

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Significance of Unheard Voices in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Shiva Shankar Bhattarai**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**Sept. 2011**

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Central Department of English**  
**Letter of Recommendation**

This is to certify that Mr. Shiva Shankar Bhattarai has completed his dissertation entitled “**Significance of Unheard Voices in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar***” under my guidance. I recommend this thesis to be submitted to the research committee for final examination of viva voice.

---

Dr. Shiva Rijal

Supervisor

Central Department of English,

T.U.

Date: .....

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Approval Letter**

This thesis entitled “**Significance of Unheard Voices in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar***” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Shiva Shankar Bhattarai has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

**Members of Research Committee:**

---

Internal Examiner

---

External Examiner

---

Head

Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Acknowledgements**

Words fail me to convey my feelings of gratitude to my honorable teacher Dr. Shiva Rijal, who as my supervisor, provided perpetual advice, invaluable inspiration and constructive comments to give the final shape of this thesis. Without his invaluable suggestions, continuous encouragement, kind cooperation and pedagogical instruction, this research work would never have witnessed the form it enjoys at present. So, I am much indebted to him.

I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of the Central Department of English, for the approval of this research work in the present form.

I owe incredible debt to my parents and family members for their silent and audible backup in the succession of this dissertation. Likewise, it would be an injustice if I do not express my sincere thanks to my friends: Raju Bhattarai, Ram Chandra Aryal, Babu Ram Ghimire, Gunga Man Thapa and Ananda Prasad Koirala for their academic support in course of completing this thesis. I received help and suggestions from various person, institution, department and well wishers to whom I am indebted individually.

Sept. 2011

Shiva Shankar Bhattarai

### **Abstract**

This dissertation does the comprehensive study on William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* to denounce the asymmetrical nexus of masculine and feminine characters in the lime light of French Feminism. Furthermore, it destabilizes the hither to myths of male supremacy created and adopted to dethrone the terrestrial reality of female existence in the name of inessential being and the second sex. Moreover, it interrogates the treacherous tendency and satanic nature of male hegemony thereby vindicating the indispensable role of female agency for the establishment of peace and harmony. In the play, the extermination and deprivation of female voices from the mainstream domestic, cultural, and even political affairs, ultimately proves fatal and self-destructive for the male characters themselves. Albeit, at a glance, the frequent emergence of female resistance and counter-resistance seem insignificant due to the parochial mindset of patriarchal vanity, at the end, it validates own existence and succeeds in legitimizing female voice as the voice of divine authority.

**Content**

	<b>Page No.</b>
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
<b>I. Interrogating the Hitherto Assumption of Male Superiority</b>	<b>1-15</b>
<b>II. Devaluation of Female Existence as the Prosthesis of Legitimizing Male Domination</b>	<b>16-49</b>
<b>III. Female Voice as the Metaphor of Divine Voice</b>	<b>50-53</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Works Cited</b>	<b>55</b>

## **I. Interrogating the Hitherto Assumption of Male Superiority**

This project on William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* validates the significance of unheard voices thereby deconstructing the manipulated male psyche. The playwright in the play not only presents the tearjerking condition and subjugation of female who are the victims of patriarchy, but also endeavors to highlight the feminist discourse of resistance in conversation with the hegemonic representation of women in classical time. The female characters Calphurnia and Portia seem highly responsible towards their husband. They totally negate themselves and devote their life for the well being of their respective male partners but their husbands totally neglect them. These females have not acquired their independent and respectable identity; their identity is hanged on the mist of rigid patriarchy. Women have not got any platform to express their desire and to be the part of this world. Women are captivated by patriarchy and given no sphere to enjoy their freedom. They are forced to dance according to the music of masculine. The males create their own norms and values for women and women are supposed to follow them. It is through cultural practices which is hierarchical, patriarchy tries to subdue females. It is by exposing the unequal relationship of Julius Caesar and Calphurnia, Brutus and Portia, the project aims at privileging the importance of female voices thereby interrogating the male's chauvinism that has been dominantly rooted since antique.

In the play, the women characters Portia and Calphurnia are so "Fathered and husbanded" that the male characters make them acutely aware of their pedigree as well as responsibility. They are definitely less than what they presume to have. They unlike their husbands have truly sensitive nature and all the tenderness that a wife and a woman should possess. This has been made amply evident throughout the play. Besides, women do not play any prominent part in this play since it is primarily

supposed to be a political play. However, vignettes of women characters to some extent sparkle significantly in the play. In spite of vehemently sketched role of male characters female characters as well dominate the plot of the play

Despite having equal potentiality and the capacity to judge the circumstances, the main reason behind presenting women as passive, and submissive one is no other than the pornographic politics of manipulated male psyche that aims at subjugating and victimizing female essence thereby constructing different myths on the basis of male ideology. The presentation of female characters as unhealthy, barren, insignificant and inessential object is completely based on the myths that are functioning all the time to subdue female role and agency.

Regarding Shakespeare the person, it is almost more than four hundred years since he passed away but even after centuries long researches, no much information has been dug out to throw the light on his personal life. However, it is not that we are totally ignorant of Shakespeare, the person. He was born in April 1564, of Stratford on- Avon in the country of Warwick. His mother Mary Arden descended from nobility and his father, John Shakespeare was a prosperous businessman of the village. He was once a student at the Stratford Grammar school but left it at the age of thirteen. He married Ann Hathway when he was twenty. Soon after his marriage, he left Stratford for London where he found some employment with a company of actors. His literary career began in 1593 with the poem *venus and Adonais*. In 1594, he became a member of a company of players working under the patronage of the Lord Chamberlain and sources show that he was quite busy at that time remodelling old plays and romantic stories into interesting plays that would interest the theatre-going public of the time. It may be because of this he gained the skill and insight for producing extra- ordinary works that, written four hundred years back, still continues



to appeal the readers as the greatest works of the greatest genius and there is no indicating that they will stop doing so anytime in near future. He continued with his theatrical company until he was retired in 1611. He was one of the main shareholders of the theatre that helped him earn fairly nice amount of lucre during his difficult times. With the income he could save, he had a house built and lived his retired life quite happily in what come to be known as 'New Place' in his native town of Stratford.

Almost for twenty four years approximately from 1588 to 1612, Shakespeare was writing actively with short breaks. Scholars and critics tend to study his works by classifying them in periods according to the development of thought and increasing workmanship. For convenience, his works can be divided or classified in different periods. the firs phase is between 1588 to 1595. The plays produced in this phase seem that the main motif and interest lay in the stage production rather than in literary accomplishment. The major plays of this time are *Richard II* (history), *Romeo and Juliet* (Tragedy), and *Midsummer Nights's Dream* (comedy) . Similarly, the second phase is between the years at 1599 to 1601. It includes the most sparkling and distinctive of Shakespearean comedies and historical plays in which there is no gloomy and tragic atmosphere other than the actual tragedy of the historical events. The major plays of this time are *The Merchant of Venice* (comedy), *As you like it* (Comedy), *Twelfth Night* (comedy), *Henry V* (history), *Henry IV* Part one and two (History), *King John* (history), Likewise, the third phase is between 1601 to 1608 that shows the grave and serious side of human life, and the disaster and punishment which follows inevitably on human error and sin. The tragedies that were produced in this phase are *Julius Caesar*, *Homelet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopetra*, and *Coriolanus*. Likely, the last phase but not the least, is approximately between 1609 to 1612. This phase includes the plays having definitely tragic and

serious elements, but the plays wind up with happy endings in which the good characters are rewarded and wicked ones are forgiven. This phase includes the romantic dramas like *Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. It also includes the historical plays like Henry VII.

Focusing back to Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, it is supposed that he derived the materials that were available to him in Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (1579). He began to write this play in 1601 setting back to the ancient Rome during the first century B.C. Backgrounding on the facts of Roman history; he constructed the plot with variation keeping focus on the political parallels between Elizabethan England and Ancient Rome. Since the period of its first publication to the present time; editors, critics, and directors have recognized special problems in the interpretation of the play. This play has been extensively debated, to be sure, but the discussion of the play has been marked by an unusual perplexity. The ambiguities of Julius Caesar can not be resolved and that Shakespeare's use of his sources show that he did not intend for them to be resolved. This is not to call the play a dramatic failure, its history on the stage in potent refutation of any such judgment. It is to say, however, that only one who tries to unify the play by resolving its paradoxes is choosing a bias and closing his eyes to a part of evidence and to what may be a deliberate and permanent suspension of all issues in the play.

Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* occupies a curious position that partakes of good and evil, joy and sorrow, mingled with endless variety of proportion and innumerable modes of combination; and expressing the course of the world, in which the loss of one is the gain of another. This play Julius Caesar foregrounds and demonstrates the nature of patriarchy which instrumentalizes the nation of male superiority as a means

to influence and manipulate female opinion. For that the play highlights the hegemonic nexus between male and female characters thereby displaying the dangerous themes of thwarted ambition, political reaction and crude demagoguery of patriarchy in a brilliant indictment of "realpolitik". Despite the employment of both male and female characters, and their mutually weighty looking roles in the play, the tilt of Shakespeare seems towards his male characters. In doing so, his finest speeches are given to be delivered by males. Apart from these issues. The most important issue that can be found in the play is the functioning of patriarchal ideology in the contemporary time. Patriarchy always creates the hierarchical relation or binaries between male and female where male is always defined positively who falls in the realm of one, first sex, and essential being whereas female is defined as other, second sex and without soul. That tendency of creating binaries between masculinity and femininity contributes to the female subordination. In the play, we can clearly sense the subordination of women in the name of rituals and customs. Female characters in the play have been given no domain to express their free will. They have been treated as non-being. Their existence is hanged in the mist of patriarchy. Thus, the play seems contextually relevant even in twenty first century to examine with the spectacle of French feminism in general and with reference to Simone de Beauvoir's concept of "existence precedes the essence" in particular.

