IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

SILENCED DESIRE AND PERSUASIVE LOVE: A FEMINIST READING OF ANDREW MARVELL'S TO HIS COY MISTRESS

Anjali

MA. English [Semester IV]

Meerut College, CCS University

Meerut Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

Among the canonical works of metaphysical poetry, Andrew Marvell's To His Coy Mistress has largely been read through the lens of its rhetorical brilliance and carpe diem urgency — yet its dynamics of desire, silence, and emotional coercion remain critically underexplored. The seventeenth century witnessed the rise of metaphysical poetry, a literary movement characterized by intellectual wit, conceits, philosophical reflection, and emotional intensity, and it is within this cultural and literary context that Marvell's poem must be re-examined. This paper argues that To His Coy Mistress employs the language of romance to disguise and legitimize masculine authority and emotional coercion. Drawing on Kate Millett's theorization of patriarchal power in literature, Simone de Beauvoir's concept of woman as "the Other", and Laura Muvley's notion of the male gaze, this study demonstrates that the speaker systematically deploys fear, urgency, and seductive rhetoric as instruments of control over female sexuality consent, functions as a site of suppression within the poem's persuasive structure. This feminist analysis ultimately reveals that To His Coy Mistress reflects not only the literary culture of seventeenth-century England, but also the broader patriarchal attitudes toward women, desire, and bodily autonomy that defined the period. By re-reading this celebrated poem through a feminist lens, this paper challenges conventional admiration of its wit and invites a more critically engaged understanding of its gender politics.

Keywords: Feminism, Metaphysical Poetry, Andrew Marvell, Carpe Diem, Male Gaze, Gender, Coercion

"Had we but world enough and time, / This coyness, lady, were no crime." With these deceptively graceful opening lines, Andrew Marvell invites his reader into what appears, on the surface, to be a tender and flattering declaration of love. The speaker addresses his mistress with an air of patience and adoration, promising her a love so vast and unhurried that it could stretch across centuries and continents. He would, he tells her, spend hundreds of years praising each part of her body, adoring her with a devotion that defies the ordinary constraints of human time. He would love her ten years before the flood, he declares, and she should refuse him until the conversion of the Jews — a hyperbolic gesture of infinite patience that is designed, above all else, to flatter. It is seductive opening — charming, witty, and disarming in its apparent generosity. Yet this generosity is an illusion. The poem's opening gesture of patience is not an expression of love but a rhetorical strategy — a carefully constructed fiction designed

to lower the mistress's resistance before the speaker dismantles it entirely. To read To His Coy Mistress attentively is to watch that fiction unravel, and to recognize beneath the language of romance the unmistakenly structure of power.

Andrew Marvell composed To His Coy Mistress in the mid-seventeenth century, a period in which the social, political, and cultural authority of men over women was not merely assumed but actively inscribed in law, religion, and literary convention. Women in seventeenth-century England occupied a profoundly subordinate position within the social order. They were denied legal autonomy, excluded from public life, and defined almost entirely in relation to the men — fathers, husbands, guardians — who exercised authority over them. Their sexuality, in particular, was subject to intense regulation and control. Female chastity was simply a personal virtue but a social and economic necessity, bound up with questions of inheritance, family honor, and patriarchal authority. A woman's body was, in a very real sense, not her own — it was a site of social meaning, subject to the demands and judgements of the patriarchal order within which she lived.

It is within this historical context that the mistress's silence must be understood. She is not merely a silent beloved in the conventional sense of the love lyric tradition. She is a woman whose voice has been structurally excluded, whose desires and fears are projected onto her by a male speaker who assumes the authority to define them, and whose body is made the object of a rhetorical argument she is never permitted to answer. Her silence is not incidental to the poem — it is constitutive of it. The entire rhetorical edifice of To His Coy Mistress is built upon and sustained by the mistress's enforced voicelessness, and it is this voicelessness that feminist criticism must make visible and interrogate.

