

FROM PROSPERO'S SUFFERING TO CALIBAN'S HATRED: READING SHAKESPEARE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE FENCE

Önder Otçu*

Introduction

My goal in this paper is to make an anthropological reading of William Shakespeare's late work **The Tempest**, that is, analyze its integral elements which are of symbolic value in the anthropological perspective, and through this process, I would like to concentrate on the significance of a particular character, namely, Caliban. Since my study is textual, I am going to regard Caliban as he is established through the text. It is hereby that I will adopt what can be called a postmodernistic attitude, using techniques derived from literary criticism. However, I will relate my literary inferences to the concepts of context and culture in the framework of social anthropology. I hope to conclude the paper establishing some links between text, reading and context, or more broadly put, between literature and anthropology.

The Last Plays: Dotage or Reconciliation?

William Shakespeare's last four plays (**Pericles**, **Cymbeline**, **The Winter's Tale** and **The Tempest**) are generally regarded to have a similar nature in terms of language, themes, characters and atmosphere. In fact, the possibility of, or the tendency for establishing connections between these plays is so strong that, as E. M. W. Tillyard puts it, "the prospect of understanding **Cymbeline** without **The Winter's Tale** and **The Tempest** is poor indeed."¹

However, views on the literary quality of the last plays can be said to bifurcate into (a) a "dotage group" (old age as the apology for the relatively lower quality of the plays) and (b) a "reconciliation group" (old age as the wisdom that is manifest in the reconciliatory theme common to all four of them). The first group holds that

*"Although **The Tempest** has always been popular, the others have received much adverse comment: but in the nineteenth century was developed the wellknown view that the plays exhibited the serene and mellow tranquility of Shakespeare in retirement ... many considered that the last plays show a falling off; Shakespeare was ageing and tired, and in*

* *Edebiyat Eleştirmeni*

¹ In J. H. P. Pafford's reference (to Shakespeare's Last Plays by E. M. W. Tillyard, 1938), J. H. P. Pafford, "**Introduction**," The Winter's Tale, The Arden Shakespeare, General Editor: Richard Proudfoot, 2nd Ed., Methuen and Co., U.S.A., 1986, p.xxxviii.

1904 Lytton Strachey reacted strongly and denounced the plays as poor and careless work of a Shakespeare "bored with people, bored with real life, bored with drama, bored, in fact with everything except poetry and poetical dreams." Strachey also showed that there was tension and ugliness in these plays...^{2 2}

According to the first group, the idea of experimenting is the explanation: In writing these plays, Shakespeare was experimenting for a new taste, that is, the taste of courtly, private or indoors theatres of an audience of higher education, rather than public theatres.

The second group, on the other hand, holds the opposite view: The plays are not written for the moral world of a theatre of the educated elite, on the contrary, they are written for all tastes. The second group supports this view by referring to the chronological fact that these plays are the culmination of Shakespeare's art, and holds that they express his final devotion to the theme of reconciliation. This group of scholars, including E. M. W. Tillyard, look upon the plays as "developments from the tragedies, showing not only destruction but also, what is only suggested in tragedies, reconstruction and rebirth brought about by virtue and time."³

A mediating view (experimenting "for" reconciliation) seems to make more sense, in the face of the need to account for why, unlike the other three, **The Tempest** has been popular:

*"Quiller-Couch discussed this in several works: he considered that, because reconciliation needs space and time, Shakespeare was for a while baffled and "simply did not know how to do it". His view was that **Pericles**, **Cymbeline**, and **The Winter's Tale**, although they show progress, are diffuse and clumsy and, on the whole, are failures, but that triumphant success was achieved in **The Tempest**."^{4 4}*

In fact, it is possible to say that **The Tempest** has been one of the most popular among Shakespeare's 36 works for the stage, and along with **Hamlet**, **Prince of Denmark**, it is one of those classic dramas that has been particularly promoted in our age (for instance, Derek Jarman's recent film, **The Tempest**. The controversial British director, shortly before he died of AIDS, had chosen this play as one of his last projects in his limited lifetime).

