https://doi.org/10.35219/cil.2022.1.22

The Island as the space of multivocal encounter: multiple discourses în Shakespeare's *The tempest*

PhD Student, Matei Adela

„Ovidius" University of Constanta

***Abstract**: This essay applies discourse theory and geocriticism to Shakespeare's The Tempest in order to show the ways in which the island space is inscribed in the play's theatrical spatial imagination as an enclosed area engendering multi-discursive meanings. The space of the stage is the site of encounter for multiple dramatic voices and identities, each of them with their own discursive structure and motivational parameters. This multivocal encounter among cultures and allusions to other spaces has contributed to the play's success in production throughout the centuries, as it has been translated in several languages, produced in many directorial interpretations, and adapted in novels, poetry, movies, manga, videogames, etc. I argue that the play's multivocal aspect—as manifested in the island space of the theatre—is the result of the sedimentary process that has allowed each character to speak with his/her own voice throughout the ages, while at the same time borrowing various voices and languages from the surrounding culture and the time in which it has been produced or adapted.*

***Keywords**: discourse theory, geocriticism, island space, Shakespeare, „The Tempest"*

Since discourse is ideology in action, theatrical discourse represents a stepping point in constructing and reconstructing a specific ideology and space related to a certain play. As Margaret Wetherell observes in the Editor's Introduction of *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (2005), the discourse domains are "the study of social interaction" (5), "the study of minds, selves and sense-making" (5), and "the study of culture and social relations" (5). While the first domain is the concern of social science, the second domain involves psychologists, and the third area relates to the historical and institutional features of discourse. It is in this broader area that literary discourse is integrated, according to Wetherell, as critical analyses intend to respond to essential questions such as "How has meaning-making been organized over time? How has it sedimented into certain formations and ways of making sense and why those and not some other forms? How can we describe and understand this sedimenting process?" (5-6). Wetherell writes about the "construction of discursive space" (6), which is closely related to speculations of power, in the Foucauldian tradition. I will focus on the construction of discursive space in the meta-theatrical context of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, where the "sedimenting process" (Wetherell 5-6) has developed over a period of more than four hundred years. In this way, meanings are more intense, they are overlapping in unstructured ways, and critics are faced with the challenge of interpreting these literary sediments as multiple archaeological stratifications of discourse. Concurrently, I will use geocritical theory, as advanced by Bertrand Westphall and Robert T. Tally, [1] in order to show that the metaphoric space of the island in the play is inextricably related to multi-discourse interpretations.

The island in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* can be seen as the site of encounter for multiple cultures and identities, as well as multiple discourses. It is the place where Prospero—and Shakespeare as author—practises his well-learned discourse of magic, using it as a tool to manipulate various personalities, but also as an instrument of mercy and redemption. The imaginary island is the place in which Miranda and Ferdinand practise the discourse of love—sometimes in a clumsy Platonic manner, but finally in a comprehensive way designed to include the entire society in their multicultural space. The island is the place where Caliban experiences, initially, the effects of the underdeveloped discourse of instincts, which makes him live a life close to nature, like the natives of the New World. However, once the ideas of power over other human beings have been introduced in his world by Prospero, Caliban learns the discourse of deceit and tries to seize the power of knowledge from Prospero, in order to rule the island. Caliban's failure in seizing power for himself—by enlisting the help of the low-life characters Trinculo and Stephano—shows that power is useless if it is not matched by knowledge. In the end, he does get to rule the island by himself, but the play is unclear as to how Caliban would be able to do it. Being left alone on the island is

an invitation to try to rule himself, through his own personality—his base instincts and his wish for power—before trying to rule others. Finally, the island is a complex metaphor for the theatre, where characters are manipulated by author-playwright, and actors interpret a role.

In this way, theatre is the symbol of multicultural and multi-discourse confrontation. It is multicultural because it represents characters with different experiences, drawn from different cultures, and it is multi-discourse because characters use several metaphoric discourses (love, power, mercy, submission, friendship, internationalism, etc.). Moreover, the theatre is also a multilingual encounter because a Shakespearean play—especially *The Tempest*—has been translated into and performed in various languages and cultures. In this way, multicultural exchange is not only necessary, but also expected. Similarly, multiple adaptations of *The Tempest* can also be seen as intercultural translations into different languages (visual arts, music, movies, novels, poetry, videogames, manga, etc.). There is no end to the multicultural and multimedia creative purposes that this play has been subject to. Each of these transformations of *The Tempest* into a different form of expression may count as its cultural translation [2] into a different language, apart from the play's actual translation into all the languages of the world, as well as its integration in a simultaneous concatenation of multiple discourses. I argue that this multicultural integration is achieved in the play through the medium of the island's symbolic space, and the theatre as encompassing this space.

The island is an intercultural space that can be transposed in various locations, as many critics have done throughout the ages. Stephen Greenblatt famously emphasized "the productive power of representation" (6) in *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (1991). As Greenblatt observes, "Cultures are not altogether an assemblage of screens, or texts, or performances. In concentrating on mimetic capital, we can get at certain important qualities—the multiple, interconnected sites of representation, the mobility of spectacle and spectator alike, the unreality of images" (6). *The Tempest* may be part of the cultural "mimetic capital" that Greenblatt speaks of, in the sense that it has been created from associations with various previous texts, such as Montaigne's essay "Of Cannibals," Richard Eden's translation of Peter Martyr's *De orbe novo*; an eye witness report of a real-life shipwreck of the *Sea Venture* in 1609 on the island of Bermuda, narrated by William Strachey; or the collection of travel stories entitled *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625) by Samuel Purchas. However, the "productive power of representation" (Greenblatt 6) has created a different dramatic text out of the narrative sources creatively collated in the play.