The metaphysical tradition within which Marvell wrote was itself deeply gendered. Poets such as John Donne, George Herbert, and Henry Vaughan crafted verse that fused passion with philosophy, desire with theology, and earthly experience with metaphysical speculation. Donne, whose influence on Marvell is widely acknowledged, established a mode of love poetry in which the female beloved is characteristically rendered as a passive recipient of the male poet's intellectual and emotional energy. In The Sun Rising, Donne's speaker addresses the sun with commanding authority, declaring his beloved the center of the universe — yet she herself remains entirely silent, a symbol rather than a speaking subject. C.S. Lewis captured this tendency precisely when he observed:

"The woman is loved, but she is not listened to."

Metaphysical poetry was overwhelmingly a masculine tradition — one in which women appeared almost exclusively as objects of contemplation, desire, and argument rather than as speaking subjects in their own right. The beloved is characteristically silent, passive, and defined entirely by the male poet's perception of her. She is the canvas upon which he projects his desires, his fears, his philosophical reflections, and his rhetorical ingenuity. Elaine Showalter makes this connection between literary canon patriarchal power unmistakably clear:

"The history of literary tradition is inseparable from the history of gender — what a culture canonizes as great literature invariably reflects and reinforces the values and perspectives of those who hold cultural power." [A Literature of Their Own, 1977]

Within the metaphysical tradition, that power was unambiguously masculine. Marvell's mistress is the inheritor of this tradition, and her silence is not merely a personal pr dramatic choice but the product of a deeply embedded literary and cultural convention that systematically denied women the status of poetic subjects.

This is precisely what makes To His Coy Mistress such a fertile text for feminist analysis. The poem does not simply reflect the gender politics of its historical moment — it enacts them. Its tripartite rhetorical structure mirrors, with uncomfortable precision, the logic of coercive persuasion. In the first movement, the speaker flatters and idealizes, constructing an elaborate fantasy of timeless devotion. In the second, he shatters that fantasy with a brutal vision of death and physical decay — of worms violating her virginity in the grave, of her beauty crumbling to dust, of her honor reduced to ashes in the cold silence

of the tomb. In the third, he presents sexual surrender not as a choice but as the only rational and life-affirming response to the reality he has constructed.

The movement from flattery to fear to demand is not the movement of a lover but of a rhetorician — and the rhetoric, as this paper will argue, is in the service of control. What is most striking about this structure is not merely its logical elegance but its emotional violence. The speaker moves from tenderness to terror and back to desire with a fluency that is itself a form of manipulation — a way of destabilizing the mistress's emotional equilibrium so completely that submission appears not as capitulation but as liberation.

Kate Millet, in her groundbreaking study Sexual Politics (1970), argues that literature is one of the primary sites through which patriarchal ideology reproduces itself — that the texts a culture celebrates are never politically innocent but always embedded in and expressive of structures of masculine power (Millet 54). To read To His Coy Mistress through Millet's framework is to recognize that the poem's celebrated wit is not separable from its gender politics but is, in fact, their most effective vehicle. The more brilliant and persuasive the speaker's argument, the more completely the mistress — and the reader — is drawn into a structure of thought that takes male desire as its organizing principle and female resistance as the obstacle to be overcome. Wit, in this reading, is not a neutral literary quality but an instrument of ideological persuasion — a way of making the exercise of masculine authority appear natural, inevitable, and even charming.

Simone de Beauvoir's concept of woman as "the other," developed in The Second Sex (1949), further illuminates this dynamic. De Beauvoir argues that:

"One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." (de Beauvoir 267)

Femininity, in this formulation, is not a natural condition but a social construction imposed upon women by a patriarchal culture that requires them to occupy the position of the other in order to sustain the illusion of male subjectivity and autonomy. The mistress of the poem exists not as a subject with her own interiority, desire, and agency, but as the other against time and nature, is in fact the only form of agency the poem permits her, and even that is systematically delegitimatized by the force of his rhetorical assault. Her resistance is not respected or acknowledged as a legitimate expression of her own desires but is reframed as an irrational, self-destructive refusal to accept the reality of her situation — a reality, of course, that has been entirely constructed by the speaker himself.

