Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education

Vol. IV, Issue No. VII, July-2012, ISSN 2230-7540

A JOINT APPRAISAL ON BLACKNESS AND DOMESTICITY IN SHAKESPEARE'S TITUS ANDRONICUS

AN INTERNATIONALLY INDEXED PEER REVIEWED & REFEREED JOURNAL

www.ignited.in

Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. IV, Issue No. VII, July-2012, ISSN 2230-7540

A Joint Appraisal on Blackness and Domesticity in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus

Kumari Rekha[1]* Dr. Reyaz Ali[2]

[1] Research Scholar, Department of English, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

[2] Supervisor, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

Abstract – Blackness and domesticity in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus David Sterling Brown Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus (c. 1590) places Aaron, a black Moor, as an oppressed stranger whose calculating acts encourage his, and his child's, uneasy incorporation into Rome's public and private domestic worlds. The only black figure on stage for approximately four acts, and one of two characters who is present but mute in Act 1, Aaron becomes the drama's most visually and rhetorically recognizable figure. Come very close to getting the play's last phrase, this visible black character in Titus acts in a position that is not solely about him. According to Imtiaz Habib, the sixteenth-century black person's 'racial prominence is thus by direct inference [his] racial in-visibility'. As a figment of Shakespeare 's imagination, Aaron, too, is intangible. He is a cultural instrument that complicates simple conclusions regarding blackness since, as Kim F. Hall emphasizes, 'In every context, the usage of a black figure as a subject of an artist 's ability in England was gradually related to the use of black people as domestic slaves and as imperial labor. In this article we will explain regarding Blackness and Domesticity in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus.

Keywords: blackness, Domesticity, Titus Andronicus, Shakespeare;

----------X----------

INTRODUCATION

In the 1590's, as he was only growing through as an exciting young playwright, William Shakespeare published what is most definitely his first tragedy, Titus Andronicus. Titus Andronicus is also linked to modern-day horror films, renowned for its shows of hideous brutality and over-the-top violence (including ritual slavery, incest, physical mutilation, assassination, torture, and cannibalism). In the play, with his nemesis and former war captive, Tamora, Roman General Titus Andronicus gets wrapped up in a violent circle of retribution. The daughter of Titus, Lavinia, is violently abused by the sons of Tamora, who cut out her tongue and cut off her hands so that she can't recognize them verbally or in prose. When Lavinia is eventually able to expose her attackers' names, by murdering the rapists and serving them (as a pie) to their mother, Titus gets vengeance.

Most of this story line was adapted by Shakespeare from Book 6 of the Metamorphoses of Ovid, in which Philomel is raped by her brother-in - law, Tereus, who even slices off her tongue. In the novel, the sister of Philomel (Prone) gets revenge by serving the son of Tereus at dinner. Shakespeare also seems to have been thinking about the play Thyestes by Seneca, where Atreus offers up the two sons about Thyestes.

"You should know that Titus Andronicus is called a" revenge tragedy, "a genre made famous in the 16th century by Thomas Kyd (Spanish Tragedy) and John Webster (White Devil), if you're curious what the heck Shakespeare was thinking when he wrote this bloody play. Some reviewers claim that the bloodshed seen in these previous plays is aiming to outdo Titus Shakespeare, whereas others see it as an effort to ridicule the genre's ridiculously excessive brutality.

The terrible brutality, for some, makes the play just plain evil. Poet of Modernism T.S. Titus Andronicus is "one of the dumbest and most uninspired plays ever produced" ("Seneca in English Translation"), Eliot announced. Some commentators (such as Brian Vickers) also speculate that Titus Andronicus was not really composed by Shakespeare, or that he had at least some support from some other dramatist, such as George Peele, who was renowned for his drama of blood-and-guts.

Nonetheless, in Shakespeare's day, Titus was a crowd favorite, even though certain commentators thought of it as the ugly "stepchild" of Shakespeare."