The pervasiveness of patriarchal dogma is one of the major feature found in the play. So the research concerns about how patriarchy operates its rigid norms and values in the shape of manner, behaviors, and activities. In the play, the playwright artistically presents how contemporary Roman society was dominated by masculine authorities. Patriarchy is a social system in which the role of male as the primary authority is central to social organizations where male hold authority over female.

Basically it refers to the power relation between males and females where females occupy subordinate status whose creativity and potentiality are exploited and controlled by males. In patriarchal rule governing system, females do not get any agency in the outdoor matters. They are bound to confine within the four walls of their house and should perform their roles as per the demand of the patriarchy. This is to say women in male dominated society should accept whatever the role they are given to perform. Patriarchal power structure is based on hierarchical ladder in which male is always on the top and female is at the bottom. Males can do whatever they desire for but females on the other hand, can not act according to their aspiration. It is through the aspirations and demands of patriarchy, females are supposed to act. In male hegemonic society, females are controlled and disciplined with the help of different discourses that include stereotypical image of woman, gender biasness, and various myths. Such discourses hegemonically rule over females. Thus, women's position in patriarchy is no more better than an amputated bird. Just like amputated bird can not fly, females can not cross the demarcation constructed by masculinity. Hence, the relationship between male and female under patriarchal system is no other than that of domination, suppression, oppression and exploitation.

Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* exhibits the clear picture of patriarchal society where women are forced to act as per the wish and will of males. The play depicts the women's subjugation in patriarchal enterprise where they are never allowed to enjoy any free domain. The female characters of the play like Calphurnia and Portia have been treated as the passive terrain thereby ranking them as inferior to their male counterparts like Caesar and Brutus respectively. These females are not allowed to practice the feminine ethos rather they are bound exist as per male's demand. They are

strictly prohibited to raise their voices against their husbands not because they are weak but because the masculine figure never permits them to do so.

Albeit Calphurina and Portia are not fully fleshed out characters, we meet them in various states of the societal mechanisms. If we observe the nexus of Calphurina and Portia with their respective husbands particularly in the domestic landscape, we can see them worrying all the time for their respective husbands. They both definitely know their place presumably as woman, but also as the lesser in the power pair. They go on pleading with their husbands along with the worriness for the well-being of their respective husbands. Portia begs her husband to share his burden and to regard her as the proper companion in the midst of tension; and Calphurnia worries for Caesar and that is why, she urges her husband to remain at home despite attending senate house. The women plead out of concern but are stuck and helpless when their male partners ignore them. Perhaps the most significantly, their cautious concern is interpreted as cowardice and foolish conduct in Calphurnia's case, and weakness in Portia's. Ultimately, no matter how much they love and honour their husbands, the men do not treat them as equal partners.

Calphurnia and Portia are stereotypically represented and hegemonically subordinated by the norms and values of pervasive patriarchal system. Calphurnia warns her husband against the decision of going to the senate house on the ides of March as she has had terrible nightmares and heard reports of many bad omens. She tells Caesar that his wisdom is consumed in confidence. She repeatedly pleads to him not to go at the senate house. But in response to Calphurnia's request, Caesar tells her that Cowards die many times before their deaths; the valiant never taste of death but once. "(II,ii, 32-33) Caesar's attempt of defining himself as valiant and labelling

Calphurnia as coward truly shows how patriarchy tries to impose its ideology upon female thereby creating dichotomies and recalling the stereotypical images.

Portia too, like Calphurnia is exploited by Brutus. The relationship between Portia and Brutus is not other than the relationship of domination and suppression. Brutus' mind is being ruled by the norms and values of patriarchal doctrine. Brutus neither shares any feeling with his wife nor does he let her voice for counseling. Brutus joins the hands with the conspirators without taking any opinion and suggestion from his wife Portia. Brutus, as a representative of masculine authority, does not let his wife to come in the public sphere. He rather treats her as unhealthy creature. When Portia comes out of the house in the cold morning, her husband tells her not to expose herself in such a cold morning for she has weak condition. Brutus refusal of letting Portia to come out shows how patriarchy endeavours to restrict the woman from being exposed in the open sphere. It further suggests how male defines woman as weak and unhealthy thing.

As there lies the tremendous gap regarding the role and rights of male and female in patriarchal society, Beauvoir in her book *The Second Sex* argues that patriarchy has constructed the notion about women's essence stereotypically and such notions are based on the myths that are created to oppress and inferiorize women's value. For Brutus, Portia is weak and fragile to struggle against the raw cold morning which further hints towards the patriarchy's psyche that regards female as incapable for dealing with outdoor issues. But in the case of himself, he is healthy and protective enough to face the threat of cold morning. This sort of judgement of Brutus reveals his internalized male superiority functioning in his sub-conscious level. Here we can firmly claim that patriarchal dogmas always tend to create binaries between male and female and in such binaries, male is defined as first sex, essential being,

transcendental and with soul whereas female is defined as second sex, other, inessential being and without soul. The main rationale behind the tendency of creating such binaries is no other than just to sustain male supremacy over female.

However, it is not so that female never dares to counter the hegemonic tendencies and behaviours of patriarchy. When she realizes that her existential value is at the verge of collapse, she goes for resisting the rigid patriarchal ethos thereby partaking in the battlefield of resistance and counter-resistance. In the play, Calphurnia's resistance at least in the form of urge petition, hints towards her intense desire for legitimizing female voice as the prominent one. Her frequent objection with Caesar, despite his arrogant attributes, displays her determination oriented towards establishing feminine ethos as the fundamental base for storing peace and harmony in the Rome. In the similar fashion, Portia too, by finding out that her husband has kept something secrets apart from her, goes on insisting to make her acquainted with his cause of grief. In the play, both Calphurina and Portia attempt to unturn the tag of insignificant object through counter-resistance which is directed against the suppression, marginalization, and subjugation of their role and agency under the trammels of patriarchal system.

Moreover, the so-called resistance which female posits to counter and control the so called maleness of male comes into end along with the extermination of their genuine voices. In the play, the urge for taking female existence into consideration is completely discarded by the patriarchal rule governing authorities which firmly regard themselves as the senior citizens. For them, woman should maintain the life inside the home while male extends his range outside to the public sphere. It is because patriarchy has already created the demarcation between male and female in which women are not supposed to raise their voice against male authority. If any one dares

to raise their voices against the supremacy of patriarchy, then they are certainly the subject of victimization. But in the course of identifying oneself as the true follower of patriarchal dogmas, males have forgotten that female really exists. The negligence and subjugation of female voices appear as the hidden motif of patriarchy aspired by the thirst for power to rule over female.

The restriction of female voices and the deprivation of their role and agency from the mainstream domestic, cultural and socio-political arena ultimately brings civil strife and anarchy in Rome. The rejection of female voices by male turns out to be the ultimate cause of disaster. It means, it is because of the underestimation of female voices, Caesar is assassinated and consequently whole Rome is suffered from civil strife and turned into battlefield. The female voice which patriarchy regards as insignificant turns out to be the voice of divine authority. That is to say in the course of time, the female voice becomes prominent and significant. In other words, we can simply say that female voice is the voice of lord which should not be discarded at any cost rather it should be taken into high consideration. If any one dares to block and restrict female voice, then obviously they are going to be punished. This is what exactly happened in Caesar's life. In the beginning, her voice was completely unheard by Caesar just by labeling it as insignificant voice but later on, previously labialized as insignificant voice, validates own existence. Hence, the project establishes the importance of female voices thereby deconstructing the hitherto assumption of assuming male as rational and female as irrational.

William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* has received many critical appraisals since its publication. It means to say various critics have analyzed the play form various perspectives throughout the different periods. For instance, Gorvan V. Stanivukovic argues:



Instead, critical approaches to the language of *Julius Caesar* have been focused mostly on the analysis of rhetoric and its correlation with the subjects of power and politics. In such critical examinations rhetorical forms are treated as instruments of persuasion [...] rhetorical style. What, I will argue about in this essay is that in *Julius Caesar* history is a concept, a cognitive phenomenon of the human subject, which helps the subject understand and interpret the past. In *Julius Caesar* "the sense of history," to borrow a phrase from Alan Liu, determines the nature of power and its rhetorical construction. (55)

His criticism makes it clear that the play is about the analysis of rhetoric and its correlation with the subjects of power and politics. Along with this, Stonivukovic's further claim justifies the fact that history is a concept i.e. a cognitive phenomenon of the human subject. We can conclude that history is always written from the perspective of male superiority which determines the nature of power and its rhetorical construction. So, his criticism illustrates the sense of history in relation to renaissance. But that very history is written from the male chauvinistic approach where, the identity of marginalized groups' especially women is highly subdued.

Similarly another critic, John Roland Dove claims:

In order to support our reading of the play, it is necessary to re-examine the character of Cassius. If a passionate and fateful friendship gave the play its organic unity, this relationship must be made clear to us from the beginning. But this is scarcely possible if our first impression of Cassius is of a scheming malcontent (a blue-print for Iago or Edmund) who cynically and unscrupulously fashions his friend as an instrument of his own petty hatred {.....} discussion of Cassius as

follows, "Thus Shakespeare, expanding few statements and hints in Plutarch, begins by depicting Cassias as a man of the breed of Dryden's Achitophel," for close designs and crooked counsels fit". and the parallel holds in other respects. (554)

John Roland Dove studies the play in association with a passionate and fateful friendship. He re-examines the character of Cassias and sketches him as a malcontent. In many statements, Shakespeare begins his writing by depicting Cassias as a man of the breed. So, we can conclude that Cassias is a representing character who merely characterizes his friends especially female cynically and unscrupulously as an instrument of his own petty hatred. In this way, Dove mainly focuses on the character of *Julius Caesar* from the beginning which clarifies the organic unity of the relation.