² Pafford, p.xxxviii-xxxix

³ Ibid, p. xli.

⁴ J. H. P. Pafford, "**Introduction**," *The Winter's Tale*, The Arden Shakespeare, General Editor: Richard Proudfoot, 2nd Ed., Methuen and Co., U.S.A., 1986, p. xl.

What does **The Tempest** say, show or do to (its) audiences, and how does it do that? Having considered the above views, in order to answer these questions, I can now pass on to the anthropological reading of **The Tempest**, to see whether this "triumphant success" involves some cultural implications. Following the terms of "destruction, reconstruction and rebirth" attributed to Shakespeare, I aim, however, at a deconstruction of the text.

The Anthropologist and the Text

Anthropologists can hold several attitudes when dealing with literary texts. My interest in **The Tempest** is concerned with two of them: (a) the play as data and (b) the play as context.

The study of literary texts can help establish an interdisciplinary view of reality with a degree of "correspondence", simply because literature is **about the human experience as a whole**, presenting not only the way people are, but also the ways they see and choose to display themselves. Literature does not compartmentalize human world. Thus, the play can be regarded as **data**.

It is anthropologically significant that "text" also becomes "reality" when it not only "is representative of" or "corresponding to" reality, but also itself establishes this very reality in a demonstrable way with a degree of "coherence".

In other words, the play is not only communicating meaning as a "text" but also "shaping" the basis on which this very meaning is based. Thus, it becomes **the context**. As Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza puts it; "Language is a structuring process and a non-referential system of communication. It shapes reality insofar as it not only transmits but also promotes the values woven through the fabric of society"⁵. Moreover, the fact that the play has been written for theatrical performance on the stage and in front of an audience reinforces its contextuality, combining the social with the textual.

Of course, the intention here is not "to transform social anthropologists into literary critics, using techniques borrowed from literary criticism to examine written cultural products"⁶. "Man himself is the subject of anthropology, whereas literature is a body of

⁵ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Text and Reality-Reality as Text: The Problem of a Feminist Historical and Social Reconstruction Based on Texts," *Studia Theologica*, 43 (1989), p. 21.

⁶ Eduardo P. Archetti, "Introduction to the Multiplicity of Writing. The Meaning of Marginal Texts in Anthropological Analysis", Unpublished Essay, Universitet i Oslo, 1991, p. 2.

writing about man and is the subject of literary history and literary criticism."⁷.Therefore, I must first answer the question: What makes a reading anthropological? According to Michel Foucault, literary criticism "should concern itself with the structures of a work, its architectonic forms, which are studied for their intrinsic and internal relationships"⁸. Hence, rather than concerning myself with the inner structures of the text in the first place, I shall try to answer this question: How are these structures intertwined to represent and promote a certain value system? It is hereby that the character Caliban in **The Tempest** comes to be significant: what could be of a peripheral importance for a literary critic becomes very central when put into the perspective of an anthropologist.

Being Human in a World of Divine Order

One of the most striking characteristics of The Tempest is that the play revolves around the idea of a very orderly world. Legitimacy of a certain status quo is problematized on the assumption that there is an underlying, almost universal order beneath all human affairs, whereby the title gains its significance: The order is God-given just like the tempest or the sea-storm that shakes it.

The storm in the beginning of the play can be construed in two related ways: It can be an indication that God's order has been abolished and the legitimacy of worldly authorities has been severely damaged. It can also be a warning from the God who, having observed this damage, intervenes the human world to help restore his order. Thus, it is the principal cause of what the characters of the play undergo throughout the story of the play. The questions that dominate the reader (or the playgoer) from the very beginning are: **1** Can the world's order hold when the legitimacy of its elements is put into question? **2** And once this questioning has taken place, and the illegitimacy of the order been recognized, how should people behave? Should they war, or reconcile?

Shakespeare reveals the illegitimacy problem at the very beginning. There are two centers of authority: The Kingdom of Naples and The Dukedom of Milan:

⁷ A. Owen Aldridge, **Literature and the Study of Man**, Literature and Anthropology, Dennis, Philip A. and Wendell Aycock (ed.) Texas Tech University Press, U.S.A., 1989, p. 41.

⁸ Michel Foucault, **What is an Author?** Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, Ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, Ed. Tr. from French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Basil Blackwell, U.S.A, 1977, p. 118.

KINGDOM OF NAPLES

DUKEDOM OF MILAN

THE KING: ALONZO

THE (FALSE) DUKE: ANTONIO

THE KING'S BROTHER: SEBASTIAN

ANTONIO'S BROTHER: PROSPERO

THE KING'S SON: FERDINAND

PROSPERO'S DAUGHTER: MIRANDA

Antonio's status is shown to be the very cause of the disorder because Antonio has usurped the power from his brother Prospero, who is in fact the right duke of Milan. Having received this information, the reader is much relieved to see that a horrible storm destroys a ship on the shores of an island, on which all of Alonzo, Antonio, Sebastian and Ferdinand happens to be! Furthermore, the storm has almost purposively caused Ferdinand to separate from his father Alonzo who, together with his companions, embarks on the island, having lost his son. In fact, Ferdinand is too valuable to lose, and Shakespeare sends him to the castle of the only ruler of the island who happens to be Prospero! While they look for a shelter, Antonio and Sebastian attempts to kill Alonzo in his sleep to usurp his powers, but they cannot manage this when he wakes up. With this very brief summary so far, the (previously asymmetrical) structure of the world before the storm has been symmetrically intervened for the better and the storm has created a resymmetry: the illegitimate one of the Milan group (Antonio) is with the legitimate one of the Naples group (Alonzo) while the legitimate one of the Naples group (Ferdinand) is placed at the mercy of the legitimate but overthrown one of the Milan group (Prospero). However, this intervention also reveals that, along with lines of hierarchy, badness is very much close to, and even embedded in, goodness.

It is plausible to expect that Ferdinand will have a central function in the restoration of the order since he symbolizes goodness taken out of the (asymmetrical) order before the storm and sent by it to the castle. Hence is the symmetrical value of Miranda, Prospero's daughter as his counterpart, who can be seen as an instance of serendipity implying the right, divine order. Once Ferdinand takes shelter in Prospero's castle, they meet each other and fall in love. Also, it is not surprising that for any possible restoration, some should suffer: Prospero puts Ferdinand into the hard labor of cutting logs, which is good enough suffering for a future king.

The real sufferer has (it seems) always been Prospero whose powers have long been usurped by his brother Antonio, so much so that, having no source of legitimate power left to

him in the natural world, he has developed supernatural powers. He is now a magician and he has control over "his" entire island by means of a spirit named Ariel, whom he made work for himself for his purposes. Ariel functions within the play to inform Prospero about what the survivors think about and do to each other. Ariel is also a literary device whose supernatural function within the story enables the reader to know about the characters what they cannot readily know about themselves and their future. Hence, it can be said that the reader is made to side with Prospero, the implication being that Prospero's resolution and the restoration of the order in the play will have much in common with the readers' sense of any restoration of the order in the real world.

The restoration implied in the play goes hand in hand with the idea of marriage between Ferdinand and Miranda, the idea of marriage as a social institution being promoted as a way to stop conflict (between families) and/or to cure the damages (as a result of sibling rivalry between brothers, as in the case of Antonio vs. Prospero). The implied attraction between Ferdinand and Miranda is so strong that even their names can be said to be phonetically fit.

Yet, there is another one, or better to say, "the" other one, whose name by no means phonetically fits any of the other names: Caliban.

Being Caliban in a World of Humans

In fact, "Caliban" is apparently and anagrammatically reminiscent of "cannibal," i.e. a complete and compact opposite to all the humanity, a human that eats human flesh, a savage, or "the other" of the structuralist anthropology. The inversion from "cannibal" into "Caliban", I feel, is also suggestive of the fact that he is an inverted, or a domesticated savage. This potentially enables him for any further inversion, that is, for instance, subversion against his domestic master, the ruler of the island, Prospero.

Caliban is unreliable. He has marked his inhuman quality not only by expressing his will against his master Prospero openly (or through his spirit Ariel), but also by attempting to sexually molest his master's daughter Miranda.

"Prospero: Thou most lying slave, / Whom stripes may move, not kindness! I have us'd thee / In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate / The honour of my child.

Caliban: Oh ho! Oh ho! would it had been done! Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans.

*Prospero: Abhorred slave, / Which any print of goodness will not take, / Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee, / Took pains to make thee speak, ..."*⁹

Caliban is the native of the island, and it is inescapable for the reader to grant him the legitimacy of his rule over his own land. But, unlike the one in the human world, the legitimacy of his rule can never be acclaimed, because his position is established through the text in such a way that, to the reader, he is an original outsider to the value system that makes human world itself. As far as his sexuality is concerned, if there is Ferdinand on the one side for Miranda, on the other stands Caliban, who can, thus, be thought to have a defining power over the question who and how Ferdinand should be: What Caliban is not, is Ferdinand! So, it is not that "his legitimacy cannot be acclaimed," but rather, it "should not" be acclaimed, as necessitated by the text.

To restore his ownership over the island, which is a futile attempt in any case, he sides with two other characters that also manage to survive from the ship and embark on the island from another place: Trinculo (a jester to the King of Naples) and Stephano (the King's butler, but now, outside his master's rule, drunken himself). These two characters are important in providing a kind of lower class effect: When (they believe) their master is destroyed by the storm; having survived it, they mistakenly think that they are now free and independent. They are shown to use this freedom wrongly and stupidly, by lawlessly wandering about in the island and drinking. Therefore, they *need* rule. Not surprisingly, Caliban sides with them, being beguiled by their easy drunkenness and reckless behavior:

"Caliban: I say, by sorcery he got this isle; / From me he got it: if thy greatness will, / Revenge it on him, for, I know, thou dar'st; / But this thing dare not,

Stephano: That's most certain.

*Caliban: Thou shalt be lord of it and I'll serve thee."*¹⁰

While Caliban refers to himself as "this thing," he is shown to recognize that they are human: they should have powers that he lacks, so they can help him to rid his island of the usurper Prospero! His hostility towards Prospero is so big that he even offers Miranda for their pleasure (which is an additional sin in the reader's mind, a sin that reinforces his

⁹ William Shakespeare, **Complete Works**, The Promotional Reprint Company Ltd., Great Britain, 1991, p. 5.

¹⁰ William Shakespeare, **Complete Works**, The Promotional Reprint Company Ltd., Great Britain, 1991, p. 13.

inhumanness, since this particular offering is known only to the reader). He is ready to accept them as his new masters. He guides them to the castle for the assassination of Prospero. Everything he does is determined by his subversive hatred to Prospero, and this dynamic is paradoxical, because, being human legitimizes Prospero's position already and beyond question. The more Caliban acts, the wronger he gets.

In the end, all the characters forgather in the castle and separate threads of their stories become gathered up into a universal oneness of justice. Prospero receives the recognition of the King of Naples, but instead of restoration of his rule as the right Duke of Milan, he asks for retirement. He also seeks the King's mercy for his alliance with evil forces and finally, emancipates the spirit Ariel. The only compensation he requires and receives is a kingly approval of the marriage between the King's son, Ferdinand, and his own daughter, Miranda. Of course, this is a rewarding compensation, saving not only his noble status, but also making him even closer to the King through kinship. While the right order is reestablished by this happy end, quite convincingly to the reader, all what Caliban can expect is the punishment that he is depicted to accept. He has clear consciousness that he deserves it:

"Caliban: Ay, that I will; and I will be wise hereafter, / And seek for grace. What a thricedoude ass / Was I, to take this drunkard for a god, / And worship this dull fool!"¹¹

Shortly, Caliban is a character Shakespeare devises to indicate how a domestic (purely, originally human) master can be betrayed (but never really threatened!) by a domesticated (half human) slave. Hence, Caliban is an antithesis to humanness, thereby employed in defining what is human, and thus is his usefulness. But he is never shown to become a serious threat. He is never that real.

So far, I used the data I derived from the play and let myself, albeit critically, contextually guided by Shakespeare's binary opposition of human vs. Caliban, suggesting that Shakespeare created this particular character as a literary device. But then, it is here that Caliban's position in Shakespeare's mind becomes problematic. Caliban's story was no harm to the popularity the play has gained through the literary history of English Language. He is depicted in such a way that he does not disturb the ordinary reader's consciousness. In other words, the character of Caliban is as convincing to the reader as any of Alonso, Prospero, Ferdinand or even Ariel! Was Caliban a decor of the play with a certain degree of usefulness,

or was he the only, ultimate sufferer, which the play itself functions as a cultural device to mystify? How is the relationship between Prospero's suffering and Caliban's hatred?

Reading Jonathan Dollimore's Reading

In his comprehensive work titled **Sexual Dissidence**, Dollimore concentrates on the concepts of dissidence, subversion and binary oppositions (or "violent hierarchies" as Jacques Derrida calls them)¹² through unfolding the manifestations of what he calls as "*the historical dynamic of the paradoxical perverse*". He suggests two lines for considering **The Tempest**, the first one is related to the implications of language in relation to colonialism, and the second one, which is a progression from the first one, is regarding how the natural/unnatural distinction coincides with the dominant/subordinate hierarchy in the dominant's legitimation of power.

In terms of language, which is the first line, he concentrates upon the instance where Caliban is accused by Prospero, of his attempt to rape Miranda. Prospero thereafter blames him for his ignoring his master's goodwill and trust to teach him "the" language¹³:

"Prospero: I pitied thee, / Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour / One thing or another: when thou didst not, savage, / Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like / A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes / With words that made them known: but thy vile race, / Though thou didst learn, had that in 't which good natures / Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou / Deservedly confin'd into this rock, / Who hadst deserv'd more than a prison.

*"Caliban: You taught me language; and my profit on 't / Is I know how to curse: the red plague rid you, / For learning me your language!"*¹⁴

¹¹ Ibid., p. 22.

¹² Dollimore's reference to Jacques Derrida's phrase. Jonathan Dollimore. **Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault**, Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1991, p. 109.

¹³ Although the perspectives Dollimore provides for the interpretation of The Tempest are invaluable, a shortcoming that escaped the editing of his book is disturbing: There is confusion in his account as to who was the teacher of Caliban. According to Dollimore, it is Miranda, Prospero's daughter that he attempted to rape. In fact, in the original text, the teacher is Prospero himself (as the quotation no.14 displays). The idea that Miranda was Caliban's teacher would stimulate a whole different interpretation in, for instance, a psychoanalytic approach to the play, but for the purposes of this study, Dollimore's views are still valid.

¹⁴ William Shakespeare, p. 5.

Dollimore firstly distinguishes between a colonialist view and an anti-colonialist one. According to the former, "the language" Miranda taught to Caliban plays "a civilizing role." But Caliban is so feral that he corrupts the civilized language by cursing, which can be called a linguistic transgression very much in parallel with his attempt to rape Miranda. On the other hand, according to the latter, anti-colonialist view, his will to curse is understandable because his original, good nature has been invaded and corrupted by an alien culture. It is the influence of an already corrupt culture (as established through the text in terms of the legitimacy problem of the colonizers among themselves) that produces corruption in Caliban.

"There is a third possibility: Caliban curses as an effect of language itself. That is, he curses not because language is the transparent medium which allows him to express, and us to see, his essentially perverted nature; nor because a corrupted language perverts his essentially good nature; rather he curses in terms of **a language which constructs him as potentially that kind of subject even as he learns it.** In this sense he possesses no essential nature, perverted or true, but an identity partly formed in and by language: in this case the language of the colonizer."¹⁵

From this point, Dollimore takes a further step: the passage (in the quotation no.14 above) implies that the characters in it as constructed by Shakespeare, and the readers or audiences of the play, are *unaware* of one possibility: The possibility, or better to say, the vague (!) information that Caliban already had a language!

*"A different language, the language of the colonial subject, is perceived only as brutish gabbling. This blindness is a crucial factor in the imposition of the dominant language. From that language is fashioned the subordinate, unnatural identity which facilitates the process of domination and enslavement."*¹⁶

This is a possibility that is mystified by and through the text written by a perfect native speaker of a language that itself constructs its Caliban in its own ways, and/or a language that is the basis of the ideological formation of the playwright. Language does really function ideologically and has a very significant role in the self-legitimation of authority. The second

¹⁵ Dollimore, p. 109 (*emphasis mine*).

¹⁶ Dollimore, p. 110.

line in Dollimore's interpretation of **The Tempest** is a progression from this point. What happens when Caliban is made to curse is:

*"a displacement of disorder from within the dominant onto the subordinate, achieved via a mapping of the natural/unnatural binary onto the dominant/subordinate hierarchy. Displacement figures significantly in the construction of the unnatural and the perverse. It also points to dangerous instability within the dominant culture, one for which the subordinate is made to pay over and over again, but which also marks the limits of the dominant's powers, and the possibility of its overthrow."*¹⁷¹⁷

The wisdom of Shakespeare in problematicizing identity (of Caliban and thus, of what is "not" Caliban) on the basis of language is, and probably has to be, confined to the ideological limits of the language in which this problematicization takes place. In my opinion, contrary to the dotage thesis, Shakespeare is at the culmination of his literary prowess in juxtaposing Ferdinand with Caliban, placing him right after "*the language talk*" between Prospero and Caliban. Ferdinand speaks to Miranda:

*"My language! heavens! I am the best of them that speak this speech, / Were I but where 'tis spoken."*¹⁸¹⁸

This, once again, proves my view that Ferdinand is what Caliban is not, and Caliban can be regarded as a literary device employed in continuously defining Ferdinand's identity. In fact, let alone the information that the island was Caliban's home, Caliban seems to be there only to reinforce the identity that is common to all the other characters and that functions as *the lowest common denominator* they gather around to reach the happy end. In other words, Caliban is there for their reconciliation. The end is a socially acclaimed marriage, approved by (and approving in turn the social status of) the King. Social peace is reconstituted and the Kingdom is safe.

¹⁷ Dollimore, p. 110.

¹⁸ Shakespeare, p. 6.

What Kind of an Audience Did Shakespeare Convince?

Having discussed the ideological implications of the text, and the role of language in the dominant's legitimation of his authority, it now seems proper to suggest that language continues to function: between the playwright and the text, between the text and the actor on the stage, and/or between them and their audiences. However, it is insufficient to take the ideological function of language for granted. Therefore, I would like to take one more step and maintain that language functions for the benefit of the dominant, whose values it promotes, and whose identity it reinforces, not only by establishing the very context of meaning on which its interpretation is based, but also, by itself creating its interpreters.

A consideration of the process of reading a text would be in point: A reader cannot understand a text outside what he has already read in it. Every new bit of information functions to form a yet incomplete narrative that potentially shapes the understanding of every new bit to come. Every "before" in the narrative has a definitive function over the mind of the reader in his understanding of every "after". Hence, a text necessitates a potential reader and itself establishes this reader once s/he has chosen to read it.

Why are some writers more chosen than others? It is beyond the purposes of this study to answer this question. But, as far as William Shakespeare is concerned, it is worth quoting Christopher Hampton:

*"Shakespeare's work has for so long held an assured place at the heart of the cultural institutions of British society as to make it seem virtually inseparable from those institutions... (Thus, it) itself becomes an institution, ... existing outside history, transcending time and change, reflecting some sort of universalizing, essentially mythical and fixed order of things. ... This is, of course, nothing but a mystifying absurdity. ... (Shakespeare's work) is what readers, critics, actors, people who see the plays enacted in the theatre, make of it as a cultural product reflecting and counterpointing and commenting upon the interests of their own time, the history they are in the act of making or of being shaped by."*¹⁹

Hampton furthers his argument by describing the socio-economical conditions of Shakespeare's time. In this view, the Late Elizabethan and Jacobean England, far from being in a condition of comparative settlement and of spiritual unity, was a society in crisis, undergoing fundamental change, such as a violent transition from feudalism into an aggressive, capitalist market economy based on competitive rivalry, which, breaking the

¹⁹ Christopher Hampton, **The Ideology of The Text**, Open University Press, Great Britain, 1990, p. 29.

bonds of the earlier feudal mores, had given license and incentive to the New Men of Europe²⁰. In short, this was a conflict society, and reconciliation was the theme to be acted out. Marriage was necessary to secure the institutional basis of the society, while, at the same time, providing the necessary labor force that the sudden industrial growth demanded.

Concluding Remarks

Rather than repeating the common view that Shakespeare's last plays are the result of his so-called dotage, I would like to lay emphasis on the theme of reconciliation and acknowledge his wisdom in processing it. "Reconciliation" is the keyword to appreciate **The Tempest**. Furthermore, as J. H. P. Pafford notes it, together with redemption and forgiveness, it is among the most important Christian virtues²¹. As he puts it, "... in **The Tempest**, as in the other (three last) plays, a central character is sinned against and there is forgiveness and reconciliation at the close"²². Combining this theme with the understanding that it is a Christian virtue, it is possible now to recognize a relationship between anthropology and literature: The anthropologist can consider **The Tempest** as based on a cultural "key scenario," calling to mind Sherry Ortner's term. In her definition key scenarios are:

*"pre-organized schemes of action, symbolic programs for the staging and playing out of standard social interactions in a particular culture. ... every culture contains not just bundles of symbols, and not even just bundles of larger propositions about the universe ("ideologies"), but also organized schemas for enacting (culturally typical) relations and situations."*²³

If it is possible to consider *reconciliation* as a key scenario of British Culture, it is also possible to surmise why **The Tempest** in particular, and other works by Shakespeare in general, have been chosen through history by English speaking audiences to ongoingly produce their sense of their identities and Culture. However, it is important to note that what is acted out is a *reconciliation at a cost*.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 34-35.

²¹ J. H. P. Pafford, "**Introduction**," *The Winter's Tale*, The Arden Shakespeare, General Editor: Richard Proudfoot, 2nd Ed., Methuen and Co., U.S.A., 1986, p. xliii.

²² Ibid, p. xlv.

²³ Sherry B. Ortner, "**Patterns of History: Cultural Schemas in the Foundings of Sherpa Religious Institutions**," *Culture Through Time: Anthropological Approaches*, Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press, 1990, p. 60.

The cost is the unknown Caliban. There is no reconciliation for him in the play, and it seems, since the play itself functions to mystify his tragicness, there cannot be any. Unlike Prospero, he is only stupid and miserable. Unlike Ferdinand, his speech is nothing more than brutish gabbling. From the position of a literary critic, we cannot take the play as our point of departure to arrive at an understanding of his tragedy. Therefore, the only reconciliation on his part can be sought (by an anthropologist?) between Caliban (seen as something more than a literary device) and the play itself (seen as a form of cultural discourse).