BLACKNESS: TITUS ANDRONICUS

Hamlet shares Shakespeare's Othello with him. An obsession with evil in its most virulent and universal

www.ignited.in

forms is King Lear and Macbeth. The play deals with the destructive consequences of the mortal sin of the spirit of envy and vengeful hatred. Othello's primary focus is the destination of passion by envy. It is a sad marriage portrait. The protagonist is neither a king nor a prince, but a newly married military general. As in Hamlet and Macbeth, there are no guests. The catastrophe of Othello would not seriously shake the societal structure. The fair-minded Duke of Venice stays securely in charge, and Cyprus is overseen by his deputy Lodovico for a just conclusion.

The fight between good and bad is comical, but the fight is realized in Othello through a taut tale between envy and assassination. Events are going much swifter. The Story is squeezed into two to three nights and days by Shakespeare. To help us appreciate this compression and compactness, there are several pertinent references. We hear that lago pleaded to take Desdemona's handkerchief from Emilia, his wife "A hundred limes" or that lago suspected Cassio of making love to Desdemona "A thousand times" Othello may not have a thoroughly formed double or subplot as Kinglier.

In addition to the theme of the dissolution of love by envy, the theme of Orientalism in Othello was quite deliberately and skillfully woven by Shakespeare. Shakespeare was well conscious of the local, national and foreign socioeconomic, educational, political and religious conditions that prevailed throughout his lifetime. As a place of civilization so cultured and so sophisticated as to approach decadence, Venice was a city of almost symbolic importance to Shakespeare, and Cyprus represents an outpost of that empire facing the threat of the Muslim Turks and all the great exotic that Othello himself is associated with in Africa. International affairs, the feeling of the wide universe of new sea finds, the remarkable allusiveness of Othello 's speech regarding Desdemona 's exciting exploits-all of these establish an Orientalist environment. In Act I and II, political problems and Orientalism continue to be important.

With a feeling of vicious insinuation over their union, Shakespeare opens this tragedy. Revoltingly animalistic and soloistic are the images used by lago to depict Othello and Desdemona's coupling. For instance:

“Even now, now very now, an old black ram

Is tupping your white ewe.”

In a Christian society, lago is a white Italian who finds himself educated, refined and elegant and black Othello, rugged, uncivilized, uncultured and unsophisticated. He taunts the father of Desdemona, Brabantio. "Tupping" is a phrase used exclusively for sheep copulating. He uses this soloistic, filthy word intentionally and informs Desdemona 's father that Othello, dark, uncivilized, strong, is going to have sex with his daughter. The term "ram" means male sheep uncastrated. To degrade Othello, he employs these offensive terms. His word of Othello expresses Othello, the Moor, with his envy and hate. His feeling of dominance is often conveyed. It is a description of the Elizabethan mindset towards black people, Arabs, Turks, etc. The Elizabethan people found them uncultured, unsophisticated and robust. For example:

“Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you

Arise, I say”,

Lago also advises the father of Desdemona that the devil means that Othello would make him a grandfather by being the father of the child of Desdemona. The demons were assumed to be black during the Elizabethan era.

Othello uses the term "thick-lips" for Roderigo, a Venetian gentleman who is in love with Desdemona. It's a racist remark on the presence of Othello. In the Elizabethan age, the term "thick-lips" was clearly used for the black African. The speech by Lago is proof of Occidental jealousy toward the Orientals:

“...you’ll have your daughter covered with a Barbary horse,

you’ll have your nephews neigh to you,

you’ll have courses for cousins and jennets for Germans.”