In an article entitled "'Thou dost here usurp the name thou ow'st not': *The Tempest* and Intercultural Exchange," Duke Pesta argues against Greenblatt's view that the play is a version of early modern colonization, discussing the play's subtle intercultural exchange. As Pesta says, Greenblatt's vision of *The Tempest* collapses when confronted with the play's complexity, "its inflexible and radical binary distinctions between colonizer and colonized are unable to accommodate a more humane vision of cultural and linguistic exchange, one readily available to Renaissance thinkers and poets and very much on display in *The Tempest* itself" (Pesta 145). Indeed, I completely agree that *The Tempest* reveals a much more complex and nuanced distinction than the mere binary opposition between colonizer and colonized, as each character has something to say in this multipart narrative of colonization and intercultural exchange.

The first element of *The Tempest* that draws attention is the island's location. From the perspective of ecocriticism, in *Shakespeare and the Natural World* (2014), Tom McFaul observes the multiplicity and heterogeneity of this imaginary location:

> Prospero's mysterious island, is a strangely liminal space, and one that enables transformations and redemptions of a limited sort; the island's one native, Caliban, is a figure of animality who challenges our notions of what it is to be human; Prospero's magical art, meanwhile, weirdly balances between natural feeling and transcendence, a balance that is focalized through his attitude to eating on the island and its penitential meanings. The island, a naturally-unnatural environment, is a place where human feelings and thoughts can change the world and be changed by it. (McFaul 179)

Indeed, the quality of "liminal space" (McFaul 179)—placed at the margins—is enabling for the characters in the play. By having transformative power, just like nature or the theatre, the island may represent many things at the same time: it can symbolize simultaneously Caliban's animality, Prospero's magical art, and, more generally, the human psyche.

It is a known fact that critics have not been able to pinpoint the exact location of Prospero's Island, as some say it is somewhere in the Mediterranean, between Tunis and Naples, while others place it as far as the Bermudas in the Atlantic. Alison Shell argues that Prospero's Island is "a heterocosm: a discrete imaginative world custom-built for a particular play, where cosmology is symbiotically related to narrative and structure" (Shell 13). A "heterocosm" is synonymous with separate alternative worlds, and this implies multiple cultures, or multiculturalism. However, on a closer look, the view from the perspective of these multiple cultures shifts and it is difficult to discern one single perspective clearly. Moreover, Shell maintains that this "heterocosm" is "custom-built for a particular play", so this multiple-meaning location has validity only in relation to the world of the play. Indeed, despite the fact that many critics have tried to discern the play's universal themes (love, friendship, redemption, mercy, forgiveness, etc.), the fact that the action is restricted to the limited space of the island (and the play's stage) restricts the interpretations of universality. However, by interpreting Prospero's Island as the inner space of human imagination, all possibilities of interpretation open to audiences and critics, because of the simple fact that the human psyche is unpredictable and famously elusive. For this reason, Prospero's inner island of the mind may be associated with the site of multiple discourses.

This is because Prospero's Island is a multicultural space of discourse, around which imagination can roam freely. In *The Tempest*, this discourse may be associated with Prospero's magic, which is a very powerful language. As David Norbrook argues in "'What Care These Roarers for the Name of King': Language and Utopia in *The Tempest*," "The magic island of Shakespeare's play is at once an instance and an allegory of the players' project of opening up new spaces for discourse. It is a place where no name, no discourse, is entirely natural; language and nature are neither simply conflated nor simply opposed to one another" (Norbrook 251). Indeed, discourse is the key in interpreting the space of Prospero's Island; this imaginary space varies according to each character's perception, but not only. The imagination of each member of the audience, as well as each critic having ever interpreted the play, or each director having ever produced the play, added to each actor interpreting every single character in this play, can open up endless ways of interpretation. In this way, space in *The Tempest* is multivocal and multifocal. If one focuses on Prospero, it is possible to see the island as a space where he can assert his authority. If the focus is on Caliban, the island is a space of survival, as well as a space of possibility, in which he can fulfil his misplaced illusions of grandeur and power. When the focus is on Miranda, the island is the adoptive space of her childhood, but also the space fostering her idealized first love. If the focus is on Alonzo, the island is a space of redemption, because he thinks he has lost his only son to the waves. And so on.

Within the world of the play, the island represents past, present and future. As a space of memory, it harbours Prospero's resentment for having been usurped by his brother in Milan, but it is also a space of cultural memory, in which Prospero tries to recreate the European civilization of his native Milan, with all the knowledge it represents. As a space of the present, the island represents the family's survival, but also Prospero's imposing of his authority over Ariel, Miranda and Caliban, at first, as well as on the Neapolitan party later in the play. As a space of the future, the island will be left to the mercy of Caliban, who will impose his own rule, while the future for the others lies in Milan and Naples, under Prospero's and respectively Alonzo's rule. None of these spaces of discourse is absolute, as none can be described exclusively. As Kiernan Ryan observes in his Introduction to the collection of critical essays entitled *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*, "*The Tempest* maroons an exiled father and his only daughter on a mysterious island in order to witness his forgiveness of his treacherous kin, his betrothal of his daughter to the son of his former foe, and their impending return in the spirit of reconciliation to the homeland from which they had been driven when the bride-to-be was but a child" (Ryan 5). The island of banishment is both homeland and foreign space, as I see it, just as Prospero's and Miranda's native Milan is a place of sorrow but also of hope, to which they long to return.

