

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Identities in The Tempest, Tempests in Identities

Begüm Tuğlu

Department of English Language and Literature, Ege University, Turkey.

Received 6 March, 2015; Accepted 25 April 2016

**This study aims to analyze the identity formation of the characters in Shakespeare's play The Tempest in terms of psychoanalytic theories of identity. It also aims to portray the patriarchal dominance over the marginalized characters and the shifting process of identification through the interpellation of the society. Since this process carries the potential to reveal the universal effects of the elements that nurture the identities of the individuals on a microcosmic scale, the play proves to be a perfect stage to explore the interactions between certain embodiments of identities. This research aims to explore the identity formation of the characters in The Tempest through psychoanalysis to reveal how the Western patriarchal ideology, mainly reflected through Prospero, subjugates and controls other formations of identity that fall beneath the social hierarchy as in the examples of Miranda, Ariel and Caliban. While Prospero stands as the main authority who rules the island, all other forms of identity seem to remain as mere subjects of his control. Though the play is presented as a romantic comedy, the findings in this study suggest that patriarchal ideology is stealthily reinforced through the notions of gender and identity.**

**Key words:** Identity, psychoanalysis, The Tempest, Shakespeare, gender.

## INTRODUCTION

Revealing universal themes within local borders, Shakespeare's plays have long been subjected to various interpretations. One of the richest plays of Shakespeare in terms of identity, in its portrayal of distinct identities and their shifting nature, *The Tempest* (Shakespeare, 1930) proves to be the perfect stage on which different characters find equal chances to perform their own roles, each fighting to establish their own beings in a society in turmoil. In "Who Needs 'Identity'?" Hall (1997) declares identity as "a construction, a process never completed – always 'in process'", and furthers his argument with an idea borrowed from Derrida that "like all signifying practices, [identity] is subjected to 'play' of différance [...] constantly in the process of change and transformation"

(original emphasized). Undoubtedly, the audience of Shakespeare can easily catch the exact embodiment of the spirit of transformation within his plays as:

Shakespeare's characters frequently manifest the desire to be recognized as something more than they 'seem,' that is, to belie the visible and audible evidence of their presence onstage by suggesting it does not and cannot adequately represent what they are (Weller, 1982).

The ideological stance of each character in *The Tempest* with an environment transcending time and space, indicates indeed a constant transformation in identities and a lack left behind this process of constant alteration,

E-mail: E-mail: [tuglubegum@gmail.com](mailto:tuglubegum@gmail.com).

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

each scene created with the aim of achieving a breath-taking pace, which can only be sutured within a magical environment that gathers the whole structure of the play together. Further calling for the assistance of what Althusser (2000) writes in his "Ideology Interpellates Individuals as Subjects," one can also explore the timeless symbolical order created in the English society with the play. Since "ideology has no history", the local borders of the island manages to expand throughout the world, the linearity of time and inhales the air of historiographic universality.

While Prospero, the white male magician who controls the whole play with his own discourse, stands as the authoritative subject who interpellates other characters with his discursive speech, his daughter Miranda reveals the development of a female identity with the lack of a mother. The familial relationship of Prospero and Miranda extends with Caliban, who is also subjected as the primitive adopted child who needs to be educated under the colonial mind of lifting the white man's burden. The existence of Ariel, whose gender cannot be identified with physical attributions within this artificial family on the island, further complicates the play, deepening the quest in search of identities. Moreover, the power exchange between Prospero and the usurper of his title of Duke of Milan who happens to be his brother, Antonio, along with Alonso and Sebastian reveal the ideological struggle of male assumption to the right to rule and control.

Thus, "the island becomes a pure ideological signifier to fix Prospero's fantasy: a hyperreality [...] the ultimate simulacrum for power relations" (Poulard, 2011). Prospero's attempt to marry his daughter to Ferdinand, Alonso's son, in order to regain his symbolic potency back in the social order within this hyper reality, is the utmost example to show how family as the "nucleus of society" is crucial in establishing a social order and ensuring the political dominance. Hence, *The Tempest* frames different formations of identities within one body, enabling a psychoanalytic discursive analysis from a patriarchal perspective which defines all relations in a hierarchical system by posing arbitrary differences in defining each identity, therefore creating lacks within the identity formation processes of the characters in the play. Therefore, the discussion will focus on the identity formations of Prospero, Miranda, Caliban and Ariel while scrutinizing their relationships with each other and other characters in the play. A discursive psychoanalytic method will be carried out in order to demonstrate the aspects of different forms of identities which eventually leads one to the conclusion of how patriarchal discourse tends to marginalize and control the development of unique identities through a simulation of power.

## DISCUSSION

The first of such characters who can be explored under

the light of psychoanalytic theories of identity is Prospero. Since his patriarchal role as a father is fully established with an omnipotent, forcefully controlling speech, enhanced with a magical touch in the play, it is not a coincidence that Prospero, defined as "the old father-wizard-scientist-conductor-director-exiled and marooned duke has also shown himself, in the way he treats his daughter, [...] despotic and authoritarian" (Strehler and Simpson, 2002), has the ability to control the island under his own desires. His authoritative role is that of the capital S of Althusser (2000), "interpellating individuals as subjects in the name of a Unique and Absolute Subject" who invites and therefore finds response in "the infinity of individuals [...] in a double mirror-connexion".

Assigning himself the role of God with his power as a "magician", Prospero subjects everyone in the play to his own commands, directing the storm on stage with an ambition that would steal the thunders of Zeus. "Prospero figures himself as the sole retainer of the past (in this of course he is wrong, as Caliban will remind him), and thus responsible for establishing the play's controlling perspective" (Tribble, 2006). He stands in the centre of the play, forcing all others to apply to his schemes to gain his power, creating a domain for himself. "Prospero the Prime Duke," who "being so reputed in dignity and, for the liberal arts, without a parallel" (1.2. 10) ensures his place with his own sophisticated language, constantly requesting Miranda to listen to him. Many a time in the play, one hears Prospero seeking Miranda's attention in order to "have an identity and be irreplaceable" (Althusser, 2000) for "the Subject needs the subjects" to fully internalize an illusionary superiority which is physically proven by language itself. "Dost thou attend me?", "[d]ost thou hear?" Prospero asks Miranda, "[t]hou attend'st not," he insists in search for a constant attention. When finally his insistence grows dull, he commands Miranda to sleep; "I know thou canst not choose." (1.2. 12), both indicating his control over the dialogue and taking away Miranda's free will in her actions. Accordingly, when Miranda awakens both in a literal and metaphorical meaning having once been told about her "noble" past; Miranda now has an identity, where only a few moments before she was a 'virgin,' born to life only yesterday, with no markings and no status beyond that of 'daughter'; [...] Perhaps she needed to sleep after this process of identification, perhaps it was all too much for her, maybe the sleep served to 'fix' this identity to her heart (Strehler and Simpson, 2002).

Miranda, indeed, has rather difficulty in keeping track of Prospero. The development of her identity on the island is subjected to her father's will as a bright cloud which has no option but to turn grey. The lack of her mother's existence creates a hole in the necessity for a female role model, which complicates, in fact stains Lacan's (2000) "Mirror Stage" process. For the moment Miranda has been ruptured from her "Ideal-I" as Lacan puts it, she is subjected to the "imago" of her father. "The imagos –

whose veiled faces it is our privilege to see in outline in our daily experience and in the penumbra of symbolic efficacy" (p. 45) writes Lacan to indicate how the inexplicable existence of these images are reflected through the actions of an identity within a certain social environment. This theory can be traced within the play since even though the reader is aware that Miranda is separated from the symbolic order of the society when she was not even "out of three years old" (*The Tempest*, 1.2, p. 133), an age in Lacanian terms crucial to obtain a socially acceptable identity, the vague image of the mother, interestingly does not haunt her. The lack of a female "imago" does not force Miranda into a trauma of identity as she would have been forced back in Milan, owing to the fact that for twelve years she has also lived without a symbolic order to enter in. Still, there is one more character not to be forgotten on the island which may be explored as a feminine mirror to Miranda's identity, Ariel;