The word "Barbary" was used exclusively for Arabians throughout the 15th and 16th centuries. For the Orient, it was a negative term-uncivilized and uncultured person. This truth is founded by the speech of Roderigo:

“But with a knave of common hire, gondolier,

To the gross clasps of a lascivious Moor”

This is a contrast between the uncivilized Orient and the Venetian culture. With repeated focus on the word disgusting, this diminished perception decreases the union to one of absolute carnality. Desdemona succumbed to "a lascivious Moor 's gross clasps" and made "a gross uprising" toward her relatives and culture. Without seeking to differentiate between Arab and African people, Elizabethan use applied the word "Moor." Speaks in Brabantio:

“...The Duke himself,

Or any of brothersof the state,

Cannot but feel this wrong as ‘twere their own,

For if such actions may have passage free,

Bond slaves and pagans shall our statesmen be”

Brabantio claims that if, in this respect, Othello and those like Othello are tolerated, they will be the rulers and the true civilization will be lost. Here we comprehensively experience the Orientalism aspect. In Brabantio 's opinion, we, as an audience as well as readers, can experience racial prejudice. The sort of imperious father who conventionally rejects romantic love may even be recognized in him.

Of necessity, Othello is very mindful of the current requirements. He's courageous, optimistic, daring, and faithful. Lago explains his encounter with Brabantio, having met up with Othello, and pretends that he feels deep anger on Othello 's behalf. In his answer, Othello is very calm. Othello says-

"... Let him do his spite,

My services which I have done the signiory

Shall out-tongue his complaints. 'This yet to know

Which, when I know that boasting is an honor,

I shall promulgate -1 fetch my life and being

From men of royal siege, and my demerits

May speak unbonneted to as proud a fortune

As this that I have reached."

The speech of Othello described above lets us realize that his services, his fidelity to the governing body of Venice, would forgive him. He is sure that, because of his merits, he has earned the rank of general. He firmly assures Lago that the Venice governing body would not be amused by Brabantio's complaint, and it always happens that way. When the Duke challenged Desdemona to articulate her mind, she talked with all her heart:

'That I love the Moor to live with him,

My downright violence and storm of fortunes

May trumpet to the world. My heart's subdued

Even to the very quality of my lord.

I saw Othello's visage in his mind,

And to his honors and his valiant parts

Did I my soul and fortunes consecrate."

The foregoing speech by Desdemona reflects her stronger and unconditional passion for Othello. She enjoys its merits and its atmosphere of adventure. Othello is very mindful of this.

Finally, Duke makes the affection of Othello and Desdemona and assures Brabantio that his son-in - law is much fairer than black.

"Let it be so.

Good night to everyone. (To Brabantio) And noble signor,

Ifvirtue no delighted beauty lack,

Your son-in-law is far more fair than black."

Duke, to whom Brabantio argues about Othello that Othello, the Venetian society's corrupter, has practiced some dark magic on Desdemona and drawn her to him, knows values in the personality of Othello and assures Brabantio that his son-in - law says that Othello is much more honest and noble than most Arabs and Africans say by dark. In general, Duke is smart and fair-minded regarding values and human attributes in human beings. For instance:

"Valiant Othello, we must straight employ you

Against the general enemy Ottoman."

The Duke trusts in the courage and adventurous nature of Othello. As "Valiant Othello," he addresses him. It is proof that among blacks, Duke respects values and individual attributes. He appoints Othello as a general to attack the adversary of the entire Christian nation, the Ottoman Turk. It is an indication of the Duke's deeper confidence in Othello. Othello, the Moor, is assumed to be the required general to assault and kill the Ottoman-Turk.

It is also an example that the Elizabethan people, mostly high-ranking people, had a strategy of exploiting the services of the Blacks for national purposes. It was an opening for the Blacks to mingle implicitly with the so-called ethnic, civilized and sophisticated Venetians. During the Elizabethan era, it was a sort of orientation of the Blacks and others than the Venetians.

These lines sound like racist epithets as Iago labels Othello a "black Moor," or Roderigo labels him "thick lips" and an "old black ram," but contemporary assumptions regarding race make it impossible for us to understand what the blackness of Othello actually implies in the sense of the play. Unlike today, skin colour was not related to hereditary or evolutionary origins among early modern Europeans; these ideas did not become widespread until the advent of modern biological science. Similarly, before the advent of Colonisation and slavery, notions of white supremacy did not become common. While a colour bias was retained by early modern European society, this bias originated from two very distinct origins. The first was the hypothesis of the mediaeval atmosphere, which related dark skin to sun exposure,

www.ignited.in

connecting blackness to the hot environment of Mediterranean North Africa. The second root of early modern colour discrimination comes from Christian myths, which relates the tale of how God cursed Noah 's son Ham to be "black and loathsome." Ham's line went on to populate the lands of Africa according to this story. The blackness of the Ham lineage probably relates to the colour of the eyes, but the primary role of the blackness in the tale is metaphorical, that is, it acts as a lingering mark of the sin of Ham.

