be thought of as a movement of women. It originates in the perception that there is a major issue with society's treatment of women. It endeavors to break down the purposes behind and dimensions of women's abuse, and to accomplish women's liberation. Kate Millet presents and examination the political relationship among men and women in *Sexual Politics* (1970) and demonstrates that the myth of the fall, the focal myth of the Judeo – Christian creative energy holds enormous power even in a rationalist time.

---

## 1. Introduction

The term feminism isn't utilized by the early women's activists. The early women's activists concentrated upon sex. As per them, the sexes are culturally, and not simply organically shaped. Their prompt center is to contradict the mistreatment of women. They remain for a general origination of humanity by uncovering ideology and contradicting against the bias and restriction.[1] A significant number of the radical English organizations assisted religious equity for women in the 1630s and 1650s. There are women who successfully freed themselves from the male authority amid this year. To enhance women's instructive and monetary chances, they attempt to control their own still, small voice.. Like Anne Hutchinson, these women are "women's activists in real life". Later the women's activist hypothesis offered ascends to a women's movement for a change. Noticeable all around, new thoughts with respect to social rearrangement are floating.[2]

In first experience with Adaptations of Shakespeare, Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier talk about their decision of the term 'adaptation': they picked it '[f]or absence of a superior term', in light of the fact that '[i]t is the word in most regular utilization'. Moreover, they supported it for its meanings to 'recontextualization' and 'process as opposed to a start and an end'. The ramifications of 'advance' might be viewed as proposing that adaptations are by definition 'superior to originals', or, in other words Fischlin and Fortier see as leeway. In particular, be that as it may, they claim that 'adaptation' is the term most drastically averse to make 'perplexity'. However, the most widely recognized understanding of the word 'adaptation' is an exchange from one medium into another, for example, a novel made into a film. This appears to me to be a strong purpose behind picking an alternate word to mean a work dependent on another work inside a similar medium. In Appropriations of Shakespeare's King Lear in Three Modern North American Novels, Anna Lindhé chooses the term 'appointment', regardless of its being seen by some as 'deprecatory' attributable to conceivable implications of feedback, the seizure of intensity and even violence. At the point when found in relation not exclusively to the appropriated content yet to the observer/peruser, Lindhé contends, appointment can be understood as 'a moral procedure's and not only 'a political or oppositional act'.

Shakespeare has dependably been adapted and appropriated by different dramatists, similarly as he himself adapted and appropriated different scholars. Shakespeare's works are both the items and the wellsprings of adapting forms; subsequently, his versions comprise one phase in a progressing procedure of adaptation. Amid the principal time of intensive Shakespeare adaptation, the Restoration, Shakespeare had not yet formed into the cultural symbol he is today. Shakespeare's play-writings were altered (or 'improved') as tastes changed. It was underestimated that present conclusions on what comprised great auditorium needed to manage any masterful decisions. In the mid-eighteenth century, in any case, things started to change. The on-screen character supervisor David Garrick was a standout amongst the most prominent figures in another theater movement that needed to return to Shakespeare's original content (despite the fact that the writings he utilized were in reality just marginally less altered than the versions performed by different organizations).[3]

## 2. Women and Shakespeare in the early 20th century

Shakespearean theatre's habit of exploring gender's multiple possibilities, and indeed women's central involvement in this exploration, is not a recent phenomenon. During World War I, in a hut in Bloomsbury built to offer respite for soldiers on leave from the front, a group of pro-suffrage women called on a heady mix of Shakespeare and patriotism to authorise their performances.[4] Ellen Terry, one of the most famous actresses of her day and herself a performer at the Shakespeare Hut, wrote that a debt was owed to Shakespeare 'for his vindication of women in [his] fearless, high-spirited, resolute and intelligent heroines'.[5] Inside the Hut, actresses performed Shakespearean pageants for the troops: on one occasion Terry herself played the cross-dressing Portia of *The Merchant of Venice* while younger actresses performed scenes from *Henry V*. [6] This echoed earlier suffragist work that had appropriated carefully chosen female characters such as Portia or the charismatic Cleopatra (*Antony and Cleopatra*), using Shakespeare to both inspire and legitimise political action.[7]