The language Prospero uses to describe Ariel suggests that this is an imprisonment within the womb, a torture inflicted by the island's only real motherly presence (she is an absence, of course, but a more vivid one than the mother of Miranda, whose only function in the play is to have been chaste). Prospero celebrates his power over that womb almost ritually, by repeating his story to Ariel once a month. (Johnson, 1997)

Since the sole motherly character in the play (whose unidentified gender proves to be problematic) is also controlled by Prospero himself, Miranda has no other chance but to be subjected to her father's desires. Though "Miranda repeatedly uses the first person singular to emphasize her identity apart from Prospero" she still "asserts the significance of her consent to the interwoven domestic and political orders of the play" (Sanchez, 2008). Prospero assures her naivety regardless her insistence of a vague memory which would mean an identity based on the version of a past of her own. "I have done nothing but in care of thee [...] who art ignorant of what thou art, nought knowing of whence I am" (1.2. 10) Prospero utters, emphasising her ignorance of her own identity, and assigning the only acceptable role for him, to be powerful in terms of state, to which she replies "you have often begun to tell me what I am; but stopp'd, and left me to a bootless inquisition" (1.2. 10). Prospero is the only stance Miranda can hold onto to find a basis on which she can start to form her own identity. Prospero, therefore, creates Miranda as he wishes by recreating her past. The "representation of memory" within this recreation, "underpins *The Tempest* and becomes particularly apparent in Prospero's attempts to defend a monodic view of memory against other minds" (Tribble, 2006). Even though Miranda ensures her father that she can remember a time when she was tended by four, five women at once, Prospero has doubts about this memory, feeling free to (re)establish his own version, enlightening the "dark backward and abysm of time" (1.2.

144) for Miranda.

Moreover, Miranda's case is even further complicated with her statement that "[m]ore to know/ Did never meddle with my thoughts" (1.2, pp. 109-110). Written by a male author in a time when feminism was far out of terminological reach, it is but realistic to hear a female character utter such a statement. Yet, it nevertheless assures the patriarchal discourse as Rose (2000) writes "men and women are only ever in language" and creating a female character attributed as a young woman would only enhance the portrayal of an arbitrary social relationship based on differences for "[t]he absolute Otherness of" Miranda, on an island where she is the only woman, "serves to secure for the man his own self-knowledge and truth" (p. 61), which is crucial to Prospero's identity formation. Miranda is "at once the sole heiress of Prospero's magical powers and the joint victim of his tyranny" (Bess, 2007). Miranda's identity, with the lack of a mother and under the sole influence of Prospero, develops with the strong hand of being the daughter of the white authority. Miranda embodies "a cipher, a figure important only for her unwitting role in helping to realize her father's political aspirations" (Slights, 2001). Notwithstandingly, Miranda still undergoes the difficulties of standing at the lower staircase of the white social hierarchy as a woman who is depended upon as an "exchange object" between Prospero and Ferdinand as Levi-Strauss states in his alliance theory which Kristeva objects so urgently by writing "various constraints imposed upon the body of the [subject] [...] by the family and social structure" (Kristeva, 2000) who is fairly supported by Rose further concluding that "woman is not inferior, she is subjected" (original emphasized, p. 59). Thus:

Miranda has inherited more than the guilty conscience and the fat wallet of her male peers. In fact, she even shares Caliban's fate as both have been relegated to the role of the other in her case, however, that otherness includes not only the burden of oppression and powerlessness but also the burden of 'the benefits and protection offered by the colonizing father and husband' (Bess, 2007).