The "blackness" of Othello refers to his skin colour, but it is symbolic in its primary role in the play. In Shakespeare's day, certain theatregoers watching the play may have understood the Moors came from North Africa, but few, if any, would have directly met such beings. An actor who had darkened his face with soot or tar, a popular trick used to suggest a character's Moorish or Turkish origin, may have played Othello himself. Yet spectators must also have known that the black skin of Othello was emblematic of his black or malicious character. Similarly, Aaron was played by an actor with a darkened mask in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus, implying both that he was a Moor and that he was an evil man. Therefore, Othello, not a true human being, but a living embodiment of envy and sin, must have struck early modern viewers as exaggerated and perhaps monstrous. What this suggests is that it is not easy to grasp the blackness of Othello purely in terms of personal presence. Nor does it have strong references to the lengthy past of prejudice that influenced our present cultural moment.

In recent decades, the issue of Othello's race has gained a great deal of coverage. In the background of recent theories regarding race and colonialism, current scholars have analyzed the script, finding out that the violence, envy, and supposed sexual ability of Othello (according to Iago and Roderigo) perpetuate societal assumptions regarding black men. The reality that Othello was performed by white performers like Laurence Olivier before the middle of the twentieth century, who darkened their skin with lipstick, a trend that echoes the profoundly discriminatory usage of "blackface" in nineteenth-century minstrel plays, is also controversial. In the 1930s, when black actor Paul Robeson performed the part in London, people were surprised to see a black man on stage embracing a white woman. But in the 1940s, Robeson resurrected his part on Broadway, and Othello has almost always been performed by a black actor in major productions since then. (On the other hand, performances of the opera Otello have included white performers even more recently in dark makeup.) In 1997, in an otherwise all-black version, the white actor Patrick Stewart played Othello; a more recent performance included black actors such as Othello and Iago. Although the original sense of the blackness of Othello has been elusive, the controversial and timeless essence of the subject matter of the play makes it suitable for endless interpretations as ideas of racial identification continue to develop.

DOMESTICITY: TITUS ANDRONICUS

A proliferation of studies on domesticity and its role in Elizabethan and Jacobean literature and culture has been seen in the last decade, and the prevalent existence of household assets on the early modern stage demonstrates that domestic life was a characteristic of dramas of the time. There is no exception to Titus Andronicus: revenge and counter-revenge go hand-in - hand with the devastation of societies and the subversion of intimate spaces; with that of the house and kin, the discourses of assassination, rape, and retribution converge. Moreover, some of the characteristics of Titus are close to those of domestic tragedy, a rather common genre of the time, the ubiquitous involvement of household assets, a prominent domestic atmosphere, in addition to the incessant emphasis of the play on the family dynamic. Titus invites consideration as such, while not a traditional domestic disaster.

Oddly enough, much of Titus' critique ignores domesticity, even as a large portion of the action takes place in the assistance of a house with household instruments with activities and promotes Titus' desire for vengeance. Instead, commentators investigate Titus through other critical lenses, including ethnicity, politics, rape and/or vengeance discourses, and attend to the usage of Ovid by Shakespeare. Because Titus Andronicus has a house and families at its heart and since the terror of its conclusion explicitly derives from the reversal of household traditions, my main purpose is to discuss the forms in which Titus is a domestic tragedy. In brief, in terms of domesticity, this work is a tremendous attempt to reconsider Titus.

