HERSTORIES OF SCOTLAND: AN ANALYSIS OF LIZ LOCHHEAD'S SELECTED PLAYS FROM A NEW HISTORICIST APPROACH

2023
PhD THESIS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA

Thesis Advisor
Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK

HERSTORIES OF SCOTLAND: AN ANALYSIS OF LIZ LOCHHEAD'S SELECTED PLAYS FROM A NEW HISTORICIST APPROACH

Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA

Thesis Advisor
Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK

T.C.
Karabuk University
Institute of Graduate Programs
Department of English Language and Literature
Prepared as
PhD Dissertation

KARABUK
October 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that in my opinion the thesis submitted by Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA titled "HERSTORIES OF SCOTLAND: AN ANALYSIS OF LIZ LOCHHEAD'S SELECTED PLAYS FROM A NEW HISTORICIST APPROACH " is fully adequate in scope and in quality as a thesis for the degree of PhD.

Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK .....

Thesis Advisor, Department of English Language and Literature

This thesis is accepted by the examining committee with a unanimous vote in the Department of English Language and Literature as a PhD thesis. October 25, 2023

Examining Committee Members (Institutions)	Signature
Chairman : Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK (KBU)	.....
Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa CANLI (KBU)	.....
Member : Prof. Dr. Sinan YILMAZ (KBU)	.....
Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Turan Özgür GÜNGÖR (KU)	.....
Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Yıldırım ÖZSEVGEÇ (RTEU)	.....

The degree of PhD by the thesis submitted is approved by the Administrative Board of the Institute of Graduate Programs, Karabuk University.

Doç. Dr. Zeynep ÖZCAN .....

Director of the Institute of Graduate Programs

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work and all information included has been obtained and expounded in accordance with the academic rules and ethical policy specified by the institute. Besides, I declare that all the statements, results, materials, not original to this thesis have been cited and referenced literally.

Without being bound by a particular time, I accept all moral and legal consequences of any detection contrary to the aforementioned statement.

Name Surname: Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA

Signature :

FOREWORD

First and foremost, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK. It has been a great privilege to have crossed paths with him not only for his guidance during the completion of this dissertation but also for his continuous support in both my academic and personal endeavors. His presence in my life has always been comforting and incredibly reassuring, a constant source of gratitude that I will forever cherish. I also cannot thank Dr. Mustafa CANLI enough for his assistance and guidance during my academic journey.

I also wish to express heartfelt thanks to my life-long partner and supporter, my husband, Ahmet MİRZA. His belief in me has been a constant source of strength throughout this process. Moreover, my son, Güneş MİRZA, has been a guiding light, a magical stick that has brought profound changes to my life. Their love and support have inspired me to persevere in the face of challenges, and I am eternally grateful for having them in my life.

Furthermore, I would like to extend my appreciation to TUBITAK for granting me the scholarship that allowed me to pursue my studies at the University of Edinburgh. Without their invaluable support, this thesis would not have reached its polished and nourished form.

Moreover, I owe a debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Robert Irvine, at Edinburgh University. His guidance and support have had a profound impact on my academic journey, leading it in a positive direction. His mentorship has been invaluable, and I am thankful for the opportunity to work under his guidance.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to SUISS, but particularly, to Dr. Lauren Pope and Dr. Dorothy Lawrance, whose talents, kindness, and personal dedication to their jobs have been a great inspiration to my personal life and academic career.

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this dissertation is to illuminate how socio-political representation of Scotland and experiences of women that have long been marginalized and silenced find expression through Lochhead's selected plays from a new historicist approach. By closely examining four pivotal plays—*Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, *Dracula*, *Medea*, and *Miseryguts*— this study spans diverse historical periods, ranging from the 14th century to the 19th century, encompassing epochs from ancient prehistory to the contemporary setting of 2002. It embarks on a journey through these historical periods within an attempt to shed light on Lochhead's positioning her plays within the complex interplay between politics and literature. Also, this research explores the web of power dynamics that govern Scotland's interactions with the United Kingdom and reveals the discourses enveloping these interactions. It highlights the subversive strategies employed to challenge grand narratives, with recurrent themes including nationalism, class, sexism, and colonialism. In this regard, the present study scrutinizes how Lochhead, reconfiguring well-known fictional and historical figures, confronts these mis-representations by depicting them grappling with their oppressive surroundings. By doing so, this dissertation aims to demonstrate the possibility of liberating history and historical analysis from a masculine gaze and intersecting historical narratives with a feminist perspective within the Scottish context.

Keywords: Scotland, Herstory, Liz Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea, Miseryguts.*

ÖZ

Bu tezin temel amacı, İskoçya'nın sosyo-politik temsilinin ve uzun süredir ötekileştirilen ve susturulan kadınların deneyimlerinin Lochhead'in seçtiği oyunlar aracılığıyla kadın anlatımıyla nasıl ifade bulduğunu yeni tarihselci bir yaklaşımla aydınlatmaktır. Bu çalışma, dört önemli oyunu -*Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea* ve *Miseryguts*- yakından inceleyerek, 14. yüzyıldan 19. yüzyıla uzanan, antik tarih öncesinden 2002 yılının ortamına kadar çeşitli tarihsel dönemleri kapsamaktadır. Ayrıca, bu araştırma İskoçya'nın Birleşik Krallık ile etkileşimlerini yöneten güç dinamikleri ağını araştırmakta ve bu etkileşimleri çevreleyen siyasi söylemleri ortaya koymaktadır. Milliyetçilik, sınıf, cinsiyetçilik ve sömürgecilik gibi tekrarlayan temalarla büyük anlatılara meydan okumak için kullanılan yıkıcı stratejilerin altını çizmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma, Lochhead'in tanınmış kurgusal ve tarihi figürleri yeniden yapılandırarak, onları baskıcı çevreleriyle boğuşurken tasvir ederek bu yanlış temsillerle nasıl yüzleştiğini incelemektedir. Bunu yaparak, bu tez, tarihi ve tarihsel analizi eril bir bakıştan özgürleştirmenin ve tarihsel anlatıları feminist bir perspektifle kesiştirmenin olasılığını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İskoçya, Kadın Anlatıları, Liz Lochhead, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea, Miseryguts.*

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Name of the Thesis	Herstories of Scotland: An Analysis of Liz Lochhead's Selected Plays from a New Historıcist Approach
Author of the Thesis	Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA
Advisor of the Thesis	Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Status of the Thesis	PhD
Date of the Thesis	25/10/2023
Field of the Thesis	English Language and Literature
Place of the Thesis	UNIKA/IGP
Total Page Number	205
Keywords	Scotland, Herstory, Liz Lochhead, Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea, Miseryguts

ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ

Tezin Adı	Kadın Bakış Açısıyla İskoçya Hikayeleri: Liz Lochhead'in Seçili Oyunlarının Yeni Tarihselci Yaklaşımla İncelenmesi
Tezin Yazarı	Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA
Tezin Danışmanı	Prof. Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Tezin Derecesi	Doktora
Tezin Tarihi	25/10/2023
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Tezin Yeri	KBÜ/LEE
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	205
Anahtar Kelimeler	İskoçya, Kadın Anlatıları, Liz Lochhead, Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea, Miseryguts

SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH

The primary focus of this research is to examine the close intersections between Scottish literature and feminist perspectives, as manifested in the plays of Liz Lochhead. Specifically, the study investigates how Lochhead's selected four plays, including *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea*, and *Miseryguts*, navigate and depict socio-political representations of Scotland while fostering the experiences of marginalized women from her own female Scottish gaze. To accomplish this, a new historicist approach is employed, allowing for a exploration of how historical contexts shape literary narratives and vice versa. Furthermore, this dissertation delves into the subversion of grand narratives that often underpin themes such as nationalism, class, sexism, and colonialism. By critically analyzing Lochhead's plays, this dissertation seeks to unveil how literature can serve as a powerful tool for critiquing and deconstructing entrenched oppressive systems. It, therefore, aims at offering a comprehensive examination of how literature can challenge prevailing narratives, liberate history from a masculine gaze, and provide new insights into familiar works, all within the context of Scottish identity and socio-political dynamics.

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The previous studies on Liz Lochhead's plays have provided readings on the exploration of either her nationalistic position or her feminist agenda. Even the researches which claim to offer a broad analysis of both Lochhead's nation and gender concerns have focused on post-Lacanian analysis and/or postmodern reading. Although they mention Lochhead's insistent connection with the past and history, none of them have taken a new historicist standpoint to inquiry the issues of gender and nation in Lochhead's plays. Lochhead exclaims "Do not let history frame you in a pretty lie" and makes her famous aphorism about history writing in "Construction for a Site". When considering her commitment to the past, previous literary and history writings, it can be argued that Liz Lochhead's plays problematize the relationship between historicity of a fiction and fictionality of the history in her reinterpretation variety which is mainly united by nationalist and feminist concerns. From this vantage point, this study aims to diverge from the previous researches in its attempt to construe her drama as an essential piece of historical text to re-present socio-cultural history of

Scotland and Scottish woman and to refute false assumptions stigmatized on her nation and gender. On a close inspection, this study aims at exploring Liz Lochhead's plays as a medium to capture the socio-cultural context of from a new historicist approach.

This new approach will both offer a glimpse to the apprehension of Scottish history which is still awaiting to be explored and it will provide new contexts for the growing interest in Scottish literature and this will eventually lead to the better appreciation and recognition of Lochhead's literary and theatrical skill in particular. To that end, the five plays *Miseryguts*, *Mary Queen of Scotland Got Her Had Chopped Off*, *Dracula*, and *Medea* have been selected as they enable good foundation for the aim of bringing new insights and better explanations to the discussion of gender and nation in a new historicist approach.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The focal point of this dissertation is Liz Lochhead's plays, so a textual analysis in the frame of qualitative research method will be applied. This approach includes the interpretation of language, structure, theme, characterization, and so on, which make Lochhead's plays literary. In this context, special attention will be given to the code switching between the Scots and Standard Queen English, alienation of Scottish people, and gender-based marginalization to explore the praxis of the Scottish identity. Moreover, using tropes, myths and stereotypes in Lochhead's selected plays will provide good premise to discuss Lochhead's concerns about the false or fixed conceptions about nation-building or identity-construction. Furthermore, to better understand her works, an extensive research will be conducted on the playwright herself and the socio-political situation of her time period. To that end, historical and biographical criticism will be also applied to establish a link between her works and two significant culturally and discursively constructed concepts: Gender and Nation. These two issues which are at the heart of Liz Lochhead's thematic concerns are the significant underpinnings of her dramaturgy to provoke a vigorous debate on power relations between Scotland and England. At that point, the histories of these two nations will be unescapably the main scope of this dissertation. This is mainly because all the images, tropes, stereotypes, and myths to define Scotland and Scottish woman

that Lochhead is wrestling with are discursively constructed on the past in different narrative forms such as history writing and fiction writing.

When considering the attempt of revisiting the past and reinterpretation of previous writings in Lochhead's adaptations, it can be argued that Lochhead seeks a transformation, new modes of perception and various versions of truth both in the past and the present through the embodiment of particular attitudes to representation of Scotland and its relationship to national and gender identities. Given that, this dissertation will adopt new historicism as an approach to consider each selected play as a historical document which Lochhead dislocates power and oppression in constructed ideas, discourses, labels and institutions in the history of Scotland. So, all these texts try to liberate the fixed descriptions and assumptions of one ruling group against the Scottish people. Thus, each text casts light upon socio-political surroundings of Lochhead related to her nation and identity.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH / RESEARCH PROBLEM

In the selected plays, including *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea,* and *Miseryguts,* Liz Lochhead revisits various historical epochs whereby she increases the women's visibility and empowerment of Scottish identities which have been neglected, silenced or mispresented in both fictional narratives and those whose credibility is unquestionable. In this regard, this dissertation hypotheses that Lochhead's plays challenge the persistent misrepresentations and oppressive narratives that have surrounded themes like nationalism, class, sexism, and colonialism. Lochhead's inclination to confront these issues aligns closely with the fundamental principles of New historicism, making it a suitable approach to comprehensively analyze and understand her plays. Through the lens of new historicism, this study seeks to ponder on how Lochhead's reconfigurations of historical contexts and characters contribute to a more feminist perspective on Scotland's socio-political history.

In Chapter One, this dissertation will establish its theoretical framework. The literary theory employed in this study is the new historicism, an approach renowned for its analytical strength in unmasking the power dynamics. Encompassing the

foundational principles of the new historicism and, more critically, its intersection with gender and nation, this chapter aims to provide theoretical base to critically examine and contextualize the complex negotiations of gender and national identity that permeate Lochhead's dramatic works, providing valuable insights into their profound socio-cultural implications.

Chapter Two delves into the socio-cultural and political background both prevailing Scotland and significantly shaping Lochhead's plays and stylistic approach. In this context, following the section embarking on an elucidation of the historical trajectory of Scottish drama, with a keen focus on the emergence of national theatre companies, the chapter portrays the historical evolution of the Scots language, casting illumination on the rationale behind Lochhead and her contemporaries' deliberate inclusion of Scots within their literary compositions. The ultimate section within Chapter Two is dedicated to a thorough examination of Lochhead's unique writing style. This scrutiny promises to offer valuable insights into the driving forces behind her creative output, the forces that have influencrf her artistic choices and influenced the composition of the plays that constitute the focal point of this dissertation.

Chapter Three focuses on Lochhead's *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* with a thorough analysis. This chapter tends to identify and dissect the textual and contextual elements that serve to either dramatize history or historicize the drama. Embracing a new historicist perspective, it reveals how Lochhead's work navigates the complex relationship between history and drama and reality and fiction by questioning the credulity of history writing as an official and scientific grand-narrative.

Chapter Four draws the attention to the dynamics of representation, power relations, and social hierarchies embedded within Lochhead's *Dracula*. It approaches these themes with a keen eye on gender, nation, and class, all of which constitute the core agenda of the prevailing ideology. In the re-writing of Lochhead, these themes engage in a constant struggle of oppression and resistance. This chapter, therefore, teases out the mechanisms through which dominant oppressive discourses are wielded and subsequently deconstructed through Lochhead's distinctive rewriting strategies.

Chapter Five sheds light on the revisions implemented by Lochhead with the aim of exposing the hidden ideological influences lurking behind the source text,

Medea. Employing the lens of new historicism, this chapter explores the layers of influence that dominate Lochhead's adaptations, offering critical insights into how these revisions function within the broader socio-cultural context.

In Chapter Six, Lochhead's adaptation of the renowned French play, *Miseryguts* will be scrutinized. The themes of the source text, including condemned corruption, hypocrisy, and pretentiousness, serve as the focal point of this chapter's analysis. Moreover, by undertaking the task of unveiling the intricate workings of libertinism, a concept firmly nurtured by playwrights of the 17th century within the realm of comedy of manners, this chapter will endeavor to elucidate how libertinism not only serves as a reflection of broader social and cultural trends but also functions as a locus of resistance against prevailing discourses that dominate the landscape of the 21st century.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF NEW HISTORICISM

The main aim of this chapter is to establish the theoretical framework of the present dissertation. Through an interplay of past and present, this research adopts new historicism to explore the power relations in the concepts of nation and gender as presented by Liz Lochhead in her selected plays. In this regard, the interaction of historical context and Lochhead's Scottish drama is crucial for this study's ability to illustrate identity construction in the complex negotiation of gender and national dissent. Conceiving of literature as a significant part of social and cultural practices is the basic standpoint of new historicism. The privileges, power relations, and discursive formations in the sense of gender and nation are the most fundamental tenets of new historicism as a means of capturing a glimpse of the close connection between history and literature and between culture and literature. Although it originates from a narrow point of view as a reaction to formalism, new historicism has indeed opened up new ways of looking at literature in its close relationship to history and politics through a wide variety of interpretations. It ensures a broad inclusiveness in an interdisciplinary manner. Therefore, as John Brannigan (1998) points out, "New historicism has succeeded in breaking down distinctions between academic disciplines, the boundaries of which seemed more bent on keeping a discipline mystical and self-authorizing" (p. 81). It is to that end that this dissertation aims to more firmly grasp and more broadly explain Liz Lochhead's drama by applying new historicism to her selected plays.

1.1. Key Definitions and Principles of New Historicism

The 1980s embarked on a new movement in literary studies called "new historicism" by its leading figure, Stephen Greenblatt. Although the term was first coined by Michael McCanles, it was Greenblatt who is credited with the popularity of the term in literary criticism (Hart, 1991, p. 93). This new trend in the literary agenda derives from a challenge against the literary assumptions of new criticism or practical criticism. The practitioners of new criticism have put considerable emphasis on the textuality of a given literary work, and they have tended to capture the sense of objectivity in literary criticism. To that end, they view a literary text as an "autonomous entity" with a strict disseverance of text from context, culture, history and society which gives rise to the production of the text. Even though there are many

other challenging ferments against this movement in literary studies, new historicism arguably builds its main literary principles on the denial of new criticism. As a main principle, new historicism no longer privileges literature by relegating context into the background. Instead, it suggests a parallel reading. As John Brannigan (1998) states, the new historicist critics tend to explore "[t]he linguistic, cultural, social and political fabric of the past in greater detail. It […] serves iterary studies as a critical practice in placing literary texts in an unprivileged exchange with the historical forces in the time of their production" (p. 12). Hence, they intend to situate literature into a web of different methodologies—linguistics, discourse theory, philosophy, feminism, Marxism, cultural materialism, deconstruction and postcolonialism—which exist in a broader sphere.

New historicism is a critical mode of practice which has been developed by a number of influences. It is said to have first come out of the New Left of the 1960s and 1970s (Gallagher, 1989; Hohendahl, 1992; Lewis, 1991; Newton, 2013) when young people in particular sought liberation from oppression and advocated social change surrounding issues such as political rights, women's rights, gay rights and so on. United by these common concerns, Americans and Europeans alike rejected authoritarianism in both violent and nonviolent activist ways (Lewis, 1991).

Cultural materialism is another root of new historicism (Veeser, 1994; Brannigan, 1998; Parvini, 2012; Newton, 1998). It is a notable discipline in the exploration of the strong connection between literary and historical narratives in literary studies. The leading figures of cultural materialism, including Alan Sinfield, Jonathan Dollimore, Richard Wilson, Richard Dutton, hereby pay considerable attention to power relations when analyzing a given text. For cultural materialists, all kinds of texts bear the traits of the culture in which they are produced. Culture is also the site of political contest and contradiction in which the dominant ideology operates. In this regard, ideology prevails and validates itself not only in texts, but in institutional forms such as churches, schools, and the media. In his *Faultlines* (2009), Alan Sinfield manifests that these literary and institutional forms are the channels for the ruling ideology to be able to generate its power. Through these channels, it first promotes the idea difference and binaries such as margin and center; good and bad; hero and villain. Then, it puts its control mechanisms into operation. Therefore, Sinfield suggests that political dissidence is generated by ideology so that it convinces

people that the control mechanisms of the ruling ideology are useful and necessary. To illustrate this, he gives the example of the mindset of soldiers, guardians, and judges because they conceive of themselves as someone who must ensure safety and order as they are different from criminals (Sinfield, 2009). Making blatant the political position of cultural materialism, Sinfield, to some extent, recasts the ideological apparatus of the state and the repressive apparatus of the state*in Althusserian terms. He factors the impacts of ideology into the interpretation of a text. In this respect, discussions of cultural materialism are often grounded in theories of culture, ideology, and politics, thus explaining why cultural materialists frequently refer to Althusser, Foucault, Gramsci. Moreover, the main context of a cultural materialist is the political action and strategies of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s in the analysis of various writers from different historical periods such as Shakespeare from the Elizabethan age, Wordsworth from the Romantic age, Dickens from the Victorian age, and others from the post-war era in Britain. The main rationale behind this eclectic tendency to analyze different periods is to show that the literary texts are always shaping and being shaped by the existing social and political landscape of a society.

New historicism shares this same fascination with inquiry into socio-cultural issues such as power relations, hegemony, ideology and discourse. Moreover, new historicism rejects the binaries built on literature (text) and politics (context) just as cultural materialism does (Dollimore, 1990; Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000). However, cultural materialism is mainly concerned with literary texts whereas new historicism more often opts for the exchange between literary and nonliterary texts. New historicism also concentrates on texts written in the past, as seen with the abundance of Renaissance studies, while cultural materialists are more flexible in focusing on contemporary texts. Furthermore, the issue of subversion is always sustained by a state for new historicist critics, while cultural materialists are slightly more hopeful about

* In a broad sense, IRAs and RSA are the terms coined by Louis Althusser to illustrate how a state exercises power and its ruling ideology from a Marxist approach. For Althusser, Repressive State Apparatus is singular as it refers to the concept of state in its public domain where it exercise his power through violence and repression against masses whereas Ideological State Apparatuses dominate the private domain of life like churches, schools, partties, trade unions, and etc. That is why, ISAs are plural and are functioned by ideology.

the distribution of power and the possibility of resistance. Another main difference between them, as Evrim Doğan puts it, is "the point of departure." (2005, p.78). While new historicism emerged as a reaction against the strict rules of formalism or new criticism in the United States, cultural materialism appeared as a reaction against the conventional readings of literature in Britain. Nonetheless, owing to their shared assumptions and reactions, they have become so "entrenched" in Neema Parvini's words, that some critics are not keen to acknowledge these disciplines as distinct methods (Dogan, 2005; Parvini, 2015). Instead, "they have been placed alongside each other in anthologies and critical books," as Brannigan states (1989, p. 27). Based on this idea, the present study tends to conceive of them as a whole rather than two distinctive veins of a similar literary approach.

This contingency in situating new historicism actually prevails as its quintessential nature. That is to say, even though new historicism is acknowledged as a theory to apply in literary studies, new historicists, themselves, claim to be unconnected to each other. Emphasizing the absence of formulations and theoretical principles in the application of new historicism, Stephen Greenblatt in *Practicing New Historicism* confesses that new historicism is not "a coherent, close-knit school in which one might be enrolled or from which one might be expelled" (2001, p. 2). To express their refusal to be indulged in a particular literary movement, Louis Montrose (as cited in Veeser, 1994) also says "new historicists are actually quite heterogenous in their critical practices" (p.1). Therefore, they are engaged in the discussions of Lacanians, Foucauldians, Freudians, and deconstructivists as well as literature so they suggest the idea of being interdisciplinary instead of being united under a strictly formulated theory. Hence, plurality dominated their criticism. However, despite the lack of a certain description or common manifesto, the journal Representations turned out to be the meeting platform of new historicists, with an editorial board able to extend their discussions (Fox-Genovese, 1989; Greenblatt, 2001). The journal was imbued with a variety of ideas about literature, hermeneutics, politics, anthropology, and history. This diversity of thought and representing their ideas in a powerful way, according to Stephen Greenblatt (2001) was the main rationale behind the Representations.

Despite the heterogeneity that the new historicists offer in collections, all of them diverge from the traditional understanding of historicism in their refusal of

universality. Furthermore, as Jeffrey Cox and Larry Raynolds (1993) layout, it differs from the old "[with] its lack of faith in 'objectivity' and 'permanence' and its stress not upon the direct recreation of the past, but rather the process by which the past is constructed or invented" (p. 4). Also, Herold A. Veeser (1989) suggests the following five main principles of new historicism after compiling a series of collections of new historicists:

> 1-That every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices
>
> 2-That every act of unmasking, critique, and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes
>
> 3-That literary and nonliterary texts circulate inseparably
>
> 4-That no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths nor express inalterable human nature
>
> 5-Finally that a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe (p. xi)

The Renaissance studies and related essays by leading figures of new historicism clearly demonstrate the state of being embedded, which is the first essential characteristic of new historicism. In the aftermath of a detailed study of the dominant literary productions of the time such as pastoral poems, masques, and plays, Jean Howard establishes the state of being embedded of literature with the other practices such as ruling a country, producing policies, laws, and history(ies) with an attempt to "read literary texts of the English Renaissance in relationship to other aspects of the social formation in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. (1986, p. 13) Louis Adrian Montrose (1980) also shows this connection in his oft-quoted essay "Eliza, Queene of Shepherd." He describes how Elizabeth I's power was perpetuated by pastoral poems written during her lifetime. In pastoral works, the use of pastoral images (e.g., the virgin, the milkmaid, the shepherd) was typically intended represent the disparagement of aspiration and physical power. However, Montrose (1980) asserts the opposite of this literary tendency, arguing that the pastoral forms of Elizabethan times were more like content enhancement for Queen Elizabeth's charisma. He conceives: "the pastoral contrast not as a desired escape from the burdens of negotium but as a foil for the exercise of power, not as a rejection of aspiration but as an assertation of authority" (p. 91). He also adds, "what is most impressive about Elizabethan pastorals of power is how successful they really are at combining intimacy and benignity with authoritarianism" (p. 110). Likewise, Stephen Orgel (1994) in "The

Role of King" focuses on the masque genre, and he shows how a court masque could serve a purpose in its way of discussing or questioning the ultimate power claims of King Charles I.

The second tenet of new historicism is that every expressive act can be the opposite what it proposes. That is to say, new historicism enables the critic such freedom in interpreting the texts that the act of opposition can be understood as a compliment or a compliment can be considered an attack. Veeser (1989) gives an example from "The Triumph of Peace," a text which lawyers used to try to thwart the ultimate power of King Charles I. However, their scolding and veiled threats, according to Veeser, "turned into harmless compliments and delighted Charles so mightily that he ordered the performance repeated. Medium in this case nullified message" (p. 15). This argument can also be explained by Greenblatt's oft-quoted "Invisible Bullets" (1981) to show the opposite case. Greenblatt gives an anecdote from Thomas Harriot who is an ardent supporter and officer of the ruling power. Harriot conveys the English colonists' experiences with the Algonquin Indians in America in *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. He demonstrates how religion is used as a means to keep the colonized under control. Given this, as Serpil Opperman contends, "The authors who advocated and supported political authority during the Renaissance were actually the authors who most critically addressed the power of the Elizabethan era without realizing it" (2006, p. 17).† To strengthen his argument, Greenblatt (1981) later focuses on Shakespeare, whose plays were often performed by order of the monarch. However, even his plays include the most subversive and critical references. The following statement by Tom McAlindon (1995) makes it explicit:

> Shakespeare's plays reproduce and contribute to this process. Instead of presenting an attitude of qualified and provisional approval towards the dominant order, or a dialectic (resolved or unresolved) of contrary attitudes, they enact and justify the submission of heterodoxy to orthodoxy: subversion is both produced and contained. …Shakespeare uses play and illusion to lead them through subversive thoughts to a positive acceptance of the dominant order. (p. 412)

Accordingly, some literary productions, such as dramas written in the Renaissance period, contained skeptical or subversive treatment, albeit inadvertently. So, the existing system both sustains the power and paves the way for the subversion in a

† Translation mine

contradictory way. These Renaissance-era examples of the close interaction between state power and aesthetic production bring the reader to Brannigan's broad definition of new historicism. He defines it as "a mode of critical interpretation which privileges power relations as the most important context for texts of all kinds. As a critical practice it treats literary text as a space where power relations are made visible" (Branningan, 1998, p. 6).

The third principle, as offered by Veeser (1989), lies in the premise that new historicism is a method based on "the circulation of literary and nonliterary texts inseparably" (p. xi). The critics of new historicism focus on the necessity of equal treatment in the analysis of literary and non-literary texts. This critical practice is coined as "poetics of culture" by Greenblatt in "Towards a Poetics of Culture" (1989). In this essay, Greenblatt distinguishes new historicism from previous critical methods such as practical criticism and formalism. His averting from the previous interpretation methods is mainly because they foreground the literariness of the text; consider fictional and historical narratives as autonomous entities; forbid the consideration of author, his or her life, social circumstances, and readers with terms of intentional fallacy, as Wimsatt and Beardsley (1946) define. In stark contrast to earlier methods of interpretation, Greenblatt offers a parallel reading of these texts in his essay by putting a new critical method into practice. Poetics of culture probes into the mutual interaction between text and its sociohistorical background. In so doing, cultural poetics aims to reveal that a given text, either historical or literary, not only portrays the culture and society in which the text is produced but also demonstrates the process of social, cultural, and individual construction. Thus, with his deliberate use of the economic term, circulation, Greenblatt illustrates the new historicism's basic formula: Literature is not autonomous but rather a web of social, cultural, political, and individual signification. Greenblatt (1989) proves his eagerness to show how symbolic formations and representations circulate within a social energy through the exchange of different channels in texts. To put it differently, Greenblatt claims that the linguistic formations and social representations must be thought of as a whole instead of viewing them separately.

The fourth essential principle that "no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths nor expresses inalterable human nature" demonstrates the political standpoint of the new historicist practitioners (Veeser, 2013, p. xii).

Fascinated by the issue of political, economic, national, ethnic, and gender differences, new historicism puts the main emphasis on the power relations which have derived from these differences in their critical interpretations. That is why; as Brannigan defines "the new historicism is a method of critical interpretation which privileges power relations as the most significant context for texts of all kinds" (Brannigan, 1998, p. 6). However, power in new historicism is an elusive term since it connotates several viewpoints and refers to different critics. Given this context, one can assume that power stands for something which can be defined by terms associated with Marxism such as hierarchy, conflict, ideology, hegemony, etc. However, new historicism can be best understood both as a continuation of and break from Marxist ideology, either in an Althusserian or a Gramscian sense (Brannigan, 1998; Gallagher, 2013; Parvini, 2015). Traces of Marxism can be seen in new historicism in that it offers the idea of "primitive accumulation" of capital, which implies a singular and progressing sense of history (De Angelis, 2001, p. 1). Primitive accumulation is a Marxist term, and it refers to the idea that history is a cultural production since it is the product of the capitalist. In this context, the adjective "primitive" indicates the past as a site of the capitalist on which the capitalist builds its future and generates its power. New historicists agree on this idea due to the fact that it makes visible the power relations in the text. According to Marx, history is full of class struggle, and the interests of the bourgeoisie become the prevalent focus of the representation in history. That is why he suggested that history is a cultural product whose primary duty is to represent the interests of the bourgeoise, and this idea increases the visibility of power relations in the history writing. This interest is viewed by Marxist thinkers in both an economic and a cultural sense. The first interpretation offers a crude view as it prioritizes economics as the foremost determinist factor of the representation of the past (Brannigan, 1998; Hamilton 1995; Veeser, 1994;). Other Marxists, such as Antonio Gramsci, Althusser and Raymond Williams, put the emphasis on the interactive function of ideology in cultural representation. They thought of ideology not only as the product of the ruling class but also the producer of the ruling class through false consciousness in Engel's parlance or via the apparatus of the state in Althusserian terms. New historicism has been influenced by Marxism in terms of detecting false consciousness, subversion of power, resolution of contradictions, viewing history as a cultural text, and viewing cultural productions as a site of struggle. However, new historicists differ with Marx

since primitive accumulation implicates progress and accumulation in the concept of history. Moreover, as emphasized by Catherine Gallagher (2013) in "Marxism and New Historicism," another crucial difference is that "[t]he new historicist, unlike the Marxist, is under no nominal compulsion to achieve consistency. She may even insist that historical curiosity can develop independently of political concerns" (p. 46).

Moreover, new historicists tend to define power in terms of ideology, culture and politics in a broader sense as marked in Veeser's fifth principle that new historicism is "a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participates in the economy they describe" (p. xi). This particular preoccupation with ideology and culture is the point where new historicists depart from the Marxists because Marxist thinkers have a tendency to see history as a metanarrative of class struggle and insist that power is equated with economics or the state. But new historicist critics believe that there are multiple ways for the ruling ideology to exercise its power, which eventually changed the singular connotation of power.

At that point, probing into the literary and political atmosphere of the 1980s, a significant new female historicist, Catherine Gallagher (1989) draws attention to the historical representation of the privileged groups in traditional history writing. By pointing to the exclusion or misrepresentation of the weaker groups, social formation and cultural discourse from history Gallagher (1989) emphasizes the importance of putting new historicism into practice to be able to grasp a better understanding of "the distinctions between signifier and the signified, the representer and the represented, history and text" (p. 43). The power which is suggested above gives the starting point of new historicism by resituating the literary texts among such discursive nonliterary texts as penal reports, medical reports, diaries, and news of the past. However, it does not necessarily mean that history is a must for literature. For new historicists, the relationship between literature and history is dialogical. To illustrate, Catherine Gallagher (1989) defines new historicism as "reading literary and non-literary texts as constituents of historical discourses that are both inside and outside of texts" (p. 37). In "Professing the Renaissance", Louis Montrose (1989) also calls for a reconfiguration of "the socio-cultural field within which canonical renaissance literary and dramatic works were originally produced" and demands to relocate them "not only in relationship to other genres and modes of discourse but also in relationship to

contemporaneous social institutions and non-discursive practices" are at the core of new historicism. (p. 17). Thus, both critics lay bare the major influence of Michael Foucault on new historicism.

Foucault influence on new historicism is that he is primarily concerned with power relation with a strong emphasis on its function in the formation of discursive events. Just as seen in Althusser and his attempt to equate culture with ideology, Foucault (1970), as seen in *The Order of Things*, delineates the close connection between culture and ideological discourses as these various discourses shape the essential codes of a given culture—"those governing its language, its scheme of perception, its exchanges, its techniques and its values the hierarchy of its practices" (1970, p. xxii). And in *History of Sexuality* (1988), he links power as a constant systemizing relationship between will to power and attempt to resist. That is why, unlike Althusser and Marxist theories, Foucault's argument was against the idea that power is upheld by a particular group in a certain time. Instead, he believes that power is dispersed in a continual flux: "Power is everywhere and comes from everywhere" (Foucault, 1988, p. 63). In his several works, he emphasizes the manifestation of power on the criticism of history writing. From this vantage point, it can be argued that initial skepticism towards the notion or privileged position of history, which new historicism sets forth, derives from Michael Foucault's critique of historicism. As Paul Hamilton (1995) puts it, "Foucault appears fascinated by history, but only, it appears, in order to prove there is no intellectually respectable continuity between past concerns and their modern transformations." (p. 116). According to Foucault, the manifestation of power in history makes a blatant claim to have linearity and unquestionable explanatory progress. A history based on continuity and consistency is a discursive formation and it was the target of Foucault.

In *The Order of Things* (1971), Foucault also displays several fields of knowledge including science, politics, economics, history and medicine in a particular periodization to make his argument clear. To broaden the perception of discontinuity and transformation in history and periodization, he postulates a new concept: episteme "as epistemic of a period, not the sum of its knowledge, nor the general style of research, but the deviation, the distances, the oppositions, the differences, the relations of its multiple scientific discourses." (1971, p. 34). In other words, the episteme refers to the certain times when a new discourse was aroused and became dominant. For

example, *Madness and Civilization* reveals an emergence of the modern perception or definition of insanity; *The Birth of the Clinic* presents the birth of modern ideas of medical care; *Discipline and Punishment* describes the beginnings of the modern way of punishing and penal methods. Also, in *The Order of Things* Foucault focuses on the Renaissance way of representation which drew attention to universal similarities. He emphasizes the impossibility of being objective in the discourse of any scientific branch since each of them requires distinct rules and methods to explain (1971, pp. xi-xii).

This recognition has given rise to the episteme which segregates language from the things it represents. Thus, each modern kind of information makes its question instead of advancing in an accumulative way. In *Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) eventually gives a definition of the new history in his own terms. He envisages the new history as "a history which drives from several branches like ideas, science, literature instead of from history which appears to be abandoning the irruption of events in favor of stable structures" (p. 6). The new history is in stark contrast to the traditional one as it focuses on discontinuity and transformation:

> The problem is no longer one of tradition, of tracing a line, but one of division, of limits; it is no longer one of lasting foundations, but one of transformations that serve as new foundations, the rebuilding of transformations. What one seeing, the is the emergence of a whole field of questions, some of which are already familiar, by which this new form of history is trying to develop its own theory: how is one to specify the different concepts that enable us to conceive of discontinuity (threshold, rupture, break, mutation, transformation)? By what criteria is one to isolate the unities with which one is dealing; what is a science? What is ouvre? What is a theory? What is a concept? What is a text? (1972, p. 5)

Consistency and continuity are not the only things that Foucault assaults in his critique of the historicist kind. He also attempts to shatter the privileged position of history with the Marxist and Nietzschean argument that "all kinds of exclamations to truth is an implied desire to power because truth was a simply a version of events preferred, indeed by the dominant or ruling group in the society" which constitutes the milestone of new historicism (Brannigan, 1998, p. 41). He thought that history had a key function in shaping thought and culture, but he questioned the unquestionable position of history (Brannigan 1998, Hamilton 1995, Veeser 1994). In *Archeology of Knowledge* Foucault provides the reader with an alternative perception of history as opposed to traditional history, which was considered to be in the domain of writings reflective of temporal developments and happenings in the past with an unquestionable objectivity. In an interplay of history and philosophy, Foucault brings a skeptical and/or

controversial approach to the privileged position of history writing. In *Foucault Live*, an interview with him about the discourse of history, he refers to the traditional history understanding as "total history," corresponding to "a conception of history organized in the model of the narrative as a great sequence of events taken up in hierarchy of determinations." (1989, p.12). According to Foucault, giving an account of the past without interpretation is not possible since "everything is already a secondary source, in the sense that available historical records have already been selected and organized through practices of conservation and organization undertaken in a particular present," which highlights the role of intertextuality in the concept of history (Foucault as cited in Falzon, 2013, p. 288). In this respect, Foucault criticizes total history as it attempts to make a generalization and a transcendent reality is justified "under the sign of the history cross" which dominates the individuals. Based upon Foucault's opinions on power, discourse and historiography, new historicism abandons the generalization to avoid totality.

Preoccupation with social and cultural differences in life is additionally grounded on the anthropological inclinations of new historicism as Greenblatt expresses his aim to introduce a "more cultural or anthropological criticism" in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980, p. 4). In this sense, new historicism experiments with anthropological studies in addition to its interest in history and literature to the degree that new historicists are more often fascinated by the differences experienced between one culture and another. Clifford Geertz became the precursor of the leading figures of new historicism as he diverged from other anthropologists in his claim that "human beings are cultural artifacts" (1973, p. 51). He contends that culture has a great role in shaping human biology as opposed to the belief that biology determines culture. This revolutionary idea is in stark contrast to previous anthropological assumptions that culture something that humans acquire after coming into being:

> By submitting himself to governance by symbolically mediated programmes for producing artifacts, organizing social life, or expressing emotions, man determined, if unwittingly, the culminating stages of his own biologşcal destiny. Quite literally, though quite inadvertenly, he created himself. (1973, p.48)

Geertz's presumption is premised on the idea that humankind requires social images and symbols and signs to be able to function. Therefore, for Geertz, it is impossible to think of humanity as autonomous of culture since every individual is a product of culture. In line with this claim, Geertz brings a different definition to the term culture.

According to him, culture is "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and their attitudes toward life" (1973, p. 5). This notion entails a rejection of essentialist humanism which embraces human nature; characteristics and traits are either the same or similar. However, Geertz asserts that every culture is different and produces different individuals. As the texts are the productions of individuals, culture also presents itself in the production of text.

Moreover, Geertz refuses to regard culture as "complexes of concrete behavior patterns—customs, usages, traditions, habit clusters" … but as "a set of control mechanisms—plans, recipes, rules, instructions —for the governing of behavior" (1973, pp. 44–45). This consideration has given way to numerous theories and assumptions in literature and cultural studies, but it is of great importance for Greenblatt, as seen in Renaissance Self-Fashioning in which he claims "[s]elf-fashioning is in effect the Renaissance version of these control mechanisms, the cultural system of meaning that creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment" (1980, p. 3). Geertz provides a theoretical context for the way in which new historicists examine how a particular period or culture fashions or manufactures itself. Geertz draws attention to the details and differences in the certain actions of a given culture while studying cultural forms including signs and symbols. He tries to understand the similar patterns and symbols in that given culture in an effort to enable people to understand themselves. As an anthropologist, or an alien of that culture, Geertz aims to decode the cultural signs and symbols. In so doing he respects cultural diversity and avoids generalizing with the cultural systems that he focuses on. This analytic approach is known as "thick description" which constitutes the major practice of new historicism. Influenced by the theory of Geertz, a new historicist also goes into detail to explore meaningful inter- or intra-changes between different forms of texts of the past. In this regard, just like Geertz, a new historicist examines the operation of power through human culture instead of doing it face-to-face with humans. By embracing the text, author, context, and culture in analysis, a new historicist aims to capture a more comprehensive and detailed explanation for their study. To this end, Greenblatt holds the claim that literature "functions within this system in three interlocking ways: as a

manifestation of these concrete behaviors of its particular author, as itself the expression of the codes by which behavior is shaped, and as a reflection upon those codes" (1980, p. 4). Delving into sixteenth-century literature in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Greenblatt preliminarily aims at the role of human autonomy in the construction of identity. However, after a comprehensive analysis of distinctive forms of text from different writers such as Spencer, Shakespeare, Marlowe and Thomas More, Greenblatt comes to understand that human identity cannot be thought independent of the culture and society in which that human lives. According to him, people have to "self-fashion" themselves or rather to create a public persona in accordance with the social standards and power relations that their society has. That is why human identity is nothing but an "ideological product of the relations of power in a particular society" (Greenblatt, 1980, p. 256).

Moreover, New historicism is defined by Hamilton (1995) as "a label usually applied to a body of critical work on the English Renaissance, most conveniently and persuasively represented by the writings of Stephen Greenblatt" (p.131). Therefore, new historicism is often identified with the Renaissance age because of the renaissance studies of Greenblatt, Montrose, and Goldberg. However, as Jonathan Hart (1991) asserts, it has undergone great changes in time. Moving the discussions of history, literature, power, and culture outside the Renaissance is one of these major changes in criticism. According to Alan Rawes (2007), Jerome McGann has initiated the new historicist outlook towards Romantic studies with these lines: "The idea that poetry, or even consciousness, can set one free of the ruins of history and culture is the grand illusion of every Romantic poet. The grand illusion of Romantic ideology is that one may escape [the] world through imagination and poetry" (qtd. in Rawes, 2007). Then the critique of English Romantic literature from the new historicist approach was followed by others—Alan Liu, Catherine Gallagher, David Simpson, D. A Miller and Gayatri Spivak, to name a few of the most significant new historicist scholars (Brannigan 1998; Klancher 1989). However, the Victorian new historicists are separated from the new historicists who have Renaissance-centered studies by rejecting the premise of one absolute state. Instead, as Jon Klancher (1989) suggests,

> There is no single Material or political framework against which to read romantic texts. English romantic writings were staged within an unstable ensemble of older institutions in crisis (state and church) and emerging institutional events which pressured any act of cultural production - the marketplace and its industrial industrializing the new media and

> they're reading audiences alternative institutions of radical dissent shifting modes of social hierarchy. (p.80)

Interpreting romantic texts in the vein of new historicist criticism will thereby mean an endeavor to locate these literary texts among institutional ones through a number of reading strategies. This trend has paved the way for the study of literary texts from more contemporary times, such as the Kennedy era, the Thatcher period, and so on in an interplay of the present and the past to explore Foucauldian or deconstructivist power relations.

The influence of power relations on new historicism is demonstrated by class conflict, or the conflict between differences in culture as evident in the readings of Foucault, Marx, Althusser, Geertz. However, new historicism is also concerned with the linguistic process of history writing because, for new historicists, history is also a text made up of linguistic formations, signifier and signified, context, style, plot and narrative. This new outlook constitutes the basic assumption of new historicism with Montrose's manifesto, "the textuality of history" which has fundamentally shaken the traditional understanding of the concept of history and has brought to it a new dimension. Theorists such as Hyden White, Louis Montrose, Dominick La Capra, and Hans Kellner emphasized the textuality of history in particular. According to them, the only way we can access past events is through texts, either in written form or pictorial form. In this respect, it makes no sense to seek historical realism outside of the text, because history is formed in the texts. It is not possible to separate the content of historical texts from forms. This view has brought the deconstructionists, postmodernists, and new historicists to agree that history is not superior to the other forms of text. The linguistic nature of historical writing has been the focal point of interpretive strategies of the new historicist criticism. Then they have started to problematize the power relations between the presumably "fixed" hierarchical position of history writing upon literature and fiction writing, which is the main vein of deconstruction, and/or postmodernism. In this respect, the new historicists address questions such as, Is it possible to know the past? What is history and textuality? Is it possible to remain neutral or objective in history writing? Can we bring history and fiction together? These questions put an unmistakable emphasis on the reading and writing processes of history and its relationship with three main concepts: textuality, intertextuality, and context.

In “Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture,” (1989) Louis A. Montrose attempts to explain the linguistic function of history through an oft-quoted motto: “textuality of history” and broadens the sphere of historical narratives by emphasizing their relation to literary texts. In his essay, Montrose gives an anecdote from J. Hills Miller’s worrisome statements about literary studies. He sees an increasing tendency from linguistic based studies to historical, cultural, political, gender and social context-based criticisms. As a response, Montrose elucidates this new trend with an emphasis on reciprocal and mutual interaction of text and context from a deconstructionist approach. Influenced by Derrida’s deconstructive readings and catchphrase, “there is nothing outside of text,” Montrose discusses recent studies in linguistics showing that the referents of a linguistic sign are unstable, and they cannot be fixed since they are inseparable from social and cultural codes. In this regard, Montrose (1989) manifests the connection between new historicism and deconstruction: “The newer historical criticism is new in its refusal of unproblematized distinctions between literature and history, between text and context” (p. 18). After the reconfiguration of heterogeneity in new historicist studies, he gives the formulation of his own new historicism: “The Historicity of Texts and Textuality of History” and defines it through these lines:

> By the historicity of texts, i mean to suggest the cultural specifity, the social embedment, of all modes of writing- also the texts in which we study them. By the textuality of history, i mean to suggest firstly, that we can have no access to a full and authentic past, a lived material existence, unmediated by the surviving textual traces of the society in question- traces whose survival we cannot assume to be merely contingent but must rather presume to be at least partially consequent upon complex and subtle social processes of preservation and effacement; and secondly, that those textual traces are themselves subject to subsequent textual mediations when they are construed as the "documents" upon which historians ground their own texts, called ‘histories’. (1989, p. 20)

This standpoint of Montrose erases the binary opposition between fictional and factual narratives in an attempt to regard history writing as a constructed text by a writer. From this vantage point, the construction of the past is left to writing strategies, styles and capabilities just as seen in the case of fiction writing.

This view makes it impossible to have access to the past without textualizing it. In this regard, new historicism also makes the linguistic function of historical narratives a focal point in its interpretive studies. Therefore, the concept of textuality is another means by which the new historicist critic can explore the social and cultural discourses. Before surveying the new historicist understanding of textuality and its

relation to history, it would be appropriate to explain how problematic it is to define textuality with the changes it has undergone, as well as to what extent it has influenced new historicist critics.

Textuality according to W.F Hanks (1989) is "the quality of coherence and connectivity that characterizes text" (p.96). This connectivity, as Hanks further adds, is a bit problematic since "it may be dependent on inherent properties of the textual artifact, the interpretive activities of community of readers/viewers, or a combination of two" (p. 96). This problem has been discussed by post-structuralists who have highlighted the vague nature of textuality. They have refused the idea that text is a set of meaningful and consistent signified of the signifier. Rather, the text, as Roland Barth (2009) states, "practices the infinite postponement of the signified" (p.238). This interpretation replaces the perception of text as closed and ended writings in a book with a web or network of signs, bearing the traces of other texts. In other words, the text consists of a complex pattern of signs and is woven with an unfixable meaning. This is called "undecidability" of the text by Hugh Silverman (2013). To him, the undecidability in the text arises as a result of the intertextual network. The textuality and undecidability of the text show its ambiguity. The reason for this uncertainty can be explained in the words of postmodernist or poststructuralist Julia Kristeva: "Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (1986, p. 37) Thus, the idea of intertextuality has also shattered the credibility of an idea of fixed meaning in the text and of the probability of an objective interpretation. Probing into the context and content of the text, postmodern disciplines hold the claim that there is no original work. To put it differently, there is no text which is independent from the influence of other text. In this respect, all kinds of text whether verbal, written, or pictorial in form, are in close and mutual interaction with each other.