The isolated island as a symbol of individual consciousness has been identified by many critics throughout the centuries. For example, the twentieth-century critic Harold C. Goddard wrote in 1951 that the island in *The Tempest* is a space of symbolic discourse:

> Of the many universal symbols on which *The Tempest* is erected that of the island is fundamental. An island is a bit of a higher element rising out of a lower—like a fragment of consciousness thrusting up out of the ocean of unconsciousness. Like a clearing in the wilderness or a walled city, like a temple or a monastery, it is a piece of cosmos set over against chaos and ready to defend itself if chaos, as it will be bound to do, tries to bring it back under its old domination. It is a magic circle, a small area of perfection shutting out all the rest of infinite space. (Goddard 182)

Indeed, in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, the fragmented consciousness of the characters on the island is similar to the elusive postmodern consciousness, in which the self can embrace multiple identities. Thus, the play has been in constant dialogue with itself throughout the ages, and it is no wonder that *The Tempest* may have served as a creative model to many other stories, perpetuated through various media.

The island space in *The Tempest* is a world in itself, just as the Globe theatre on which it was first performed is a representation of the world. Dennis Kennedy, in the article "Shakespeare Worldwide," observes that Shakespeare belongs to the world because, in Elizabethan and Jacobean times, England witnessed the first major period of its expansion, encouraging an overseas empire that continued until the late twentieth century. As Kennedy notes, "From *Titus Andronicus* to *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's work repeatedly turns to the themes touching on the stranger, the alien, the other, and often deals openly with questions of empire and colony" (Kennedy 251). Not only is the island in *The Tempest* a symbol of England's incipient imperial aspirations, but it is also a sign of the individual mind and consciousness, which colonizes reality, just as an empire colonizes other spaces, including islands. Prospero can be interpreted as a colonizer of the island because he tries to impose the European (Italian) political principles and modes of thought, but he also colonizes other people's minds, through the intercession of the spirit Ariel, making them experience the illusions that he intends them to have. At the same time, Prospero himself is under the illusion that he can set things right in his world by punishing the malefactors and making them realize they were wrong. Therefore, he is the prisoner of his own system of thought, expressed through his self-absorbed discourse, and he does not even realize that this is so. Even if, at the end, Prospero intends to retire to Milan and reflect on the nature of his mortality, as he says, "Every third thought shall be my grave" (5.1.311), [3] he is still a prisoner of his own island of interiority, formed of his beliefs.

It is no wonder that the location of Prospero's Island has preoccupied many critics. As Dan Brayton observes in *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*, "Locating the island setting of *The Tempest* has long been a scholarly preoccupation, and with good reason. To demarcate a literal territory for Shakespeare's insular plot would solve many interpretive problems: Caliban's identity would then become somewhat less overdetermined; Prospero would become a conquistador (or not); the eponymous storm would, or would not, be the Bard's imaginative rendition of that quintessentially New World phenomenon, the hurricane" (Brayton 167). Indeed, even if New World imagery permeates the play, the island's location is unstable and audiences and critics throughout the times have found difficulty in explaining all the complexities of this imaginary place, which can be associated with the human psyche. The island's imagery evokes archipelagos like the Bermudas and the Bahamas, even as its most obvious geographical coordinates remain within the bounds of the Mediterranean. The play's disruption of the conventional notions of place has a postmodern ring, which go along with the characters' thoughts and emotions.

Prospero's Discourse of Magic

From the general notion of multiculturalism in a fictional and idealised society to the various symbolic discourses represented in the play, *The Tempest* creates a theatrical universe in which the individual psyche is just as important as society is. In this respect, Prospero's discourse of magic is nothing more than what a person perceives to be true, the fictions or fabulations that the mind creates and takes them as reality. Starting from the passage in which Gonzalo indirectly mocks Antonio and Sebastian for their belief in

idealised fictions (II.i.177-179)—which they take as truth even if they are down-to-earth pragmatic characters—I would say that the need for progress is embedded in the human mind, even if there are certain individuals who, because of their social, racial or gender prejudice, try to prevent this change from happening. Moreover, the discourse of magic that Prospero uses throughout the play—even at the end, when he gives up his magic staff and book—is a sign of human progress, despite these prejudices. This is paradoxical because Prospero himself is a prejudiced person, who considers the lower classes (Caliban) or the airy spirits (Ariel) as fit to be his slaves. Nevertheless, the discourse of magic that Prospero uses in the play empowers him to have control over the others, and ultimately over himself, though he cannot achieve this state entirely and he is still a prisoner of preconception at the end of the play.

Prospero, therefore, seems to be a male chauvinist who thinks that the whole world must obey his orders, including his daughter Miranda and the spirit Ariel—to say nothing of the slave Caliban. Yet Prospero's discourse of magic is of a different kind than the common meaning of this art. As Sandra Clark observes in a critical study about *The Tempest*, "Prospero is no conjuror or wizard, dressing up in magic robes and waving a wand to perform spells or charms. … He is a learned man and a scholar who has turned his scholarship to a particular direction—the study of magical arts" (Clark 33). In the Renaissance, supernatural power was subdivided into three areas: natural or elemental magic, celestial magic (which relates to the stars and the planets), and the supra-celestial or intellectual magic (which concerns the control of the spirits and intelligences). Prospero's art gives him control in each of these spheres. Derived from the Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophy, as well as the humanist principles combining philosophy and theology, Prospero's magic is the discourse of the highly educated, the elect, who try to disseminate their knowledge to the less privileged. As David Scott Kastan observes in "'The Duke of Milan / And his Brave Son': Old Histories and New in *The Tempest*," while reviewing the history of criticism about this character, "Prospero is no longer an inspiring magus but an arrogant and ill-tempered magistrate …; and the romance form is no longer a utopian spectacle of wonder but itself a participant in the ideological activity of imperialism—performing the necessary act of colonialist legitimation by naturalising domination as the activity of a 'Providence divine' (I.ii.159)" (Kastan 227). Indeed, Prospero's discourse of magic is a distorted means of achieving control over the others—whether colonizer or colonized.

The Tempest was written in 1611, therefore in what is called the Jacobean period, but cultural influences from the earlier Elizabethan period are clearly observed. Shakespeare must be seen inside the Renaissance phenomenon, inside its ideas, culture, and customs, because all of them influenced the author's writing, even though he just continued some of them and changed others. Barbara Mowatt highlights the importance of Prospero's magic book in the economy of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, because it is related to the knowledge of the time and to magic practices. As Mowatt argues,

> the text indicates that Prospero not only has a magic robe and a magic staff (both of which are explicitly called for), but, like Friar Bacon and Doctor Faustus and other stage magicians before him, he also has a magic book. Further, the play presents Prospero's always-offstage book as crucial to his rule over the island, the magical instrument that enables him to control the spirits. (Mowatt 2).

Prospero's magic book, therefore, is both a theatrical prop and a symbolic sign of his trade, along with the magic staff and the magic robe.

Prospero's dominating tendencies can be seen right from the beginning. He is the leading figure in *The Tempest*, but this comes at a price. Sandra Clark says that "Prospero is a ruler and *The Tempest* is a study in power: spiritual and temporal; natural and supernatural; power over the outer world and power over the self" (49). He leads all the actions and makes them happen in the first place. Prospero, with his magical powers, shapes and controls the entire action of the play. The fact that he is controlling and deciding everything about the events on the island is considered an important function of the magician in all the shows, the function of producer and director of that particular show. Similarly, Muriel Bradbrook points out the manipulating tendency evidenced in Prospero: "For what is the magician but, as always in the old plays, a stage manager of shows, with his wand and his inscribed 'book'?" (Bradbrook 57). Prospero has all the details of the play, he gives all the back-stage directions; not even his loyal servant Ariel knows the

continuation of the act before Prospero considers it right to tell him and gives him another part of the script, which needs to be acted. This idea makes him like the God of the island, because what is a director on his/her stage if not God himself/herself? Prospero is also the one who decides who goes where and what happens to whom and when, so he is truly a God-like figure.

Prospero may have been modelled on figures of magicians of Shakespeare's time, but he is also different from them. In Elizabethan England, there were influential magical thinkers such as Robert Fludd and John Dee. They tended to believe that everything was connected by unseen natural sympathies. They were trying to reveal what was hidden from science by means of natural magic and, at the same time, as John S. Mebane argues, they were the ones to assert the idea that "the quest for truth should not be limited by traditional religious, political, or intellectual authorities" (Mebane 3). Yet Prospero's quest of truth is actually limited by his own prejudice and his wish for revenge. His restricted vision does not allow him to accept a multicultural view, in which creatures like Caliban or spirits like Ariel can live in a world of equality. In addition, Peggy Muñoz Simonds argues "that Prospero is an alchemist as well as a magician, that his goal in *The Tempest* is to restore the Golden Age or, in terms of the future, to create a 'brave new world' by perfecting the people, including himself, who will live in it, and that the art or science of alchemy thus provides a major shaping pattern for the tragicomedy as a whole" (Muñoz Simonds 542). I would argue against this view, because, even if one might idealistically think so, when looked closer, we can see that Prospero is just another selfish person who seeks to punish the people who harmed him.

From the idealistic perspective, considering that Prospero is a wise magician who tries to recreate a golden age and set things right, we might say that the discourse of Prospero's magic is used judiciously, leading every character to see who he or she really is. As Barbara Howard-Traister points out when she writes about *The Tempest*, "The play presents the most complete picture of the positive potential of magic we have seen. While *Dr Faustus* shows magic at its lowest, as a trick the devil uses to ensnare a human soul by deceptive promises of power, *The Tempest* reveals magic at its most powerful, used carefully" (Howard-Traister 145). Indeed, the play may show that magic can make the world full of possibilities and help people achieve their full potential. Yet the play is not formed only of characters like Miranda, who benefits from her father's magic to meet romantic love and take her place in the high society as the future queen of Naples. Or characters like Ferdinand, who learns about love and loss, and tries to improve himself. Or characters like Gonzalo, who was humanitarian to begin with, so he did not need to change his identity as a result of Prospero's magic. Most of the characters from the Neapolitan party do not change much, even if they are confronted with visions that are intended to make them see their faults. Perhaps only Alonzo, the King of Naples, may have suffered a change of mind, when he thinks that his son is lost and there is little hope in life. But Antonio and Sebastian remain the same schemers and manipulators as before, with no intention to change. Antonio remains silent in the end, when all rejoice, and when Alonzo says "Amen" (V.i.204), as does Gonzalo (V.i.215). Prospero's discourse of magic does not have the same effect on all the characters, so it is *not* the universal language of human understanding.

The Discourse of Love: Miranda and Ferdinand

While Prospero communicates through the metaphorical discourse of magic in *The Tempest*, Ferdinand and Miranda are involved in the discourse of love. On the occasion of Ferdinand and Miranda's first meeting, arranged and controlled by Prospero, in Act I, scene ii of *The Tempest*, a curious exchange takes place between the three of them. Miranda articulates her desire for Ferdinand by distinguishing him from the other two men she has known: her father and Caliban. When Miranda first sees Ferdinand, she says, "I might call him / A thing divine; for nothing natural / I ever saw so noble" (I.ii.420-422). For the naïve Miranda, nobility is something acquired through birth and education, and it is opposed to the natural world in which she lives. Caliban may be part of the surrounding natural world, but Ferdinand is from a different society and his birthmark is nobility. Miranda, therefore, uses the discourse of emotion when she first encounters the Neapolitan prince.