Moreover, Robert F. Fleissner interprets the play in the following way:

In assessing this oblique relation, one is obliged also to recall the suggestion that Brutus was born out of wedlock, that historically it was no more than a rumor; still, even though such a matter is not specially alluded to in *Julius Caesar* itself, Shakespeare at least does call attention to it elsewhere (2 Henry VI, 4.1.137.38). So it could also have thereby had a certain implicit effect on the Roman tragedy. Indeed, a kind of "Brut [ish]" connection is already discernible in Arthurian legendry, onomastic though such an incidental linkage turns out to be. (87)

Similarly, Robert F. Fleissner has reviewed this play as a form of oblique relation where the character Brutus has been characterized as a representative figure of wedlock i.e. historically no more than a rumor. Shakespeare does pay some attention to it elsewhere. His criticism justifies the fact that there is an implicit effect on

Shakespearean writing from the Roman tragedy and Arthurian legendry. So, we can conclude that the character Brutus was born out and his connection with Roman tragedy is an incidental linkage.

The poets in *Julius Caesar*, I have suggested, represent the suppressed or unacknowledged (in Antony's case: abused) element of imagination and intuition in the main characters; on a critical metal eve of the play the fate of the poets indicates the imbalance between reason and imagination which leads the political and personal tragedy. (321)

Thomas Pughe aims at digging out the condition of the poets in relation to the main characters. In a critical eye the poets indicate the imbalance between reason and imagination which leads the political and personal tragedy. It means like poets few characters are also the representative of minority groups whose imagination and intuitional aspects are suppressed by the patriarchal mind set. Hence, by invoking the idea of Pughe into consideration, it is a manifesto of imbalance relationship between characters.

Though the afore-mentioned critics have observed and interpreted the play from different critical perspectives, none of the critics has interpreted it from the perspective of French feminism. Without a proper study of this text from the spectacle of French feminism, the meaning of the play remains incomplete. Therefore, the present researcher proposes to carry out the research form the perspective of French feminism in general and Beauvior's notion of female as the second sex and other in particular.

This research not only seeks to deconstruct the patriarchal notion of male supremacy but also validates the importance of female existence in the shape of essential being and whose voices are supposed to be taken into high consideration for

preventing the country from entering into civil strife. In order to legitimize the significance of female voices and to turn the evil ideology of patriarchal society, this study acknowledges the appropriateness of French feminism. French feminism believes in the importance of female's active participation in the domestic and socio-political landscape in order to ensure equal status and identity. In addition to this, it also deals with the philosophical agendas regarding female existence. According to Beauvoir, patriarchal society creates the negative and stereotypical images of women on the basis of the myth to dominate or inferiorize female. In "The second sex", Beauvoir examines the myths created by male dominated society and culture and goes on attacking those myths. French feminism claims that in patriarchal myth, we find asymmetrical position between male and female in terms of gender. In that myth, males are defined as first sex essential subject, transcendental and superior one where as females are defined as second sex, other, inessential being and submissive one. Moreover, French feminism refuses the notion of female essence prior to individual existence demonstrating her existential feminism. For that, Beauvoir prioritizes the existence and argues that the prevailing notions of woman's nature is nothing more than just a concept of patriarchy, women have nothing womanish by birth. In order to counter the hegemony of male and to validate the significance of female existence, French feminism primarily Beauvoir asserts that myths should be discarded thereby subverting the mythical norms and values adopted by patriarchal society.

The primary objective of the study is to bring the feminist discourse of resistance and the significance of their existence in conversation with the hegemonic representation of women in classical period. Through the minute and thorough examination of relationship of Calphurnia and Caesar, Brutus and Portia, the project aims at privileging the significance of the voices of female characters.

Moreover, the research establishes the importance of female characters in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*.

While discussing about the significance of this project, this study makes significant contribution mainly in three areas or concern. Firstly, the study brings the unheard voices of women characters in *Julius Caesar* with in the view of critical analysis. Secondly, this research makes a significant theoretical connection between French feminism and Behavior's contribution in the flourishing of French feminism who basically defines the exploitation and marginalization and female essence as the outcome of the myths created to rule over women. And, lastly, this project shows the intricate nexus between the dramatic performances framing of women and framing of men discourses to expose the logic of patriarchal society.

This project has been classified into three parts to make it easier to understand and acknowledge. In the beginning chapter, the introduction, the statement of problems and its hypothesis has been clarified. To clarify the objective and the significance of the project, different critics' and scholars' view on the play have been taken into account.

To make study comprehensive and reliable, various textual evidences have been quoted and analyzed by applying the concept of French feminism as explained and elaborated by Simone de Beauvoir. In the concluding chapter of the project, the core concept of the study has been clarified.

## II. Devaluation of Female Existence as the Prosthesis of Legitimizing Male Domination

William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* foregrounds a genuine dramatization of pre and post assassination milieu to unravel the central relationship of male and female characters in which female voices are primarily victimized and exterminated by the so called rationale of male figures. And at the same time, it is due to the excessive suppression and the deprivation of female role and agency from the mainstream domestic, cultural, and even political landscape, Rome entered into civil strife and anarchy. Although female characters of the play as represented by Calphurnia and Portia incoherently and frequently enter into the wrestling of resistance and counter-resistance for the quest of having equal existential value, they are treated merely as second sex without having any reciprocity. The submissive role that Calphurnia is compelled to perform and the extreme domination of women in the name of tradition and culture can be observed during solemn procession:

CAESAR : Calphurnia ! [the procession halt

CASCA : Peace, ho ! Caesar speaks.

CAESAR : Calphurnia !

CALPHURNTA : [Comes forward] Here, my lord.

CAESAR : Stand you directly in Antonius' way

When he doth run his covrse. Antonius !

ANTONY : Caesar, my lord ?

CAESAR : Forget not, in your speed, Antonius,

To touch Calphurnia, for our elders say,

The barren, touched in this holy chase,

Shake off their sterile curse. (I.ii. 1-9)

If we scrutinize the above conversation, we clearly sense the hegemonic nexus between man and woman where male figure constructs different propagandas to maintain the hierarchical status. When Caesar instructs Calphurnia to take part in the holy chase to get rid of her barrenness as resulted out of "sterile curse", it discloses the masculine doctrine and assumptions that women are unfulfilled as a woman if they do not have children. Caesar's desperate will of having child from Calphurnia that he intended as he orders Calphurnia to take part in that ritual for getting exhibits the evil ideology of masculinity according to which Calphurnia still lacks Calphurnia.

Womanly instinct that is essential to be categorized as woman. Regarding this issue,

Lois Tyson says:

Yet Patriarchy tells them that they are unfulfilled as women if they don't have children, and there is a great deal of pressure brought to bear upon women in order to recruit them for motherhood. Clearly, how can we know that "woman" is "by nature", given that we never see her outside the social conditioning of patriarchy ? (97)

The condition under which Calphurnia is forced to perform the part of ritual, further reveals the jeopardy atmosphere that has pressurized woman to act as per the social conditioning of patriarchy.

Similarly, the peculiar image of Calphurnia as presented during solemn procession, displays masculine mentality that regards Calphurnia mere as a mysterious and a strange creature. Furthermore, it is by presenting female as a sinner and cursed one, patriarchal myth has exploited women throughout its cruel history. Regarding Calphurnia as a barren woman, the woman suffering from sterile curse, and relegating her to the level of inessential being, further reveals the lobotomical schema which always regards woman as a peculiar object. It is confusing that if woman is a

demon, a sinner, and a mysterious object having devilistic outlook, then why it is important for Caesar to have children from Calphurnia ? It is because patriarchy always seeks personal benefit thereby distinguishing oneself as superior to female. And it also exhibits double nature of patriarchy which simultaneously discards woman for her peculiar position and needs a children from her in order to maintain its dignified status in the ladder of male governing society. Regarding the myth constructed for viewing female as mysterious. Simone de Beauvoir states:

Wonder at the feminine body, dislike for menstrual blood, come from perceptions of a concrete reality. There is nothing mythical in the experience that reveals the voluptuous qualities of feminine flesh, and it is not an excursion into myth if one attempts to describe them through comparisons with flower of pebbles. But to say that Woman is Flesh, to say that eh Flesh is Night and Death, or that is the splendor of the Cosmos, is to abandon terrestrial truth and soar into an empty sky.  
(qtd. Hazard Adams, 997)

For Beauvoir, the root cause behind the construction of women's peculiar images are solely based on the perception of abstract reality and mythical experiences, that are in practice since antique. It is the treacherous tendency of male dogmatism that aspires for abandoning females from their belonging terrestrial reality.

Moreover, how patriarchy constructs asymmetrical rank of master and slave, lord and worshipper, and finally posits itself in the apex of social strata, can be seen if we thoroughly examine the ongoing scenario of solemn procession. The phrase "my lord" as muttered by Calphurnia in response to Caesar's call for her, hints towards hazardous milieu in which female identity is confined in the frame of worshipper and whose existence is under the grace and mercy of so called lord. Under the trammels of



patriarchal enterprises, the existence of female is determined as per the beliefs that are established and practiced from the perspective of patriarchal system. Likewise, Caesar exhibits his internalized possessive mindset while calling Calphurnia. When Caesar instructs her to stand "directly in Antonius' way", he appears in the role of master who holds all the divine authorities to order, instruct, guide, and mobilize female object. It further implies that women are bound to act just as an object who are supposed no more than mere instrument and are always in possession of male. For men, women are just like the slaves. They are forbidden to raise any voice against their male partners. Just like the master imposes his evil ideology upon his slave, in the similar manner, patriarchy imposes its rigid ethos upon female.