## 3. Political participation of women

women in parliament generally contribute to stronger attention to women's issues. Women's political participation is a fundamental prerequisite for gender equality and genuine democracy. It facilitates women's direct engagement in public decision-making and is a means of ensuring better accountability to women.[8]

Political accountability to women begins with increasing the number of women in decision-making positions, but it cannot stop there. What is required are gender-sensitive governance reforms that will make all elected officials more effective at promoting gender equality in public policy and ensuring their implementation.

One of the pillars of UN Women's work is advancing women's political participation and good governance, to ensure that decision-making processes are participatory, responsive, equitable and inclusive. Efforts are focused through strategic entry points that can advance the status of women by catalysing wide-ranging, long-term impacts.[9]

Support is provided to equip women to translate the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), now ratified by the majority of the world's governments, into legal guarantees of gender equality. Another strategy is through working with multiple stakeholders, like women's organizations, governments, the UN system and the private sector, to bring more women into government, train women leaders, and boost women's skills to actively participate in elections as candidates and voters.[10]

#### 4. Ancient Greece and Rome

Family life in ancient Greece and Rome illustrates a principle that applies in part to Shakespeare's time, certainly more than it does to the modern world: namely, that—in contrast to the modern view of family as a private set of associations among autonomous individuals—families in traditional cultures functioned both as parts of the larger community and as units from which individuals derived their identities.

#### 5. Ancient Greece

family life in ancient Greece had important personal functions—for instance, it was a place where emotional bonds were formed and where individuals received practical and religious instruction—the family's most important role was to serve as the foundation of the social structure. Family life varied from one ancient Greek city-state to another, but in every city-state, people viewed themselves as belonging to a polis, or community—a social unit in which all citizens participated and whose laws and customs were binding on all. The polis in turn was made up of smaller units based on kinship, the smallest being the individual family or household. Groups of related families formed what were known as gene (singular: *genos*). Several gene formed a phratry (a "brotherhood" or clan), and the phratries were grouped into phylae, or tribes. Each household included parents, children, and often additional members, such as slaves or unmarried female relatives. The father was the head of the household and was responsible for representing the family in public affairs, providing dowries for his daughters and sometimes for other

relatives, caring for his aged parents, carrying on the family's religious traditions, and keeping ancestral lands intact. A father's public functions included helping to defend the city and ensuring the continuation of his family, an essential role given that each family was an integral part of the polis as well as the means by which traditions were handed on.

Men were the main or only participants in some of the most important activities of ancient Greece, including warfare, athletic competition, and the feasting and poetry recitation that took place at gatherings known as symposia. Women's activities, with the notable exception of religious worship, were confined mainly to the home. In cities, a portion of the house was often reserved exclusively for women and children, and women did not generally go out in public unsupervised, except during festivals. In addition to bearing and raising children, wives also managed household affairs and supervised the family's slaves. Besides work inside the home, women also played a prominent role in religious worship, some serving as priestesses.

#### 6. Ancient Rome

Family life was, if anything, even more central to ancient Roman life than it was for the ancient Greeks. Family was the focus of much in Roman law and culture, including mythic and legendary stories, and terms from family life were used in the political and religious spheres. Greg Woolf notes, for instance, that Roman deities were often referred to as "Mother" or "Father" and that a leader might be honored by being called the *pater patriae* or "Father of the Fatherland" (80). The Romans saw themselves as constituting a kind of large-scale family. Like the Greeks, the ancient Romans saw the family (in the sense of the household) as playing an important public role. Especially during certain periods, such as the reign of Augustus, the state encouraged childbearing and sought to discourage celibacy and adultery. Families were expected to inculcate traditional values and prepare children for participation in the community. Family connections served important functions in many political and economic activities and helped establish one's social rank. Yet despite many similarities, there were significant differences between Greek and Roman family life. For instance, whereas ancient Greeks normally married close relatives (a practice known as endogamy), the Romans practiced exogamy—that is, they married nonrelatives. Also, Roman brides were older than Greek ones. To some extent these differences reflect a general difference between what some scholars have called "Eastern" (or "non-European") and "Western European" types of marriage. Ancient Greeks were closer to the Eastern type, with endogamous marriages, very young marriage for women, greater separation between men and women, and exclusion of women from public life. Though ancient Romans were strongly influenced by Greek culture, the greater mingling of the sexes, slightly older age of brides, and practice of exogamy associate the Romans with the Western European family type.