History writing is also included in such discussions about the text and postmodern historicists and/or new historicists embrace the text's embedded nature with context. In line with this understanding, the reality of the past, as Opperman argues, comes to be constituted by multiple historical texts; therefore, the context is viewed as a text (2006). With this remark, Opperman aptly refers to Dominic La Capra and his arguments on context. In *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*, Dominick La Capra (1983) discusses the ways of reading and interpreting

"the great" texts of tradition like history, and he initiated the debate on the contextual understanding of historical writings. To explain his theory, he starts to define the context as "a text of sorts." For La Capra, context is "a matter of inquiry into the interacting relationships among a set of more or less pertinent contexts" (p. 680). La Capra's emphasis on interaction and the notion of multiple contexts is important here, not only because it does challenge the narrow reductive readings of history but also calls for the intellectual historians to engage in developments in different disciplines. For La Capra, to write a historical narrative does not require information in synchronic context but rather:

> A subtle interplay between proximity and distance in historian's relation to the object of the study. This dialogical relation between the historian or the historical text and the object of study raises the question of the role stylization, irony, parody, self parody, and polemic in the historian's own use of language. (1983, p.760)

As discerned by the quotation, the discussion of La Capra makes free the reading of historical narratives from conventional understandings, which implies a totalized meaning, objective truth, and great narration. Rather, he attempts to include history in interdisciplinary studies which are embedded by literary criticism and philosophy. This view lays the stress on the mutual interaction between literature and history because if a document offers a wide range of interpretation in context, a fictional text can also function in the same degree: "And literary works may well serve as the richest evidence for the complexity of the historical epoch in which they are embedded" (1994, p. 793). This also leads us to one of the five main assumptions of new historicism suggested by Veeser.

Hayden White is another postmodernist figure who has had a great impact on the new historicist perception of history and textuality by decoding the contextualization or narrativization of history writing. To inquire into the formal strategies in historical narratives, he delineates the history writing and understanding of the nineteenth century. He avers that the historical consciousness of that time was regarded as a metanarrative consisting of "narratives that attempt to explain the nature of the human condition", or "why things on a broad scale got to be the way they are" in an allegedly objective position (Thompson, 2004). This evokes an ultimate reliability among literate communities about their past, near and distant. However, history is not merely a recording of events in chronological order so much as it is a process of writing with certain methods that are integrated with the writer's personal

political position and writing abilities. This kind of writing, from Hyden's viewpoint, is ideologically political and one-sided since it represents "specifically Western prejudice by which the presumed superiority of modern, industrial society can be retroactively substantiated" (p. 2). That is to say, historicity or history writing perpetuates the existing power relations, and it does not reflect the objective truth at all.

To decipher the legitimizing attempt of Western ideology through history writing, White brings up the question of difference between a novel writer and a history writer. Within a formalist approach, Hyden theorizes the process of history writing and focuses on the five levels: 1.) chronicle; 2.) story; 3.) mode of emplotment; 4.) mode of argument; and 5) mode of ideological selection. According to him, the first two stages are just the result of a primitive account of what happened in the past in a chronological order. As they do not require any story or any involvement of personal ideas, attempts to account for what happened can be considered objective. However, what a historian does in this process goes far beyond a dutiful recording of events. A historian also adds a plot and an argument which can fluently present a happening in a prose narrative form.

At a certain point, literary and linguistic devices such as metaphors, syntax, smiles, creativity and emplotment become part of the process of writing, and a piece of historical account turns into a "verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse that purports to be a model, or icon, of the past structures and the process in the interest of explaining what they were by representing them." (p. 2). So, history writing is also a kind of writing which relies on the selection and editing process just as a fiction writer does. Furthermore, he puts forward that historians formalize their stories in four main modes of emplotment: romance, tragedy, comedy, and satire. So what White claims here is that there is no major difference between a historian and a novelist in terms of using the literary devices and linguistic syntax. The main difference lies in the fact that a historian is inspired by the factual events which happened in the past, whereas a novelist writes what he imagines and fantasizes. His comprehensive study on writing formulations of the past conjoins context and literature by shattering the truth claim of history and hierarchical position between two modes of writing. In this respect, as Opperman contends, "White's emphasis of the literary aspect of historical writing has not only opened an ever-growing debate over

historical studies, but also determined the politics of historical interpretation" (p. 41). Therefore, if the main focus is on the way(s) to reflect the past in history writing, the literature should necessarily be included in the discussion. At that point, it is indispensable that historical texts, just like literary texts, become open to discussion and interpretation (Opperman, pp. 7–8).

Keith Jenkins (2015) also problematizes the authority and objectivity of history writing and probes the self-determination of historical writing in *Re-Thinking History*. She addresses the im/possibility of objectivity in the literary texts through the following questions:

> Is it possible to say what really happened in the past, to get to the truth, to reach objective understandings or, if not, is history incorrigibly interpretive? What are historical facts (and indeed are there any such things)? What is bias and what does it mean to say that historians ought to detect it and root it out? Is it possible to empathise with people who lived in the past? Is a scientific history possible or is history essentially an art? What is the status of those couplets that so often appear in definitions of what history is all about: cause and effect, similarity and difference, continuity and change?" (p.13)

Throughout his book, he seeks to give probable answers to these questions from a postmodernist approach. Viewing the past as "an endless circulation of substantiation interests and styles," Jenkin sets out the impossibility of capturing objectivity or fact in history writing. In his opinion, history is a field of contradictions in which each people, group or class clashes with each other, propagating their own interpretations of an imagined past. Thus, Jenkins does not discern history writing from fiction writing. Instead, he connects the binary opposition between fiction and history writing to the power relations. However, what new historicist critics accept is that the perception of history as a battlefield for a clash between center and margin does not only correspond to class struggle but to a broader sense. Specifically, they see history as a site of struggle in the representation of various groups instead of two particular classes.

New historicists include the struggle among the races, blood, gender, and lineage since human identity is shaped by cultural representations which include all kinds of divisions and variety in a society. To be able to ensure this inclusiveness, practioners of new historicism refuse the notions like universality and objectivity in giving account of a past. Instead, they focus on historical texts as a matter of the representation and a part of discursive formation within claims of diversities and complexities. Thus, as seen in the case of cultural discourses, the new historicist approach insists on the significance of multiple representations of the past as they were

produced within and by these discourses. For the new historicist critics, as Hans Kellner remarks, "any ideology that claims to represent some reality principle becomes epiphenomenal" (1989, p. 207). This notion of Kellner aptly stresses the fact that history is one of the ideological modes of representation which distorts the sense of reality in its particular claim of absolute truth, reliability and objectivity. However, this new perception situates the history as a tale of multiple representation, power relations, struggle which is "contradictory, heterogenous and fragmented" (Newton, 1989, p.152).

1.2. Herstory: Trajectories of New Historicism and Feminism

New historicists diverge from the earlier methodologies of historical narratives in its particular emphasis on representation since representation makes thing happen to them. With the influence of various ideas in different disciplines, New historicism no longer regards historical texts as ideologically objective site or as ideologically superior genre to the other modes of writing. This departure from the old opens up new criticisms in different fields of text by enabling a wide range of alternative interpretations. This occurs in several ways. First of all, new historicism shatters the ideologically structured centers and margins in the cannon, and it includes the writings of margins or oppressed groups like women, blacks, or other inferior groups under its scrutiny. To put it clearly, it combines its own methodology and assumptions with feminist criticism in its suggestion of new ways of offering an account of the past and representing the women with these historical narratives. This entails to reconsider the past because the past is as Ellen Pollak (1988) states "the entire process of exclusion by which canons are defined and then sustained" (pp. 283). Thus, by putting the new historicism in practice, feminist writers have started to create Herstory instead of History by including women's past into historical narratives.

At that point, feminist new historicist Judith Lowder Newton (1989) in "History as Usual": Feminism and New historicism" initiates a discussion about the origin of New historicism. She displays or accepts the multiple impacts like postructuralism, and the historiography of Michael Foucault on New historicism. However, she later expresses her consideration about the rarity of information which puts the relation between women's movement and the beginning of new historicism

"as if their assumptions and practices has been produced by men" (1989, pp. 153). She asserts that the break from the notion of objectivity, totality, universality was initiated by second wave of feminism as this movement dealt with the visibility of women in historical or fictional narratives. Through a comprehensive exploration of women's cultural power, influence and representation in the historical accounts. The starting point for this feminist movement in the sense of representing the past in the mainstream historical narratives was the assumption that history was symbolic production of social relations including politics and social institutions which is sustained by and built on the process of exclusion of suppressed groups and the inclusion of the powerful. Thus, as Newton (1989) contends, "Since the late sixties, moreover, feminist work has emphasized the role of ideas or symbolic systems in the construction not only of identity's but social institutions issues relations as a whole." (153). However, the significance of Newton's essay is not basically due to its implicit on the origin of new historicism; rather on its blatant premise that demonstrates the close and inseparable conjunction of new historicism with the analysis of discourse with a particular attention to the gender roles. In this regard, Feminism shares the distrust of the authority of historical narratives with new historicism and they encourage the reader to reconsider the representation of past in terms of power and gender relations just like leading figures of new historicism does for the 18th century.

To strengthen her argument, Newton gives a reference to *Sisterhood is Powerful* by Robin Morgan (1970). In Newton's discussion, this book is presented as an originator of new historicism since it displays how androcentric discourse operates in the patriarchal societies with a meaningful rejection of universal human nature, impartiality, biased political readings and representations which are currently attributed to the main assumptions of new historicism. Furthermore, she claims that this book made use of "cross cultural technique", an important methodology of new historicism which juxtaposes historical documents, anecdotes, diaries, literary texts and cultural discourses in its analysis. In line with the fundamentals of new historicism, feminist new historicists who count the history as a social relation such as Newton, Pollak, Catherine Gallagher and Dollimore links the outbreak of "New Women's History" with new historicism. Accordingly, women's history before the new one had one basic aim: to resist the perception of male-centered and neutral history and to challenge the invisibility of women in the history which triggers a

campaign for “herstory” encompassing women’s accounts and experiences from female gazes.

To be able to get away from traditional male-dominated premises of old historicism, the early feminist historians presumed that they needed a different methodology both from the traditional one and from the other inferior and/or suppressed groups. That is to say, they conceived the historical presence of women and their lives with the masculinist parameters by ignoring the existing male-dominated standards for historical validity. This meant to be concentrating on few individual women who fought for equality with masculinist deeds as in the case of suffragette history. Claiming equality with the same terms as men manifests how they internalized and accepted the superiority of men. As Gerda Lernar states in “Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges” (1975), “it is their culturally determined and psychologically internalized marginality that has made their historical experience different from that of men. Writing woman into history might well mean that traditional division definitions of history itself would have to change” (p. 185). However, with the coming of Second Wave, feminist historians concentrated on prescribed gender roles, construction of identity, and the women became the center of their historical studies. This realization not only started to change the meaning of history since it destabilized the masculinist and European-centric canon with the inclusion of the women’s stories but also put the emphasis on the vital role of representation which “makes things happen” in the historical narratives. Thus, they meant to apply Foucauldian strategies to decode the dominating discourse in the certain epistemes.

Other postmodernist and/or new historicist feminists including Catherine Gallagher, Nancy Armstrong, Mary Poovey, Helene Cixous, Lucy Iregaray are also attentive and responsive to the representation of women in history. These feminists shatter the notion of impartiality, basic assumption of old historical narratives. After a detailed exploration power dynamic of gender, they recognized the sustained normative power determined by male standards and never questioned before. Then, they point to main problems in the traditional history writing with a strong claim of social change. According to them, the old historicism was male-dominated site and it did not give voice to underprivileged groups. Even if it did, the history narrated the past with a gender-blind eye. To illustrate, one may encounter the different groups like

struggle of working class in the representation of labor and social past. However, even this Marxist account focused only male workers and ignored the struggle of women. That is why, this often to mean that as if there had been only class difference in the society. Or rather, even though a mainstream historical narrative gives an account of a woman's life, "it often places women within androcentric assumptions about the nature of history" (Ryan, 2014, p. 2). However, once these unvisible women become visible, then exploration of history started to involve a cross cultural montage which includes every kind of text as a focus of historical study. It is then women's manual, diaries, letters have been juxtaposed with parliamentary reports, journals, and political debates.

In another case, they realized how male dominated standards in history manipulate the way of representing women. This happens in two ways. The first is the separation of women from the world of men. To put it in a different way, the masculinist version of history situates or entraps women in the private or domestic sphere by excluding women's text like diaries, novels, letters and short stories as they belonged to the private realm as seen in the case of invisibility. In a reaction against this view, feminist historians like Poovey, Gallagher and Armstrong hold the main insight of feminism that public and private are not separate but intersecting. In Armstrong's own words in *Desire and Domestic Fiction*,

> The division of discourse that makes it so difficult to see the relationship between the finer nuances of women's feelings and a capitalist economy run mainly by men. Those cultural functions which we automatically attributed to and embody for women-those, for example, of mother nurse, teacher, social worker and general overseer of service institutios- have just been as instrumental in bringing the new medical classes into power and maintaining their dominance as all economic takeoffs and political breakthroughs we automatically attribute to men. (1987, p.26)

The second scenario is that of mis/representing women as mere victims, passive, and servile. This issue is discussed in detail by Fox-Genovese (1989) in "Literary Criticism and the Politics of New historicism". She puts the shared assumptions and close relationship between feminist criticism and new historicism. Defining texts "as manifestations or expressions of social and gender relations" she asserts that historical texts do not refer to just relations innocent of history, but to historical relations of time, place, and domination. Then, she draws the reader's attentions to the lack of authority in constructing a historical woman self and talks about the necessity of resistance to this mispresentation.

Jonathan Dollimore, an important figure in the studies of new historicism brings up the entailment of resistance through women activism in the historical readings and writings. In *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (1991), he calls for women to step outside the territory of otherness and to revisit the representation of the past in its all relation to politics and social relations from a different point of view. For Dollimore, this kind of activism works in the reconfiguration of the past as "[i]t is also necessary that we use the history recovered to read, question, and modify theory itself" (1991, pp. 25). "Feminist historians need to take on not only the task of salvaging, critiquing, and rewriting stories of past women's lives and experiences, but also the responsibility to avoid carving our-present centeredness into the frames of our accounts of our own, and other women's stories" (Ryan, 2014, p.2). It is then possible for women to achieve atonement or to create a "counter memory", in Foucauldian term, through the re-reading and reconfiguration of the past and representation.

Helen Cixous (1975) *in Sorties: Out and out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Forays* also draws the attentions to the significance of open reading and writing practices rather than close reading techniques since she thinks that a reading and writing practices which consider various parameters in life can provide the required means for rebelling against the oppressive patriarchal system. This resistance process involves challenging the foundational dichotomies present in Western philosophical ideas, all of which the author traces back to the fundamental contrast between masculine and feminine concepts. She labels this style of writing as "l'ecriture feminine". The primary objective of this writing approach is to move away from the conventional, language-centered interpretation of the world and to discover novel methods of acquiring knowledge. Writing by women as "a way out of patriarchal oppression [where] [h]istory is condemned" (p.72) Her discourse, even when theoretical or political, is never simple or linear or objectivized," universalized; she involves her story in history. (p.92). This concept strongly resonates in the subsequent chapters' literary analysis of Lochhead's plays.

1.3. Close Interaction of New Historicism With Cultural Distinctiveness

As much as the formation of (historical) identity in terms of gender, new historicism is a critical practice which is concerned with national identity. That is why; the discussions of new historicism have always been in close interaction with the postcolonial discussions and the notions like nation and power. As observed in "The New historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics", new historicists published several essays on nationalism particularly on Irish nationalism. They have showed how the Irish literature has played a great role in the construction of national consciousness and how the politic atmosphere in Ireland has influenced the literature. Furthermore, there have also been some examples exploring Indian and Scottish literature from new historicist approach. Nation and new historicism are in close interaction. It is first because nation is one of the primary sources of identity. Mankind is innately curious about his heritage and the roots of his ancestors to feel the sense of belonging as this feeling is essential to be able to claim a self for himself. Nation in the contemporary sense refers to two definitions; sharing the same territory and sharing the same history as Anthony D. Smith (2000) defines: "a named human community occupying a homeland, and having common myths and a shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members" (p. 13). The past plays a great role in shaping the sense of nation and nationalistic feelings. People are bound to each other through shared traditions, rituals, folklore, stories, social codes as well as the symbolic national objects like flag and anthem. When considering the socio-political atmosphere of the world, it seems impossible to discard the nationalist concerns from the new historicist studies.

From new historicist perception, history can nourish and cherish an individual's memory so that one can build his own identity by internalizing the national representations of the bygone days. At that certain point, historical narratives come to be considered as a textual instrument in the construction of identities and they pave the way either for propagating the self as illuminated by Greenblatt in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* or for hiding the self behind a public mask as touchingly explained by Frantz Fenon in *Black Skin, White Mask*. Given that, new historicism seeks to find emotive symbols in historical narrative. In so doing, it serves to its main principle; to

refute truth claim of history because history projected the way of the historian views his nation and culture.

Another reason why new historicism is engaged in the discussions about nation discourse is that nation is indivisible part of ideology and power. The sense of nation is built on the shared and socially constructed myths which give a meaning to the individual's existence and identity. However, these national myths are open to manipulation in the hands of a historian. Besides, a historian can be controlled by the ruling power of a country. But each case lays bare the fact that writing history means controlling the past. To put it differently, one historian can legitimize a nation's wrong doings whereas s/he can humiliate the other nation's high values. According to John Coakley (2004) national historiography makes it in 5 stages. First, historian defines a nation by drawing its physical and social boundaries. Then, he heightens the sense of pride by portraying the national achievements. After this reinforcement, he promotes the sense of consolation over the unfair pains a community had. Later, s/he legitimizes the national struggle with reference to the ancestors. Finally, s/he draws a bright future. This strategic systemization in writing history shows us how history writing and the process of ideology are closely connected to each other. This realization has inspired the new historicists to unclose the reality because as Hamilton states, "all sort of historical narratives, wherever they are progressive, altruistic, or fatalistic, have employed the full range of associated discriminations, … to justify almost any behavior of one group of people towards another" (1995, p. 152). Therefore, the ideology lurking behind the national history awaits to be demystified by New Historicists.

From this vantage point, new historicism primarily attempts to unmask the assumed natural realities that grant stereotypes, fixed identities and unjust differences. The practitioners of new historicism attempt to concern these fixed identities as historical constructions. That is why, Frederic Jameson's famous motto "Always Historicize" in in *The Political Unconscious* (2013) has become the core principle of New historicism. In this context, new historicists view history as a tool manipulated to uphold the dominance of specific groups, reshaping history into a battleground where interpretations of the past are controlled.

Given that this dissertation's main focus is on Lochhead's recurrent attempts to foster Scottish identity and her intense preoccupation with Scottish history, the New Historicist perspective offers a broader lens for interpreting the relationship between Lochhead's plays within her fictional realm and the tangible influences of the real world. This aligns with her writing approach, which often delves into the past to unearth the discursive shaping of Scottish (female) identity—an issue embracing complexities, involving debates over hierarchy and power dynamics between England and Scotland. Exploring Scotland from a new historicist perspective, Elder-Woodward (2023) gives reference to Niklas Altermark (2018) describing postcolonial theory as "seek(ing) to understand how power lives on, … after we have left the oppression of the past behind us" (p. 157).

Indeed, Scotland's hierarchically inferior position to England traces back to the union of parliaments. While the Scottish parliament's decision to unite with England in 1707 might lead some to question whether Scotland was genuinely colonized, this unification was orchestrated by the power holders marginalizing Scottish language and culture. This trend took root when James VI relocated from Holyrood House to London and assumed the English throne in 1603.

Despite facing significant opposition from many Scots, the ruling upper class in Scotland gave their support to the idea of being dependent of England. Their motivation was primarily rooted in the belief that aligning with prosperous and influential England would bring about substantial benefits. Particularly, they were drawn to the prospect of a thriving Scottish economy through unlimited access to English markets, which served as the primary rationale behind this union. However, the following quotation attributed to Andrew Fletcher blatantly reveals the consequences of Scotland's dependence on England: "It was this type of Union that England intended and desired, as it bound the Scots in perpetual subjugation, stripping them of any legal recourse to address the injustices they might suffer, while keeping them in a state of poverty and under English control" (as cited in Scott, p. 53). Thus, instead of enhancing the Scottish economy through free trade with English markets, the Union had a negative impact on Scottish manufacturing. In this context, even though there was no formal colonization period in Scotland when compared to what occurred in other countries, the Scottish people have strongly sensed both cultural and economic exploitation. The perception of the union from the perspective of the

Scottish population has been explored by Chris Gittings in his work *Canada and Scotland: Conceptualizing 'Postcolonial' Spaces* (1995). Gittings characterizes this perception as follows:

> England desired this kind of Union because it maintained Scots in perpetual subjugation, without any legal recourse to protect themselves from harm. It kept them impoverished and under control, underscoring a persistent sense of being dominated and unfairly treated (as quoted in Gittings 1995, p. 7).

The excerpt provided offers insight into the intentional construction of Scotland's identity and historical discourse through strategic framing.

The subjugation of language, culture, and even religion within the context of Scotland evokes a postcolonial interpretation or reinterpretation from the standpoint of Liz Lochhead. While this argument may initially appear audacious, it could be refuted on the grounds that Scotland did not experience colonial settlements, as previously mentioned. Nevertheless, M. Gardener (2011) highlights the diversity of colonial practices across different nations. Gardener thus negates the imperative need for a decolonization process as a prerequisite for designating a nation as postcolonial. He encourages readers to consider that "it is also more fundamentally a critique working within various forms of empire, whether understood in terms of occupation, formal arrangements or epistemological dependency, and as a form of resistance the postcolonial has a history as long as colonisation itself" (Gardener, 2011, p.1).

In accordance with Gardener's perspective, when one delves into Scotland's history, including episodes like the Highland clearances and the prohibition of Gaelic and Scots languages, Scottish Literature and Postcolonial Literature cease to exist as isolated trends or distinct bodies of texts; instead, they become relevant and interrelated. These critical positions often conjoined, as noted by Gardener (2011), "within a broader historical context that primarily seeks to critique the authority of the imperial framework within British state culture" (p. 2). These perspectives have deep historical roots, primarily centered on critiquing the authoritative and imperial structure observed in British state culture. Nevertheless, despite this connection, the formal recognition of this understanding has only relatively recently emerged within scholarly contexts.

The origins of the well-known terms "Scottish Literature" and "Postcolonial Literature" can indeed be traced back to the dissolution of the British consensus during

the global shifts in the postcolonial landscape, which began in the mid-1950sDuring this era, a constitutional arrangement that had persisted for around two centuries grappled with challenges stemming from social, educational, and economic issues that it struggled to address satisfactorily. A significant obstacle emerged from the fact that the longstanding association between the British state and English culture could no longer be extended to the empire as the term, English, had been served as an ideal representation of culture and language. The quotation below of Gardener (2011) sums up the origin of affiliation between Scottish literature and Postcolonial literature by highlighting the writing back strategies of Scottish writers against English dominated canon and language:

> Within the United Kingdom, the transformative shift of the 1950s–1960s witnessed both the resurgence of civic-national sentiments and the decline of imperial influence due to the progression of decolonization. It's notable that this period also marked substantial changes in the field of English Literature as an academic discipline. Established approaches anchored in a 'strong-canon,' heritage-centric, or Leavisite framework encountered notable criticism. This academic and disciplinary challenge echoed the situation of the 1790s when British consensus was last rigorously questioned. During that time, critics of the precedence-based unwritten constitution found sanctuary from the oppressive atmosphere of 'Pitt's Terror' in the intellectually enlightened environment of Edinburgh, creating a distance from London. (2011, p.1)

In the light of this approach, new historicists view history as an instrument to sustain power of one particular group. History hereby comes to mean a struggle for controlling the past. So, by historicizing national constructions as well as gender constructions, new historicism seeks to shatter the transcendental realities, unquestioned powerful ideologies that ground the national and gender discriminations. These discussions have provided new insights both on national and literary level. The present study will extend the discussion to the construction of the Scottishness on historical and literary levels. That is why, before probing into Lochhead's selected plays, the following discussion in the next chapter will be based on the close interaction between Scottish nationality and Scottish drama. Through this academic lens, one can effectively dissect and examine the inherent fragility and susceptibilities inherent in the portrayal of historical narratives within established official records.

> All nationalisms are gendered; all are invented; and all are dangerous – dangerous in the sense that they represent relations to political power and to technologies of violence. As such, nations are not simply phantasmagoria of the mind; as systems of cultural representation . . . they are historical practices through which social difference is both invented and performed . . . But if the invented nature of nationalism has found wide theoretical currency, explorations of the gendering of the national imaginary have been conspicuously absent. (McClintock 1993, p. 61)

In the scope of this dissertation, the intention is to undertake a multidimensional exploration of Scotland's historical narrative, employing a dynamic interplay between postcolonial theory and the new historicist lens. This combined critical framework aims to reveal the discursive practices that have shaped Scotland's historical representation while unmasking its interconnectedness with imperial forces at the same time. The primary aim is, in this regard, to bring to light the suppressed narratives, marginalized voices, and constructed power dynamics that have been crucial in forging Scotland's evolving identity in centuries. Within this analytical framework, the plays written by Liz Lochhead will be faciliated as a central focal point of this dissertation. The selected plays will provide a good premise to explore the extent to which Lochhead's creative expressions reflect and challenge established discourses and prevailing power structures. Through the integration of these interdisciplinary perspectives, the dissertation seeks to expose the underlying circumstances of resistance, agency, and negotiation inherent within Scotland's historical context. This study will also draw parallels with the struggles encountered by postcolonial nations. It, thereby contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how Scotland's historical narrative, as exemplified in Lochhead's plays, is closely relevant to British imperialism. Furthermore, this approach endeavors to illuminate the complex processes of identity formation, cultural negotiation, and historical representation within the broader discourse of colonialism.

2. LITERARY AND CULTURAL BACKGROUND OF LIZ LOCHHEAD

To explore Lochhead's plays from a new historicist perspective, it is essential to uncover the socio-cultural and political context in Scotland that significantly influences her works and writing style. This chapter is divided into three sections, each addressing key aspects to facilitate a deeper understanding of the plays selected for this dissertation. The initial section outlines the historical evolution of Scottish drama, focusing on the emergence of national theatre companies. This foundational knowledge is crucial for exploring how these companies influenced Lochhead to write her plays and for comprehending her efforts to promote and reexamine Scottish identity within the English-dominated canon of British literature. In addition to the establishment of national theatre companies, the present chapter delves into the history of the Scots language, shedding light on why Lochhead and her contemporaries chose to incorporate Scots into their literary creations. This linguistic dimension is of great significance to the reader of this dissertation as it provides a clear glimpse of the cultural expressions embedded in her works to evince Lochhead's political standpoint. The final section is dedicated to an analysis of Lochhead's distinct writing style encompassing the recurrent themes and subject matters. This exploration will provide valuable insights into her motivations, influences, and the artistic choices that shape the plays examined in this dissertation.

2.1. The Evolution of Scottish Drama as a Political Force

In his book, *Scottish Literature: An Introduction*, Alan Riach (2022) examines the origins of Scottish literature and discusses how it has often been overlooked and obscured under the umbrella term of British literature. Thus, he sheds light on the historical neglect of Scottish literature within the larger British literary landscape, a phenomenon perpetuated by British imperialism and the dominance of English in the literary sphere. In this regard, he attributes this invisibility, in part, to the historical imperialism of Britain, which marginalized and suppressed distinct cultural and national literary expressions in Scotland. One instance of this marginalization was T. S. Eliot's disparaging question, "Was there a Scottish Literature?" posed in the "Athenaeum Periodicals" in 1919. Eliot's query reflects a prevailing perception at the

time that Scottish literature was not worthy of recognition or consideration as a separate entity but should be subsumed under the broader category of British literature. This phenomenon of neglect extended to the erasure of Scotland's name itself, as during the 1950s, Riach (2022) remembers his father's letters on which their address in Scotland was often referred to as "North Britain", effectively rendering its identity and cultural contributions invisible and unrecognized (p.28).

Furthermore, the literary establishment propagated the idea that English was the preeminent world language for artistic expression and high-brow literature, leaving little room for the promotion and appreciation of Scots and Gaelic languages. This exclusion persisted until the emergence of the Scottish Renaissance‡ in the mid-twentieth century, led by figures such as Hugh MacDiarmid.

As for Scottish theatre, there is a general perception articulated by Marshal Walker in his book *Scottish Literature since 1707* (1996) as such "Drama is the genre in which Scottish writers have shown least distinction" (p. 106). However, some critics including Ian Brown and Alan Riach (2009) disapprove this general misperception within an endeavor of profound analysis of Scottish theatrical evolution from past to present. In the introduction of *Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Theatre*, Ian Brown (2011) challenges previous misconceptions about Scottish theatre, which have been based on the suppression of its existence. He argues that Scottish drama has been misrepresented in general histories and often overlooked in research, leading to misunderstandings about its significance and vitality.

One factor contributing to these misunderstandings, as Donald Smith (2011) points out, is the lack of "a continuously-remembered playwriting tradition" in Scotland (p.127). While earlier playwrights did exist, their styles and the theatrical

‡ The Scottish Renaissance was a cultural, artistic, and political movement that sought to rejuvenate Scottish language and culture through various artistic expressions. In 1926, MacDiarmid declared that the Scottish Renaissance was essentially a "propaganda of ideas." (Riach, 2022, p.277) These ideas were rooted in embracing contemporary international artistic movements while fostering their growth within a specifically Scottish context. He emphasized that the term "Scottish" should not be limited to fixed literary forms or confined to specific conventions. Instead, the movement aimed to promote a distinctive national culture characterized by free and non-prescriptive self-expression. The primary objectives of the Scottish Renaissance were to increase the number of Scots engaged with literature and cultural issues, challenge the tendency of academic or professional circles to stifle intellectual exploration, and, most importantly, stimulate the creation of art that reflected and represented Scottish identity and experiences.

forms they wrote for, such as the declamatory forms of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have declined or changed over time. As a result, their texts may seem peculiar to contemporary readers, causing a loss of understanding and appreciation for their work. Another reason for the neglect of Scottish drama lies in the transformation of the theatre industry due to commercial factors. The ways in which theatres operated shifted, adopting industrial processes with far-reaching consequences not only in the UK but also worldwide. This change in the theatre landscape has contributed to the overlooking of Scotland's national drama (Brown, 2011)

Before the Reformation, drama played a significant role in marking and expressing various aspects of Scottish life, including religious festivals, civic identity, the status of burghs, the projection of the courts image nationally and internationally, and political debate and propaganda. From the 1930s onward, several political theatre groups in Scotland aimed to engage with local audiences and drew inspiration from Scottish variety theatre. Some of these groups sought to connect with working-class audiences by performing in the venues of the variety theatre network. Other popular dramatists adopted the performing techniques of music hall, particularly emphasizing audience participation, music, comedy, and direct address, to create politically relevant and entertaining theatre. In this regard, as Ian Brown and Alan Riach (2009) in their introduction foster the idea that Scottish theatre has undergone a remarkable journey of revitalization, driven by the efforts of influential theatre companies that have left an significant mark on the nation's dramatic landscape and rise of socio-cultural consciousness. Among these pioneer companies, Unity, 7:84, and Traverse have played pivotal roles in shaping Scottish drama and fostering a distinct Scottish voice.

Unity Theatre Company emerged in the 1930s with a noble mission to discover new Scottish plays and writers, aiming to develop a distinct Scottish voice, as Paul Maloney (2011) sums up in "Twentieth-Century Popular-Theatre" (p.223). Inspired by the works of Sean O'Casey, Unity sought to spread a belief in the Scottish idiom with a faith in the Scottish common people. The company's commitment to an international repertoire allowed them to explore various theatrical styles while actively experimenting with the Scots vernacular performances. A noteworthy example of this exploration was their successful adaptation of Maxim Gorki's *The Lower Depths* into Scots vernacular, presented to acclaim at the Athenaeum Theatre in Glasgow and the Edinburgh International Festival "Fringe" in 1947.

Founded in 1963, the Traverse Theatre also marked a turning point in Scottish drama as it was the source of inspiration for the foundation of the other theatre companies and for the initiation of cultural and political movement, as Mark Fisher (1996) points out, "driven by compelling social factors and the most prominently the abolution of theatre censorship, in 1968 and the concomitant rise of politically-driven theatre companies" (p.51). Thus, initially offering standard repertory and experimental drama, it later evolved into an innovative platform for new writing and describes itself as "Scotland's National New Writing Theatre" (Horvat, 2011, p.69; Riach 2022, p. 243). Its relocation to larger venues further solidified its position as a cultural hub for fostering innovative works which are peculiar to Scotland and Scottish identity. The Traverse Theatre's commitment to nurturing emerging talent and supporting new playwrights enriched the Scottish theatrical landscape, allowing diverse voices and perspectives to thrive within its walls. Its foundation is seen so influential that Alan Riach and Ian Brown (2009) call its foundation as "beginning a revitalisation of Scottish drama, but it cannot be seen simply as a renaissance's beginning" (p.9).

Also, established in 1973 by John McGrath, the 7:84 Theatre Company of Scotland was influenced by the earlier English 7:84, founded in 1971 (Fisher, 1996; Maloney, 2011; Smith G. G, 1919). Rooted in a working-class drama tradition, the company sought to create a vibrant popular theatre that could directly engage with and reflect the lives of working-class audiences. Central to this vision was the use of language and conventions of entertainment that resonated deeply with the target audience. John McGrath's emphasis on directness, community, music, emotion, and localism provided a fertile ground for a theatre that genuinely represented the complexity and richness of contemporary working-class life.

The emergence and contributions of Unity, Traverse, and 7:84 Theatre Companies have been instrumental in reshaping Scottish theatre. These companies played a significant role in encouraging Liz Lochhead to carve out a fictional space to discuss her own concerns related to her nation and gender on stage. Through their relentless pursuit of a distinct Scottish voice in theatre productions, dedication to new writing, and engagement with diverse audiences, they not only revitalized the theatrical landscape of Scotland but also provided a fertile ground for artists like Liz Lochhead to thrive. Their commitment to new and diverse voices helped break away from traditional narratives, allowing artists like Lochhead to challenge conventions

and bring forth narratives that reflected the complex varieties of Scotland's cultural and social identity. Lochhead, inspired by the vibrant and innovative atmosphere fostered by these theater companies, found her own voice as a playwright. She was able to use the platform provided by these companies to address issues related to her nation and gender by creating powerful and thought-provoking works that contributed significantly to the Scottish theatrical canon.

In 2006, the National Theatre of Scotland was established, marking a significant milestone in the development of a twentieth-century drama for Scotland. (Savage, 1996, Brown and Riach 2009). The establishment of The National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) in 2006 marked the realization of a long-held aspiration by many individuals over several decades. The NTS was unique in that it was envisioned as a theatre "without walls" which means it would not have a physical building. (Riach, 2022, p.76). Instead, its space would be defined by imagination, learning, and play. This approach sparked a debate between those who saw it as a significant and lasting achievement and others who viewed it as a mere illusion. Riach (2022) conveys the binary opposition regarding the establishment of the NTS. Some proponents of the NTS had advocated for a substantial theatre building, possibly situated in the capital city, to serve as a recognizable cultural statement of self-possession and political self-determination on the international stage. The absence of such a physical establishment left these individuals feeling dissatisfied and uncertain about the NTS's impact. However, there was recognition and appreciation for the NTS's dedication to producing theatre accessible in various parts of Scotland, across diverse terrains, and for different audiences. This emphasis on visibility and versatility was seen as valid and refreshing. Several NTS productions received acclaim for their impressive work, garnering appropriate praise and validating the organization's approach.

Roger Savage (1996) also discusses the establishment of National Theatre of Scotland from a different angle and refers to the nationalist concerns behind its foundation. According to him, it was a matter of polarized perspectives. One group argued that they already had a national theatre, pointing to the English National Theatre. However, the other group expressed concerns about their merged identity under the term "English" in the official name, "The Royal National Theatre of Great Britain and Northern Ireland". Despite this polarization, the period leading up to the foundation of the NTS was characterized by a newfound confidence in the creative

sustainability and versatility of Scottish drama. As Scottish culture reimagined itself through theatre, the absence of a traditional national theatre establishment became a strength in the contemporary landscape.

While it is true that the establishment of the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) aims to address concerns about Scottish identity in theatre, it is essential to recognize that the NTS and its playwrights are not solely defined by blind nationalism. The NTS's mission of embracing a distinct Scottish voice and exploring the nation's cultural heritage does not preclude its engagement with diverse influences and perspectives from the global theatre community. The NTS operates in a complex and ever-changing theatrical landscape, where artistic expressions often transcend national boundaries. Playwrights associated with the NTS may have their own contradictions and multifaceted identities, shaped by various experiences and influences. They may draw inspiration from a range of sources, incorporating global themes and narratives into their works. Furthermore, the NTS's emphasis on inclusivity and experimentation does not necessarily equate to an exclusively nationalist agenda. The theatre company may seek to explore contemporary issues, universal themes, and human experiences that resonate with audiences within and beyond Scottish borders. This openness to diverse influences enriches the artistic exploration within the NTS and contributes to a more dynamic and relevant theatre experience. In this context, it is essential to recognize that national identity is not a monolithic concept, but rather a fluid and evolving aspect of cultural expression.

In line with this, playwrights working with the NTS may challenge traditional notions of Scottish identity by exploring complexities and contradictions within the nation's history and culture. Their work may interrogate political and social issues through which prompt critical reflections on the very idea of nationalism itself. As Steven Cramer (2011) quotes David Greig, one of the most prolific Scottish playwrights:

> Playwrights can't be good nationalists because they, more than anyone, have to seek out the contradictions, the stupidities and the platitudes. Nationalism is a sentimental ideology, an ideology of simplicity, hearth and home, an ideology of belonging and playwrights don't belong [. . .] But if playwrights can't be good nationalists, they can [be] and are good for a nation. (as cited in Cramer, p.173)

McGrath's *The Cheviot, the Stag, and the Black, Black Oil* (1973), also presents Scottish history, from the Highland Clearances to the 1970s discovery of North Sea

oil, as marked by exploitation and struggle. McGrath examines both social and national exploitation and, although supportive of Scottish independence, his attitude towards the national question is perhaps best encapsulated in a speech delivered at the end of the play: “Nationalism is not enough. The enemy of the Scottish people is Scottish capital, as much as the foreign exploiter” (McGrath, 1973, p. 66).

2.2. Neo-Scotticism: Revitalization of Scots in Drama

The question of Scottish independence has been a topic of continuous discussion since the abolition of the Scottish Parliament following the Act of Union in 1707. Despite numerous attempts to restore the Scottish Parliament before 1997, these efforts have proved unsuccessful. In the context of this ongoing debate, the Scots language holds a significant historical and cultural importance as it deeply connected to Scotland’s heritage. It frequently plays a substantial role in discussions about Scottish independence. The growing number of playwrights who choose to use Scots in literature, including artists like Lochhead, serve a broader socio-political purpose within this discourse. They contribute to the cultural and linguistic dimension of the discussions surrounding Scottish independence.

To be able to understand Lochhead’s commitment to Scots, it would be necessary to understand the decline of Scots can be traced back to pivotal historical events, particularly three key turning points in the history of Scotland as J. Derrick McClure (2000) points out: The Protestant Reformation, the Union of the Crowns in 1603, and the Act of Union in 1707. With the rise of the Protestant Reformation in Europe, figures such as John Knox were deeply influenced by Calvinist ideas, emphasizing the removal of intermediaries between individuals and God. Knox encouraged people to read the Bible and interpret it themselves. By so doing, he promoted a direct connection with God. Paradoxically, this religious enlightenment paved the way for the erosion of Scots since, as Matt McGuire (2009) points out, “the first vernacular Bible in Scotland was not written in Scots but in English” (p. 46). This choice, as also noted by McClure (2000), triggered “a strong revulsion against the native tongue and fostered a desire among some to replace it with the perceived literary prestige of London-Oxford-Cambridge standard English” (p. 4). Furthermore, the subsequent union of crowns and parliaments between England and Scotland led to

significant societal changes. In an effort to conform to the new political reality and be seen as more civilized while seeking the advantages of the Empire, Scottish individuals actively sought to shed their distinct Scottish speech patterns. As observed by McGuire (2009), some went so far as to take speech lessons to rid themselves of their Scottish accents and linguistic traits. This transformation reflected a broader trend of linguistic assimilation as the country grappled with its evolving identity within the union. In the 18th century, as McGuire highlights, people were striving to eliminate their "Scotticism" through speech lessons. In contrast, in the 20th century, authors who aim to highlight cultural distinctions in their literary works. This new increasing trend in Scottish literature can be referred to as proponents of "neo-scotticism" as the writers included in this new politicized culturally specific writing style are actively working to raise awareness of and celebrate cultural differences through their writing.

The revival of Scots as a language can be seen as a response to historical circumstances in the 1950s, which posed a significant threat to the language's existence. (Riach, 2022). During this period, Standard English was rapidly gaining influence throughout Britain. This growth was largely driven by the expansion of centralized media based in London, a trend that began in 1953 with the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. Also, television sets became quite popular. During the 1950s, there were concerns that traditional forms of entertainment like cinema, theater, and even private reading might struggle to compete with the allure of television. Besides, Standard English dominated the television. This cultural shift posed a challenge to traditional forms of media and had significant implications for language use, including the preservation of Scots. (Riach, 2022)

Furthermore, following the 1979 referendum, there has been a noteworthy shift in the position of Scots in the Scottish Literary Tradition. The referendum, which took place in Scotland in 1979, was canceled by Westminster on last-minute excuses, although the majority said yes. Margaret Thatcher's victory in the prime minister elections that followed this annulment had great negative consequences for Scotland. The new economy system, which is based on extreme capitalist and privatization from the understanding of the social state, has caused the Scottish youth to be unemployed and the working class to become poorer. The deterioration of the economy, the benefits of Scottish workers' labor profits and taxes for the British government led the Scots to seek national autonomy again in the 1990s. In 1997, the New Labor party won

the election with a historic majority, and the Scottish parliament, which had been suspended since 1707, was re-established in 1997 with devolution (Riach 2022).

The unstable political landscape in Scotland paved the way for a growing inclination towards using Scots. This linguistic shift from standard English to Scots is viewed as an act of resistance against the dominance of angiocentric literary norms and likened to, what Alexander Scott referred to as, a "guerrilla movement" (as quoted in Hames, 2019, p. 77). As Matt McGuire (2009) also notes in Contemporary Scottish Literature, "the other predominant inclination was to lean towards cultural nationalism, distinguishing and defending Scottish literature from the assimilating energies of English literature. (pp. 6-7). He furthers his discussion with the contemporary definition of Scotland as a nation, "still looking over its shoulder at the Auld Enemy, England" (p.7) Within this context, some Scottish writers identify themselves with this movement owing to their use of Scots, while others strongly oppose it. This divergence is likely to lead to a literary dispute, one that may surpass the petty disagreements of recent decades but promises to be more constructive.

Lyndsay Paterson, however, presents an alternative perspective in relation to the use of Scots as a nationalist voice. Paterson's below quotation suggests that Scotland has adopted a more different form of nationalism, moving away from extremist tendencies, and embracing a gentler form of cultural distinctiveness that accommodates multiple voices. This shift in perception offers a more inclusive and diverse approach to nationalism as stated by Paterson as such:

> The playwrights strived to create a new way of looking at the world. They aimed to shape a fresh vision of Scotland, envisioning it as a model for other countries to learn how to develop a form of nationalism that is inclusive and doesn't threaten others. This form of nationalism would be accepting of diversity within the country and open to adapting its sovereignty to larger social structures that benefit its people (as cited in Reid, 2011, p. 191).

Ian Brown (2006) also refers to the cultural nationalism which embraces multilingual cultures and gives voice to the marginalized voices as follows:

> English, Scots or Galeic, has meant that Scottish theatre has embodied and led in the dtermination that there is no single identity. Rather there is recognition of many identities which make up Scottish culture, or nationhood – gender-based, sexual, regional, social – and linguistic. There is a real sense in which the twentieth century saw a new freedom for the Scots language on stage. (p.91)

In modern Scottish literature, a key feature is that writers and critics have shifted away from reacting to political issues. Instead, they're focusing on other things. As McGuire

(2009) points out, this change has been very active. The 1980s were a particularly creative and productive time in Scotland. It seemed like the energy that politicians could not capture was channeled into other areas. Therefore, as he postulates, "In literature, in thought, in history, creative and scholarly work went hand in hand to redraw the map of Scotland's past and realign the perspective of its future" (McGuire, 2009, 11).

Moreover, Christopher Whyte (1995), in *Gendering the Nation*, discusses how literary representation has often been faciliated for political reasons in Scottish literature. With the absence of an elected political authority in Scotland, the responsibility of representing the nation has been taken up by its writers. This tradition has helped maintain a unique national identity for Scottish culture over the years. However, a significant turn occurred in 1999 when a successful election opened the door to a devolved Scotland, which marked a pivotal moment in the nation's political landscape. These political fluctuations within the country's landscape have been significant in triggering an increasing trend in the revitalization of cultural and national distinctiveness which permeate various facets, including literature and theatre. As articulated by Trish Reid (2011) in her work in *Post Devolutionary Drama* "Questions of inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and borders, whether real or imagined, have for a generation of Scottish playwrights working in a post-devolutionary context, affected their terms of engagement with issues of identity and difference." (p. 188) Also, Scott Hames (2019) sums up the overall influence of devolution in his *Literary Politics of Scottish Devolution: Voice, Class, Nation*, as such:

> If I have one simple and uncontentious conclusion to offer the reader, it is that Scottish devolution is not only a set of political structures, but a cultural condition. Indeed, the legitimacy of the political structures has been premised on the historic reality and electoral salience of cultural difference, and on these terms the 'cultural devolution' thesis is easy to accept. (p. 302-303)

The core idea of these observations is that changes in the political arena significantly influence how literature reflects those shifts. This influence is so profound that the expression of political desires for independence and cultural distinctiveness through literature has arguably become more impactful than similar expressions in formal politics.

The new political and cultural upheavals in the period sought to find artistic expressions that could grasp the essence of the contemporary cultural and political

environment. In the midst of these socio-political shifts, a pivotal change can be observed in how the classical canon was employed. John Corbett in *Tranlated Drama in Scotland* (2011) claims that "the watershed of devolution marks a move away from the use of the classical canon to affirm the vibrancy of the language, towards a more critical mode" (p.99). This transition is particularly significant in the context of Scots, one of Scotland's official languages alongside English and Gaelic. Scots holds a unique position in theater and literature, extending beyond linguistic variety to play a central role in cultivating Scottish identity.

Unlike MacDiarmid's approach to language in poetry, where he sought an authentic reflection of the audience's speech, stage Scots does not necessarily have to be a precise mirror of everyday Scottish dialects and regional variations. Achieving such authenticity would be challenging given the wide range of linguistic diversity in modern Scotland. Instead, authors often create a "totally invented . . . theatrical Scots", as noted by Liz Lochhead in her Introduction to *Tartuffe.* In the context of theatre, it is not authenticity that matters most; but rather, it is the difference -particularly from standard English- that gives the Scots language its powerful ability to communicate a distinctively Scottish experience. This emphasis on difference highlights the "differentia" that MacDiarmid mentions. By utilizing Scots on the stage, playwrights effectively convey the uniqueness of the Scottish experience by setting it apart from the dominant language of standard English. They, hereby, celebrate the rich linguistic and cultural heritage of Scotland.

Scots also plays a pivotal role in creating a sense of community in Scottish theatre. In his introduction to *Scottish Theatre since the Seventies*, Randall Stevenson (1996) discusses the role of Scots in shaping a communal identity in theatre, contrary to the splitting effect that Hugh MacDiarmid projects in his portrayal of the Scottish imagination and soul, particularly in poetry. In the context of theatre, according to Stevenson, "the use of Scots language fosters a sense of solidarity, bringing together the stage and the audience within a community of speech. This collective cocooning includes a shared outlook, values, and emotions, reinforcing a sense of unity and common experience" (1996, pp.4-5). Thus, it forges a collective bond between the stage and the audience, fostering solidarity and shared emotions. While it may not always be an authentic reflection of everyday speech, the difference it brings from standard English provides a powerful means of expressing the distinctively Scottish

experience, embracing the rich linguistic diversity and cultural uniqueness of the nation.