Astonishingly, the belief that masculine authority holds regarding the view of women's barren condition and the way it posits itself in the central position of cultural practices discloses the treacherous tendency of male hegemony that always aims at ruling over females. During holy chase, Calphurnia is the object to watch, observe, and to rejoice in her performance. As we can see Caesar requesting Antony to be the central part of her way towards redemption from the barrenness resulted from sterile curse, it puts forth the claim that patriarchy attempts its label best to put oneself in the transcendental position thereby defining oneself as a pious, spiritual, and holy figure bearing all the divine qualities as prescribed by the divine laws. Similarly, the simultaneous role of both judge and party that Caesar and Antony performed during the time of holy chase, reveals male psychology that always aims at placing oneself in the rank of unquestionable entity who at once constructs and complies the laws that is favorable for them. After the Solemn procession, the moment Antony takes part in the holy chase along with Calphurnia, he also appears in the role of judge who is going to release Calphurnia from the sterile curse. In the similar fashion, Caesar too, at once

identifies oneself with Calphurnia in the sense that after all he is the one who needs a child from Calphurnia on the behalf of himself, and also performs the role of judge who decides to punish Calphurnia for the sin that she has committed. It is Calphurnia who never gets distinct agency only because she is destined to perform the task solely intended for public humour. In this particular context, it is quite appropriate to borrow the idea of Simone de Beauvior who by comparing male-female hegemonic relation with that of master-slave and oppressor-oppressed nexus, further claims:

Master and slave are united by a reciprocal need, in this case economic, which does not liberate the slave. In the relation of master to slave the master does not make a point of the need that he has for the other; he has in his grasp the power of satisfying this need through his own action; whereas the slave, in his dependent condition, his hope and fear, is quite conscious of the need he has for his master. Even if the need is at bottom equally urgent for both, it always works in favor of the oppressor and against the oppressed. (7, 8)

From above mentioned claim, what we can conclude is that female existence under the patriarchal rule governing society is never taken into consideration rather it is always identified in relation to her dependency that works in favour of male.

In addition to this, the way of imitating patriarchy's stereotypical representation of women by women themselves thereby vigorously submitting themselves to the dogmatic ethos and values of patriarchal society, turns out as one of the vital cause behind the frequent postponement of female liberation. After solemn procession, as Calphurnia obediently "comes forward" in response to Caesar's call and the way she addresses Caesar as "my lord", signalizes her internalized male superiority. The complete submission that she displays in the holy chase without any

doubt and question regarding the appropriateness of her participation in the ceremony, reveals her silent nature that has time and again forced her to act as per the wish and will of the male figure who always threatens her thereby carrying the weapon of phallus. Addressing Caesar as Lord implies the imitation of masculine will that ever wants to see female in the role of worshipper. Throughout the scene of solemn procession, we only can find self-submission in Calphurnia as she meekly kneels to the dogmas of patriarchal system and does not attempt to raise her voice against her exploitation done in the name of ritual and ceremony. This is how Calphurnia fails to snatch her subjectivity in order to proclaim for having distinct existential being.

Regarding this point, Simone de Beauvoir says:

When man makes of woman the other, he may, then, expect to manifest deep seated tendencies towards complicity. thus, woman may fail to lay claim to the status of subject because she lacks definite resources, because she feels the necessary bond that ties her to man regardless of reciprocity, and because she is often very well pleased with her role as the other. (8)

Here, along with the help of Beauvoir, we can firmly claim that female while making herself busy in the quest of bond that ties her to man, forgets the need of having the status of essential subject. Rather than confronting, she seems happy from the role of Other as prescribed by patriarchal authority.

Likewise, the frequent emergence of discourse in the name of culture and ritual moves toward subjugating female figure and making them scapegoat for transcending themselves thereby putting male belief in the apex of societal mechanisms. As Caesar invokes his elders. "For elders say," (I.i.7) he is reminded of the tradition and culture which firmly holds a certain doctrine solely oriented at

liquidating female existence. As Caesar instructs Antony to touch Calphurnia and be the way for her redemption that is essential for getting rid of sterile curse from which it is supposed that Calphurnia is suffering, foregrounds the treacherous tendency of male authority which always creates the hierarchy between male and female in which male always posits himself to the level of lord whereas females are thrown into the level of sinner. It further hints towards the patriarchal assumption that Calphurnia must act according to male belief and should display the evil characteristics which are shaped and formed by masculine figure so as to marginalize and dominate her even in the arena of culture and tradition.

Displaying Calphurnia as a barren woman, and descending her to the position of sinner are not the product of natural phenomena rather these are the myths constructed around the periphery of custom and cultural frame. Since men are always in the superior position, they make the certain belief regarding women in order to legitimize own superiority over female. And it is what exactly Caesar did during the procession of holy chalice. After all, Caesar is in the position of lord and hence, he has all the authority to give meaning to any thing that is favourable for him and that might fulfil the needs that he has. More importantly, it is the politics of patriarchy which by invoking the "stereotypical and archetypal images of female in the landscape of culture, always seeks for mobilizing women for the sake of personal benefit and interest. Here, the culture functions as the blackmagic and overriding force that finally minimizes the intuitional and emotional faculty of women. Victimization of Calphurnia in the name of holy chalice and ritual is non other than the evil ideology of patriarchy that in order to oppress woman, attempts to retain at least the memory of former days. In response to patriarchal myths that deny the individual essence of woman Beauvoir "Vociferously refused the notion of a female essence prior to

individual essence and attacked the patriarchal myths of woman that presume that false essence" (qtd. Hazrd Adams). Thus, what we can colnclude is that it is by presenting Calphurnia as a sinner and cursed one, and more importantly by granting culture as the basis for practicizing previously established cruel tenets regarding the view of women, male authority fully aims at discarding female essence as equal as that of individual essence.

Similarly, in domestic landscape too, though woman urges and begs her male partner for taking her voice into consideration, her agency always receives ignornance and negligence. Under the hegemonic relationship of husband and wife, how patriarchy generates and exhibits the patriarchal tenets of male dignity and superiority in front of their wives is evident when Caesar discards the prophecy as indicated by Calphurnia's nightmares:

CALPHURNIA. Caesar, I never stood on ceremonies,  
 Yet now they fright me. There is one within,  
 Besides the things that we have heard and seen,  
 Recounts most harried sights seen by the watch.  
 A lioness hath whelped in the streets,  
 And graves have yawned and yielded up their dead;  
 Fierce fiery warriors fought upon the clouds,  
 In ranks and squadrons and right form of war,  
 Which drizzled blood upon the capital.  
 The nose of battle hurtled in the air,  
 Horses did neigh and dying men did groan,  
 And ghosts did shriek and squeal bout the streets,  
 O Caesar ! these things are beyond all use,

And I do fear them.

CAESAR : What can be avoided

Whose end is purposed by the mighty gods ?

Yet Caesar shall go forth; for these predictions

Are the world in general as to Caesar. (II.II. 13-29).

Here too, Calphurnia attempts to make Caesar aware from the horrible and dreadful nightmares, her imaginative faculty is suppressed by the rationale of her husband. Doubting over the purpose of mighty gods and the act of keeping oneself above to common worldly things disclose the arrogant nature and hypocrisy of Caesar aspired at proving oneself as superior, powerful, and dignified than the fellow female partner. The asymmetrical nexus of husband and wife is further seen when Caesar attempts his label best to mark Calphurnia as a coward thereby regarding oneself as a valiant:

CALPHURNIA: When beggars die, there are no conets seen,

The heaven themselves blaze forth the death of princes.

CAESAR: Cowards die many times before their death;

The valiant never taste of death but once.

Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,

It seems to me most strange that men should fear,

Seeing that death, a necessary end,

Will come when it will com. (II.ii. 30-37)

The act of labeling Calphurnia as a coward and identifying oneself as valiant one provides the spectacle for foregrounding the treacherous tendency of husband who can not accept any sort of inferiority in front of his wife. For Caesar, it seems most strange that men should fear. He says so only because he has internalized the concept of male superiority that has created the demarcation between husband and wife in

which fear is supposed as the female instinct not of male. The matriarchal ethos as carried by Calphurnia while performing the duty of feminine love and bondness towards her husband in order to keep him safe from the danger as implied by her nightmares, no longer succeed to get triumph over Caesar's dogmas. Rather all her ethos are exterminated by the Caesar and compelled her to act mere as a docile followers of patriarchal principles. Equalizing oneself with mighty gods and threatening back to Calphurnia's prophecy, implants the male hegemony over female body. Calphurnia's imaginative and intuitive faculty is marginalized by the so called reason which all the time is in the possession of male governing system.

Moreover, the tendency of claiming oneself more dangerous than danger itself: "No, Cesar shall not: Danger knows full well that Caesar is more dangerous than he" (II.ii. 43-44), and the way of regarding oneself as more terrible than danger: "We are two lions littered in one day, And I the elder and more terrible." (II.ii. 46-47), reveals the rigid motif of husband who just by wearing the mask of bravery aims at ruling over his wife. As Calphurnia fears for Caesar, Caesar fears Calphurnia. For Caesar Calphurnia is an inessential being but slowly and gradually her voice is culminating and threatening back to Caesar in the shape of nightmares. So the ignorance of Calphurnia's prophecy can be taken as the politics played by Caesar to protect male hegemony from the uprising threat of Calphurnia. Moreover, it is the marginalization of imaginative, intuitive, and emotional aspect of human beings in general and female existence in particular. Despite Calphurnia's fear of death, Caesar appears as valiant who never fears of death. No matter how lovelingly Calphurnia calls Caesar as prince, not the beggar one; he never regards her as important and essential being. When Caesar claims that it is strange for men to fear, it displays his psyche that firmly believes in the opinion of male sovereign. In the similar manner,

Caesar's effort to mark Calphurnia's kneel and her beg as the fundamental basis for his stay at home: "Calphurnia her, my wife, stays me at home: [...] Hath begged that I will stay at home today (II.ii. 75, 82), hints towards the inner-workings of Caesar's lobotomical skimming that aims at preserving oneself from being humiliated and embarrassed in front of his wife. It further implies Caesar's hegemonic nature that never tolerates any sort of inferiority in front of his wife only because if he regards his fear of death as the final cause behind staying at home, then obviously, the very traits of male hegemony will lose the battlefield. That is why in the search of appropriate role and proper territory for the establishment of female voice as a prominent one, Calphurnia is always treated and misbehaved as the second sex. The othering of Calphurnia particularly in the landscape of domestic affairs, links her with the similar condition of unpaid labour whose reciprocity is always opposite of what he or she really aims for. By relating Calphurnia's condition with that of unpaid labour, Lois Tyson points out Delphy's claim:

[a]II contemporary "developed" societies ... depend on the unpaid labor of women for domestic services and child rearing. These services are furnished within the framework of a particular relationship to an individual (the husband). They are excluded from the realm of exchange [i.e. these services are not treated like the jobs people do for money outside their own home] and consequently have no value. They are unpaid. Whatever women receives in return is independent of the work which they perform because it is not handed out in exchange for that work (i.e. as a wage to which their work entitles them), but rather as a gift. The husband's only obligation, which is obviously in his own



interest, is to provide for his wife's basic needs, in other words he maintains her labor power. (60)

By taking Delphy's claim into consideration, Lois Tyson argues that women are excluded from the realm of exchange thereby consequently discarding the existential value of female.