One of the most important features of family life in ancient Rome was the power of the father, or *paterfamilias*, who had authority over all his living descendants as well as his slaves and former slaves. This authority theoretically included power over life and death (though this power was rarely exercised),

as well as control of property and the power to dissolve his children's marriages and even convene court sessions to try family members for misdeeds. Romans referred to the authoritarian paterfamilias as an ideal, and the notion, though to some extent a myth, served important social functions. Yet the image of the all-powerful paterfamilias is certainly exaggerated; in reality his authority was limited in various ways (for instance, he often counseled with other family members in making decisions), and the relatively short life span of ancient Romans meant that a paterfamilias could wield his authority for only a limited period. Still, whatever the limits on his power, the paterfamilias was the main authority figure for an extended familial group and might exercise authority over a wider group than would have been the case in ancient Greece. Besides referring to a household or to a group connected by common lineage, the word familia could also mean all the persons and property over which a paterfamilias had authority. Family members in this sense included slaves and former slaves, who might live in various locations and who were often employed by aristocrats and other men of influence and wealth in governing, managing property, and carrying out economic enterprises.

## 7. Conclusion

A few distinct components added to the emergence of feminist showy Shakespeare re-dreams in the late twentieth

century. The parts that had originally been composed for kid on-screen characters had now long been played by professional on-screen characters, who couldn't perceive any reason why they ought not to be as integral to the tasks they worked on as their male partners. Shakespeare's development into a cultural symbol implied that feminist assignments could utilize him to censure the Establishment and utilize his status to give their message more prominent effect. The development of the job of the cutting edge executive had just prompted ideologically determined productions of Shakespeare's plays in both fringe and standard theater. Allotments make this one stride further and are a characteristic continuation of politicized engagement with Shakespeare. Also, allocations composed cooperatively by forthcoming casts offer an alternative to on-screen characters' avoidance from giving feminist interpretations of Shakespeare's plays. Shakespeare re-dreams are likewise an opportunity to talk about worries of secondwave feminism, for example, male centric society, sexuality and household parts of misogyny. These phenomena are as of now in proof in Shakespeare's plays; however they are conveyed to the fore in the re-dreams, where different parts of Shakespearean dramatization are precluded, for example, national legislative issues and fighting, the emphasis on which can at times cloud the natural engagement with sexual orientation issues in Shakespeare's plays.

## References

1. Adamson, Jane. *Othello as tragedy: Some Problems of Judgement and Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 1980.
2. All's Well That ends Well'. *The Readers Encyclopedia of Shakespeare*. 16th Ed. 1966
3. Ballough, Geoffrey, Ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. 7 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-1975.
4. Bamber, Linda. *Comic women, Tragic Men: A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare*. 1982, rev. Ed. 2003.
5. Barnaby, Andrew, "The political Consciousness of Shakespeare's As you like it ". *Studies in English literature 1500-1900*, 36, no-2 (1996): 373-95
6. Bayley, John. *Shakespeare and Tragedy*, 1981
7. Ben Jonson, "To the memory of my Beloved The Author, Mr. William Shakespeare" *Shakespeare Criticism*, Ed. D. N. Smith, London
8. Campbell, Oscar James. "The Tragedy of Macbeth". *The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare*. 1966 Ed.
9. Dasinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of women*. 1976, rev. 1996
10. Pitt, Angela. *Shakespeare's Women*. Newton Abbot, London: David and Charles, 1981.