Furthermore, *Taking Liberties Scottish Literature and Expressions of Freedom* (2016) is one of the essential books offering the premise how Scottish intellectuals seek for liberty through their distinctive voice in time. Ian Brown (2016) in "Freeing the Tongue: Scots Language on in the twentieth century" explores the evolution of Scots-inflected plays from representing stereotypical rural conservatism to addressing the actual life in Scotland. He reminds his reader of how Scots was "ghettocized" before 1910s as it was reserved for working class or illiterate highlanders. However, after that period (p. 74), he shows the positive invocation in the increasing usage of Scots and gives a quotation from Alexander Reid as follows:

> The Return to Scots is a return to meaning an sincerity. We can only grow from our own roots are not English (…) If we are to fulfil our hope that Scotland may some day make a contribution to World Drama (..) we can only do so by cherishing, not repressing our national peculiarities (including our language), though whether a Scottish national drama, if it comes to birth, will be written in Braid Scots or the Speech, redeemed for literary purposes, of Argyle Street, Glasgow, or the Kirkgate, Leith, is anyone's guess. (2016, p.85)

To sum up, the linguistic and cultural political dynamics during this period exemplify the complex interplay between religious, political, and social factors in shaping language attitudes. Its use in drama serves as a powerful means of reconnecting with the nation's linguistic past and preserving a unique aspect of Scottish identity. The inclusion of Scots in theatre productions allows playwrights to capture the pace and authentic expressions of Scottish life by bringing a real and relatable voice to the stage. Moreover, the utilization of Scots in drama revitalizes the theatrical scene by infusing it with new perspectives and engaging storytelling. It introduces audiences to Scottish culture, traditions, and history, while also challenging the notion of a singular national identity. Scots, as a dynamic and living language, provides a platform for exploring the complexities of contemporary Scottish life, politics, and social issues. From this vantage point, Scots in drama can be viewed as a catalyst for the arousal of cultural pride and self-reflection among the audience. It celebrates Scotland's linguistic heritage and asserts its distinctive voice on the theatrical stage. The language, in this regard, becomes a vibrant thread that weaves together the past, present, and future of Scotland's dramatic heritage which forms the Scottish identity.

2.3. Liz Lochhead as a Female Bard of Scotland

The profound and multifaceted approach to the Scots language in conjunction with the celebration of cultural and political developments appears to be more than mere coincidence. This phenomenon has been embedded into the fabric of Scottish theatrical renaissance since the late 1990s, which culminates in significant events such as devolution and the independence referendum of 2014. Throughout this transformative period, Lochhead's writing has been notably influenced by the prevailing socio-political climate that leads to the conception of her works as an aesthetic and dramatic response to the dynamic occurrences surrounding her. Her use of the Scots language not only reflects a celebration of cultural diversity but also signifies a conscious effort to carve out a distinct artistic identity which is deeply interrelated with the socio-political developments of her time. By situating Lochhead within the larger framework of Scottish drama and literature, scholars gain a more comprehensive understanding of her role as a Scottish female bard and her exceptional ability to resonate with audiences through her powerful and evocative poems and plays.

Liz Lochhead, born in 1947 in Motherwell, Lanarkshire, embarked on her academic journey at the Glasgow School of Art in the early 1970s. During this significant period, she actively engaged with a writing group led by Philip Hobsbaum, dedicated to promoting writing workshops across various cities. This marks a milestone in her life as it plays a transformative role in shaping her career, offering her valuable collaborations with fellow Scottish writers within the network, such as the renowned novelist Alasdair Gray and esteemed poet Tom Leonard. Lochhead's creative path was deeply influenced by this collaborative environment, laying the foundation for her future achievements as a prominent figure in Scottish literature.

Lochhead is celebrated as a versatile and exuberant "teller of tales", as described by Gioia Angeletti (2018, p.69). Her exceptional craftsmanship and talent extend beyond the borders of Scotland, making her a prominent figure among contemporary poets and playwrights. Bestowed with the title of "Scotland's Makar" and appointed National Poet in 2011, Lochhead's influence on various creative realms, including poetry, playwriting, translation, and performance art, is undeniable. Her

artistic pursuits constantly blend them together in her literary output which proves her boundless skill and artistic flair.

As a "Scotland's Makar", Lochhead's impact on the nation's literary and cultural landscape is profound. Her poetry and dramatic expressions effectively capture the essence of Scotland and its people, enthralling readers and audiences with captivating narratives. Her first debut poetry collection "Memo for Spring" (1972) as Leanne McGrath states in *Discover: the Magazine of the National Library of Scotland* (2023) "[Lochhead] certainly shook up the male-dominated poetry world" (p.11) Then the following collections have maintained to break traditions, stereotypes imposed on women and Scottish identity as observable in the case of "Islands" (1978), "The Grimm Sisters" (1981), "Dreaming Frankenstein" (1984), and "Bagpipe Muzak" (1991). All of them serve as powerful testaments to her artistic brilliance.

Lochhead's literary talent proves itself in her dramatic plays, as well. But instead of switching the genres while writing, she is prone to defy the traditional boundaries between poetry and drama. That is to say, she skillfully blurs the lines that separate the two genres. The quotation below taken from *Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama* (2011) presents Ksenija Horvat's detailed analysis of Lochhead writing by scrutinizing distinctive and multiple writing strategies of her. She refers to the inseparable or joint trajectories of poetry and drama seen in Lochhead's writing and states that:

> The narrative component has always been significant in Lochhead's poetry, and a lot of her poems are constructed around a dramatic character, making them attractive for performing before an audience. It would be short-sighted to separate Lochhead's dramas from the performative potential that rests at the heart of her poetry. Indeed, at the time of writing her fi rst full-length play it does not seem that Lochhead consciously thought in terms of dramatic structure. (p.181)

The narrative aspect, as stated by Horvat, has always held significant importance in Lochhead's poetry, and many of her poems are structured around dramatic characters, making them inherently suitable for performance before an audience. Indeed, Lochhead confesses that being a poet is 'the most precious thing' to her: "If I were a playwright, I'd like to be a poet in the theatre" (BBC Scotland, 2004).

Embracing her role as both a poet and playwright, Lochhead's creative expressions find harmony and balance. Her poetry enriches her plays with lyrical beauty and emotional depth, while her playwriting provides a platform for her poetic

voice to reverberate within the theatrical realm. Blending of artistic identities exemplifies Lochhead's ability to navigate and transcend conventional boundaries, making her a true visionary in contemporary literature and theater. Lochhead's diverse body of work, spanning poetry, plays, translations, and performance art, makes her exceptional talent evident in crafting narratives that blend the new and familiar. Her creative expressions resonate with depth and complexity, earning her widespread acclaim as a masterful storyteller in Scottish literature and beyond.

Lochhead is also known for her re-writings. Her revisionist adaptations and distintive approach to storytelling sürprize reader/audience with narrative twists, poetic incongruities, and historical anachronisms. Drawing inspiration from a wide array of sources, including popular traditions, historical events, and mythical tales, she tends to offer captivating stories that resonate deeply with readers and audiences alike. Her ability to incorporate diverse influences into her works not only evince her creative ingenuity but also highlights her deep appreciation for the similarities and differences of human experiences across time and culture.

She uses various binary oppositions like female/male, past/present, Scottish/English, working-class/middle-class, and performance/text in her work to break down rigid boundaries and explore the complexities within her own identity as a writer. Her use of language is described as "heteroglossic", as Robert Crawford puts it, indicating a diversity of voices and perspectives in her work, moving away from a single, fixed narrative. Indeed, she employs these binary oppositions not as separate themes but as simultaneous elements, creating a complex and multifaceted exploration of identity and division in her writing. With regards to rewriting techniques, Angeletti (2018) points out,

> Lochhead is a gifted writer as well as a re-writer, able to present and past, popular and highbrow literature, national and transnational cultural memory in unexpected ways, surprising the reader and spectator with peculiar narrative twists, poetic incongruties, historical anachronisms, and coup de theatre. (pp. 69-70)

The engagement of past and present, highbrow and lowbrow, reality and fiction are presented in her *Dracula* (1985), *Tartuffe* (1986), *Miseryguts* (2002) *Educating Agnes* (2008), Euripidies' *Medea* (2000) and *Thebans* (2003).

After 1990s Lochhead's writing slightly veered from re-writing to re-exploration of human nature and personal experiences. Plays such as *Mozart and*

Salieri (1990), *Quelques Fleurs* (1991), *Perfect Days* (1998), *Britannia Rules* (1998), and *Good Things* (2006) highlight her mastery over language and style. In these mature plays, Lochhead moves away from the feminist agenda prevalent in her earlier works, while still focusing on women's experiences from broader humanist and personal perspectives. As a theamtic concern, her plays delve into the reminiscences of the past, exploring the heartwarming and heartbreaking events that shape the lives of ordinary people, from love and heartbreak to family secrets, weddings, and funerals.

Her ouvre is also committed to exploring gender dynamics. Lochhead challenges traditional representations of women and femininity on stage by emphasizing the split nature of the female subject, moving away from the conventional, static portrayals. Lochhead fearlessly confronts stereotypes and societal expectations, providing a voice to the experiences and struggles of women. Through her poetic lens, she offers a fresh perspective on gender roles and challenges ingrained biases, contributing to a broader discourse on feminism and gender equality. In Gioia Angeletti (2018)'s seminal work, *Nation, Community, and Self: Female Voices in Scottish Theatre from the Late Sixties to the Present*, she explores the contributions of seven playwrights, Ure, Lochhead, di Mambro, Glover, Jackie Kay, Evaristi and Macdonald hereby positioning Lochhead as an essential figure confronting with the English literary bard, Shakespeare, particularly through her play *The Magic Island* for children. By delving into the rich Scottish theatrical tradition, Lochhead's plays can be seen as an intentional act of reclaiming and reinterpreting cultural heritage while establishing her unique voice within the broader canon of Scottish drama. Furthermore, Matt McGuire's publication, *Contemporary Scottish Literature: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism* (2009), effectively characterizes Liz Lochhead as "a pioneer and original frontier rider setting accross the bandlands of a male dominated Scottish literature" (p.76). According to Anne Kathrin Braun-Hensen (2004),

> In defamiliarizing various historical and literary narratives one of Lochhead's goal is to expose how questions of gender remain crucial to the politics of popular culture and our understanding of the past. In tapping various sources of literary material, Lochhead does therefore not distinguish between the text and context. Both historical information biography, historical records) and literary intertexts are treated according to their significance for the present time. (Braun,2004, p.62).

This metaphor lays bare Lochhead's daring exploration of new thematic territories and her political commitment to breaking down barriers for female writers in the Scottish literary scene.

Another outstanding feature of Lochhead's ouvre is that she presents her fictional world which frequently sets in Scotland the Scottish phrases and variants. Her writing engages in a diverse range of language styles and forms in her poetry and drama. She skillfully uses various tones, from lyrical and classical to everyday and urban, bringing a wide array of colors and flavors to her work. She fluently switches between Standard English and her grandmother's broad Lowland Scots, adding depth and richness to her creative expressions. As Ksenija Horvat asserts, "[Lochhead's] work never fails to remind readers that language is both a subject and an object of fiction; it is a construct shaped by a variety of socio-cultural factors as well as by its author's mind's eye" (2009, 179). This linguistic approach in the play, therefore, emphasizes Lochhead's Scottish identity, presenting her as a writer deeply rooted in the cultural fabric of Scotland. Furthermore, when considering the intentional efforts of the Scottish writers to revitalize the artistic potential of the Scots language after the 1970s, Liz Lochhead's use of Scots in her play can be beyond her individual background and a strategic part of necessary or desired contribution to maintain Scots, thereby, the cultural distinctiveness of Scotland through her poems and plays. Randall Stevenson (2021), a significant critic in Scottish literature and history refers to the use of Scots in Lochhead's *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head* as a significant sample of the national effort among Scottish writers to "redevelop[s] the potentials of Scots", (p. 119). He addresses the decreased tendency in using Scots in public spaces, in radio commentaries on football matches and theaters. Being aware that these platforms held significant power in shaping the connection between the language and its people, Scottish playwrights including Liz Lochhead started to put the vigorous and expressive use of Scots on stage establishing a profound sense of identification between characters and audiences, fostering a shared understanding of outlooks, values, and emotions. This linguistic medium proved highly effective not only in original plays but also in translation and adaptation work, as evident in Lochhead's efforts with Molière's plays, particularly with her Scots translation of Tartuffe.

Apart from the intention to use Scots as a medium of emotions in literature and art, it is also possible to view it as part of desired atonement or liberation of Scottish

nation and culture from the definitions within another culture's lens and terms. When considering Lochhead's use of Scots and frequent attempt to foster Scottish identity and past, it may be conceived of an endeavour to forge Scotland with Scottish terms from the Scottish perspective since Neal Ascherson (2003) states: "Too many British historians still unconsciously see Scotland in the period through an English lens" (185). Given the critics' arguments, the use of Scots can be considered as Lochhead's cultural affirmation and challenge to the linguistic hierarchy between two countries and dramaturgical refusal to interpret Scotland and its past from an English perspective and in English language.

Liz Lochhead's literary prowess has helped her gain a prominent position in academic collections, where her works are subjected to comprehensive critical analysis. In these books, her literary contributions undergo thorough examination, drawing from a wide array of academic perspective. One of those academic collections is *Liz Lochhead's Voices* (1993) edited by Robert Crawford to explore Lochhead's diverse writing. This volume marks a cornerstone in revealing the multifaceted and polyphonic nature of Lochhead's artistic output. Through the multiple perspectives of several esteemed critics, the book delves deep into various facets of Lochhead's ouvre which is full of the intricacies and complexities.

Another key book, *The Edinburgh Companion to Liz Lochhead*, edited by Anne Varty (2013), further illuminates the diverse range of talents possessed by Lochhead as a poet, playwright, and significant cultural figure. The book delves into the generic slipperiness and interpenetration characteristic of Scottish literature, showcasing Lochhead's ability to playfully oscilliate between different artistic forms and genres. Furthermore, the given work sheds light on the intricate relationship between Scotland's languages and dialects, particularly the dynamic interplay between Scots and English. Lochhead skillfully slides between oral and literary traditions, exemplifying her profound understanding of the nuances and complexities of language.

Anne Kathrin Braun-Hensen (2004) offers profound insights in *Dramatic Laboratories: Figurations of Subjectivity in Liz Lochhead's Writing* by highlighting the significance of repetition, revision, and subversion in Lochhead's ouvre. She also refers to the fact that she fearlessly challenges conventional norms by revisiting and

reworking historical information, biographical elements, and literary intertexts, infusing them with new meaning and relevance for contemporary audiences (Braun, 2004, p. 62).

To conclude, through her writing, Lochhead not only showcases the significance of the Scottish language and traditions but also addresses social issues and the everyday experiences of ordinary people. Her use of familiar language and relatable settings fosters a sense of belonging and identification among her readers and audiences, creating a powerful and engaging literary experience. In this regard, Lochhead's works embody a deep sense of cultural pride and social consciousness, making her a significant and influential figure in contemporary Scottish literature. Her ability to blend the political, the cultural, and the personal in her writing demonstrates her skill in crafting narratives that resonate with a wide range of readers and leave a lasting impact on the cultural landscape.

3. DRAMATIZATION OF HISTORY AND HISTORICIZATION OF DRAMA IN *MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS GOT HER HEAD CHOPPED OFF*

Don't
let history frame you
in a pretty lie.
(Lochhead, 1984, "Construction for a Site")

The above words of caution, taken from Liz Lochhead's poem "Construction for a Site" (1984), forewarn the reader about history, as history, supposedly authentic and truth-based narrative, may distort the facts to be able to form ideologically constructed partial and idealized stories. In these three lines, Lochhead's understatement is also infused with irony and denies the authenticity of history. Instead, she encourages the reader to disbelieve this pretty naturalization process of historiography. This mindset is the standpoint of new historicism since it conceives history and literature as discursive practices. In British drama, since the very early eighteenth century, history as a dramaturgical theme has been employed by playwrights to address political issues in Britain. Shakespeare's history plays are among the first examples to present the use of history as a theatrical metaphor "for political nation-building and hidden political references" in Ian Brown's words (2016, p. 3). The use of the past allows the exploration of veiled political concerns or a silent voice in drama, whereby the audience reconsiders the past from a different and multiple perspectives. That is why, in the history plays, the history is problematized to give the audience new insights into and perspectives on the socio-political condition of the past. This tendency changes the account of the bygone days from monophonic to polyphonic in political and ideological terms, as there are always other stories to be told in history. In *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* (1987), Liz Lochhead gives a voice to Mary Stuart and liberates the stereotypical configurations about Mary and Scotland drawn by the monophonic "pretty" male voice of his-tory. Instead, she constructs histories about the story of Mary Queen of Scots' execution.

Mary Queen of Scots§ was first performed in 1987 on the commemoration of Queen Mary's execution by her cousin, Queen Elizabeth. The celebration of Mary's death instead of her birth is very ironic and a good start for Liz Lochhead to write an interesting execution story that can attract the audience's attention and make them reconsider the past and its negative impact on the present. In the play, she focuses on the sixteenth century to retell the story of Mary Stuart from a female Scottish gaze, which is in stark contrast to historical accounts from the English Protestant male perspective, and multiplies her image as much as she can with the help of different theatrical elements. With the revision of Queen Mary's story, Lochhead traces the construction of (mis)presentations of Scotland in terms of class, gender, and religious segregation in the past. More specifically, the play shows how stereotypes and clichés about females and Scottish identity were constructed in the sixteenth century in Scotland through discursive practices in terms of gender and nation, and how the influence of the past has been perpetuated and prolonged in the 1980s. However, although the play problematizes history and its influences, it does not keep the dramaturgical elements in the background. Mary Queen of Scots includes a wide variety of theatrical techniques, such as a Greek chorus, mask, farce, interludes, and Brechtian Verfremdungseffekt. Regarding the abundance of theatrical devices, Lochhead said in an interview that this is not a mere "history play" (Gonzales, 2004, p. 104), as the play rejuvenates Scotland's history, which is harmoniously embedded in her conscious theatricality. This enables the play to comply with the theory of historicity of the text, the textuality of history, which is one of the main principles of the new historicism approach. Therefore, this chapter characterizes Lochhead's rewriting of Mary Queen of Scots' life in her play as dramatization of history and historicization of drama. In the light of this argument, this chapter aims to highlight textual and contextual elements of the play that dramatize history or historicize the drama from a new historicist perspective.

The majority of *Mary Queen of Scots* is set in sixteenth-century Scotland; however, the last scene presumably takes place in the mid-twentieth century. It consists of two acts with fifteen scenes. Act One introduces two distinct queens and

§ Hereafter, Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off will be abbreviated as Mary Queen of Scots.

two different nations on one island. The distinction between Queen Elizabeth of England and Mary Queen of Scotland is depicted in a forced and stereotypical conflict. Thus, while it reveals the clichés about Scotland, the first act historicizes the gender politics and the construction of gender roles at a time when both Scotland and England had an unmarried female regent. Here, the reader/audience views Elizabeth as a strong female character focusing on her patriotic duties by refusing marriage as a ruler of England, whereas Mary articulates her conflicting feelings since as a female ruler of Scotland, it is almost impossible for her to maintain public and private roles at the same time. The difficulty in holding power in this duality increases for Queen Mary when Calvinist John Knox preaches against her womanhood as a threat to country, her dual roles, and her Catholicism. The contrast between Mary and Elizabeth becomes increasingly sharp in the subsequent scenes. Act Two focuses mainly on Queen Mary and problematizes her polarized image as a seductress or victim but transcends this image and also discusses to what extent she would possibly be considered as national heroine from a Scottish gaze In this act, Elizabeth develops a strategy to arrange a marriage between Darnley and Mary to secure control of Scotland. However, this marriage is broken by Darnley's improper behaviors. Then, rumors about Mary's pregnancy begin to circulate, and these rumors are followed by successive murders and other power intrigues, which lead to the execution of Mary. In the last scene, the main characters turn into children of the twentieth century who imitate and prolong the cruelty of the adults to the 21st century. Wee Betty (Elizabeth) treats Maree (Mary) and Smelly Wee Knoxy in a very bad way, just as she did in history. At the end, all the children repeat the execution story of Mary Stuart in their games, and they start to chant, "Mary Queen of Scots got her head chopped off" (Act II, viii), so the influences of the past, cultural childish biases, are brought to the present in a striking playful way.

Even though there are more than six characters, the play is centered on Mary Stuart, who is Scotland's iconic female figure. Besides, the title explicitly alerts the reader/audience about the ending of the play. Thus, there is no suspension about the tragic end of Queen Mary. Instead, she probes into the story that leads Queen Mary's to the execution. By so doing, she explores her unsteady and complex relationships with her contemporary historical figures, as well as with her own country.

The choice of "the last queen of an independent Scotland," as Carla Rodriguez Gonzales (2004, p. 106) puts it, seems deliberate and very subtle for Lochhead's drama

to bring up the long-lasting debate on Scotland's tangled threats of nationalistic concerns and gender politics that went hand in hand in Mary's lifetime. An examination of Scottish writers during the Scottish Renaissance in the twentieth century reveals the emergence of a distinctive literary canon. This canonical formation was notably influenced by a group of prominent male intellectuals, including Hugh MacDiarmid, the foundational figure of the Scottish Renaissance. MacDiarmid, along with contemporaries such as Morgan MacGaig, Sorley MacLean, and Edwin Morgan, played pivotal roles in shaping this literary landscape. Their collective impact and significance have been portrayed, for instance, in Moffat's notable work, "Poets Pub" (1980) as depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Moffat, A. (1980) Poets Pub

What these men sought was to enable Scottish culture to flourish and to trace the possible meanings of Scottishness in their literary texts. These intellectuals also published feminist manifestos, as Willa Muir did in "Women: An Enquiry" (1925), or as Neil M. Gunn displayed in a scenario in which women can get what they want but will not decide what it is in *The Silver Darlings* (1941).

Portrayal of women or nations from a male-oriented perspective was a danger to Scottishness and Scottish identity for Scottish female intellectuals. Therefore,

writers following MacDiarmid's generation, such as Liz Lochhead, Kathleen Jamie, Gerrie Fellows, and Jackie Kay, have marked a departure from a masculine gaze on Scottishness and tend to see Scotland as a uniting knot of nation and gender. They attempt to revise the past and the legacy of the stories told in the present. From this vantage point, the characterization of Queen Mary is quite pertinent to get rid of male-oriented meanings of Scottish nationalism and to capture possible cultural and historical determinants of the national identity of women in Scotland. To emphasize the dual axis of identity, Lochhead focuses on Queen Mary, whom Susan C. Triesman (1993) calls "the body of the nation/woman" (p. 129). Narrating her life and death, in this sense, means depicting Scotland and its history. The embodiment of nation and womanhood in Queen Mary's character enables Lochhead to encourage women's visibility and female agency in literary or historic writings.

In Mary Queen of Scots, Lochhead reflects cultural and political influences of her society on the process of portraying Mary Stuart. Throughout the centuries, Mary Stuart has been central for the political agendas to represent a woman as a villain or victim. Especially in Scotland, Queen Mary has constituted a great part of Scottish myths and folk tales. Scottish children have been raised by distinct versions of Queen Mary myths. The main difference in presenting Mary Stuart stems from Scotland's political and religious restlessness in its history. In *Mary Queen of Scots: Romance and Nation* (1998), Jayne Elizabeth Lewis demonstrates how Queen Mary is represented as powerfully different and paradoxical, which depends on a historian's religious faith and nationality. In this light, from a Protestant writer's perspective, she is characterized as a "seductress and bloodthirsty 'competitor' for Elizabeth's crown," whereas she is portrayed by Catholic supporters as a "saintly victim of a barbarous state" (Lewis, 1998, p. 17). As a Scottish writer, Lochhead definitely acknowledges these opposing features of Queen Mary stories that characterize the widespread Scottish stereotype in people's minds. This oxymoronic definition and binary cultural impinges on Mary Queen's image is the main force that first director of the play, Gerry Mulgrew, a Scot of Irish-Catholic descent, and Lochhead herself, a Scot of Lowland Presbyterian origin, are drawn to the play as seen in the following Lochhead's explanation in the introduction of the play: "The Catholic Mary is certainly a martyr and almost a Saint; the Proddy version of Mary veers between limp victim and politically inept nymphomaniac devil woman who almost scuppered Our Glorious

Reformation" (1987, p. xii). Such a binary image in little children's minds, from a new historicist approach, provides significant glimpses to the reader about the forces of history since the dichotomy of Queen Mary was constructed by the hegemonic discourses in the past. As Anne-Kathrin Braun (2004) explores *Mary Queen of Scots*, she views the play as a feminist project and argues that the play exposes how history serves the patriarchal order to legitimate its structure and distribution of power (p. 59). Lochhead dismantles this particular patriarchal mentality and drastically disrupts the childish cultural biases and stereotypes that are imposed by historical and political narratives in a new historicist standpoint.

However, before linking her political concerns to Mary's images served by cultural or artistic expressions, Lochhead starts with the re-exploration of Scotland and Scottish historiography. The play begins with the introduction to the nation through a human-animal ambiguous figure, La Corbie (a crow, Scotland's national bird, and the narrator). She is one of the central characters, as she stands and speaks for Scotland, Scottish identity, and Queen Mary. The play begins with her soliloquys about Scotland and its stereotypical vision as follows:

> CORBIE. Country: Scotland. What is it like?
>
> It is a peatbog, it's a daurk forest.
>
> It's a cauldron o lye, a saltpan or coal mine.
>
> If you're gey lucky it's a bonny, bricht bere meadow or a park o kye
>
> Or mibbe… it's a field o' stanes.
>
> It's a tenement or merchant's ha'.
>
> It's a hüre hoose or a humble cot. Princes Street ot Paddy's
>
> Merkit. (Lochhead, I.i.p.11)

The excerpt highlights how La Corbie's portrayal of Scotland is marked by contrasting and polarized images. Also, she puts the emphasis on Scotland's recognizable streets, geographical features, rural beauty, mountainous landscape, forests, and green parks. These depictions have been a part of stereotypical identifications of Scotland in literature over the centuries. However, one must go beyond the natural beauty of Scotland to deepen one's understanding of Scotland and Scottish identity since it is much more complex that it is thought. With the aim of positioning Scotland beyond the clichés, La Corbie's visual calm depiction of the

country is interrupted by an abrupt alternative: “Or mibbe… it is a field o stanes. It depends, it depends…” (Act I, I, p.11). This alternative way of looking is the first step to delve into Scotland’s historical complexity and cultural variety.

This thematic approach reflects her attempt to deploy fixed and stereotypical images of Scotland. Therefore, instead of presenting Scotland as a one political and cultural unit, La Corbie embraces the multiplicity and diversity inherent in the country’s socio-cultural history. In this respect, La Corbie’s reflections on Scotland reveal the complex and fluid nature of the nation’s identity since the perception of Scotland is bound to people’s social backgrounds, personal experiences, and historical contexts. This multifaceted portrayal challenges the idea of a monolithic national identity and offers diverse perspectives that go beyond one-dimensional representations.

Another significant aspect is that Scotland is presented through the Scottish phrases and variants. According to Ksenija Horvat, “[Lochhead’s] work never fails to remind readers that language is both a subject and an object of fiction; it is a construct shaped by a variety of socio-cultural factors as well as by its author’s mind’s eye” (2009, 179). This linguistic approach in the play, therefore, emphasizes La Corbie’s Scottish identity, presenting her as a character deeply rooted in the cultural fabric of Scotland, just as Lochhead herself. Furthermore, when considering the intentional efforts of the Scottish writers to revitalize the artistic potential of the Scots language after the 1970s, Lochhead’s use of Scots in her play can be viewed as strategic and significant contribution to “redevelop[s] the potentials of Scots”, as Randall Stevenson (2021) remarks (p.119). But it is also possible to view it as an endeavour to define Scotland with Scottish terms from the Scottish perspective since Neal Ascherson (2003) states: “Too many British historians still unconsciously see Scotland in the period through an English lens” (185). Given the critics’ arguments, La Corbie’s position as a narrator of the play in Scottish language can be regarded as Lochhead’s cultural affirmation and challenge to the linguistic hierarchy between two countries and dramaturgical refusal to interpret Scotland and its past from an English perspective and in English language.

On the one hand, the variety or conflict suggested by La Corbie’s definition of Scotland is a mere reflection of the essential nature of Scottish identity. The

dichotomizing tendency in thinking is defined by Gregory Smith (1919, p.4) as "Caledonian Antisyzygy." The term describes the Scots as having a clash of identities and contrasts in their history. Furthermore, Finlayson supports these arguments by claiming: "The Scot contrives effortlessly to contain his contradiction. It is a quintessential feature of Scottish thought" (1988, p. 30). This paradoxical nature of Scotland and Scottish identity is easily observed in Mary's depiction of her country when she arrives in Scotland after spending a long time in France:

> Haar fae the sea… Cauld… rebecks and chanters, a pretty masque and goldheired bairn presents me wi a filigree hert that's fu o golden coins,new minted. Clouds. Aflytin fae Knox. Daurkness. A mad poet tries to mak a hoor o me. Wisps… A revel! Smoke… A banquet for the Ambassador new fae Spain. Fog. A bricht affray in the Cannongate, abloody clash at the Butter Tron, a murdered bairn in the Grassmarket, sunshine, and a ragged, starving crowd o cheerin weans jostle to touch ma velvet goon as I go by. My kingdom. Alternately brutal and boring. And I canny mak sense o it at aw. (Lochhead, 1987, Act I.iii, pp. 16-16)

Mary's stream of consciousness, as given above, illustrates how Scotland oscillates between grim darkness and bright light in geographical and socio-economic terms. In one part of the country, there are masque parties, banquets for the ambassadors, bright streets in the Canongate, and golden-haired happy children of the upper class. The other part represents the chilly and dark side of the nation in which masses are starving and in bloody conflict because of class division and sectarianism. The conflict between opposing extremes in the external environment significantly influences the cognitive processes of individuals. This influence is notably evident in the frequently discussed concept of the "split Scottish character" and in the internal divisions and thought processes of characters such as Mary. However, the central argument of this paper posits that Lochhead diverges from this argument and partial historical depictions of Scotland and Scottish figures in the way that she does not interpret this contradiction in a negative or pessimistic manner. To be clearer, Lochhead does not tend to delineate Mary or a Scottish identity in rigid, polarized terms. Instead, she embraces the contradictions inherent in cultural identity. Lochhead's approach, therefore, acknowledges and celebrates diversity and plurality within cultural identities.

This is also obvious in the variability of the definitions of Scotland in the play. This plural portrayal is once again associated with a multicultural and diverse historical context of Scotland marked by population displacement, replacement, and language shifts. La Corbie as a remembering figure or bard of Scotland describes

herself as a female figure embedded with Scotland's socio-cultural past as quoted below:

> How me? Eh? Eh? Eh? Voice like a chocked laugh. Ragbag o a burd in my black duds, aw angles and elbows and broken oxter feathers, black beady een in my executioner's hood. No braw, but Ah think Ah hae a sort of black glamour? (Act I, i. p.11)

La Corbie characterizes herself and nation's trajectories at the same time by a recurring pattern of cycles alternating between periods of war and peace domination In her own depiction, she is a bird/woman narrator, combines familiar and unfamiliar words to the Scots and the English. While oxter, braw and glamour words (armpit, brave, enchantment) are Scottish words, words such as burd, aw, ah, hae (bird, all, I, have) are just invented words that can be easily understood from their similar pronunciation to the standard English version. Such combination of real and fabrication of language in the depiction of Scotland's past reinforces the idea that "history's putative and solemn truths are rendered playful and debatable" as J. B. Harvie (1996) notes (p.7). Moreover, in the following scenes, La Corbie incorporates Italian and French words into her language. The wide range of linguistic forms in the play is highly experimental, and this experimentation is interpreted by Nancy K. Gish as "renewal of confidence in Scots writing" (2013, p. 52). She further explains it as a nationalist goal which embraces the multiplicity that the play attempts to achieve:

> Like Hugh MacDiarmid, Lochhead aims for a language available for all modern purposes and draws on whatever Scots words will work. Unlike MacDiarmid's conception of a return to one national language, hers is linguistic play across the vast range now present in a country with three languages, one of which is Scots English in varying degrees of mixed vocabulary and accent. (2013, p.53)

This linguistic diversity emphasizes Lochhead's attempt to secure the perception of Scotland and Scottish identity from the dangers of one-sided, oversimplified cliché definitions.

Even though it is a very small nation with a population that is smaller than London, Scotland has a wide variety of culture. To highlight the indefinability of Scotland due to this cultural diversity, Robert Louis Stevenson in 1884 writes in his memoirs: "It has no unity except upon the map" (2017 p. 194). Alan Riach (1990), also depicts how this small nation was formed by various groups of people speaking different languages. It is a country of three languages: English, Scottish, and Gaelic. However, each part of the country, from the North to the South, including the archipelagos encircling the country, has distinct terminology and dialects within it

since some areas are rural, some are isolated, some are industrialized, and some are post-industrialized. Each part of the country, thus, suggests the diversity of perspectives about Scotland and Scottish identity and each one creates different ways of seeing.

However, it is also worth to focus on Lochhead's linguistic invention and diversity as they fracture the prevalent idea of linguistic union in nationalist viewpoints. Exploring Scotland's past and the potential origins of Scottish nationhood, Neil Davidson (2000), highlights the fact that Scottish nationality emerged from distinctive small burghs rather than a unified national identity. He also points out that "Nor did language help nationhood develop. The inhabitants of Scotland were not united by language but divided by it into Gaelic and English speakers" (2000, p. 56). As evident in the excerpt, he does not refer to the Scots as a distinctive language of Scotland as it is based on a sort of "misunderstanding" since he believes that it is a particular English dialect which originates from Lallans, and there is nothing wrong with calling it dialect in terms of nationalism. As K. White (1998) notes in "Scotland History and the Writer", "Nobody in contemporary Scotland speaks consistent Lallans – that is part of our historical linguistic situation. What we speak is English with local accents and intonations, and sprinkled with elements of Lallans, and indeed of Gaelic, which have come down to us" (p.149). In this context, the utilization of multiple languages in the play, Mary Queen of Scots, serves to communicate complex and profound implications related to Scottish nationalism. By doing so, it challenges and breaks away from the mythical notion of a unified nation and language, usually propagated by masculine discourse. Furthermore, through the incorporation of an invented language, Liz Lochhead examines the extent to which a singular standard Scots language, English language, or Gaelic language exists within Scotland's extensive cultural diversity. As noted by renowned playwright David Greig, Lochhead's use of an invented language in the play liberates Scottish theatre from being merely "an outpost of folkloric pastiche" (p.2). This indicates that Lochhead's linguistic choices in the play transcend traditional and simplistic representations of Scottish culture and language, allowing for a more dynamic and authentic portrayal.

Even though there are diversity and a dichotomy in the perception of Scotland as beautifully incorporated in La Corbie's linguistic variety, La Corbie reveals three things on which almost all the Scottish people agree regarding what they suffer from:

everlasting wars, poverty, and not being English. Since the very beginning, Scotland has been the destination of different groups of people. Even though these people were able to live together, the country suffered a number of wars in successive years. The Wars of Independence led by Scottish heroes such as William Wallace or Robert the Bruce culminated in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Scotland. However, the threat of English forces or Norse raiders still dominated in the sixteenth century.

Before introducing the characters and the play, La Corbie reflects this sense of uneasiness and threat to the Scottish people in a sarcastic way: "Oh, see, after the battle, after the battle, man, it's a pure feast – ma eyes are ower big even for my belly, in lean years o peace, my belly thinks my throat's been cut" (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, i, p. 12). Although this emphasizes the ravaged status of Scotland after suffering wars, the discrepency between what is said and how it is said casts away the serious and authorizing tone of history, or Scottish history in particular, and makes it more entertaining in a challenging way. Thus, with the voice of La Corbie, Lochhead forewarns the reader/audience to upcoming comic reversal of historicity. Thus, by adopting the voice of La Corbie, Lochhead provides a warning to the reader or audience of an upcoming comedic reversal of historicity. Through this approach, she opens up new historical spaces that are inverted, incorporating fresh voices, representations, and definitions. This interpretation highlights the deliberate choice to deviate from traditional academic discourse. By employing humor and irony, Lochhead subverts the expected authoritative tone, thereby inviting the audience to engage with the material in a more playful and reflexive manner. The character of La Corbie offers a distinctive perspective that challenges established historical accounts, broadening the discourse by incorporating marginalized voices and perspectives. This shift in tone and perspective allows Lochhead to reconfigure the historical landscape and encourages critical examination of historical narratives.

Actually, authoritarianism is the prevailing mode to be reconstructed or rather distorted in the play. Therefore, it can be traced almost each concept and relationship that the play tackles with. In this aspect, Lochhead's choice of sixteenth-century Scotland is also very intentional to discuss the concept of authoritarianism in official history writings, gender roles, intra-sex relations, country relations and religion. The period the play refers to is a landmark for Scotland as it oscillates between the Renaissance and the modern period and marks a transition period. During this period,

there were monumental changes in the perception and enactment of monarchy, government, division of labor, class distinction, sectarianism, and gender roles. Regarding Scotland in particular, it was the time of the establishment of the Kirk, Scotland's Reformed Church, and the regiment of the queen, and the unsteady sovereignty of Scotland. To put it in Lochhead's terms, it was "a bit of quirk of History" (Gonzales, 2004, p. 106) that enables her to probe into the dual trajectories of national and gender politics in her political commitment. Thus, Mary Queen of Scots contextualizes the time when the unsteady religious, political and cultural institutionalization process had taken its toll on Scottish citizens, including women. By alluding to sixteenth-century Scotland, the play provides deeps insights into the nation-building, women's cultural roles, and freedom in faith through the deep and complex interaction of dramaturgical and historical narrative elements.

However, Lochhead's interaction with the past and historical figures is so playful that it jeopardizes the reliability of history. The significant serious issues and crucial changes in the sixteenth century are framed by an ambiguous ragged animal-like character, La Corbie, in the play. Through La Corbie's unconventional perspective, Lochhead blurs the lines between past and present, history and fiction and invites one to reconsider the perceptions of the past and the complexities of historical representation. The connection between history writing and La Corbie's role, as presented in Lochhead's stage directions in Act Two, is particularly noteworthy: "Riccio rips out the sheets of paper, takes them over to Mary. She plucks a feather out of La Corbie's coat sleeve and signs flamboyantly" (Lochhead, II.i.p.39) This flamboyant signature with La Corbie's feather is quite symbolic in terms of representing the past and historical writing from La Corbie's unique perspective as a female bird creature. In this regard, La Corbie's feather acts as a mediator between actual events and their textual portrayal, enabling the reader/audience to consider her as a gendered spirit of Scottish history.

Furthermore, through the enchanting tale of La Corbie, Liz Lochhead challenges authority of master narratives, particularly those intertwined with religion and history. With a playful and subversive touch, the play calls for a re-evaluation of the established power structures and a more cynical analysis of historical truths. Lochhead surprises the reader/audience in the play with La Corbie's peculiar introduction of the royal characters, such as Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, and other

ambassadors with a whip in hand. She presents them as animals within the confines of a circus ring. This act employs reversal of the roles and serves as a humorous satire against fixed and simplistic identities that are often presented as either grandeur or villainous. This symbolic presentation endows La Corbie with an author-figure as well as her narrative position. She organizes the characters and presents them to the reader/audience. In this and other aspects, the presence of a ringmaster serves as a metaphorical representation of a guiding force, orchestrating the narrative surrounding Scotland's historical past. With her authoritative voice and role as the narrator, La Corbie embodies the power and authority traditionally attributed to official historians, whose accounts are often regarded as unquestionable and synonymous with ultimate objectivity and reality.

Besides, the whip she holds is notable in terms of symbolic function since the whip, as a theatrical prop, is shown as a force capable of manipulation, diversion, and punishment. Amos Funkenstein supports the given argument by reminding reader about the orthodoxy of historical facts and argues that "'facts' gain their meaning and even their very factuality from the context in which they are embedded, a context reconstructed solely by the historian, whose narrative makes and shapes the fact" (1992, p. 68). In line with this, in the 2000 version of the play, Lochhead admits La Corbie's partiality and directly forewarns the reader about the position of La Corbie as a narrator shaping the facts of the given time period. She is watching and listening to the happenings and the two queens but she adds "Nevertheless she is, always and quite openly, partial. On MARY's, not ELIZABETH's, side" (Lochhead, I, i. p. 12). La Corbie's narration seeks to liberate Queen Mary's image(s) from mispresentations made by anglo-centric male dominated official history writers and her partial and unreliable narrative challenges the notion of a singular and objective historical truth, inviting the reader/audience to critically evaluate various narratives and their construction by historians.

La Corbie, as a Scottish remembering/retelling figure, is also portrayed as a clever trickster with a talent for using different types of language and "generic slipperiness" as Ian Brown and Thomas Owen Clancy (2013) put it to define the main characteristics of Lochhead's oeuvre. La Corbie can slide between playful and pun-filled language to more serious and poetic language. One example is seen in how she tells the story of the rivalry between Scotland and England and the conflicts between

Mary Stuart and Elizabeth Tudor. Instead of just presenting it as a basic history which solemnly reflects the truth about past, she prefers a fairy-tale-like narrative style that combines the elements of folktale and myth with the following lines:

> Once upon a time there were twa queens on the wan green island, and the wan green island was split intae twa kingdoms.
>
> For the northern kingdom was cauld and sma. And people were low-statured and ignorant and feart o their lords and poor? They were starvin! And their queen was beautiful and tall and fair and… Frenchified.
>
> The other kingdom in the island was large and prosperous, with wheat and barley and fat kye in the fields o her yeoman fermers, and wool in her looms, and beer in her barrels and, at the mouth of her greatest river, a great port, a glistening city that sucked all wealth to its centre – which was a palace and a court of a queen. She was a cousin, a clever cousin, a wee bit aulder, and mibbe no sae braw as the other queen, but a queen nevertheless. (Act I.i. p.12)

This shift in narration holds a significant meaning as it playfully mirrors the establishment of the relationship between the two nations and the two women within a framework of clichéd or stereotypical binaries. The fairy-tale narrative form is employed as it most probably is the best version to encapsulate the didactic and dialectic portrayal of opposing forces, such as good and bad, poor and rich, and beautiful and ugly, typically found in children's stories. This type of narration through a crow's voice enables Lochhead to explore the complexities of the historical relationship through a perspective that embraces the familiar tropes and patterns of fairy tales, thereby inviting the reader/audience to contemplate on the role of reflection and interpretation in conveying the narrator's ideas.

The attempt to narrate the power division between the two nations with fable-like or fairy-tale phrases can also be conceived as a satire on childish biases and binaries that have been continued until today via ideological and historical discourses. This way of framing the tale of sixteenth-century Scotland and England suggests the identification of La Corbie with a bardic figure of Scotland and of England. Lochhead subtly gives an authoritarian voice to La Corbie as she is the ringmaster and the bard of the tale of the given two queens. The interaction and relationship between the two countries given in the historical documents and evidence are sardonically underestimated by La Corbie, from a Scottish female gaze. Ksenija Horvat (2005) describes La Corbie's narrativization of the past as "a folkloric symbol of Scotland, a cawing crow or a scalloped female bard, presaging the country's past, present and future in a profoundly sardonic voice" (p. 148). Accordingly, as a narrator, La Corbie

not only refers to the past but also establishes a theatrical tie with the present and the future, as the influence of the past echoes on them via discursive practices. In this respect, La Corbie's narrator voice, as noted by Horvat, is not serious and reliable, but rather cynical. At this point, the play veers from Bakhtinian grotesque or what he calls historical poetics to Greenblattian cultural poetics, as it is able to provide the audience with a profound insight into Scottish cultural practices and the power relations that have evolved out of these practices.

Besides, her partiality and manipulation of the characters is made clear through Brechtian dramaturgical ways. La Corbie frames the play by interfering in the dialogues and taking an active part in Queen Mary's decisions with her comments and music. Her chorus-like character is also another force in the play that reinforces or deploys the possible meanings in the perception of history and historical narratives. Additionally, in the following scenes, the audience witnesses the shift in La Corbie's role and the change in her patronage to the other character's role by "snap[ping] her fingers" (Act II, i. p.39). To exemplify this, she turns proud Queen Elizabeth into Bessie, Queen Mary's maid, and changes Queen Mary into Marian, Queen Elizabeth's maid. Even though she is expected to narrate what she is seeing, she is actively involved in the action, as she changes and reverses the roles and shapes of the characters. This conscious theatricality is very typical Brechtian Verfremdungseffekt, creating a distancing effect between the audience and the performance to constantly remind the audience that this is just a fictional narrative. This type of caution with the Brechtian distancing effect seems very intentional to warn readers that Mary Queen of Scots is just a play even though it alludes to real characters and real events. Also, as Koren-Deutch states: "This emotional distance therefore allows the audience legitimately to examine historical events through a filter of contemporary morality" (1992, p.425). As discerned from Koren-Deutch's suggestion, Lochhead constantly attempts to establish a continuum between the past and the present in terms of the ways that history is treated and perceived.

As well as deconstructing the mythical "facts of history", the play is deeply engaged in gender politics to seek the roots of ideologically constructed power relations through the distinct roles assigned to men and women. To that end, Lochhead follows Fredric Jameson's infamous motto "Always historicize!" and returns to the sixteenth century to uncover the interconnectivity between the past and the present in

terms of identity construction, in particular, that of the female identity. Therefore, Mary Queen of Scots can be a perfect example of this, as it historicizes the construction of female identity and gender roles in the Scottish patriarchal society. In Act one, scene two, the framework of the geopolitical distinctions between two countries and two queens is suddenly interrupted by the voices of commoners and ambassadors. In this scene, the ambassadors from different countries arrive in England and Scotland to convey marriage proposals of their kings or dukes to the two queens. What is striking in this scene is that the proposals and the queens' answers are always affected by the involvement of the commoners in the consort selection, which should supposedly be done by the queens. The cacophony of the different voices in the play gives the audience glimpses into body politics, culturally and ideologically constructed sexual roles, and the separation of spheres for women and men.

In sixteenth-century Britain, before the union of the Crowns, both England and Scotland were governed by an unmarried female regent. People thought that the lack of a male figure would have a negative impact on the political relations of their countries. Furthermore, it could leave the throne without a rightful succession, which could lead to chaos and bloody wars. Therefore, the only solution was marriage for the queens to stabilize their reigns and to secure their countries. This social pressure on the queens in the play is strongly felt in "The Suitors" scene, as seen in the following excerpt:

> AMBASSADOR 5 (to MARY) What think you of the King Denmark?
>
> AMBASSADOR 3 (to ELIZABETH). From the King of Sweden on behalf of his son, Eric -
>
> SCOTS NOBLE 1 (to MARY) The Queen should mairry a Hamilton!
>
> SCOTS NOBLE 2. No she shouldnae! She should mairry a Douglas.
>
> SCOTS NOBLE 3. A Gordon! (Lochhead, 1987, Act I.ii. p.14)

Even though each voice suggests different names, and some do not support various names for either religious reasons or political reasons, they agree on the idea that the queens must marry since the norm was a male sovereign and queens were the defendants of kings through marriage. However, the given period lacks a sovereign male subject and Lochhead in her play explores how deep-rooted patriarchal ideology inhabited the two nations and how these women wrestled with the given conditions.

The emphasis on marriage that the play proposes is based on a medieval patriarchal convention. There was a widespread belief that the king had two bodies

(Axton, 1977; Kantorowicz, 1957). The theory takes its premise from the king's divine right to rule. Accordingly, a king has both a physical and a spiritual body. His natural physical body is just like the other people, so it is subject to corruption and death, whereas the other body is exempt from earthly and physical attributes. Instead, the latter is heavenly, mystical, and divine. The incorporation of two bodies in kingship is of utmost significance for the continuity of the monarchy so that even when a king dies, the monarchy will live on. In this respect, this type of belief is just an ideological vehicle for the ruling monarch to exercise power and justify his acts. In the case of Mary and Elizabeth, the two countries lack masculine authorities and ruling figures, so the countries are open to every type of threat. To prevent this, the commoners, ambassadors, nobles, and almost every citizen are involved in the queen's choice of consort.

A forced marriage for a queen reveals another ideological discourse in addition to maintaining the power and security of the monarchy: separate spheres of males and females. It was believed in the sixteenth century that ruling a country alone was not the duty of these queens, not since they did not have the capacity to do so, but since the society excluded this biological sex from politics. This is mainly due to the fact that politics requires authority, aggressiveness, and the other behaviors that are associated with masculinity. Therefore, for an aristocratic woman, there is no choice other than marriage, as she cannot become a ruler alone since she must be a man's dependent, "if not his slave; the two sexes have never shared the world in equality" (de Beauvoir, 1949, p. 9).