Similarly, the so called resistance which women posit to dub masculinity of masculine, boomers at themselves as nimbus without nimbusness. This is to say, Calphurnia in the play, at least attempts to resist the hegemonic tendency of male partner. But later on, all her attempts ends into vigorous submission emerged from the trap of masculine trammels. The resistance that Calphurnia organized at least in the form of urge and petition: "What mean you, Caesar ? Think you to walk forth ? You shall not stir out of your house today" (II.ii. 9-10), hints towards her intensity to put female voice into the level of prominent voice. Her frequent objection with Caesar reveals her determination oriented towards being rebellious rather than the subject of hard conditions of time. But her resistance is no longer capable to bring any positive result because the moment she embarks on resistance against the marginal space is non other than a terrifying mistake committed against the principles of patriarchal vanity. That is why Caesar vehemently discards the instruction posited by calphurnia: Caesar shall forth: the things that threatened me, Ne'er looked but on my back: when they shall see the face of Caesar, they are vanished" (II.ii. 10-12). If we analyze it from the perspective of individual essence, though Calphurnia is free to regard herself as an autonomous being like all human creatures, nevertheless finds herself living in a world where men compel her to assume that status of other. The urge for taking female voice into consideration is completely neglected by the patriarchal authorities which firmly regards themselves as the senior citizens capturing the apex of social

strata. The act of undermining Calphurnia's resistance signalizes the practice of male ideology to wield his power over Calphurnia. Patriarchy always demands complete devotion of female. For males, woman should maintain life while man extends its range through his activities. And it is how the ignorance of Calphurnia's appeal unmasks the bitter reality under which she is not allowed to live a life according to her wish and will. Interpolated by the crack and fissures of patriarchal tenets, Calphurnia is compelled to live with acute superssion. Moreover, she realizes that she can never be equal to Caesar and her demand is at the verge of collapse. And this is how along with resistance, she also acts as if she is the inferior one and goes on vigorously submitting herself to her lord:

CALPHURNIA: Alas, my lord,

Your wisdom is consumed in confidence

Do not go forth today: call it my fear

That keeps you in the house and not your own.

We'll spend Mark Antony to the sencite house,

And he shall say you are not well today:

Let me, upon knee, prevail in this. *She Kneels II.ii. 49-54).*

Although Calphurnia is ready to assert oneself and take all the blames upon herself, her faithful attempt is discarded by her male partner. The way Calphurnia accepts herself as the slave of Caesar just by letting down upon his knee, discloses the female psyche which completely submits to male even in the course of countering male hegemony. Since Calphurnia kneels and begs to Caesar for benediction as the reciprocity of her love and compassion for him, she could not become able to over power Caesar. Even if male figure agrees to remain at house for the sake of his wife's beg and petition, he puts all the blame upon her wife to keep his position safe. In male

dominated society, Calphurnia is bound to perform the role of submissive creature and all her resistance is turned as the beg and petition in which there is no any hope of female liberation. In this context, Simone de Beauvoir says:

But a woman hardly has means for sounding her own heart: according to her moods she will view her own sentiments in different lights, and as she submits to them passively, one interpretation will be not truer than another. In those rare instances in which she holds the position of economic and social privilege, the mystery is reversed, showing that it does not pertain to one sex rather than the other, but to the situation.

For a great many women the roads to transcendence are blocked: because they do nothing, they fail to make themselves anything. They wonder indefinitely what they could have become, which sets them to asking about what they are. It is a vain question. If man fails to discover that secret essence of femininity, it is simply because it does not exist. Kept on the fringe of the world, woman can not objectively defined through this world, and her mystery conceals nothing but emptiness. (qtd. Adams, 998)

Here, Beauvoir argues that it is because of the construction of world from the perspective of male superiority, woman can not define herself objectively. And it is due to the extreme suppression of male authority, female are compelled to submit her resistance into the realm of male possession.

Furthermore, how female voice has been interpreted and analyzed from the perspective of masculine principles is evident when Caesar and Decius misinterpret the Calphurnia's nightmares:

CAESAR: Calphurnia her, my wife, stays me at home:

She dreamt tonight she saw my statue,  
 Which like a fountain with an hundred spouts  
 Did run pure blood, and many lusty Romans  
 Came smiling and did bathe their hands in it.  
 And these does she apply for warning and portents  
 And evils imminent, and on her knee  
 Hath begged that I will stay at home today. (II.ii. 75-85)

While explaining the very reason behind his on going absence at senate house, Caesar puts all the blame upon Calphurnia. The moment, the voice of woman aspires to dismantle patriarchy's hegemonization, male authority goes on misinterpreting female prophecy. As Caesar explains the horrible nightmares seen by Calphurnia in which many lusty Romans are seen smiling and bathing their bloody hands upon his statue and its further signification as warnings and portents, we can sense the fear of death that has struck Caesar's conscience. But in order to prevent masculine vanity and to maintain male superiority over female, Caesar puts his hand up and labels Calphurnia's beg and her act of kneeling as the fundamental reason behind his decision to remain at home. Since patriarchal tenet is at stake, Caesar goes for misinterpreting the cause of his stay at home to fulfill its motto of protecting and preserving the sphere for perpetuating its hegemonic power over female.

In the similar fashion, when Calphurnia's voice enters into the domain of patriarchy, its misinterpretation is further led by Decius. The moment Caesar interprets Calphurnia's prophecy as per his interest, Decius goes on calling it a misinterpretation. The motto of protecting male oriented principles and cutigue from the threat of uprising voice of female and the way of playing with female voice for the

sake of personal benefit is seen when Decius misinterprets the nightmares of Calphurnia:

DECISU : This dream is all amiss interpreted;

It was a vision fair and fortunate;

Your statue spouting blood in many pipes,

In which so many smiling Romans bathed,

Signifies that from you great Rome shall such

Reviving blood, and that treat men shall press

For tinctures, stains, relics, and cognizance,

This is by Calphurnia's dream is signified.

CAESAR: And this way have you well expounded it.

DECIUS: I have, when you have heard what I can say.

And know it now: the senate have concluded

To give this day a crown to mighty Caesar.

If you shall send them word you will not come,

Their minds may change. Besides, it were a mock

Apt to be rendered, for some one to say

'Break up the senate till another time,

When Caesar's wife shall meet with better dreams. (II.ii. 83-99)

Here, in order to manipulate Caesar for political aspiration, Decius uses Calphurnia voice as a tool. As Decius goes on interpreting Calphurnia's dream as a "Vision fair and fortunate", it discloses his corrupt motif and evil ideology that always seeks for personal benefit thereby making female voice as the ladder for the accomplishment of his political aspiration. If we critically examine the arrogant attitude of Decius towards female, what we can find is that patriarchal society can not accept the notion

of regarding female voice as a prominent one and female as an autonomous entity. Rather for Decius, Calphurnia's dream is merely a matter of gossip and humour. In order to accomplish the task given by his fellow conspirators, Decius misinterprets the dream of Calphurnia. Moreover, he reminds Caesar that if Caesar becomes ready to take Calphurnia's voice into consideration, and decides to remain at home despite of attending senate house, he would be the subject of mockery at the senate house. In this context, Decius appears as a blind follower of patriarchal ethos who in order to protect and preserve Caesar from being the follower of Calphurnia's prophecy attempts to misinterpret her nightmares. Decius rebukes upon Caesar for losing the spirit of patriarchy and for his act of hiding under the shelter of female figure. And later on, Decius goes on exaggerating Caesar for dismantling Calphurnia's prophecy. For that, Decius claims that if any male figure accepts the suggestion of female, then that very male figure, certainly becomes the subject of humour and mockery. This means to say that men are not allowed to consider the voice of women. It is so because patriarchal society always regards female voice as fruitless, meaningless, and worthless thing. Moreover, the interpretation and misinterpretation of Calphurnia's nightmares are enacted through the medium of language which is formed in the territory of male hegemony. This means to say that the language that Calphurnia uttered while elaborating her nightmares and about its further signification, functions as the basis for interpreting her claim according to the interest and desire of male authority. Similar to this claim. Lois Tyson by invoking the view of Luce Irigaray, states:

Similarly, Luce Irigaray suggests that, in a patriarchal culture, much of women's subjugation occurs in the form of psychological repression enacted through the medium of language. In other words, women live

in a world in which virtually all meaning has been defined by patriarchal language [...]. That is, men have defined femininity in terms of their own needs, fears, and desires. (101)

According to Luce Irigaray, since Calphurnia is living in a world in which virtually all meaning has been defined and interpreted from the perspective of patriarchal language, there is no any role of female liberation. And it is because of the extreme dominance of the masculine language which functions according to the male needs and desires, Calphurnia's warnings and portents only receive misinterpretation.

