

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English**



**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of Master's Degree in English**

Option: Cultural and Media Studies

Title

**Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko, or, The Royal Slave* (1688) as a Feminist
Response to William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611).**

Submitted by: Lynda Zeroukhi

Supervised by: Dr. Mouloud Siber

Panel of Examiners

**RICHE Bouteldja, Professor, Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou, Chair;
SIBER Mouloud, MCB, Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou, Supervisor;
ZERAR Sabrina, MCA, Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou, Examiner.**

Academic Year: 2013-2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my supervisor, **Doctor SIBER Mouloud** for his unrelenting encouragement and precious help. Without his supervision and constant help, this dissertation would not have been possible. I would like also to express my sincere gratitude to him for his useful comments, remarks and encouragement through the process of writing my work. I am sincerely grateful to the members of the panel of examiners, **Professor RICHE Bouteldja and Doctor ZERAR Sabrina** for having accepted to examine my work despite their tight schedules.

Finally, I would like to express the deepest appreciation for my teachers in the English Department for their research support, without which this thesis would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

This paper studies Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko, or the Royal Slave* (1688) as a feminist response to William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611). It reads both works in the light of Mikhail Bakhtin's and Moira Ferguson's ideas. In my analysis, I focus on the dialogism that exists between the two works in their representation of ethnicity and gender with a special emphasis on their respective ideologies. Behn's novella revises the status of the slave, which she uses as a metaphor for women's confinement to the domestic sphere of life. She achieves her revision of the slave through her male protagonist Oroonoko. Behn's novella rewrites Caliban's savagery, ignorance, obedience, and naivety through Oroonoko's nobility, education, independence and eloquence. In addition, Behn responds to Shakespeare's representation of women through Imoinda and the white female narrator. The narrator is portrayed as an active female agent and an independent travel writer through whom Behn answers Shakespeare's portrayal of Miranda as a woman subjected to the patriarchal rules of British society. Finally, by the qualities she attributes to her native female character Imoinda, she responds to Shakespeare's stereotyped conception of native women embodied in his depiction of Sycorax as a witch and a prostitute. Besides, Behn's criticism of the harem and the veil serve her intentions as a woman who calls for the suppression of female objectification and confinement to the domestic space. Imoinda and Onahal are Behn's native women through whom she revises the status of the British women as the 'Other'.

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
Contents	iii
I. Introduction	1
a. Issue and Working Hypothesis	3
b. Endnotes	5
II. Methods and Materials	6
a. Theory	6
b. Materials	14
1. Summary of William Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i>	14
2. Summary of Aphra Behn's <i>Oroonoko</i>	15
Endnotes	16
III. Results and Discussion	17
a. Aphra Behn's Oroonoko as a Revision of Shakespeare's Caliban, or the Slave as a Metaphor for Women	18
Endnotes	31
b. Shakespeare's Patriarchy, Behn's Feminism and Female Representation	33
Endnotes	49
IV. Conclusion	51
V. Bibliography	53

I. Introduction

Seventeenth-century Britain was a patriarchal society, and life was male-dominated. Men saw themselves as rational beings trained in eloquence and the arts of war and women as creatures likely to be dominated by impulse and passion who were urged to keep silent and attend to their needlework. Women were treated in the same way as slaves, servants and properties. The literature produced in that period would naturally include these social issues. William Shakespeare is the bard and the best representative of British literature in the seventeenth century, and almost all his plays highlight the gender inequalities which gave birth to controversies. As a result, a number of feminist writers have focused on his works and have analyzed the female characters in his different plays to reveal his patriarchal view on women and to clarify the kind of roles he left for them in society. Aphra Behn, like other feminist writers, asked for social, political and gender equality through her works especially *Oroonoko, or, The Royal Slave* (1688). *Oroonoko* is Behn's best known work, and critics consider it as the novel which earns her a place among noted writers like Shakespeare.

Behn has attracted much critical attention as an early and very popular woman writer, and *Oroonoko* has been criticized from different perspectives. Previous research on it highlights the different interpretations of the literary work as dealing with imperialism, race, gender, honour issues. For instance, Laura Brown in her essay "The Romance of Empire: Oroonoko and the Trade in Slaves" states: "the novella has been recognized as a seminal work in the tradition of anti-slavery writing, from the time of its publication down to our own period."¹ She also emphasises the significance of female characters. Although men are obviously important in the novel, Brown states that "female figures, either Imoinda or the narrator, appear as witnesses for almost all of Oroonoko's exploits."² Throughout the novel, Imoinda supports Oroonoko in all of his decisions like when he suggests to kill her to avoid her being molested by their captors.

In addition to Brown, Stephanie Athey and Daniel Cooper Alarcon examine the influence of women throughout Behn's novel. In their text, "Oroonoko's Gendered Economies of Honor/Horror: Reframing Colonial Discourse Studies in the Americas", Athey and Alarcon state that to better understand the novel the reader should "first see the white and black women who mediate the exchange between male antagonists."³ Furthermore, they illustrate Imoinda's strength because she "fights at Oroonoko's side, while other slave wives urge their men to surrender."⁴ Although Athey and Alarcon focus on Imoinda's greatness, they also illustrate the importance of the female white narrator. Because the novel is mediated by a white woman and Imoinda is portrayed as having European features, the text "uses slavery, rape, and dismemberment to foreground an economic competition for the black female body and to outline an implicit competition between black, white, and indigenous females."⁵ The authors believe that the narrator attempts to illustrate competition between the women in the novel and the significant role that Imoinda plays throughout it. In addition, Charlotte Sussman in "The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and slave culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko" highlights the importance of the female protagonist, Imoinda. She claims: "In the conventional character of a romance heroine, Imoinda is not submissive but aggressive: dominating rather than dominated."⁶

One should not ignore what previous research has demonstrated through their analysis of Behn's novel. However, it is worth saying that they ignored the fact that this work may be read as a feminist response to a previous work produced by Shakespeare. Though this is not clear when reading them at first glance, making an in-depth analysis and study would prove the validity of our assumption.

Issue and Working Hypothesis

Women in Britain during the seventeenth century were subject to male domination. Therefore, many female writers emerged and unified themselves as sharing and enduring the same common cause. Early British female writers could not denounce directly the bad treatment of their patriarchal society and could not write about the condition of women in their works. As a result, some of them wrote under male names, and others who had enough courage wrote in an implicit way. Among the latter, Behn in *Oroonoko* used the slave as a metaphor for the domesticity and privacy of women's lives. Therefore, she revises Shakespeare's play in relation to slaves and native women. By stating slaves and native women, Behn emancipates the British women as she responds to Shakespeare in particular and British society as a whole. Our aim is to undertake a study on Behn's *Oroonoko* from feminist and dialogic perspectives in relation to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Transcending the provided critical restrictions, we shall investigate further the issue of gender by using Behn's novella as a response to Shakespeare's play. One of our hypotheses is that she revises Shakespeare's conception of Caliban through her main character of "Oroonoko". She uses Oroonoko to serve as a metaphor for domestic slavery and women's confinement to the domestic sphere. Moreover, she responds to the subordination of Miranda and defends the cause of women through the narrator. In fact, the author states herself as a first-person narrator to impose herself as an active agent in her society as a travel writer. Finally, she uses native women to revise Shakespeare's treatment of Sycorax and other indigenous females. Behn's native women also serve as a metaphor for British women.

Before Behn first published *Oroonoko*, she had already established her reputation as a rebellious female author. Although she lacked a classical education, she was able to read and write several languages, and this allowed her to live by her female pen. She was often perceived as a social rebel who criticized the institution of marriage and the suppressed position of women

in British society. Behn was a Tory supporter. She believed in absolute allegiance to the King, who was King Charles II at that time. She was also a feminist who fought for the right of women to write and to reach the public sphere. Both of these aspects are brought to the forefront in *Oroonoko* through Oroonoko himself, the female narrator and Imoinda. She was a popular dramatist of the English Restoration period. She was one of the first English women to support herself financially by writing. She played the role of a political spy. This job did not fulfil her financial needs, so she turned to writing, a bold move for a female at that time. She made a trip to an English sugar colony on the Surinam River. On this trip, she encountered an African Slave Leader whose story she admired and transformed into a fiction work entitled *Oroonoko; or The Royal Slave*. In early British writings, gender and race intersected. Because females could not speak about their rights publicly and overtly, they resorted to the idea of slaves who were equal to women's status as the dominated "Other".

To study this issue, I will work on both Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Behn's *Oroonoko* as primary sources. As for the theoretical framework, it is appropriate to use Bakhtinian thought on dialogism extracted from *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981) to show the dialogic nature of Behn's novel in relation to Shakespeare's play. As for the feminist approach to the issue, it is important to refer to the type of feminism that Moira Ferguson (1992) identifies in seventeenth-century female writings on slavery and anti-slavery. This aims at showing the extent to which Behn is in dialogue with Shakespeare about the status of women, British and colonized, the notion of race and the role of British women in the slavery and anti-slavery culture. As for the discussion, it will be divided into two sections: the first will analyze how Behn uses the slave as a metaphor for the domesticity of women. The second will tackle Behn's revision of Shakespeare's Miranda and native women through the first person narrator and Imoinda who stands for British women.

Endnotes

¹ Laura Brown, "The Romance of Empire: Oroonoko and the Trade in Slaves" in *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 25.

² Brown, "Romance of Empire", 40.

³ Stephanie Athy, Daniel Cooper Alarcon, "Oroonoko's Gendered Economies of Honor/ Horror: Reframing Colonial Discourse Studies in the Americas", *American Literature* Vol.65, No. 3 (1993): 416.

⁴ Ibid, 423.

⁵ Ibid, 424.

⁶ Charlotte Sussman, "The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and Slave Culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko" in *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*, ed. Heidi Hunter (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 221.

II. Methods and Materials

a. Theory

To check my hypotheses and analyze the above mentioned issue, I decided to follow and borrow some concepts from the theoretical guidelines of Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination* to show the dialogic nature of Behn's *Oroonoko* with Shakespeare's play. I will use Bakhtin's dialogism as a frame theory. It will be supported by secondary ones advanced by Moira Ferguson in her *Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670 to 1834* about anti-slavery writing which fostered the emergence of British feminism and the use of slavery without distinction between male and female as metaphors for western/ British women and Clare Midgley's notion of 'Imperial feminism.'^{6a}

In the chapter entitled "Colonial Slavery and Protest: Text and Context", Moira Ferguson states that Anglo-Saxon female writers protested against slavery in their writings for over a two hundred-year period.⁷ In their writings, they misrepresented African-Caribbean slaves whose freedom and emancipation they advocated. They attributed their inferiority and powerlessness to their representation of slaves. Ferguson claims that women articulated a feminist version from the seventeenth century. They were courageous enough to relate gender issues with their criticism of slavery that was defended by men. The women who had been mythologized as "domestic angels and the nation's moral instructors took to the streets, writing and disturbing political resolutions door-to-door, and using their economic power as consumers by refusing to buy slave-grown sugar, tea and coffee."⁸ Author agitators fought for emancipation and for the denial of the stereotypes that European males drew on Africans and Africa, slaves and slavery. Ferguson states:

Women mediated their own needs and desires, their unconscious sense of social invalidation, through representations of the colonial other who in the process became more severely objectified and marginalized, a silent or silenced individual in need of protection and pity who must always remain "under control".⁹

According to Ferguson, emancipationist writers attached some attributes both to male and female slaves that arouse pity.