Ferdinand, however, may seem to use the discourse of love, when he is amazed and addresses Miranda as "goddess" (I.ii.424) and "O you wonder!" (I.ii.429). This "wonder" epithet is a play on Miranda's name, which, in Latin, means "that to be admired". Yet Ferdinand uses the discourse of social

interaction, not the mystic expression of emotion, when he wonders "If you be maid or no?" (I.ii.429). Even more so, Ferdinand is amazed that she speaks his language, Italian, which takes away the aura of goddess-like mysticism from Miranda: "My language! Heavens! / I am the best of them that speaks this speech, / Were I but where 'tis spoken" (I.ii.431-433). There is no trace of modesty in Ferdinand's words, which show that, after the initial amazement, when he thought Miranda was a goddess, when he heard her speak his native language, Italian, he started thinking of social class and difference. In his home country, Ferdinand sees himself as the "best" (I.ii.432) of others, because he is a prince and, as he thinks, the potential king. Therefore, Ferdinand becomes race- and class-conscious the moment when discourse and cultural memory are imposed on him.

Prospero is even more sensitive to class difference when he hears Ferdinand's words "the best of them" (I.ii.432), because this expression implies that Ferdinand thinks himself to be the king; so, Prospero reprimands the young man, reminding him of his second place in the royal hierarchy of Naples: "How? The best? / What wert thou, if the king of Naples heard thee?" (I.ii.433-434). As Ferdinand believes that his father died in the wreck, he asserts self-confidently "Myself am Naples" (I.ii.437) because, as Ferdinand says, he saw with his eyes "The King my father wrack'd" (I.ii.438). Ferdinand is class-conscious and he knows—as he believes his father is dead—that he is the ruler of Naples. Yet all this is an illusion, because Ferdinand is on a desert island on which class and social hierarchy matter little. However, like Ferdinand, Prospero is himself aware of dynastic heritage. Ferdinand continues to narrate that he saw "The Duke of Milan / And his brave son being twain" (I.ii.440-441) dying in the waves. Ferdinand implies that the usurper Antonio has a son, who is supposed to have perished in the waves, but this character does not appear as a member of the Neapolitan party on the island. It may well be that Antonio's (non-existent) son is designed as a mirror image of Prospero's daughter, thus levelling the dynastic scale. If Antonio no longer has a son, even more so is Prospero entitled to return to the Dukedom of Milan. Ferdinand continues his dynastic discourse of social inequality when he identifies Miranda as "a virgin" (I.ii.450). If she is a virgin, and she did not give her affection to somebody else, Ferdinand promises to make her "The Queen of Naples" (I.ii.452). Both Ferdinand and Prospero speak the dynastic discourse of power, in which Miranda is just an object to be colonized, according to the hierarchy of rule.

The medieval hierarchy beast–human–angel is symbolically embodied in the representation of the play's male characters in competition for Miranda's love, with Miranda as the main evaluator. As Jyotsna G. Singh observes in a post-colonial interpretation of *The Tempest*, "In eliding Caliban and Ferdinand in vague comparison to 'most of men'—while rhetorically suggesting an identity and difference between them—Prospero points out how he uses Caliban as the less-than-human other in order to define gender (and racial) identity in conveniently elusive terms of what is *not*" (Singh 212). In doing so, Prospero unwittingly reveals that not only does he fear Caliban's potential for miscegenation with Miranda, but that every man who desires his daughter is potentially a Caliban, unless that desire can be channelled to fulfil the demands of an aristocratic lineage. Thus, Miranda's expression of love and emotion is opposed to Ferdinand's social discourse of aristocratic hierarchy, which is backed by Prospero's discourse of family and social difference. Caliban's vernacular dialect of nature and instincts—since he tried to rape Miranda—is opposed to the discourses of these civilized males, but it is not certain which is the best. Even if Ferdinand seems to gain the upper hand, in the sense that he marries Miranda, this is only part of Prospero's machinations and it is not the direct result of genuine human interaction. In the eyes of Prospero, Miranda and Ferdinand are just tools that can be manipulated with the help of his magic staff, so they are no better than the slave Caliban, even if they believe they have free will and can shape their own destiny as free individuals.

The discourse of love, therefore, is just an intermediary between the all-powerful but imperfect discourse of magic and the discourse of social and political power, which is reinstated at the end of *The Tempest*. When Ferdinand is made to carry logs by Prospero—in this way suggesting that Miranda cannot be won so easily—Ferdinand is refreshed by the "sweet thoughts" (III.i.14) about his love: "But these sweet thoughts do even refresh my labours" (III.i.14). While Miranda offers to bear Ferdinand's logs for him (III.i.24)—or to share the burden imposed upon him by Prospero—she does this while she knows that her father is "hard at study" (III.i.20) in his cell, and "He's safe for these three hours" (III.i.21). This insistence on time and duration—as the play develops between two and four in the afternoon—brings to mind the

meta-theatrical issue, because a play would take place during this time interval. However, when Miranda thinks that her father is studying in his cell, she is actually wrong, because Prospero is observing them unknowingly. As Prospero says about Ferdinand, "Poor worm, thou art infected! / This visitation shows it" (III.i.31-32). From Prospero's perspective of the powerful magician who can manipulate destinies, Ferdinand seems to him as a "poor worm" (III.i.31), even if he is a prince. Moreover, the discourse of love is, in Prospero's eyes, an infection that young people catch, because they are inclined to take things at their face value. The discourse of love, therefore, is just as imperfect as the discourse of instincts (represented by Caliban) and the discourse of subversion and power (represented by the Neapolitan party). In Prospero's opinion, only his magically derived power allows him to achieve control over the others.