Likewise, although woman goes for resisting male figure in order to ensure equal participation even in the political frame, all her efforts appear as a foolish conduct for patriarchy. In the play, Calphurnia's urge further implies her desperate desire for finding out the appropriate place in the political landscape. And that is why Calphurnia aims for withdrawing the ceremony organized at the senate house for the political activities. The moment she interrupts the ongoing conversation between male figures and the way she instructs Decius: "Say he is sick" (II.ii. 65) just by taking all the authorities, it discloses her intense determination aspired for legitimizing her voice in the mainstream of Roman politics. All her efforts of attempting to stop Caesar from attending senate house is associated with the political affairs because at that very day senate have concluded to declare some breakthrough decision regarding the governing system of Roman politics thereby officially offering a crown to Caesar. What she believes is that this particular day is not appropriate day for Caesar to be crowned because she thinks that Caesar's way towards crown might take his own life. And that is why, she orients all her efforts toward convincing Caesar over the legitimacy of her voice and urges him for taking her voice as an appropriate advise for political decision. As Lois Tyson argues: "French feminism believes in the importance of

social and political activism in order to ensure equal opportunity and equal access to justice for women" (60). Calphurnia's frequent urge and petition displays her intense determination oriented for finding out equal place as that of male even in the social and political ladder. All her activities directed towards blocking Caesar from attending senate house, clearly provokes her desire for identifying herself as equal as that of Caesar in the divergent mechanism of social and political system.

However, desperate attempts of female to be prominent agency in socio-political milieu, does not succeed due to the possessive, dominant, and othering tendency of patriarchy. The exploitation and suppression of female voice can be seen when Caesar completely discards and terminates the urge and petition of Calphurnia: "How foolish do your fears seem now, Calphurnia ! I am ashamed I did yield to them. Give me my robe, for I will go (II.ii. 105-7). In order to protect male hegemonization from the threat of Calphurnia, Caesar interprets her fear as a foolish conduct organized to make male figure feel ashamed of themselves. The moment Caesar gets ready for attending senate house thereby exterminating the voice of Calphurnia, shows the victimization and marginalization of women in different scenarios of global and local patriarchy. Caesar turns his cold shoulder to the advice given by Calphurnia only because he regards Calphurnia as an inessential being who lacks the conscience about political activities and its affairs. Here, Caesar represents the male ideology which regards male as sovereign whereas Calphurnia is forced to represent the unheard, undervalued, and undermined sex who has lost own identity and existence. Whatsoever the circumstance may be, her role and agency is limited as per the male's demand. After all, in the ward, a man is discounted for his every vile behavior whereas female is not. A female is sizzled within the backdrop of patriarchy. Calphurnia is bound to represent only negative as defined by the limiting criteria of



masculine landscape. Caesar is right in being a man; it is the Calphurnia who is in the wrong. And hence, in Roman society, Calphurnia is never allowed for any free domains rather completely bounded to bow down before patriarchy.

Although Calphurnia's urge and petition is ignored and kept in the corner of the cruel history just by labeling it as the insignificant voice, later on resulted as the divine prophecy. That is to say, the continuous restriction and negligence of Calphurnia's voice establishes a metalevel criticism in which Caesar's patriarchal vanity can be seen collapsed along with his assassination. The significance of Calphurnia's voice as approved along with the assassination of Caesar, deconstructs the former claim of male superiority and also interrogates their rational faculty. The significance of Calphurnia's voice lies in the fact that if Julius Caesar had taken her urge and petition into consideration, the assassination as such might not have happened. It is because of the refusal of Caesar to acknowledge the worthiness of Calphurnia's voice, he is assassinated by the hands of conspirators who are aspired for political power.

The evil mindset and the satanic nature of patriarchy as revealed while attempting to bracket and undervalue Calphurnia's prophecy, turns as the fundamental reason behind the calamitous consequences occurred in the life of Caesar himself. And it is also due to the subordination and marginalization of Calphurnia, Rome entered into civil strife and anarchy. After minutely observing all the circumstances, we can claim that Calphurnia's portents represent the voice of divine authority. It is female voice through which almighty prophecies the upcoming incidents and warns male figures. In other words, we can simply argue that female voice is the voice of god which should not be regarded mere as a petty thing at any cost. If someone dares to undermine female voice then obviously he is doomed to be the subject of mockery

and punishment. And this is what exactly happened in the life of Caesar when he vehemently discards the warnings of Calphurnia. In the beginning, Calphurnia's voice is rejected regarding it as an insignificant voice, but in the course of time, the previously unheard voice of Calphurnia validates its own existence thereby legitimizing own voice as significant voice having the strong capacity for evaluating both the present and upcoming scenario. In this context, it is quite appropriate to borrow the idea of Simone de Beauvoir who just by opposing the treacherous tendency of patriarchy, talks about the supremacy of women. She writes:

It is be seen from these examples that each separate writer reflects the great collective myths: we have seen woman as flesh: the flesh of the male is produced in the mother's body and re-created in the embraces of the woman in love. Thus woman is related to nature, she incarnates it: value of blood, opens rose, siren, the curve of a hill. She represents to man the fertile soil, the sap, the material beauty and the soul of the world. She can hold the keys to poetry; she can be *mediatrix* between this world and t he beyond: grace or oracle, star or sorceress, she opens the door to the supernatural, the surreal. She is doomed to *mmanence*; and through her passivity she bestows peace and harmony. (qud.

Adams, 994)

What Beauvoir firmly believes is that though patriarchy denies to regard female as the essential being, woman is always related with nature that represents the fertile soil to man. In this case, Calphurnia is the soul of the world who desperately aims for saving Caesar's life. It is the love, grace, and affection that ties her and makes to feel worry about Caesar. But it is the Caesar who does not care about her suggestion and compassion. Hence, the ongoing asymmetrical nexus of male and female ends up

along with the assassination of Caesar in which his patriarchal vanity and arrogant attitudes are swept away.

Furthermore, the way of labeling women as an unhealthy creature by patriarchy can be seen if we examine the hegemonic relation between Portia and Brutus. Portia too, like Calphurnia, is subdued and subordinated by the so called lord. Patriarchy always endeavors to restrict the woman from being exposed in the public sphere. The man rationale behind blocking woman's agency is to perpetuate its relationally loaded male ideology over female. Male dominated society defines females as something weak, unhealthy, and fragile creature who are supposed to be confined within the four walls of her house. In the play, when Portia comes out of the house, her husband instructs her not to come out just by pretending that as if he is very conscious about her health. The following episode of the play vindicates how patriarchy attempts its label best to define woman as a weak and unhealthy creature:

PORTIA: Brutus, my lord !

BRUTUS: Portia, what mean you ? Wherefore rise you now ?

It is not for your health thus to commit

Your weak condition to the raw cold morning. (II.i. 233-36)

From above mentioned conversation, we can strongly discover that patriarchy neither allows woman to come out of the house nor does it treat her as a strong figure. Since Brutus is sitting outside in the raw cold morning without feeling cold, it is the Portia who is the subject to suffer from the harsh condition resulted out of raw cold morning. For Brutus, Portia is unhealthy by her birth who do not carry any strength to deal properly with cold morning. Here, what we can claim is that Brutus indirectly relates cold morning with the ongoing political scenario of Rome. The current political scenario that has made Brutus to think seriously seems cold for him. And

what Brutus thinks is that it is bad for female to enter into political landscape. It is by invoking the archaic and stereotypical image of woman, Brutus treats Portia as weak, fragile, and unhealthy creature whose existence must be determined on the basis of male needs. If there is any one who can fight against the cold morning resulted out of ideological matrix, then obviously, it is non other than Brutus himself. For Brutus, Portia is weak and submissive but he is the valiant one who is capable of dealing with cold morning. This sort of calculation and evaluation is resulted from the internalized male superiority that is functioning into the subconscious level. Regarding the treacherous tendency of males that aims at othering women, Beauvoir states:

... Man can think of himself without woman. She can not think of herself without man: And she is simply what man decrees, thus she is called 'the sex', by which is meant that she appears essentially to the males as a sexual being. For him she is sex-absolute sex, no less. She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her, she is the incident, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the subject, he is the Absolute. She is the other. (4)

For Beauvoir, women are always treated as the other by male. Patriarchy always differentiates himself as essential entity and relegates female to the level of inessential being.

Although, masculine doctrine castigates the idea of letting down any sphere for feminine agency, female agency attempts to unturn the logo of passivity imposed upon them under the trammels of rigid patriarchal ethos and principles. However, the frequent emergence of counter resistance for the quest of having equal participation even in the man's world too is blocked by the rule governed patriarchal enterprises in the name of female inferiority. Moreover, in the course of entrance into the wrestling

of claim and reclaim, Portia is devalued as a second sex whose identity is formed in the landscape of otherness. Portia's entrance into the battle field for the search of existence can be observed when she ignores Brutus' suggestion:

PORTIA: Not for yours neither. You've ungently, Brutus

Stole from my bed: and yesternight at supper

You suddenly arose and walked about,

Musing and sighing with your arms across,

And when I asked you what the matter was,

You stared upon me with ungentle looks.

I urged you further; then you scratched your head

And to impatiently stamped with your foot

Yet I insisted, yet you answered not.

But with an angry wafture of your hand

Gave sign for me to leave you, so I did,

Fearing to strengthen that impatience

Which seemed too much enkindled, and withal

Hoping it was but an effect of humor,

Which sometimes hath his hour with every man.

It will not let you eat, nor talk, nor sleep,

And, could it work so much upon your shape

As it hath much prevailed on your condition,

I should not know you Brutus. Dear my lord,

Make me acquainted with your cause of grief. (II.i. 236-55)

When Brutus attempts to stop Portia from entering into his private affairs, Portia neglects the suggestion and moves forth for the search of her role. For that Portia

blames Brutus for ungently leaving from her bed. For Brutus, Portia never exists and so there is no way for informing Portia. Likewise, when she states her disagreement with Brutus for his misbehavior and misconduct that he disclosed 'yester night at supper', it hints toward her resistance for neglecting the value of her existence. The sudden arrival and exit from Portia's company without informing her, clues towards parochial mindset of Brutus who exercises the absolute male power for the suppression of Portia. Furthermore, as Portia asked Brutus for disclosing the secret, he stares upon her with ungentle look. In addition to it, the impatient stamped of Brutus foot and his act of scratching his head in response to Portia's appeal, clearly signalizes towards her tear jerking condition in the world of male hegemony. And it is because of the extreme domination and suppression Portia engages herself in the matrix of resistance and counter resistance against Brutus' domination. As Brutus can not forget that he is a "Brutus," she is also filled with the consciousness of being.