Similar in sharing the fate of embodying "otherness" with Miranda, Caliban is also subjected to the margins, yet not in terms of gender this time but race. In Vaughan's (1988) words, "colonial situations produce two basic personality types, which Prospero and Caliban conveniently represent [...]. Colonials (Prosperos) are competitive, crave power, lack patience" (p. 300) and as if to remind one of the symbolic colonial hero in the 18th century Robinson Crusoe and his enslavement of Friday, Prospero accordingly acts as the superior force of the Western white "father" teaching the local who to live on his own island, long before the ship-wrecked colonialist. Greenblatt (1990) declares in his "Culture" that "The

Tempest, contains many details drawn from the writings of adventurers and colonists" which "reiterates the arguments that Europeans made about the legitimacy and civilizing force of their presence in the newly discovered lands". Thus, he quotes from the play to reveal Caliban's identity further;

This island's mine, by Socrax my mother,  
Which thou tak'st from me. When thou first cam'st first  
Thou strok'st me, and made much of me; wouldst give  
Water with berries in't; and teach me how  
To name the bigger light, and how the less,  
That burn by day and night: and then I lov'd thee,  
And show'd thee all the qualities o'th'isle,  
The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile:  
Curs'd be I that did so! All the charms  
Of Sycorax, toads, beetles, bats, light on you!  
For I am all the subjects that you have,  
Which first was mine own King: and here you sty me  
In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me  
The rest o'th'island. (p. 232)

Greenblatt (1990) argues that "if it is the task of cultural criticism to decipher the power of Prospero, it is equally its task to hear the accents of Caliban" (p. 232), which is exactly why an exploration within identity would be incomplete without the case of Caliban. Since Althusserian terms enable one to comprehend the effect of interpellation, Caliban's subjection to Prospero does not seem to be lingering on an "absent shot" as could be criticized by Kaja Silverman, indicating a lack of justifiable basis to his enslavement.

Nevertheless, Homi Bhabha is the one who further explains this colonizing process in terms of identity as an answer to this question of an objective correlative for Prospero to force his own authority upon Caliban. Since Caliban learns English through Prospero, his expression of his own self is bound to remain within the strict lines of the superior Subject who controls him. Bhabha (2000) asserts that one "commonly articulates [one's] self consciousness" (p. 97). Yet, if one's language is distorted through means of discursive power, according to a Subject who seeks ultimate power of control, how can one articulate a unified self-expression? Caliban suffers the same pains of being forced to express himself in a language out of his own that dominates him. This split in Caliban can be explained by "the importance of depth in the representation of a unified image of the self" which "is born out of the most decisive and influential formulation on a personal identity in the English empiricist tradition" (Bhabha, 2000). Yet, as in interpellation and as in many other theories of identity, this is a double edged process, a mirror image creating an ambiance of smoke and mirrors that would enchant the audiences of Prospero the magician.

As Hall (1997) states in "Cultural Identity and Diaspora" the formation of the English identity has always been

bound to its "unifying differences" with other societies (p. 228). Therefore, one can conclude that as Prospero controls Caliban's tongue, Caliban in relation to this act unintentionally has a counter effect on Prospero's acts. Even though Prospero's control over nature and the way he can also interpellate nature to satisfy his own desires fits into the dichotomy of "the division in Nature/Culture" (Bhabha, 2000, p. 95), he also seems to learn how to survive on the island through Caliban's teaching, whether he admits it or not. The way he establishes an order on the island may seem appropriate in Western patriarchal order, yet does Prospero not give up on certain empirical Western values to survive on the island? Nixon (1987) has answered this question by writing that "[i]ssues of national or racial identity have largely been superseded by issues of survival" (p. 577). The fact that Prospero has to convey magic in order to carry out his schemes suggests an Oriental way out of the Occidental conflict in an attempt to gain back executive power.