Caliban and the Discourse of the New World

Caliban has often been interpreted as the colonized alien "other," who is subjected to the controlling colonizer Prospero and made a slave, with no say in the organization of the island. In the chapter "*The Tempest*, Outsiders, and Border Crossings" of the book *Shakespeare and Outsiders*, Marianne Novy maintains that Caliban is probably the Shakespearean outsider who is invoked by political movements around the world. As Novy notes, "The frequent reference to him as 'monster' or 'disproportioned' can foreshadow the alienation that colonialism's imposition of different standards of aesthetics and behaviour can impose" (Novy 147). However, as I see it, Caliban is also a being with his own thoughts and desires—as he desires Miranda and wants to populate the island "with Calibans" (I.ii.353), and he suggests to Stephano to displace Prospero from power, as Caliban would "serve" him as lord of the island (III.ii.56). Stephano envisages an illusory scenario in which he will be king, and Miranda will be "queen" (III.ii.105), while Trinculo and Caliban will be "viceroys" (III.ii.106). Yet Caliban's plot fails lamentably, as the three would-be plotters get to fight for the rich clothes that are laid before Prospero's cell. For them, the rich clothes are the embodiment of power, whereas the clothes are, in fact, just the façade of real power. As Prospero chases the three schemers with the help of his hounds (significantly named Mountain, Silver, Fury and Tyrant), the three rascals end in physical suffering, as Prospero instructs to "grind their joints" (IV.i.258), give them "dry convulsions" (IV.i.259) and "aged cramps" (IV.i.260). Just as the discourse of instincts that Caliban uses when desiring Miranda, the discourse of power that he wants to learn is imperfect and useless in the context of the fake plot that he and the three conspirators contrive.

Yet Caliban also employs the discourse of imagination, besides the discourse of instincts and his wishful thinking about power. Caliban is given some of the best lines about music and imagination in all of Shakespeare, when he describes the illusory sounds of the island. As he tells Stephano and Trinculo, "the isle is full of noises, / Sounds and sweet airs, that give delight and hurt not" (III.ii.133-134). This looks like the description of music in a masque, with "a thousand twangling instruments" (III.ii.135) and "sometimes voices" (III.ii.136) humming about his ears. The beautiful voices with instrument accompaniment make Caliban "sleep again" (III.ii.137) and then, "in dreaming" (III.ii.137) he is able to see clouds opening and showering riches upon him. This is why, when he wakes, he cries to dream again (III.ii.140-141). Caliban's visions of beauty and riches caused by the sounds of music and voices prove that he has poetic imagination, and he can also express his visions in beautiful words. Therefore, Caliban is not totally an insensitive and instinctual being, who desires Miranda and knows the good water sources and berries on the island. He is also a creature endowed with poetic imagination, as his dreams represent the power to recreate feelings through words. This makes Caliban a sensitive creature, not only a monster, and audiences can feel some sympathy for him.

In an illusory place, such as Prospero's Island, therefore, different characters use various discourses, according to their level of education and personal development. While Caliban is able to perceive beautiful music and imagine riches brought by his dreams, Stephano brings a more pragmatic approach to the music that Caliban hears. When hearing Caliban's description of the island's "noises" (III.ii.132), which provoke dreams in the instinctual creature, Stephano exclaims, "This will prove a brave kingdom to me, where I shall have my music for nothing" (III.ii.141-142). Stephano's experience about music is only what he was able to get at popular fairs, when he had to pay for listening to ballads interpreted by minstrels. Therefore, Stephano appreciates all the more the power he will have as the king of the island,

when all the good things of life would come free for him, including music. Stephano's pragmatic view of poetry and music is contrasted with Caliban's creation of an imaginary world, but it is no less illusory than Caliban's vision. While Caliban is the victim of Ariel's creation of imaginary music—which he perceives as beautiful sounds—Stephano imagines the position of kingship as an ideal state in which he would have everything for free, and no responsibilities. Therefore, Stephano does not really use the discourse of power—as do Prospero and the people in the Neapolitan party—but he perceives only the illusion of power, as manifested through various representations, including music, and later clothes.

Even though Caliban is a native of the island and his presence can be interpreted from the postcolonial perspective, he is not merely an exotic character who uses the discourse of instincts. He shares the past and the cultural heritage of his ancestors—including that of his mother Sycorax—and also some influences from Prospero's Western European culture, represented by music. Caliban proves that he can absorb all cultures and, therefore, he can manipulate several discourses. By contrast, Stephano and Trinculo, as limited and non-educated servants, can use only the discourse of submission, even when they have dreams of power. The space of the island, therefore, includes all these multi-discourse encounters. From the perspective of ecocriticism, Simon C. Estok writes: "the space that *The Tempest* describes is … a space whose Otherness, difference, exoticism and promise of wealth make it very fertile ground for the seeds of colonialist ambitions and fantasies, and it is a space from which Caliban is characteristic and inseparable" (104). Therefore, the magic space of the island in *The Tempest* can be interpreted as the illusion of the theatre. Indeed, ultimately, the illusions that Caliban and Stephano describe can be assimilated to the illusion of the theatre, which can create multiple parallel worlds through the interaction of various characters and discourses in the play.

The Theatre as Multi-discourse Confrontation

The plot of *The Tempest* rests on the transformational power of the Island. In this context, the discourse of magic is the fuse that drives the plot, the catalyst that shows that this is only a play, a piece of creative imagination. Without the catalysing infusion of the Island's properties, Prospero would be little more than a scholarly Duke banished and lost at sea, and shipwrecked on a desert island. Therefore, the play's genre is rather debated. According to Jonathan Hart, "For contemporary critics, it has become increasingly difficult in the face of political and ideological issues arising from *The Tempest* to concentrate on the genre of the play, which some have called a comedy, others a tragicomedy and still others a romance" (Hart 131). Before he left Milan, Prospero had already been "transported and rapt in secret studies" (I.ii.76-77). Not only does the study of magic bring about Prospero's downfall in Milan, but it also foreshadows his triumph over magic on the island. The discourse of magic, for Prospero, is only a tool he uses to recreate himself and impose his will on the others. When he has completed his transformation, he casts aside magic, in the form of his staff and cloak.

The magic Prospero practices on the island is devoid of lasting physical effect, like all magic illusions. Prospero is an illusionist who can cloud the audience's attention and redirect it to the desired object. The reason for which Caliban, Prospero, and Ariel remain unafraid in the midst of the tumult in Act I lies in the fact that they know that the storm is not real, and that its physical effect will not last. However, as Robin H. Wells observes, "Directed by providence to an enchanted island, Prospero is less interested in establishing a colony than in using his magical powers to reconcile old enemies" (Wells 27). The storm's apparent power to destroy is not real, since certain characters know that Prospero does not intend to harm those aboard the ship. The passengers aboard the storm-torn vessel will provide his passage back to the world, but only Prospero and Ariel know this, when Ariel reports, "The mariners all under hatches stow'd; / Who, with a charm join'd to their suffer'd labour, / I have left asleep" (I.ii.230-232). The mariners' sleep is both the result of natural causes, because they are tired, and also provoked by Ariel's magic charm. Therefore, the storm, the visions, and the masque of Juno and Ceres are just theatrical devices, which speak of meta-theatricality and the power of the theatre to create illusions.

These illusions are represented both in the play and in the audience's imagination. In Act IV, scene I, Prospero is given a speech relevant for the quality of the theatre and meta-drama. It starts with "Our revels now are ended. These our actors, /As I foretold you, were all spirits, and/ Are melted into air, into thin air"

(IV.i.148-158), and it refers to the illusion of art and theatre. Prospero's meditation on the insubstantiality of the theatre world seems, to many critics, as Stephen Greenblatt puts it in his Norton introduction to *The Tempest*, "the pinnacle of the play's visionary wisdom" (Greenblatt, Introduction to *The Tempest* 3053). Furthermore, ever since the early nineteenth century, critics have been tempted to see in this speech and in Prospero's epilogue an autobiographical reference to Shakespeare's own supposed retirement from the stage. The idea is attractive because it promises access to Shakespeare's private thoughts and personal life, but there is little evidence to support it, and it is by no means certain that *The Tempest* is Shakespeare's last play. However, if we understand the speech in relation to the play's meta-dramatic self-referentiality at this point—that is, its concern with its own theatricality—the idea of magic as the meta-discourse related to the theatre is apparent.

Prospero, himself a character in a play, speaks of the insubstantiality of the spirit actors he has conjured and compares the brevity of life to the dreamlike quality of a masque with its shows of "cloud-capp'd towers" (IV.i.152) and "gorgeous palaces" (IV.i.152). However, not only these proud human works must fade. In an allusion at once to the Last Judgment and to the King's Men's principal theatre (the Globe), Prospero reminds his audience that even the "great globe itself" (IV.i.153) must eventually dissolve and leave not so much as a wisp of cloud behind. Yet again, the globe is a geographic symbol of globalization and multiculturalism. The theatre, therefore, stands for everything that Prospero's magic could not represent: the universality of human thought. In this sense, the theatre is symbolic of multiculturalism and multi-discourse interaction, while the discourse of magic is just a tool to achieve the playwright's purpose.

Prospero's meditation on the illusion of the theatre is, perhaps, a self-referential moment in *The Tempest*. However, nearly everywhere that we look in this play, we will find that, in subtle ways, the discourse calls attention to its own theatricality. Thus, the opening scene leads us to take as "natural" a storm at sea that the next scene will reveal to have been invoked by Prospero's art. In addition, Prospero's other magical displays—the disappearing banquet, the showy garments that distract Stephano and Trinculo from their plot—are evidently theatrical. Particularly notable is the way that Shakespeare's play advertises its time scheme. Two exchanges between Prospero and Ariel—one in I.ii and one in V.i—establish that the action begins about two in the afternoon, the same time that Shakespearean performances began, and concludes three or four hours later, at about six. Thus, the play takes place not merely within the single day prescribed by the classical doctrine of unity of time, but within three to four hours. Plays at the Globe used to take place between two and four in the afternoon, to take advantage of the daylight. Therefore, the same actor interpreting Prospero's part, who speaks on the island of his creation, is actually standing on the stage, interpreting a role. Prospero's island is the theatre, with all that this idea implies: isolation as well as public spectacle; human interaction as well as individual development; unicity as well as change. The tempest is a symbol of change, just as the theatre is.

Multiculturalism, therefore, is not just an ideological notion that theorists advance to suit their own purposes, but a real-life event performed on the stage, in the global theatre, which gathers various people who, for the duration of the two hours, use the same conventional idiom: theatrical discourse. Even if characters in the play seem to use several discourses—of magic, of love, the pragmatic discourse of power and colonialism—the truly multicultural discourse that englobes all of them is the theatre. Through the illusion of the theatre, the audience can imagine that they can understand various discourses, used by various characters, and they can recreate their own illusions, brought about by this multicultural environment. This is only what may have happened at productions of *The Tempest* in Shakespeare's time. However, the play has been translated and interpreted in various languages ever since, and each production on stage may bring a different interpretation and refer to a different discourse of creation, specific to each director producing the play. In addition, the multiple adaptations and rewritings of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* [4] reinterpret the play in a discourse of their own—whether in theatrical productions, novel, opera, music, ballet, painting or movie adaptation.

Notes

[1] In *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces* (2011), Bertrand Westphal refers to "reading spaces" (149), through which one may unveil the "inextricable" link between text and place (Westphal 149). Alternatively, Eric Prieto, in "Geocriticism, Geopoetics,

Geophilosophy, and Beyond," included in the collection of essays edited by Robert T. Tally Jr., entitled *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies* (2011), writes that, in the postmodern period, "geographers and other spatial thinkers have showed a renewed sensitivity to the fact that narrative, metaphor and other paralogical modes of discourse that we often associate with literature are also at work in the social and even the physical sciences" (Pieto 14).

[2] I refer to the concept of "cultural" translation as it has been advanced by Susan Bassnett in *Translation Studies* (2002), especially p. 3.

[3] References to Shakespeare's *The Tempest* are keyed to the Arden edition, edited by Frank Kermode (1988), and acts, lines and scenes are given parenthetically in the text.

[4] Among the many adaptations of *The Tempest* are: the dramatic adaptation by Sir William Davenant and John Dryden entitled *The Tempest, The Enchanted Island* in 1667; Thomas Shadwell's opera of the same name in 1674; the operatic version by David Garrick, with music by John Christopher Smith, in 1756. Among the productions of *The Tempest* in the twentieth century, we must mention the production by Henry Beerbohm Tree (1904), the American Percy MacKaye (1916), Peter Brook (1968), Jonathan Miller (1988), Gerald Freedman at the American Shakespeare Theater (1979) and Ron Daniel's production at the Royal Shakespeare Company (1982). Prospero was interpreted by John Gielgud (1930), Patrick Stewart (1995), and Derek Jacobi (2003). *The Tempest* was performed at the Globe Theatre in 2000 with Vanessa Redgrave as Prospero and in 2016, produced by the Royal Shakespeare Company and directed by Gregory Doran. In music, Arthur Sullivan composed a set of incidental music to *The Tempest* (1861), and also Jean Sibelius, Hector Berlioz, Henry Purcell and Michael Tippett composed music inspired by *The Tempest*. A one-act ballet of *The Tempest* by choreographer Alexei Ratmanski was presented by American Ballet Theatre in 2013. In 1968 the Franco-Caribbean writer Aimé Césaire published the novel *Une Tempête*, which is a radical adaptation of the play based on its colonial and post-colonial interpretations; in Canada, in 1974, Margaret Lawrence published the novel *The Diviners*; there are also the novels *Prospero's Daughter* by Constance Beresford-Howe and Marina Warner's *Indigo*. In painting, in 1735 William Hogarth produced *A Scene from The Tempest*; Henri Fuseli modelled Prospero on Leonardo da Vinci; and the pre-Raphaelite painter John Everett Millais portrayed *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*. On screen, various movie adaptations of *The Tempest* are: the 1960 version of *The Tempest* directed by George Louis Schaefer, with Richard Burton as Caliban; in 1979, Derek Jarman's production the homoerotic film *The Tempest*, which used Shakespeare's play but had many deviations from it; in 1982, Paul Mazursky's production a modern-language adaptation of *The Tempest*; and Peter Greenaway directed *Prospero's Books*, featuring John Gielguld, in 1991.

Referances and Bibliography

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Bradbrook, Muriel. *The Rise of the Common Player: A Study of Actor and Society in Shakespeare's* England. London: Chatto and Windus, 1962.

Brayton, Dan. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012.

Clark, Sandra. *Critical Studies: The Tempest*. Penguin Critical Studies. London: Penguin Books, 1988.

Estok, Simon C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Goddard, Harold C. "1951—Harold Goddard. 'The Tempest' from *The Meaning of Shakespeare*." In *Bloom's Shakespeare through the Ages: The Tempest*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008, pp. 172-187.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. Introduction to *The Tempest*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 3051-3054. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Hart, Jonathan. *Columbus, Shakespeare, and the Interpretation of the New World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Howard-Traister, Barbara. *Heavenly Necromancers: The Magician in English Renaissance* Drama. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984. Edited by Lawrence Stone. London: Longman, 1965.

Kastan, David Scott. "'The Duke of Milan / And his Brave Son': Old Histories and New in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare's Romances*. Edited by Alison Thorne. Contemporary Critical Essays. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 226-249.

Kennedy, Dennis. "Shakespeare Worldwide." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, Edited by Margareta di Grazia and Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 251-264.

McFaul, Tom. *Shakespeare and the Natural World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 2015.

Mebane, John S. *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Mowatt, Barbara A. “Prospero's Book.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 1. Spring 2001, pp. 1-33.
Muñoz Simonds, Peggy. “‘My charms crack not:’ The Alchemical Structure of *The Tempest*.” *Comparative Drama*, vol. 31, no. 4, Winter 1997/1998, pp. 538-570.
Norbrook, David. “‘What Care These Roarers for the Name of King’: Language and Utopia in *The Tempest*.” *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*. Edited by Kiernan Ryan. 2nd ed. London and New York, 2013, pp. 245-278.
Northcote Toller, T. and Joseph Bosworth, eds. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
Novy, Marianne. *Shakespeare and Outsiders*. Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Pesta, Duke. “‘Thou dost here usurp the name thou ow’st not’: *The Tempest* and Intercultural Exchange.” *Renascence*, vol. 67, no. 2, Spring 2015, pp. 127-146.
Pieto, Eric. “Geocriticism, Geopoetics, Geophilosophy, and Beyond.” *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies*. Edited by Robert T. Tally Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 13-27.
Ryan, Kiernan. “Introduction.” *Shakespeare: The Last Plays*. Edited by Kiernan Ryan. 2nd ed. London and New York, 2013, pp. 1-21.
Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Frank Kermode. The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.
Shell, Alison. *Shakespeare and Religion*. The Arden Critical Companions. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010.
Singh, Jyotsna G. “Caliban versus Miranda: Race and Gender Conflicts in Postcolonial Rewritings of *The Tempest*.” *Shakespeare’s Romances*. Edited by Alison Thorne. Contemporary Critical Essays. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 205-225.
Wells, Robin H. *Shakespeare on Masculinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Wetherell, Margaret. “Editor’s Introduction.” *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. Edited by Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates. London: Sage Publications, 2005, pp. 9-13.
Westphal, Bertrand. *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Translated by Robert T. Tally Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2011.