Generally speaking, Titus is not a domestic tragedy, but domesticity and revenge are inextricably connected in the play, and in the following pages I explore the nexus between domesticity and vengeance, domestic vengeance, as it were. While this analysis is by no way comprehensive, it looks at many major junctions. The house of Titus becomes the focus of the numerous vengeance plots of the play; household conventions turn into murderous weapons; a cannibalistic feast becomes a dinner party. I look at how they cohere in Shakespeare's play rather than distinguish and examine domesticity and/or retribution separately. An acute appetite for vengeance impacts domestic practices, after all. The domestic sphere and practices, on the other side, are tinged with vengeance and perverted towards sinister purposes. I have divided it into two parts, which explore various aspects of domestic retribution in the play, while often overlapping them. The two key parts of my study can be read as a spectrum instead of two separate components, as they are part of the same company. One supplements the other and reflects on it.

In terms of domesticity, the first segment, entitled "The Butcher, the Baker, the Pasty Creator," discusses Tamora and Titus' revenge plots. To accommodate a discussion of the family structure and the domestic

spaces themselves, I use domesticity and its counterpart "domestic" loosely. First, I look at Tamora's vengeful endeavor, her hunger for the Andronicus family line to be exterminated. In the context that she aspires to break the domestic circle of Titus as well as kill him in his den, Tamora's vengeance is domestic. As both a public and private topic, she threatens him, and to influence one's public identity is to influence their private identity (and vice versa), as the play reveals. I transform to Titus from Three Tamora's Retribution. I investigate the strategy of Titus to vengeance and the "uncanny" existence of his house against conceptions of typical domestic tragedy, since they strongly correspond with elements present in plays that have historically been known as such. Focusing on Act 3.2 and the gory finale of the play, I discuss the uncanny nature of the house and the inversion of domestic norms by Titus, claiming essentially that Titus Andronicus can and should be treated as a domestic tragedy in its own right.

The second segment, "Domestic and Dynastic," explores the classical origins of Titus' house and its position in the play, drawing on insights and claims from the first section. I contend, looking back to Seneca's Thyestes, that the "woeful home" of Titus is Thyestean in fact. The Latin play takes advantage, as does Titus, of both senses of "domus"-dynastic line and dwelling space. What's more, an abode turns into an unheimlich realm in each event. The contrast between "home" and "home" (or "domus" and "domus")-domestic room and dynastic rows-is blurred in both plays. The domestic climate often frames the manner with which characters exact their vengeance, and utter disrespect for what can be called appropriate domestic conduct infuses the house with tinges of the unheimlich in both instances. Indeed, the house of Shakespeare works just like Seneca's. But, as Titus is from another age, the house of Titus speaks directly to Elizabethan issues, one of which is the porous essence of one's house. And it is with the permeable house that I conclude my debate.

The Butcher, the Baker, the Pasty Maker

Domestic tragedy remains a limited realm, while the thesis of Henry H. Adams on the genre has been interrogated and extended by recent critics. "Adams describes" domestic tragedy "as a" didactic or homiletic "tragedy of the ordinary citizens, typically placed in the domestic scene, concerned in a practical manner with personal and family ties rather than broad state affairs, and resulting in a catastrophic or otherwise serious way." Plays such as Arden of Caversham and The Yorkshire Tragedy stage the annulment of a marriage and/or a family Any of these simple generic concepts have been criticized by commentators attentive to cultural materialism and gender in recent years and changed the focus of important discussions away from aesthetics, age, and didacticism. These readings are valuable precisely because the intellectual, historical, and gender problems that Adams brushes aside are brought to the fore. Critics such as Lena Cowen Orlin, Viviana Commensal, and Catherine Richardson, however, retain their critiques within the limited boundaries of "domestic disaster" as conventionally defined; instead of the genre itself, they challenge other critics. They limit their discussions to a limited notion of the genre that eliminates several plays, such as Titus Andronicus, who are deeply domestic since they are so 'orthodox' by retaining Adams' underlying generic assumptions-an English atmosphere, middle class protagonists, a dispute that dissolves a family from within.