Ferguson illustrates her argument with some writings dealing with colonial slavery from 1670 to 1834. Those writings were produced by both Anglo-Saxon women and African-Caribbean ex-slave women on the abolition of the slave trade and the emancipation of slaves. She cites Mary Prince as the only ex-slave woman in Britain to write against slavery all at the same time. Ferguson claims that “The historical intersection of a feminist impulse with anti-slavery agitation helped secure white British women’s political self empowerment.”¹⁰ In other words, British feminists related their aim to the anti-slavery movement which helped them to have a place in the public sphere. Moreover, Ferguson argues that British female abolitionists included in their writings voices of the slaves who could only be heard through the voices of abolitionist author-narrators¹¹. In addition, Ferguson suggests that a kind of discourse called Anglo-Africanism was created by some British writers. In Jordan Winthrop’s words, “To be Christian was to be civilized rather than barbarous, English rather than African, white rather than black.”¹² This was accepted by a majority of the white population as an “authentic expression of slavery’s reality.”¹³ Ferguson mentions Hannah More as having anti-slavery ideas. More states: “even though Africans are ugly, rationally inferior, and basically savage, Christian values dictate that they do feel. By debasing Africans, by kidnapping, selling and brutalizing them, Britons only debase themselves.”¹⁴

Ferguson gives the example of Mary Prince, an ex-slave woman, to justify that Africans are human beings who do feel and think to deny by that what Europeans think about them. Mary Prince experienced the hardships of slavery and Europeans’ mistreatment. In her *The History of Mary Prince, a West Indian Slave*, she argues:

The black morning at length came, it came too soon for my poor mother and us. Whilst she was putting on us the new osnaburgs in which we were to be sold, she said in a sorrowful

voice (I shall never forget it) see I am shrouding my poor children; what a task for a mother!- “she then called Miss Betsey to take leave of us. “I am going to carry my little chickens to market”, (these were her very words) “take your last look on them; maybe you will see them no more...After this.”¹⁵

Slaves were degraded and silenced, “gazed-upon other”¹⁶. However, Mary Prince identifies herself to the world as a “thinking and feeling woman”¹⁷. Moreover, she asserts that if slaves were to be kept as slaves at work, they must be considered as waged labourers.

In “The Condition of White Females in British Society: Power and Powerlessness”, Ferguson claims that white females in the period of colonial protests were considered as slaves to their male masters. They refer to themselves as “pawns of white men, denied education as well as access to law and allied deprivations, feminists of all classes were prone to refer loosely to themselves as slaves.”¹⁸ Feminists compared themselves to slaves and used slavery as a metaphor for their condition since they were confined and “were subjected to patriarchal order.”¹⁹ Furthermore, Ferguson quotes Roy Porter who claims that in Restoration England “men were designed to be on top and they were intended to excel in reason, business, action, decision; however, women were to be passive, maternal, submissive, modest, docile and virtuous.”²⁰ To be more precise, the public sphere was reserved only to men. Roy Porter states: “throughout their lives they were as far as possible to depend on men, as daughters on their fathers, and once wives on the “masculine dominion” of their husbands.”²¹

A few feminists like Bathsua Makin, Judith Drake and Mary Astel “equated females’ limited education and the effects of marriage in women’s lives as a sort of enslavement.”²² In other words, anti-slavery feminists compared themselves to slaves since they suffer from approximately the same condition and from the same common cause; slaves suffer from the colonial domination just like women in Britain suffer from male domination and patriarchal confines of their society. In “An Essay to Restore the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen”, Bathsua Makin compared women to slaves since men deny women’s right to education. She says:

“It is an easy matter to quibble and droll upon a subject of this nature, to scoff at women kept ignorant, on purpose to be made slaves. This savours not at all of a Manly spirit, to trample upon those that are down.”²³ Feminists also tend to compare marriage to slavery. For instance, in *Some Reflections upon Marriage* (1700), Mary Astel says: “marriage is a form of slavery.”²⁴ In other words, slavery is a “vicious condition from which women must escape.”²⁵ Ferguson claims that the African slave woman subjected to sexual advances and forced into marriage in Behn’s *The Forced Marriage* could be decoded as one that “rang the bell” for white female readers due to their similar experiences²⁶. In other words, forced marriage was common for all British women who were under the patriarchal domination.

Ferguson claims that the first pro-emancipation speech occurs in *Oroonoko; or the Royal Slave, A True History* (1688), where she gave voice to an African slave protagonist. Ferguson states in the chapter entitled “Oroonoko: Birth of a Paradigm” that the narrator in *Oroonoko* eulogizes the protagonist’s heroic stand against slavery. If she eulogizes him for this, she is against slavery, too. She asserts that Behn’s political engagement with the lives of white women and colonial slaves emerged from her own circumstances. According to her, Behn condemned male cultural domination. In *Oroonoko*, Behn “pronounces female lives a form of slavery and introduces a virtuous West African female as a co-protagonist.”²⁷ Ferguson goes back to the story of an ex-slave woman so as to illustrate further. Her story serves as emancipationist evidence. Mary Prince argues that “slaves cannot represent themselves; they must be represented.”²⁸ She then formulates herself as a slave representative.

In addition to Moira Ferguson, Midgley in her article entitled “Anti-slavery and the Roots of Imperial Feminism” in *Gender and Imperialism* (1998) related anti-slavery to imperialism. In her study, she identifies two ideological perspectives between the female anti-slavery campaigners and the liberal feminists. According to her, the first one deals with women of African descent in Britain’s West Indian colonies, whereas the second deals with Indian women

under British imperial power. However, both shared a concern for “other” women. Midgley claims that abolitionists

attacked white planters’ treatment of black women under slavery, mother’s separation from children, and the flogging and sexual abuse of women; feminists attacked the victimization of women caused both by British impositions such as the Contagious Diseases Act and by indigenous Indian customs such as female seclusion, child-marriage, sati and the prohibition of widow remarriage.²⁹

Midgley states that female anti-slavery was “a form of Western proto- feminism, which provided one of the main roots out of which full-blown ‘imperial feminism’ emerged.”³⁰ In fact, she argued that female anti-slavery which was a proto-feminism helped in the foundation of imperial feminism. In addition to female anti-slavery, the discourse of female anti-slavery in early feminist writings helped to create the notion of imperial feminism. Midgley was struck by what she read in early feminist writings of the period 1790-1869. She argues that though British feminists were concerned with their position in Britain, they critiqued British women’s oppression with reference to three forms of slavery exercised outside Britain: “slavery in Britain’s West Indian colonies and North America”, “the slavish position of women in savage societies” and “the enslavement of women in the harem under ‘Oriental despotism’.”³¹ This means that based on their own ‘enslaved’ experiences at home, British feminists sympathize with their sisters in the Orient. With empire, woman could negotiate a place where British “women could assert their ‘moral power’ as reformers without straying far from the domestic ideal of ‘separate spheres’.”³² By going to the empire, British women defend not only the right of the slaves to have their emancipation but also to emancipate themselves from the patriarchal restraints of British society.

As for Bakhtin’s theory *The Dialogic Imagination*, it describes the novel as a new genre. Bakhtin saw the novel as new and unique among genres because of its capacity to incorporate material from other genres, and reformulate and parody them. Bakhtin was influenced by Dostoevsky’s invention of the polyphonic novel. This genre is a new one in contrast to those that precede it. It means that his novel unlike the others organised in a way that equal authority to the

word of the characters is given. The main characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels, Bakhtin writes, is "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices."³³ The voices of the characters and that of the narrator engage in an unfinished dialogue. The dialogue of the polyphonic novel is authentic when it represents a dialogue or discourses of self and other. Bakhtin celebrates Dostoevsky's idea that the "other" is included in discourse. He writes: "to affirm someone else's 'I' not as an object but as another subject which is the principle governing Dostoevsky's worldview."³⁴ Bakhtin affirms that "consciousness is in essence multiple."³⁵ According to Bakhtin, consciousness can realise itself only in dialogue with the other. Therefore, "Two voices is the minimum for life, and the minimum for existence."³⁶ It means that Dostoevsky's novel is dialogic since the words of the characters are highly dialogised. An utterance acquires meaning only when it is related to another one. The dialogic novel ought not give priority to one dominant voice, attitude or idea but to the interaction of many voices which creates the dialogue.

Bakhtin divides novelistic prose into three categories: direct discourse which means to speak directly about the referential object with a claim to authority, objectified discourse which means the discourse of a presented person and discourse with an orientation towards someone else's discourse that signifies double voiced discourse³⁷. Bakhtin shows his preference for the last category since many voices can be heard, the voice of the narrator and the voice of the character, sometimes also the voice of a third interlocutor. Bakhtin also highlights different mutual relations between the speakers in this third category: "Stylisation, parody, and hidden internal polemic."³⁸ The hidden internal polemic involves the speaker's engagement in an implicit argument with another external figure, a presence of an interlocutor in even the most private seeming discourse.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (1929), Bakhtin's revolutionary concept of "Dialogism"³⁹ emerged. Dialogism is concerned with his approach to intertextuality, a work that exists in a constant dialogue with another one in context. This is seen as a dialogue between languages,

cultures, between the language of the text and the languages that make up the world in which the text exists. According to Bakhtin, the novel serves to make the original genre more open and flexible. It has the power to present patterns, show inner lives, and reveal new perspectives in a work. Bakhtin contends that literary criticism used to study form separately from content, and highlighted the problems found in prose, what he names “concrete problems of artistic craftsmanship.”⁴⁰ In other words, traditionally speaking, novelistic analysis has tended to isolate questions of form from those of content or theme (ideology). Bakhtin’s thesis in his essay is that “form” and “content”⁴¹ are inseparable, something he proves by focusing on the novel. This is what Bakhtin calls “sociological stylistics.”⁴² Form is ideological at the same time as ideology must take some form. Bakhtin contends that the novel does not consist in a single, unified form. As a new genre, it subsumes several sub-genres that Bakhtin terms “several heterogenous stylistic unities.”⁴³ Second, the novel is not like lyric poetry. It does not express a single voice or point of view (it is not monological). It is rather dialogical or other voiced. Dostoevsky terms these features “polyphony” and “heteroglossia”⁴⁴ that is expressive of a multiplicity of points of view and voices, which includes but not limited to the authors’. In short, as Bakhtin puts it: “the novel is ‘multiform in style and variform in speech and voice’.”⁴⁵ These voices include: the author’s voice and the voices of various characters. In other words, the author’s voice is one among many others to be found in the novel. It is through the diversity of voices and points of view that there is what is called “heteroglossia.”⁴⁶ This is compared to the internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects, each of which corresponds to the ideological perspective of a particular class.⁴⁷ The novel is, thus, a “centrifugal” dispersion that includes a multiplicity of voices as opposed to “centripetal” unification.”⁴⁸

On the dialogic nature of language and the heteroglot nature of the novel, Bakhtin argues that the language of poetic discourse is unitary and monologic: only one voice, the poet’s, he adds, is to be heard⁴⁹. Bakhtin writes about poetry: “the pure and direct expression of his own

intention.”⁵⁰ A poem does not subsume several stylistic unities as a novel. In short, lyric poetry is neither multiform in style nor variform in voice. Heteroglossia is the dominant characteristic of prose fiction like the novel. Most traditional critical approaches to the novel are oriented towards the interpretation of poetry. Therefore, they reduce its ideological and stylistic diversity to the monologic and stylistic unity of poetry. The novel was once approached like poetry in a monological way simply because in the period of realism the novel has become the genre most favoured by the bourgeoisie; it contains only the ideologies of the upper class. In short, literary criticism has long ignored the dialogic nature of language and the heteroglot nature of the novel preferring to view it as “hermetic and self-sufficient whole,”⁵¹ that is as “a close authorial monologue.”⁵²