It was believed that queenship was equivalent to domestic support of the king. Exploring the lives of aristocratic women in her book, Barbara Jean Harris (2002) argues that marriage is the only way for an aristocratic woman to maintain her power. However, her individual choice of husband is quite limited when compared to other women since their marriages will provide their husband with some legal rights, such as holding and transacting money, lands, and inheritance. In relation to the aristocratic women's marriage as a social force, Barbara Jean Harris states that "the material and ideological structures that defined aristocratic culture collaborated to secure women's compliance with the system of arranged marriage" (2002, p. 56). Thus, marriage for a queen means sacrificing her individual likes and dislikes for the welfare of the country,

as “she is only queen,” as Knox refers to Queen Mary (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, vi. p.34).

Concerning the male-oriented society in today’s Scotland, or Britain, Lochhead seems to trace the roots of this patriarchy in the idea of separate spheres and two bodies of the king in the play’s political commitment. Thus, the social pressure on women to marry to survive or maintain their power is the point of the play that gives rise to a sudden realization about the interconnectivity between the past and the present. This medieval idea is so persistent that it has been perpetuated to this day by the patriarchy through its power mechanisms. In 1949, the subordination of women and separate spheres were explored in detail by Simon de Beauvoir in her frequently quoted feminist book *The Second Sex*, in which she postulates the definition and evolution of women throughout history. When she questions what a woman is, she argues that she is defined in man’s terms, and she is what a man is not since

> [H]umanity is male, and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being… She is defined and differentiated with her reference to man and not with her reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute – she is the Other. (De Beauvoir, 1949, p. 16)

De Beauvoir’s implication is strongly felt in the play when the two queens feel the need to get married since each one cannot be a subject and a ruler of her country on her own. She is just the other and needs a husband for politics and governing the country from a patriarchal standpoint.

The acknowledgement of the limited individual choice of aristocratic women helps the empowerment of patriarchal power since the queen’s choice of consort is left either to her father or, as seen in the case of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, to the citizens. In Lochhead’s version, this is articulated by Knox when he and the people will decide on the person whom Mary will get married to. Thus, he says: “We, the people, should choose a husband fur a lassie rather than a silly wee furrin lassie should choose a king for a people” (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, vii). The involvement of the citizens, nobles, and religious figures in the queen’s choice creates an unstable atmosphere both for the queen and the country. This instability in the two countries paves the way for the opportunists to benefit from the restlessness of the country. Alluding to this historical background of (gender) politics, the play playfully lays bare the historical fact that Austrian dukes and princes want to take advantage of the

unsettled political atmosphere in England and Scotland because of the queen's bachelorhood:

> AMBASSADOR 6. (to ELIZABETH). Archduke Ferdinand of Austria…?
>
> AMBASSADOR 7(TO MARY) Archduke Charles of Austria?
>
> AMBASSADOR 6 (to MARY) Archduke Ferdinand of Austria ?
>
> AMBASSADOR 7(TO ELIZABETH) Archduke Charles of Austria? (Lochhead, 1987, Act I. ii.p. 14)

With the specific example of Austrian dukes, the given suggestions highlight how the patriarchy attempts to utilize every opportunity to perpetuate and exercise its power by exploiting women and their power for its own purposes. In fact, as Susan Doran highlights in *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (1996), during the period 1564–1568, there were marriage negotiations between Charles and Elizabeth. However, Emperor Ferdinand I also tried to ensure this marriage with the hope of inaugurating Charles as the successor of England's monarch. However, these negotiations ended with Elizabeth's refusal. Then, Charles became a suitor of Mary Queen of Scots to assist Mary in her governance of Scotland. These historical negotiations and Austria's will to expand were merely a patriarchal and political stratagem to gain control of Scotland and England. The political trap is subtly mocked and underestimated by the witty and sharp intelligence of Elizabeth in the play:

> ELIZABETH. Methinks they do try to play me and my Scotch cousin off against each other. We must keep the Emperor of Austria sure that Charlie and Ferdie will land him the fat salmon, England, until it is too late for him to net the skinny brown trout of Scotland. (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, ii. p.14)

On the one hand, Elizabeth's words remind the audience about the sharp economic distinction between the two countries, as metaphorically, one is a fat salmon and the other is a skinny brown trout. On the other hand, her comment reveals her foresight in politics and her wittiness to avoid any traps that the males and countries have set for these women. In this regard, from the very beginning of the play, the audience witnesses Elizabeth's powerful skills in the political sphere. She adopts a degrading and cynical stance against Austria's inappropriate attempt to intervene in English and Scottish politics through the idea of an arranged marriage and the possible "womanly" clash between cousins.

The political consciousness of Elizabeth is in sharp contrast to what one might expect from a woman in the sixteenth century. This expectation derives from the

distinct spheres of men and women in the society. The prescriptive roles and stereotypes for the two sexes are issues that are mentioned frequently in the gender studies. In Bodies That Matter, Judith Butler argues that sex is normative:

> It is what Foucault has called a 'regulatory ideal'. In this sense, then, 'sex' not only functions as a norm, but is part of a regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs, that is, whose regulatory force is made clear as a kind of productive power, the power to produce—demarcate, circulate, differentiate—the bodies it controls. (2015, p. 18)

What is suggested here is that sex is not just a categorization of biological difference, but a set of assumptions and norms prescribed for men and women. These assumptions formulate some rules for women and men to regulate the "suitable" or "ideal" behaviors for their sexes. In this respect, the distinctions in roles and spheres are the ideal site for patriarchal discourse to perpetuate its power and control the other.

However, as seen in the case of Elizabeth, some women can liberate themselves from the normative space of the biological determinism to resituate their power in the performative space of gender in Butler's term. This is possible for them by rejecting dominant cultural codes and adopting masculine behaviors without fear. Throughout the play, Elizabeth represents a perfect example of Butler's performativity. Elizabeth's aggressive behaviors and assertive sentences often invite the reader/audience to reconsider discursively constructed roles for women. From the very beginning, she uses impersonal royal language ("methinks"), which creates distance between herself and the others. This royal language is the reflection of her vaulting ambition not to share her royal power with a man in ruling England. However, in later scenes of the play, the audience sees that such a female character is completely drowned in the cruel masculine stereotype. To guarantee her own security and to be able to take control of Scotland, Elizabeth plots against her cousin, Mary, and arranges a marriage with the nineteen-year-old Lord Darnley, succeeding in leading her cousin into an unhappy marriage. These plots that Elizabeth instigates in the play are interpreted by M. M. Kostic as "the destructive masculine prototype, even reinforcing its cruelty by practicing cunning political opportunism she gradually takes pleasure in" (2014 p. 109).

Elizabeth's plots and cruel opportunism in the play are also portrayed by Lochhead as masculine. La Corbie describes Elizabeth in following lines: "And in England the Lass-Wha-Was-Born-To-Be-King/ Maun dowse her womanische nature" (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, v. p.23). Thus, from the very beginning, the chorus like

character La Corbie opens up the scene and manipulates audience's perception of Elizabeth with her emphasis on Elizabeth's suppressed femininity. By womanish nature, Lochhead does not imply that Elizabeth must obey the assigned roles, but rather she refers to her refusal to listen to her heart for the sake of her power and patriotic duties. In relation to this, the audience witnesses her readiness to use and abuse her lover, the English Lord Robert Dudley, for her political purposes. She sends him away to Scotland and is able to make him marry Queen Mary. She prioritizes her reign and power over her emotional relationship, as she says: "We really cannot have her married in France again, else the French King can straddle England with one foot in Calais, the other in Edinburgh, and piss down on us all fire, brimstone and poison" (Act I, v. p.25). As seen in her implication, the sense of fear outweighs her sense of love. Therefore, the fear of being executed as she witnessed in the reign of her sister, Bloody Mary, and her mother, is the main force of her performativity. Her royal voice, assertive tone, and masculine behaviors enable her to escape from the entrapping circle of patriarchy.

In history, Elizabeth adopts the concept of two bodies of the king to reassure her position and to announce her refusal to marry, and she issued an act in 1554 to deal with the absence of a masculine sovereign on the English throne. Parliament declared that all the rights and authority that a king has in the realm of monarchy can also be possessed by the queen to reign, rule, exercise, and execute "without doubt, ambiguity, scruple, or question" (as cited in Mueller, 2001, p. 3). This act also specifies the rights of a legitimate monarch of either sex to authority and power. The historian Carole Levin (1994) configures Elizabeth's masculine language and attitude in ruling her country as androgynous. Therefore, she notes: "It may mean that politically [a queen] is a man or that she is a woman who can take on male rights. She may be both woman and man in one, both king and queen together, a male body politic in concept while a female body natural in practice" (p. 124). This historical background of Elizabeth and her laws is significant in the sense that it offers a perfect glimpse into the construction of female identity, gender, and separation of spheres.

Indeed, Elizabeth's portrayal by Lochhead goes somehow parallel with historical accounts in its depiction of her powerful, duty-oriented personality. However, Lochhead's new historicist approach, as this study suggests, takes its premise on the representation of Elizabeth by shedding light on her psychological

vulnerabilities, weaknesses, imperfections, and the less apparent aspects beneath her powerful persona. In this regard, play's references to the recognizable past of Elizabeth promote the idea that how circumstances of the patriarchal period play great role in conditioning her conducts and influencing her way of ruling the country. These rigid rules of the given period and her painful past led her to be what she was. Thus, Lochhead tends to give her psychological conflicts and painful experience to prevent reader/audience from getting a fixed identity representation. The dilemma between the feelings and the choice of ruling power is observable in both queens. However, in Elizabeth's case, the decision between marrying the Earl of Leicester and ruling her country on her own as a queen is given in a nightmarish situation. In scene 5, the stage directions offer he deadlock that Elizabeth senses simultaneously both in real time and dream time through stage props and music:

> In dream lighting and strange music, very stylized, FIDDLER comes on with a doll whose head is off and she holds it separate by the hair. She is like a child and she is crying her eyes out. But slowly, silently. In real time and like a child, Elizabeth, still asleep, is crying for her dead mama (and her dead dreams if marry-ing LEICESTER too, probably) and tossing and returning. (Lochhead, 1987, Act. 1.iii.p.23)

Her nightmare as given in the stage directions once again highlights the influence of the past on the shape of present. The stage prop, the beheaded doll can be read as a symbolic mime to represent her childhood memories regarding her mother, Anne Boleyn and her execution. This painful past agitates her anxiety and densifies her stress as she profoundly fears of loosing her crown if she gets married to Lord Leicester. Then, she makes a decision with her own assertiveness:

> What shall it profit a woman if she can rule a whole kingdom but cannot quell her own rebellious heart. Robert, you are more dangerous to me than a thousand, thousand Norther Catholics poised and armed. I am not proud I love him – but I am proud that loving him, still I will not let him master me. (Lochhead, 1987, Act I, v, p.25)

As observed in Elizabeth's speech, Lochhead's play explores the idea that women tend to distance themselves from love within the realm of crown issues. This is because love in such situations is seen as more strategic than emotional. Elizabeth, the protagonist, consciously chooses independence and refuses to be controlled by a king because she understands that love often leads to an imbalanced relationship where women are seen as inferior to men. Both in the play and in real life, Elizabeth's decision to reject her femininity and adopt masculine qualities reflects how women internalize feelings of inferiority. By embracing traditionally masculine traits, Elizabeth prioritizes the well-being of her country over her own personal desires. This

transformation illustrates the challenges women face as they navigate societal expectations and power dynamics within relationships and society as a whole. Lochhead's exploration of gender dynamics in relation to love and power encourages the reader/audience to consider how women negotiate their identities and societal pressures. Through Elizabeth's character, Lochhead prompts the reader/audience to critically examine the ways in which women confront and challenge perceptions of gender inferiority.

The theme of inferiority is quite crucial in understanding or reevaluation of the queen Elizabeth. While Lochhead's portrayal of Elizabeth is in line with the anglo-centric historical evidences, it is indeed that Lochhead re-imagines her as a woman who implicitly plagued by the sense of inferiority. Thus, Lochhead subtly imbues her characterization with certain degree of jealousy, which she evokes through Elizabeth's interest in Mary's outlook and talents. In Act I, scene iii, Elizabeth asks her servant whether she is beautiful and compares herself to Mary, inquiring who is taller and more lovely. Besides, the dominance of role-shifting scenes enacted by the queens on stage further adds to the reader/audience's engagement with the text. These scenes see the queens transform into children, adopting different versions of their own names. This artistic choice allows for various interpretations, including the subversion of power dynamics, the loss of innocence, and, to a certain extent, an attempt to give voice to their lost childrenhoods. Both queens were crowned at a young age and thrust into the political sphere without a true understanding of its complexities.

However, another perspective arises when examining Lochhead's deliberate emphasis on Elizabeth's infertility. While Scotland is often depicted as barren and dark in comparison to England's perceived richness and fertility, the frequent presence of child actors on stage illuminates the fact that the true barren country may be England itself, lacking a suitable successor. It is worth noting that Mary's son, James, eventually becomes the successor after Elizabeth. In this aspect and others, Elizabeth's stereotypical image of power is constantly diversified, challenges and usually contradicts itself and Lochhead boldly presents alternative ways to imagine and understand the past.

Moreover, the focal point in the characterization or historicization of Elizabeth bases its premise on not only gender politics but also national politics, as her

characterization provides fertile ground to discuss state affairs between Scotland and England in the 1980s when Margaret Thatcher was in power. Lochhead herself highlights the similarity between the Elizabethan and Thatcherite masculinity that they display when they are in power. However, she adds that Queen Elizabeth is not Margaret Thatcher, but her characterization is important in the problematization and discussion of women and power. Given this, the contextualization of Elizabeth in the sixteenth century can be subversive and a reflection of "social prejudice in Thatcherite Britain through the manipulation of "the most pathetically interesting woman in the annals of [Scotland]" (Hume, 1903, p. 10).

The question of women and power is also problematized by Lochhead in her attempt to historicize and dramatize Mary's life from a new historicist approach. However, the presentation of Mary is much more complex than one might expect from a Scottish playwright. Initially, Queen Mary and her country are delineated in a sense of forced conflict or binary opposition. In this regard, Mary is presented as a countertype of Elizabeth. It is acknowledged that she was raised in France as a Catholic. When she returned to her country, she recognized Presbyterianism to placate Protestants, but she refused to change her Catholic faith. The three determinants of her identity, namely, her sex, Scottishness, and faith, are the main forces that make her portrayal complex and complicated since her posthumous image depends fully on the historian or artist's nationality, religion, and sex. As Lochhead confesses in the introduction of the play, Queen Mary is portrayed as either martyr or villain. Probing into the attempt of historians to create a stereotypical image of Mary, Danielle Grega (2017) postulates: "Any account of Mary, Queen of Scots's image therefore must contend with the romance, mystery, and misrepresentation associated with her life story" (p. 5).

To avoid any attempt to categorize, romanticize, heroize or vilify Mary Queen, Lochhead displays a very ambiguous character as much as she can. First, as Carol Lewis argues, Mary Stuart was posthumously conceptualized as a sexualized mother, thus making her a "complicated object of political and personal desire" (1998, p.20). This idea is echoed by Lochhead in the play in her depiction of Mary as passive and docile, which are associated with femininity. Mary becomes an object of desire and political manipulations in the beginning of the play since she tends to listen to her heart and follows her own desires, unlike Elizabeth. In the play, when Don Carlos of

Spain, a Catholic Prince of Spain proposes to her, she thinks: “He’d be the most politik marriage…” (Act I, ii). She wants to maintain her belief freely at home with her consort and she says: “I shall marry Don Carlos of Spain” (Act I, ii). However, her own desire arouses uneasiness in both Scotland and England since the Protestants are afraid of being executed, as Elizabeth’s sister, Bloody Mary, has done in the past. Therefore, again in an aggressive manner, Elizabeth refuses this type of marriage: “We shall never recognize her or her progeny as heirs to the throne of England” (Act I, i). Then, she has to give up her choice. Subsequently, Elizabeth arranges a meeting with a nineteen-year-old prince, Henry Stuart, and utilizes some tactics to lure Mary. Again, Mary is influenced by his mother’s Catholicism and is guided by her sexual desires, as Henry is very young and handsome. Therefore, in her case, marriage is presented something required for political intrigues but for her own female fulfillment.

As the play unfolds, particularly in Act Two, the portrayal of Mary undergoes a profound transformation, marked by complexity, contradiction, and conflict. In line with historical accounts, the reconfiguration of Queen Mary shifts from her initial depiction as a domestic, docile pawn in political contrivances to a more assertive and influential public figure whose actions bear significance for both Scotland and Scottish identity. Subsequently, Mary’s character evolves into a more humane figure, complete with her rights and fallibilities, who wrestles with inner and external conflicts.

This transformation is exemplified when Mary is portrayed as a sexualized motherly figure, offering both maternal care and authoritative presence to her ailing husband, Darnley, while he is sick. However, a pivotal moment occurs when Mary encounters the first coin of her reign, bearing the name “Henry and Mary” rather than “Mary and Henry”. Her reaction to this discovery is one of anger, prompting her to issue a command for its correction.

Later, Lochhead attempts to evoke an image of Mary as a Scottish heroine, as she is now popularly depicted as an epitome of Scottish identity and the symbol of independence (Grega, 2017; Horvat, 2007). The romantic heroization of Mary in Scotland is the direct result of the political atmosphere of post-Union Scotland. In other words, historians or fictional writers are attempting to redraw her image as a national heroine with the aim of preserving Scotland as a separate nation. To quote Grega,

> The Union sparked political protest against Scotland's treatment, prompting the birth of Scottish nationalism, a cultural development now known as the 'Scottish Enlightenment.' During this period, as a result of both the Union and the Industrial Revolution, 'there developed a sense, among many middle-class Scots, that the identity of Scotland was being eroded'. (2006, p. 26)

In the face of the British impact, some Scottish writers, including historians, developed a resistance to the erosion of Scottish distinctiveness. Therefore, they have started to return to the Scottish past and Scottish figures. This spurred a rejuvenated interest in Mary's life within nationalist concerns. Thus, the increasing interest in Mary's image is explained in nationalist terms as Gonzales (2004) avers, "With the passing of time, the icon has been assigned various antithetic identities born out of clear political agendas to either warn against women's wickedness or to represent the religious/ nationalist oppression of the groups that claimed revenge of her death at Protestant/English hands." (p. 144). With the aim of this, several published historical narratives of Mary's reign in the late eighteenth century reflected this interest. Thus, by incorporating narratives about her legitimacy and authority into her play, which were intimately tied to the politics of the time, particularly the growth of a nationalist movement, Lochhead also attempts to invite the audience to re-consider Mary as a strong nationalist symbolic figure.

As a strong national symbol, Mary is served by Bothwell in the play. After marrying Darnley, she is frustrated by his improper behaviors and segregationist insults, as shown in the following excerpt: "Mind you, the Scotch are as bloody bad. God made the Highlander out of a lump of dung… Then for the bloody Lowlander, He decided to economise on even that basic raw material" (Act II, i). These assumptions by the English that the Scots are backward, bloody, and violent make some Scots internalize this inferiority. Mary Queen of Scots and the portrayal of Mary as a cultural sign is significant in Lochhead's rewriting project. As Gonzales puts it, "[t]he revision of History then becomes essential to subvert the hierarchies of nationalist discourses, even if such recovery is made from the artistic text" (2008, p. 94). However, in the case of Mary in the play, she does not succumb to her feelings but starts to focus much more on her public duty. However, her occupation with political affairs makes her spend more time with her secretary, David Riccio, which leads to the murder of Riccio because of Darnley's jealousy. Moreover, when Darnley is killed in a plot in which Mary is supposed to die, people cry out things such as: "Burn the hoor! Burn the hoor!" (Act II, vi).

Mary's survival makes her and Bothwell suspicious about the murder of her husband, and she gets closer to him and eventually marries him after Darnley dies. The main reason Bothwell helps Mary is that he is well aware of the uneasy political atmosphere which may endanger the independence of Scotland, as the kingless country whose queen is accused of murder is open to every type of international threat. Prioritizing the country's sovereignty over anything else, Bothwell supports Mary against Knox's vilification attempts.

> BOTHWELL: And has she restored yin Scotch Catholic or yin abbey?Ye hae dingit doon the nests. The rooks are flown awa. Never tae return! Oh! The Queen does maintain her diplomatic contacts wi the Pope and aw Cathaloic Europe. Whit does it avail her? Jist words. ' Parole, Parole.' There are three things they can send: Promises, Hard Cash. Soldiers. Hae they armed her? Hae they fattened oor skinny Scotch coffers? I say we maun maintain her safely on this throne – otherwise foreigners will be forcit to intervene to uphold the vera idea o sovereignity and legality. On oor throne we hae a Catholic who has aye in word and deed affordit oor New Truth toleration.
>
> And she is oor queen. Anointed by God. (Lochhead, 1987, Act II, iv. p. 46)

As Bothwell explains to Knox, even though Mary has relations with the Pope and the Catholic European countries, she does not jeopardize the sovereignty of the country, as her relations are just a part of diplomacy, which depends on "promises, hard cash and soldiers" (Act II, iv). Actually, her Catholicism is the only diplomatic way to ask for help in the case of a sudden attack. Therefore, Bothwell thinks that recognition of her throne is the only way to preserve Scotland's independence and to avoid the intervention of foreigners, including England, in Scotland's domestic affairs. This message is most explicit when James I becomes the king of both Scotland and England in the aftermath of Mary's execution.

Even though Mary is notably considered nationalist due to her use of Scots, the Scottish dialect, interest in Scottish history, and Scottish identity, as a postmodern dramatist and poet, Lochhead never proposes a message of blind nationalism to her audience. In other words, she does not support a type of extreme nationalism that gives one a sense of superiority and allegedly the right to marginalize the other, as seen in the case of Darnley and Elizabeth. She does not view Scotland and its citizens as the best and the others as just the others. To avoid this idea, she dares to blame and announce the names of Scottish nobles in history who took part in David Riccio's murder. Riccio's murder can be considered as the climax of the play, as it changes the political atmosphere of the country, which eventually leads to the downfall of Queen Mary. Therefore, Lochhead prefers to recount this incident in the most traditional

Shakespearean theatrical device, the mummers play or play within a play in "Mummers and Murderers". Mummers, disguised players, visit Mary's court to perform the Masque of Salome. Salome, the daughter of the New Queen, is performed by Darnley. Mary becomes King Hesiod, who takes his brother's wife. Thus, the main characters are played in cross-gender roles, which shows us how gender identities are fluid and plural, as seen in the case of Mary. However, while this scene gives a significant idea of gender and roles, both of which are performative, it also reveals a significant historical event, the murder of David Riccio, Mary's Italian secretary, whom she trusts most at that time. While Darnley and Mary perform their roles, Mummers suddenly kill Riccio. While this leads Mary to take revenge on Darnley since it is his plot, La Corbie, the narrator, takes the floor and declares the name of the Scottish nobles who put their country at risk and destroyed the sovereignty because of their misogynism:

> CORBIE. There's Ruthven and Morton and Lindsay and Lethington, Ormiston,
>
> Brunstane, Haughton and Lochlinnie,
>
> There is Kerr o Fa'donside, Scott, and Yair and Elphinstone,
>
> There's Ballantin and Douglas. (Lochhead, 1987, Act II. v. pp. 55-56)

Considering the historical accounts, one cannot claim that these men killed Riccio, but what Lochhead tries to accuse them of is their hatred of female rulers and their backbiting, spreading the idea that Riccio was the father of Mary's baby. At the end of this scene, La Corbie continues to repeat the names as a stage direction "sotto voce" (Act II, v). This repetition of real names evokes the satire of the silenced Scottish narratives or historians who are afraid to accuse these nobles of murder because of their extreme nationalism.

It is indeed that Lochhead seemingly pushes the reader/audience to sympathize with the Queen Mary. Her outbursts, dilemmas, and conflicts distorts the evil presentation of Queen Mary in the past. However, in Act 2, as mentioned before, Lochhead deconstructs her own glorious image given by Bothwell and La Corbie and the street children of Scotland. The portrayal of the glorious past of Scotland which was very popular in Scottish historical drama during the 60s and 70s. Anne-Kathrin Braun (2004) views this tendency as the "attempts to glorify the past and were part of a clear political agenda that led up to the Devolution Referendum in 1979" (p.62). She

furthers her argument stating that that Lochhead's Mary Queen of Scots is a reaction or signifies a change in the direction of the Scottish theatre which idealizes it (2004). This twist from a sympathetic Queen Mary to a Queen who also has wrong decisions for her kingdom relocates the text in a new historicist approach.

Mary's inconsistency and emotions make her the target of the English queen's intrigues. Almost all her attempts fail owing to the other's intervention or manipulation. From this vantage point, she is depicted by Lochhead as the feminine ideal in Butler's terms, as she is the only subject in her own tragic story. Her weak condition and subjection to political threats echo the circumstances of Scotland at that time, which was poor in political and economic terms when faced with the looming threat that there would be a British Empire. In this respect, as a Scottish regent, Queen Mary can now also be interpreted as "representative of the subjugation—and even assimilation—of Scotland by England, despite her historical repudiation by the Scots" (Agustsdottir, 2012, p. 32) instead of a part of glorious proud national representative of Scotland.

The subjugation of Queen Mary is also explicit in her language. The assertive tone in impersonalized expressions such as "methinks" and "we" is the exact opposite of Mary's repetitive use of "I". Her use of the first-person pronoun portrays Mary as passive, subjective, emotional, and away from the royal power and royal language, which establishes distance between her personal life and her patriotic duty. Her insistence on utilizing "I" may stem from her endless endeavor to make her personality recognizable by her country, Scotland. Her personality includes the very axis of her identity, including her faith, desires, and personal choice of a future husband, as well as her language. Highlighting the use of language as a medium to convey the theme and meaning in Mary Queen of Scots, Dietmar Böhnke states that "Mary is characterized as a double outsider" by her Frenchified Scottish language (2006, p.318). She tries to speak Scottish by using French words or vice versa ("it's cauld enough to gie me chair de poule!" [Act I, iii]). She finds herself so strange to her country that she confesses: "Ah dinna think Ah'll ever understand this country o mine" (I, iii). Her marginalization by her own country makes both Scotland and Mary weaker and more insecure. Therefore, while Elizabeth thinks of marriage as a way to have children and to produce rightful successors for her kingdom, Mary wants marriage to reign over her country; therefore, she says: "I hae nae power tae mak my country flourish" (I, iii). Her

statement uncovers the female internalization of inferiority that de Beauvoir defines in The Second Sex: "Women can and do internalize patriarchal messages that women are not as strong, competent, and capable as men. This is known as internalized sexism" (1949, p.19). This internalized sexism causes Mary to have more internal conflicts and makes matters much more complicated, as she cannot claim her identity and power without abandoning her desires and faith. She attempts to express her feelings about how strange she is to her country, and how much her country is strange to her. She is very confused, and she expresses her heavy burden through a real stream of consciousness:

> The stour o the air clears, then, sherp, a kafuffle atween a Lennox an a Hamilton, a Hamilton and a Douglas…
>
> Haar fae the sea… Cauld… rebecks and chanters, a pretty masque and goldheired bairn presents me wi a filigree hert that's fu o golden coins, new minted. Clouds. Aflytin fae Knox. Daurkness. A mad poet tries to mak a hoor o me. Wisps… A revel! Smoke… A banquet for the Ambassador new fae Spain. Fog. A bricht affray in the Cannongate, abloody clash at the Butter Tron, a murdered bairn in the Grassmarket, sunshine, and a ragged, starving crowd o cheerin weans jostle to touch ma velvet goon as I go by. My kingdom. Alternately brutal and boring. And I canny mak sense o it at aw. (Lochhead, 1987, Act I.iii. pp. 16-17)

While this stream of consciousness reveals the deep internal conflict, it also encapsulates the real portrayal of Scotland in the sixteenth century, which is in stark contrast to heroic narratives or partial historical narratives that were written through the lens of English. Mary's conflicts result from both her character and her nation. The Scotland of that time is too complicated for her to understand and plan the right strategy to follow, and it leads her to inexorable deadlock. Thus, she is not as docile and passive as historical narratives depicted, but the pressure coming from inside and outside the country, political restlessness, poverty, class division, and other conflicts made her monarchy more unstable and more open to threats.

The denomination of Mary's femininity is not only figured by the English Protestants and/or historians but also by her own people. When she returns to Scotland from France, her arrival coincides with the establishment of a reformed Church, named the Kirk. Considering the unstable political atmosphere of the country and the previous experiences of the Protestants, Mary allows her citizens to embrace their own faith. However, John Knox, an ardent religious reformer, does not respect and tolerate her monarch. Consequently, Mary becomes the subject of constant humiliation and criticism by Knox because of her sex and her faith. With his cultural and religious bias,

Knox propagates a sinful woman image among the Scottish citizens, as he is against "the monstrous regiment o women" (I, iv). Even though Mary in scene 4 constantly tries to prove her knowledge and invites him to a bit tolerance, Knox communicates through a total authoritarianism and gives no space for flexibility in thoughts. Mary, just like the other women, is very dangerous to him. Thus, power of monarchy does not absolutely belong to Mary to his religious ideals, as political leadership is the realm specific to males. Related to Lochhead's rewriting of the sixteenth century religious uneasiness in Scotland, J. B. Harvie (1996) notes that "Mary Queen of Scots traces a legacy of religious repression and persecution in Scotland, foregrounds some of the detrimental effects of these conditions, and demonstrates their hegemony, so powerful they suffuse twentieth-century school yard play" (p. 124). In other words, Mary Queen of Scots harshly condemns religious sectarianism in Scotland, notably its concomitant misogyny, and demands that this history and legacy be remembered.

In scene 4, an ironic issue arises during the conversation between Mary and Knox, highlighting the detrimental effect of patriarchal religious authoritarianism. When Mary can no longer bear Knox's humiliations, she exclaims, "Ye are ower sair for me!"(Act I, iv. P.22), expressing her emotional pain and beginning to cry. Knox's response to Mary's outburst is depicted with poignant irony through stage directions: "KNOX is uncomfortable, genuinely. There is a stirring of certain pity, perhaps lust" (Act I, iv. P.22). This juxtaposition of pity and lust reveals how extreme patriarchal thinking paves the way for unhealthy emotions. Caring and pitying someone, viewed as humane characteristics, are considered effeminate to Knox. To avoid succumbing to these effeminate emotions, Knox retreats to his familiar masculine domain—lust—perceiving women solely as sexual objects rather than humans deserving of pity. This scene compels the reader/audience to contemplate the interconnectedness of religion and gender issues in the construction of today's patriarchal Scottish society, as well as the harmful effects this paradigm has on men, who are forced to alienate themselves from humane emotions and become trapped within rigid masculine confines devoid of kindness, flexibility, and genuine emotion.

This is another sign of the interdependence between the past and the present, as all these cultural biases drawn for Mary are the stereotypical assumptions about femininity, such as their being moody, emotional, weak, sensitive, submissive, and docile. However, while Lochhead reflects these cliché representations on Mary or

women in general, the portrayals in the play are able to take these framing biases one step further. Lochhead multiplies Mary's image as a challenge to patriarchal authorities and historical narratives. Even though she is under huge pressure, she maintains her Catholicism regardless of what she is subject to. Nonetheless, she never gives up her femininity or feminine aspect, as Dobson and Watson claim she was perceived as "all woman", and they continue their argument as follows: "In whatever mode she was displayed […] Mary Stuart remained a remarkably durable and potent version of femininity, a femininity that a remarkable number of women, and women writers, seemed to want to occupy" (2002, p. 100).

Referring to "the diverse interpretations of Mary Stuart's life," Gonzales (2008) avers that "Lochhead created a hybrid character that is subject to constant transformation throughout the play, thus connecting her text with contemporary" (p. 94). This transformation is observed particularly in Act Two. Lochhead constantly situates Mary oscillating between the passive, compliant, domestic configuration and active, assertive, powerful, intelligent image of Mary in the play's commitment to dealing with historicity and its impacts. Thus, her image is always in transformation.

Another issue in the play to be considered from a new historicist approach is Lochhead's urgent call for increasing the visibility of women in history and correcting their mispresentations. In Act Two, Bothwell, the husband of Mary after Darnley, is introduced to the audience. However, the scene is significant, as it discloses a recondite historical incident in sixteenth-century Edinburgh. Mary asks Bothwell about the rape and murder of a woman named Alison Craik, the daughter of an Edinburgh merchant. However, Bothwell tries to change the subject and accuses Lord Hamilton and his supporters of triggering the affray in negligence. Pertaining to Alison Craik, it is interesting that few historical sources refer to the woman and her murder since the focal point of the incident is the antagonism between the Scottish nobles rather than the murder of a woman. The incident is described by John Guy in the biography of Mary Queen of Scots. When Queen Mary returned to her country, Bothwell was appointed to the Privy Council after being an escort of the Queen during her travels (Guy, 2003). However, it is said that he could not do his job because of his enemies, Lord Moray and the other supporters of Lord Hamilton. To take his revenge, one night he visits Alison Craik to attend a mask party, which was a remarkably widespread party to allow the male gaze to view women freely in the sixteenth century. However,

that night, Bothwell was not received into the home, and a riot between the lords was sparked (Carpenter, 2007; Guy, 2003). John Knox describes the woman in this incident as a "hoore" (whore) (1559 as cited in Carpenter, 2007, p.626), and John Guy calls her a "mistress" (2003, p. 274). The reader does not know anything about that woman, as all the historical narratives are in the monopoly of the male gaze. Indeed, from the problematization of Alison Craik's murder, Lochhead shows the political dynamics of Scotland at that time, and, needless to say, the sphere of politics does not belong to women.

On the one hand, the fictionalization of this incident manifests how women and their fates are in the hands of men, either their partners or relatives. Women are exploited, abused, and sacrificed by men for the sake of their political or personal purposes, but few or no narratives, which supposedly tell the truth, give voice to them, their suffering, or their victories and power. As a dramaturgical challenge, Lochhead allocates one distinct act to Alison Craik, and Mary mentions her name many times to make her story heard by people. She declares her desperate attempt to end the scarification of women with Queen Mary's words: "I want, in my realm, Maister Hepburn O'Bothwell, that women should sleep sound in their beds./… No mair Alison Craiks" (Act II, ii). On the other hand, Lochhead's feminist protest against women's subjugation and exploitation, as in the case of Alison Craik, also reflects the deafness of history to allegedly the other. Throughout the play, she attempts to give a voice to the females and focuses on the life of Queen Mary, whose image is most often drawn and narrated by a male gaze. Highlighting the inclusion of the neglected in the past in literary texts, Jürgen Pieters remarks: "Literary texts give a voice to the past; they enable us to listen to its absent representatives and, more extraordinarily, to converse with them" (2019, p. 106). Pieters' understanding of the relationship between the text and excluded voices from the past is not limited to literary texts: both the dramatist and the historian expressly articulate that voice in their own ways. Furthermore, Lochhead's attempt to mention the name of this woman can be a perfect example of Pieters' argument, as it allows the audience/reader to renegotiate the past and the text with multiple meanings and new perspectives.

On the other hand, this scene sarcastically reveals Lochhead's feminist refusal of male domination in history writing. This is evident when Mary gets angry while Bothwell is telling the story of the riot and the clash of male nobles and ignoring

Alison Craik and her death. As soon as he says, “But, Your Majesty, there is a history to this dispute!”, Mary speaks in a crescendo: “I dinna want to hear your story! / Doom. A drumbeat” (Act II, ii). Mary’s refusal to listen to his story invites the audience/reader to consider the play as a herstory project of Lochhead. This refusal should be understood as political and strategic in the play’s textual and contextual meanings, as it aims to free women from being mere objects and/or victims of the male gaze and resituate them in the play as subjects. This is also notably linked to the stereotypical images of Queen Mary, as she does not wish to portray an image of saintly victim or seducing villain. She shatters the image of the passive and submissive queen that is imposed on her and conveys the message that women should be saved from being victimized by men in both factual and fictional life.

As seen in the play, Lochhead employs multiple images of Mary Queen as much as she can. Besides, she draws these diverse images as literary medium to connect Scotland’s cultural past and present. By so doing, Lochhead presents her own unique approach to writing history. She introduces a lot of uncertainties and raises questions about the possibility of truly knowing the past, especially when it is written by fallible humans who are influenced by socio-cultural and political contexts. This aligns with a new historicist perspective that recognizes the inescapable subjectivity inherent in historical narratives.

Lochhead’s portrayal of Mary Queen challenges traditional historical accounts by offering alternative perspectives and interpretations. By presenting different images of Mary, Lochhead invites the audience to question and reconsider their understanding of the past. She suggests that history is not a fixed, objective entity but rather a complex interplay of personal experiences, cultural influences, and political circumstances. In this way, Lochhead’s approach to writing history embraces uncertainty and highlights the limitations of historical knowledge. She recognizes that the past is shaped by individual biases, societal norms, and power dynamics. Lochhead’s aim is to encourage a critical examination of historical narratives and a recognition of the subjective nature of historical past which is open to constant re-reading and reinterpretation.

4. SARDONIC RENUNCIATION OF VICTORIAN VALUES AND ANXIETIES IN LIZ LOCHHEAD'S ADAPTATION, *DRACULA*

FLORRIE: No, no, Lucy, I didn't say bogies didn't exist. I just say bogies is all kinds and sort of things except bogies (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. xiii. p. 42).

Liz Lochhead's adaptation of *Dracula* had its premiere at the Royal Lyceum in Edinburgh in 1985. Later in 2009, it was published as a new edition by Nick Hern Books to supersede the popular Penguin edition. In the introduction to the published edition, Lochhead refers to the adaptation works of Isak Dinesen and Angela Carter. She expresses her interest in the narration styles of the familiar stories from different perspectives in which a woman becomes the subject rather than the object of the stories – aware of the fact that Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1798) reverberates the voice of Victorian sexual politics that suggest women's sexual desires must be suppressed and evoke guilt. This guilt-based female sexuality that the novel provides to the reader is but a starting point for Lochhead to refigure the Dracula story and its female characters. She finds the novel "soul food for feminine imagination" (Lochhead, 2009, p. viii). As well as gender and sexual issues, Stoker's Dracula is also viewed as a crucial novel that hints at late-Victorian anxieties about class, racial pollution and empire. Repetitively drawing her fictional rewritings onto history, Lochhead cannot hold herself in her Dracula adaptation. She ubiquitously bespeaks her gender and nation concerns by juxtaposing the real and imaginary. She takes what is gothicised and otherised in the novel and attempts to remodel it as a resistance against the oppression of British Imperialism. Given this, the main aim of this chapter is to explore Liz Lochhead's Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, a rewriting of a canonical work in its Victorian context and concepts. Therefore, the focal point of the present study is on the predominant conventionalised concepts of England during the reign of Queen Victoria, such as womanhood, sexuality, sisterhood, class, nation, postcolonialism and war. By drawing on a new historicist approach, this chapter will ponder on representations of master and servant, superior and inferior and the circulation of power relations in terms of three concepts: gender, nation and class. This study tends to conceptualise these themes in the same trajectory as they are the main agenda of the ruling ideology, where they constantly oppress and resist each other. Therefore, this chapter will examine the

ways whereby oppressive dominant discourses are operated and deconstructed through Lochhead's rewriting strategy.

Before delving into a detailed analysis of Lochhead's adapted text, it is essential to establish an understanding of the source material from which she derives her adaptation. Bram Stoker's novel, Dracula, stands as a literary classic with widespread popularity, capturing the attention of both writers and filmmakers alike. This enduring fascination has led to the creation of numerous films and TV series centered around the iconic and complex character of Dracula. Notably, these adaptations present Dracula in diverse archetypal roles, ranging from villain to hero and from victimizer to victim. The novel's engagement with themes related to gender and nationality makes it particularly open to adaptation that transcends conventional generic boundaries in fiction. This year, the National Theatre of Scotland is ready to premiere Morna Pearson's *Dracula: Mina's Reckoning* (2023). In this rendition, Mina Murray assumes the narrative voice, recounting her encounters with Dracula within the confines of an asylum in Aberdeenshire during the year 1897.

Academically speaking, it is one of the over-researched works which encapsulate the socio-cultural problems and concerns of the late-Victorian period in a Gothic mode. England was an imperial power at the time, and its industrial growth took its toll on society by creating huge gaps between the upper class and the working class. England increased its imperial power and encountered diverse nations through its numerous colonies. These rapid developments forced the Victorians to keep up with changes in conflicting intellectual and moral matters. Walter Houghton (1985) defines this age of transition as "the age of science, new knowledge, searching criticism, followed by multiple doubts and shaken beliefs" (p. 11). The Gothic novel emerged as a response to the sense of shaken morality and socio-cultural transformation of society in the eighteenth century. In Punter and Byron's (2004) words, "Gothic represented excess and exaggeration, the product of the wild and the uncivilised, a world that constantly tended to overflow cultural boundaries" (p. 7). From this vantage point, it can be said that Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) is a typical Gothic novel whose set moves back and forth between the wilderness of Transylvania and the heart of civilisation, London.

The novel's first half focuses on Jonathan Harker and his voyage to Transylvania, where Count Dracula resides in his castle. Harker, an English solicitor, goes to Dracula's castle to process an estate transaction. However, as soon as he arrives, Harker finds himself amid a series of strange events, such as terrible howling wolves, child-eating women and night terrors. Harker eventually becomes Dracula's prisoner. Once he manages to escape and return home, he learns that Dracula has been in pursuit and has attacked Lucy Westenra, the best friend of Harker's fiancée, Mina. Lucy is engaged to a wealthy man, Arthur Holmwood, but still flirts with three other suitors: John Seaward, a clinal doctor in the asylum; Quincey Morris, an American; and Van Helsing, a Dutch scientist who is not blind to alternative treatments conducted by the folk such as using crosses and stinky garlic flowers to avoid diseases. Thus, he is called upon to save Lucy. Despite the abundant precautions taken by the three suitors, such as garlic and crosses, Dracula succeeds in transforming Lucy into a vampire. When Lucy awakens from her tomb, she learns that the newspapers call her 'Bloofer Lady', a mispronunciation of Lucy's little victims. Hereupon, all the suitors and Jonathan join to give Lucy eternal peace through the famous staking scene.

The conflict between good and evil is explicitly framed in this simple plot. All the characters are fighting against one monstrous character, Count Dracula. He is discursively represented as what the British ruling class is not. In stark contrast to the British group, Dracula is defined in 'negative' terms as he does not reside within the central territory of civilisation. Thus, as a Transylvanian, he is encoded as immoral, perverted, bisexual, an outsider, primitive, untamed, backward and chaotic. Therefore, his invasive visit to England to transform English citizens into vampires is perceived as a cultural threat to Great Britain and British Imperialism. However, no matter how cunning and monstrous Count Dracula is, Jonathan and his companions manage to stop and silence Dracula. By doing so, Stoker offers relief to the Victorian readers and unequivocally grants the British ruling class a glorious victory in the end.

Lochhead brings Stoker's story to the stage by leaving the framing plot of Stoker's *Dracula* virtually untouched. Instead, she highlights the Victorian period's moral, political and cultural issues that are somehow problematically portrayed in the novel. Therefore, offering an alternative perspective to the given issues from a female view in a new historicist manner. She discloses Victorian society's genuine fears and anxieties that operate through Stoker's novel and elaborates on them with rebellious

imagination. By the way that she approaches Dracula, the literary production as a socio-historical document enables this study to adopt a new historicist theory to Lochhead's *Dracula*. Her adaptation permits her to create a new literary text in this context. She finds a literary domain to discuss and problematise the Victorian age's socio-cultural and moral issues that still, to some extent, dominate present British society.

Pointing to the significance of the adaptation of *Dracula* by Lochhead, Benjamin Poore (2013) states that "In the case of such a well-known novel as Stoker's *Dracula*, an adaptation can never be simply of the source-text alone, but of the cultural memories and associations generated by that source-text and its intertexts" (p. 87). As Poore states, the cultural memories of the Victorian age are reflected in Lochhead's play with its unique stage scenes that trespass the temporality of time and space. It moves back and forth between London, the asylum and Dracula's castle – especially in act one, scene ten, where the composite scene stages three settings simultaneously. By so doing, she evokes conflicting moral upheaval of the given time by shattering the unity of place and time.

As for theme and plot, she does not diverge from the path of Stoker. However, Lochhead historically knits a theatrical tie between the seemingly 'glorious' age of Britain's past and the Thatcherite present. Using Dracula's story, she initially calls the reader or audience to revise the socio-economic terms that Britain went through because of the extreme privatisation and capitalist policies. Stoker's Dracula does not depict the plight of the working class and their suffering; instead, he tends to portray the ruling class's double-dealing sufferings to maintain the British culture and tradition. The ruling class's conventions are grounded on class strata, economic exploitation, privilege, and the social power they possess due to their inheritance.

In several metaphoric readings of *Dracula*, the monster stands for capitalism, so it is shown to be a threat to the ruling class. It offers the working class an opportunity to climb social ladders and accumulate property like the bourgeoise. Jennifer Harvie explains the middle class's anxiety through the following lines:

> Fear of declining bourgeois power is stimulated more specifically by a growing and increasingly powerful working class and anxious perception that this class may potentially supersede the bourgeoise in controlling cultural power. Whatever specifically provokes this fear, Stoker's Dracula is strongly inscribed with the fear of declining bourgeois power. (1996, p. 59)

Facing this threat, the four middle-class males start a war against Dracula and defeat him at the novel's end. The final triumph of the British ruling class over the evil or monster is symbolically defined by Jennifer Harvie as "a late-nineteenth-century fantasy of ruling class hegemony where the ruling class is British (or, more precisely, English), imperialist, bourgeois, male, heterosexual and liberal humanist" (1996, p. 51). In this respect, the glory that the male characters achieve in the novel must be considered an ideological agenda that attempts to maintain and naturalise the constructed social hegemony.

The ideological agenda set in the novel's background constitutes a crucial landmark in Lochhead to unfold the twentieth century's socio-economic and political atmosphere. The 1980s were different from the 1800s. The hypocrisy of the ruling class, unfair distribution of power and the sexual, racial and economic exploitation of unprivileged groups perpetuate the present ideologically. The play was performed in the 1980s, coinciding with Britain veering from a social state position to an extreme privatised economic system due to Thatcherism, which had a tremendous toll on Scotland and Wales. Thus, the plight of the working class and privilege battles of the ruling class perfectly suit the socio-political transition period of Britain at that time,

> Britain […] was a country ill-at-ease with itself, reeling from the alienating ideological and industrial shifts of Thatcherism, which were particularly strongly felt in the north of England, in Scotland and in Wales. One response was the dark escapism of Gothic rock. Whether the movement is read as a critique of bourgeois culture and resistance to gender and sexual norms, or as means of expressing discomfort with the realities of the late-capitalist, postmodern Western world. (Poore, 2013, p. 91)

Therefore, Lochhead imposes the idea that bloodsuckers have transformed and taken many shapes except for vampires, referring to the twentieth-century vampires. Florrie's following remark strengthens this argument: 'I didn't say bogies didn't exist, I just say bogies is all kinds and sort of things except bogies' (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. xiii, p.13). By evoking horrible supernatural creatures, such as vampires, bloodsuckers and bogies, Lochhead appeals to the power of imagination and somehow forces the reader and audience to think about the horrible things they experience daily in the grim reality of life. The implicated idea is to invite the reader or audience to think about those who constantly exploit the underprivileged group.

Considering Lochhead's persistent dedication to her prominent triple concerns: class, gender and nation, it would not be wrong to regard the bogies as a metaphoric

reconfiguration of working-class exploitation. In Stoker's *Dracula*, there are several working-class characters, like the maidens of Westenra house, the children who play in the streets and become the target of the bourgeoise Bloofer Lady (vampire Lucy), an old sailor, Mr Swales, who has a Scottish accent and others. However, the locus of power is always reserved for the upper-middle class. At the same time, the working-class people are somehow kept otherised, voiceless and always under the supervision of the bourgeoise character's first-person narrations. For Franco Moretti (1982), this narrative strategy of Stoker to otherise Dracula and working-class characters functions collectively, so it is called "collective narrator" (p. 77). Lochhead's adaptation deconstructs this collective sense that the novel offers and gives voice to the otherised characters and enables them to express themselves in dialogues. In this regard, the novel's adaptation to drama perfectly serves Lochhead's purpose to rise against the subjugation of underprivileged groups in British society.