Interestingly, in all of these "orthodox" tragedies, the state and the domestic sphere converge. To some point, most tragedies contend with the ruin of a family or a marriage, and sometimes family troubles are inextricably related to the law of the poleis. Richard Helgeson suggests that "if we think of domus in a somewhat different way, neither Shakespearean tragedy nor history nor Greek tragedy are less domestic than what is called canonical English domestic tragedies, on which neoclassical interpretation of the genre relies." They may be called more domestic, he adds. In several, if not all, examples, the action of those Greek and Shakespearean plays is based on problems within a single family or 'home.' It is not because the domestic condition of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays is overlooked by scholars. In dramas such as Hamlet, they have famously considered marital structures, but they do not identify plays like Hamlet as "marital." They are dramas of another order. Perhaps, then, as historians think of it, "domestic disaster," is at best a misnomer, or, at worse, an anachronism. I want to turn to Titus with Helgeson 's statement in mind and discuss it as a "domestic disaster," but not entirely in the biblical context. My aim is not to redefine "domestic tragedy" nor to shoehorn Titus into a category that is too small; rather, I propose that the idea of "domestic tragedy" extends to more than plays that involve the middle class of England. In doing so, I propose to look loosely at domesticity, in terms of the family system as well as the domestic spaces themselves, and to examine their role in the first revenge tragedy of Shakespeare.

Titus is essentially a tragedy of vengeance, and, as such, important debates sometimes (but not always) mask domestic issues. In Titus, Ann Christensen may have delved into domesticity more thoroughly, but her research stays beyond the gender purview. Her article discusses the idea of "nurturing persons," concentrating in particular on "male 6 violation" in the usurpation of the maternal role as cook and surrogate mother not only in the domestic sphere but also in Titus. "In brief, Christensen's interpretation of the play explores aspects in which the participation of Titus in so-called feminine positions dramatizes "dislocation encounters in the 'gender structure.'" Titus' embrace of both male and feminine roles-butcher, cook, pasty builder, and nurse to his maimed daughter-blurs

www.ignited.in

gender lines, since it "[reflects] the ambivalent positions of women and men within the 'private' Domesticity lends itself to gender critique, to be sure. The household was (and still is) a gendered setting, so it follows that observations of the home, its occupants, and their behaviors will be compatible with gender studies. In addition, as Wendy Wall has seen, domesticity often serves as a mirror by which national identity discourses can be interpreted. Though, analyzing nationalism throughout the play remains controversial, as it is set in Rome, not England. Critical studies have concentrated on the family as a microcosm of Roman culture, most prominently Robert Miola's, however, as with Christensen 's research, Miola's concentrates on just a couple of the aspects in which family discourses are entangled in the play. In this situation, an analysis of the family is rendered to fulfil a greater vital interest; it is not the key subject of the debate by Miola.7 The domestic circle and domain play a greater role in Titus than a symbol of gender ties, sexual policy, and national identification. Domestic spaces and interactions pervade the story, and exploring the multiplex forms in which domesticity works in the story is to understand them independent of gender and Roman identity.