According to Bakhtin, the novel is more dialogic than other genres. It is a literary hybrid, an artistically organised system for bringing different languages in contact with one another^{52a}. Bakhtin coins the term “Parodic Stylisation”⁵³ to mean the appropriation of others’ discourses with the desire to subject the same words to a different intention, to replace them in a different context, to abrogate them^{53a}. Bakhtin suggests that point of view in a novel is dispersed through several directions, and among them there is direct authorial intervention, through the use of a narrator/ teller, and / or through the languages used by the characters that are to some degree verbally autonomous. Bakhtin also points to the notion of intertextuality. To be explicit, “each writer may be said to be always in the process of “writing back” to (or parodying) other writers, sometimes deliberately and sometimes accidentally, sometimes implicitly and sometimes explicitly”^{53b}. In short, no literary text or movement should be studied in a vacuum: writers and their literary texts must be studied in terms of their relationship to their precursors and successors (anticipating future responses of others on them)⁵⁴.

b. Materials

1. Summary of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*:

The play opens with a tempest in the sea raised by the protagonist Prospero, the rightful Duke of Milan, and a powerful enlightened man who by his brother's envy was exiled from his country with his daughter. His power as a magician made him survive and control every inch on the island including its native Caliban. This latter is Prospero's slave who obeys and serves his master in carrying loads and making fire. He is an ignorant, deformed creature in the service of his master who attempted to rape the honour of Prospero's daughter. This latter, who is Prospero's only heir, is the compassionate character who urged her father to cease the storm he engendered. In addition to Miranda and Caliban, Sycorax is the native woman and Caliban's mother who was banished from her country because of her witchcraft and sorcery. Ferdinand, another male character present in the play is the prince of Naples who as a result of the tempest was cast alone on the island. He meets with Miranda and falls in love with her. At the end, the whole characters are reunited before Prospero's cell. With the marriage of Ferdinand and Miranda, the whole characters are reunited and tolerated each other.

2. Summary of Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko, or the Royal Slave* (1688) :

Oroonoko, or the Royal Slave is a story of a noble slave ventriloquized through the voice of a white female narrator. The novella relates the story of an African prince who was displayed as educated in a European fashion. His fame rests on solid achievements which he gained through his bravery in fighting and winning honourable battles. The first part of his life consists of his good physical and moral characteristics advanced by the narrator. His status in the African society, Coramantien, is characterised by his deeds as a brave warrior and a man of action who has a great and high code of honour. He is a respected man who gained this respect through his attitude towards issues related to honour. In his mother country, he falls in love with Imoinda,

who has all the features a good woman may have. She is presented as someone who is fit for the male protagonist in terms of her faithfulness to one man and her equal code of honour that she possesses. In addition, her beauty is a remarkable feature in her which made every man sigh for her. However, the selfishness and power of the king rendered the lovers' relationship impossible by imposing his patriarchal rules on Imoinda to be his sexual object among other female characters. His harem and veil are key elements for the objectification of women. Oroonoko's relationship with Imoinda proved to be impossible with the intrusion of the King, Oroonoko's grandfather. Therefore, their separation from each other culminated in the King's selling of Imoinda into slavery. Oroonoko experienced at second hand the fact of being sold into slavery after being betrayed by the European slave traders. In Surinam, a colony in the Caribbean islands, he gained fame and earned respect of all. He reunited with his maid accidentally which resulted in Imoinda's pregnancy. Slavery restricted their freedom, and this pushed Oroonoko to kill his beloved in order to escape and avoid his child's birth into slavery. His intention was both to preserve his child from being exploited as a slave and to preserve his wife from the Europeans' exploitation of her body. His revenge against his masters resulted in his murder in a savage manner.

Endnotes

^{6a} Clare Midgley, "Anti-slavery and the Roots of 'Imperial Feminism'" in *Gender and Imperialism* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), 164.

⁷ Moira Ferguson, *Subject to Others: British women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670-1834* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 3.

⁸ Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, 4.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 6.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., 5.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 9.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., 10.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., 19.

¹⁹ Ibid., 21.

²⁰ Ibid., 22.

- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Ibid., 24.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Ibid., 25.
- ²⁶ Ibid., 26.
- ²⁷ Ibid., 39.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 282.
- ²⁹ Midgley, *Anti-slavery*, 164.
- ³⁰ Ibid.
- ³¹ Ibid., 166.
- ³² Michelle Tusan. Review of Midgley, Clare, *Feminism and Empire: Women Activists in Imperial Britain, 1790-1865*. *H-Soz-u-Kult, H-Net Reviews*. May, 2009, 1.
- ³³ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 6.
- ³⁴ Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 10.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 288.
- ³⁶ Ibid., 252.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 199.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 24.
- ⁴⁰ Bakhtin, *Dialogic*, 260.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., 300.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Ibid., 261.
- ⁴⁴ Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 38.
- ⁴⁵ Bakhtin, *Dialogic*, 261.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., 263.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., 400.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., 15.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 271.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 285.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 273.
- ⁵² Ibid., 274.
- ^{52a} Richard L. W. Clarke, 'Mikhail Bakhtin Discourse in the Novel', Viewed 3 April 2014.<
<http://www.rlwclarke.net/courses/LITS3304/20082009/07BBakhtinDiscourseintheNovel%28Overview%29.pdf> >,4.
- ⁵³ Bakhtin, *Dialogic*, 292.
- ^{53a} Clarke, Mikhail Bakhtin "Discourse in the Novel", 5.
- ^{53b} Ibid, 7.
- ⁵⁴ Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 197.

III. Results and Discussion

The reading of Behn's novella as a response to Shakespeare's *The Tempest* revealed that she revises his patriarchal ideas by appropriating the slave Oroonoko standing for women and calling for the improvement of the condition of the native woman to call her feminist claims at home. Shakespeare uses the slave Caliban to work out his colonialist ideology while Behn uses Oroonoko for her feminist objectives. Shakespeare holds Miranda under her father's authority while Behn criticizes this condition through the narrator. Shakespeare's use of Sycorax is also patriarchal since she is categorized as a witch and prostitute, two attributes used in English culture for women who claimed their place publically. Behn uses Imoinda and other native women to call for the improvement of women in the colony and Britain.

I have first focused on Behn's central character as a revision of Shakespeare's portrayal of Caliban. The slave stands as a metaphor for the domesticity of women and through whom Behn achieves her revision. In fact, she reconsiders Shakespeare's definition of the slave as ignorant, savage, naïve, and submissive with her own definition of the slave as royal, gallant, noble, intellectual, brave, and eloquent. She parallels the slave with the condition of women as being domestic slaves on whom males exercise their control. Her ennoblement of her royal slave serves her feminine purposes to emancipate women. As for the second one, it consists of Behn's female characters: the narrator, Miranda and native women as a response to Shakespeare's female characters Miranda, Claribel and the cause of the native women. Shakespeare's patriarchy towards native and European women is considered in the light of Behn's feminism through her criticism of polygamy and the veil as means of maintaining control over women and of promoting their subordination to their husbands, and Shakespeare's female representation as witches and prostitutes.

a. Aphra Behn's Oroonoko as a Revision of Shakespeare's Caliban, or the Slave as Metaphor for Women

Behn revises the condition of the slave in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* through her male protagonist Oroonoko. In *The Tempest*, the condition of slaves is no lesser than that of women in the colony or in the metropole. That treatment is due to the colonizer's need to explore new unexplored areas to make their profits. Shakespeare deals with the colonialist discourse and supports the ideological foundations of the British Empire. The play highlights the master/slave and colonizer/colonized relationship: Prospero, the civilized European and Caliban, the 'savage' slave. Prospero considers himself as powerful because he has knowledge that makes him believe in his superiority over the others mainly the islanders. It is the case of Prospero, the representative of the beginnings of the First British Empire. Prospero represents the enlightened man who puts himself in a position that allows him to govern the islanders and native people. His power, in terms of magic and intellectual capacities, legitimates his supremacy on them.

Caliban is described as the submissive "mis-shapen"⁵⁵ creature that must submit to Prospero's demands and will. Therefore, he is seen as a symbol of the exploited native and the victim of colonial oppression. He is presented in the play as a deformed creature not only by Prospero but also by the other Europeans like Stephano and Trinculo. Trinculo identifies Caliban as a fish-like monster who is "legged like a man; and his fins like arms."⁵⁶ This is to say that all the European characters used by Shakespeare produced a colonial discourse about the native people. Moreover, Trinculo says: "What have we here? A man or a fish? Dead or alive? A fish: he smells like a fish; a very ancient and fish-like smell."⁵⁷ Trinculo considers Caliban as a deformed creature that is more like a fish because of his disgusting smell. In addition, Trinculo describes Caliban and says: "A most ridiculous monster...A howling monster: a drunken monster."⁵⁸ In addition, Stephano, another representative of the European colonial enterprise,

describes him as “a devil, and no monster.”⁵⁹ The image assigned to Caliban about his deformity explains the clichés that Europeans created about the native people to legitimate in part their presence on the island under the pretext of bringing civilisation to them. Throughout the play, Trinculo maintains his idea about Caliban to be a fish and a monster: “being but half a fish and half a monster.”⁶⁰ In addition, Prospero presents his slave as a “devil, a born devil...and as with age his body uglier grows, so his mind cankers”⁶¹, and he “is as disproportion’d in his manners as in his shape.”⁶² Prospero supports the idea of the ugliness and deformity of his slave. He dehumanises him all over the play by attributing him some animal-like features when he tells him: “thou tortoise!”⁶³ Therefore, these stereotypes serve the European coloniser’s ideology to maintain their domination and control over the slaves.

Shakespeare as a male writer has no concern with notions of human freedom while women like Behn have it because they feel their freedom has been taken over. Therefore, Behn’s novella serves as a revision of the condition of the slave through the male protagonist Oroonoko. In fact, *Oroonoko, or The Royal Slave* (1688) is a prose narrative in which the female colonizer records a story of the colonized ‘Other’ during the first expansion of the British Empire in Surinam. Her portrayal of the slave serves as a parody to Shakespeare’s slave only because she is a woman. Indeed, she presents him as her hero and favourite character through a very smooth and elegant description and language. She praises his physical appearances when she says:

His face was not of that brown rusty black which most of that nation are, but of perfect ebony, or polished jet. His eyes were the most awful that could be seen, and very piercing; the white of 'em being like snow, as were his teeth. His nose was rising and Roman, instead of African and flat. His mouth the finest shaped that could be seen; far from those great turned lips which are so natural to the rest of the negroes. The whole proportion and air of his face was so nobly and exactly formed that, bating his color, there could be nothing in nature more beautiful, agreeable, and handsome.⁶⁴

The quotation above explains and emphasises Oroonoko’s difference from his race by praising and eulogising his appearances. In this perspective, Laura Wyrick states: “Oroonoko’s nobility shines through his suspiciously European face.”⁶⁵ She attributes Oroonoko European-like features

so as to make him different from the natives. In this context, she adds: “He was adorned with a native beauty, so transcending all those of his gloomy race that he struck an awe and reverence even into those that knew not his quality; as he did into me, who beheld him with surprise and wonder, when afterwards he arrived in our world.”⁶⁶ His “good and graceful mien”⁶⁷ is contrasted to Caliban’s deformity who is presented as the mis-shapen creature. The author inserted all the good qualities a white man can have so as to make him unique and different.

Behn also revises Caliban’s lineage which is presented by Shakespeare to be the reason for his marginalisation. In fact, Caliban is described as the illegitimate son of the witch Sycorax and the devil. Therefore, Prospero’s attitude towards him is explained by his family lineage and origins. Prospero calls him “Hag-seed”⁶⁸ and “A freckled whelp hag-born, not honour'd with a human shape.”⁶⁹ However, Behn’s Oroonoko is seen as having good genesis. He is described as a “prince”⁷⁰ and “a well-bred great man.”⁷¹ Therefore, his lineage dictates the kind of treatment others should pay for him.

Shakespeare’s description of his Caliban at the level of his behaviour to rape Miranda is that of a savage. In fact, Prospero tends to marginalise and dehumanize Caliban and considers him no more than a savage creature when he says: “taught thee each hour one thing or other: when thou didst not, savage, know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like a thing most brutish.”⁷² In addition, Caliban’s savagery is most exemplified by Shakespeare through his behaviour towards Prospero’s daughter. In his attempt to rape Miranda, his savage and animal nature is externalised. Therefore, Prospero says in a very angry tone: “I have used thee, filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged thee in mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate the honour of my child.”⁷³ In addition, Shakespeare portrayed the slave as ignorant through Trinculo’s words: “most ignorant monster.”⁷⁴ Moreover, Caliban is presented as a naive character that is easy to be tricked. His naivety made him believe in the veracity of the story of the man which Trinculo and Stephano narrated. These latter attributed him notions of ignorance and

naivety when Trinculo says: “A most ridiculous monster.”⁷⁵ Therefore, Shakespeare succeeded in portraying the native race with stereotypes related to savagery, naivety and most of all ignorance.

Behn’s novella, on the other hand, emphasises Oroonoko’s nobility and education. In fact, the narrator ennobles and elevates him to a higher position that made him appear completely different from Caliban. She eulogises his qualities like civility, nobility, gallantry and code of honour as opposing Caliban’s savagery, ignorance and naivety by means of a “Parodic stylisation.”⁷⁶ Indeed, Behn emphasises her protagonist’s noble virtues and denies his barbarity by saying: “He had nothing of barbarity in his nature, but in all points addressed himself as if his education had been in some European court.”⁷⁷ In fact, Caliban’s ignorance is revised by Oroonoko’s education which he seems to have received from a European court. The author goes on by emphasizing Oroonoko’s virtues and says: “’twas amazing to imagine where it was he learned so much humanity; or, to give his accomplishments a juster name, where ’twas he got that real greatness of soul, those refined notions of true honour, that absolute generosity and that softness that was capable of the highest passions of love and gallantry.”⁷⁸ Throughout the novella, she ennobles and elevates him to a higher position that made him appear completely different from Caliban.

Behn also revises Caliban’s savagery with Oroonoko’s “refined notions of true honour.”⁷⁹ Caliban’s savagery in his endeavour to rape Miranda is contrasted with the native people’s honour. Behn writes: “And though they are all thus naked, if one lives forever among ’em there is not to be seen an undecent action, or glance: and being continually used to see one another so unadorned, so like our first parents before the Fall.”⁸⁰ This implies the state of innocence and honour that the native people possess.

Moreover, Behn revises Caliban’s education and use of language through Oroonoko. In *The Tempest*, while the master uses the language of command that maintains him as a master, Caliban uses language as a way to revolt against the injustices he receives through only cursing.

Caliban says: “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.”⁸¹ He revolts against his master saying that the only thing he learned by the language is how to curse: “as wicked dew as e’er my mother brush’d with raven’s feather from unwholesome fen drop on you both! a south-west blow on ye and blister you all o’er!”⁸² However, Oroonoko’s language has a far stronger objective than Caliban’s. He was able to learn many languages like French and English. Behn states: “This great and just character of Oroonoko gave me an extreme curiosity to see him, especially when I knew he spoke French and English, and that I could talk with him.”⁸³ Furthermore, his language is seen as having weight in convincing people to take action. In the colony, he noticed the coloniser’s oppression which pushed him to pronounce a speech to his fellow men about the necessity of a mutiny and revolution. The author says: “Caesar, having singled these men from the women and children, made an harangue to’em.”⁸⁴ His language is characterised by eloquence and persuasiveness thanks to which he has a considerable influence on his people. He tells them:

my dear friends and fellow- sufferers, should we be slaves to an unknown people? Have they vanquished us nobly in fight? Have they won us in honorable battle? And are we by the chance of war become their slaves? This would not anger a noble heart; this would not animate a soldiers soul: no, but we are bought and sold like apes or monkeys, to be the sport of women, fools, and cowards; and the support of rogues and runagates, that have abandoned their own countries for rapine, murders, theft, and villainies”. Do you not hear every day how they upbraid each other with infamy of life, below the wildest savages? And shall we render obedience to such a degenerate race, who have no one human virtue left, to distinguish them from the vilest creatures?⁸⁵

The quote above suggests his ability to make a speech with a diction that heightens his people’s awareness to take action. Through his dialogue with the slaves, one can clearly see his influence on them. In fact, his speech is very influential, his words meaningful, and these are enough ingredients to convince his people of their need to rebellion. His eloquence and art of speech are clear from his very words in trying to convince them to take action. Despite the fact that he was not exploited in the colony as a slave, his code of honour did not allow him to be silent in front of the injustices his fellow men suffer from. Therefore, he succeeded to convince all the slaves to

rebel. His influence on his fellow men made them agree on the fact as the author says: “they all agreed- and bowed.”⁸⁶ She adds: “They bowed and kissed his feet at this resolution, and with one accord vowed to follow him to death; and that night was appointed to begin their march.”⁸⁷ Since the condition of slaves is the same as women, we understand that by siding with Oroonoko in his decisions, the author as a woman calls for women’s rebellion against the patriarchal rules their societies exercise on them.

Moreover, Prospero educates Caliban to make him submissive and obedient to his commands. Though at times Caliban wants to alter his situation, his master meets him with threats and says: “If thou neglect’st or dost unwillingly what I command, I’ll rack thee with old cramps, fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar that beasts shall tremble at thy din.”⁸⁸ Therefore, Caliban’s fear of being tormented makes him obey and let his rebellious plans aside and says: “I must obey: his art is of such power, it would control my dam's god, Setebos, and make a vassal of him.”⁸⁹ Oroonoko, on the other hand, is Behn’s favourite of all characters in terms of education and knowledge. She portrays him as having an education that surpasses even that of the white men. The author admires his knowledge and education when she says: “addressed himself as if his education had been in some European court.”⁹⁰ The author distinguishes her protagonist from his race and features him as someone special and unique. Unlike Caliban, Oroonoko’s education carries is weighty even in the political sphere. It allows him to excel in leadership and participate in politics. In this respect, the author says:

Nor did the perfections of his mind come short of those of his person; for his discourse was admirable upon almost any subject: and whoever had heard him speak would have been convinced of their errors, that all fine wit is confined to the white men, especially to those of Christendom; and would have confessed that Oroonoko was as capable even of reigning well, and of governing as wisely, had as great a soul, as politic maxims, and was as sensible of power, as any prince civilized in the most refined schools of humanity and learning, or the most illustrious courts.⁹¹

According to Behn, her male character’s intellectual faculty allows him to participate in the public sphere which is politics. In fact, her support of the idea that Oroonoko is capable of

reigning implies Behn's advocacy of women's right to go beyond the defined roles the patriarchal societies reserved to them. In fact, she sides with Oroonoko in every action he undertakes and any decision he takes. This suggests that race serves her purposes as a woman to voice the hardships women face in the male-centered world. She compares the state of women at that period to that of slaves and creates a story about the slave so as to serve her aims without being exposed to the danger of being killed or punished. Unlike Caliban's limited education as an obedient slave, Oroonoko's education serves him to be more independent in terms of others' treatment towards him. This can also be related to British feminists' call for education for women in the seventeenth century.

Furthermore, Behn sympathises with the black slave with the intention to carve her own space in the world of action. The narrator of *Oroonoko* does express sympathetic identification with the royal slave and outrage at his cruel treatment. According to Laura Brown: "female sympathy with the black slave involves a critique of white colonialism due to the sense of analogy between racial and gender superordination."⁹² The author uses an elevated diction of romance when describing her main character. In fact, she ascribes qualities to him that make him seem the best-breed of English nobility. She expressed her sympathy when she wrote to Lord Maitland and said: "a man gallant enough to merit your protection."⁹³ This quote clearly shows Behn's protection of her main character. She claimed that slavery was unworthy of a society that claimed to be based on Christian ideals because "To be Christian was to be civilized rather than barbarous."⁹⁴ This implies according to Jordan Winthrop that Christian countries that claim to be civilised should have egalitarian beliefs, common for the entire human race.

In addition, Caliban is Prospero's possession and his status as a slave remains so until the end of the play. In fact, he is considered as his master's property available to use at any possible juncture. In this context, Prospero states: "We'll visit Caliban my slave."⁹⁵ Prospero represents the master who dominates every inch of the island, whereas Caliban is his subservient slave who

receives his master's commands and orders. Therefore, Prospero's language is always in an imperative mode that highlights his superior position over Caliban. In fact, Prospero exercises his power on the native by giving orders and says: "Come forth, I say! There's other business for thee: come: thou tortoise!"⁹⁶ This is to say that the condition of the slave at that time was like that of women who were also considered as men's properties. Therefore, Behn's attitude towards the slave is different from that of Shakespeare. In fact, her portrayal of her male protagonist as a "royal slave"⁹⁷ denotes his difference and serves her intentions as a female writer. Although he was sold to slavery, his status was not as Caliban's since "he was above the rank of common slaves."⁹⁸ Behn contrasts Caliban's slavery to Oroonoko's independence by giving him a special position and respect. Oroonoko is presented as a slave who "endured no more of the slave but the name."⁹⁹ He was not considered as a slave on the plantations, and this appears through his relationship with the white men and the respect they pay for him. In addition, "they assigned him his portion of land, his house, and his business up in the plantation"¹⁰⁰ which denotes his difference from the rest of the slaves in terms of position.

In addition, Oroonoko's relationship with the white men is not that of the slave with his master. In fact, his relationship with the narrator and other Europeans like Trefry shows that he is not a common slave. The narrator, for instance, expressed her admiration and high esteem in him when she refers to his appearances, his smooth language with women, and his education, and all these characteristics make him different from Caliban. Moreover, he was also adored by Trefry who "began to conceive so vast an esteem for him that he ever after loved him as his dearest brother."¹⁰¹ His relationship, therefore, allows him to be independent and treated not as a slave. Furthermore, the narrator admires Oroonoko for his modesty when he came to visit for the first time the plantation where his fellow men work and says: "Caesar, troubled with their over-joy and over-ceremony, besought 'em to rise, and to receive him as their fellow-slave; assuring them he was no better."¹⁰² His modesty shows in his assurance that he is no better than the slaves.

Behn responds to Caliban's behaviour with women by Oroonoko's friendship and amity. In fact, Caliban's relationship with the only female character in *The Tempest* is very different from that of Oroonoko with women. This is due to Caliban's attempt to rape her. This created hatred towards the slave in Miranda's heart. Even if she is presented as a compassionate character, what Caliban attempted to do made her hate him. In this respect she says: "Tis a villain, sir, I do not love to look on."¹⁰³ However, Oroonoko is presented with a good relationship with women especially the white female narrator whom he calls: "his Great Mistress"¹⁰⁴ and his black female lover Imoinda. His good behaviour with women showed from the very beginning when the author met him for the first time and says: "He came into the room, and addressed himself to me and some other women with the best grace in the world."¹⁰⁵ This suggests that the future relationship between him and women will grow stronger in the coming events. This implies that women have strong ties with slaves since they have a parallel position in the society as being the marginalised. In fact, he befriended the author to the extent that one can consider the narrator as belonging to the same race as Oroonoko. Her admiration for him emerged from Oroonoko's behaviour towards women when he was pursued by the colonists. The narrator says: "But as soon as Caesar found he was pursued, he put himself in a posture of defense, placing all the women and children in the rear; and himself, with Tuscan by his side, or next to him, all promising to die or conquer."¹⁰⁶ His decision to put women and children at the rear while he exposed himself to danger shows the strong ties he had with women. This, in fact, suggests that her ties grew stronger with Oroonoko's since she found all the qualities she hopes to find in males in her society. Therefore, she defends him by celebrating his great story by her feminist pen which she states at the end: "I hope, the reputation of my pen is considerable enough to make his glorious name to survive all the ages, with that of the brave, the beautiful, and the constant Imoinda."¹⁰⁷ The only thing with which she can reward him is by making his story heard and survive at all ages by a female pen which at that time was at issue. It becomes clear that Behn parodies

Shakespeare's use of Caliban to put women in a position inferior even to that of the slave. Oroonoko becomes a man who respects and adores women.

In addition, Oroonoko's love to one woman is contrasted to Caliban's lack of emotions towards Miranda. In fact, Oroonoko represents Behn's ideal and utopian character, and the story of the young lovers implies her advocacy for a society where men pay attention to women. Oroonoko, therefore, is the character in whom she finds all the qualities that she loves a man to possess. He courts one woman and loves her to the extent that "without Imoinda, he no longer desires to conquer his foes and claim his share."^{107a} Their love is pure, and despite polygamy in his country, Oroonoko's faithfulness does not allow his heart to love many at one time. This idea is well illustrated through the words of the narrator:

Nor did he use those obligations ill, that love had done him, but turned all his happy moments to the best advantage; and as he knew no vice, his flame aimed at nothing but honor, if such a distinction may be made in love; and especially in that country, where men take to themselves as many as they can maintain.¹⁰⁸

This explains the love Oroonoko pays to his darling maid and how his honour aimed at nothing but his love for one woman. The narrator shows her admiration even in Oroonoko's love for one woman because if otherwise women will become as commodities exchanged and exposed to abandonment with age. In addition, the author supports Oroonoko's monogamy when she says:

contrary to the custom of his country he made her [Imoinda] vows she should be the only woman he would possess while he lived; that no age or wrinkles should incline him to change; for her soul would be always fine, and always young; and he should have an eternal idea in his mind of the charms she now bore; and should look into his heart for that idea, when he could find it no longer in her face.¹⁰⁹

The author suggests the importance of swear words in keeping faithful to each other. In this respect, Adelaide P. Amore states: "The beauty of their relationship serves as a model to all those who believe in monogamous love."¹¹⁰ Oroonoko and Imoinda promise to be faithful to each other, and it serves as a kind of contract. In Amore's words: "fidelity, love, virtue, honour, and a special passion for life all play important roles in the heroic tradition and the special relationship

Oroonoko and Imoinda develop is based on these values.”¹¹¹ Though they have no restrictions to consume their love before marriage, Oroonoko’s high refined notions of honour do not allow him to show an indecent action towards his maid as Behn puts it: “nor did he use those obligations ill that love had done him; But turned all his happy moments to the best advantage; and as he knew no vice, his flame aimed at nothing but honour.”¹¹²

Therefore, Behn inserted a story of the slave so as to empower herself politically. According to Charlotte Sussman, Behn is an emancipationist writer, for she “sides with the status quo of slave culture”¹¹³ and denies the bad treatment that Europeans exercise on the native races. In her novel, her portrayal of the male protagonist as a slave is different from Shakespeare’s representation of the same issue. Though their literary works were written approximately in the same period, their ideological position is different. Behn revises Shakespeare’s play in terms of his portrayal of Caliban and the status of slaves in general. She appears in a constant dialogue with Shakespeare’s work in that her portrayal of Oroonoko is different from his portrayal of Caliban. Behn presents Oroonoko as a man educated in a European fashion that renders him different from Caliban. In fact, Behn parodies Shakespeare by assigning positive features to her protagonist, which are absent in Caliban.

The narrator who is a white mistress sides with the slave culture and seems to have anti-slavery ideology. The fact that she places Oroonoko in a higher position means that she has a strong relationship with slaves. According to Clare Midgley, female anti-slavery was a form of “western proto-feminism.”¹¹⁴ Feminism emerged in the context of the imperial history through women’s writings and Behn’s novella is one example among others. In other words, it is thanks to Western female writings about slavery that feminism emerged. In dealing with slavery and slave narratives, British women found themselves participating in the empire and thus overcome all what is related to domesticity and became active agents in the metropole when defending the rights of the blacks. In this context, Janet Todd claims: “Aphra Behn’s novel confronts the

ownership of Africans by the British and the ownership of women by men.”¹¹⁵ Behn’s participation in the imperial context helped her to ground a place in her patriarchal society. Her sympathy with slaves shows that she identifies with them because she considers herself as a domestic slave like all women in Britain at that period.

Throughout the novel, the use of personal pronouns like ‘we’ and ‘they’ signifies Behn’s belonging to and exclusion from the white imperial ideology. When she deals with the injustices done to Oroonoko and his beloved, she seems to exclude herself from that, but when she speaks about the amity and friendship that is between her and the native people, she uses the pronoun ‘we’ just to include herself. At the end of the novella, however, the narrator excludes herself completely from the events and says: “But they were no sooner arrived at the place where all the slaves receive their punishments of whipping but they laid hands on Caesar and Tuscan, faint with heat and toil; and surprising them, bound them to two several stakes, and whipped them in a most deplorable and inhumane manner.”¹¹⁶ By placing herself aside, she denies her participation and belonging to the system of slavery. The narrator has an ambivalent and ambiguous attitude towards issues related to the “other” and slavery. Holmesland Oddavar states: “the fact that critics differ on how the realism relates to the romance features shows the difficulty of ascribing a stable political and moral attitude to the narrator. A case in point is Behn’s attitude towards issues such as slavery and the other, embodied most prominently by the African protagonist.”¹¹⁷ Jane Spencer discussed her ambivalence too: “As a character, the narrator seems caught uneasily between admiration for her hero and allegiance to European civilization, but this means that she can present a picture of both sides.”¹¹⁸ The ambivalence is shown right at the beginning of the novella when describing Oroonoko. Behn’s novella, therefore, serves as a feminist revision of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. She revises the condition of Caliban by her male protagonist Oroonoko who stands as a metaphor for the domesticity of women. In this respect, Bonnie S. Enderson exemplified her study by reference to Behn who claims:

Men have taken everything from us, even the right of spiritual creation! We can only be the slaves of our husbands and bear their children, that is our duty and our profession...But I, I want to be equal to men! I want to be free, not bound!...I don't want to be a wife anymore, but rather a free, feeling, thinking, and purposeful human creature.^{118a}

The quote clearly shows Behn's stand as a feminist writer against the injustices and the male treatment of women as slaves. She is against the idea that women are their husbands' slaves who are deprived of their freedom. She calls for women's emancipation and freedom by criticising the institution of marriage which promotes women's subordination to their husbands.

According to Ferguson, feminists compared themselves to slaves and used slavery as a metaphor for their condition since they were confined and "were subjected to patriarchal order."¹¹⁹ By praising Oroonoko's education, Behn implicitly criticises the British patriarchal society which confines women to the domestic sphere and therefore deprived them of education. Women, therefore, become "pawns of white men, denied education as well as access to law and allied deprivations, feminists of all classes were prone to refer loosely to themselves as slaves."¹²⁰ Behn used the story of the slave so as to hint at her slave-like position in her society. She criticised the institution of marriage which for her is a kind of enslavement and imprisonment. She embodies this idea through the story of her male protagonist when sold into slavery. The renaming of Oroonoko when sold into slavery serves as a metaphor for marriage. In this context, Karen Offen states: "Marriage as slavery and as a violation of women's individual freedom."^{120a} Behn wants to say that marriage is just like slavery. Oroonoko in the new world is no longer called by his name, and his new one is Caesar. Though this name is great, Behn seems to criticise it because by renaming him, Oroonoko would lose forever his identity. She says: "I must call Oroonoko Caesar; since by that name only he was known in our Western World."¹²¹ This implies that women lose their identities once they get married, and they are no longer called by their previous names because it is only by their new ones that they are known in society. Oroonoko belongs to the African culture with European features such as education, eloquence, gallantry, wit

and above all honour. The story of the royal slave is a clear criticism to the British society. She achieves her dialogism through her protagonists about values related to love, monogamy, honour and nobility that the countries in a state of “other” possess. Her criticism and dialogism are achieved through “a hidden polemic”¹²² when she says: “such ill morals are only practised in Christian countries, where the bare name of religion; and, without virtue or morality, think that’s sufficient.”¹²³ She admires the Non-Christian notions that native people have and condemns the Christian religion which she as a woman considers as a means of domination and control.

Endnotes

⁵⁵ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* (London: Penguin, 1995), 94.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 57.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 61.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 59.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 66.

⁶¹ Ibid., 82.

⁶² Ibid., 95.

⁶³ Ibid., 37.

⁶⁴ Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko, The Rover and Other Works*, (London : Penguin, 1992), 81.

⁶⁵ Laura Wyrick, *Facing Up to the Other : Race and Ethics in Levinas and Behn*, (Texas: Texas Tech University Press, 2001), 59.

⁶⁶ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 79.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 80.

⁶⁸ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 39.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 36.

⁷⁰ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 79.

⁷¹ Ibid., 80.

⁷² Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 38.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 66.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 61.

⁷⁶ Bakhtin, *Dialogic*, 292.

⁷⁷ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 80.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 79-80.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 80.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 76.

⁸¹ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 39.

⁸² Ibid., 37.

⁸³ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 80.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 126.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 127.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 39.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 80.

- ⁹¹ Ibid., 81.
- ⁹² Oddavar Holmesland, 'Aphra Behn's Oroonoko : Cultural Dialectics and the Novel', *ELH*, V. 68 N. 1 (Spring 2001), 4.
- ⁹³ Holmesland, 'Cultural Dialectics and the Novel', 61.
- ⁹⁴ Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, 5.
- ⁹⁵ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 37.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 75.
- ⁹⁸ Ibid., 106.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid., 109.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 108.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid., 106.
- ¹⁰² Ibid., 109.
- ¹⁰³ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 37.
- ¹⁰⁴ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 114.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 80.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 129.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 140-141.
- ^{107a} Adam Sills, 'Surveying the Map of Slavery in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko', *Journal of Narrative Theory*, V.36, N.3 (Fall 2006), 331.
- ¹⁰⁸ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 83.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰ Adelaide P. Amore, "Introduction", *Oroonoko, or, The Royal Slave: A Critical Edition* (The United States of America: University Press of America, 1987), xxxviii.
- ¹¹¹ Amore, *Oroonoko*, xxxviii.
- ¹¹² Behn, *Oroonoko*, 83.
- ¹¹³ Charlotte Sussman, "The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and Slave Culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko" in *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*, ed. Heidi Hunter (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 229.
- ¹¹⁴ Midgley, "Anti-slavery", 164.
- ¹¹⁵ Catherine Gallagher, 'Behn in the Canon', in *The Critical Fortunes of Aphra Behn* by Janet M. Todd (Columbia : Camden House, 1998), 126.
- ¹¹⁶ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 131.
- ¹¹⁷ Holmesland, 'Cultural Dialectics and the Novel', 58.
- ¹¹⁸ Jane Spencer, *The Rise of the Woman Novelist : From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen*, (Oxford :Basil Blackwell, 1986), 51.
- ^{118a} Bonnie S. Enderson, 'Frauenemancipation and Beyond : The Use of the Concept of Emancipation by Early European Feminists' in *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation* (New Haven & London : Yale University Press, 2007), 85-86.
- ¹¹⁹ Ferguson, *Subjects to Others*, 21.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid., 19.
- ^{120a} Karen Offen, 'How (and Why) the Analogy of Marriage with Slavery Provided the Springboard for Women's Rights Demands in France, 1640-1848' in *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*, ed. Kathryn Kish Sklar and James Brewer Stewart (New Haven & London : Yale University Press, 2007), 61.
- ¹²¹ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 108.
- ¹²² Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 199.
- ¹²³ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 83.

b. Shakespeare's Patriarchy, Behn's Feminism and Female Representation

Behn in her novella looks for the improvement of the condition of both native and British women through her female characters: the white female narrator, Imoinda and other native women. In doing so, she criticises and parodies Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. In this latter, Shakespeare's patriarchal ideas are prominent and achieved through the definition of the male/female relationship. Shakespeare is a patriarchal writer. The circumstances under which Shakespeare wrote his plays obliged him to exclude strong female characters. He depicts women as 'angels in the house' who are robbed agency and the right to speak. Therefore, they always appear silent or silenced. In *The Tempest*, he tends to marginalise women even when they are of special positions in the society. For him, women are there just to fill their duties and obey their fathers' or husbands' orders. As a result, Behn revises Shakespeare's depiction of women (native or European) as selfless characters, witches and prostitutes by offering alternatives achieved through the feminist representation of the white narrator, Imoinda and other native women.

In *The Tempest*, the only woman who is present is Prospero's daughter, Miranda. She is presented as the only female character on an isolated island filled with men and their actions, but she was completely excluded from participation in the action. In this perspective, Ann Thompson argues that in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* "women are largely excluded."¹²⁴ Miranda is portrayed as a submissive woman who receives the males' orders without questioning them, and her presence on the island does not make any change. Her submissiveness appears in her very silence in the face of her father and her blind obedience to his orders. Her father thinks that she is not mature enough to know about what is going on. He silences by saying: "Stay: not yet."¹²⁵ Her silence shows in her few utterances despite her importance for the fulfilment of her father's political project. The dialogue is dominated by Prospero, and Miranda's speech is viewed as a little fragment of the whole. We notice her constant absence in some important scenes where

Prospero takes decisions in her place, and her participation in dialogue in the remaining scenes does not have a special effect on the course of events. This suggests that being present or absent is quite the same since the characters do not wonder at her absence. She is only used as an object through which reconciliation between rivals is achieved.

Prospero considers Miranda as an invisible woman. Every time she wants to know about something that attracts her attention, he stops her and puts an end to her queries. According to Donaldson Prospero is “responsible for his erasure of Miranda as the invisible woman.”¹²⁶ He tends to silence his daughter either by making her sleep or by ordering her to be silent. In one of their conversations, he says: “Silence! One word more shall make me chide thee, if not hate thee...foolish wench.”¹²⁷ He compels his daughter to be silent so that he can do what he wants without being disturbed by her compassion and tenderness. Thus, Shakespeare’s portrayal of Miranda fits the patriarch’s ideology. Miranda’s silence and ignorance of what is going on serves as a prototype of seventeenth century European women. In one passage when Prospero wants to order Ariel to follow the work he began in raising the storm, he made his daughter sleep with the help of his magic and said: “Here cease more questions: thou art inclined to sleep; ‘tis a good dullness, and give it way: I know thou canst not choose.”¹²⁸ His intent is to keep his daughter away from participation in the world of decisions and power so as to keep her under his control. The fact that he succeeded in doing so shows that he controls everything he plans to.

Furthermore, Shakespeare’s portrayal of Miranda equates the characteristics of a confined and submissive woman because of her character. Miranda resolves herself into the very elements of womanhood. She is beautiful, modest, tender and obedient, and she is these only. She is depicted in the play as being beautiful when Ferdinand says:

full many a lady I have eyed with best regard and many a time the harmony of their tongues
hath into bondage brought my too diligent ear: for several virtues have I liked several
women; never any with so fun soul, but some defect in her did quarrel with the noblest grace
she owed and put it to the foil: but you, O you, so perfect and so peerless, are created of every
creature’s best!.¹²⁹

In fact, Ferdinand compares Miranda with women he knew before he came to the island and praises her good qualities that he has never seen in European women. Her beauty enslaves him to the extent that he admires her from the first glance. In addition, Miranda is portrayed as emotive and compassionate in order to argue that women are weakened by their feelings. When Miranda wants her father to release Ferdinand, she says: “Alack, for mercy.”¹³⁰ Her fears and emotions appeared for the first time when she saw the storm caused by Prospero. She says: “O, I have suffered with those that I saw suffer: a brave vessel, who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her, dash’d all to pieces. O, the cry did knock against my very heart. Poor souls, they perish’d.”¹³¹ In different scenes, Miranda appears emotive and weak. In this context, Theo Tebbe says: “Miranda appears to be a compassionate and gentle, but also quite passive heroine”¹³² since she accepts everything dictated on her.

On an island filled with men, her presence is only important for the purpose of marrying Ferdinand so as to bring reconciliation and redemption to their fathers, Prospero and Alonso. In fact, Prospero arranged everything from the very beginning. He planned the marriage of his daughter and Ferdinand to fulfil his plan by making them fall in love. He observes the young lovers secretly to see the efficiency of his art in making each one seduce the other. In one passage, Prospero says: “the Duke of Milan and his more braver daughter could control thee, if now ‘twere fit to do’t. At the first sight they have changed eyes. Delicate Ariel, I’ll set thee free for this.”¹³³ This explains that Prospero is satisfied by his daughter and Ferdinand’s love. He also tries to make his daughter believe that Ferdinand is a traitor just to see what kind of reaction she could make and to make himself appear in their eyes as being out of the affair. In seeing the efficiency of his plan, Prospero says: “It works.”¹³⁴ He adds: “so glad of this ...my rejoicing at nothing can be more.”¹³⁵ Theo Tebbe states that Prospero “knows that the only way to win the power struggle against Antonio is to involve his daughter into his political plan, who serves as

the ultimate fantasy for any male.”¹³⁶ According to Tebbe, Miranda is just a commodity for the males of the play, and her opinion in front of her father’s interest equals nothing.

Moreover, Shakespeare emphasises the idea that marriage based on love does not exist in the British society at that time. Prospero uses his power as a father and magician to control Miranda’s life by organising her marriage to the king’s son whom he feels better suits her. This suggests that even in her personal life, she is not free. In Miranda’s eyes, it is accidentally that she fell in love with Ferdinand but in reality it is her father who arranged such a relation. The marriage of Miranda and Ferdinand secures public and political harmony and stability. Prospero, who makes anything just for his well-being, sacrifices his daughter’s emotions to achieve his will. His slogan towards Miranda is “I have done nothing but in care of thee.”¹³⁷ Her father, Prospero, according to Laura E. Donaldson, “enacts the role of the omnipotent western patriarch.”¹³⁸ He controls everything on the island and only what pleases him occurs. The planned marriage aimed not only at regaining his dukedom but also at making his ties and relations in the field of control solid.

This is not the only political marriage stated in the play, for Alonso’s daughter also has been married to the king of Tunis. She was married against her will. Her uncle Sebastian reminds his brother Alonso: “the fair herself weighed between loathness and obedience at which end o’ th’ beam should bow.”¹³⁹ Sebastian serves as the ego of Alonso since he reminds him about what kind of decision he has made. This is partly the regret that he feels in front of what his brother did. Sebastian tells his brother: “you may thank yourself for this great loss, that would not bless our Europe with your daughter, but rather lose her to an African; where she at least is banish’d from your eye, who hath cause to wet the grief on’t.”¹⁴⁰ However, Alonso’s response to that was: “Prithee, peace.”¹⁴¹ This is a way to say that Alonso escapes his moral torture through silencing his brother who represents his alter-ego. Claribel like Miranda could only be obedient to male orders. This supports the idea that women’s primary value is as chatter; she is bartered in the

marriage market for the husband that her father most desires.

Miranda is presented as a prey to men who see her as a sexual object endowed with attractiveness and beauty. Even from the slave's point of view, women are viewed as sexual objects. Caliban's attempt to rape her justifies such an attitude towards women. His intention was to populate the island with his race, so the only role he gave to women is that of reproduction. He says: "O ho, O ho! Would't had been done! thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else this isle with Calibans."¹⁴² This suggests that Caliban objectifies Miranda since he sees in her the sexual object that has reproductive functions. In this context, Donaldson argues: "Miranda's own position emerges in her status as the sexual object of both the Anglo-European male and the native 'Other' and as the loyal daughter/ wife who ultimately aligns herself with the benefits and protection offered by the colonizing father and husband."¹⁴³ Shakespeare uses Caliban to promote his patriarchal ideas. Caliban is different from Oroonoko, who courts and loves only one woman.

In addition, Miranda's marriage to Ferdinand maintains her dependency on her husband. Roy Porter states: "throughout their lives they were as far as possible to depend on men, as daughters on their fathers, and once wives on the "masculine dominion" of their husbands."¹⁴⁴ It can stand as an argument that women are always dependent on men to survive. Though portrayed as obedient to men on the island, her assertiveness and rebellion appears in her refusal to Caliban. She says: "'Tis a villain, Sir, I do not love to look on."¹⁴⁵ According to Virginia and Alden Vaughan "Earlier her rebuke of Caliban reveals an assertive young woman."¹⁴⁶ Her assertiveness also shows in her disobedience to her father when she decided to meet her lover secretly. Being oppressed made her feel the necessity to disobey for matters related to her love. As Virginia and Alden Vaughan put it:

But even though she conveniently (or magically) falls in love with the man of her father's choice, Miranda is not as meek and submissive as she is often portrayed. She clandestinely (she thinks) meets Ferdinand without permission and then disobeys her father's command not to reveal her name.¹⁴⁷

Besides, her existence is not for herself but for the benefit of others. Prospero is not only viewed as an oppressor to the native islander but also as the patriarch who uses his daughter for his own interest. Miranda played an important role in the play because without her Prospero's future would be nothing and his plans to regain his power would have vanished. Nevertheless, Miranda's role was denied, and she was neither given voice nor opportunity to decide on herself. In this respect, Tebbe says: "Nevertheless, Miranda's actions are controlled by her father. Her prior concern is not to develop self-reliance but to serve as a vehicle in order to solve a political problem."¹⁴⁸ In fact, Miranda serves her father's needs the most important of which was to bring his political plans to fruition.

Her value was first of all in her own virginity when Ferdinand asks her: "if you be maid or no?"¹⁴⁹ Virginity was very important at that time because unless Miranda is pure Ferdinand cannot marry and accept her. Non-married women that show in public at that time were considered as prostitutes. Therefore, his primary concern is related to her purity. He says: "O, if a virgin, and your affection not gone forth, I'll make you the queen of Naples."¹⁵⁰ In addition, Miranda is a commodity just as her mother and her value dwells in her purity. Miranda's virginity was not only important to Ferdinand but also to her father. The fact that he punished Caliban in his attempt to rape Miranda shows that her purity is necessary to him too. Prospero says to Caliban: "I have used thee, filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged thee in mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate the honour of my child."¹⁵¹ This is to say that honour and purity were the chief concerns of society in the seventeenth century, and women who are not pure become more objectified and othered. In Act Four, Scene One, Prospero speaks about the notion of purity and tells Ferdinand: "then as my gift and thine own acquisition worthily purchased take my daughter: but if thou dost break her virgin-knot before all sanctimonious ceremonies may with full and holy rite be minister'd, no sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall to make this contract grow."¹⁵² Virginity is very important because without it Ferdinand could not have

accepted Miranda, so Prospero's plans would be in vain.

In addition, Miranda's position is paralleled with that of Caliban only because of her gender. Miranda like Caliban is submissive to her father. This is to say that women at that time were treated in the same manner as slaves, servants and sexual objects. Therefore, the slave is regarded as a metaphor for the subordination of women and their submissive state. In fact, in every important incident, Prospero thinks that he is responsible, and the decisions he takes are for the benefit of all. Prospero always orders his daughter and says: "obey and be attentive."¹⁵³ His orders are always accompanied by threats as Prospero says: "Silence! One word more shall make me chide thee, if not hate thee. What! An advocate for an imposter! hush!"¹⁵⁴ When she tries to mediate the conflict between Ferdinand and her father, Prospero threatens her by saying that he would hate her if she still advocates a traitor. Thus, her role is to obey the commands of her father and keep silent. This is common to British women at that time. Their point of view and choice is not heard at all nor taken into consideration.

Though Miranda has a special rank in the society as the "only heir, a Princess"¹⁵⁵, her position is similar to that of common women in the European societies of that era. Regardless of social ranks and positions, women were all called for submission and subservience. Her social rank as the daughter of the Duke of Milan does not allow her to be higher than other women in status but rather identified with the slave Caliban simply because she is a woman. In this context, Rachel Ingalls says: "regardless of the social rank Miranda has inherited from her father, she is identified with Caliban because she is a woman."¹⁵⁶ In addition to her submissiveness, her actions are likened to those of the slave. She addresses Ferdinand: "if you'll sit down, I'll bear your logs the while: pray, give me that; I'll carry it to the pile."¹⁵⁷ Miranda's speech signifies that she accepts her condition of being a male's slave. Because of gender roles in British society at that period, Miranda does not even question her subservience to her husband or to her father because of her deep loyalty to them.

Shakespeare uses Miranda as a prototype of submissive womanhood. Therefore, Behn responds to him first by the narrator of the novella and second by Imoinda and other native women who are used as metaphors. Behn's novella revises the condition of women through her female protagonists: the white female author-narrator and Imoinda who stands for native women as well as British ones. The narrator is a white woman who has travelled to the colony where she met with the characters of the story. Indeed, she is the representative and the teller of their story. As an independent travel writer, she has the legitimacy and right to defend the oppressed both in terms of race and gender. She is the spokeswoman of the natives whom she thinks are incapable of rendering their condition visible in front of the patriarchal claims. In accordance with what Antoinette Burton terms as "international sisterhood"¹⁵⁸ and the "White Woman's Burden"¹⁵⁹ in her *Burdens of History* (1994), Behn places herself among the female writers who claimed women's rights. Behn responded to Shakespeare's portrayal of native women as witches, prostitutes and submissive. The narrator, who seems to have more independence than Miranda, is herself a revision of Miranda. The narrator's independence is explained through the fact that the novella has been written by a female writer.

In addition, travel writing at that time allowed women to go beyond the confines of the domestic sphere not only geographically with the change of area but also politically. By transcending the geographical boundaries, Behn detaches herself from the patriarchal restrictions of her society and aligns herself with the periphery to defend not only the rights of the colonized but also to emancipate herself from the kind of patriarchy from which both Imoinda and Miranda suffer. By travelling to Surinam, Behn and her narrator become more independent. According to Sara Mills, travel allowed women to prove that they were "somehow strong, exceptional [and] somehow managed to escape the structures of patriarchy"¹⁶⁰ and to escape the domestic sphere in which they are considered as "angels in the house."¹⁶¹ Indeed, women at that time were confined to domesticity because they were viewed as weak, and travel was the only available option for

them to claim their independence. Therefore, many women writers of the period took this advantage to emancipate themselves.

Moreover, the narrator's position as an independent travel writer placed her in the position of defending Oroonoko. In fact, she sees herself responsible in front of Oroonoko when she said: "but his misfortune was to fall in an obscure world that afforded only a female pen to celebrate his fame."¹⁶² This implies that since women and slaves are treated in a similar way, the slave could only afford a female pen to write his story. Therefore, what pushed the female writer to celebrate Oroonoko's fame is due to their "Common cause."¹⁶³ She takes the story of the noble characters to voice what she could not do overtly in her country. The story of the slave is the metaphor for British women's domesticity. According to Bakhtinian thought on dialogism, the point of view in a novel is done through the use of the narrator/ teller. This is the case with the narrator of *Oroonoko*. Her point of view is understood through her account of the slaves and native people. She is not like Miranda, a submissive and a silent woman, but rather an independent travel writer, who is speaking on behalf of the silent and silenced. She represents Imoinda and Oroonoko as she inserts herself in the story by her first person narrator. So the personal pronoun "I" is found repeatedly in the novella because of the importance of her authorial voice. Her travel account is clear from the very beginning when Behn says:

I was myself an eye-witness to a great part of what you will find here set down; and what I could not be witness of, I received from the mouth of the chief actor in this history, the hero himself, who gave us the whole transactions of his youth: and though I shall omit, for brevity's sake, a thousand little accidents of his life, which, however pleasant to us, where history was scarce and adventures very rare, yet might prove tedious and heavy to my reader, in a world where he finds diversions for every minute, new and strange. But we who were perfectly charmed with the character of this great man were curious to gather every circumstance of his life.¹⁶⁴

This is to say that she has been in close contact with Oroonoko, and she could only narrate his story. At the end of the novella, she claims her intention as a writer and says: "I hope the reputation of my pen is considerable enough to make his glorious name to survive all the ages,

with that of the brave, the beautiful, and the constant Imoinda.”¹⁶⁵ As a feminist, she does not only hope to make Oroonoko’s name survive in history but also her name as a female writer.

According to Bakhtin, the novel(la) offers a more appropriate genre for the polyphony of voices and the emergence of dialogism. In the case of Behn’s novella, the author takes Shakespeare’s representations of women and re-interprets them following her feminist concern. In addition to his representation of Miranda, Shakespeare’s patriarchal ideology appears in his representation of native women. In *The Tempest*, he stereotypes on Sycorax who plays a metaphorical role. Being a native woman, Sycorax was subject to Prospero’s misrepresentation and hatred. She is described by Prospero: “This damn’d witch Sycorax, for mischiefs manifold and sorceries terrible to enter human hearing, from Argier...was banish’d.”¹⁶⁶ Prospero refers to her by attributing her some characteristics related to ‘sorcery’ and ‘witchcraft’. The latter are clichés used to spread both hatred and fear of women and to strengthen the stereotypical view on them. Even though Prospero does not know her, he describes her in a malignant manner. In discussing the relationship of the colonizer Prospero with the native people, Aparna Mahanta claims:

Sycorax is dead before the play begins and Prospero has not met her, for when he came to the island there was only Caliban there, Yet Prospero is obsessed with her. He frequently refers to her and spends much energy in maligning her. He even boasts of her prowess as a witch before his guests. Caliban and Prospero evoke her name alternatively for purposes of legitimising or delegitimizing their claim to the island, which was indisputable hers alone at one time, if possession means ownership, which even Prospero has to accept”.¹⁶⁷

Mahanta means that despite Sycorax’s absence in the play in terms of actions, she is present in others’ speech. Even though Prospero does not know her, he stereotypes her heavily to the degree that she is presented as a devil. Sycorax is placed in as a woman damned and banished from her mother country because of her power. This suggests European women’s exclusion from the public sphere since women of power are feared and therefore marginalised. Prospero always refers to her with words that distort her to make her image appear bad in the eyes of others. He

says to Caliban: “Thou liest, malignant thing! Hast thou forgot the foul witch Sycorax, who with age and envy was grown into a hoop? hast thou forgot her ?”¹⁶⁸ Sycorax’s presence in the play is referred to by the characters of Caliban, Prospero and Ariel. Caliban’s reference to his mother was to show his legitimacy over the island and says: “This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother.”¹⁶⁹ However, Ariel’s reference is not like that of Caliban because she was the reason of his imprisonment. Prospero tells him: “Thou wast a spirit too delicate to act her [Sycorax’s] earthy and abhorr’d commands, refusing her grand hests, she did confine thee.”¹⁷⁰ In dealing with Sycorax, Edrik Joel Lopez states: “In the play, Sycorax is only mentioned a few times” and “we only know her through the references made to her by Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel. She was banished from Argier (or Algiers), and dropped off on the island.”¹⁷¹ Though her name is repeated several times by the characters, the attributed references to her were not in the same direction and definition. Sycorax exists in the play as the referent object who is used by Prospero to threaten and control his servant, Ariel. Lopez adds: “Sycorax remains a spectre in the play, a figure used by Prospero to instill fear in Ariel.”¹⁷² Thus, she has no other existence almost like Miranda’s silent presence.

Furthermore, women’s place was reserved to domestic tasks, and those who dare to change their lives are accused of being witches like Sycorax. The images that seventeenth century British society attached to women are divided into three main categories: ‘angels in the house’, prostitutes, and witches. Sycorax represents the combination of both prostitution and witchcraft because she has power and bore a child from a devil which implies her prostitution. Linsey D. Allnat studied the way women were used as sexual commodities in seventeenth century literature with reference to male and female authors like Shakespeare and Behn. Allnat suggests that “The position of wife was the only occupation a woman was suitable to fill. She could become a prostitute and sell her love in a different manner, but good, honourable women did not do so.”¹⁷³ As a matter of fact, women were compelled to marry even against their will or be subjected to

sexual commodification and considered as prostitutes. Therefore, stories about forced marriages are common in seventeenth century literature. Men's aim was to maintain women under their control. Speaking about Sycorax's involvement in both witchcraft and prostitution, Prospero says: "For mischiefs and sorceries terrible to enter human hearing, from Argier ...was banish'd: for one thing she did they would not take her life."¹⁷⁴ According to Mahanta,

Sycorax has the most active presence in the play, and indeed serves as discursive center of the term "female" which gives definition to all the other females in the play including Miranda as against the maleness of the patriarchal male, Prospero. Prospero represents her as the stereotypical demonical woman of patriarchal tradition, being literally a witch, an evil woman.¹⁷⁵

The witch Sycorax represents all other female characters in the play since their concern is the same, or more likely they suffer from the same "common cause."¹⁷⁶ That is to say that their position is that of the subjugated and the oppressed. Women in this way are represented as subservient to male domination.