Anthropology can contribute much to literary studies. An anthropologist can read a literary text synchronically and without reference to its place in the literary history of its culture. This enables her/him with an ampler capacity to deconstruct the text and unfold it to the final perfect goal of understanding the culture in which it operates as a cultural discourse. Anthropology and literature are related to each other to the extent that the ties between Culture and Discourse are relevant to our understanding of human reality.²⁴

Bibliography:

- Aldridge, A. Owen, **Literature and the Study of Man**, Literature and Anthropology, Dennis, Philip A. and Wendell Aycock (ed.) Texas Tech University Press, U.S.A., 1989, 41-63.
- Archetti, Eduardo P, "Introduction to The Multiplicity of Writing. The Meaning of Marginal Texts in Anthropological Analysis." unpublished essay, Universitet i Oslo, 1991.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, **Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault**, Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1991.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler, **Text and Reality-Reality as Text: The Problem of a Feminist Historical and Social Reconstruction Based on Texts**, Studia Theologica, 43 (1989), 193-4.
- Foucault, Michel, **What is an Author?** Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, Ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, Ed. Tr. from French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Basil Blackwell, U.S.A, 1977, 113-138.

²⁴ A question has been left unanswered: How is the relationship between Prospero's suffering and Caliban's hatred? The answer is simple now: In a world of divine order, there is no such relationship, and no need for it, as long as Caliban remembers his God-given (!) identity.

- Hampton, Christopher, **The Ideology of The Text**, Open University Press, Great Britain, 1990.
- Ortner, Sherry B, "Patterns of History: Cultural Schemas in the Foundings of Sherpa Religious Institutions", **Culture Through Time: Anthropological Approaches**, Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Pafford, J. H. P, "Introduction," The Winter's Tale, **The Arden Shakespeare**, General Editor: Richard Proudfoot, 2nd Ed., Methuen and Co., U.S.A., 1986.
- Shakespeare, Wlliam, **Complete Works**, The Promotional Reprint Company Ltd., Great Britain, 1991.

Özet:

William Shakespeare'in son dört oyunu arasında olan Fırtına (The Tempest), kimi eleştirmenlere göre, Shakespeare'in "yaşlılık ve bunaklık dönemi"nin tek başarılı oyunu, kimilerine göre ise, yazarın "uzlaşma yoluyla kazanılan barış" izleğine yöneldiği "olgunluk ve bilgelik dönemi" ürünü bir başyapıttır. Fırtına'nın bugün dahi güncel kalmayı nasıl başardığı sorusuna yanıtlar ararken, bu yazınsal değerlendirmelerin yanısıra, "söylem"i odağa alan (yapısalcılık-sonrası) insanbilimin yöntem ve kavramlarından da yararlanabiliriz. Günümüz insanbilimi yazınsal metinlere edebiyat tarihindeki değerlerinden çok, belli bir kültürde belli simgesel/ideolojik işlevleri olan "kültürel söylemler" olarak bakar. Yazınsal metin hem "kültürel veri", hem de "bu kültürel verinin değer kazandığı bağlam"dır; değerleri yalnızca yansıtmakla kalmaz, onları yüceltir de. Bu makalede, Fırtına'nın nasıl bir "değerler sistemi"ni yücelttiği ve bunu hangi metinsel stratejilerle gerçekleştirdiği, "Caliban" karakterini odağa alan insanbilimsel bir bakışla incelenmekte, drama metninin yapısı "Caliban" aracılığıyla sökülmemektedir. Soyluların "uzlaşma yoluyla barış"a ulaşmasında gereksinim duyulan her ne ise, Shakespeare'in Caliban'ın omuzlarına yüklediği karmaşık ve yorucu işlevi kaçınılmaz kılan da odur.