I intend to concentrate strictly on the aspects in which the discourses of retribution, the dynamic of the relationship, and the eventual death of Titus converge with the domestic domain and the breakup of the relationship. When gender and national origin issues are suspended, the status of the play as a 'domestic disaster' becomes apparent. Titus is not simply a Roman general's tragedy; it is a family's tragedy: the Andronicus. Though it begins and finishes as a catastrophe of the state, the close decimation of the family of Titus would not undo the state. Indeed, in Titus, the state does well; the ruin of those in charge encourages a better administration to come forward, and the core catastrophe of the play ultimately benefits the welfare of the national body. The catastrophe of Titus becomes a catastrophe of domestic dimensions, and this paper attempts to investigate certain domestic dimensions. (Inarguably, in the past, even in the most family-oriented scenes of the play, the state lurks perpetually.) The family implodes in proper domestic tragedies. One participant (sometimes with outside assistance) in a marriage defects, and the resulting disastrous activity unfolds from inside the home. The same may be said in the classical vein for family tragedies, for as Aristotle observes, "What tragedies would pursue are situations where the misery takes place inside families, such as brother against brother, son and father, mother and son, son and mother." Titus varies from Elizabethan domestic tragedy and classical tragedies such as Oedipus, in that the Andronicus are killed from without. Although it may be and has been claimed that the catastrophe in the play derives from the greed and stupidity of Titus, the enemies of the family orchestrate attacks on them, attacks that speed up the collapse of the family and significantly lead to its final collapse. It is the active attack from without that separates Titus from the proper domestic tragedies. That makes the play no less sad, though. Death severs the ties of the family, and 8 rivals threaten to break their domestic circle. I first examine the vengeance of Tamora and her quest to decimate the whole line of the Andronicus in a continuous review of the nexus of vengeance and domesticity, discussing the means of the empress to eradicate the Andronicus: the raping of Lavinia, the assassination of the two sons of Titus, alleging that they are domestic murders, and her final quest to kill Titus in his own home. The wrath of Tamora is aimed against the dynastic line of Titus and his living room, two seemingly different individuals. Still, the two remain inextricably related, and the acts of Tamora predict the breakdown of the dichotomy of the house-state at the end of the play. I then shift to the counter-vengeance of Titus, paying special attention to the house of Titus and the process of his vengeance. Titus, like Tamora, tries to kill the whole family, however he does it in an openly domestic fashion. Cooking has been his chosen tool. Titus, in general, displays a respect for domestic partnerships and rooms. Families are broken through vengeance, and the domestic room, ostensibly a family spot, becomes distinctly unheimlich.

CONCLUSION

In fascinating and thrilling respects, Titus Andronicus deals with modern discourses of domesticity. The house of Titus itself, the cookery, the tables, the retribution, the attention on the family: Titus will not be what it is without any of these things.

In this study, I have attempted to prove that the first vengeance tragedy of Shakespeare can and should be viewed as a 'domestic tragedy and blackness' Tamora and Titus 'aiming at family circles their individual vengeance plots; they commit domestic crimes; and in the case of Titus, domestic routines are turned into blood-soaked revenge tactics. Titus' house resembles a slaughterhouse by the end of the play, not a happy abode. As I have tried to prove, the classical precedent for Titus' house is Seneca's Thyestes. The expression used to denote one's dwelling place becomes a trope for both dynastic and domestic fear in both dramatic documents. As we have shown, unhomely homes are traits of domestic tragedies, whether present in Seneca or Shakespeare.

REFERENCES

1. Shakespeare, William (1991) on Titus Andronicus

2. Shakespeare, William (2002) on Othello, The Moor of Venice. T. Woodman,

3. David Sterling Brown (2019) on Remixing the Family- Blackness and Domesticity in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus

4. Hughes, Alan, Ed. (2006) on Titus Andronicus: Updated Edition. The New Cambridge Shakespeare.

5. Deborah Willis (2002) on "The Gnawing Vulture": Revenge, Trauma Theory, and "Titus Andronicus"

6. ASHLEY MARIE BRINKMAN (2008) on DOMESTIC TITUS

7. Matthew Trey Jansen (2013) on A New Critical Edition of Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus.

8. Dr. Katherine Walker (2020) on Titus Andronicus.

9. Natalie Marie DeJonghe (2008) on THE PENALTY OF PATRIARCHY: HOW MISOGYNY MOTIVATES FEMALE VIOLENCE AND REBELLION IN SHAKESPEARE'S TITUS ANDRONICUS

10. Nas, Gamal Qasem Saleh AL (2013) on Orientalism in Shakespeare s titus Andronicus the merchant of Venice and Othello

11. bdel-Malek, A. (2000) on "Orientalism in Crisis." In Orientalism: A Reader

12. Leggatt, Alexander (2005) on Shakespeare's Tragedies: Violation and Identity.

Corresponding Author

Kumari Rekha*

Research Scholar, Department of English, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya