

UDK: 811.111.09 Šekspir V.

Izvorni naučni rad

**Ana PENJAK (Split)**

Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Split

ana.penjak@kifst.hr

## **THE BODY MAKES THE WRITING: DISCOURSE OF POWER AND THE BODY IN WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *TITUS ANDRONICUS***

This article attempts to analyse the body motif in William Shakespeare's tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*. The main idea of the article is that Shakespeare treats the body as a part of his medium of expression and communication. As such, the article shows the deconstruction of stereotypes and the concept of female body as a passive and powerless means of communication. The article analyses the process that leads to and from the horrific violation of Lavinia's body, to her death. Also, the article shows how the presence of Lavinia's raped and mutilated body becomes an agent in writing and righting her body's violation. Lavinia is shown as a monologue of the body, which subverts the unheard words to heard words through which her body gains revenge.

Key words: *body, corporeity, Lavinia, violence, silence*

### **1. Introduction**

Caroline Walker Bynum in her writing on the medieval body states, «however we construct it and whatever it stands for to us, body is what we've got»; thus, writing on the body always «opens out beyond itself into an intractable physicality [...] what we study – what we can study – is culturally constructed. But we know we are more than culture. We are body. And, as body, we die.» (Bynum according to Rowe 1999: 207) Such a statement offers fresh and provocative discourse about the important place of the body.

Michel de Montaigne's in his brief address *To the Reader* that introduces his *Essais* (*Essays*) anticipates postmodern theorists' and critics' concerns regarding the body issue. Montaigne's idea is simple – he wants to write an intimate self-portrait, a portrait of himself being wholly naked; he wants to write himself, with his body and all. His body is meant to (re)present, to stand

between himself and what he can write of himself, between his subject and the expression of it, somehow capture himself in the words and the form in which that embodiment will be registered, viewed, and perceived. He would like to portray himself in the form that will be mediated and limited by respect for social convention and cultural construction. He writes in the essay *On presumption*,

*We (our body) are nothing but etiquette.* We are carried away by it and neglect the substance; we cling to branches and let go of trunk and body. [...] I find myself bogged down in the laws of etiquette, which do not allow a man to speak well of himself nor ill of himself. (Montaigne 1993: 718; my emphasis and insertion)

If we accept Montaigne's effort in his ability to bridge the gap between culturally encoded body and writing, than, perhaps, my idea that writing is corporeal should not be so surprising. Or as Gabriel Josipovici said, writing is «in one sense produced biologically, in the same way that a laugh or a scream has biological roots.» (Josipovici 1982: 10)

Writing like any work of art presents the bridge between biology and system of representation. In the process of writing, someone, some body, is making the writing, «as if language were in the head, and the body were simply a convenient form for chattering (or scribbling) out its messages.» (Sheets-Johnstone 1992: 12)

Every culture, social and political values constantly accumulate on the body thus creating new identities and relations. In such a way the human body becomes not only readable but understandable, too. To move closer to the subject at hand, the theatre presents a special issue in considering the relation of discourse and embodiment, writing and body. «[...] theatre is, and has always been, a place which exhibits what a human body is, what it does, what it is capable of. [...] Theatre is a practice in which societies negotiate around what the body is and means.» (Shepherd 2006: 1) Theatre is a means of communication by and through the body. In the theatre and on the scene, bodies are the ones who become, with or without words, the means of communication, that bridge between the audience and the playwright's text. In the theatre bodies are also part of the medium of expression, performance. Or as Johannes Birringer points out, «performers have always only performed representations of bodies inscribed by language, theatrical codes, and gestural/corporeal stances, and imprinted by history.» (Birringer 1991: 212)

Herbert Blau continually interrogates the place and situation of the body in its appearances and representations. He believes that the body on the stage is a subject to and constructed by the productive gaze of its audiences. Richard Bauman calls the communication between the performer and audien-

ce, « a communicative interchange.» (Bauman 1977: 9) Therefore, the communication of the body in the theatre remains a spectacle of itself.

There is another critical dilemma concerning the body in the theatre: it is a debate that by extension concerns the situation of bodies in writing. Julia Walker takes it up in her essay 'Why Performance? Why Now?' In her analysis, Walker relocates the body in a text. While I do not wish to go through the history of performance criticism, nor into feminist criticism concerning the issue of female body, a few points are worth rising to help understand the whole debate about the relationship of theatrical texts to their performances. In particular, the text/performance debate within Renaissance and Shakespeare, Janette Dillon interrogates «is there a performance in this text?» She actually questions to which degree the printed text (of a play) is capable of bringing used as evidence about the material practice of performance. (Dillon 1994: 74) Dillon wants to point out that a general notion that sees performance as a superior text, yet recorded within a text, can actually serve to erase or ignore the complex material processes involved in theatrical performances that are supposed to be at issue. As Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor point out, «*dramatic texts* are necessarily the most socialized of all literary forms.» (Erne 2003: 175; my emphasis) Janette Dillon maintains that playwriting is an engaged social and material practice, «in which complex interaction between author and stage often occurs and in which the author may be precisely not a rarefied, immaterial presence behind the playtext but a collaborator in the process of performance.» (Dillon 1994: 76) The key is to think that there are a lot of bodies involved in performances and playtexts, specific bodies working within specific material and social conditions. So, if we reformulate Dillon's initial question «is there performance in this text?», meaning do the material conditions of performance impinge upon a particular form of textuality, then the answer is yes. Thus, as performance is positioned within text, we should look at the playtext as a conditioned text by the relation of the two. «It is through *the bodies* of the actors, their long training, inspired from the theatres of the East, in mime, dancing, meditation, make-up, costume, that the text now speaks, is communicated.» (Cixous 1990: 46)

Having the aforementioned in mind, the idea that Shakespeare did not write just with pen and ink but with bodies, too, comes as no surprise. This article is an attempt to follow and to analyse how Shakespeare writes and represents the dilemma of body and corporeality, and how he writes and represents the social constructions that form and inform the body's capacity 'to speak'.

The choice of play, *Titus Andronicus*, allows me to follow the dilemma on body (re)presentation and the issue of body writing. Also, the notion of violence, since this is the crucial element in this tragedy, is indeed an indis-

pensable feature of tragedy, in general, and thus Shakespeare's tragedies, too. In this context, «staging of violence in public theatre is both a displacement and a transference of a *violence which existed not far beneath the surface of Elizabethan society itself*.» (Drakkakis 1992: 15; my emphasis) It is in *Titus Andronicus* that the issue of violence operates at the level of bodily representation. More precisely, the following analyses shows different aspects of bodily representation: the process that lead to the horrific violation of Lavinia's body; the effects of Lavinia's raped and mutilated body continued presence; the perception and expression of her pain, and the possibilities for her active role in writing and righting her body's violation.

## ***2. The body is the arena in which honour is won or lost<sup>1</sup>***

Stewart: There is something to be said for silence ...and with time she will, I'm sure,  
become affectionate.

Aunt Morgan: Certainly, there is nothing so easy to like as a pet, and they are quite  
silent. (Campion 1993: 40)

Looking at the social structure of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century, we notice the strongly emphasized patrilineal descent principle, the importance of sons and the absolute authority of the father in the family. Males (father or husband) were central authority figures that were central to social organization. They occupied roles of political leadership, moral authority and control of property. But, above all, fathers had to hold authority over women, children and servants. By occupying the superior position, fathers or husbands were able to have power over the situation in the house. Power in patriarchal society meant that of the father, either political or natural.

Furthermore, patriarchal ideologies dictated that male honour, primarily the father's honour, was deeply entangled in and by the reputation of female family members, particularly daughters. His daughter's honour, her virtue or her shame, was a part of her father's working capital, his patriarchy's social privilege. What's more, the trading in female bodies, in daughters, was the father's privilege - the trade in female bodies for male honour. Patriarchal ideologies dictated that a female body needs a male head: whether it is a head of a household, head of the family or the head that decides on female body's possibilities. Just father or husband could hold the position of the head. «In a patriarchal society men's bonds with women are meant to be in a subordinate, complementary, and instrumental relation to bonds with other men.» (Ko-

---

<sup>1</sup> Robertson 1991: 218.

sofsky Sedgwick 1985: 51) In fact, father was both authoritarian and a head of the family, benevolent as a protector against the danger from the outside. The hierarchical order approached patriarchal society through two spheres: male sphere and women sphere. This division determined and buttressed the accepted ordering of the sexes as well as sexual division of labour. Men's sphere was the world of public and political, while women's sphere was that of private and domestic. (Figs 1970) Without choice, women internalized what was socially and conventionally required for the female sex, such as, docility, dependence, purity, vulnerability, etc. Also, the conservative model of male activity/assertiveness and female passivity/receptivity determined male role as the protector and female role as the protected, placing the former in the public sphere, and the latter in the domestic sphere.