Giving voices to the working-class characters starts with Lochhead's characterisation. To start with, Florrie Hathersage is Lochhead's invention and contribution to Dracula's story. She is the servant of the Westenra sisters, Lucy and Mina, and is responsible for the mansion's daily chores and the sisters' wellbeing. She is the most down-to-the-earth character in the play as she is aware of the world's grim reality in which people are classified according to their economic status, gender and race. Life is so busy that she does not have time to dream or think about herself, which becomes most explicit when Mina asks her whether she is happy or not:

> FLORRIE: Happy, miss? … I haven't thought to think.
>
> MINA. I hope for you to be happy, Florrie.
>
> FLORRIE: (curtseying). Yes, miss.
>
> MINA. Don't 'Yes, miss' me, that is not very familiar!.. Don't you think we can all work together, be—what's the cliché—one big happy family? … Call me Mina! Florrie, we want but one year to a brand new century, times are changing, we'll have no more mistress and servants, I don't believe in them. (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. viii. p. 28)

The concept of a large family is a significant Victorian value of the bourgeoise as it is the demo model of the idealised society. Sally Mitchell (2007) describes the Victorian family in the introduction of *Family Ties* as "often idealised as a model of parental authority, loving relationships, inner harmony and secure values untroubled by pressures from the public World" (p. xi). In this cult of the domestic sphere, there is a father who indisputably represents authority. Thus, he is the boss of the family and

responsible for everything, and the mother is a devoted helper and docile towards her husband. Other family members are also submissive to the boss and contribute to the family with hard work, religious devotion and dedication (Nelson, 2007).

Mina's remark reminds Florrie of a social cliché; however, it also alludes to business companies' famous motto: "one big happy family?" (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. viii. p. 28). It is often the case that big businesses, organisations and companies use cliché metaphors to connotate positivity and create a familial bond between the worker and the employer so the worker can feel at home while at work. Nonetheless, in this discursive relationship, the boss condemns the worker to hard work, significant contributions and limitless allegiance. Therefore, the cult of domestic authority and cooperation among family members can be read as an incredibly meaningful implication in revealing the operation of power both in the domestic and public sphere. In this case, it would not be a surprise if one asked: who actually takes advantage of this idealised family discourse? Because the boss demands hard work, the contribution is made by the worker to the employer. For this very reason, Lochhead highlights the influence of Victorian parental values on people, and she displays it as an ideological means to control its members. She presents these domestic mores as a political strategy in emotional and financial terms to contribute to the upper class's comfort zone and maintain its hierarchical order.

Additionally, Lochhead distorts the pure angelic idealized woman image of Mina Murray and she opts for unfold her hypocrisy as a representative of the middle-class and her feigned concerns about the subjugation of Florrie as a working-class person in situational irony. When she does not receive a letter from her fiancé, Jonathan Harker, Mina's mood suddenly turns terrible, and she yells at Florrie in anger: 'Florrie! Florrie, look at the mess in there. Things everywhere! Go tidy it up! (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. viii. p. 30). This sudden mood swing is the reality of Mina and other middle-class characters in the novel. From a psychoanalytic point of view, these characters are analysed with the double theory.

Almost all of them have inner conflict and identity crises, and their double entendres are personified in vampire form. However, Florrie is the only character who does not have any inner conflict or double, so in Benjamin Poore's words, she is the 'down-to-earth' character (2013, p.88). Thus, Mina's sudden orders are received by

Florrie in bitter but mocking derision: “FLORRIE: Don’t believe in servants? Oh, don’t believe in servants, don’t you, that’s very interesting. Better pinch yourself, Florrie my girl, look in the mirror, pinch yourself to see if you’re real” (Lochhead, 1985, Act I.viii. p.30). As indicated above in Florrie’s rhetorical questions, Lochhead attempts to discover some answers about the dream of a classless society or questions about whether social equality is possible. She attempts to illustrate the sharp dichotomy between what is seen and genuine by the discourse of the large family. As seen in Mina’s case, financial equality, which can destroy the master-servant relationship, is empty rhetoric for the upper class and politicians to attract attention or to use people for their benefit. A society that is not based on class segregation cannot be desired and cared for by the middle-class because they take their power from the lower class’s weakness or rather their underprivileged socio-economic position.

Furthermore, Lochhead links the class-based hierarchy with gender-based inequality in Victorian society. Therefore, she traces the construction of sexuality, sexual norms, taboos, and hierarchy in Britain’s fin de siècle time. In this regard, as observed in the relationship between Mina and Florrie, Lochhead examines to what extent a classless society was possible even in the twentieth century. This interpretation is strongly supported by Lochhead’s reconfiguration of Mina Murray and Lucy Westenra as Westenra sisters. By so doing, she invites the reader to question, if there were a real sisterhood between these female characters, would the novel’s sexist premise on women be different?

At the end of the Victorian age, almost every aspect of society was rapidly transformed. Britain had been experiencing a moral panic as people were keeping up with society’s political and economic changes. Therefore, Victorian morals, which set taboos and banished overt sexuality for women, were at stake and questioned and resisted by both sexes. In this respect, women started to gain their property rights in the family; they refused to give birth to unintended children and education and employment conditions improved. Those women who were aware of their rights and preferred to resist being oppressed by male figures for political and cultural reasons were called ‘new women’. They were famous for pursuing their sexual instincts and enjoying new experiences and pleasures. They sought self-fulfilment instead of self-sacrifice. Thus, as they firmly believed in equality, they did not present submissive

behaviours. They were often well educated, intellectual and open to following their sexual desires.

It is interesting that Lucy and Mina are depicted as New Women in Stoker's Dracula. While Mina represents the intellectual side of the new woman, Lucy, as stated by Elaine Showalter in *Sexual Anarchy*, "represents the new woman's sexual daring; sought after by all the men, she girlishly wonders, "why can't they let a girl marry three men, or as many as want her?"' (1991, p.180). In Stoker's novel, Lucy's uncertainty in her choice of husband implies that women, just like men, desire to be polygamous, so she refuses the cultural and sexual presumptions placed on women. However, the novel also premises the idea that, in a patriarchal society, a woman who pursues her own sexual desires must be tamed or destroyed. Consequently, she becomes Count Dracula's victim and returns as the Bluffer lady, threatening and biting the children. This is most likely a metaphor or cautionary tale regarding the rising women movements that began at the start of the twentieth century because they enacted a threat to society and children. From a male gaze, Stoker seems to approve of women striving for their own legal rights. However, it is also made explicitly clear that he is not into the idea of sexual freedom. Thus, he conveys that marriage is safe and necessary for women and children. Children represent the next generation, and single, polygamous or sexually free women are shown as demonised and/or cursed because they are a significant threat to future generations and the established hierarchical order. Thus, even though Mina Murrey exhibits the new woman's characteristics, according to Showalter, she is acceptable because she is eager to get married and have children and is more conventional/domestic compared to Lucy. That is why she was able to 'be saved' by the male characters at the end, whereas Lucy's sole remedy was certain death with a stake driven through her heart.

Lochhead does not totally omit the double standard that is imposed on women and their sexuality and does not distance herself from Stoker's plot. In Stoker's terms, Lucy becomes unclean and evil, so her tragic end remains the same with the source text. However, Lochhead's reconfiguration of the character depiction and the way those women wrestle with the issues raising from a beastly character makes the play deep, controversial and political. To put it differently, without making significant changes in the plot, Lochhead plays with language and representations by adding

humour, irony, parody and character contribution through which she captures the sense of resistance against the oppressive discourses operated in the novel.

In accordance with this argument, Stoker's Lucy Westenra's sexual impulses and interest in sexuality are depicted by Lochhead in a rather cynical, funny, yet thought-provoking way. Lochhead's play begins with Lucy's song: 'Who shall I marry/ Tom, Dick or Harry? She kisses her own lovely reflection in the mirror' (I. i. p.3). Due to her familiarity with Margaret Atwood and the feminist framework of her writings, Lochhead uses Atwood's recurring mirror image in the depiction of Lucy. This is most likely because she wants to incorporate her feminist concerns into the character building. A mirror is a traditional metaphor used to reflect a woman's split character and generally symbolises subject/object and active/passive dichotomies. She kisses her duplication in the mirror because she thinks that what she sees in the reflection, the reflection of her body, is her true self.

The fragmentation in her identity also shows itself in Lucy's obscene jokes and Lochhead's repetitive use of ellipsis in her lines.

> LUCY: Sometimes I can't help think…
>
> MINA: What?
>
> LUCY: Nothing… (A sigh) Just…
>
> MINA: Just what?
>
> LUCY: Just, I wish something was going to happen to me. (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. i. p.4)

The duplication that she sees in the mirror reflects her sexual self, who aspires to be active; yet, the society in which women have to be passive, docile and delicate makes her hesitant even to use the word sex as it is a big taboo for women. After exploring the sexual education of women during the Victorian age in "Eyes Tightly Shut", Hall (2004) avers how girls were condemned to be limitlessly obedient to their husbands and away from the pleasures of sex without marriage. Thus, in the sexual pedagogies of girls, as Nelson suggests, "There was silence, suffering, anxiety, and fear enough" (Hall, 2004, p.54). Lochhead censures the word "sex" with an ellipsis to reflect this dominant social custom. However, her repressed sexuality hovers around the play and makes itself blatant in almost each of Lucy's lines. Therefore, Lochhead's satire is not based on the visibility of the word in the play through repetitions, but it lurks behind Lucy's silence.

Another example that shows the association of female sexuality with uncleanliness is the depiction of a woman's menstrual cycle. Lochhead problematises the idea that biological menstruation makes women unclean by evoking the sense of monstrosity. After a stormy night, Lucy calmly shows up. When Florrie asks the reason why she looks pale, she answers: "LUCY. Oh, nothing! I've got a visitor… Must have come in the night… My friend, my bloody friend. MINA. The curse" (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. xi. p.38). The visitor not only resonates with the evil, monstrous Dracula but also evokes Lucy's menstruation. Besides, Mina's view of the visitor as a curse is the voice of a society that conceives menstrual blood as unclean and demonic. In this respect, the analogy between the monstrous visit of Dracula and a menstrual circle is clear enough. But, in Lucy's case regarding the bloody friend, the vague appellation demonstrates both society's perception and Lucy's embrace of her own body.

The ambivalence in the perception of womanhood and a woman's body is also embodied in the visual imageries of the play, particularly the flower image. At first, Mina is depicted as a perfect 'English rose', praising her virginity, purity and femininity. Florrie's name also evokes the tie between womanhood and flowers. However, as given below, Lucy's rose petals shatter the single image that associates virginity and purity with flowers and makes the flower referent, diverse, ambivalent and/or ambiguous.

> LUCY: Roses, roses, oh, I do love roses. So sad when all the pretty petals fall… Mina and I used to gather up all the petals in the garden when we were little, and put them in a jar with rainwater and try to make a perfume. Did you ever do that, Florrie?
>
> FLORRIE: Should think all little girls did, Miss Lucy.
>
> LUCY: But after we left it a week it always festered. Stink and fur! So then we'd turn into a poison. We'd put in… oh, a dead mouse and, …pee and poison-pods from off the lupins. It was even better fun making poison than making parfume. Don't you think anyone'd rather?
>
> (Lochhead, 1985, Act I.xii p.45)

The given excerpt provides insight into Lucy's character and her relationship with Mina. It hints at their childhood innocence but also foreshadows Lucy's fascination with the macabre and a willingness to explore the darker aspects of life. This transformation from innocent play to a more sinister fascination may have implications for Lucy'ss character development as the story unfolds. Besides, with a metaphoric mime, Lochhead shows to what extent a flower can be poisonous and fatal even if it

evokes a sense of delicacy, beauty, purity and life. Therefore, through Lucy's characterisation, Lochhead liberates the forcedly imposed stereotypical definitions of femininity. She, as Harvie (1996) postulates, "extrapolates that associative continuum to include not only fragrant perfume, at one end but festering poison, at another" (p.80).

However, from a new historicist perspective, it's crucial to recognize that the context of femininity in this play does not solely rely on binary oppositions in meanings and perceptions. What this research reveals is the amplification of meanings and references related to concepts such as femininity, virginity, purity, sex, and desire—topics often treated as taboo for women. Through the diversification of these allusions, Lochhead normalizes and emancipates these concepts from their status as unspeakable issues, providing a lens through which we can examine the evolving roles and constraints placed on women within the historical and social context of the narrative. In this regard, those roses exemplified here can connotate both virginity and the dangerous situation that can occur at the loss of one's virginity. They can also refer to the birth-death-decomposition-rebirth eco-cycle. Just like in life, the biological issues of womanhood, such as virginity, menstruation, sexual desire and sexual exploration, are construed as significant cyclic progress of women's self-fulfilment. This is also very explicit in Florrie's answer when Lucy asks Florrie what sex is like: "Very strange. Very ordinary" (I. xiii. p.43). In line with this, this research argues that Lochhead does not prefer to delineate a woman's body and bodily functions from one perspective or its opposite. Instead, she obfuscates the binary dichotomies. Therefore, the point in rose imagery is not that purity offers eternal obedience/fidelity to men or kills attraction, but that roses should be seen as the natural cycle of life. When considering the social customs that confined and controlled women during the Victorian era, "Lust was male, and lust was evil" (Nelson, *Sexual Pedagogies*, p.55). Thus, the trapped mindset of society in terms of the dual dichotomy of its perception of femininity is seen. Lochhead seems to have linked this dichotomy to the perfect cycle and balance of life and death, which is very strange and ordinary at the same time. Therefore, the suggestion that the play offers can be seen as a strategic and literary resistance against a discriminatory dominant discourse.

Apart from deconstructing the pernicious lusty image of Lucy as demonstrated by Stoker, Lochhead also does not allow her to be incapacitated by patriarchy in an

exaggerated way. When Lucy gets sick because of Dracula's bite, her fiancé Arthur, a hybrid character of wealthy Englishman Arthur Holmwood and clinical psychiatrist John Seaward, shaves Lucy's hair. Appalled by her appearance, she complains about Arthur and his efforts to make her look like a schoolgirl. Even when Florrie explains that her health was the reason for the haircut, she does not believe in this justification for what he has done to her. This awareness demonstrates the fact that Lucy refuses to be patronised by the male dominance coming from her 'Daddy… Arthur… Someone…? I forget … (Pause.) Dead and coiled in a box.' (II. ii. p.49). Thus, all the male characters in her life, including Dracula ("dead and coiled"), want to patronise her for some reason.

Nevertheless, Lochhead shatters the expectation of a subjugated woman image from Lucy without transform her into a vampire and lets her to express her anger. In Dramatic Laboratories, Anne-Kathrin Braun (2004) discusses Lochhead's invocation of Lucy and below quotation expresses how Lucy struggles with her position as a woman:

> Yet in spite of her anger, Lucy is still wavering with her regard to her own position as a woman. She misses her hair mainly because it used to please her father: "Said he loved it long and loose and me looking like a little schoolgirl" (Dracula 114). Her future husband has turned her into a schoolboy, deprived her of the sexuality she threatens to develop independently of his command. (p.139).

Braun highlights Lucy's inner conflict and the societal expectations placed upon her as a woman in the Victorian era. Lucy's anger and frustration stem from the realization that her impending marriage to Arthur Holmwood has led to a transformation in her appearance and identity. Her mention of her father's preference for her long, loose hair reflects the idea that her primary role as a woman is to conform to the desires and expectations of men in her life. Also, the reference to looking "like a little schoolgirl" underscores the infantilization of women in Victorian society, where they were often expected to maintain a youthful and innocent appearance. This perception restricts her agency and autonomy.

In contrast to Stoker's portrayal of Lucy in his writing, Lochhead takes a twist in her invocation of Lucy. While Stoker's narrative suppresses Lucy's inner conflicts and ultimately transforms her into a monstrous outcast, Lochhead chooses to reveal these internal struggles. Lochhead's depiction of Lucy adds depth to her character and challenges societal attempts to marginalize her or women without empathy. This

choice by Lochhead features Lucy's acute awareness of how her desires and sexuality are stifled by both her future husband's expectations and the prevailing societal norms.

In the second act of Lochhead's re-writing, Lucy undergoes a transformation into a vampire with a particularly unsettling shift: she preys on young poor children. This narrative choice can be seen as a deliberate attack on the idealized image of Victorian womanhood, which often emphasized motherly virtues and a prescribed social role. Rather than nurturing the children, Lucy becomes a predator, feeding on their blood for her own sustenance. In the source text, this demonic representation of women, as embodied by Lucy, is met with an exaggerated staking scene as a form of punishment. However, Lochhead takes a different approach. Instead of subjecting the reader/audience to a graphic depiction of Lucy's demise, she narrates the staking scene in a succinct manner. Thus, she just narrates the staking scene in the fifteenth scene with a few lines: "Just a single stroke. There is a single gasp, a deep sigh or a sort of shudder of LUCY's voice. Certainly nothing violent, not a scream, but a consummation" (Lochhead, 1985 Act II. xv. p.79). This staking scene is often read by a male gaze as a sexual ritual or aggressive manifestation of male perversion in their sexual fantasy. (Braun, 2004). However, avoiding exaggeration in this staking scene can be considered as quite strategical to reinforce her political stance by siding with women, just like Lucy who are demonised and severely punished as they follow their sexual impulses and reject the social roles assigned by patriarchy in an effort to control and confine them into one stereotypical angelic image.

In the play, Mina, unlike Lucy, seems like a stereotypical angelic Victorian woman as she is domestic and caring. She refuses the intimate prenuptial advances of her fiancé, Jonathan Harker, to protect her virtue. She is a conformist to the extent that she thinks that "her mother would turn in her grave" if she disgraces her family with premarital sex. Therefore, her virtue is elevated with an appellation in a cliché mocking way: the "Proper English rose" (Lochhead, 1985, Act I.vii.p.23). In this respect, through a stereotypical image of womanhood in Mina character, as Braun (2004) puts it "Lochhead takes off and goes beyond the mask of social conformity." (p.141) the reader/audience meets a stereotypical woman who is forced to learn how to repress her desire and pretends not to understand any sexual implications as indicated below:

> JONATHAN: Mina, let me come and sleep with you tonight.
>
> MİNA: Jonathan!
>
> JONATHAN: Let me come. I'll hug you close and keep all the bogeymen away.
>
> MINA: Oh. Jonathan, we cannot- not here at Heartwood, Mrs. Manners would know- and Florrie and Lucy and… everyone.
>
> JONATHAN: I'll sneak into your room secretly after everyone is asleep. Damn it, who cares if they know? I love you. Let me love you. (Lochhead, 1985, I. vi. P. 18)

From a new historicist perspective, this excerpt from Lochhead's adaptation offers a window into the societal norms and constraints of the Victorian era. Jonathan's request to sleep with Mina and her hesitance to comply reveal the strict moral and social codes that governed the behavior of individuals, particularly women, during this period. His desire to be close to Mina is not just an expression of affection but also a reflection of the societal expectations of marital intimacy and companionship. However, Mina's reservations about this act are indicative of the strict surveillance and judgmental gaze of society, represented by characters like Mrs. Manners and others.

However, later on, the play implicitly challenges Broker's representation of Mina by giving her patronising manners that constitute a threat to the Victorian patriarchal establishment. Indeed, Showalter (1991) says in Bram Stoker's novel, "Mina represents the New Woman's intellectual ambitions. […] With her "sweet woman's heart" but her "man's brain"' (p.180). Nevertheless, she later accepts how Mina has yielded under the oppression of patriarchal hegemony, so Mina gets hysterical and becomes a dutiful wife at the end of the novel because, as Showalter states, "[she]is a dangerous hybrid, who must be domesticated through hysteria" (1991, p.181). This transformation, as aptly given by Showalter, is seen as a means of domesticating her dangerous hybrid nature, a consequence of challenging traditional gender roles.

In Lochhead's play, Mina retains her ambition and zeal to secure her inheritance, much like in Stoker's novel. That is why, even though Jonathan wants to get married at once, she aggressively denotes: "Jonathan! My inheritance" (I. x. p.17). Such kind of materialist attitude is emphasized and repeated by Lochhead. However, Lochhead's Mina is more aggressive and has the type of dominant manners that could be associated with masculinity. She gives commands to Florrie, often scorns her sister Lucy and can turn her face to Jonathan when she hears that he is sexually attracted to

Dracula's three vampire brides. Therefore, Lochhead's Mina is far from being a dutiful and submissive wife to Jonathan or any other man. After Mina and Jonathan marry, she undergoes a sexual transformation, embracing her confident sexual desires in the play when Jonathan asks whether she knows what he desires, her response is "Loving-Mina-to-bits-on-Mina's big-fat-goosefeather-bed?" (Lochhead, II. vii, p.59.) This portrayal contrasts sharply with Stoker's Mina, further breaking free from the limitations imposed by traditional gender norms.

Lochhead's transformation of Mina can be seen as an act of resilience against patriarchal norms, possibly influenced by Cixous's concept of "l'écriture feminine". This feminist literary theory explores the physical and spiritual aspects of the female experience, emphasizing the transformative power of writing. L'ecriture feminine is fundamentally concerned with the transformational power of writing. Cixous (1976) describes it as an "explosion, diffusion, effervescence, abundance" and emphasizes that women find pleasure (jouissance) in being limitless (90-91) According to Cixous (1976), jouissance serves as the wellspring of a woman's creative power. However, the suppression of this profound pleasure hinders women from fully embracing their empowered voices.

Lochhead celebrates women's pleasure (jouissance) with her own creative abilities, which are often suppressed in a patriarchal society. In line with the notion of jouissance as a liberating force, Lochhead empowers Mina beyond the confines of her time and the stereotypical dutiful image portrayed in the past by Stoker. By blurring the lines between novel and drama, Lochhead presents Mina as a character who challenges the barriers imposed by patriarchal systems and breaks away from the idealized feminine perfection. In this context, Vampire is only trigger to the women's instigation. Women gain dominance and primacy. The excerpt below taken form Braun (2004) explains the issue of women's dominancy in Lochhead's version:

> Lochhead's 'interpretive licences' in her adaptation seem all derived from such areas where the position and relationship of Stoker's characters is already unstable. Turning to such narrative openings, Lochhead exaggerates the textual signals present in Stoker's novel and excavates those that are absent or suppressed. (Braun, 2004, p 13)

The portrayal of female jouissance is metaphorically associated with the movement of tides, embracing nature and empowering women, resonates with Lochhead's depiction of Mina's transformation. This concept signifies a profound connection to oneself and a sense of boundless freedom, ultimately defying oppressive societal constraints. Thus,

Lochhead with generic slipperiness between novel genre and drama, she empowers Mina who goes beyond her time and stereotypical dutiful image. She breaks through the barriers of patriarchal system drawn in the past by Stoker and goes beyond the image of ideal of feminine perfection. In this regard, some feminists argue that Freudian "hysteria" is the distorted expression of jouissance under the influence of patriarchal culture. They propose that jouissance represents a transcendent state, liberating women from oppressive linearities and societal constraints. Female jouissance, akin to the movement of tides, reaches out to cover and caress the shoreline, embracing the undulations of the cliffs. Within this notion lies a sense of boundless freedom and empowerment, symbolizing a profound connection to nature and oneself.

Ostensibly enough, Lochhead problematises the objectification of women and the double standards imposed on women through Mina and Jonathan's relationship. As a stereotypical Victorian male, Jonathan has polygamous desires and feels attracted to women apart from Mina. This is most obvious when he implies his intimate relationship with his secretary, Miss Bell which is more than a boss/employee relationship. He defines her with fruit images as he says things like, "Miss Bell? A peach. A poppet. Actually, yes, she is quite delicious…"(I. iii. p.12). He is even attracted to his fiancé's sister, Lucy, and their servant Florrie. When Jonathan visits the Heartwood house, and Florrie serves the dinner, Lochhead humorously presents Jonathan's flirtatious and unfaithful nature:

> FLORRIE: Leg or breast, Mr Jonathan?
>
> JONATHAN: Pardon?
>
> FLORRIE: The chicken, sir. Leg or breast?
>
> JONATHAN: Breast. No. Leg. Leg. Breast… I think… emm.. could I have a little piece of each please, Florrie? (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. x. p.15)

The fruit and chicken imageries that Lochhead uses here have explicit sexual connotations regarding female sexuality. However, Lochhead propounds food imagery to show how the Victorian male's imagination objectifies women's bodies and how humorous their insatiable desires sound in a patriarchal society versus how Lucy's teasing talks are perceived as disturbing and unsettled. Lochhead resists this double standard by depicting Mina as masculine and possessive. Thus, when Lucy shows interest in Jonathan, Mina warns her: "Hands off, miss. He's mine!" (Act I. i. p.5).

This sense of possession in a woman for either a husband or an inheritance can be read as the displaced or inverted imagination of a Victorian male and must be read as a threat or challenge against the oppression of men and objectification of women. Mina's authoritarian manners over her fiancé liberate the representation of Victorian women from idealised stereotypical models such as angelic, submissive, dutiful and domestic.

However, there is also something meaningfully vexed in Mina's aggressive attitude toward her sister and servant. At first, Lochhead refigures Mina and Lucy's characters as sisters, which seemingly aims to create a sense of female support. Given that, their connection to each other through blood connotates the idea of sisterhood and community, particularly when Lochhead's feminist concerns are considered. Besides, the reader/audience is invited to consider this sisterhood community in Mina's repetitive sisterly behaviours; they are often inconsistent and humiliating. In this regard, it is obvious that Lochhead attempts to unite these three women and make them the subjects of the Dracula story instead of objectifying them. However, it is also clear that her attempts to unite them either by blood or social/ist reasons fail because there are other paradigms in the background, such as class, temperament, identity and education. To exemplify, Lucy is too emotional to have a stabilised mood. Besides, it seems that her father's death has traumatised her a lot, unlike Mina. Besides, Lucy is more impulsive and overly sexualised no matter how much she tries to repress it. Mina exhibits a strong personality, especially in maintaining her inheritance and virtue, but she is too selfish and self-driven. As for Florrie, she does not belong to Lucy and Mina's world as she is a servant. Their unique and distinctive characteristics do not necessarily refer to the idea that Lochhead succumbs to patriarchal oppression. Rather, it conveys that women cannot unite in the face of such extreme patriarchal practices on women. Lochhead also admits that no one 'could have seen Dracula and called it feminist' (Wilson, 1990, p.28). However, as Kiki Gounaridou states, 'But feminist drama need not, should not, present only strong, triumphant women […] A sympathetic rendering of female sexual uncertainty can also be understood as feminist' (2011, p.89). Therefore, it would be proper to argue that the representation of disunited women in theatre contrarily invites the reader/audience to avoid the generalisation, totalisation and stigmatisation that women have been subjected to for centuries. That may be why the play does not end with the hope that Mina's baby arouses, but rather

the hope captured through red petals in the play. The hope grounds the play not in fulfilling the roles assigned to women by someone's pressure but in women accepting themselves as they are. This seems to be possible with diversity and ambivalence rather than a single or general type as society wants. With this purpose, Lochhead refashions Dracula's story into a destructive force of repressed sexuality in a theatrical form to free women from diminutive stereotypes and generalisations.

In Dracula, Lochhead not only wrestles with the ideological one-sided and restricted approaches to women's sexuality and gender-based hierarchy but also the explicit representation of her contempt for racial hierarchy and ethnic prejudice that have otherised people throughout European history. As David Punter declares in his book, The Literature of Terror, 'Gothic has been, over the last 200 years, a mode of history and a mode of memory' (2014, p.188). In this case, it can be argued that Stoker's novel is the literary form of a cultural history that is established by Stoker and negated by the then-dominant racial discourse of the given Victorian age. It is therein that the colonial aspect of the novel is evoked.

Even though Stoker's novel is narrated by different voices via first-person narration, it is not polyphonic and heterogeneous, as seen in Liz Lochhead's Dracula. All the characters in Stoker's novel homogenise the narration and unite under the holy duty of English society to destroy evil. However, Lochhead disrupts this social and narrative unity by giving voice to the characters who were silenced in the Victorian period due to their mental status, social status or their banishment from society due to a perceived representation of pure evil. Even if Stoker's Count Dracula does not have a distinct, separate voice in the narrative compilation of the novel, Jonathan's diary reports Dracula's strange feel through the following lines:

> Here I am noble; I am boyar; the common people know me, and I am master. But a stranger in a strange land, he is no one; men know him not—and to know not is to care not for. I am content if I am like the rest, so that no man stops if he sees me, or pause in his speaking if he hear my words, to say, "Ha, ha! a stranger!" I have been so long master that I would be master still—or at least that none other should be master of me. (Stoker, p. 22)

These words that Dracula utters inevitably direct the attention of the reader/audience to the postcolonial context. Issues, such as feeling like a stranger to your country and yourself, are central to Homi Bhabha and a feeling coined by him as 'unholiness' in The Location of Culture (1994). This unholy feeling, according to Bhabha, is an inevitable result of hybridity that he defines as 'neither the one nor the other' (1994).

When considering Transylvania's geographical location, which is far from London, the heart of Europe, and has a border with the East, Dracula entitling himself and his country as strange seems very meaningful.

Even though it is a part of Europe and there is no official colonial connection with Europe, the cultural distinctiveness of his own country makes him feel foreign. Given that, his hierarchical position as a master in his country does not satisfy Dracula. Thus, his attempts to pursue Jonathan Harker and the other characters as representatives of the British middle class symbolically stand for reversed colonialism. From the historicist approach, this context reflects the anxiety of the Victorian class as it was the age when significant notions, such as colonialism, expansionism and imperialism, were at stake. However, many scholars also elucidate that Stoker providing the British middle class with a victory over Dracula promises the invincibility of the glorious British Empire and offers a sort of relief.

When it comes to Lochhead's Dracula, one easily notices no big difference in Dracula's characterisation between the source text and adapted text. The tragic end of Dracula is also the same in Lochhead's adaptation. It is not until the seventh scene that Dracula appears. This delay is most likely due to her enthusiasm about presenting her contributions, Florrie and Mina and Lucy's sisterhood, at the very beginning of the play. She also seems very aware of this suspension, as in Act I, Scene 7, she suddenly leaves the stage to Dracula. While welcoming Jonathan into his castle, Dracula hits the mark and seemingly addresses the reader/audience and their expectations with 'At Last! I am Dracula' (I. vii. p.20). From this moment on, Lochhead delves into the concerns about British imperialism and the expansionist strategies of the Victorian age.

At first, Lochhead uses Dracula's appearance and voice to construe the ideological and physically chaotic atmosphere of the Victorian age. When he has a conversation with Jonathan, Dracula depicts London as such:

> DRACULA. Through my books, my friends whom I love, I have travelled all over your great country without leaving my own armchair. I am pressed by the throng of your London crowds in their Brown fog. I flow with them over London Bridge, to the heart of the city. The rush of humanity, its life, its change, its death – all that makes it what it is. Books are good. But I lack the living tongue. (Lochhead Act I. vii.p.26)

As stated above, he articulates how the industry has placed a great toll on the city and paves the way for this chaotic, noisy atmosphere. The 'brown fog', 'crowd', 'rush of humanity' and 'change' are the meticulously selected words used to satire Britain's

greedy and speedy industrialisation, and 'the death' also refers to how the city has lost its vivacity and vividness owing to both ecological destruction and the lethargy of the citizens. This kind of depiction is very familiar to those who have read at least one of Charles Dickens' novels. Besides, Stoker's Dracula is also knowledgeable and acquainted with England and English writers. But, unlike Stoker, Lochhead does not present him and his ideas in an enclosed reported speech from a British class perspective, which is nationally superior to Dracula. Rather, she gives him a distinctive voice.

Regarding Stoker's novel as a cultural text, particularly from the new historicist perspective, propagating and celebrating the superiority of British middle-class values and traditions and giving a voice to a monsterised character is a very deconstructive act. Thus, the real deconstruction against the oppression of Western hierarchical structure, which is observed in the play, starts with a distinctive language that enables Dracula to express his ideas in his own way.

As soon as Jonathan arrives at Dracula's castle, he tries to show his hospitality, but his language is so distinctive, playful, ironic and sarcastic that almost none of his sentences have one certain meaning. At the welcome session between Dracula and Jonathan, Dracula welcomes Jonathan with a caustic remark, 'What's mine is yours' (I. vii. p.21). This is apparently a playful and humorous implication that points out the possessive and expansionist behaviour of the British Empire. Besides, when he addresses Jonathan, he does not avoid using his own cultural way of calling names, so he puts the surname first and then the name, such as 'Harker Jonathan' (I. vii. p.21). Later, he apologises for miscalling Jonathan's name and defines himself as a person who '[has] the manners of a barbarian' (I. vii. p21). By doing so, Lochhead, from the very beginning, demarcates the binary difference between English culture and Transylvanian culture. And his definition of his manners as barbaric vocalises the hostile perceptions of British people towards other ethnic cultures and groups. Thus, unsurprisingly, England is portrayed as the new world of industry, rational thinking and revolution, while Transylvania epitomises the old world of mystery, horror and superstition. Therefore, the play lays bare the fact that Western ideology is based on the rule of otherising as it establishes a hierarchical order between cultures and nations.

In accordance with this, the people who stay in the margin of central Europe and are economically more powerful than the others feel strange and inferior in political, cultural and physical aspects. In this respect, the binary opposition between us and them becomes the natural and inescapable result of this ideology. The power of the powerful lies in the discourse that leads to the internalisation of inferiority. However, Lochhead's adaptation offers another sense of meaning behind the seen expressions of Dracula. Even though his words claim that he is barbaric, the reader/audience does not feel convinced that he accepts his inferiority because Dracula's character is quite a cynical teaser. Thus, this sentence that he utters sounds very ironic and even challenging as he dares to contempt Jonathan's so-called superiority with his wit and language skills.

Moreover, as the conversation between Dracula and Jonathan goes on, Lochhead gradually veers to the significance of origin and cultural distinctiveness. Again, she employs the words of Western otherising language but, interestingly enough, deconstructs them in an ironic and parodic way. This is quite clear when Dracula explains the meaning and origin of his castle's name, Carfax.

> DRACULA. And every Englishman's home is his castle, don't you say so? Well, I shall make me fine English man. (Pause) Carfax. Is strange name, yes? Perhaps from the French. Quatre Faces. Such corruption of language interests me much. 'Four Sides'. Ah well, I suppose there are at least four sides to every question. Is that not so, Mr Harker? (Act I. vii. p.22).

On the one hand, the aspiration to be a 'fine English man' reflects how Dracula seems to be influenced by Britain's political and economic dominancy over the other countries within Europe. On the other hand, his quotation above also invites the reader/audience to consider him outside of the dominant cultural territory. Thus, it must be reckoned with a 'corruption of language' as Dracula states.

The issue of language always draws Lochhead's interest as she belongs to a nation with three official languages. However, as often stated in her poems, such as 'Kidspoem/Bairnsang' and 'The colour of black and white', Lochhead expresses her disdain over the imagined superiority of one culture over another through the occupation of one language and the decay of the other. This should not be mixed up with linguistic variety and variations. She is just averse to the monopoly of one language for political and ideological reasons. Scotland in the 1940s and 1950s, as

Lochhead represents it, ‘is an occupied nation - occupied by anglicised thought structures (Anne Varty, p. 40).

The way Lochhead handles Dracula and his country ostensibly suggests that she corresponds with Scottish identity and history. At first, just like Stoker’s novel, Transylvania and its citizens are judged by a British male gaze. As soon as Jonathan arrives there, he defines them as ‘A fascinating mixture. They seem full of good qualities. But very, very superstitious. . .’ (Act I. vii. p.24). From this definition, those who are familiar with Lochhead and her work can easily establish the relevance between the stereotypes about Scottish identity from British male-dominated history books and the definition of Transylvanian people from a British male character. Lochhead gives a voice to Dracula because, no matter how evil, he must not be judged according to British terms and their stereotypical standards. Thus, he deserves a voice in order to make his own definitions and terms about his people as follows:

> DRACULA. Foklore, my friend. You write it down in your recipe book. ‘Fascinating mixture’? ‘Mixture’ is true. You are at heart of Europe. In the deeps of the dark forest at its black heart. My country is a whirpool. Of blood. The Berserker, the Hun, the Magyar, the Turk, he came, he conquered, he was conquered, he bred, and he bled. There have been so many battles on this soil that the earth itself… you have phrase, I think, from your Bible? ‘Flesh is grass.’ I wish to turn this upside down. Here in my country the grass… is flesh. (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. vii. p24)

As given in the excerpt of the play, at first, Dracula feels a need to correct Jonathan’s statement about ‘superstition’ by replacing it with ‘folklore’, which excludes the implicit judgement of the allegedly superior group. Then, he reveals how his people are ethnically hybrid because of the invasion of different rulers and emperors. He furthers his explanation by creating an analogy between ethnic hybridity and the crossroad. However, he then suddenly declares his dislike of the crossroad and uses the word ‘whirlpool’ instead of ‘crossroad’

Using the whirlpool image instead of a crossroad is quite notable when considering Transylvanian ethnicity and history and Lochhead’s political stance. He is left in the margins of Europe as a Transylvanian. At first, it connotates the chaotic situation in the country due to the expansionist and imperialist endeavours of the other countries. Thus, the word implicitly unfolds the social malaises of expansionist politics. The constant wars in the country have devastated Transylvania and ruined its stability and peace. What is more, these constant wars to conquer the nation have led to the cultural and ethnic variety that characterises Transylvanians as a ‘fascinating

mixture' in Jonathan's words. However, this mixture, to Dracula, or rather Lochhead, does not necessarily refer to the intersection of the two. This is because it mainly connotates the binary opposition between one and the other, just like the imaginary lines between European blood and others. To challenge this idea, Dracula postulates the whirlpool image in which there is no stark line between black and white and one and the other. Transylvania's ethnic and cultural variety is so interconnected and interdependent that there is no distinctive difference between the culture's colours. There is no superiority among them: the more colourful they are, the more beautiful they are.

The use of the whirlpool rather than the crossroad image in the definition of Transylvania, especially when acknowledging Lochhead's dedication to forging Scottish identity and history, also seems very relevant to Scottish history. That is why it would not be wrong to claim that Lochhead, consciously or unconsciously, establishes a bond between two countries and draws the reader/audience's attention to the negative outcomes of (British) imperialism. Like in Transylvania, the Scottish population is a fascinating mixture of Celtic highlanders, Anglo-Saxon lowlanders and Norse heritage, which comes from archipelagos. Scottish history is full of independence wars against the kingdom of England during the 13th and 14th centuries. However, even after the union of the crowns in 1707, these wars did not end. Instead, they led to different versions of conflict and discrimination.

Such wars, either in Transylvania or Scotland, are seen as part of the ideological games of privileged rulers and lead to loss and devastation, which Lochhead presents in her Dracula adaptation. No form of such an expansionist policy should be seen as glorious. Lochhead explicitly propounds a disdain against imperialism in Dracula through the mouth of Florrie. In the play, Florrie has a lover, and he enlists in the army either by force or to earn money. When he joins the war, Florrie receives a telegram. Even though she is illiterate, she easily understands that her lover died in the war. Florrie starts to curse the war, the generals and the British Empire, as seen in the following lines:

> FLORRIE: (WAVİNG TELEGRAM). Cant read. Cant read. Dont need to read. Telegram from the military, it mean just one thing. Dead. Dead, you bastard. Torn up bits of you all over some patch of dirt other side of World. Bloody generals! Bloody Empire! Dead and me three weeks late. (Lochhead, 1985, Act II. iii. p.51)

As seen in Florrie's case, her lover is dead, and she is three weeks pregnant. Thus, the wars leave people alone and kids fatherless, making both sides desperate and desolate. This is the only statement where Lochhead explicitly verbalises her hatred of the expansionism of the British Imperialism in the past and goes against the present, discriminating and unfair policy that Britain imposes on other nations and cultures.

Furthermore, with the help of Dracula's lines, Lochhead points out how the violence and oppression of Britain have changed and continue to exist in different forms even though the physical wars have ended somehow. To put it differently, she not only romanticises people's pain due to the consequences of the war but also shows the other versions of violence that emerged courtesy of the establishment of parliament and the emergence of democracy. This bond between the past and present in the Gothic genre is very political and strategical because, to William Hughes, 'Superficially, Gothic – to be Gothicized, even – liberates that past, allows it to again be present in all its oppression and arbitrary injustice' (p.89). According to Lochhead, the new forms of conflict, which are based on otherising, polarising and ethnic and cultural discrimination, seem more dangerous and vile. Dracula postulated this through these lines: "Ah… democracy. The twentieth century. Ah yes… The warlike days are over. Blood is too precious a thing in these days of dishonourable peace" (Lochhead, 1985, Act I. vii. p.24).

Dracula's mention of the dishonourable peace refers to the idea of feigned peace established by international agreements and/or strict domestic regulations. Also, it is dishonourable because it leads to the polarisation of society, class-based hierarchy, and new ways of maintaining superiority through political, cultural and ideological means. Even though Transylvania has a colonial past due to the eastern imperial powers, such as the Ottomans, Turks and Habsburgs, one cannot claim that Transylvania is similar to India or other African countries exposed to Britain by severe exploitative practices. Besides, Transylvania is part of Europe. Nonetheless, it is simply ideological and discursive. Thus, the matter for countries is how to situate in the centre or margin of Europe. Dracula strongly feels like an outsider as he stays in the territorial and psychological margin of European culture.

Acknowledging the historical background of Transylvania, Lochhead, through her adaptation, seems to find great opportunities to use her play as a political

metaphor. It is mainly because the history of Transylvania evokes Scottish history and how Scottish culture has been influenced in the face of English supremacy in both cultural and political aspects. Like Transylvania, which is officially part of Europe, Scotland is not a colony of Britain, though it is already a part of the United Kingdom. However, one cannot assert that Scotland is culturally and economically independent and free. The history of Scotland teems with the conflicts of those who aspired to use their native languages, such as Gaelic and Scottish, with the oppression of England and compulsory use of English. Thus, Britain's cultural and ideological occupation and oppression are undeniably felt in both nations. Lochhead thereby connects two countries' past and present through explicit and implicit theatrical metaphors.

To sum up, the play presents the reader/audience to the extent that a familiar vampire story can be allusive, political and profound at the same time. Lochhead utilises the gothicized Dracula story to discuss the significant socio-cultural codes, morals and politics of Victorian society. Later, the reader/audience is invited to re-appraise the present's socio-cultural system. Some diminutive and otherising practices are still operated through the circulation of dominant ideology and discourse. Dracula's ability to change shape reverberates in the play with the idea that changing shape is a form of oppression and violence. That is why Lochhead knits a theatrical tie between the past and present, as 'bogies is all kinds and sort of things except bogies', according to Florrie (Lochhead, 1985 Act I. xiii. p.42). Through the use of binary opposites, symbolised by shadow, mirror and picture imagery, Lochhead exposes the falsity of the mimetic representation of women in terms of a sisterhood who have universal experience, and nods to the existence of plural feminine identities. The perspective offered here implies that the female imagination seeks to revise the traditional perception that represses and demonises woman's sexuality in literature. Also, initially inspired by the idea of the guilt-driven sexual impulses of Victorian women, Lochhead finds a literary domain to articulate her disdain for gender and racial binaries. Therefore, the voluptuousness of the vampirical elements in *Dracula*, which Stoker employed to demonise women and racially the other, has been an ambivalent continuum used to comment on imperialism, conventional gender roles, stereotypes and all kinds of hierarchical structures in society. Thus, instead of giving particular attention to one aspect of the novel in her adaptation process, Lochhead touches upon almost every aspect of the matter in Stoker's novel, as Dracula states in the play: 'there

are at least four sides to every question' (Act I. vii. p.22). She digs out the hierarchical and discursive establishments in the past. By unfolding the rigid distinction between good and evil, seductive and angelic, civilised and barbaric, she plays with the borders of transgressions between these polarised concepts and blurs the line between them. By doing so, this research suggests that Lochhead eliminates socio-cultural judgement and stigmatisation and opens people and nations to new possibilities in which the worn distinctive lines of the past dissolve in the whirlpool of diversity from a new historicist approach. Besides, by revealing the lurking ideology behind the limited Victorian values and anxieties of Stoker, Lochhead raises political and social awareness through her drama. Herein, her play is quite ambivalent, allusive, referent and sarcastic.

5. MEDEA: RECONSTRUCTION OF A SURVIVAL STORY IN A MANSPLAINED TYRANNICAL WORLD

"Stories save your life. And stories are your life. We are our stories,
stories that can be both prison and the crowbar to break open the door of that prison" (Solnit, 2017)

This chapter focuses on Liz Lochhead's 2000 adaptation of Medea which was originally written by Euripides. It is indeed that the Lochhead's Medea is often considered as modern translation of the classical work which is about the revenge of a mythological "witch" character on her adulterer husband Jason by victimizing her own children. However, this translation is not literal one in which she translates the entire work word by word. Instead, she is faithful to Euripides' Medea only in structure, then she comes up with her own revisions in narrative style and characterization. In this play, with punctuation-free but plenty of gaps between words in narrative, Lochhead veers the emphasis from on the plot itself to the representation. This is most probably because the source text includes plenty of misrepresentation about womanhood as it is the production of a long-standing androcentric world. Even if Euripides centralizes a woman in the story, he, from a male perspective, cannot prevent himself from vilifying Medea because of the things she has dared for her love. Given to this, Lochhead lets it go with the plot but makes it more profound story by which she invites the reader/audience to consider this story from a different female angle. She depicts a woman who makes a lot of mistakes for the sake of love but has been betrayed at the end and forced to exile without children. Furthermore, Lochhead, as a part of her recurrent attempts, fosters Scottish dialect and aspect to the story and makes it quite relevant with the past and present of English-dominated androcentric Scotland. By doing so, she also delves into the meanings of being a foreign in her own land. She displays the circumstances of a woman who lives in a place (even if it is highly civilized Greek city) where everything is explained by the male terms and regulated by hierarchical ideology, and she puts the emphasis on the power of a woman who is able to survive after all she has gone through. The present chapter hereby aims to scrutinize those revisions which reveal the ideological influences lurking behind the source text in a new historicist approach.

To grasp the better understanding of Lochhead's Medea character, a brief information about Medea story which comes from Classical Greek mythology would

be necessary. There is no distinct story about Medea in mythology. She originally plays a part in the story of Jason, "the first hero in Europe" who dares to undertake a challenging journey which is well known as "the Quest of the Golden Fleece" (Hamilton, 1942, p. 161). According to the story, Jason's father, the king, is betrayed and deposed by his uncle Pelias. In the meantime, Jason is raised as a powerful hero and as a future rightful king who can regain the throne when he grows up. When Jason returns to Colchis to claim the throne, Pelias tells him that he will only give it if he brings the Golden Fleece to his country. Gathering the legendary ship team, "the Argonauts" including the most famous and best heroes of the Greeks, Jason sets out for the Golden Fleece. When they arrive in Colchis where the Golden Fleece is protected by a dragon, Medea falls in love with Jason at first sight with the help of Aphrodite, the goddess of love. This pivotal encounter in Jason's voyage helps Jason and his crew a lot in fetching the Golden Fleece back to Corinth as Medea's father King Aetes does not permit them to take it. Medea as a princess does not abstain from using her dark powers against her family and country and she dedicates herself to Jason's achievement. With the help of Medea, Jason can tie two horrible bulls whose breath flames fire and plow a dangerous field from which horrible mighty warriors springs, make the dragon sleep. Then, Medea flees from her country and joins the Arganouts. On the way to Greece, Medea helps Jason kill her own brother as he is pursuing them. When they arrive in Greece, at the palace of King Pelias, Pelias refuses to keep his promise and does not leave the throne to the rightful heir Jason. Then, Medea grudgingly uses her magical powers and lets Pelias be torn and devoured by his daughters, piece by piece. After this incident, Medea and Jason must flee from Iolchis and land in kingdom of Corinth under the kingdom of King Creon. Corinth is where Medea is cheated by Jason with Creon's daughter Glauce and ostracized by the Corinthians. The story ends in Medea's revenge by killing the king, the princess Glauce and her own children.

This tragic end of Jason has been added by fifth-century poet Euripides in his famous tragedy Medea. Her story and the depiction of such an evil and vengeful sorceress offer significant glimpses about Ancient Greek society's dominant ideology which is based on extreme act of misogyny and xenophobia. Lochhead seemingly seeks after revealing these ideological influences in Euripides's Medea and she draws her particular attention to the issue of her mis-representation which is based on

pernicious definitions and terms such as witch, evil, outsider, child-murderer, revengeful and so on. Thus, when she decides to adapt Medea, she first starts with humanizing her by getting Medea stripped of all kinds of male-centered misogynist definitions and stereotypes. Then, with a cross cultural montage technique, she playfully replaces Euripides' constant references to Greek culture and the Olympian Gods with the recurrent emphasis on Scottish culture and natural cycle which signifies the shifting power.