PORTIA: I grant I am woman, but withal

A woman that Lord Brutus took to wife.

I grant I am a woman, but withal

A woman well reputed, Cato's daughter. (II.i. 292-95)

The feeling of so fathered and so husbanded makes her acutely aware of her pedigree as well as her responsibility on the basis of which she aims to justify her existence.

On the one hand though it seems that Portia by invoking her reputed further, vigorously submits herself to male figure for the construction of female identify, on the other hand, the frequent claim of having distinct identify as that of male signalizes towards her counter resistance. Her act of resistance is extended when she comes to her husband and insists to make her acquainted with his cause of grief. After that, though Brutus hesitates to disclose the secret, Portia refuges:

PORTIA: ... No, my Brutus,

You have some sick offense within your mind,  
 Which by the right and virtue of my place  
 I ought to know of : [Kneels] and, upon my knees,  
 I charm you, by my once commended beauty,  
 By all your vows of love and that great vow  
 Which did incorporate and make us one,  
 That you unfold to me, your self, your half,  
 Why you are heavy - and what men tonight  
 Have had resort to you; for here have been  
 Some six or seven, who did hide their faces  
 Even from darkness. (II.i. 267-78)

But that is not all what she wants. She wants to be the part of man's world. As a woman Brutus chose her as his wife and as a Cato's daughter, she considers herself worthy to support her husband in his anxieties. She reminds him that she had once proved herself as capable for charming Brutus to incorporate and make them one, and now too, she regards herself capable for keeping the secrets as secret.

But no matter how many times Portia begs and insists for answer, Brutus answers not. It is because patriarchy calims himself as one whereas female is treated as the other. Patriarchy has created the demarcation between male and female in which male falls into the category of one whereas female is forced to fall into the relam of others. It never mutters t o Brutus that how lovingly Portia appears in front of him and displays her affection towards him. As Portia explains about the harsh condition through which Brutus is suffering from, it reveals her desire for the establishment of mutual cooperation and proper understanding between them. But

how Brutus deceives Portia just by presenting the fake reason is evident when he denies to reveal the secret. "I am not well health, and that is all" (II.i. 257). Indeed, it is what the real identity of male. If any woman wants to be acquainted with male partner's cause of grief, male body conceals the actual cause only because for him, female is the second sex.

Moreover, females are treated interms of the object of beauty, smile, gracefulness, and pleasure. Though unheard, women are taken as the subject of their dream and infancy. The moment Portia counters the negligence of her agency, she only gets the logo of second sex: "Why, so I do: good Portia, go to bed" (II.i. 260). When Portia denies to accept Brutus' bad health as a real cause of his grief, she is not heard enough rather treated as the object of pleasure. It further hints toward the assumption that for male female body merely sense as a testimony of live experience that does not carry any agentive role. Rather, female is the subject for sexual pleasure whose existence is limited within the periphery of bed.

However, in the course of entanglement between Portia and Brutus, her constant resistance seems to be overpowering Brutus vanity. The acceptance of female existence by patriarchy is revealed when Brutus agrees to disclose the secret:

BRUTUS: O Ye gods.

Reader me worthy of this noble wife ! [knocking]

Hard, hark ! One knocks: Portia, go in a while;

And by and by the bosom shall partake

The secrets of my heart:

All my engagements I will construe to thee;

All the charactery of my sad brows.

Leave me with haste. [She goes] (II.i. 303-309)



Though, at a glance, Brutus appears as a loser because of his submission to Portia's frequent resistance, it does not guarantee her complete liberation. The way Brutus promises to partake Portia in the secret of his heart hints towards his realization of Portia as the essential being. But if we ejaculate the underlying hemlock, we can clearly find the politics of Brutus who agrees to disclose the secrets of his heart only when Portia promises to keep secret as the secret without any attempt for counsel:

PORTIA: Tell me your counsels, I will not disclose 'em:

I have made strong proof of my constancy,

Giving myself a voluntary wound

Here in the thigh: can I bear that with patience

And not my husband's secrets ? (II.i.298-302)

When Portia by recalling her past deeds, attempts to present the strong proof of her capacity to keep secrets as the secrets, then only Brutus agrees to disclose his secrets. It is only when Portia vows not to disclose the secrets Brutus becomes ready to acknowledge her. In the surface level, it seems as if Brutus ultimately acknowledged the worthiness of Portia, but in the underlying level, once again Brutus brackets the agency of Portia thereby restricting her from getting any counsel regarding the view of on going conspiracy. No matter how careful, and affectionate Portia appears in front of Brutus, it is the Brutus who always seeks for personal benefit. It is by subjugating female agency, Brutus aims at concealing his treacherous tendency and hidden motif at least till the time of Caesar's successful assassination. And it is because of the sense of being confined without having any way out, Portia suffers from alienation and frustration. At this moment, it is not surprising that her self control slips. In her distraction, Portia is scarcely aware what she is saying Lucius:

PORTIA: O constancy, be strong upon my side !

Set a he mountain tween my heart and tongue !

I have a man's mind, but a woman's might.

How hard it is for women to keep counsel !

Art thou here yet ? (II.iv. 6-9)

If we scrutinize the above lines as muttered by Portia, we can evidently find the internalization of male superiority resulted out of extreme domination over women. When she claims that she has a man's mind not woman's, it can be interpreted as the internalized self inferiority emerged out of the loneliness, and anxiety. Similarly, as she says that it is hard for women to keep counsel especially in the world, in which she only suffers from pain, anxiety, eerie, and agony. Portia's anxious words reveals as much a fragility that women have been traditionally associated with. Moreover, when she imagines that she heard: "a bustling rourmour like a frag" (II.iii.17) from the direction of senate house, it reveals the traumatic condition of Portia because that very sound is the imagination resulted out of her psychological conflict. After all, she is worried about Brutus who is at the senate house for the accomplishment of the conspiracy oriented towards Caesar's assassination and what so ever she imagines in her anxiety and agony, she thinks that it is the reality that is happening at the senate house. Her mental turmoil is further extended when she almost reveals her husband's secretes:

PORTIA: I must go in. Ay me, how weak a thing

The hart of woman is ! O Brutus,

The heavens speed thee in thine enterprise !

Sure, the boy heard me. Brutus hath a suit

That Caesar will not grant. O, I grow faint. (II.ii. 38-42)

Yet, despite having the qualities of confronting with Brutus, there is a lingering doubt about her real worthiness. Though she wants to know the secrets of her husband and give company in his anxieties, once she knew it, does nothing but watches in acute distraction and anxiety. We do not know what her true beliefs are apart from the qualities she has inherited from her father and husband. As Brutus had promised to reveal the secrets to Portia, we can assume that she might be well acquainted with that secret. And because of the burden and anxiety resulted from the strict prohibition for counseling the secret Portia suffers from mental disturbance and psychological torture. Regarding the myth about female burden and her state of anxiety as resulted out of the marginalization and extreme suppression of woman by patriarchy. Simone de Beauvoir claims:

Few myths have been more advantageous to the ruling caste than the myth of woman: it justifies all privileges and even authorizes their abuses. Men need not bother themselves with alleviating the pains and the burdens that physiologically are women's lot. Since these are "intended by Nature": men use them as a pretext for increasing the misery of the feminine lot still further, for instance by refusing to grant to woman any right to sexual pleasure, by making her work like a beast of burden. (qtd. Adams, 997)

Similar to the act of refusing to grant woman any right for sexual pleasure, patriarchy by rejecting any possibility of granting woman as the essential being, puts her in the world of anxiety and eerie.

Moreover, the moment sense of alienation, laneliness, and existential crisis by merging altogether reaches in its apex, then it seeks for the redemption. The traumatic

occurings through which Portia suffers and her successful attempt of suicide as redemption is evident when Brutus states:

BRUTUS: No man bears sorrow better: Portia is dead.

CASSIUS: Ha ! Portia !

BRUTUS : She is dead.

CASSIUS: How scaped I killing when I crossed you so ?

O insupportable and touching loss !

Upon what sickness ?

BRUTUS: Impatient of my absence,

And grief that you Octavius with Mark Antony

Have made themselves so strong: for with her death

That tidings came: with this she fell distract,

And, her attendants absent, swallowed fire. (IV.iii.145-54)

Here, as Brutus narrates the incident of Portia's suicidal act and the very cause behind her suicide, we find the evil mindset of patriarchy which is solely responsible for her existential loss. When Brutus states the impatient of his absence and the grief provided by Octavius and Antony as the basis of her suicide, it carries some serious issues regarding female existence. As Lois Tyson writes, "French feminists have tended to focus more strongly on the philosophical dimension of women's issues" (96), Portia's continuous struggle for preserving oneself from losing existential ground further strongly raises some serious agendas on the philosophical dimension of women's issues. At first, Portia rationalizes the sense of danger hovering over her existential territory. After that, she deploys the sharp weapon of counter-resistance in the shape of both emotional attachment and rational arguments in order to protect her existential space. But all her efforts wind up in the authoritative networks of patriarchy. Then she

began to suffer from the sense of alienation, isolation, and frustration. And later on, as her anxiety, pathos, and existential angst culminated, she commits suicide. Here, her suicide appeared as the exit from all her traumatic happenings. In this context, the harsh condition of Portia which led her towards committing suicide and the bitter experiences that she got in the form of agony, anxiety, pain, and suffering, obviously bears some philosophical issues regarding female existence. It further reveals the bitter reality that in male dominated society, the distinct identity and the right of surviving as essential being is no longer possible. And it is due to what Portia commits suicide thereby marking it as a female victory over her existential struggle.

Although committing suicide is against the norms of masculine system which asserts it as a kind of sin, her suicidal case at least challenges the established values. It can be assumed that she took suicide as a relief instead of escaping in illusionary world. It means to say that she felt her life bore and decided to commit suicide. She took suicide as a kind of protest against male canonical world. Instead of choosing unreal world as the option for getting rid off anxiety, pathos, and angst, she chooses ultimate reality, i.e. death. For her, death is the ultimate weapon against the threat of existential angst. When Portia felt sad, frustrated, insecure, and no longer became able to endure her husband's enterprises, she swallowed the burning coals to kill herself. For Portia, both the real and illusionary worlds are themselves illusion. It is only the death that can cure female. As we are informed that Portia swallowed the burning coals, it shows her strong disagreement against male brutality. Clearly, just as burning coals refer to red, so as red refers to rebel. Hence, her act of swallowing the burning coals to kill herself is not other than her final triumph over traumatic happenings.

In addition to it, Portia's suicidal action can be interpreted as the outlet of her rebel which is solely resulted because of underestimation and devaluation of her true potentiality. As we closely examine the hot discussion between Portia and Brutus regarding the issue of Brutus' secrets, we can sense the evil ideology of male who regards female as an inessential being. When Brutus unwillingly agrees to disclose the secret plan along with a condition that forbids Portia from counselling, it shows the arrogant attitude of male hypocrisy that vehemently opposes the idea of letting down any sphere for female to reveal the secrets. It means Brutus completely discards her wishes and desire. If we critically examine all the anxieties and worries of Portia through which she suffers a lot, we can find the restriction of her voice as the fundamental cause behind her miserable condition and calamitous consequences. Here, it means to say that if Portia is kept free from whatever she likes to do as that of male, she would definitely have stopped Brutus from organizing the conspiracy. What it further implies is that if Brutus has allowed Portia for counseling, she might have attempted to stop Brutus from attending the senate house. And as a result, both Portia and Brutus might not have committed the suicide. Above all, the Rome might not have entered into civil strife and anarchy.

Whatever the circumstance may be, the root cause behind the calamitous consequences that occurred in the lives of both Portia and Brutus is not other than the negligence and devaluation of Portia ability to deal with the harsh conditions of the time. This is how Portia's voice turns out to be significant though unheard. Significant because there was a chance of maintaining political stability in Rome if her suggestion was taken into due consideration, and unheard because it is due to underestimation of the incredible capacity of female in the process of evaluating the circumstances, the chance of preventing Rome entering into civil strife and anarchy is

lost. In response to patriarchy's claim of female as mysterious and the subject to be ignored, Beauvoir asserts:

But what is commonly referred to as the mystery is not the subjective solitude of the conscious self, nor the secret organic life. It is on the level of communication that the word has its true meaning, it is not a reduction to pure silence, to darkness, to absence, it implies a stammering presence that fails to make itself manifest and clear. To say that woman is mystery is to say, not that she is silent, but that her language is not understood, she is there, but hidden behind veils; she exists beyond these uncertain appearances. (qtd. Adams, 998)

With the help of Beauvoir's claim what we can conclude is that though masculine authority orients toward putting woman into silence, she is still there behind the veils. In similar fashion, albeit Portia commits suicide, the resistance that she organized against patriarchy, still exists in the form of danger for patriarchy. The effort of patriarchy to throw Portia into the realm of darkness thereby compelling her to commit suicide, however, never succeeds to eliminate the trace of Portia's existence. It validates that even Portia's suicide marks the trace of her presence in the form of memoir that frequently threatens back to male and justifies own existence.

### III. Female Voice as the Metaphor of Divine Voice

This dissertation on William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* aspires at excavating and interrogating the treacherous tendency and evil ideology of masculinity in order to unturn the logo of insignificant object and the inessential being thereby subverting the myths created and adopted by patriarchal society. Furthermore, this project foregrounds and demonstrates the nature of patriarchy which instrumentalizes the very notion of myths as the means for undermining and devaluing female existence. In addition to this, the frequent emergence of women's counter-resistance against the myths of masculine system that has relegated femininity into the position of 'Second sex' and 'the Other' comes into collapse along with the subjugation and extermination of their resistance. However, in the course of time, female essence succeeds to vindicate and validate own existence thereby legitimizing oneself as a divine authority and the essential being.

Moreover, this study highlights the genuine dramatization of pre-and post-assassination milieu in order to scrutinize the central relationship of so called rationally loaded logic of masculinity and emotionally intensified logic of femininity. Through minute and careful examination, it is revealed that the very nexus is based on the myths that are in practice since antique to uphold the legacy of male supremacy. And all these myths are false, they block the way to transcendence to women; and they insist that woman should remain silent and just serve them. Masculine doctrine always forms the images of women as an inferior and submissive creatures who are never allowed to hold any sort of authority at any cost. Calphurnia and Portia are the representative of women's tearjerking condition who are the victims of patriarchy. If we interrogate the hegemonic nexus of males and females characters, females are mainly imprisoned, terrorized, and exploited within the four walls of their house. Men



are always powerful and allowed to do whatever they desire for, but in the case of women, they are forbidden to act according to their aspiration and no matter whatsoever the circumstances may be, they are compelled to regard men as the subject of vanity. It is already through the aspiration and demands of males, females are supposed to perform and act. Just like the amputated bird can not fly, women can not cross the assigned demarcation. Nearly both of the female characters of the play are the subject for mockery and humour. Interestingly, Roman society regards Calphurnia and Portia as a symbol of antiquated and retrograde culture because their role and agency is pre-determined within the system of Roman patriarchal ethos. Astonishingly, Calphurnia's body is mythologized as the passive terrain in the cultural practices organized during holy chase. Internal heterogeneity, hierarchy, and the oppression are pervaded in the masculine institution and enterprise inside which women are dehumanized. In the play, history is regarded as a concept, a cognitive phenomenon that interprets the situation by relating with the personal interest and will of male. During holy chase, when Caesar instructs Calphurnia to partake in holy chase just by invoking the history in the name of recalling his elders' saying, we can find him interpreting the history as per the personal desire of having a child from Calphurnia. In Roman society, females are never allowed for any free domains and hence compelled to bow down before male hegemony.

Although, masculine authority vehemently castigates the idea of letting down any free sphere for feminine agency, female attempts to subvert the tag of second sex as imposed upon them under the trammels of rigid patriarchal dogmas. In the play, female characters are seen as entering into a dynamic and unpredictable kind of wrestling in order to counter male hegemony. The entrance of female characters into the battlefield of claim and reclaim is based on the aspiration oriented towards the

establishment of women's prominent role and agency in the state mechanism and its apparatus. In the similar fashion, female characters' counter attack against male authorities enters into the complex web of competing masculine ideologies and its conflicting socio-political agendas that have marginalized and subordinated female essence since classical time. Why do male and female as two distinct but essential beings, clash in the play ? It is because both Calphurnia and Portia no longer became able to endure the pathos and angsts given by patriarchal society, they engaged themselves into the wresting of countering masculine myths.

Symptomatically, calamitous consequences are the by product of prevailing male suppression over female that has attempted to declare itself to be reasonable for the underestimation and the negligence of female voices. It further exhibits the arrogant attitudes of masculinity which just by wearing the veil of having divine authority attempts to undermine and neglect female potentialities for the sake of political action. It is also by cultivating different propagandas and myths of male supremacy, patriarchy aims of subduing female agency. Moreover, it represents the attributes of male that can be considered as a deception, a false consciousness and a myth which most oftenly interprets the circumstances by centralizing own action. It is remarkable, in a way, in which the nexus of male and female characters in the play is embellished and masked with the professions and rites of honor in order to cammouflage male's satanic motifs.

Thus, to ejaculate the underlying hemlock, it is by featuring Calphurnia and Portia in a prominent and polemical position, this study scrutinizes the inner happenings of history and the cruel ironies of masculine supremacy. It highlights the significance of female voices thereby scattering the male vanity and its intricate nexus in the formation of patriarchal myths. By subverting the dominance of cultural and

socio-political practices as adopted in patriarchal myths. This research validates the importance of female existence and warns patriarchal society thereby vindicating the necessity of female voices for the establishment of peace and harmony in the country.

### Bibliography

- Blits, Jan H. "Caesarism and the End of Republican Rome." *The Journal of Politics* 43.1 (1981): 40-55. Print.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999.
- Chartton, H.B. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1952.
- Conley, Verena Andermatt. *Helene Cixous: Writing the Feminine*. New York: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. Dympha C. Callaghan. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 2000.
- Miola, Robert S. "Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.2 (1985): 271-289. Print.
- O'Dair, Sharon. "Social Role and the Making of Identity in Julius Caesar." *Studies in English Literature*. 33.2 (1993): 289-307. Print.
- Plessix Gray, Francine du. "Dispatches from the other." *The New York Times* 10-12 (May 27, 2010): 8.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A. "The Crisis of Aristocracy in Julius Caesar." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (1990): 75-111. Print.
- Ribner, Irving. "Political Issues in Julius Caesar". *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56-1 (1957): 10-22. Print.
- Yoder, R.A. "History and Histories in Julius Caesar." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24.3 (1973): 309-327. Print.

### Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed.  
Boston: Thomson Madsworth, 2005.
- Beauvior, Simone de. "The Second Sex." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College, 1992.993-1000.
- Dove, John Roland, and Peter Gamble. "Lovers in Peace: Brutus and Cassius A Re-examination." *English Studies* 60-5 (1979): 543-554. Print.
- Fleissner, Robert F. "Political Irony in Julius Caesar." *Renaissance Quarterly* 46.2 (1991): 87.
- Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex which is not one*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.  
--- *Philosophy in the Feminine*. New York: Routledge Press, 1991.
- Kedourie, Elie. "Why Brutus Stabbed Caesar?" *Wilson Quarterly* 16.4 (1992): 112-120. Print.
- Pughe, Thomas. "What should the Wars do with these Jigging Fools ?" *The Poets in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*. London: Rutledge, 1988. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar*. Cumberland House: Wordsworth Classic, 1992.
- Stanivukovic, Guran V. "Phantasam or a Hideous Dream: Style, History and the Runs of Rome in Julius Caesar." *Studia Neophilologica* 73.1 (2001): 55-70.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Graland Publishing Inc. 1999.