Laura Mulvey's notion of the male gaze adds yet another critical dimension to this reading. Mulvey argues that within patriarchal culture, the gaze is structured as inherently masculine, with women consistently positioned as its passive objects (Mulvey 837). The speaker's prolonged, itemized contemplation of the mistress's body enacts precisely this structure. He declares:

An hundred years should go to praise

Thine eyes, and on thy forehead gaze;

Two hundred to adore each breast,

But thirty thousand to the rest. (Marvell 13-16)

This blazon — the conventional poetic technique of cataloguing the beloved's physical attributes — has often been read as a gesture of adoration. From a feminist perspective, however, it is equally a gesture of power and possession. To itemize a woman's body is to fragment it — to reduce her from a whole person to a collection of parts that exist for the pleasure and consumption of the male observer. The speaker's mathematical calculation of time assigned to each body part is particularly revealing. The mistress is not simply admired; she is measured, divided, and quantified. Her body becomes a kind of property to be inventoried — a possession whose value is determined entirely male gaze that surveys it. The speaker sees; the mistress is seen. The speaker speaks; the mistress is spoken about. These asymmetries are not accidental features of the poem's dramatic situation but the very foundation upon which its rhetorical and ideological structure is built.

The second movement of the poem marks a dramatic and violent shift in rhetorical strategy. Having constructed the fantasy of timeless adoration, the speaker abruptly dismantles it, confronting the mistress — and the reader — with a stark and terrifying vision of mortality. He warns:

But at my back I always hear

Times's winged chariot hurrying near;

And yonder all before us lie

Deserts of vast eternity. (Marvell 21-24)

The image of time's winged chariot is among the most celebrated in the English literary tradition, yet its function within poem's rhetorical structure is far from innocent. It is deployed not as a philosophical meditation but as a weapon of fear — a way of making the mistress feel the full weight of her mortality so that her resistance appears not only irrational but fatal. This rhetorical maneuver is deepened further as the speaker extends his vision of death into an explicit and disturbing description of physical decay:

Then worms shall try

That long-preserved virginity,

And your quaint honour turn to dust,

And into ashes all my lust. (Marvell 27-30)

These lines are among the most ideologically revealing in the poem. The speaker's invocation of worms violating the mistress's virginity is not merely a memento mori — a reminder of death's inevitability. It is a calculated act of rhetorical violence, designed to make the preservation of female chastity appear grotesque and futile. Virginity, which the mistress guards as an expression of her own agency and social identity, is here transformed into a source of horror — something that, if not surrendered to the speaker, will be surrendered to the grave. The logic is unmistakable: yield to me, or be consumed by death. This is not the language of a lover but of a coercive rhetorician who uses the fear of mortality to strip the mistress of the very agency her resistance represents. As Millet observes, patriarchal culture routinely employs the language of nature and inevitability to make the subordination of women appear not as a social construction but as an inescapable biological fact (Millet 26). The speaker's invocation of death operates in precisely this way — it naturalizes female surrender by presenting it as the only sane response to the human condition. The third and final movement of the poem presents sexual surrender as an act of liberation and defiance against time. The speaker urges:

Now let us sport us while we may,

And now, like amorous birds of prey,

Rather at once our time devour

Than languish in his slow-clapped power. (Millet 37-40)

The imagery here is strikingly predatory. The lovers are figured as birds of prey — creatures defined by their capacity for violent consumption. Yet within the poem's rhetorical logic, this predatory energy is presented as empowering, even romantic. The speaker invites the mistress to become an active participant in her own possession, to embrace the very surrender he has been engineering throughout the poem as though it were her own freely chosen act of rebellion. This is perhaps the poem's most ideologically sophisticated gesture — the transformation of coercion into consent, of submission into agency. By the poem's final lines, the mistress's yielding is framed not as defeat but as victory:

Thus, though we cannot make our sun

Stand still, yet we will make him run. (Marvell 45-46)

The poem ends with an image of shared triumph — yet it is a triumph entirely defined by the speaker's terms, achieved through the speaker's argument, and serving the speaker's desires. This mistress has been

persuaded, but she has not been heard. Her silence throughout the poem ensures that her perspective, her desires, and her fears remain permanently inaccessible — subsumed beneath the brilliance of a rhetorical performance that was never truly addressed to her as an equal but always directed at her as an object to be overcome.