The hatred towards Caliban, therefore, though comprehensible with a colonial mind, still remains a mystery which can only be put to light with the theories of Rustin (2000) and Fanon (2000). Both critics suggest there is more than ideological distinction behind the hatred towards a certain race. "Racism" for Rustin (2000), "involves states of projective identification, in which hated self-attributes of members of the group gripped by prejudice are phantasied to exist in members of the stigmatized race" (p. 191). In fact, even though Caliban is the one who is constantly defined linguistically as a "villain" Miranda "do[es] not love to look on" (1.2. 454), "an abominable" and "most scurvy monster", "a most perfidious and drunken monster", one can only hear Caliban threaten other characters with a language taught by Prospero himself, but never actually performing any sign of actual violence. "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!" (1.2, pp. 517-19) exclaims Caliban to Prospero, who is defined by Ariel as a "potent master", which is crucially important with the words "potent" (many a time used to refer to Prospero in the play) and "master" used together in psychoanalytical terms. Yet, it is Prospero who physically carries out physical violence throughout the play over Caliban. Caliban is so worn out by Prospero that he cherishes the idea of a "new master – a new man" (2.2, p. 1272) [emphasis added], without even dreaming to be in control of his own identity. Furthermore, "Caliban organizes no conspiracy against Prospero, does not even tell Stephano and Trinculo about the presence of Prospero on the island" (Pask, 2003) while one can hear Prospero claiming that he can "rack" Caliban "with old cramps", "fill all [his] bones with aches; make [him] roar/ That beasts shall tremble at thy din" (1.2, p. 13) which leads one to question who the real savage is. "Racism" therefore, "is primarily to be located as a problem of those who perpetrate its practices, not of its victims" (Rustin, 2000),

leading one to Prospero, not Caliban to solve the problem.

Prospero's castration anxiety reaches to such extent that he has to be sure that all actions should be controlled by his supreme authority. The end of the play is where he succeeds in his plans as if to ensure his potency in the matter. For all Fanon argues, Miranda should have been attracted to Caliban, yet she abhors the thought to even look at him. Speaking in terms of the Electra complex defined by Freud, Miranda has a "potent" father as the model of a husband, who is the polar opposite to Caliban in terms of skin colour that diminishes the possibility of an interracial marriage. One can assert in alliance with Fanon that Prospero is threatened by the oriental illusionary image of Caliban and his sexuality, creating "the fear of the sexual potency of the Negro" (Fanon, 2000) which may explain Prospero's hatred towards him. Miranda's hatred to Caliban's image also finds explanation under the doctrines of Fanon's (2000) theory, for he argues that "The Negro symbolizes the biological danger" (210), which means the symbolic invasion of Miranda's body by the illusionary potent marginalized, and thus disfigured, body of Caliban. "The black man is the symbol of Evil and Ugliness" (p. 212) writes Fanon, in parallel with the adjectives chosen to define Caliban within the play.

Ariel, another character under Prospero's interpellation, complicates the play in terms of identity. Ariel's constantly shifting representation and her vague physical depiction in the play suggest a reading open to queer theory, especially that of Judith Butler's. Butler (2000) argues how "[g]ender is neither a purely psychic truth, conceived as 'internal' and 'hidden,' nor is it reducible to a surface appearance; on the contrary, its undecidability is to be traced as the play between psyche and appearance" (p. 111). Therefore, one can argue that what is presented with Ariel is "the sign of gender, a sign that is not the same as the body that it figures" (original emphasized, p. 113). Regardless of the fact that Ariel once uses the pronoun "he" for himself, the lack of an established male description for Ariel hinders the possibility of a sole masculine sex, further blurring Ariel's gender while Prospero ensures this vagueness with titles as "my Ariel, chick" (5.1, p. 2388). One can trace Ariel shift into the form of a Nymph, a form of feminine manifestation, and her close use of nature through Prospero's words. Yet, Ariel is a mythical creature itself, "it" uses the pronoun I to remain strictly attached within the ambiguous representation of Ariel –which cannot be separated from nature, whereas Prospero is the one who simultaneously dominates nature and Ariel. At one point, Ariel asks Prospero, "[d]o you love me, master? No?" (4.1, p. 1752), suggesting a homoerotic bond rather than a relationship which remains within the realm of solely the master and the slave. Since Ariel is not identified with "a given gender" she does not have to "desire a different gender," which explains her affectionate question towards

Prospero (Butler, 2000).

Ariel is the perfect instance to reveal that "man" and "woman" are merely labels of the society to distinguish the border lines of authoritative power in discourse whereas "gender", even though it constantly shifts and enhances, signifies a totality, a unity in identity. This unity in identity is that of a possibility of a gender identity without the constraints of sexual difference. As Irigaray (1985) explains in *Sex Which is Not One*, "sexual difference" does not exist. Therefore, Ariel's existence without a certain depiction which may be attributed to either sex, signals a formation of identity which embraces all possibilities of a gender. Ariel's gender ambiguity can also be explained by "the drag" that Butler so insistently depicts, for it proves that an identity does not have to take upon labels to be, it is the symbolic order which forces one to do so. What is manifested as carrying both sexes openly on stage, signifies the existence of both sexes within an identity which explains Butler's (2000) statement that "[g]ender norms operate by requiring the embodiment of certain ideals of femininity and masculinity, ones that are almost always related to the idealization of heterosexual bond" (p. 110) for Ariel diminishes such a distinction in gender norms. Ariel's performance is controlled by Prospero, who orders it to take the shape of a water-nymph or a different muse, yet its gender is never defined by him. Never does Prospero use a pronoun to address Ariel, the only reference is "my Ariel" which is of course nothing but a statement of possession. Furthermore, it is also significant that Ariel is only visible to "the master", which reveals how "performative acts are forms of authoritative speech" (Butler, 2000, p. 108) since Ariel's all actions are foretold by Prospero's discourse.

Ariel's function within the play can also be explained within Winnicott's (2000) theory of "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena." It can be accepted that the theory's use in the symbolic sense rather than its fundamentally organic one within familial relationships and infantile development. Nevertheless, it can be argued that it could also be extended to the realm of symbolism with its natural tendency to be metaphorically interpreted. Since Prospero is stripped from his title as a Duke, he is - to an extent- symbolically castrated. Therefore, he needs to re-establish his power once again on the island, which may also explain his necessity, even urge if I daresay, to remain at the centre of all actions holding the power to control at his own hands. Ariel thus turns into his transitional object to re-enter the symbolic order, by carrying out all his demands which will eventually lead to his daughter's marriage to Ferdinand which would give political power back to Prospero. Indeed, Prospero "assumes rights over Ariel" (p. 153) and he cannot give it up until the end of the play when he regains his place in the symbolic order of politics. "[T]he play's ironic presentation of Prospero's fantasy shows the tensions inherent in this model. Ariel's gratitude is never as

complete or as certain as Prospero would wish" (Fuchs, 1997). Only after all his desires are fulfilled can Prospero give Ariel's freedom back.

Prospero symbolically "passes from (magical) omnipotent control to control by manipulation" through the manipulation of Ariel (155). Moreover, Ariel is "subject/to no sight but" Prospero's, "invisible/To every eyeball else" (1.2, p. 13). Winnicot explains how "the transitional object is not an internal object [...] –it is a possession" (original emphasized, p. 155), justifying Prospero's use of possessive pronouns while referring to Ariel; as in "[m]y Ariel" (5.1, p. 30). The transitional object is "without from our point of view, but not so from the point of view of" Prospero, "[n]either does it come from within; it is not a hallucination" (Winnicot, 2000). Therefore, Ariel remains as a creature of supernatural visible only to Prospero, yet it is certainly not a merely imaginary being. The vague image of Ariel's gender deepens with its questionable existence between being and nothingness, yet her function in the play as Prospero's transitional object remains stable. Moreover, Winnicot (2000) clearly states that the transitional object "must survive instinctual loving, and also hating" (p. 154) and as one reads from Strehler and Simpson, Prospero does carry such afflictions towards Ariel;