The whole complex sphere of human relationships, especially the way in which men and women influenced each other, intrigued Shakespeare a lot. Thus, he «tacitly accepts the conservative idea of a hierarchy in nature with man at the top and woman second, he does not preach it.» (Pitt 1971: 33) Through his plays, we witness many examples of this relationship presented through his female characters. One of the examples is Lavinia, Titus daughter.

In a dominant male society, women of the Elizabethan time were reduced to the stereotypic image of women staying at home, in the so-called 'woman's place', as wife and/or mothers. In *Titus Andronicus* Lavinia's body 'writes' on this patriarchal pattern. Lavinia's body that has been defined by patriarchal laws and ideology as a repressive and regulative structure becomes means of communication of three different relationships: first, her body speaks on behalf of her being a virgin daughter, secondly, as a female body that, in a patriarchal society, has been perceived as being 'a property', different and Other, and, thirdly, as a tortured body, subjected to the will of male figures.

Lavinia's story begins with the scene on which various arrangements are made for her, on her behalf. In the moment when Titus says his latest farewell to his dead sons that Lavinia is physically introduced and first speaks for herself. In her eight lines she first quotes Titus, then echoes her brother in addressing Titus as «noble lord and father» (1.1.158), then offers very formalized grief for her slain brothers with words «at this tomb my tributary tears/I render for my brethren's obsequies» (1.1.159-60). And at the end of her dutiful speech, she kneels at her father's feet and asks his blessing. In contrast to Lavinia's speech, the way Titus addresses her and speaks to her does not come as a surprise. «Lavinia, live; outlive thy father's days,/And fame's eternal date, for virtue's praise!» (1.1.167-8) In his blessing we can easily read the assumptions of a patriarchal culture in two basic things – legally, in the patriarchal culture daughters were 'reserved' for their fathers, they were their

father's property, their honour or shame, and as such they were prized for their virtue. Moreover, within a family, daughters were '*produced*' by their mothers who passed mothering capacities, duties and the desire to be mothers to them and *defined* by their relationship with the father. (Chodorow 1978)

Lavinia speech is quite limited in scope, and the way in which she speaks is very dutiful and formal; she is and will continue to be spoken for through the whole play.

<i>Bassianus</i>	Lord Titus, by your leave, this maid is <i>mine</i> .
<i>Titus</i>	How, sir, are you in earnest then, my lord?
<i>Bassianus</i>	Ay, noble Titus, and resolved withal To do myself this reason and this right.
<i>Marcus</i>	<i>Suum cuique</i> is our Roman justice. This prince in justice seizeth but his own.
<i>Lucius</i>	And that he will and shall, if Lucius live. (1.1.276-282; my emphasis)

Both Bassianus and Marcus speak of and not to Lavinia, but for her. As if Lavinia's body has been absent of her active participation in matters concerning her own body. The irony about Lavinia lies in the fact that at the beginning, before being rendered mute, her voice in matters concerning her is not asked for; it is only after the horrific violations (rape and mutilation) visited upon her, that she is asked to speak. While Bassianus speaks of his right using 'me' and 'mine' to bask up the claim, Marcus speaks of the legal justification, while Titus speaks only of his honour and not Lavinia's.

By reading what her body speaks, the reader actually reads on dialogues in which Lavinia constitutes different identities, mirroring, at the same time, cultural and social spirit of the period. Through such body communication, we read not just on power that 'stronger' gender proceeds over the 'weaker', but we read on the political, state power that mirrors in such relationships within the patriarchal context. This debate over possession, exchange and entitlement was not just a debate among the men of the time, but it also had legal status. It is interesting to notice that the definition of rape and its legal status prior to an act of Parliament in England in 1597, had more to do with property than bodies:

In Medieval Europe a woman was often abducted and sexually penetrated in order to force an unwanted or unsuitable marriage, thereby enabling her abductor to take possession of her lands and inheritance. Legally this was seen as to theft of property by one man from another. (Wynne-Davies 1991:131)

Before 1597 laws in England allowed the family to reclaim its possession that is to redress the property violation, but not necessarily to punish the perpetrator of the physical violation. In 1597 the emphasis was put on a 'tacit' consideration of rape as a 'crime against the woman's person' (Wynne-Davies 1991:130-131), against her private body rather than through it to her material possessions. The shift suggested that woman's body was also her possession. Furthermore, in such a society, the trade in female bodies could easily slip between marriage and rape because 'theft of property' could be interpreted as 'rape', just differently applied. Her father's role becomes important – he is responsible to act as a guard who will ensure the right exchange through marriage rather than theft or rape.

*Saturninus*      Tell me, Andronicus, doth this motion please thee?  
*Titus*              It doth, my worthy lord, and in this match  
                         I hold me highly honoured of your grace ... (1.1.243-5)

With the social mechanism in place Lavinia's body is used as an object in a social exchange; the object that has no voice in the proceedings. Of her performance in general, what seems to be expected of her is silence, but the silence of non-participation. Referring to her status in the open market of male honour, Saturninus, in Act 1, Scene 1, line 306, calls her 'changing piece' - piece of flesh, piece of exchangeable figure, the mute female body whose options for personal expression have been socially and politically overdetermined and severely curtailed.

«Rape is a violent act aimed at humiliating women.» (Clark 1987: 39)  
Since there is no need for the property itself to consent to its exchange, meaning Lavinia's body seen as property, thus the rape is justified and protected by the Roman law.

Rape is first introduced into the play through Bassianus and Lucius abduction and, again, a property issue.

*Bassianus*      Rape, call you it, my lord, to seize my own –  
                         My true - betrothed love, and now my wife?  
                         But let the laws of Rome determine all;  
                         Meanwhile am I possess'd of that is mine. (1.1.402-5)

While one calls it rape, the other calls it marriage appealing to Roman's laws. But Demetrius and Chiron reduce Lavinia's body beyond recognition. A scene so brutal in which «a crimson river of warm blood, Like to a bubbling fountain stirr'd with wind.» (2.4.32) At the opening of Act II, Scene 4, Lavinia enters



with her «hands cut off, and her tongue cut out, and ravished.» (2.4.1-3) With her body that has been «lopp'd, and hew'd, and made ... of two branches.» (2.4.24-25), undergendered and depersonalised, Lavinia is left «to her silence walks.» (2.4.12)

Disease and rape are considered to be the ultimate forms that show our loss of control over our own body. Also, these two forms show how somebody else of something else can have power and control over our own body. Such distorted forms of passion as well as discovering its own corporeality are not so 'harmless' areas – they open issues on the (im) possibilities of the interpersonal communication. Rape is not the only form of violence in which the body suffers. The struggle for the possession of someone else's body, and on the contrary, the struggle for self-preservation of its own body, points towards many possibilities through which the body tries to communicate its feelings beyond language. Patriarchal society and its ideological context, as well as rape have one thing in common – desire to use and abuse the private body.

The inside of Lavinia's body contains the whole history of her experience. Her body has become, to use Virginia Woolf's expression, 'a room of her own'. In her own room, Lavinia has been silenced. But, to remain silent and silenced in one's own body does not mean to be passive. Or as Hélène Cixous point,

History, love, violence, time, work, desire inscribe it in my body ... the whole of reality worked upon in my flesh, intercepted by my nerves, by my sense, by the labour of all my cells, projected, analysed, recomposed into a book. Vision: ... scrolls are imprinted and unfurled throughout time and on the same History, all the stories, ephemeral changes and transformations are written, I enter into myself with my eyes closed, and you can read it. (Cixous 1990: 120)

Following Cixous, Lavinia's body is now structured around the phantasmatic operations of the 'silent mnemonic trace'.<sup>2</sup> As such, we may read her silence in two ways: as the dissent, and as an indicator of lack of choice. In other words, even though Lavinia results to be a speechless victim, her body cannot be silenced. Silence, in Lavinia's case, is a source of expression wrapped in silence. Her body 'speaks' through gestures; her mute figure's silence actively expresses her experience to those around her, it speaks for her. For

---

<sup>2</sup> Freud defines the mnemonic trace as: 'A trace is left on our psychological apparatus of the perceptions which impinge upon it. This we may describe as a 'memory trace'; and to the function relating to it we give the name of 'memory'. (Freud 1961: 576) In particular, Freud sees these memory traces as inherently visual entities, components of a former scene. (Freud 1961: 576-82)



Lavinia, the injustice done upon her body is literally unspeakable, but visible and presentable. «Enter ... Lavinia, her hands cut off, and her tongue cut out, and ravished» (2.4.1-3) It is in this detailed image that the issue of violation is at its most acute. It is in this image that we are faced with Lavinia's mission to speak the unspeakable through the rest of the play. It is quite ironic to notice that at the beginning, before Lavinia is rendered mute, her voice in matters concerning her is never requested; she has never been asked herself to consent to anything. Only after her tongue has been cut off, and the horrific violation visited upon her, even after she has been silenced, that she is asked to speak. Although her body is horrifically violated, her body is still present. And, suddenly, her voice matters; her voice becomes profoundly necessary. Lavinia's mission is, thus, to speak the unspeakable; to express her experience to herself and to those whose surround her. But, again, it is the people around her that ask of her to speak so that they could seek for revenge. Again, it is not her voice that is important for herself, but for the revenge that her father seeks to find for the damage, for the physical incompleteness that has been done on his 'capital' – his daughter's body. Titus's honour has been affronted. It is from this that his passion for revenge emerges. Susan Brownmiller points out that if you think of women as property, then you are destroying the enemy by raping the enemy's women. (Brownmiller 1975) Through all this, Lavinia's body is again used as an object in a social exchange – this time as the object by and for which Titus acts decisively and appropriately - he seeks to avenge the damage that has been done to his honour.

The patriarchal culture may try to keep us from feeling and sensing the pain, but it is through pain that Titus finally comes to understand the Roman ideals. Lavinia's prolonged sufferings make an uncomfortable spectacle to her father and everyone around him. She is a «symbol of the destruction of the Roman political order.» (Willias 1993: 1) After seeing Lavinia mutilated and violated body, Titus realizes that the Roman culture and patriarchal ideology to which he has given his body and the body of all his children, is in fact the source of his pain. Titus changes from looking to ideology to looking to the body, Lavinia's body, for the answers he needs. Lavinia's body functions as an ideological delivery device that reveals the truth. Not until her body is in pain, that Titus realizes that Lavinia is not just an object of exchange, but a person who has voice and who feels.

*Marcus*                      This was thy daughter.

*Titus*                        Why, Marcus, so she is.

*Lucius*                     Ay me. This *object* kills me.

*Titus*                        Faint-hearted boy, arise and look upon her. (3.1.62-5; my emphasis)

Now that she cannot speak, that she cannot express and reveal the violation to her father, Titus wants to stop her feeling physical pain. Titus avenges this by killing the rapists and serving their flesh to their mother, Tamora, and their stepfather, Saturninus, in a pie.

Throughout the rest of the scene, Titus will attempt to communicate with Lavinia. It is through physical pain that Lavinia expresses herself to others. Titus wants to feel what she feels; he believes that the only right way to understand her is to be like her. Thus, he will say:

Give me a sword, I'll chop off my hands too ...  
... Shall we cut away our hand like thine?  
Or shall we bite our tongues, and dumb shows  
Pass the remainder of our hateful days? (3.1.72, 130-32)

But, he realizes that his bowels cannot hide her woes, he cannot take away her pain. His understanding must come through the successful expression of pain. So, we witness that Lavinia's body suddenly goes from being unnoticed and unheard to overread and important. Just as an example, the interaction between Lavinia and Marcus proofs the way her body speaks.

*Marcus*                      Who is this – my niece that flies away so fast? (11)  
                                    Ah, now thou turn'st away thy face (28)

Also, once Lavinia writes on the sand, with her body three lines in Latin, '*Stuprum* [rape] – Chiron - Demetrius' (4.1.77; my insertion), her body literary speaks on the violation without ever releasing a sound. She is not only writing her body's violation, but also pointing towards to righting of the violation itself. These words make the violation legible; her body calls for justice. Now those, Chiron and Demetrius, who silenced Lavinia, are now being violated and silenced by her. Although her silence fixes her in the position of passivity where her words are not spoken words, she manages to make herself clear and heard. It is in this moment that the reader gets to understand how Shakespeare did not just write with ink, but with bodies, too. Through the expressive body, Shakespeare forces his listeners to recognize this by encoding a (grotesque) image of his own theatrical technique in the mutilations of Lavinia – in this sense she is both a character and a metonym of Shakespeare's dramaturgy. Her bodily presence provides a means of expression that we can come to listen with our own bodies. At the end of the play, Titus decides to kill Lavinia's body, since he considered it from the start his own property. Thus, Titus takes justice in his own hands. As in the beginning of the play, so at its end we read on the dangerous interim before the new order can assert itself.

### 3. Discussion

The case of Lavinia has been examined in the light of several Renaissance ideas: the relationship between man (father or husband) and woman (daughter in the family); about female body perception; and about various types of violation. Evidences were drawn from religious and legal writings, historical recordings and modern theories on body issue which make explicit assumptions that Shakespeare took for granted.

Three related concepts emerge from this examination: Lavinia's rape as a process that invalidates female body; the violated, silenced female body as an agent in a transaction between men; violated and mutilated female body as a medium of expression.

Also, we witness that woman's body was seen and perceived as a man's possession, their object of exchange. We notice that it was not just Lavinia's body that was subordinated to man; her duty was to be obedient; her duty was to subordinate both her body and will to men. Thus, she shows to be unquestionably obedient to her father on the issue of marriage. All these elements lead to her body extreme violation.

«Rape is consequently a crime against property and an offence against the person.» (Williams 1993: 2) Being raped violated and mutilated Lavinia's body results to be contaminant to her whole family, especially to her father. Her father can no longer decide on the future of his 'property'. Such a contaminated body can no longer be a subject of exchange. Lavinia cannot be married. Titus very identity is now obscured. So, the only left solution for Titus is to kill her, so she would no longer remind him of his shame, humiliation and 'dishonour'd'. (1.1.345) In different cultures and at different times, body punishment in a form of death was perceived differently. (Edwards 2007) In ancient Rome, violated bodies could be removed only by death. But before Titus does so, Lavinia manages to tell her story. It is only through her body that she manages to write and right her body violation. When she scrapes three words in the sand, «Sturpum, Chiron, Demetrius» (4.1.78) she is believed unquestionably. The monologue of her body subverts the unheard words to heard words through which her body gains revenge.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, through her wounded body, she tries to save the political body of Rome. By calling upon her rapists, she calls upon justice in Rome. Afterward, even though she has avenged her violated body by writing those three words, she pleas for death. Titus action, thus, can be

---

<sup>3</sup> There are many secondary sources that deal with Lavinia as written upon by violence, for example Coppelia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, Women*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

interpreted as a substitute for the suicide she cannot do by herself. In this act Titus sees his duty, his moral responsibility.

Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee;  
And with thy shame thy father's sorrow die! (5.3.46)

#### 4. Conclusion

When we put the body into discourse, it is as if a psychoanalyst holds up a mirror to the self. William Shakespeare puts Lavinia's body into discourse, thus using it as part of his medium of expression. Her body witnesses horrific elements of private body violation: her body rape, her hands cut off and her tongue teared out. *Titus Andronicus* is a play where horror occurs one after the other, each more gruesome and bizarre than the last. It is a play where violence is done both on language and body. It is for sure that Lavinia's body suffered the most violence – it has been demoralized by this shattering experience. Although Lavinia has been raped and mutilated, she manages to use her body as a medium of performance in order to authorize her own words and to create truth. Her body (re)presents. If we accept Montaigne's idea of writing himself, and then we accept the idea that writing is indeed corporeal. Is it not that via her body Lavinia witnesses her crime and calls for justice? But, unfortunately, for her body the punishment will come after her death. Or as Michel Foucault says, «Justice pursues the body beyond all possible pain.» (Foucault 1977: 34) Thus, through Lavinia's body and character, the reader witnesses how the Bard uses the body as a medium of expression, as a voice, and not only words.

#### references

- Bauman, R. (1977). *Verbal Art as Performance*: Waveland Press.
- Birringer, J. H. (1991). *Theatre, theory, postmodernism*: Indiana University Press.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*: Fawcett Columbine.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The Reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*: University of California Press.
- Cixous, H. (1990). *The Body and the Text: Cixous, Hélène, Reading, and Teaching*: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Clark, A. (1987). *Women's Silence, Men's Violence: Sexual Assault in England 1770-1845*: Pandora.
- De Montaigne, M. (1991). *The Complete Essays*: The Penguin Press.

- Dillon, J. (1994). Is There a Performance in This Texts? *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4, 74-86.
- Drakkakis, J. (1992). *Shakespearean Tragedies*: UK, Longman Critical Readers.
- Edwards, C. (2007). *Death in Ancient Rome*: Yale University Press.
- Erne, L. (2003). *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*: Cambridge University Press.
- Figs, E. (1970). *Patriarchal Attitudes: Women in Society*: Fawcett Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish*: Penguin.
- Freud, S. (1961). *The Interpretation of Dreams*, ed. and trans. James Strachey: Avon.
- Harris, B. (1996). Sexuality as a Signifier for Power Relations: Using Lavinia, of Shakespeare's "Titus Andronicus." In *Criticism* 38 (3), pp. 383-406. Accessed September 10, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/23118107?uid=2&uid=2134&uid=3&uid=3738200&uid=2474396623&uid=60&uid=2&uid=70&uid=3&uid=63&uid=60&uid=2474396613&sid=21104673454473>
- Josipovici, G. (1982.) *Writing and the Body*: Harvester Press.
- Kossofsky Sedgwick, E. (1985). *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*: Columbia University Press.
- Pitt, A. (1981). *Shakespeare's Women*: Barnes & Noble Books.
- Robertson, K. (1991). Chastity and Justice in "The Revenger's Tragedy." In Carole Levin and Karen Robertson: *Sexuality and Politics in Renaissance Drama*: E. Mellen Press, pp. 215-236.
- Rowe, K. (1999). *Dead Hands: Fictions of Agency, Renaissance to Modern*: Stanford University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (1975). *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*: Gramercy Books.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (1992). *Giving the Body Its Due*: SUNY Press.
- Shepherd, S. (2013). *Theatre, Body and Pleasure*: Routledge.
- Williams, C. D. (1993). "Silence, like a Lucrece knife": Shakespeare and the Meanings of Rape." In *The Yearbook of English Studies Vol. 23*, Early Shakespeare Special Number, pp. 93-110. Accessed September 10, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3507975?uid=2&uid=2134&uid=3&uid=3738200&uid=2474396623&uid=60&uid=2&uid=70&uid=3&uid=63&uid=60&uid=2474396613&sid=21104673454473>
- Wynne-Davies, M. (1991). "The Swallowing Womb": Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*." In Valerie Wayne (Ed.), *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, pp. 129-151, Cornell University Press.

### TIJELO U PROCESU PISANJA: O MOĆI I TJELESNOSTI U WILLIAM SHAKESPEAREOVOM *TIT ANDRONIKU*

Ovaj rad analizira poimanje ženskoga tijela i tjelesnog u William Shakespeareovoj tragediji *Tit Andronik*. Glavna teza ovoga rada temelji se na tvdnji kako se Shakespeare odnosi prema tijelu i tjelesnome kao prema sredstvu izražavanja i komunikacije. Teza opovrgava uvrijeđene stereotipe i ideje o ženskom tijelu kao pasivnom i nemoćnom sredstvu komunikacije. Kroz tijelo kao sredstvo komunikacije, rad analizom prikazuje proces koji vodi do brutalnog sakaćenja Lavinijinog tijela, a naposljetku i do njene smrti. Rad ukazuje kako Lavinijino silovano i osakaćeno tijelo postaje sredstvo pisanja, a kroz pisanje i sredstvo ispravljanja zločina koji joj se dogodio. Lavinia je prikazana kao monolog tijela, koji pretvara neizgovorene riječi u izgovorene, uspijevajući tako osvetiti se za zločin koji je počinjen nad njom.

Ključne riječi: *tijelo, tjelesnost, Lavinia, nasilje, tišina*