Elaine Showalter, in A Literature of Their Own (1977), argues that feminist literary criticism must attend not only to what texts say but to what they silence – that the absences and exclusions of literary tradition are as ideologically significant as its inclusions (Showalter 12). Applied to To His Coy Mistress, this principle directs our attention to the most conspicuous absence in the poem – the mistress's voice. Throughout the poem's forty-six lines, the mistress never speaks. She is addressed, described, imagined, warned, and finally commanded, but she is granted no opportunity to respond, to refuse, or to articulate her own experience of the situation the speaker constructs around her. This silence is not a neutral dramatic convention. It is the structural condition that makes the speaker's rhetorical project possible. A mistress who spoke – who answered the speaker's flattery with her own desires, his fear with her own reflections on mortality, his demand with her own terms – would fundamentally destabilize the poem's rhetorical architecture. Her silence is therefore not merely an absence but an enforced exclusion, and it is in this enforced exclusion that the poem's deepest ideological commitments are revealed.

It is worth noting that the poem's critical reception has, for much of its history, participated in precisely this exclusion. Traditional scholarship celebrated the poem's wit and rhetorical ingenuity without adequately interrogating the gender politics that make that wit possible. T.S. Eliot, whose influence on the critical reception of metaphysical poetry was enormous, praised the poem as a supreme example of the unified sensibility – the capacity to fuse thought and feeling into a single, seamless poetic experience (Eliot 64). Yet Eliot's framework, like the poem itself, takes the male speaker's perspective as its organizing principle and treats the mistress's silence as an unremarkable feature of the lyric tradition rather than as an ideologically charged exclusion. More recent feminist scholarship has begun to correct this critical imbalance. Critics working within the tradition established by Millett and Showalter have drawn attention to the ways in which the poem's rhetorical strategies are deeply implicated in structures of masculine authority and female subordination – revealing that what has been celebrated as poetic brilliance is inseparable from the patriarchal assumptions that sustain it.

Ultimately, To His Coy Mistress emerges from this feminist analysis as a poem of profound ideological complexity- one that demands to be read not only as a triumph of metaphysical wit but as a document of the patriarchal culture that produced it. The speaker's movement from flattery through fear to coercive demand mirrors, with uncomfortable precision, the logic of emotional coercion – a logic in which female desire is irrelevant, female resistance is an obstacle, and female surrender is the inevitable and natural conclusion. The poem's celebrated carpe diem argument, stripped of its rhetorical elegance, reveals itself as an elaborate justification for the subordination of female sexuality to male desire. The mistress's silence, far from being a neutral dramatic convention, is the structural expression of a culture in which women's voices, desires, and bodies were subject to the authority of men. By reading To His Coy Mistress through the lens feminist frameworks of Millett, de Beauvoir, and Mulvey, this paper has sought to restore visibility to that silence – to hear, beneath the speaker's brilliant argument, the voice that the poem systematically suppresses, and to recognize in that suppression the broader patriarchal attitudes toward women, desire, and bodily autonomy that defined seventeenth-century England and whose echoes continue to resonate in literary and cultural discourse today.

Works Cited

1. De Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage Books, 2011.
2. Eliot, T.S. The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism. Alfred A. Knopf, 1921.
3. Marvell, Andrew. The Complete Poems. Edited by Elizabeth Story Donno, Penguin Books, 2005.
4. Millet, Kate. Sexual Politics. University of Illinois Press, 2000.
5. Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." Screen, vol. 16, no. 3, 1975, pp. 6-18.
6. Showalter, Elaine. A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing. Princeton University Press, 1977.