Very complex, antagonistic relations, composed of love –and also of a certain hate. Ariel trembles with craving to have his freedom back. Prospero is brutal to deny it him, but at the same time Prospero loves Ariel almost morbidly, his feelings almost sensual toward the asexual Ariel, the spirit of air, his chosen aide, uniquely capable of staging and performing Prospero's scenarios (p. 11).

The actual conflict which ties all the characters together, Prospero remaining in the centre of all, is the main theme of gaining back the claim to the title of being a Duke, which requires an analysis of the domain borrowed from Foucault. Foucault (2000) declares "the family, the keystone of alliance" as "the germ of all the misfortunes of sex" (p. 106). What one can read in *The Tempest*, is this establishment of familial relations and the nucleus of a family tied with the knot between Ferdinand and Miranda. The reason why Prospero contemplates such a storm is actually hidden beneath this pact he forms between his daughter and the son of the King of Naples, Alonso, indicating "the two primary dimensions" which Foucault (2000) speaks of; "the husband-wife axis and the parents-children axis" (p. 105). The first axis of being husband and wife is formed between Miranda and Ferdinand which seems like a romantic affliction, yet when read in detail reveals itself to be a result of mere manipulation, while the latter axis forms an aristocratic base for this relationship to work out on since both Miranda and Ferdinand are children of noble parents which makes their holy union in marriage socially valid. Prospero takes aside in the play to give away how "[t]he Duke of Milan/And his more braver daughter could control" Ferdinand, since "at the first

sight/They have changed eyes" and how he "must uneasy make" this relationship to further raise the bet in the deal of such a marriage (1. 2, pp. 611-614) [emphasis added]. It should not be forgotten that this is the first man Miranda "[t]hat e'er sigh'd for" (1.2, p. 621), the only eligible bachelor that fits into Miranda's ideal husband image borrowed from her father's image.

Prospero slips away how he sees this relationship as a business agreement when he states, with "thine own acquisition/Worthily purchased, take my daughter" (4.1, pp. 1713-1714) [emphasis added]. "[T]he love is there" because "Prospero wished it" (Strehler and Simpson, 2002) to happen for the sake of his own desires, to regain his masculine power cut off from him after the usurpation of his title which posed as a symbolic castration. "The larger narrative situation makes it difficult to separate Prospero's will from Miranda's -though she believes that she is rebelling, she is in fact acting out a predetermined role in her father's plot, for Prospero's restoration hinges on her marriage" (Sanchez, 2008). However, in creating such a bond, Prospero also needs to keep her daughter "chaste" as her mother was so appraised for, since it is the only way he can secure his deal. "Prospero's return to power- his return to being 'absolute Milan,' is accomplished in part through this marriage [and] [...] in part upon his ability to construct a theatre devoid of sexual provocation; the eroticized destruction of identity" (Johnson, 1997).

## CONCLUSION

All characters considered within *The Tempest*, thus portray how identities are controlled, shaped and shifted through patriarchal discourse. The characters in the play turn into signifiers of different forms of identity, with Prospero turning into an embodiment of an all-knowing, potent authority; Miranda employing the role of feminine sexuality without the image of a mother, revealing how she is subjected to the exchange between hierarchical power relations; Caliban as the racially marginalized other who stands as a stance on which Prospero (re)establishes his own potency, while the siblings Prospero and Antonio along with Alonso and Sebastian portray the power struggle of the ruling class. Together they indicate how signifiers "differ and defer" in Derrida's (2000) terms, in relation to one another, constantly straying away from the utmost "consciousness" (p. 92), which can be defined through language. *The Tempest's* chaotic environment is the perfect scene to depict the turmoil within the constantly changing nature of identities always struggling to find a mediation in between external and internal forces to fill in the lack, or rather absence, created within them during their unique formations of identity. The play's "attempt at recreating reality within the boundaries of a claustrophobic open space are somehow excessively 'real'" (Poulard, 2011), which elevates the

effect of “suture” which Silverman (2000) so thoroughly explores in her article “Suture: The Cinematic Model”. Hence, the suturing schemes of Prospero “whose gaze controls what it sees”, having granted “access to the symbolic order” once again, fully assures “the viewing subject” (pp. 76-77) - the audiences of the play throughout centuries - that the symbolical order still stands with the re-establishment of the hierarchical power order Prospero so desperately struggles to achieve, and with the rejuvenating force of jouissance, it creates upon the audience, the play continues to storm on stages.

### Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

- Althusser L (2000). “Ideology Interpellates Individuals as Subjects.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Bhabha HK (2000). “Interrogating Identity: The Post Colonial Prerogative.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Bess J (2007). “Imploding the Miranda Complex in Julia Alvarez’s *How the Garcia Girls Lost Their Accents*.” *Coll. Lit.* 34(1):78-105.
- Butler J (2000). “Critically Queer.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Derrida J (2000). “Différance.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Fanon F (2000). “The Negro and Psychopathology.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Foucault M (2000). “Domain.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Fuchs B (1997). “Conquering Islands: Contextualizing *The Tempest*.” *Shakespeare Quart.* 48(1):45-62.
- Greenblatt S (1990). “Culture.” *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. London: Chicago UP. pp. 225-232.
- Hall S (1997). “Cultural Identity and Diaspora.” *Identity and Difference*. Ed. Kathryn Woodward. London: Sage. pp. 51-59.
- Irigaray L (1985). *The Sex Which is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke. New York: Cornell UP.
- Johnson N (1997). “Body and Spirit, Stage and Sexuality in *The Tempest*.” *ELH* 64(3):683-701.
- Kristeva J (2000). “Revolution in Poetic Language.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Lacan J (2000). “The Mirror Stage.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Nixon R (1987). “Caribbean and African Appropriations of *The Tempest*.” *Crit. Inq. Polit. Poetic Value.* 13(3):557-578.
- Pask K (2003). “Caliban’s Masque.” *ELH* 70 (3): 739-756. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029897>
- Poulard É (2011). “Shakespeare’s Politics of Invisibility: Power and Ideology in *The Tempest*.” *Int. J. Zizek Stud.* 4(1):1-18.
- Rose J (2000). “Feminine Sexuality.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Rustin M (2000). “Psychoanalysis, Racism and Anti-Racism.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Sanchez ME (2008). “Seduction and Service in *The Tempest*.” *Stud. Philol.* 105(1):50-82.
- Shakespeare W (1930). *The Tempest*. In *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Romania: Murray Sales & Service Co.
- Silverman K (2000). “Suture: The Cinematic Model.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.
- Slights J (Spring 2001). “Rape and the Romanticization of Shakespeare’s *Miranda*.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, Tudor Stuart Drama* 41(2):357-359.
- Strehler G, Simpson T (2002). “Notes on *The Tempest*.” *PAJ: J. Perform. Art* 24(3):1-17.
- Tribble EB (2006). “‘The Dark Backward and Abyss of Time’: *The Tempest* and Memory.” *College Literature, Cognitive Shakespeare. Crit. Theory Age Neurosci.* 33(1):151-168.
- Vaughan AT (1988). “Caliban in the ‘Third World’: Shakespeare’s Savage as Sociopolitical Symbol.” *Massachusetts Rev.* 29(2):289-313.
- Weller B (1982). *Identity and Representation in Shakespeare*. *ELH* 49(2):339-362.
- Winnicott DW (2000). “Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena.” *Identity: A Reader*. Eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman. London: Sage.