At one point, one may question why such kind of mythological story which is often known as fictional must be taken into serious consideration and awaits to be deconstructed by writers and playwrights. The answer takes its premise on the definitions and functions of mythology. Mythology is defined in many terms and the way to approach to mythology is often as an imaginary production and symbolic form of art because it deals with stories, supernatural happenings, miracles, creatures, gods, and goddesses even if these supernatural beings are anthropomorphized. However, it is also possible to read them as masks that stand for deeper hidden meanings to reflect mankind to mankind itself. Edith Hamilton (1942) construes mythology as "a humanized world" in which everything about human life is described with human terms so that people can get free from "the paralyzing fear of an omnipotent Unknown" (p.7). Also, Joseph Campbell points out that mythology shows the fact that how mythological stories are useful and practical in human life. Those stories are not just made up for entertainment, but it establishes the socio-political norms, codes, laws and ethics for people who lived in the ancient times as he suggests within the explanation of sociological function of mythology.

Mythology, in this light, can be imagined as a guideline for citizens as those stories make clear about the boundaries between the good and the evil; the acceptable and the unacceptable. In this respect, as Alexander Campbell (1991) asserts in "The power of myth", mythology teaches citizens what to do and not to do in the ancient time Greek society. That is why; he defines mythology as an "experience of life" (p. 5) instead of giving a distinct attention to its fictional or nonfictional nature. The non-binary approach to mythology suits new historicism very well as as Herold A. Veeser (1989) asserts in the third and fourth principle: "3-That literary and nonliterary texts circulate inseparably/ 4-That no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths nor express inalterable human nature" (p.xi). As given in the

excerpt, from a new historicist approach, Euripides' *Medea* can be considered as a referential and contextual text which can give remarkable insights about ideological assumptions of the past and can shed light upon the present. From this angle, it is almost impossible to claim that myth is purely fictional and irrational. On the contrary, as many scholars endeavor to put forth, it is about humankind through which they find a way to express their own way of life and thought and belief and as Campbell puts it, "myths are clues to the spiritual potentialities of the human life" (1991, p.5). That is to say, each story represents a part from a human life and explores the social and cultural dynamics of life. This common feature of mythology catches the attention of many writers so those stories turn out to be a raw material to comment on the society in which the writer or playwright is born to. In this respect, one can claim that those stories are the manifestation of human life from the very beginning of human history. Thus, the timeless and universal topics that the classical mythology provides with the readers are well noted by Lochhead: "Greek drama reminds you that we're just the same as we've always been." (Scott, 2003, The Times). Indicating the spousal crisis that is often reported on magazines and media today, Lochhead, to some extent, accepts the fact that she has not exerted an extra effort to make the story relevant when she reminds the reader that:

> There is no time in history when they didn't seem both prescient and contemporary. Recently especially, it has been a Greek time - a time of revenge at an almost primitive level.... it's incredibly exciting to work where the stakes are so enormous, where the play is about how you live and how you die. (Scott, 2003)

As indicated by Lochhead in the given quotation, the issues the play deals with such as revenge, love, betrayal, cultural alienation are still prevalent and give rise to the remarkable questions about women and human life in general. That is why, Lochhead liberates Medea's character from mythicized and vilified demi-goddess to a human being. In Edinburgh International Festival of 2022, Lochhead's *Medea* was presented and directed by Michael Boyd as a National Theatre of Scotland production. This time, Medea who takes refuge in Korinth was played by a black actress, Adura Onashile with a tremendous performance and the play got audience's attention and fascination across the globe. Lochhead uses her ability to address prevalent issues within the target culture through her re-writing techniques. By so doing, she first de-contextualizes and dislocates the universal themes of the source text, in order to then re-contextualize and

relocate them in the target culture by innovating as well as renovating the classical hypotext.

Both in text and performance of the play, Lochhead also admits that she avoids exclusive supernatural emphasis which is peculiar to one particular time period and (high) culture. Instead, she takes the play's premise on real life and adapts into her own cultural dynamics. By doing so, she attempts to lay bare the ideological influences and links Medea Jason relationship to an ordinary relationship between a woman and a man. In this respect, what she portrays in *Medea* is not revenge but rather a survival story of an otherized woman no matter how much pain she has to suffer and dare. Angeletti (2018) refers to the inherent openness of mythological narratives to accommodate diverse interpretations and revisions and she posits that:

> If myths belong to high culture and are receptacles of universal truths, at the same time, they can become culture-specific and acquire new meanings the moment they are handed down, absorbed, appropriated and decoded within a particular socio-historical frame of reference. It is against the general theoretical background informed by such ideas and concepts that the rewriting of Greek tragedies in the context of Contemporary Scottish theatre can be best understood. (p. 218)

It is very common motif in classical mythology that women are defined in binary terms. In Helene P. Foley's work, "The Conception of Women in Athenian Drama," she directly outlines this dichotomous portrayal of women. She states that the 'good' women "align themselves with marriage, or, as virgins, sacrifice themselves for the preservation of family, state or nation, while the ['bad' women, e.g. Clytemnestra, Medea…] resist marriage and confinement to the oikos, behave irrationally, and uphold private interests" (1981. p. 142). Given to this, self-indulgence and freedom-seeking behaviors are depicted as the characteristics of a woman who can ruin her reputation. More dependent she is, better character she is. It is also worth to note that women are depicted as innately evil since it was believed that Zeus created womankind "who are evil to men, with a nature to do evil" (Hamilton, 1942, p. 89).

However, it is also worth mentioning that no matter how vicious they are, the mythological stories presents that they are always oppressed, tamed, and overpowered by male characters. For instance, the mother earth, Gaia is a very powerful deity in charge of creation. She can create her own progeny without any male assistance. However, she is portrayed just as a partner of Uranus whom she herself gives birth to. Besides, she is always depicted as a vengeful goddess as observed in Uranus's

mutilation story and Titanomachy wars and she is always succumbed to the patriarchal oppression. As for mortal evil women, they are either severely punished or killed by the patriarchal valorism or they just commit suicide.

On the other hand, classical Greek mythology depicts women who are docile, sentimental, self-sacrificial and just support to foster the heroic deeds of the main male character, either a god or a hero. Therefore, these stories delineate women who are either angelic mother or wife to the heroes such as faithful Penelope, the wife of Odysseus or Danea, dedicated mother to Perseus. Even goddesses exist to support and please the immortal mighty gods or mortal heroes. Thus, it is almost impossible for a female character to be the central character of a mythological story. In this light, classical mythology presents how patriarchy ideologically dominate the Ancient Greek society and how Greek society benefits from those stories to circulate and enforce this dominant ideology. Lochhead's portrayal of this tragic heroine affirms her as a mythical character who resists easy categorization, and her ability to undergo transformations underscores her enduring relevance across different cultures and eras. The author's approach involves reconstructing rather than dismantling the original character's exceptional qualities, while also highlighting her humanity. This includes depicting her as a distressed woman grappling with inner turmoil and as an individual experiencing the challenges of being a minority and marginalized within her society.

The conventional perception situates woman in a secondary social position and makes them dependent on men’s mercy. Gender oppression is hereby postulated by Lochhead’s Medea but in a very stern and satirist way. In this context, Medea poses a question about her position in the society: “[A]re we women not the most miserable /and mocked of all Gods’ creatures?” (Lochhead, 2000, p.10). She views her sex so agonizing that she thinks as though women are created to be pathetically ridiculed by those who are in the upper position such as mortal and immortal males as seen in the case of Medea. The ideological agenda with which the play imbues the reader/audience is the fact that women are oppressed, humiliated, and subjugated to such extent that the system turns them into mere objects for the male owners to possess or sell. This idea is contemptuously emphasized by Medea through following lines:

> our fathers scrimp and save
>
> a dowry a lavish wedding breakfast

to buy the man he sells us to

and then for better or worse richer or poorer

in sickness or health -your sickness his health-

this man lords it over us

our lives at the mercy of how his lordship feels

stuck with him and his every demand

we little women must look to him alone

for company kindness our meal ticket

our every trinket (Lochhead, 2000. p.10)

The above lines strikingly invite the reader/audience to consider the beginning of gender oppression in a woman's life. Given to this, it starts in the place where women are born and goes along with the place where they become wife to husbands. The domination of the man over woman is shown as to be a chain which systematically prolongs the subjugation of women from father to husband. Here is also commentary against the family institution in parental and marital terms as it is a drive to objectify women and enables men to use, abuse, sell and possess them as if they are just inanimate buyable or consumable "things". To be more precise, the androcentric view prolonged by the institutions is harshly put at stake as it causes an unquestioning and blind homage of women to the man, either father or husband as a standard of being a good woman. This kind of expectation driven from patriarchy leaves women defenseless as she needs to be dependent on the male partner in every circumstance. Given this, a woman turns out to be "essentially passive role as a reproductive vessel and as an ornament to man", as a new historicist feminist Ellen Pollak puts it in her readings of sexual myths in the eighteenth century (1985, p.58). This passive role is such an extent that women presumably are seen as things who must please husband all the time and meet every sort of his demand just in return for meal and company. Men and their needs are always prioritized as highlighted by Lochhead through terminal caesura "-your sickness his health-" (2000, p.10) It puts the emphasis on the significance of man's need while ignoring that of women's. This reveals that women need men to not please themselves or enjoy the life but only to satisfy and support the man. In that case, woman expectedly will sacrifice her health for the sake of husband's well-being.

Self-sacrificing and docile married women are enshrined through several different stories in classical mythology. However, the representation of Medea in Euripides's work contradicts with this stereotypical woman image. First, as a young princess before her encounter with Jason, she has a wild sprit of freedom so that she could give the decision about the person whom she gets married with by herself. Thus, she is brave enough to challenge against the established value about marriage institution which is based on a sort of contract between the groom and bride's father. Thus, her escape with Jason to Greece manifests itself in the play as an offense to family honor and it is in stark contrast with the family perception which banishes self-determination from women.

Likewise, Lochhead promulgates the reader/audience that Medea confronts with the conventional terms about womanhood and gender roles in family institution. Thus, she somehow replicates the old oppressive hierarchies. The sense of freedom and self-determination which characterize only men in patriarchal societies whereas women are universalized as dependent of men "for company kindness / our meal ticket / our every trinket" (10) as framed by Lochhead's Medea. The stereotypical dichotomies between women and men force women to live in restrictions and trap them into a domestic sphere. These gender polarities in social life are so sharp to that extent women are not allowed to think and question as it is very hazardous to the potential power and order of patriarchy. Accordingly, those women who do not pretend to be silly and naïve are subjected to unfair treatment and described with unpleasant terms. This is obvious in the following lines by Medea in his conversation with the King Kreon:

> I am oppressed by my reputation
>
> The evil one the witch the clever woman
>
> Don't educate your daughters Kreon!
>
> Clever men are envied
>
> But a clever woman
>
> Fie (Lochhead, 2000, p.12)

Medea's self-assertion in Lochhead's re-writing serves as a glaring revelation of the profound disparities in the attribution of intelligence between women and men. Lochhead, in her portrayal, nurtures Medea as an unconventional woman who

questions and highlights the prevailing double standards embedded in her society. Medea's pursuit of her perspective and her vehement resistance against the construct of these unjust standards can be viewed as an integral component of Lochhead's broader literary project, which aligns with the concepts of "herstory" and "l'écriture feminine" in Helene Cixous's (1976) term since with Medea, Lochhead effectively challenges and dismantles the objectified values and expectations placed upon women.

In the realm of feminine writing, Cixous (1976) theorises that feminine writing practice and it defies simplicity, linearity, objectification, and universalization. She states that "Her speech, even when 'theoretical' or political, is never simple or linear or 'objectified.' generalized: she draws her story into history" (p.881). Lochhead's portrayal of Medea exemplifies this notion by portraying her resilience through the transcending of generic and spatial boundaries. This creative endeavor observed in Lochhead's female character resonates with Cixous's political and intellectual ambitions, as it reinforces the transformative power of feminine expression and the capacity to challenge societal norms by redefining the narrative of women's roles and agency within a patriarchal context.

It is also significant to note that what is meant by education in the previous quotation is not the institutional education system which fosters the male individual happiness, activeness and promotes passivity and self-sacrifice to women. However, what Lochhead addresses here is the real education which improves the person's thinking faculty and encourages individuals regardless of sex to constant doubt and the education which allows individuals to speak for their mind. In other words, the education suggested in the excerpt is an educational approach that teaches not to accept everything as it is, but to question, to doubt, not to remain silent in the face of injustice, and to resist even if the price is to be booed as seen in Medea's case.

Furthermore, Lochhead seeks an answer for the question of what it means to be a woman, so the patriarchal assumptions that give shape to the identity of women has been brought to the stake. To this end, Lochhead portrays having a gender or rather being a woman in particular as something that forces women to fit into a certain kind of shape which is drawn identical to almost every woman. Therefore, womanhood is metaphorically presented as a kind of shocking slap to Medea's face which comes from her lover suddenly. When she learns that the man whom she dedicates herself so

long and whom she betrays her nation and family for, has humiliated her by cheating on her, she admits that she is a woman now it becomes her grim reality:

> I was never a woman at all until I met my man!
>
> Maiden Medea my father's daughter was a creature
>
> Who did not know she was born she knew such
>
> Sweet freedom! (9-10)
>
> If it is a struggle in a bed or behind a bush engenders us
>
> then it's when we fall in love that genders us
>
> Jason I am a woman now!
>
> Right out of the blue
>
> humiliation! (Lochhead, 2000, p.10)

Lochhead's portrayal of womanhood poignantly evokes the association of womanhood with a sense of humiliation, as evident in the passages above. Medea's assertion that she was, in her youth, largely unaware of her gender suggests that, prior to her encounter with Jason, she has enjoyed a state of relative freedom and emotional fulfillment. Her spirit has been characterized by unrestrained passion and a sense of wild autonomy. However, with her fateful union with Jason, which was seemingly orchestrated by Aphrodite, the goddess of love, Medea found herself compelled to relinquish many of the pursuits she once held dear. This transformation led her to Greece, where her presence among the Corinthians was met with less than warm reception, prompting her to make earnest efforts to conform to societal expectations and the established norms of womanhood. In this regard, Medea's outcry expresses a profound metamorphosis, driven by her love for Jason. It illuminates the multifaceted challenges and sacrifices she underwent in adapting to a new cultural setting, reflecting the broader theme of societal expectations and the constriction of female agency within the context of her narrative.

Besides, underlying the disappointment of Medea because of her sex and the underprivilege position that it brings, Lochhead points out that women are forced to fit into one particular format and those who are out of this circle end up in being frustrated and heartbroken. This message constitutes the core message of Lochhead's works as seen in restrictions and dilemma of Queen Mary in *Mary Queen of Scots* (1987) and of Westenra sisters in *Dracula* (1985). However, this message is not

necessarily about the womanhood's itself but the limitations set on it. These boundaries and expectations of the male-oriented society, according to Lochhead, cannot describe womanhood as there is no one inalterable fix definition of womanhood. These assumptions are totally ideological and socially constructed. From this vantage point, this paper argues that womanhood does not actually mean humiliation but hierarchical structure between women and men causes this degradation. Thus, it is not biological but ideological reasons that bring the womanhood into that point. And the love that women have for the male partners makes women open to be hurt and abused so they fall prey to the male possessiveness. It is again not womanhood but male partner's exploitation of his social privilege that comes from male-oriented society sets the association between womanhood and humiliation.

Lochhead's *Medea* also lets reader/audience tease out the distinct spheres of male and female which lock women into circumscribed domestic roles such as doing errands, household duties, taking care of husband, pleasing husband, and most importantly giving birth to children. These conventional roles are assigned to the female by the androcentric world and it is allegedly accepted to be the best for the wellbeing of societies. The following quotation from Angeletti (2018) not only affirms the dualistic representations of women in mythology but also delves into how Lochhead's *Medea* satirically elucidates the delineation of separate spheres for different genders:

> There is no denying the fact that Lochhead, by capitalizing Medea's inner tensions, seems to engage critically with the polarized visions of women in classical mythology as either angels or monsters, as well as addressing gender powers against a patriarchal system assigning man and woman fixed social roles. (p.225)

Actually, the main reason behind this separation of roles and spheres is put by the false explanations that display women as innately fragile, weak and instinctual and "curse for mortal men" that Zeus has created. In accordance with that, women are not individuals who are competent enough to make their own decisions about their own lives, but only 'things' that need to be subjugated and tamed by their male authorities. This is the main premise behind the reification and exploitation of women. At this point, Lochhead's Medea addresses the reader/ audience with a witty sarcasm by taunting male valorism.

> Oh yes wartime
>
> and they'll die for us!

Well I'd three times sooner fight a war

Than suffer childbirth once

…

We woman are too weak they say for war

Wrong us in bed though oh man

We'll have your guts for garters (Lochhead, 2000, p.10)

Medea lays ground for well-rooted excuses offered by the male-dominated Greek society to control women. Medea's character, as portrayed by Lochhead, serves as a catalyst for highlighting the pervasive excuses offered by the male-dominated Greek society to assert control over women. Her portrayal encourage the reader/audience to engage in a critical re-evaulation of the prescribed gender roles that confine women to domestic spaces while affording men a greater degree of personal agency. Notably, Medea juxtaposes the perceived sacrifices made by men during times of war with the constraints imposed upon women within the societal framework. From Medea's perspective, participation in warfare represents a choice, a freedom of action, while childbirth is presented as an obligatory duty for women. Moreover, she points to the extreme sense of pain associated with childbirth. In this and otyher aspects, Medea's perpective not only satirizes the societal norms but also raises pertinent questions regarding who stands to benefit and who may suffer if the roles of the sexes were to be interchanged. Her discourse invites contemplation on the far-reaching repercussions of such a profound inversion of established gender roles and values, ultimately challenging the prevailing norms within Greek society.

Moreover, what makes Medea evil or otherized is her emotions, but particularly rage that she manifests when being dumped by Jason. This emotion vilifies her because she shatters a taboo by displaying the sense of anger which is allowed to be shown only by men. This may sound absurd as emotions are universal and even animals are able to display them freely. However, when taking the patriarchy's operation of power into consideration, assigning genders with certain emotions is quite meaningful in terms of entitling men with power and justifying their violence. In *Emotions in History: Lost and Found* (2011), A German historian, Ute Frevert, digs out the gender construction in the past which allows and forbids some emotions to women in a deconstructive manner. According to her, women in history have been portrayed as sentimental creatures who must show various emotions in one single type

of expositions: tears whereas men can show their emotions in different ways such as hitting, yelling, throwing things and so on. All the state apparatus in Althusser's term serve to align the sentimentality with women which can restrict and passivize them and anger with men which enables them to be assertive, aggressive, and active. Thus, education system, media, fictional or nonfictional books, in one sense, teach how to show and cope with different emotions to men and women separately. According to Frevert, "Those gender differences bear a strong moral touch, and are institutionalized in expectations, standards of behavior and 'display rules.' Thus, women who give free rein to their rage, tend to feel "uncomfortable" because they have violated a social norm" (2011, p.97). As addressed by Frevert, displaying anger has been strictly forbidden to women. In the case of Medea, she not only expresses her outrage but also takes decisive actions as a direct consequence of her intense anger. In this light, Medea emerges as a character who transcends the rigid boundaries imposed upon women and ventures into the emotional territory traditionally associated with men. Consequently, her vexed emotions in response to betrayal are depicted as potentially perilous not only to the male figures in her domestic sphere but also to the broader societal order.

Nevertheless, Medea is not the only one who is furious in the play. Jason is also very angry with the "unreasonable rage" of Medea in the face of being dumbed (Lochhead, 2000, p. 20). According to him, her rage is without a reason since she does not keep her silence and not accept to be a second woman. From Jason's point of view, what he has done by having a relationship with the princess is the best thing for the protection of his family. This kind of justification of men is called in the 21st century as "mansplaining". OED defines mansplaining as an explanation "[o]f a man: to explain (something) needlessly, overbearingly, or condescendingly, esp. (typically when addressing a woman) in a manner thought to reveal a patronizing or chauvinistic attitude." This new term comes from Rebecca Solnit's *Men Explain Things to Me* (2008) in which she criticizes male supremacy in terms of experience and knowledge. This kind of strategy that they have developed in time ignores women's experience and knowledge and it is very useful strategy to silence women. To exemplify, when Medea finds out she is cheated, she also comes to know that she will be punished as she feels angry and vengeful. Then, Jason visits Medea to make his mansplaining and starts with a stern exclamation "it is not what you think!", then he goes on as such:

Call me every low thing that crawls I'll still care for you

You make it hard for me I've always done my best

To calm him down. Persuade him you should stay

I could have crept back to you in secret would have

But you cant keep it zipped you will talk treason

Court your own banishment (Lochhead, 2000, p.17).

Jason ironically tries to prove Medea how he is benevolent in his intentions when he dumps her. Therefore, as a man, he is ready for all kinds of offense coming from Medea as he is strong and sensible which is opposite of Medea who is hot-tempered, vengeful, and emotionally weak. However, what he truly offers Medea is to turn out to be a second woman whom Jason can creep back to at night, if she could maintain her silence, of course.

Jason's speech adopts such a stance wherein being cuckolded is portrayed as a benevolent act on his part, something for which Medea should be eternally grateful. He claims that his involvement with Glauke, the king's daughter, is a matter of "politics not passion" (Lochhead, 2000, p.19), effectively forcing women to the realm of emotions, love, and passion while excluding them from the political sphere. From his perspective, steeped in male supremacy, Jason belittles Medea by implying that she lacks the competence, in his view, to comprehend the intricacies of politics and his true intentions for their family. Despite Jason's assertions, he, yet, fails to convince Medea to believe that he has acted in her and their children's best interests. Their exchange goes to a point where Medea expresses her disdain and resentment by spitting out the words: "I made you, Jason!" (Lochhead, 2000, p.19) Subsequently, Jason shifts his approach from attempting to portray himself as magnanimous and righteous to emphasizing Medea's perceived insignificance in his life. This interaction evinces the gender dynamics whereby Jason seeks to invalidate Medea's experiences and diminish her worth in their relationship as follows:

JASON: first let's not exaggerate your role in my story

What you did for me Medea you did it

in the first flush of lust for me lets face it

Aphrodite ought to get the credit

I was her darling you were her mere instrument

A cunning woman passion's puppet (Lochhead, 2000, p. 23)

This kind of mansplaining invalidates Medea's role in their relationship and ignores her emotions, efforts, and experiences. The humiliating manner in mansplaining has been viewed by Kidd "as a substantiation of institutionalized sexism which contributes to the silencing and marginalization of women's voices" (2017, p. 2). In this respect, it can be argued from a new historicist approach that Medea either as a myth or text shows the reader/audience how stories functionally serve the dominant ideology in the deeply rooted androcentric world. Besides, with Lochhead's Medea, the reader/audience witnesses how a mythological text written hundred centuries before can be relevant in the patriarchal societies of today. In regard to this relevance, Pollak (1988) in "Feminism and new historicism" puts forward that

> No longer are texts presumed to be either ideologically neutral territory or places where ideology inevitably deconstructs itself; rather a text is a site of ideological struggle, deeply implicated in its own historical moment and in the competing ideologies present in the culture in which it was produced. (p. 281)

As given in the excerpt, Pollak points out the conventional readings of the texts which are based on dichotomies either advocating the neutrality or deconstructing the main ideology of the text. Instead, within a new historicist framework, she tends to generate texts as a site of ideological struggle.

Ideological struggle through a mythological text written in the distant past is what Lochhead achieves to capture in her adaptation to call attentions to the ideological struggle of today in terms of gender inequality. Especially in the scene of confrontation, Medea resists as much as Jason resists against her. Therefore, Medea, as mentioned before, is not a conventional type who can be scummed to Jason's patronizing and humiliating explanations. She is very aware that the words of Jason are not reliable and do not reflect the truth as they are only the endeavors of justifying the betrayal and pointless male-supremacy. At this certain point, Medea from the fifth century comes up with the witty answer which can be counted as the definition of the 21st century term, "mansplaining":

> I dont call them clever words that cant
>
> cloak evil in a plausible coat Wrap up this crap
>
> in fancy phrases but one thing gives the lie to it
>
> You did it behind my back (Lochhead, 2000, p.20)

As revealed by Medea, Jason employs a skillful discourse, seemingly well-intentioned to mask his infidelity to Medea. His rhetoric may be artfully articulated, yet Medea remains unconvinced, as she contends that one cannot justify wrongdoing with eloquent explanations alone. Consequently, she places no faith in his utterances. Moreover, Medea possesses the fortitude to articulate her sentiments with a palpable sense of anger and resolve. This situation highlights the contrast between Jason's artful manipulation of language to conceal his transgressions and Medea's unwavering skepticism, grounded in her belief that persuasive words cannot excuse malevolent actions. Furthermore, her willingness to confront Jason with her unreserved emotions and convictions underscores her courage and refusal to acquiesce to his persuasive tactics.

It is also noteworthy to point out the stark contrast in the lengths of Jason's elaborate explanations compared to Medea's concise and direct responses. Jason's long speech appears to be rooted in the concept of "mansplaining", a practice characterized by the imposition and teaching of ideas, often laden with untruths, as a means to justify malebetrayal, while simultaneously suppressing the voice of women. This verbosity serves to leave little room for women to foster their perspectives. Anna Grace Kidd's (2017) insightful analysis, as elucidated in "Mansplaining: The Systematic Sociocultural Silencer", offers a comprehensive exploration of the political dimensions inherent in mansplaining. She interprets it as a mechanism of oppression, and her work underscores the systematic nature of this sociocultural silencing phenomenon. In this context, mansplaining serves as a tool for maintaining dominance and control within discourse, while concurrently marginalizing the voices and agency of women, as succinctly articulated in the following lines:

> Mansplaining is a systematic and institutionalized form of oppression that silences women, implicitly disclosing the lesser value of the female voice. This presentation demonstrates that mansplaining is not only as the way in which men make needless explanations to women, usually in a condescending manner, but also as the chronic interruption of women. (Kidd, 2017, p.1).

In this context, the key ideological tenant of mansplaining is to oppress and silence women with long male speeches or constant interruption of women. In Lochhead's Medea, it is quite clear that Jason's interruption and his long speeches are aiming to trivialize Medea's experiences and to silence her voice. Nonetheless, no matter how hard Jason tries to silence Medea, she does not tend to keep herself quiet in the face of

his infidelity. But rather, she, as Benjamin Poore puts it, "confirms men's worst fears about a scorned women: she responds to Jason's name calling with "yes I am."" (2013, p.101). In this regard, there is a distinction between Jason's lines and hers. Unlike Jason's speech, her lines are concise and full of emphasis on her emotions and opinions which reflect only her own truth and experience in the face of betrayal. In order to focus on Medea's gaze at the happenings, Lochhead abundantly employs caesura in the middle of the lines or just between the lines. These physical gaps in or between lines are considered by Graham McLaren (2013) as "the pacing: each phrase is actor's mouthful" (p.23). Thus, he thinks that those pauses represent a time to be able to utter the words that are difficult to utter. However, it is also possible to consider them as a linguistic vehicle to catch up the strong influence that the words conjure up. In this regard, this paper argues that they are remarkable to evoke the striking effect either emotionally or thematically in the text and performance of the play and Lochhead makes use of them for mainly three purposes: to emphasize a point, to criticize an idea, and to make a sarcasm.

In Lochhead's Medea, Chorus also serves those given three purposes at once with their songs and remarkably functions to break woman's silence in the feminist context. However, Lochhead's chorus is a bit of problematic since they are not consistent in the text and do not comply with the Greek idea of chorus. At first, chorus enters as that of women "of all times, all ages, classes and professions" (Lochhead, 2000, p.7). This is one of the major differences that Lochhead has contributed to Euripides's text. Accordingly, Lochhead attempts to bring all types of women from all ages to reveal and relate the male mistreatment and she most probably wants the reader/audience to face its results by "break[ing] out of snare of silence" in Cixous' words (1976, p.881). Thus, those women in Lochhead's play react to Medea's wish for death owing to her extreme grief in passive way but instead encourages her to speak up and take action as such:

> Oh daft to wish for death
>
> When it comes soon enough
>
> Without you tempt it
>
> So your man fucks another? Fuck him
>
> Loves her? Though love him do you?

You'll grow out of that

We are not born yesterday

We are all survivors of the sex war

Married women widows divorced

Mistress wives no virgins here

Marriage over? Shame that's the end of it

So get on with it (Lochhead, 2000, pp.7-8)

As suggested in the quotation above, Lochhead's chorus in her adaptation of Medea serves a crucial role as a supportive and empathetic entity for Medea, drawing upon their collective experiences as women who have endured suffering within a context of male supremacy and exploitation. Their presence can be interpreted as a representation of solidarity among women, aligning with the broader objective of deconstructing gender-based oppression. These women, in contrast to succumbing to male oppression or resorting to self-destructive measures in response to their spiritual and physical pain, exhibit resilience and active resistance. Lochhead characterizes them as the "survivors of the sex war" (2000, p. 8), emphasizing their agency in navigating the complex power dynamics inherent in male-female relationships. In this context, the notion of a "sex war" highlights the idea that the dynamics between men and women are not solely driven by universal emotions like love, hatred, frustration, or passion, nor are they solely attributed to human flaws. Rather, they are fundamentally rooted in hierarchical power structures.

To elaborate further, the destructive elements within families or personal lives are not inherently a consequence of love itself but are instead driven by the hierarchical power imbalances between men and women. Love, in this context, is not the primary cause of discord, but rather it is the hierarchical structure governing male-female relationships that plays a pivotal role in shaping these destructive dynamics. Moreover, the chorus effectively links women's experiences to their interactions with men, and their omission of the concept of the "virgin" from their discourse underscores the idea that, as Medea proclaimed earlier, one's gender identity and freedom become defined within the context of a male partnership.

Then, Chorus in Lochhead's Medea turns out to be a voice coming from the future, instead of being Corinthian woman community who can comprehend Medea's sorrow. When they hear Medea's elegiac cry, they assure the reader/audience that they are not so stranger to that sort of cry, then they identify Medea's cry with that of "the woman/ opening the door to the telegraph boy in wartime/ or the cry out from/ the unquite wife/ opening the door/ to the chequered hats of two policemen" (Lochhead, 2000, p.8) or that of "a mother in the hospital corridor" (Lochhead, 2000,p. 8) or "the cry from our sisters mothers from ourselves/ that cry/ we did not know we knew how to cry out/could not help but cry" (Lochhead, 2000, p. 9). Those concepts such as telegraph, hospital and policeman are the apparatuses of modern world which are quite far from Medea's world and time. Thus, chorus' song suddenly breaks the boundaries of spatiality and linearity. However, even if they disrupt the time and place unity, Lochhead achieves to bound and meet those women in Medea's despair. This should be view as a great contribution of Lochhead in terms of conveying woman oppression as timeless and universal.

Furthermore, it is significant to recognize that the women portrayed within the chorus epitomize those individuals whose voices have historically been suppressed or systematically disregarded within male-dominated societies. The profound silence that envelops them finds its roots in the enduring mistreatment and oppression experienced by women, which persists to this day. In patriarchal societies, governments often fail to enact comprehensive legislative measures capable of alleviating the suffering inflicted upon women by their domineering partners. This enduring silence of women is, as aptly articulated by Rebecca Solnit in Mother of All Questions (2017, p. 23), "allows people to suffer without recourse, what allows hypocrisies and lies to grow and flourish, crimes to go unpunished" (2017, p. 23). In this regard, it is the very condition that perpetuates their ability to endure suffering without recourse. Moreover, it enables the proliferation of hypocrisies and falsehoods, as well as the evasion of accountability for various transgressions. The act of affording a voice to these silenced women through the chorus carries with it a revolutionary dimension. It serves as a means to establish a collective feminist voice, thereby enhancing the visibility of these marginalized individuals and actively resisting the dominance of narratives that are often articulated through the lens of mansplaining.

However, as the story proceeds, all those women who gather around Medea to be able to help her punish Jason start to retreat their support from her because Medea ultimately decides to kill her children. This kind of wicked plan is unacceptable to the chorus. When they find out the way she plans to punish Jason, they react against Medea as such: "Medea we are your friends we want to help you/ don't do it! Life death Gods' law/ you cannot!" (28). The main rationale behind here is the inviolable holiness of motherhood with which women are endowed. Given that, the chorus propounds that motherhood is a universal, innate instinct, and natural which requires infinite dedication, unconditional love, and self-sacrifice in all circumstances. This idea nourishes the androcentric world order which constantly keep women busy with domestic chores so that they can be away from being a threat against the well-established androcentric order. This enables men to live freely and gives implicit message that they are not responsible for parenting the child.

Magnifying and sacralizing motherhood provides an opportunity with men that they can do wrong whereas this perception prevents women from prioritizing their own needs by no means. They seriously remind Medea of the significance of motherhood:

> What greater power than the love of a mother for her children?
>
> Every animal would die for its young
>
> Is that not nature's way Medea?
>
> The mother sheep offers her own white throat
>
> To the wolf and saves her lambs (Lochhead, 2000. p. 29)

As explicitly articulated by the chorus, the ideologies surrounding motherhood and its inherently self-sacrificial nature are portrayed as "nature's way" in Lochhead's adaptation (2000, p. 29). The act of attempting to harm one's own children is, in this context, regarded as the "horror of horrors" with no possibility of redemption (p.29). According to this ideology, the multifaceted dimensions of a woman's life, encompassing her sexuality, social interactions, career pursuits, and even negative emotions like revenge and rage, are expected to be relegated to the background in deference to her role as a mother. This perception of motherhood is regarded with problematic undertones, a sentiment echoed by Hélène Cixous (1976), who characterizes the maternal role assigned to women as a form of "noname", a concept that universalizes women and confines them to a singular role (p.881). Women are,

therefore, compelled to distance themselves from their sexual desires and assertive tendencies.

However, Medea emerges as a notable counterpoint to this prevailing paradigm, as her overwhelming desire for revenge overshadows her maternal instincts. While feminist discourse often debates the extent to which motherhood should be prioritized, there exists a refusal on Medea's part to victimize her children as a means to channel her rage, emphasizing the presence of a female perspective that vehemently opposes such a sacrifice. It is crucial to acknowledge that this ideological conflict concerning motherhood unfolds within the realm of intra-female discourse, rather than through the lens of a singular male perspective. This dynamic aligns with Lochhead's recurring assertion that there exists no monolithic archetype of womanhood. Thus, pivotal debates encompassing themes such as love, motherhood, class, and race are effectively confronted through the narrative, accommodating a diverse array of female viewpoints.

From this vantage point, it can be argued that the chorus's invocation of motherhood does not serve to reinforce patriarchal ideals but rather operates to decentralize the prevailing patriarchal structure and the oppressive influence of Greek gods. By so doing, they seek to replace established patriarchal cultural norms with the inherent codes and terms of nature. That is to say, the chorus endeavors to undermine Medea's actions not by emphasizing the fear of retribution from Zeus and other deities but by reminding her of the laws of nature and the principles governing natural order. Therefore, the conception of motherhood depicted through the ritual sacrifice of the sheep does not bolster patriarchal authority; instead, it functions as a deconstruction of the patriarchal norms meticulously crafted by the Olympian establishment.

What Lochhead's novelty, as suggested in this chapter, does not only driven from the sense of grudge. Medea's plan is also influenced by her future concerns. Taking action by killing children means a rescue of children to Medea as she puts as follows:

> I'll kill the children must
>
> To save them
>
> Shall I let my sweet boys become cruel men like their father?
>
> Shall I let my daughter grow up to womanhood

> And this world's mercy? Never! (Lochhead, 2000, p.25)

As stated above, her major concerns are notable when considering her children's future. This androcentric world teaches boys how to become cruel men who exploit their privileges on women when they grow up. Besides, her daughter will be raised into adulthood or womanhood what Medea associates with humiliation. As the world is ruled by gender inequality and tyranny of men, she does not want to leave her children to make them prey or predator in the society. What is more, she knows very well that even though the new bride accepts them to care for them and love them, she knows very well that as soon as a new child comes to the world, her children's lives will be in jeopardy because of the throne struggle. Lydia Craig (2015) points out Medea's concern for children as a new motivation which is contributed by Lochhead. She calls it a new device "Transmotivation to distance the woman Medea from her divine origins in the original Greek myth" (2015, p. 47). This refers to the revision of the playwrights and making changes in the character's intentions. She thinks that by changing Medea's intention from awoved desire for a glorious reputation to motherly concerns for their children's future and Jason's punishment.

> Medea's motivation represents a deeply developed understanding of gender dynamics that the chorus, despite its wealth of feminine experiences ranging across history, cannot process. Like them, Medea does understand how maternal sacrifice should be enacted, but refuses to perform her role, knowing that it will lead to future female suffering for her daughters and enable her sons to become tyrants. Instead, the children become the innocent casualties of the matrimonial fracas, dispatched in a preemptive act. From the chorus's viewpoint, Medea, not Jason, has doomed the dynasty through succumbing to excessive emotion and unhinged fantasies. (Craig, 2015, p.48)

This gender dynamics are even obvious in the case of Glauke even if she is the princess of Corinth. She tries to be nice and sensible as she can understand Medea's frustration. This is another novelty of Lochhead that Glauke instead of Aigeus of Athens meets Medea to convince her to leave the country without children for Medea's and children's good. Just as observed in the case of chorus, it is very clear that Lochhead is in attempt to seek ways to rationalize Medea's heinous act. Besides, by casting Glauke and featuring an encounter of two rival, Lochhead supports how women are manipulated and exploited in the hands of male dominancy. When she first meets Medea, she tries to be gentle and sensible to Medea's rage and displays that she can understand her. However, as their talk proceeds, the reader/audience witnesses come to the realization that Medea is totally close to any kind of reconciliation with the woman whom she has been cheated with. Besides, as chorus depicts "she is in love

and happy now!" (Lochhead, 2000, p. 25) since she thinks that her love is reciprocal and pure love as much as she has for Jason. Actually, Jason does not share the same feelings with her. Or at least the reader/audience is unable to hear it from Jason's mouth. Jason claims that it is all about politics instead of love and passion (Lochhead, 2000, p.19). In this case, a woman is once again subject to the manipulation of a male figure, reduced to an object strategically leveraged to further Jason's political ambitions. She assumes the role of a mere instrument serving Jason's economic pursuits, with their relationship primarily serving to advance Jason's personal contentment and satisfaction.

Another significant dimension that contributes to the vilification of Medea in Lochhead's adaptation pertains to her foreign nationality, which remains implicit yet profoundly influential throughout the narrative. While the preceding sections of this chapter have extensively examined aspects related to her gender, womanhood, and motherhood, her status as a foreigner residing on an alien island remains a latent but potent theme, effectively imbuing the character with a sense of Scottishness. This, in turn, allows for a profound exploration of the experience of foreignness within a xenophobic society, a dynamic reminiscent of postcolonial discourse.

Lochhead artfully constructs a stark binary opposition between Corinth and Kolchis within the narrative. Corinth is cast in a favorable light, depicted as a domain of civilization and progress, as represented by Jason and King Kreon. In contrast, Kolchis is consistently portrayed in negative terms, establishing a hierarchical dichotomy between the two. Through the lens of Medea's foreign identity, Lochhead strategically explores the complexities of being an outsider in a xenophobic society that perpetuates its own culture as superior, preeminent, and evolved, while concurrently marginalizing, humiliating, and disregarding the Other. This subtle yet impactful implications invite reader/audience to ponder on the pervasive themes of cultural superiority and dominance within the play by offering a perspective on the experience of foreignness and otherness within the context of Scottish identity.

The selection of classical themes by Scottish writers during a pivotal moment in their country's political evolution is not so coincidental. This deliberate choice to engage with the authority of the classical tradition can be exemplified not only in Edwan Morgan's Pheadra but also in David Greig's Oedipus the Visionary and,

notably, in Lochhead's adaptation of Medea. Within this historical context, the classical tradition served as a powerful literary vehicle to address and legitimize pressing debates surrounding political and national identity, particularly in the wake of the 1999 reopening of the Scottish Parliament and the subsequent referendum. Lochhead's decision to adapt Medea is, therefore, far from arbitrary but a deliberate and meaningful choice. Her reinterpretation of this classical narrative delves into complex themes of nationhood, identity, and otherness. By tapping into the timeless resonance of the original myth and infusing it with contemporary relevance, Lochhead's Medea teases out multifaceted concepts that have great resonance within the Scottish socio-political landscape.

The political and ideological operation of the binary between the self and the Other in colonial terms manifests itself from the very beginning of the play:"The people of this country all have Scots accents, their language varies from Scots to Scots-English – from time to time and from character to character- and particular emotional state of character" (Lochhead, 2000, p.3). Hereby, Lochhead this time makes use of reverse colonialism in which Scottish vernacular language and culture are dominant whereas making standard English spoken by minority such as Medea and Jason. As Braun (2004) suggests, "Here, Scots is no longer the language of the victim, but the institutionalized language of civilized 'Greece'" (p.185). In this regard, Medea is presented as the one who is in the exile, foreigner, and otherized as mournfully depicted by the NURSE in the play:

> My lady Medea would never then have sailed wi Jason
>
> Daft for him doted!
>
> Would no have for his sake
>
> Swicked Pelias' dochters into killing their faither
>
> For Jason's sake she fled here to Corinth
>
> Wi Jason and their bairns ingratiating herself
>
> Sookin in a fawning exile a foreigner (Lochhead, 2000, p.2)

Here the NURSE delineates the suffering of Medea who flees from her own country for Jason's sake. What is so remarkable here is her Scottish accent and perspective to Medea's experience. As a woman who is among the minority speaking standard English, Medea is ostracized as a foreigner, wild, primitive, wicked, and barbarian.

Her characteristics are right opposite of King Kreon's daughter Glauke, who is "a civilised person a Greek" (Lochhead, 2000, p.26). In the play, the dichotomy between Glauke and Medea is strongly stressed within the postcolonial framework. Medea is offensive and vengeful whereas Glauke is amicable and avoids quarreling with Medea as she is allegedly more rational than Medea. In this regard, bringing two rival women together is not only striking in terms of comparing different types of women and casting women rivalry for a man on the stage but also very meaningful to grasp the better understanding of other dynamics in otherizing or polarizing people. From a postcolonial approach, the encounter of these two women is quite essential both to display the extreme dichotomy drawn by the hegemonic societies and to witness how this encounter influences the both sides and causes the negative consequences: violent resistance of the other and the unintended losses of colonizer. Cairns Craig (1996) tries to construct the postcolonialist tendency through the hegemonic relationship between England and Scotland. In his approach, he points out the extended perception of colonialism which may not be limited with the territorial settlement and economic exploitation and applies Frantz Fennon's Black Skin, White Masks as a theoretical approach to offer new insights to the perception of Scottish identity which has a tendency to overvalue Englishness. And he furthers his argument as follows:

> If the Scots were indeed, as is often claimed, the backbone of the Empire, it is perhaps because only before the eyes of the backward could they play with success, the role of fully achieved civilised Britishness to which they aspired. It is not by our colour that we have stood to be recognised as incomplete within the British context, it is by the colour of our vowels: the rigidity of class speech in Britain, the development of Received Pronunciation as a means of class identity, is the direct response of a dominant cultural group faced by a society in which the outsiders are indistinguishable by colour. (1996, p.12)

Within the framework of this theoretical perspective, it can be argued that the character of King Kreon in the play assumes the role of the colonizer. King Kreon holds an authority and is depicted quite dominant as the supreme figure in Corinth. An intriguing facet of his character is his exclusive use of the Scottish vernacular language in his discourse, which is indicative of Corinth as a setting where Scots or Scots-English holds sway. This linguistic twist by Lochhead can be interpreted as a strategic reconfiguration of King Kreon, representing an imaginative and oppositional postcolonial fantasy nation, effectively positioning Scotland as the ruling authority.

From this standpoint Medea as postulated by Braun (2004), "evokes both abhorance and pity, horror and respect, because she personifies the Unheimlich, the

inscrutable darkness of human being, his or her contradictions and inner battles" (p. 223). In this regard, Lochhead reconfiguration of Medea's national identity and culture construct a narrative wherein Scotland assumes a dominant role, effectively challenging the traditional power dynamics associated with colonization. This representation of Corinth as a realm where Scottish language prevails over Standard Queen English presents an alternate vision of linguistic and cultural authority, symbolizing a shift in the traditional colonizer-colonized relationship. Thus, the prevalence of Scottish language on the island serves as a manifestation of this postcolonial fantasy, wherein Scotland emerges as the ruling entity, subverting the conventional linguistic and cultural norms associated with colonization and dominance by another culture.

The notion of situating Scotland within a colonized position within the play is open to debate. Yet, an underlying theme that cannot be overlooked in the analysis of Lochhead's play is the portrayal of a Scottish nation imbued with a fantasy of freedom and independence. Within this framework, the use of impeccable English, marked by a distinct foreign accent, effectively positions this linguistic form as the Other, serving as a foil to the prevailing linguistic norms. Actually, this transformation is not merely linguistic but profoundly symbolic, as Scotland is transposed into a role akin to that of Greece, embodying the establishment and ruling class within the narrative. Lochhead's language is intrinsically tied to the broader cultural and political shift that Scotland experienced following the 1997 devolution referendum. This referendum marked a pivotal moment in Scotland's history, signifying a newfound sense of autonomy and self-governance. Given to this, the linguistic juxtaposition within the play serves as a reflection of this evolving cultural and political landscape, where Scotland assumes a position of authority, challenging the conventional power dynamics and redefining its place within the broader context of the United Kingdom.

> It was after seeing the play in performance here in Glasgow this spring, that it struck me the conventional way of doing Medea in Scotland until very recently would have been to have Medea's own language Scots and the, to her, alien Corinthians she lived under speaking, as powerful 'civilised' Greeks, patricial English. That it did not occur to me to do other than give the dominant mainstream society a Scots tongue and Medea a foreigner-speaking-English refugee voice must speak of a genuine in-the-bone increased cultural confidence here. (Lochhead, 2000, p.x)

John Corbett (2011) describes this cultural confidence as one of the outcomes of devolution that paves the way for "an increasing tendency to rethink Scotland as "the

Centre" and problematize the issues arising from being more directly in control of one's national identity. (p. 78)

Even though Scotland has perplexing past to imagine it as a colonized nation, one cannot deny that they have been discriminated by England because of their pervasive insistence on sticking to their own cultural distinctiveness and against standardization. Scotland's cultural marginalization and social discrimination, as Liam Connel argues, "arises from Scots' ability to conceive of themselves as a nation rather than England's identification of Scotland as a foreign nationality in need of assimilation" (2003, p.52). Such dichotomies in the identification of Scotland cause postcolonial tendencies in the studies of Scottish literature. In this regard, the subordination of Medea and marginalization of her culture by King Kreon can be considered as the reverse colonialism.

This reversal of the roles manifests itself in King Kreon's speech when he speaks of his past. When Medea wants a second chance to be able to live with her children in Corinth, and promises to keep quiet and conform every rule that is enacted by the King as displayed in the following statement of Medea:

> You are a man you should protect the helpless
>
> The weak the women children
>
> You are a Greek a man of reason
>
> Civilization shall it be said
>
> Barbarians treat women and children better?
>
> You are a king you have the power to Show mercy (Lochhead, 2000, p.14).

As clearly observed in Medea's words, Kreon stands for reason and civilization which is quite opposite characteristics of Medea and her country. He represents the great Greek culture whereas the others can be called "barbarian". This kind of dichotomy is the fundamental premise of postcolonialism.

Besides, the representation of the colonialist with the King Kreon is shown as ruthless, exploiter, and tyrant. He does not show mercy or tolerance to Medea as he views her as a great threat against his family as well as his country as observed in his speech:

> Get out shut up
>
> Enough get out my mind's made up (13).

You murdering whore

Like vermin from my doors (Lochhead, 2000, p.13)

In his eyes, Medea is a great threat haunting around his country's borders. Thus, her soft speech, kind words and promises are viewed as lies and a sign of dangerous hypocrisy by King Kreon. Therefore, a little compromise that can be offered to Medea as a representation of England can be a disaster for his country as well as his family as he knows very well "But by showing saftness/ I've sometimes been the one to suffer for it in the past" (14). This blatantly makes Scotland's past and King Kreon's past quite relevant.

It is also noteworthy to argue that Lochhead lays bare the negative and pernicious aspects of colonialism or hegemonic structure of cultures even when she fantasizes the supremacy of the Scottish rule in the land. In other words, by reversing the power relations between two countries, Scotland and England, it seems at first Lochhead tries to capture an atonement against England and she displays a fantastic/fictional world in which this time England and English culture are ostracized. However, the reader/audience later comes to the realization that her satire is not against England but the system itself. Or rather a social satire which encompasses Scotland itself as Lochhead admits in the introduction of the play, "we are a long way from a truly tolerant Scots society" (p.vi). In other words, Medea's integral struggle and pain are deployed to express the predicament and battle of survival of all cultures, communities or individuals at the margin of society owing to class , gender, or race discrimination. The system, the idea of supremacy of one over another is wrong, painful and destructive for the oppressed one. The following address of Medea teases out what it means to be stranger and marginalized one in a land and what the painful outcomes are:

I know you've thought me strange 'standoffish' 'a snob'

You have said of me not understanding my shyness

My coolness merely masked my terror of being snubbed

No one loves a foreigner

Everyone despises anyone the least bit different

' see how she ties her scarf' ' that hair outlandish' (Lochhead, 2000, p.9)

Medea is mispresented through the wrong stigmatizations like “standoffish” and “snob” as people cannot relate her behaviors with their own culture, they tend to stigmatize and otherize the other. This tendency is not natural but cultural in discrimination-based countries in cultural, gender and economic terms. She is forced to live in in-between Colchis and Corinth where she cannot find respect but instead where she is despised. This strengthens her social exclusion and intensifies the stigmatization process being imposed on her. Therefore, even though Lochhead displays the supremacy of Scotland, she does not justify the discrimination and marginalizing attempts of Scottish people against standard-English-speaking Medea. Wherever she observes oppression, she expresses her contempt.

In an attempt to convey the backlash of oppressor and oppressed based societies, Lochhead casts the Scottish King, King Kreon as a tyrant as much as possible. From her political stance, this kind of regime is to be shuttered and deconstructed. However, as mentioned before, Lochhead is not only interested in expansionist and nationalist aspects of the colonialism. Instead, she amplifies the adverse effects and outcomes of colonialism and presents it as a multifaceted dynamic which has great toll on societies. In relation to this, she explores how colonialism leads to class discrimination, gender oppression and xenophobia as the system embraces all kinds of discriminative ideologies. In this regard, the sense of superiority is not only restricted with the oppression against those who are from other nations and cultures but it is also prevalent in their unfair treatment against its own citizens, as well.

This negative domestic discrimination manifests itself in the case of NURSE and MANSERVANT characters. They share the same culture with the King Kreon as they all have heavy Scottish vernacular language. However, sharing the same culture and belonging to the same nationality are not enough for the equal treatment. NURSE and MANSERVANT are the slaves and they make explicit their social difference from the other characters: “Speak to me we’re slaves/ Baith in the same sair place in this catastrophe” (Lochhead, 2000, p.5). As well addressed by NURSE, they are just servants who are assigned to serve those who are more powerful in economic terms. However, in the tragedy of Lochhead, there are many slaves. But while NURSE and MANSERVANT suffer from the financial inequality, Medea suffers from social exclusion and emotional ignorance as a colonial other in Korinth.

It is usual that the colonial other is exposed to suffering and punishment. However, in the case of Medea, the reader/audience encounters a totally different end. This time the colonial and sexual other is not the one to obey the decisions but she becomes the decision-maker and survivor even though it seems she decides what one can imagine as the most horrible decision. In the beginning of the play, MANSERVANT and NURSE introduces and frames the story of Medea and Manservant purports the patriarchal rule and purpose of the world when he narrates Jason's betrayal:

> MANSERVANT: What's the world about?
>
> Jason can do so Jason does
>
> Hello bride bye bye bairns (Lochhead, 2000, p.6)

As MANSERVANT states that there is an overvalue imposed on manhood as if everything that the male is right as they are infinitely free. This male-dominated aspect centralizes and prioritizes the male and his desires, wishes, thoughts, opinions, and actions. Thus, everything in this world is about male and his action. However, this time the otherized sex and culture determine the end and victimizes the children even if it is the worst kind of action and decision. Therefore, there is no predeterministic end which can be finalized by the decisions of Greek deity Faith in the end of the play. But the reader/audience sees how a woman can take the action.

Overall, the refiguration of a well-known mythological story is a quite meaningful action to explore the socio-political and cultural issues of Scotland which is still relevant to the present. Through the story of Medea, Lochhead, within feministic concerns, highlights the visibility of women both in history and society. By putting the emphasis on her revenge and rage, Lochhead reminds the reader/audiences of how patriarchy does not satisfy with assigning different social roles to women and men and it goes further to aligning different emotions for different sex. Thus, she shatters the system which ignores the rage of women and forces them to suppress them and pacifies them. Thus, the present chapter argues that the dominant emphasis is on the manifestation of emotions which have to be different in men and women in patriarchal societies. Also, the recasting of Medea teases out to what extent mansplaining can further. There is a Jason who does wrong and betrays but who is justified in each action by the society just because he is a male. However, this time

Lochhead with different narrative techniques puts forward how men explain things to the women in their own way to be able justify their unacceptable treatments. Thus, Jason's lines are given so long whereas Medea's are short as she does not how to "cloak evil in a plausible coat" (Lochhead, 2000, p.20). Lochhead exclusively focuses on his patronizing and diminutive manners whereby he ignores Medea's all sacrifices and experiences. As the story furthers, the NURSE and MANSERVANT's perspectives turn out to be more central so Lochhead contributes a sort of Scottish aspect to the play to invite the reader/audience to consider what is the meaning of being a marginalized in a land. Thus, at first Medea is mispresented from a foreign eye as a wild, snob, and weird as she cannot comply with the cultural codes of Corinth. Later, it becomes obvious that the discrimination is not only based on sex and culture but encompasses the economic circumstances as well. Therefore, Lochhead presents how mispresentation and discrimination are interlocked and interdependent with each other. Because wherever there is an unprivileged or different group, there is an oppression and discrimination. From this vantage point, this chapter argues that Lochhead conveys the message that oppression is not innate in the oppressor culture and societies. As long as the government system is based on hierarchy, there will be a dichotomy between oppressor and oppressed. That is why, Lochhead's Scottish dream to rule the land peacefully ruins. Besides, the present chapter comes to the conclusion after overall analysis, Lochhead purportedly features a survival story instead of a revenge story. It can be said that this is the foremost novelty of Lochhead.

6. SEVENTEETH CENTURY CYNICISM INFILTRATING CONTEMPORARY SCOTTISH SOCIETY IN LIZ LOCHHEAD'S *MISERYGUTS*

Lochhead's *Miseryguts* (2002) offers a complex and cynical representation of the intersection between history, culture, and ideology in contemporary Scotland, particularly in 2002, Scotland. It would not be an exaggeration to state that her play can be seen as a fictionalized representation of a specific period in Scottish history. It highlights the socio-political corruption with a portrayal of duplicitous and witty characters and re-situates the plot and characters within an entanglement of corrupted political systems and superficial-level human connections. The purpose of this chapter is to explore Liz Lochhead's play *Miseryguts* from a new historicist perspective, with a specific focus on the infiltration of 17th century cynicism which was dominant in comedy of manners genre into the 21st Scottish society as portrayed in Lochhead's play. Through a close and comparative reading of the text, this chapter aims to discuss the ways in which Lochhead uses historical context and cultural references to comment on contemporary society's embrace of individualistic values, Alex's snobbish and misogynist behaviors as well as the corruption of political institutions in Holyrood Palace for the politicians' pursuit of power and privilege. By examining the play's forging themes such as condemned corruption, hypocrisy and pretentiousness, this chapter also seeks to uncover the ways in which libertinism, which was firmly fostered by comedy of manners playwrights in the 17th century, functions as a manifestation of broader social and cultural trends, as well as a site of resistance against dominant discourses of the 21st century.

Miseryguts or *The Misanthrope* was originally written by a French playwright, Jean-Baptiste Poquelin Molière (1622-1673). It is a prime example of a "comedy of manners", a genre that is described by Ashley H. Thorndike as the plays whose main focus is on "the exhibition of the habits, manners, and customs of the society of the time" (p. 259). The term "manners" used by Thorndike has a wide range of references from fashionable dress code to certain conducts and social norms. Yet, it primarily puts the emphasis on the society and social pre/judgements rather than individual moral decisions. Within this framework, plays belonging to this genre, as seen in the case of Molière's *The Misanthrope*, often scrutinize the manners and modes prevalent

in a particular society, questioning to what extent characters fit into the established standards of their time and setting. Given this, these plays can be construed as literary vehicles through which political and social tendencies of the coterie during the 17th century are represented through witty and intelligent dialogues. The main aim, therefore, is to illuminate the intricacies of social dynamics and provoke critical reflection and contradiction between the outward refinement and elegance of characters and their underlying nature, which often includes backbiting and deceit.

In *The Misanthrope* (1666), Molière portrays the follies of human nature behind the nice manners through a misanthrope character, Alceste who vehemently hates insincerity of people. The play revolves around his constant refusal to conform a societal necessity to be nice and polite. He preaches his best friend, Philinte about a necessity of true honesty in the interaction with other people. However, his morbid desire for authenticity is almost always at odds with Philinte's defense for a mediocre conduct. Alceste's another morbid obsession is his lover, Celimene. She is far away from the depiction of an obedient faithful womanhood. She is quite flirtatious and enjoys being accompanied by her suitors. She is represented as intelligent and witty as much as a man could be. Additionally, she deeply takes pleasure in gossiping and backbiting. Even though she perfectly fits into the vicious and duplicitous character type that Alceste abhors, he cannot help loving her so much. In Molière's play, Alceste's interactions with characters like Oronte, an impostor who attempts to tarnish Alceste's reputation by mocking his sonnet, and the prudish Arsinoe, who aims to expose Celimene's infidelity, shed light on the concealed motives lurking beneath the façade of societal politeness. Additionally, the ongoing discussions regarding Alceste's legal disputes and personal relationships reveal the manipulative dynamics inherent in social networks. Also, Molière's characters and topics he addresses in the play can be argued to transcend superficiality and caricature, setting him apart from other renowned writers of the comedy of manners genre during that period. According to Joseph Harris (2013),

> [H]e did not always seek to produce belly-laughs; across his plays, indeed, he shows a mastery of numerous comic techniques, including wordplay, bathos, surprise, satire and slapstick, producing responses that range from outright hilarity to what one of his contemporaries described as 'laughter in the soul.' (p. xxvi)

As stated by Harris, the characters in *The Misanthrope*, as well as other works by Molière, are not mere caricatures meant to evoke laughter; rather, they possess

complex personalities, distinct perceptions, and individual motivations. In this regard, they are depicted as conflicted, dedicated, rebellious, and capable of philosophizing on some concepts such as love, justice, hierarchy, and hypocrisy. Apart from his skillful characterization, his intricate plot twists, and compelling dialogues contribute to a thought-provoking and humorous theatrical experience. By simultaneously entertaining and encouraging a reconsideration of prevailing social conventions, Molière invites the audience to engage in a captivating exploration and reevaluation of the existing society.

Before delving into the analysis of Lochhead's own adaptation, it would be helpful to provide a brief history of Molière's impact on Scottish literature since it will offer a better understanding of Lochhead's decision to adapt this particular play. During the 1950s, there was an increasing interest in Molière's works among Scottish playwrights but particularly with the contribution of Robert Kemp's translations of Molière's famous plays such as *L'École des femmes* (1662) [*Let Wives Tak Tent* (1948)] and *L'Avare* (1668) [*The Laird o' Grippy* (1987)]. (Peacock, 2004; Smith, 2011; Corbett, 2011,). Noel Peacock notifies this new popularity of Molière in Scottish stage with the following statements: "Perhaps one of the most curious aspects of post-war Scottish theater history has been the upsurge of interest in the seventeenth-century French comic dramatist, Molière. (2004, p.87). Besides, the increasing literary fascination with Molière's works has become so dominant that Peacock refers to the post-war era in Scottish literature as "The MacMolière Industry" (2004, p. 87). This frequent utilization of Molière and his plays by Scottish playwrights through adaptation and translation was surely intentional because through his plays, they foster Scotland's linguistic and cultural diversity with humorous but critical ways.

Those adaptations include serious changes in setting such as making the place more precise unlike Molière's unidentified French indoors even though they are mere translations. Furthermore, Scottish playwrights such as Kemp make use of Scottish vernacular language by sacrificing some Molière's linguistic touches in his plays. As they directly aim at Scottish audience, they comment on lack of authenticity and ethical values which were very similar to 17th century French society. Hence, they do not hesitate to add Scottish idioms and a Scottish sense of humor to Molière's story as "weaponry of satire and ridicule" as Donald Smith puts it (2011, p. 127). This

popularity has made him “almost a Scottish playwright-byadoption” and even “helped define the distinctiveness of modern Scottish theater” (Findlay, 2004, p.203).

Randal Stevenson explores the reasons why Molière is so popular in modern Scottish drama in the book chapter “Triumphant Tartuffification: Liz Lochhead’s Translation of Molière’s Tartuffe”. He comes up with a plausible explanation by referring to Lochhead’s Tartuffe (2002) and compels the reader/audience to reconsider the translation theory not in language but in a cultural context. Derrick McClure (2015) furthers this argument in “From Misanthrope to Miseryguts: Liz Lochhead’s Naturalization of Molière” and relocates Lochhead’s contemporary adaptations of Molière’s plays within the broader context of Scottish drama’s historical evolution and the translation of classic European works into the Scottish cultural landscape. Her approach to Molière’s plays, as examined by McClure, demonstrates an interplay between the European and the local, expanding the role of the translator. In Lochhead’s reinterpretation, Molière’s plays, according to McClure, find a new home in the setting of Edinburgh. By so doing, Lochhead retains the essence of the European and classic texts while imbuing them with a distinctly Scottish character. This transformation not only revitalizes Molière’s works but also offers fresh insights into their relevance in modern-day Edinburgh. Roger Nicholson and Claudia Marquis (2015) in *Contested Identities* also sums up how Lochhead diverges from Molière despite rewriting his play with the following lines: “The extraordinary vigour of Lochhead’s Miseryguts, for instance, prompts a contrast between Molière’s concern with ‘the quirks of human nature’ and her compelling interest in political criticism and satirical commentary” (2015, p. Xviii). When considering the given arguments, it can be argued that the satire of society, religion, and monarch in a subtle elegant humorous style in Molière’s plays is borrowed as a literary medium to comment on the polyphonic, complex, and duplicitous politics of (post-Devolution) Scotland.

Even though Lochhead’s Tartuffe is akin to her *Miseryguts* in terms of fostering Scottish dialect and identity, *Miseryguts* is more than a translation but an adaptation. It shares many similarities with Molière’s *The Misanthrope* in terms of plot and the socio-cultural issues which Molière satirically addresses and ridicules. However, it is not a literal translation into English or Scots, as Lochhead has added her own fingerprints and touches to the dialogues, language, setting, and characterization. Lochhead’s *Miseryguts* consists of five act dramatic structure without any scene

breaks. The play is set in Edinburgh in 2002, and the original names of Molière's characters have been adjusted to modern common Scottish names. For instance, "Alex Frew" is the counterpart of Alceste, Celimene is transformed into "Celia Mann" Philinte is reincarnated as "Phil Innes" and so on. Lochhead's characters with their new names struggle with the new circumstances of their own time in a different city.

Despite the differences in time and setting, both plays explore the possessive, insincere and greedy characteristics inherent in human beings, which reflect the significant aspects of enduring human nature. The characters presented in both plays are driven by a desire for social status and they are portrayed in a constant struggle to maintain their individuality in the face of societal pressures. Also, both societies place a high value on language and wit, as seen in the clever dialogue and wordplay found in both Molière's and Lochhead's versions. In Lochhead's text, Alex is obsessed with the truth and honesty, no matter what it costs. His lover, Celia, is again presented as a witty and flirtatious woman who is capable of love and cruelty simultaneously and she is often inclined to tell people what they seek to hear. Both Celia, as a woman who does not conform to the rules of 21st century patriarchy, and Alex, who desperately seeks for honesty but cannot stop loving his unfaithful lover Celia, frequently strive to maintain their own personality. The conflict arises from the relationship between Alex and Celia, as well as Alex's contradictory behaviors which go against what he fervently rejects. Their socio-political interaction with other characters displays the fact that, despite the passage of considerable amount of time, crucial human elements remain unchanged. Given to this, drawing inspiration from Molière's characterization, Lochhead investigates the question of to what extent it is possible for individuals to fit into an imperfect society or choose to isolate themselves from the given social framework, as particularly exemplified in the case of Alceste/Alex's experiences.

Although these two works share many similarities and have some differences, Lochhead's play diverges from Molière's in one crucial aspect. Molière constructs a human landscape where two lovers, accompanied by supporting characters, are the survivors of an imperfect world. In other words, their humorous and flawed characterization is shown as a consequence of an imperfect world which is dominated by corruption in politics and religion. In contrast, Lochhead employs similar characters and characterizations, but instead of solely emphasizing the actions and struggles of the marginalized and comical figures attempting to adapt to an imperfect world, she

seems to display how these individuals contribute to the flawed nature of their surroundings through their imbalances, excesses, selfishness, hypocrisy, and ambitions. To put it differently, Lochhead directs her focus towards the archetypes that perpetuate imperfection in the world, rather than solely examining those that emerge as a result of an imperfect world. In this regard, corruption, selfishness, and extremism are portrayed in a more severe manner within Lochhead's work. In this regard, Lochhead's play can be considered as more serious and offers a more poignant critique of the human nature and the society that they have established for themselves.

To be able to establish the play's social relevance with her own time and society, Lochhead employs some literary strategies, benefitting from comedy of manners genre characteristics as a medium for satire. Hence, the setting of Liz Lochhead is not a background of no significance but more intricately interwoven with the plot and narrative. As in "From Misanthrope to Miseryguts: Liz Lochhead's Naturalization of Molière", Derrick McClure points out, "[t]his version is far more closely bound to a particular cultural location than Molière's play, and thus endeavours not only to re-state his timeless observations on the quirks of human nature but to provide a satirical commentary on the setting in which they now manifest themselves" (2015, p.110-111). Lochhead's *Miseryguts* presents a greater interest in location and culture instead of just focusing on the behaviors of the characters and trends of the coterie. Instead, it offers a unique perspective ranging from Scottish history, identity, mass media, and to the Thatcherite period through its examination of the complexities of human relationships and the impact of societal and political pressures on the individual. Lochhead skillfully employs the comedy of manners genre and its associated literary characteristics to provide insightful commentary on the influence of societal and political pressures. Through her play, she explores how these pressures can shape public perception and social interaction, shedding light on the intricate dynamics of human behavior within a given social framework. Furthermore, Lochhead delves into the impact of social networks on socio-political pressures, illustrating how individuals navigate and are influenced by these networks in their pursuit of social status and acceptance. By utilizing the comedy of manners, Lochhead highlights the interplay between personal ambitions, societal expectations, and the complexities of human relationships, offering a nuanced exploration of the power dynamics and social forces that shape individuals and their interactions.

First and foremost, a notable literary similarity is observed in the employment of libertine character type. As mentioned before, Molière transcends the common lines drawn for stock characters and portrays them more complex. Humor does not only come from physical humor and slapsticks, but from the conflict between characters, the character and the society, and the inner conflict of the character, which is evident in Alceste's experience. However, Lochhead takes Alex, her own version of Alceste, one step further. She liberates him from being a cuckolded husband or the embodiment of "deep-seated hatred for the hypocrisies of modern society" in Harris's words (2013, p. xxvii). Rather, she adds some essential elements of philosophical libertinism type. The term "libertine" frequently refers to the male or female person who does not have any sexual restriction and it was first used as a reference to a person with "free-thinking or antinomian opinion" in 1563 (Mintz, 1962, p. 134). It emerged from the Protestant Reformation in order to deny "the truth and relevance of Scripture" (Turner, 1985, p. 78). However, the term gained a new meaning at the beginning of the seventeenth century in Italy and France and became something different in England with Restoration Comedy or Comedy of Manners.

To give a brief historical background, during 1649-1660, England was ruled by Oliver Cromwell and his extreme Puritanist practices resulting in the prohibition of all kinds of activities which could give people pleasure. As a result of this, theatres were not allowed during his regiment. In the meantime, Charles I's son, Charles II, was in exile in France, so he got accustomed to French way of living and French worldview. When he came to the throne to restore the monarch in England, he also brought French customs to his country. This French influence on him had also great impact on English theatre so it formed a new mode of genre, Comedy of Manners. This new type of English comedy used humor and ribaldry to portray love in a playful and humorous way. It aims to satirize social types as society was established on a strict social hierarchy. John Herald Wilson makes an analogy between Restoration period society and pyramid (1965, p.33). Given to this, the King and his royal family constitute the peak point of the triangle and they are followed by nobility, bishops, gentry which were often referred as the squire and the poor citizens. The upper class had no tolerance to see the poor around and they disdained the squire as he did not fit for the standards of coquette. Besides, the most bothering aspect of him was that he was imitating the upper class's modes of behaviors and this imitation was realized and

despised by the upper-class (Wilson, 1965). The given social hierarchy during the period created stock types of characterization such as fops, who adopt French manners and fashion in style, speaking French, country bumpkins who hunt fortune with tricks and disguise, libertines who do not have any restrain in sexual attitudes and cynical characters. Through the employment of those characters, the plays such as George Etherege's *The Man of Mode or Sir Fopling Flutter* (1676) aimed to satirize and ridicule the feigned strict morality and evoked the sense of cynicism which went against senseless rules and seemingly rightful and useful institutions which often propagated the ethics and honnette (Wilson, 1965).

It is quite often the case that libertinism presented in comedy of manners is associated with liberated free sexuality, as mentioned before. However, Webster makes evident the fact that it has more philosophical base and it is associated with "a reputed skepticism of public institutions combined with a need for public attention." (2005, p.25). In this respect, cynical attitude as well as being sexually driven is the indication of a libertine character. Lochhead firmly heightens the skeptical stance of libertinism with Alex's overblown responses to every kind of corruption that he observes in the 2002 Scotland and Scottish society.

To widen the scope of commentary, Lochhead does not confine her character Alex into the characterization of Molière's Alceste, a French aristocrat, who has an extreme negative position against seemingly social niceties. Instead, she revises him as a multitasking man who is a refined poet, broadcaster, journalist and an official art critic. Unlike Alceste, Alex's criticism does not only come from his personality and his privileged position but also from his extensive knowledge and personal experiences in Scottish society. Lochhead, rather, premises Alex's misanthropy on his real-life encounters. Based on this life-long experiences, he is quite furious as he thinks that almost all the institutions in Scotland has been corrupted by human greed and foibles. To theatrically show this wide range of corruption, Alex is presented by Lochhead as more impolite when compared to Alceste's French mild and polite criticism. To exemplify, in the very beginning of the play, Molière's Alceste is complaining about human deceits and double-dealing nature of people by referring to Philante as he shows lots of affection to a person whom he does not recognize at all. He articulates his aversion to that kind of insincerity through the following statements:

For God's sake! It's unworthy, squalid, vile

To be so faithless to your own true self.

If by mischance I'd sunk so low, at once,

In sheer remorse, I'd go and hang myself. (Molière 1666 I.i. p.70)

As evident in the given excerpt, Alceste defines hypocrisy as a contemptible situation for humankind to feel ashamed within the most possible polite words. He, therefore, dignifies the sense of shame. Even though the situation and the main idea to be satirized are the same in the case of Alex, he employs much coarser and slang language, so he presents more angry and spiteful attitude in the face of insincerity. Thus, when he criticizes his friend Phil and blames him of being a double-dealer, he cannot refrain himself from using obscene language:

Admit it, all of them, you not-so-secretly despise them.

Pleasant? You worked that room in fucking order

Of highest down to lowest. In perfect pecking order

Tonight at that opening, man, I saw you lick

Enough arse to make a rentboy sick (Lochhead, I. p.6)

The hatred against people's servility is viewed by Alex as something unacceptable instead of something pleasant because it involves sacrificing one's beliefs for the sake of pleasing the other. But, according to Alex, one must cling to truths all the time even though they cause trouble. This explicit use of coarse language in his criticism is in direct opposition to the French style criticism, which employs meticulous vocabulary when commenting on the follies of French aristocracy. Alex's rage is in line with the representation of the Angry Young Man, as seen in British culture during the Thatcherite period. The socio-economic struggles of this time, marked by strikes and protests heavy privatization attempts and the increasing gap between the working and upper class, made social mobility available for the working class. Thus, Alex's language can be a hint for the reader/audience to figure out that the privileged position of Alex Frew is not a result of inheritance but of hard work, as the reader is not familiar with his past. This vague background makes possible the idea that he comes from a working-class background and he has toiled hard to be able to get his current socio-economic position which could explain his rage and coarse language. It is also possible that he belongs to the upper class from birth. However, the boundaries

between high and low language have blurred in the postmodern world so anyone can speak with delicacy or use casual profanity.

Another issue which Alex vehemently feels aversion to is the extreme sense of greed and ambition which is nourished by the existing government during the specified period. Lochhead, employing a skeptical libertine character, Alex, directly aims at Thatcherite policies which were implemented in the 1980s Britain. Her neoliberal economic policies brought about a significant shift in the country's social landscape. As they promoted the accumulation of wealth and unfair economic rivalry, they caused a significant change in the society's priorities. They, thereby, paved the way for the emergence of a culture characterized by an insatiable pursuit of wealth and privilege. This kind of ambition was nourished by the government's dominant discourse on the possibility of social mobility with hard work.

Of significant cultural reference here, Lochhead's portrayal of Alex as a dissent voice enables her to delve into the values of materialism and opportunistic tendencies prevailing in the Scottish society. This idea is evidently offered to the reader/audience in the exchange between Alex and Phil when Alex harshly criticizes Candy Tate's relentless pursuit of money and position.

> Take Candy Tate, that bitch takes every opportunity
> To do others down, claw herself another rung up the ladder
> And not care who she steps on the way. She is madder
> For success and her own Show than anyone in the station
> -which is saying something! No one's seen the like of such
> ambition,
> Blind, blonde and rampant! Behind the girly mask (Lochhed, 2002, Act I, p.11)

The given quotation from the play reveals the intense competition that arose during the Thatcherite policies, where individuals were driven by an excessive desire for success. Furthermore, it exposes the prevailing ideology centered around overarching ambition and the relentless pursuit of success within the British economy which prioritized market forces and privatized the institutions. Alex, portrayed as a 21st century Scottish libertine, perceives Candy's ambition for a social status devaluating the ethical considerations. In an antagonistic and misogynist manner, Alex criticizes Candy for being "Machia-fucking-velli" (Lochhead, 2002 I, p.11). By characterizing Alex as a

libertine who opposes Candy Tate's pretty mask to get what she wants, Lochhead reveals her concerns regarding the prioritization of individualistic goals over one's values that places immense importance on materialistic achievements and social mobility. However, in a broader concern, Lochhead's play, as Praskekova puts it, "continues the study of female identities in the Scottish context and problematises the cultural need of wearing social masks by women. It also treats the way female sexuality is perceived by the dominant masculine culture" (2014, p. 55). This dominant masculine gaze is explicitly given by Alex's discourse.

Celia Mann, the updated counterpart of Celimene, is also depicted as such an ambitious woman character who is in a social mask, just like Candy Tate. Lochhead's Celia and Molière's Celimene share lots of resemblances as both female characters feel or seek to be sexually liberated as female protagonists of the given plays. They do not have any restrain for themselves and they seek for individual pleasure. Therefore, they are flirtatious, pleasure-seeking and refuse to fit into the standards determined by patriarchy. This link between the protagonist female characters stems for the fact that patriarchy and its ideology still survive and dominate the 21st century. Those female characters can be considered as female libertine characters who adopt Machiavellian strategy for themselves for the sake of personal happiness and success.

The female libertine in Restoration Drama has often been studied as a counterpart to her male equivalent, the rake hero. This approach has primarily focused on exploring the ways in which women's libertine identities are constructed and measured in relation to men and puts the emphasis on those female characters' flirtatious, seductive and infidel nature just as seen in the given female characters. While Celia and Celimene prioritize their individual pursuit of pleasure over traditional norms and ethics as seen in both plays, Lochhead challenges the notion that the pursuit of sexual freedom is the only way-out to women's emancipation. In order to shatter this idea, Lochhead shifts the focus of womanhood and women's rights from sexual terms and makes it less scandalous in Celia's aspect and she drives Celia to the political realm. Celia, for instance, demonstrates a greater interest in political power rather than sexual gratification. And, in both cases, she resists the traditional expectations of women to be subservient to men and to prioritize the needs of others above her own and she shows her disdain for male possessiveness and feeling of their superiority when Alex bothers her with his jealousy through the following lines.

CELIA:

You have a novel way of showing it, that's true!

What's the matter with you, you can't enjoy a

Wee bit of amore without possessiveness and paronia

When other folk would be to settle for a cigarette!

I let you love me, Alex, this is what I get? (Lochhead, 2002, II. p.27)

As evident in the given quotation, Celia likes to be free from all kinds of social constraints. She demonstrates her hatred against the possessive tendencies which are frequently exhibited by men. She actively seeks liberation from Alex's sexual oppression and even challenges the notion of male superiority in her expectation that he should be grateful for she loves him back. This is made blatant when she views herself superior to Alex as she is too much to him. The others "would be to settle for a cigarette!" (Lochhead, 2002, II.p.27).

Besides, the last line of the given quotation shows repetition of "I" which evokes a strong assertiveness and a profound yearning for being a subject rather than an object in her own life. This attitude was frequently employed by comedy of manners or restoration drama playwrights as a stereotypical characteristic of libertines as they challenge the oppression of sexual desires. In this regard, they do not follow the social codes of their time. To put it differently, unlike the hypocritical and superficial members of the society who suppress their impulses and desire, that is against their true selves, libertine characters show demeanors complying with their instincts, or rather their true selves. From this and other aspects, Lochhead's Celia can be viewed as a real embodiment of libertine character as she is free-thinking, witty and sexually free women and she refuses to get older with Alex within marriage institution at the end because it symbolizes common social expectations from women and limit their personal growth and fulfillment.

Nonetheless, Lochhead does not put forward one type of female libertine who seeks for sexual freedom. In other words, she seeks for the ways to propose womanhood and feminism in multiple terms. She reimagines Molière's prudish woman, Arsinoe as a successful journalist Zoe Arnott. She is introduced in Act Three and depicted as zealous but jealous woman. She is depicted as ugly and manly as she is away from men and refuses their relationships. When she tries to warn Celia about the

roaming gossips about her multiple relationship with the other men, Celia furiously shouts that this loneliness is not her feminist choice but the result of her bad looking with a diminutive explosion: "feminism-schmeminism! Yeah, Mascara's a sin!" (Lochhead, 2002, III. p.50) And Zoe accuses Celia of being too flirtatious and defaming Alex's reputation with her infidelity. Then, they start a kind of cat-fight on feminism and they have opposite sides on the freedom of women. Zoe represents the New Celibacy as she cannot get laid from Celia's perspective whereas Celia stands for the woman image who misuse her sexual attraction on men to take her serious. Then Celia is overblown as follows and manifests her own ideological stance on feminism:

> I am sorry! Effort to get men to what?
>
> I must have it all wrong, I thought
>
> Feminism was about fighting the good fight
>
> For the assertation of female values and our right
>
> To validate ourselves and have autonomy .
>
> But it's about what men think of us, I see! (2002, III. p.51)

As stated above, Celia's view on feminism aims to free women being considered in men's terms. Thus, she totally ignores what others think and challenges the patriarchal ideology. However, Zoe also thinks that woman can only free from men's domination by refusing their company. However, this polarizing image on emancipation of woman oppression is given neutral. To put it differently, Lochhead intentionally does not present one side better from the other. Both sides are represented right in their own terms and both sides are the victims of Alex's masculinity.

In Lochhead's play, all the female characters are depicted as female libertine but all of them including Celia, Zoe and Candy Tate become targets of Alex's harsh and hostile criticism. He even attempts to exploit the feelings of Ellie Bird, the counterpart of Eliante in Molière's play. When he learns that he has been cheated by Celia, he immediately asks for Ellie's hand to alleviate his love pain and when he is refused by Ellie, he suddenly shifts his hatred to other women. The constant web of humiliation and resistance is a significant contribution of Lochhead to the 21st century reader/audince as she lays bare the operation of patriarchal mind and attempts to show a wide array diversity in resisting against this patriarchal oppression as each woman in the play carves out rebellious spaces for themselves within the restrictions of

patriarchal structures. Paraskevova addresses Lochhead's intentional employment of various libertine characters and states that: "At the heart of the play, despite the strong characterisation of Alex (Alceste), the Scottish misanthrope, lies the question about institutionalised misogyny towards successful women in their professional careers" (Paraskevova, 2014, p. 57). In this regard, while the debate between Prudish Arsione and Celimene seems superficial, revolving around reputation and jealousy in Molière's play, Lochhead's portrayal of these two women delves deeper, offering a more intellectually-driven discussion. Lochhead moves beyond personal motivations, presenting a sociological exploration of topics such as the objectification of women and the significance of social perception on women's bodies.

Another notable aspect of Lochhead's portrayal of the female libertine, Celia, is her pivotal role in revealing the prevalent corruption within Scottish politics. Lochhead captures the humor-satire blend of comedy of manners in the 17th century by entangling Celia within a complex web of relationships involving four male characters: Alex, Oscar, Archie, and Clint. By strategically situating Celia in the deadlock of these relationships, Lochhead unveils the significance of social and political networks and manipulations of these connections in the political sphere of Scotland. Each of these male characters represents a different facet of the corruption and hypocrisy in Scottish politics. Through their interactions with Celia, Lochhead sheds light on the various ways in which power is wielded, personal agendas are pursued, and moral compromises are made for personal gain. As a notable illustration of her assertive character, Celia actively cultivates close connections with Archie Fairbarn and Clint Andrews, who serve as counterparts to Molière's rival fop suitors, Aceste and Clitandre. Notably, in Lochhead's play, these characters have transformed into MSPs (Members of the Scottish Parliament). However, Celia's motivations extend beyond mere personal pleasure; they are fundamentally underpinned by her political aspirations. Therefore, she views Archie and Clint as political allies who can potentially help her in advance her career ambitions.

On the one hand, this situation demonstrates a common bias in the patriarchal societies, suggesting that women can navigate men by using their sexuality and they can exploit their relationships with men in power to gain political influence for the benefit of themselves. On the other hand, Celia's political ambitions and her relationship with Archie and Clint highlight the complex intersections between gender,

power, and politics from a new historicist perspective. Women have historically been underrepresented in political positions of power, and Celia's desire to become an MSP represents her desire to challenge and subvert this trend. What is more, the fact that she may have to use her sexuality to achieve her goals clearly reveals the limitations and challenges those women face in male-dominated political spaces. In a society where politicians and power-holders are often selected based on wealth or connections rather than qualifications, political and personal connections tend to prevail. In this context, women find themselves either having to work hard to prove their worth or being compelled to rely on networking. This becomes evident when Archie and Clint come to visit Celia, causing Alex to become furious as he wishes to have more private and intimate time with Celia, urging her not to receive her visitors. However, Celia responds to his frustration in the following manner:

> CELIA:
>
> Are you insane? Dont you know how to network?
>
> You put out feelers, set in motion little things you let work
>
> For you across the party lines, and Arch knows everyone.
>
> It's the age of spin when all is said and done
>
> And Archie's got all the old connections, plus his charm.
>
> He might not able to do me good but could do harm (Lochhead, 2002, II. p.29)

In the given quotation, Celia articulates the importance of political connections and makes explicit her intentions by insisting on maintaining her relationship with Archie. Her determination is driven by her political aspirations and her free nature. Thus, she refuses to succumb to male possessiveness by ignoring Alex's frequent attempts to control her actions and she opens her doors to Archie and Clint.

The given scene, viewed from a New Historicist approach, reflects the complex power dynamics and political landscape of the time. The dialogue between the three characters delves into the realm of politics within the Scottish Parliament. They engage in a long conversation marked by criticism and gossip, slandering prominent political figures behind their backs which have significant resonances in the 2000s of Scotland. The language used by the characters in this scene is particularly noteworthy as they are full of accusations and insults. They refer to their political rivals as "ignoramus", "verbose", and "fantasist", which indicate their disdain for those in power in most

extreme negative ways. By doing so, they expose the immoral and corrupted parts of political establishment which seemingly represent the voice of people deeply yearning for justice and equality

This is quite relative to the political and cultural atmosphere which have rising questions on nationalism, establishment of the Scottish parliament, being aunonymous and so on. However, just recently established Scottish parliament in 1999 was a successful or a failure? Are they interested in education, people, justice or they seek for their personal gain. Within the discourse surrounding Scottish nationalism and cultural identity, divergent perspectives come out. James G. Kellas (1989), in his influential work, The Scottish Political System, strikingly distinguishes cultural nationalists from political nationalists draws the attentions to opposing trends between them in fostering Scottish sense of nationalism. Even though both group acts with nationalist sense they seem indifferent to each other. The quotation below sums up Kellas's disparaging attitude to the role of culture:

> Cultural nationalists make a small but vociferous contribution to Scottish nationalism. They encourage the use of a Scottish means of expression in literature, and cultivate Scottishness in the other arts. A few support the SNP, or political devolution, but most are uninterested in politics, preferring to change Scottish society through education and cultural activities. The SNP, for its part, takes little interest in cultural matters. (129)

Celia, Archie, and Clint position themselves as those who have a more proper understanding of the political landscape since the others just talk but do not take any action for the sake of communal well-being. Therefore, they blame them of being ineffectual and detrimental to Scotland's progress. Corbett (2011) addresses the act of domesticating drama translations offering their audiences a double perspective and he notes that

> Lochhead affords audiences the opportunity to glimpse the unfamiliar world of Molière's back-biting courtier through the distorting lens of contemporary Scottish culture, whilst drawing inspiration from the plot, rhyme and wit of the original to satirise that very culture. (p. 103-104)

This commentary offers a cynical perspective to the reader/audience on the ruling power and representative voices of people. It also exposes the underlying power struggles which is different from what is presented to the citizens and those struggles shape the political arena.

It is indeed that Archie and Clint are presented as the rival suitors of Celia just like Aceste and Clitandre in Molière's plays. However, they represent much more than

foppery characteristics. Molière's quarrelling fops, Aceste and Clitandre are quite meticulous in their attires and way of speaking. they deceive everyone with their double-dealer nature. To exemplify this, in Molière's play, Aceste boosts and flatters himself with his money, wealth, as well as his charm and fashionable body shape as follows:

> At first nights, which I love, I play the critic:
>
> Upon the stage I lead the claps and boos
>
> And at the best bits stamp and scream Bravo!
>
> I am deft, I move with grace, I have charisma,
>
> I've a slim waist, my teeth are much admired;
>
> And as for dress-sense, in all modesty,
>
> I think he'd be a fool who challanged me. (Molière, 1666, III.i. p.100)

These descriptions illustrate how the character's manners are deliberate and artificial, aimed at presenting themselves as a true wit. His words unmask the self-assuredness as he has the elegant taste and manners. Through the portrayal of the character as a fop, Molière seeks to satirize the prevalent social norms that overvalue pretensiousness as a means to gain acceptance within a community. This is elucidated by John Traugott (1966) when he refers to the fop characteristics in the Restoration Drama in the following line:

> People will be fops and mask all and fain all. More- over, if one does not escape manners, one does not want to. Deception, protection, fashion, deference, insult, ease, play, ritual- these are the uses of manners and they are as well the attributes of society itself. The world of manners comedy is a sort of Hobbesian state of nature in the drawing room; the best artificer will win. (p.397)

When considering Traugott's argument, it can be deduced that Aceste is a truly embodiment of 17th century fop who imitates the true wit and overdresses himself with a constant attempt to prove himself to society or be approved by the society. Also, the humor in Molière's fop characters arises from Celimene's billet-doux, a love letter that both characterizes and belittles the other rivals. Consequently, these characters are portrayed as quarreling fops who compete with each other for Celimene's love.

In contrast, Lochhead's Archie and Clint are depicted as politically inclined, apart from their rivalry for Celia's hand. They not only feel frustrated with the politics in Scotland but also represent the personification of the disillusionment itself in the Scottish political system. Thus, while Molière employs the humorous element of the

billet-doux to create a satirical situation where the fops' vanity and pride are exposed, Lochhead's Archie and Clint are characterized as politically aware individuals who are disenchanted with the political landscape of Scotland. Besides, in Molière's play, love becomes a vehicle of ridicule as they fight with each other for her attention whereas the rivalry between Archie and Clint for Celia's hand serves as a good premise to highlight and comment on the political corruption in their country. By intertwining the personal and political realms, Lochhead presents Archie and Clint as embodying the larger disillusionment prevalent in the Scottish political system.Furthermore, Lochhead employs Archie and Flint characters and their foppish characteristics to be able to make her play quite relevant to Scotland and post-devolution period. Given to this, she makes abundant use references to the real debate topics of Scotland. Archie, in particular, addresses the main debate issues of the specified years. In his self-exclamation, he boosts himself for the reader/audience in a foppery style. However, his sexual desire for Celia and his political considerations are depicted inseperably hand in hand, suggested as follows:

> ARCHIE FAIRBARN:
>
> I am rich! I am young! I'm what you'd call landed gentry.
>
> -Pied a terre here, stately home in the country.
>
> Myself, I think nothing of inherited wealth and class –
>
> Debretts and debutantes can kiss my ass,
>
> Quite frankly. I am confident I'll make it my own,
>
> That my talent, wit and acumen can stand alone.
>
> I half-own that seafood joint down the shore at Leith
>
> The Greens would be nowhere without me, they wouldn't
>
> Necessarily have had someone with the charm to get elected
>
> So the environment in Scotland would be unprotected –
>
> And the environment is something I'm passionate about.
>
> I'll fight for a Dear Green Scotland, have no doubt!
>
> Now, with a politically converted Celia by my side-
>
> Wouldn't she be the ultimate classy politician's bride? (Lochhead, 2002, Act III. p.43)

The first lines of his speech support the connection between Archie Fairbarn of the 21st century and the rake of the 17th century as he admires himself in every aspect.

Thus, he proudly declares that he is wealthy and energetic enough to get Celia. However, this also emphasizes the significance of inherited wealth which enables one to have a privileged social status associated with the landed gentry. This actually reverberates the historical context of the early 2000s, where economic disparities and class divisions were prominent in Scotland. Archie's dismissive attitude towards this landed gentry, as evidenced by his disregard for Debretts and debutantes, can be seen as a manifestation of his deep-seated inferior complexity and a response to the existing power structures and a desire to climb social ladders.

Moreover, Archie's claim of half-ownership of a seafood joint in Leith and his association with The Greens, a political party known for its environmental focus, directly ties his character to the specific political climate of 2002 Edinburgh. The mention of the environment and his passion for a "Dear Green Scotland" indicates the growing concern for ecological issues during that period. This evokes the wider socio-political discourse at the time, where environmentalism and sustainability were gaining support within political circles. But this once again reflects Lochhead's local concerns as a Glaswegian citizen. According to Glasgow city council report released in 2019, Glasgow is on the top of Scottish cities in terms of the amount of accessible greenspace. Therefore, Glasgow and its nature are protected by activists with the name of Dear Green Place. By referring to Scotland's eco-political concerns with Dear Green Scotland, Lochhead subtly incorporates her political side as a Glaswegian. Additionally, Archie's desire to have Celia, a politically converted and seemingly sophisticated partner, by his side reflects the importance of image and alliances in politics. The reference to a "classy politician's bride" highlights the role of personal relationships and social status in shaping political careers and public perception. By incorporating these elements into Archie' character and speech, Liz Lochhead's adaptation captures the spirit of the 2002 Edinburgh political landscape.

It is indeed that Lochhead's deliberate choice of Molière's *The Misanthrope* as the source material for her theatrical adaptation holds significant strategic value. The original play, belonging to the comedy of manners genre, focuses on scandals and sensational occurrences within personal relationships and institutions. By reimagining Molière's work, Lochhead employs her adaptation as a medium for social satire, intertwining it with the Scottish political landscape of the early 2000s. This period saw an upsurge in nationalism and an expression of anxiety regarding cultural loss, themes

that found resonance in Molière's plays. In this regard, examining Lochhead's The Miseryguts from a new historicist perspective enables one to draw connections between the scandalous years in Scotland during the 2000s and the play's depiction of a socio-politically chaotic atmosphere. This era was marked by turmoil within the Holyrood Palace, with the Officegate scandal and the revelation of leaked confidential governmental information (The Guardian 2003). Additionally, the Scottish Socialist Party (SSP) faced suspension from the parliament. The unsettled political landscape in Edinburgh spurred a broader discourse on the role of political parties in the Scottish Parliament, notions of nationalism and cultural diversity, and the pressing need for greater transparency and accountability within democratic institutions. Lochhead effectively mirrors and engages with these heated debates of the time, incorporating elements such as media scrutiny, public scrutiny, and the dynamics of the Scottish Parliament into her work.

In 2002, according to McClure (2015), after three years since its establishment, the Scottish Parliament had lost the initial enthusiasm. Instead, there was a growing sense of disappointment and disillusionment as the Scottish government, officially a coalition of the Labour and Liberal Democratic parties but effectively dominated by Labour, failed to effectively utilize its devolved powers to bring about any noticeable positive changes in Scottish society. Furthermore, the theatre industry in Scotland is actively involved in lobbying for a greater level of independence for the devolved Scottish government. Hence, theatre becomes inherently political, engaged in propagating certain ideologies or engaging in disputes. Lochhead skillfully incorporates the fundamental principles of new historicism, highlighting the equal weighting influence of theatre and politics on the formation of society and public opinion. Thus, she gives a voice to Alex to expresses her own frustration with the theatre's political endeavors and the nationalist discourse in the following manner:

> ALEX:
>
> I told Roz Riverbed her plays are rubbish, derivative!
>
> I goes can you no dae nuthin original? The nation's
>
> up to here with your numpty doggerel 'translations'?
>
> She was there with a tribe of haun-knitted lost-the-plots
>
> Who wanted me to sign their petition lobbying for Scots

-Scots the language – to be taught in schools.

New devolved Scotland? It's a ship of fools!

I said I'm signing nothing, she says But Alec!

I says next you'll be asking me to support the Gaelic?

Gaelic! No cunt speaks it! It's moribund!

So 'Oh let's shall we set up a special fund!'

See, I'm the only person that's no too polite

To tell new devolved Scotland it's a bag of shite. (Lochhead, 2002, Act I, 9)

In the given quotation, the reader/audience witnesses an extreme sense of frustration towards the increasing number of poor-quality plays during the time. Alex criticizes Roz Riverbed's plays as derivative and lacking originality, in particular. But these plays, which is well indicated by Alex, can also refer to more common tendency among playwrights in Scotland who employ mere translations of existing works into the Scots language, intending to revitalize and preserve the linguistic heritage of Scotland. This dismissive manner does not necessarily mean that Alex is refusing or devaluing Scottish nationalism, but he believes that it will be impossible attempt to build a unified and independent nation-state concept just by institutionalizing the local native language Scots" -to be taught in schools" (Lochhead, 2002, I, p.9) He, rather, questions the possibility of building a nation-bond solely on the preservation of culture.

Moreover, considering his strong emphasis on genuine human connections and his intense dislike for superficial social interactions, it can be inferred that his concept of nation primarily revolves around shared sincere values and deep bonds. This form of nationalism aligns closely with Cairns Craig's definition of "nation" in "Re-definiton of Scottish Nationalism" as he states as follows:

> The nation is not founded on ethnicity or on some imagined unity but on the structures of civil life which protect and assert certain values: values. which the nation maintains in and through those institutions. The nation is the medium through which values are constructed asserted and maintained and those values can be reasoned about (1998, p. 90).

As Craig (1998) points out in the given excerpt, the concept of nationhood is not always necessarily on one language and one ethnicity but on shared customs, believes and values. In line with the given idea, Alex also implicitly suggests that a nation should be founded on shared common values and original and creative literature. That is why, he vehemently diminishes the ballooned ideal devolved Scotland and views the

supporters as a “group of fools” as they are out of reality and sincerity. Besides, his disdain sheds light on a broader aspect of language since the Scots is the language of “the other” to be marginalized in Britain. Thus, those speakers have been discluded from social and political areas of life. Nihtinen (2008) addresses the prevalence of this problem even after the devolution of Scotland and he states that:

> Scots has been largely excluded from political life in Scotland after devolution. As a result of this, the market value of Scots is extremely low as the language continues to be seen as a dialect or, at best, a low-status language and it is often associated with class issues or regional differences.” (Nihtinen 2008, p.74).

Nihtinen’s argument reinforces Lochhead’s challenging and cynical stance towards politicians who claim to support an independent and distinctive Scotland, but whose primary motivation lies in obtaining power and privilege. The parallels between Nihtinen’s observations and Lochhead’s perspective further emphasize the enduring obstacles faced by the Scots language and the insincerity of certain politicians in their supposed advocacy for Scotland's cultural distinctiveness.

Another language problem, being significantly highlighted in the given quotation, is the institutionalization of Gaelic language. Alex refuses to support the Gaelic since it is spoken by the minority of Scottish population. When peering into the historical context of the given period of time, is interesting to note that the languages including Gaelic and Scots, as he points out, mattered less than Scottish history and separate institutionalization process in the aftermath of devolution even though they foster distinctive Scottish identity (Nihtinen, 2008). With the opening of Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh in 1999, the position of those language got strengthened by the political changes and they have been institutionalized by the UK’s approval of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages officially support Gaelic and the Scots languages (Nihtinen, 2008). Here, Alex refers to this political upheaval and the rise of nationalistic practices regarding the use of languages. As it is obvious, he first refers to the Scots and then Gaelic, so the reader/audience has a false glimpse that the Scots was the primary interest of Scottish Parliament.

Contrary to that point of view, Nihtinen claims that Gaelic was supported more than Scots. In Nihtinen’s terms, “It was Gaelic, and not Scots, that was used briefly but symbolically at the otherwise English language ceremonial opening of the new Parliament in Edinburgh. (2008, p.8) The position of Gaelic in the Parliament has been viewed as a symbol of cultural heritage and distinctiveness of Scottish identity even if

it has been not used by the majority. Therefore, in comparison to Scots, Gaelic has been considered as both a serious issue by the government and a convincing symbol with historical and indeed contemporary importance." (2008, p.73). However, as seen in the case of Lochhead's play, Nihtinen underscores one essential difference between two languages as such: "Gaelic is promoted, institutionalized and supported both as a national and cultural issue and as an endangered minority language. Scots is usually supported with regard to its role as a national cultural asset, but even this has not been visible in governmental language policy" (2008, p.87).

Nepotism or cronyism, where staff members are selected based on their connections rather than their qualifications, is another concern that Lochhead satirically ridicules in Miseryguts. Oscar Scougall, a character in Molière's play, is the foppish son of the Head of Culture, Art, and Entertainment in Lochhead's version. While the reader/audience is not fully acquainted with his occupation, it is clear that he is interested in poetry and has a relationship with Celia to some extent. One day, Oscar decides to seek Alex's opinion on his poem and visits him, demanding honest criticism. Oscar's reason for choosing Alex is that he cannot find genuine feedback due to his social status as the son of a prominent figure. He dismissively regards those around him who insincerely flatter him. This is portrayed as follows:

> OSCAR:
>
> 'It's alright for you, Oscar' – that's what people say
>
> But me? I'm determined to make my own way
>
> Whoever my father is! I dont need to use that!
>
> Nepotism might be one way but I dont choose that (Lochhead, 2002, Act I, p.17)

Despite Oscar's cynical view of people and their superficiality, he cannot help revealing his arrogant humility. He does not genuinely seek sincere connections with others, including Alex. He is overly confident in himself and cannot entertain the possibility that his poem might be lacking. Therefore, when he faces Alex's harsh criticism, he becomes intolerant and retaliates by suing Alex in court. Once again, the reader/audience witnesses Lochhead's skillful intertwining of the text with history, humor, and satire.

Of great relevance here, a significant aspect of Lochhead's commentary lies in her depiction of the lack of independent judgment through the relationship between

Oscar and Alex, borrowing from the problematic lawsuits of Alceste. In Molière's play, the protagonist, Alceste, finds himself entangled in two legal processes, one involving Oronte, although the details of the first lawsuit remain vague to the audience. However, it becomes apparent that the legal system is plagued by pervasive corruption of the time. This idea is highlighted by Philinte when he advises Alceste to seek the support of an advocate, recognizing that "His friends might influence the—" (Molière 75). Drawing inspiration from the idea of legal corruption, Lochhead satirically echoes the influence of relationships on individual judgment, portraying a more chaotic scenario. In Lochhead's portrayal, Alex is not accused of harsh criticism, which is not a crime, but instead faces fabricated allegations of sexual assault. This portrayal serves to highlight the distortion of justice when personal relationships pave the way for the undue influence over legal proceedings. Alex fervently reacts to the impasse he is forcibly got into and he blames the politicians through these lines:

> ALEX:
>
> Malicious accusation given credence by a force who can't
>
> Be annoyed
>
> To go wait a minute before indulging the schadenfreude
>
> Of the public by announcing that they are questioning me
>
> Over allegations of sexual assault they're taking seriously!
>
> Seizing my computer to check for kiddie porn! Oh yes! (Lochhead, 2002, p.69)
>
> …
>
> I blame the politicians. In this, the age of spin, the public
>
> Wants
>
> Their blood, their guts, gruesome press conference true
>
> Confessions
>
> Of financial shenanigans and extra-merital indiscretions-
>
> At least the ones that might come out some day!
>
> So lets detonate the ticking bomb and make it go away! (Lochhead, 2002, p. 70)

The excerpt from Alex's speech presented here provides a compelling and interdependent portrayal of the power dynamics within the political and media landscape and constitutes the core criticism of Lochhead's adaptation. Alex invokes the basic tenets of a new historicist perspective influenced by Michel Foucault's

theories. Foucault's concept of power as pervasive and discursive becomes evident as Alex laments the influence misused by political forces and the media in shaping public opinion. Here, the reader/audience can easily observe how Lochhead has somehow demonstrates her mastery of her vast grammar and politicizes Molière's adaptation to address a topic in her home country. The word "the schadenfreude", which means to take pleasure in one's misfortune, primarily reflects the general tendency of society. Later, she openly accuses politicians who turn this general tendency in their favor, who can instill the idea they want to the public with the media apparatus as they want, and who can easily manipulate the public.

From a new historicist perspective, the excerpt reveals the intersections between power, knowledge, and the construction of truth. Alex is deeply frustrated with the unquestioning acceptance of those fabricated allegations by the public and he likens public's acceptance and aggrandization of Alex's allegations to a thrown-away ticking bomb to erose his reputation. This proves the power of politicians who have ability to fame or defame a person via media. Besides, they do not only tarnish a person's image in the public eye by false accusations through media, but also they use security forces to threaten him/her. The invasive search for a child-porn evidence on his computer highlights the mechanisms of disciplinary power at work. This also reminds the reader/audience of how the control and regulation of individuals are operated through surveillance and the production of knowledge.

Alex extends his profound disillusionment with the political establishment aligns and draws a pessimistic image of Scotland as such:

> I had high hopes for a new Scotland and that Holyrood
> Might say enough is enough, and for the public good
> Refuse to pander to the lowest or grub after power at any cost.
> Once I had high hopes indeed- but now they're lost.
> Forever! That's it! I have simply had it up to here
> With this place, media, with the world's gowd and gear. (Lochhead, 2002, Act III. p.70)

As stated by the given quotation, Alex reflects a poignant criticism on his hometown's political landscapes. Having "high hopes for a new Scotland" echoes his yearning for a positive change and progress in the aftermath of devolution. His expectation from the

politicians and repsentatives has been to prioritize the public good and to ignore power and personal gain for the sake of communal well-being.

To conclude, Lochhead's rewriting serves as a theatrical bridge that connects the cynicism of the 17th-century comedy of manners with her 21st-century skeptical perspective on Scotland's political landscape. Drawing inspiration from Molière's satire on human duplicity and corruption, Lochhead delves into the dynamics between power and resistance by compelling the reader/audience to reevaluate the societal constructs that both shape and are shaped by its citizens. Furthermore, it provides Lochhead with a fertile literary ground to reflect upon and engage with fundamental concepts such as feminism and nationalism, which occupy a prominent space in her political discourse. Her adaptation, in this sense, contributes somehow depth to Molière's characters, particularly the female ones by highlighting their struggles within the patriarchal confines of their society. Moreover, by reimagining Alceste as a more impassioned figure forced by societal pressures and his own convictions, Lochhead elevates her adaptation to a level of profound thought-provocation.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has been conducted to comprehensively explore the entrenched representation of Scottish history and identity, especially regarding the portrayal of Scottish womanhood as conveyed in Lochhead's selected plays such as *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off, Dracula, Medea,* and *Miseryguts*. The central focus of this study is the analysis on Lochhead's politicized commitment to multifaceted issues such as (mis)representation; perpetuation of stereotypes; experiences of marginalization based on gender, nationality, and class; and other complex dynamics surrounding Scottish identity. Lochhead's ouvre effectively integrates these themes with historical narratives. She hereby invites the readers or audiences to view the subject matters fostered in her plays through a skeptical perspective, especially regarding narratives conventionally regarded as unquestionable and rooted in objective truths. The skepticism presented to the readers or audiences is one of the fundamental tenets of new historicism. In this regard, it is a critical tool that facilitates the emergence of new perspectives on how the sociopolitical context of writers, regardless of their chosen genre such as fiction or history, invariably shapes their creative output. In addition, it improves our interpretation of Lochhead's plays wherein the past, present, and sociopolitical context frequently intertwine with each other.

Rooted by the new historicist theoretical framework, this research has delved into the complex interplay between fictional narratives and historical realities of the mentioned plays. The connection between literature and politics is most evident during times of intense public discourse within nations. A new historicist perspective highlights the profound interdependence of these two realms, which revealed that literary works, whether fictional or nonfictional, are inherently shaped by the sociopolitical landscape of their respective eras. This dynamic relationship finds a vivid illustration in the context of Scottish history, particularly against the backdrop of sociopolitical fluctuations that followed a heightened cultural awareness and a yearning for a Scottish parliament and distinct national identity.

The four plays presented in this dissertation demonstrate the inseparable link between literature and politics owing to the postulation that history writers just like fiction writers cannot remain neutral. Instead, they are inevitably shaped and

influenced by the prevailing sociopolitical currents of their time. This observation is particularly relevant in Lochhead's plays. This is because the plays refer to definite periods of history, which establish a fictional space to portray how real and fictional characters struggle with the dominant tendencies/customs of the given period, how their circumstances led them to be mispresented, or how their truths are intentionally or politically excluded or included. Moreover, Lochhead challenges the prominent tendencies used in the manipulation of the facts.

To illustrate, in *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, she revisits the sixteenth-century Scotland, a time when the country was independent and had its own distinct identity. Lochhead's portrayal of Mary Queen, as discussed in Chapter Three, disrupts conventional historical narratives by offering alternative perspectives and interpretations. By presenting multiple facets of Mary and shedding light on the radical patriarchal practices surrounding Mary and Elizabeth, Lochhead invites her readers or audiences to question and reevaluate their preconceived notions about the past and historical figures. In line with this, rather than subscribing to binary oppositions that idealize or vilify these queens, Lochhead proposes that the past is elusive and history is far from an unchanging or objective truth, which is the key argument of new historicism. Instead, she depicts history as a complex interplay of personal experiences, cultural influences, and political circumstances. Lochhead's approach to writing history embraces the concept of uncertainty by revealing the limitations of historical knowledge. She acknowledges that history is influenced by individual biases, societal norms, and power dynamics. Her intention, as observed in this dissertation, is to inspire a skeptical analysis of historical narratives that are often considered unquestionably supreme and reliable. To challenge this perspective, she playfully delineates the royal characters, portraying them as complex fallible figures. This irreverent and joyful reimagining of the past is considered, from a New Historicist perspective, as a recognition of the subjective nature of history itself, which should remain open to continual reevaluation and reinterpretation. In this regard, *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* sheds light on the ever-evolving nature of historical understanding and reinforces the critical role that literature plays in shaping our perception of the past, akin to official historical records.

Dracula, which Lochhead borrows from Stoker, delves into themes such as vilifying women and their sexual-driven impulses and racial discrimination during the

imperial Victorian period of Britain. However, as Chapter Four suggests, Lochhead transforms this ambivalent continuum into a vehicle for commentary on imperialism, conventional gender roles, stereotypes, and the various hierarchical structures deeply embedded in society. To put it differently, the hierarchies in England and Scotland in *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* are reverberated to the power relations between Britain and other countries. That is to say, Lochhead excavates the historical hierarchies and discursive constructs of the past. She skillfully unravels the rigid demarcation between notions of good and evil, seduction and angelicism, as well as civilization and barbarism. In her fictional realm, she blurs the boundaries that separate these polarized concepts, thereby challenging the sociocultural judgments and stigmatization that have prevailed for centuries.

In *Medea*, she takes the readers or audiences to the ancient times when the civilizations were being formed and established. Once again, Lochhead refers to a particular era of humanity, digs out the binaries between sexes and nations, and explores how these biases have caused discrimination and misunderstanding. Lochhead uncovers these deep-rooted ideas from a historical perspective, indicating that even in ancient myths, there is a prevalence of discrimination in societies. From a new historicist standpoint, Lochhead's engagement with this mythological story evinces how she equally reads mythological stories and historical accounts. In addition, myths also function as a narrative that depicts the customs, power relations, and ideologies of the ancient Greek society. In her adaptation of the source text, as elucidated in Chapter Five, Lochhead confronts the pervasive issue of human suffering owing to discrimination. Although she reverses the cultural capital from England to Scotland, she expresses that oppression and discrimination are inevitable wherever underprivileged or distinct groups exist. Lochhead's play, from this vantage point, is a call to action, urging us to recognize and challenge these systems of hierarchy and oppression.

In *Miseryguts*, Lochhead reverberates a contemporary political agenda of Scotland by setting the play right after Devolution and establishment of Scottish parliament. It serves as a vital theatrical conduit that bridges the gap between the seventeenth-century cynicism inherent in the comedy of manners and Lochhead's twenty-first-century skeptical approach. Drawing inspiration from Molière's incisive satire on human duplicity and corruption, Lochhead delves into the intricate dynamics

of power and resistance. Her work compels readers and audiences to reevaluate the society they collectively shape and by which they are, in turn, shaped. Moreover, it provides Lochhead with an ideal canvas that she can reflect upon and dissect her observations regarding fundamental concepts such as feminism and nationalism. These concepts occupy a substantial space in the realm of political disputes and discourses, which often served as tools for manipulating public opinion. By exploring these intersecting themes, Chapter Six discusses that Lochhead politicizes and enriches Molière's original play within her adaptation. She amplifies the portrayal of women and redefines Alceste as a more impassioned figure, one compelled by societal pressures and personal convictions. By so doing, Lochhead elevates her adaptation to a higher level of profundity and intellectual engagement, leaving her audiences with much to ponder and discuss.

In addition to the critical examination of the problematic construction of history and its far-reaching influence on contemporary society, this dissertation has embarked on a comprehensive exploration of what Scotland signifies and where it stands within the larger United Kingdom. Scotland, throughout this study, is portrayed as a subject of not only historical misrepresentations but also oversimplified and stereotypical depictions, particularly the clichéd portrayal of its geographical features. In addition, this dissertation focused on the profound effort to diversify and liberate Scotland from the constraints of these restrictive and prototypical highlander images. This endeavor to break free from such limiting narratives is not merely an aesthetic pursuit but is of immense political significance. The plays scrutinized in this dissertation indicate that every instance of writing, much like a spoken discourse, is inherently imbued with political implications and possesses the power to influence. That is to say, it challenges the status quo, questions established norms, and confronts the oversimplified representations that have persisted in the discourse surrounding Scotland. It emphasizes Lochhead's deep awareness of the inherent political nature of writing per se. In this context, Lochhead's literary endeavors, therefore, transcend the boundaries of mere storytelling; they became vehicles for sociopolitical commentary, advocating for a more complex portrayal of Scotland and its multifaceted identity.

Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off is as a good example that resonates profoundly with Lochhead's overarching concern regarding the multifaceted representation of Scotland, as explored in the preceding chapters of this dissertation.

Within the narrative of the play, the opening speech delivered by La Corbie, which begins with the poignant query, "SCOTLAND. Whit is it like?" (Lochhead, I.i. p. 11) encapsulates Lochhead's ultimate objective, that is, to find a possible definition for Scotland and to depict Scotland in all its complexity and diversity. Lochhead's portrayal of her country is given as an entity, characterized by positive and negative facets, mirroring the complex real-life representation of Scotland. In addition, it is worth noting that the only character in the play who remains inflexibly rigid is John Knox, who is boldly blamed by Lochhead for leading an intolerant generation in Scottish society that resists embracing the inherent diversity of the nation. Scotland, as presented in the play, is inherently multicultural, national, and linguistically diverse. Herein, this rich multiplicity is skillfully entrenched into the narrative of the play. Instead of portraying Scotland as one homogenous political and cultural entity, Lochhead's play embraces the multiplicity and multivocality embedded in the sociocultural history of the country. Therefore, it is clear that the perception of Scotland, according to Lochhead, is closely linked to individuals' social backgrounds and personal experiences and the specific historical contexts in which they are situated. This multifaceted portrayal decisively challenges the notion of a monolithic national identity, ushering in a narrative that offers a plethora of diverse perspectives, transcending the limitations of one-dimensional representations.

In *Dracula*, the deliberate choice of the whirlpool image in defining Transylvania, particularly when considering Lochhead's dedication to crafting Scottish identity and history, holds remarkable relevance for the context of Scottish history. This choice, whether conscious or subconscious, established a significant link between two countries and draws readers' or audience's attention to the detrimental consequences of (British) imperialism. Just as Transylvania represents a captivating blend of diverse cultural influences, Scotland also has Celtic highlanders, Anglo-Saxon lowlanders, and Norse heritage from archipelagos converge. Scottish history is teemed with independence wars fought against the Kingdom of England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. However, even after the Union of the Crowns in 1707, these conflicts persisted, taking on different forms of tension and discrimination. Those wars, whether in Transylvania or Scotland, are perceived as pawns in the ideological games of privileged rulers, often resulting in loss and devastation. Lochhead masterfully presents these consequences in her adaptation of Dracula. Through the

evocation of Transylvania and its power dynamics, which resonate with the historical subjugation of Scotland by England, as exemplified in the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, Lochhead invites her readers and audiences to critically reflect on the enduring power relations of these nations. Her work serves as a poignant reminder that no form of expansionist policy should be glorified because it inevitably leads to suffering and devastation, a message that resonates through the narrative tapestry of her Dracula adaptation.

In *Medea*, Lochhead experiments with the concept of reverse colonialism to represent Scotland as a culture capital. The cultural marginalization and social discrimination in Scotland stem from its people's self-identification as a nation, juxtaposed with the perception of Scotland by England as a foreign nationality in need of assimilation. This study argued that it is most probably Lochhead's political response to the extremely idealized expectations imposed on Scottish devolution, which initiated a growing inclination to reposition Scotland as the center, prompting a nuanced analysis of the complexities surrounding the assertion of national identity. Thus, Lochhead's centralizing Scotland and otherizing Medea's standard English distorted this idealistic image of Scotland in which everything will change when it becomes a center. Thus, national concerns in Lochhead's rewriting became a platform for advocating global tolerance and acceptance of diversity.

In *Miseryguts*, Lochhead creates a totally different representation of Scotland of 2002 from the expected one. This is owing to the fact it is normally expected to delineate a better and more powerful image of Scotland because the country has been recently devolved and there is a way to referendum for independence. However, out of expectation, Lochhead portrays a chaotic nation in which the media is a dominant state apparatus to manipulate people's perception and the MPs of Scotland are just interested in their own privilege and power in the society rather than the well-being of the nation.

Moreover, this dissertation found that Scotland is presented through the Scottish phrases and variants. One of the pivotal findings of this dissertation underscores the profound connection between the identity, history, and language of Scotland, which is predominantly conveyed using Scottish phrases and variants in the works examined. In almost all the plays scrutinized in this dissertation, Scottish history

and culture are portrayed in the authentic voice of the Scottish people, presented through the medium of the Scots language. Lochhead's deliberate choice to incorporate the Scots language in her literary creations reflects a deep commitment to preserving and celebrating her own cultural heritage. This serves as a testament to her dedication to forging a distinct national identity for Scotland.

However, it is important to emphasize that Lochhead's approach is far from a narrow and one-dimensional form of nationalism. Instead, she employs the Scots language to evince that it can be used in the expression of art and thoughts in daily life. Using the Scots language, she explores the multifaceted challenges and complexities faced by her nation. Her literary endeavors transcend monolingualism, embracing a dynamic, multilingual approach. She seamlessly integrates standard English, French, and even American slang into her works to highlight the influences that have shaped Scottish history. To clarify, Lochhead's use of language serves as a reflection of the multicultural, polyphonic social structures that have evolved over centuries owing to migrations, wars, and displacements, mirroring the intricate complexities of real-life societal dynamics. While the common thread in these four plays lies in their advocacy for linguistic polyphony, Lochhead's approach is anything but narrow-minded or bigoted. Instead, her works showcase diversity, acknowledging that the strength of an identity of a nation lies in its ability to embrace and harmonize the various voices that contribute to its cultural mosaic.

Moreover, this study found the significance of the voice of those who delineate the past. That is to say, the plays discussed in this dissertation show that who conveys the past and how is equally important as the history and representation of Scotland. Except for *Miseryguts* as it has a modern setting, history or story is framed by someone who crossed the time restrictions and gave a panoramic portrayal of the past by jointing the different periods in the story. In *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, this remembering or retelling figure is assigned to La Corbie, a fascinating supernatural female figure who recalls and recounts the past with her sardonic voice, using cawing and sarcasm to satirize societal binaries and women's roles. In a similar vein, Lochhead offers Dracula as a figure of remembrance owing to his centuries of existence like La Corbie. In addition, he is a supernatural entity attempting to expose the unjust hierarchical power dynamics between the British Empire and other nations. Just like how La Corbie, who is silenced by beheading,

symbolizes the suppression of certain narratives, the staking of Dracula parallels the silencing of voices to uphold a glorified version of history. In *Medea*, this remembering figure is CHORUS, which consists of women from all ages such as the prehistoric times to the present. These figures remind the readers or audiences that even though the time goes by, some constructed ideologies resulting in suffering globally remain. Therefore, those remembering figures are the irreverent reding of history from a new historicist approach since the past was written in a quite selected period, in a restricted perspective. By offering a panoramic vision of the past and present, Lochhead in a sense distorts the linearity and neutrality of history.

Apart from a remembering figure who trespassed the boundaries of the past in a supernatural entity, the gender of those remembering figures greatly matters. In Mary *Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*, the remembering figure is La Corbie, a gendered bird, not le corbie but la corbie a femine creature. Moreover, in *Medea*, the remembering and manipulating figures are CHORUS, the women who have suffered from patriarchal practices in their own societies. Furthermore, even though Lochhead assigns Dracula as a remembering figure, the readers or audiences realized that he is not depicted as such a masculine but instead depicted with fluid and homosexual implications. Besides, the roles of women and voices of women together with their blood transfusion get interwoven. Finally, in *Miseryguts*, the readers or audiences are presented with the different and multiple voices of women. The main argument of these findings from a New Historicist approach tries to shatter the history by peeling it from a narrow-sided masculine gaze to a feminine gaze. Thus, this dissertation argues that this is a part of Lochhead's Herstory project whereby she endeavors to increase visibility of women in stories and centralize their point of views and give voices to the silenced marginalized groups. Besides, she does this in a similar approach with her tendency in depicting her own nationalist concerns. Her feminist concerns in this regard are not again just restricted. She liberates the oppressed voices not in single-minded way but in multiple characters. Thus, her feminist concern is not only related to the gender equality in life but also a space for women in writings to make their experiences and stories visible and relevant.

Another noteworthy theme that evokes in Lochhead's plays, as observed in this dissertation, is her portrayal of sisterhood as less harmonious and marked by elements of rivalry. This theme is apparent in instances such as Mina's mistreatment to a servant

in *Dracula*, conflicts among women in *Miseryguts* and *Medea*, and the strained relationships among characters such as Glucea, Mary, and Elizabeth. Her deliberate choice to depict such conflicts challenges conventional, idealized portrayals of feminism, which often present women's cooperation as pure and devoid of conflict. Instead, Lochhead disrupts this image and suggests that the struggle for equality in life and representation does not necessarily result in seamless harmony among women; rather, it can entail complex dynamics and internal tensions. This standpoint encourages a critical examination of the multifaceted nature of women's experiences and interactions, enriching the discourse on feminism and gender relations within her works.

In addition, this dissertation has probed into Lochhead's exploration of issues regarding income inequality and exploitation of the working class. This stems from Lochhead's strong connection to her cultural heritage and her commitment to capture a more realistic representation of Scotland, rather than a utopic or desired nation. Her personal experiences and Glaswegian society, wherein she was born, play great role in the depiction of the lives of ordinary Scottish working-class individuals. In addition, it is evident in each play because all of them include a servant or master–servant relationship. Besides, using a language that resonates with these communities, which gave them a voice and representation in her literary works, Lochhead and her plays hold meaningful significance within the new historicist framework.

In conclusion, a common thread running through all of Lochhead's plays is her relentless effort to deconstruct prevailing power dynamics and hierarchical structures, be it a realm of nationhood, gender, or narrative conventions. This overarching theme underscores the profound significance of Lochhead's works within the English and Scottish literary studies. Her plays provided invaluable insights into the intricate web of binary oppositions that define the relationship of Scotland with England, complex dynamics between men and women, construction of historical narratives, and interplay between fiction or storytelling and religious influences. In summary, Lochhead's efforts in literature and representation establish her plays in academic discussions in drama studies. Her plays are compelling evidence of how literature can achieve change by highlighting the ever-changing nature of human experiences and societal structures while prompting one to critically examine the established norms and biases that influence the society.

REFERENCES

"Mansplaining." OED Online. Retrieved from https://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/59997929;jsessionid=7FAD43355C71EF8CC8C34813AA6AAFBE#:~:text=colloquial%20(originally%20U.S.).&text=transitive.,a%20patronizing%20or%20chauvinistic%20attitude.

"Officegate".(2003). McLeish avoids prosecution for. Officegate. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/mar/21/scotland.devolution

"The Writers, Liz Lochhead (1947–): Biography"(2004). *Writing Scotland, A Journey through Scotland's Literature.* BBC Scotland, http://www.bbc.co.uk/ scotland/arts/writingscotland/writers/liz_lochhead/ (accessed 25 March 2010).

Ágústsdóttir, I. (2012). "Mary queen of scots as feminine and national icon: Depictions in film and fiction". Études écossaises.

Angeletti, G. (2018) *Nation, community, self: Female voices in Scottish theatre from the late sixties to the presen*t.

Ascherson, N. (2003) *Stone voices: The search for Scotland*. London: Granta.

Axton, M (1977). *The queen's two bodies: drama and the Elizabethan succession*. London, UK.

Barthe, R. (2009). *From work to text. The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000,* 235

Bhabha, H. (1994). *Location of culture.* Routledge

Böhnke, D. (2006). "Liz Lochhead's Mary queen of Scots got her head chopped off." *Teaching contemporary literature and culture*. Susane Peters, et all. Ed. (313-331)

Brannigan, J. (1998). *New historicism and cultural materialism.* Basingstoke: New York.

Braun-Hansen, A-K (2004). *Dramatic laborotories: Figurations of subjectivity in Liz Lochhead's writing*. Glienicke: Galda Wilch.

Brown, I. (2011). *Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama*. EUP

Brown, I. (2016) *History as theatrical metaphor*. London, United Kingdom.

Brown, I. (2016). *Taking Liberties: Scottish Literature and Expression of Freedom*. David Clark and Ruben Jarozo-Alverez. ASLS.

Brown. I. And Alan Riach (2009). *Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth Century Scottish Literature*. Edinburgh University Press. 22 George Sq. Edinburgh.

Butler, J. (2015). *Bodies that matter*. TAYLOR & FRANCIS.

Cairns, C. (1996). *Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and British Culture, Scottish Dimensions*. Edinburgh: Polygon. Scotland.

Campbell J. & Moyers B. D. (2011). *The power of myth*. Broadway Books. Retrieved January 18 2022 from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=738834.

Campbell, J., & Moyers, B. (1991). *Power of myth*. Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

Carole L. (1994), "The heart and stomach of a king": *Elizabeth I and the politics of sex and power*. Philedelphia.

Carpenter, S. (2007). Masking and politics: the Alison Craik incident, Edinburg 1561. *Renaissance Studies, 21*(5), 625–636. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24417258

Christopher, W. (1995). Gendering the nation.

Cixous, H (1975) *Sorties: Out and out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Forays*. Trans. Betsy Wing. In H. Cixous and C. Clement, the Newly Born Woman. London: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Cixous, H., Cohen, K., & Cohen, P. (1976). The Laugh of the Medusa. *Signs, 1*(4), 875–893. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173239

Coakley, J. (2004). "Mobilizing The Past: Nationalist Images Of History, Nationalism and Ethnic Politics". 10:4, 531-560, DOI: 10.1080/13537110490900340

Coakley, J. (2004). Mobilizing The Past: Nationalist Images Of History, Nationalism And Ethnic Politics, 10:4, 531-560, DOI: 10.1080/13537110490900340

Corbett, J and Ian Brow. *The Edinbrugh Companion to Scottish Drama* . P.78

Cox, J. N., Larry J. Reynolds, Eds. (1993). N*ew Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP.

Craig, C. (1996). *Out of history. Narrative paradigms in Scottish and British Culture, Scottish dimensions*. Edinburgh, Polygon.

Craig, L. "Politic Silence: Female choruses in Lochhead's Medea and Wertenbaker's The love of the nightingale"

Cramer, S. (2011). "The Traverse, 1985–97: Arnott, Clifford, Hannan, Harrower, Greig and Greenhorn". *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama* (pp. 165-

176). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748646340-016

Crawford, R. (2019*) Liz Lochhead's voices.* Edinburgh University Press.

Davidson, N.(2000). *The origins of Scottish nationhood*. Pluto press.

De Angelis, M. (2001). Marx and primitive accumulation: The continuous character of capital's "enclosures". *The Commoner. Retrieved from https://thecommoner.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Marx-and-primitive-accumulation-deAngelis.pdf*

De Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex*. H. M. Parshley trans. (1972). Harmondsworth, Middlesex.UK.

Dobson M. and Watson N. J (2002). *England's Elizabeth: An afterlife in fame and fantasy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.

Dogan, E. (2005). New historicism and renaissance culture. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 45,1 (2005) 77-95

Dollimore, J. (1990). Shakespeare, cultural materialism, feminism and marxist Humanism. *New Literary History, 21*(3), 471-493. doi:10.2307/469122

Dollimore, J. (1991). *Sexual dissidence: Literatures, histories, theories*. Clarendon Press.

Doran, S. (1996). *Monarchy and matrimony: The courtships of Elizabeth I*. London: Routledge.

Elder-Woodward, J. (2023). "Personal assistance in Scotland: A postcolonial perspective". *The International Journal of Disability and Social Justice*, 3(1), 114–120. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48724370

Falzon, C. (2013). *Making history. A companion to Foucault*, 282-298.

Findlay, B. (2004). *Frae Ither Tangues: Essays on Modern Translations into Scots.*

Finlayson, I. (1988). *The Scots*. Oxford, OUP

Fisher, M. (1996). "From Traverse to Tramway: Scottish theatres old and new". In R. Stevenson & G. Wallace (Eds.), *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies* (pp. 49–56). Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrnm1.7

Foley H. P. (1981). "The concept of women in Athenian drama". *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*

Foucault M. (1971). The order of things (1st American). Pantheon Books. Retrieved September 30 2023 from http://www.aspresolver.com/aspresolver.asp?SOTH;S10021787.

Foucault M. (1972). *Archeology of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault M. (1988). *The history of sexuality*. Viking.

Foucault, M. "Foucault live: Interviews, 1966-84 (J. Johnston, Trans.)." New York: Semiotext (e) (1989).

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1988). The history of sexuality. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). The birth of the clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M., & Nazzaro, A. (1972). History, discourse and discontinuity. *Salmagundi,* (20), 225-248. Retrieved May 21, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40546718

Fox-Genovese, E. (1989) "Literary Criticism and the politics of the new historicism" *The New historicism*. Edit by H. Aram Veseer.

Frevert, U. (2011). *Emotions in History: Lost and Found.* Central European University press.

Funkenstein, A. (1992), "History, counterhistory and narrative". Probing the Limits of Representation : Nazism and the Final Solution. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Gallagher C. & Greenblatt S. (2001). *Practicing new historicism* (Pbk.). University of Chicago Press.

Gallagher, C. (1989). Marxisim and the New historicism. *The new historicism*. Ed. H. A. Veeser. London: Taylor and Francis. pp. 37-48

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. (2000). Practicing new historicism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gardiner, M., Macdonald, G., & O'Gallagher, N. (Eds.). (2011). "Scottish literature and postcolonial literature: Comparative texts and critical perspectives". Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1r299t

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. New York: Basic Books.

Gish, N. K (2013). "Liz Lochead, Shakespeare, and the invention of language." *Edinburgh companion to Liz Lochhead*. Anne Varty. Ed. 48-61

Gittings, C. (1995). Canada and Scotland: Conceptualizing "postcolonial" spaces. Essays on Canadian Writing, (56), 135-161. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/canada-scotland-conceptualizing-postcolonial/docview/197248653/se-2

Gonzáles, C. R (2008). "Performing Identities in Scotland: Liz Lochhead's Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off." AEDEAN 31.93-100.

González, C. R., & Lochhead, L. (2004). An Interview with Liz Lochhead. *Atlantis, 26*(1), 101–110. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41055139

Gounaridou, K. (2011). Text and Presentation: The Comparative Drama Conference Series,8. McFarland.

Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.

Greenblatt, S. (1981). *Invisible bullets: Renaissance authority and its subversion*. Glyph, 8, 40-61.

Greenblatt, S. (1988). "Invisible Bullets." Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England. Berkeley: U of California P,786-83

Greenblatt, S. (1988). *Representing the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: U of California P. Greenblatt, S. (1980). Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Greenblatt, S. (2013). "Towards a poetics of culture." *The new historicism* (pp. 1-14). Routledge.

Grega, D (2017). "Mythologizing Mary. William Allan's The murder of David Riccio and scottish national identity in the 1820s".

Guy, J. (2003). *My heart is my own: the life of Mary queen of Scots*. London, Harper Perennial. Jarrot Charles (ed.).

Hall, L. A. (2004). "Eyes tightly shut, lying rigidly still, and thinking of England? British women and sex from Marie Stopes to Hite 2000". In *Sexual Pedagogies: Sex Education in Britain, Australia, and America, 1879–2000* (pp. 53-71). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.

Hames, S. (2019). *The Literary Politics of Scottish Devolution: Voice, Class, Nation. Edinburgh*: Edinburgh University Press. https://doi-org.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/10.1515/9781474418157

Hamilton, E. (1942). *Mythology: Timeless tales of gods and heroes*. Little, Brown and Company: New York, USA.

Hamilton, P. (1995) *Historicism*. New York: Routledge.

Hanks, W. (1989). Text and Textuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 18,* 95-127. Retrieved May 21, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155887

Harris, B. J. (2002) E*nglish aristocratic women, 1450-1550: Marriage and family, property and careers*. Oxford, OUP.

Harris, J. (2013). Introduction. *Four French Plays: Cinna, the Misanthrope, Andromache, Phaedra*. J. Racine.

Hart, J. (1991). "New historicism: Taking history into account." *Review of International English Literature*, 22:1, January 1991, 93-107

Harvie, J. B. (1996). "Liz Lochhead's drama." Glasgow University. Phd thesis.

Helen Cixous (1975) in *Sorties: Out and out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Foray*

Hohendahl, P. (1992). A Return to History? The New historicism and Its Agenda. *New German Critique,* (55), 87-104. doi:10.2307/488291

Horvat, K. (2007) "Gender politics in late twentieth-century drama", in Ian Brown, ed., *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature* vol. 3. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University PresS. 295–303.

Horvat, K. (2011). Brown, I. (2011). Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama.

Houghton, W. (1985). The Victorian frame of mind: 1830-1870. London. Yale University press.

Howard, J. E. (1986) "The new historicism in renaissance studies." *English Literary Renaissance*. Syraucusa University.

Hume, M. (1903).*The love affairs of Mary queen of Scots*. London:E. Nash.

Jameson, F. (2013). The political unconscious: Narrative as a socially symbolic act. Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (2015). *Rethinking history*. London: Routledge.

Kantorowicz, E. H (1957). *The king's two bodies: A study in mediaeval political theory*. Princeton, UK.

Kellas, J. G. (1989). *The Scottish political system*. Cambridge University Press.

Kellner, Hans (1989) Language and Historical Representation : Getting the Story Crooked, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kidd, A. G. (2017), "Mansplaining: The Systematic Sociocultural Silencer" The 33rd Annual Conference on the Advancement of Women, Texas Tech University, Texas, ABD. Retrieved March 20,2022 from https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1681&context=ngresearchconf.

Klancher, J. (1989). The New historicism. Veeser, H. Aram, Ed. New York: Routledge. 15-3

Koren-Deutsch, I. (1992). "Feminist nationalism in Scotland: Mary Queen of Scots her head chopped off". *Modern Drama*, Volume 35, Number 3, Fall 1992, pp. 424-432

Kostic, M. (2014). "Twa Queens. Wan Green Island." Nationalist and Feminist Issues in Liz Lochhead's Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off. 103.113

Kristeva, J. (1986). The Kristeva Reader. (Ed. Toril Moi), Columbia University Press, New York.

La Capra, Dominick (1989) Soundings in Critical Theory, lthaca, London: Corneli University Press

LaCapra, D. (1994). *Rethinking intellectual history: Texts, contexts, language*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lernar, G.(1975). *Placing Women in History*: *Definitions and challenges*.

Lewis, J. E. (1998). *Mary queen of scots: romance and nation*, London, Routledge, 1998.

Lewis, T. (1991). The New historicism and Marxism. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association, 24*(1), 14-23. doi:10.2307/1315022

Lochhead, L. (1989). *Dracula*. London: Nick Hern.

Lochhead, L, (2013).'The Referendum Q&A', ed. by Herald Scotland (Herald and Times Group, 2013).

Lochhead, L. (1984). "Construction for a site" *Dreaming frankenstein and collected poems*. Edinburgh: Polygon.

Lochhead, L. (1987). *Mary queen of Scots got her head chopped off*. Nick Hern Books, London.

Lochhead, L. (2000). *Medea*. A Nick Hern Book, London, UK.

Lochhead, L. (2002). *Miseryguts.* A Nick Hern Book, London, UK.

Maloney, P. (2011). "Twentieth-Century Popular-Theatre" The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama.

McAlindon, T. (1995). Testing the New historicism: "Invisible Bullets" Reconsidered. *Studies in Philology, 92*(4), 411-438. Retrieved April 6, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174529

McClure, D. (2015). "From Misanthrope to Miseryguts: Liz Lochhead's Naturalization of Molière" Contested Identities. Literary Negotiations in Time and Place. Roger Nicholson and et al.

McClure, J. D. (2000). *Language, poetry and nationhood : Scots as a poetic language from 1878 to the present / J. Derrick. McClure.* Tuckwell Press.

McCrone, D. (2005), Cultural capital in an understated nation: the case of Scotland. The British Journal of Sociology, 56: 65-82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00047.x

McGrath (1973). *The cheviot, the stag and the black, black oil.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

McGuire, M. (2009). *Contemporary Scottish Literature: A reader's guide to essential criticism*. Palgrave MacMillan.

McLaren, G. (2013). "Poet and Performer: Practitioners Speak." Ed. Anne Varty. The Edinburgh Companion to Liz Lochhead. Edinburgh, Edinburgh UP, Scotland.

Mintz, S. (1962). *The hunting of Leviathan: Seventeenth-century reactions to the materialism and moral philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.

Mitchell, S. (2007). Introduction. *Family Ties in Victorian England*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2007.

Montrose, L. A. (1980). "Eliza, Queene of shepheardes," and the Pastoral of Power. English Literary Renaissance, 10(2), 153–182. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43446985

Montrose, L. A. (1989). "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." The New historicism. Veeser, H. Aram, Ed. New York: Routledge. 15-3

Montrose, L. A. (1989). Professing the Renaissance: The poetics and politics of culture. In The new historicism (pp. 15-36). Routledge.

Montrose, L. A. (1994). " 'Eliza, Queen of Shepheardes', and the Pastoral of Power." *The New historicism reader*. H. Aram, Ed. London: Routledge

Moretti, F. (1982). "The dialect of fear". New Left Review, 136. 67-85.

Mueller, J. (2001). Virtue and vituality. Alumni Club. U of Chicago.

Mugglestone, L. (1993). "Styles, Status, Gender and Identity", in *Liz Lochhead's Voices*, ed. by Robert Crawford and Anne Varty (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), pp. 93-108.

Nelson, C. (2007) *Family Ties in Victorian England*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2007.

Nelson, C., & Martin, M. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Sexual pedagogies: sex education in Britain, Australia, and America, 1879-2000* (p. 30). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Newton, J. L. (1989). History as usual? Feminism and the "New historicism." *The new historicism*. Ed. H. A. Veeser. London: Taylor and Francis. pp. 152-167

Nicholson, R., Marquis, C., & Szamosi, G. (Eds.). (2015). *Contested identities : Literary negotiations in time and place*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Nihtinen, A. L. (2008). Gaelic and Scots in devolved Scotland. *Studia Celtica Fennica, 5*, 69-81.

Opperman, S. (2006) Postmodern tarih kuramı. Phoenix Yayınevi.

Orgel, S. (1994). "The Role of King." *The New historicism reader*. H. Aram, Ed. London: Routledge

Parvini, N. (2015). *Shakespeare and Contemporary Theory: New historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Peacock, N. (2004). Robert Kemp's Translations of Moliere. Frae Ither Tangues: Essays on Modern Translations into Scots. Bill Findlay. 2004. Google Books.

Pieters, J. (2019). *Speaking with the dead: explorations in literature and histor*y. Edinburgh University Press.

Pollak, E. (1985). *The Poetics of Sexual Myth: Gender and Ideology in the Verse of Swift and Pope.* University of Chicago Press. US.

Pollak, E. (1988). "Feminism and the new historicism: A tale of difference or the same old story?" *The Eighteenth Century, 29*(3), 281-286. Retrieved May 21, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41467456

Poore, B. (2013). “Liz Lochhead and the gothic.” Ed. Anne Varty. The Edinburgh Companion to Liz Lochhead. Edinburgh, Edinburgh UP, Scotland.

Praskekova (2014). Undoing Scotland after devolution in Liz Lochhead’s dramatic adaptations of classical texts on page and stage. Queen Margaret Uni. Ph.D Dissertation

Punter (2014). *Literature and terror: Volume 1. The Gothic tradition.* Routledge.

Punter, D. Byron G. (2004) *The Gothic*. Vol 10. Blackwell Publishing.

Rawes A. (2007) Romantic Form and New historicism: Wordsworth’s ‘Lines Written a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey’. In: Rawes A. (eds) Romanticism and Form. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230206144_6

Reid, T. (2011). “Post-devolutionary Drama”. The Edinburg Companion to Scottish Drama.

Riach A. (2022). Scottish literature : an introduction. Luath Press.

Riach, A. (2014). *Representing scotland in literature, popular culture and iconography: The masks of the ... modern nation*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riach.A. (2022). Scottish Literature: An Introduction. Luath Press.

Savage, R. (1996). A Scottish National Theatre? In R. Stevenson & G. Wallace (Eds.), *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies* (pp. 23–33). Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrnm1.5

Sbulia J, no. 112 (faU 1975): 8, 13. See abo Carroll Smith-Rosenberg. •The: New Woman and

Scott, R. D. (2003). “Life Death and a national treasure”. *The Times.*

Showalter, E. (1991). *Sexual anarchy : gender and culture at the fin de siècle*. Viking.

Silverman, H. J. (2013). Textualities: Between hermeneutics and deconstruction. Routledge.

Sinfield A. (2009). *Faultlines*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved September 30 2023 from https://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=4964536

Sinfield, A. (2009). *Faultlines: Cultural materialism and the politics of dissident reading*. Bekeley: University of California Press.

Smith G. G (1919). Scottish literature: Character and influence. London, Macmillan.

Smith, A. D. (1989).Nationalism. Cambridge, Polity.

Smith, Donald (2011) The Mid-Century Dramatists. The Edinburg Companion to Scottish Drama.

Solnit, R. (2008). *Men Explain Things To Me*. Haymarket Books. Chicago, US.

Solnit, R. (2017). *The Mother of All Questions*. Heymarket Books, Chicago,US.

Stevenson, R. (1996). Introduction: Snakes and Ladders, Snakes and Owls: Charting Scottish Theatre. In R. Stevenson & G. Wallace (Eds.), *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies* (pp. 1–20). Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrnm1.4

Stevenson, R. (2002). "Triumphant Tartuffification: Liz Lochhead's Translation of Molière's *Tartuffe"*

Stevenson, R. and Craig, C. (2001). *Twentieth-Century Scottish Drama: An Anthology* (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2001), 465.

Stevenson, R., & Wallace, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies*. Edinburgh University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrnm1

Stoker, B. (1879). *Dracula.* Penguin books

Thompson W. (2004) Representation, Metanarratives and Microhistories. In: Postmodernism and History. Theory and History. Palgrave, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-62945-5_8

Triesman, S. C. (1993) "Transformations and transgressions: women's discourse on the scottish stage. " British and ırish women dramatists since 1958: A critical handbook. Ed. Trevor R. Griffiths and Margaret Llewellyn-Jones. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open UP (124-134).

Turner, J. G. (1985). "The Properties of Libertinism." Eighteenth-Century Life 76-87. Project Muse.

Varty, A. (1993) 'Scripts and performance', in Robert Crawford and Anne Varty (eds.), *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Varty, A. (2013). The Edinburgh Companion to Liz Lochhead. EUP.

Veeser, H. A. (1989). *The new historicism*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Veeser, H. A. (1994). *The New historicism reader*. London: Routledge

Walker, M. (1996). Scottish Literature Since 1707. Longman.

Webster (2005). *Performing libertinism in Charles II's court: Politics, drama, sexuality*. Springer.

White, Hayden (1973) Metahistory: The Historical lmagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

White, K. (1998). “Scotland History and the Writer” *On Scottish ground. Selected essays*. Polygon.

Wilson, & Somerville-Arjat, G. (Eds.). (1990). Sleeping with monsters : conversations with Scottish and Irish women poets / research and interviews by Rebecca Wilson ; edited by Gillean Somerville-Arjat and Rebecca E. Wilson. Polygon. Wilson, J. H. (1965)

Wimsatt, W., & Beardsley, M. (1946). The Intentional Fallacy. *The Sewanee Review*, *54*(3), 468-488. Retrieved May 30, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/27537676

Zammito, J. (1993) "Are We Being Theoretical Yet? The New historicism, the New PhHosophyof History, and 'Practicing Historians,'" Journal of Modern History 65,4: 783- 814.

FIGURES LIST

CURRICULUM VITAE

Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA obtained B.A. degree in English Language and Literature from Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey, in 2015. In addition to this, she completed another B.A. program in International Relations at Anadolu University (Open Edu.) in Eskişehir, Turkey, in 2013. Since 2009, she has been working as a Research Assistant at Karabuk University in the department of Western Languages and Literature.

Her academic achievements have been recognized with various awards, including the 2021 Scottish Universities International Summer School (SUISS) Saltire Scholarship in Scottish Literature at the University of Edinburgh and the 2022 Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) 2214-A Scholarship under the "International Research Fellowship Programme for Ph.D Students" that allows her to become a visiting postgraduate student at the University of Edinburgh from June to August 2023.

Her research interests include Scottish Literature, Scottish Drama, Gender Studies, and Sci-Fi Studies. Driven by her passion for these areas of study, she is committed to contributing new insights to these study fields. Pelin GÖLCÜK MİRZA combines her academic knowledge with a personal dedication to learning, aiming to provide an engaging and enriching learning experience for her students.