Moreover, Prospero's and Sycorax's powers are not presented in the same way by Prospero. Though their power is the same as they both have great knowledge of magic, Prospero defines Sycorax's as being something that is threatening whereas his is noble. In this context, Mahanta claims:

Prospero's magic is used in the pursuit of his plans to augment his power by regaining his dukeship and by concluding a dynastic marriage ratifying his power by allying himself with his powerful lord. By contrast Sycorax is represented, of course by Prospero, as using her magic for malevolent purposes like imprisoning Ariel or merely to show off, as when Prospero mentions her grand hests.¹⁷⁷

To put it differently, women who possess power are always viewed as having ill intentions, and their power is used not for the benefit of the society but for its destruction. In this respect, Mahanta adds:

The magic or sorcery as Prospero describes it is illegitimate, because it is not for gaining legitimate power but for expressing malevolence or envy. Of course, Prospero's use of his magic to torment Caliban and his fellow conspirators is considered legitimate use of magic because it is used in the interests of maintaining power, the conspirators must be punished.¹⁷⁸

This suggests that Prospero's power and deeds either to punish or regain his social rank are

justified as contributing to restore the place he has lost in his country. Therefore, he legitimates his power and delegitimizes Sycorax's. He sees his assault on Caliban legitimate in that it allows him to keep his power and punish him for his disobedience. Prospero says about the conspirators: "These three have robb'd me; and this demi-devil for he's a bastard one-had plotted with them to take my life."¹⁷⁹ He assaults Caliban and says: "He is as disproportion'd in his manners as in his shape."¹⁸⁰ As for the illegitimacy of Sycorax's power Prospero says: "This mis-shapen knave, his mother was a witch, and one strong that could control the moon, make flows and ebbs, and deal in her command, without power."¹⁸¹

In addition to the narrator, Imoinda is Behn's best female character through whom she draws her dialogism with Shakespeare's patriarchal use of native women through Sycorax. Behn uses Imoinda to argue that native women are not as they were portrayed by the Europeans. Though she is attributed beauty and attractiveness, Imoinda's deeds make her appear honourable, modest and above all faithful to one man. She has been portrayed by the female narrator at the beginning of the novella as the "beautiful black Venus, to our young Mars; as charming in her person as he, and of delicate virtues."¹⁸² Behn's description of Imoinda's beauty is a means of stating her effect on both Europeans and native men. Moreover, the narrator praises her beauty and differentiates her from the rest of women. She sees in her a special woman who is the one who deserves to be loved by Oroonoko. She describes her and says: "that lovely modesty with which she received him, that softness in her look, and sighs."¹⁸³ Imoinda's beauty, faithfulness, and love for Oroonoko are contrasted with Sycorax's ugliness, unfaithfulness and hatred that others especially Prospero owe her. She is described as "this damn'd witch Sycorax, for mischiefs manifold and sorceries terrible to enter human hearing, from Argier... was banish'd: for one thing she did they would not take her life."¹⁸⁴ This refers to Shakespeare's portrayal of her. In addition to being a witch, she is a prostitute. This implied in Prospero's words that she "was banish'd: for one thing she did they would not take her life."¹⁸⁵ Her child was not legitimate.

Therefore, she was banished from her country and considered as a prostitute. Sycorax in Shakespeare's play is completely different from Behn's Imoinda, and despite the fact that they share the same status as native women, the way male and female writers depict them is dialogic. In her novella, Behn speaks about the native people including women in a positive way. The dialogue appears at the level of the character depiction and ideology. Shakespeare's ideology was patriarchal and oppressive at the same time, but Behn's is to defend the right of women through the slaves and native women. In their different depictions of women, their dialogue is strikingly apparent.

Imoinda is portrayed as a victim in the midst of a society that does not know compassion. In fact, the Old King, a powerful man, uses his power to satisfy his sexual lusts. Though he knew that Imoinda was another man's mistress, his insistence to have her has become an obligation and abused his power as a king and as a man to compel her to gratify his desires. The narrator says about the king: "the obedience the people pay their king was not at all inferior to what they paid their gods, and what love would not oblige Imoinda to do, duty would compel her to."¹⁸⁶ While Shakespeare portrays Sycorax as a witch because of her powers, Imoinda is forced to have sex with the King. This is Behn's manner of condemning the abuse of patriarchal power.

Besides, the writer criticises the veil and the harem as she sees in them means of control and subjugation. In order to respond to Shakespeare's condemnation of women who do not conform to their domestic roles, the veil and the harem are metaphors for domesticity. In fact, the veil shows man's desire to promote women's confinement to the domestic space. Therefore, Behn criticises it through her novella. Her objective is to emancipate women from patriarchy. She criticises the royal veil which the King sent to Imoinda. She says: "He was therefore no sooner got to his apartment but he sent the royal veil to Imoinda; that is the ceremony of invitation: he sends the lady he has a mind to honor with his bed, a veil, with which she is covered, and secured for the king's use; and 'tis death to disobey; besides, held a most impious disobedience."¹⁸⁷ This

quote suggests that the royal veil is sent to Imoinda, and from the moment she receives it, she has no right to disobey because, according to the narrator, refusal means death. Since Behn uses Oroonoko for a feminist intent, she shows that he does not adhere to patriarchy. The King's attribution of the royal veil to Imoinda "raised" him "to a storm."¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, the King's invitation of Imoinda to honour his bed exemplifies his patriarchal ideology for his possession of women and his conception of them. The king, who represents the male society of that epoch, considers women as sexual objects used for entertainment and pleasure. In addition, they are used as commodities and objects which they use and leave when they want. This is illustrated through the narrator's words: "the king went to entertain himself with some one of his wives or mistresses"¹⁸⁹, and this shows that he does not possess one woman but a plurality of them.

In addition, the veil is a means of restricting women's freedom and adherence to the public sphere. Wearing the veil shortens the opportunity to women to show publicly. In this respect, Fatima Mernissi in her *Beyond the Veil* claims: "The veil means that the woman is present in the men's world, but invisible; she has no right to be in the street."^{189a} Mernissi hints to women's lack of freedom by wearing the veil because it is simply a means that promotes the domesticity and control of women. Veil permits women to exist only in the private and husband's world, but publicly they are completely invisible.

Furthermore, Behn criticises the otan or harem which in her own view encourages men of power to have as many wives and mistresses as they can. She says: "the otan, which is the palace of the king's women, a sort of seraglio, it was both just and lawful for him so to do."¹⁹⁰ When a woman enters the harem of the king, her life and freedom are lost forever since when they are old, the king throws them as useless objects. A man could not enter to the king's harem other than him. The harem and the veil also imply that women are not allowed to be seen in public. Thus, a parallel can be drawn with the domestic sphere in British society, and the author

condemns them all. In this context, Midgley claims that British feminists criticised British women's oppression with reference to "the enslavement of women in the harem under 'Oriental despotism'".^{190a} This implies that western feminists attack the harem because it promotes domesticity and the reference to Oriental women stands as a metaphor for their confinement in British society.

Women become commodities in the marriage market. Behn, consequently, condemns polygamy through her criticism of the king who has many wives. She says: "the Old king... had many wives and many concubines."¹⁹¹ We have seen that Miranda's marriage to Ferdinand is used by Prospero as the means for the objective of reconciliation. Behn claims that polygamy determined life in Coramantien but that Oroonoko did not adhere to this act that is so degrading to women. This is shown in his courting of one woman only. In this perspective, Laura J. Rosenthal states: "Oroonoko loves Imoinda against the norms of his culture, which practises polygamy."¹⁹² The quote highlights the author's feminist stand against the objectification of women. In fact, Behn criticises the King's polygamy by referring to Oroonoko's love for one woman.

In addition to Imoinda as being a native woman, Onahal is another one on whom the abuses of patriarchy are heavily exercised. Onahal represents the native women of her country as well as British women. She is used by Behn so as to refer to the status British women have since she stands as a metaphor for the oppressed in the British society at that time. Indeed, Onahal is considered as a sexual object and was among the king's victims. Onahal's status as the 'Other' does not allow her to revolt but instead she executes the king's commands. Her rejection of being the King's property appears in her very words: "I am the abandoned mistress of a King."¹⁹³ This shows explicitly her victimisation as the abandoned. She is used when she is a young lady, but with age she became useless. Her revolt appears when she tells Aboan: "I can have lovers

still.”¹⁹⁴ Onahal is another native woman through whom Behn achieves her revision of native women as a whole and of British women in particular.

Endnotes

- ¹²⁴ Ann Thompson, *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 3.
- ¹²⁵ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 27.
- ¹²⁶ Laura E. Donaldson, ‘The Miranda Complex’ in *Decolonizing Feminisms: Race, Gender & Empire Building* (London: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 17.
- ¹²⁷ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 43.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid., 32.
- ¹²⁹ Ibid., 54.
- ¹³⁰ Ibid., 41.
- ¹³¹ Ibid., 25-26.
- ¹³² Tebbe Theo, ‘Young Women in Shakespeare’s Comedies’ (Bachelor thes., Auflage : Norderstedt Germany, 2008), 3.
- ¹³³ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 42.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid., 44.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid., 65.
- ¹³⁶ Tebbe, ‘Young Women in Shakespeare’s Comedies’, 2.
- ¹³⁷ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 26.
- ¹³⁸ Donaldson, ‘Miranda Complex’, 16.
- ¹³⁹ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 48.
- ¹⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁴² Ibid., 38,
- ¹⁴³ Donaldson, ‘Miranda Complex’, 17.
- ¹⁴⁴ Ferguson, *Subjects to Others*, 22.
- ¹⁴⁵ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 37.
- ¹⁴⁶ Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, ed., *The Tempest : Third Series* (London : Black Publishers, 1999),27.
- ¹⁴⁷ Vaughans, *Tempest*, 27.
- ¹⁴⁸ Tebbe, ‘Young Women in Shakespeare’s Comedies’, 4.
- ¹⁴⁹ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 47.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 42.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid., 38.
- ¹⁵² Ibid.,75-76.
- ¹⁵³ Ibid., 27.
- ¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 43.
- ¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 27.
- ¹⁵⁶ Rachel Ingalls quoted in Colleen Regan, ‘Feminist Readings of The Tempest’: Viewed 3 April 2014.<
[http:// cmregan.iweb.bsu.edu/portfolio/resources/The-Tempest_Research-Paper_REVISED.pdf](http://cmregan.iweb.bsu.edu/portfolio/resources/The-Tempest_Research-Paper_REVISED.pdf)>.
- ¹⁵⁷ Shakespeare, *Tempest*,63.
- ¹⁵⁸ Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915* (London : University of North Carolina Press, 1994) ,1.
- ¹⁵⁹ Burton, *Burdens of History*, 10.
- ¹⁶⁰ Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: an Analysis of Women’s Travel Writings & Colonialism* (New York : Routledge, 1991), 29.
- ¹⁶¹ Mills, *Discourses of Difference*, 27.
- ¹⁶² Behn, *Oroonoko*, 108.
- ¹⁶³ Burton, *Burdens of History*, 10.
- ¹⁶⁴ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 75.

- ¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 141.
- ¹⁶⁶ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 35.
- ¹⁶⁷ Aparna Mahanta, 'Race and Gender in Patriarchal and Colonial Discourse: The Case of the Foul Witch Sycorax in the Context of Modern Witch Hunting Practices in India' in *The Tempest* (India: Dorling Kindersley, 2009), 200.
- ¹⁶⁸ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 35.
- ¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 38.
- ¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 35.
- ¹⁷¹ Edrik Joel Lopez, *The World Contracted to Recognizable Images* (2008), 5.
- ¹⁷² Ibid.
- ¹⁷³ Linsey D. Allnat, *For Sex or Marriage: The Commodification of Women in William Shakespeare's Measure for Measure and Aphra Behn's The Rover*, (2008), 45.
- ¹⁷⁴ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 35.
- ¹⁷⁵ Mahanta, 'Race and Gender in Patriarchal and Colonial Discourse', 200.
- ¹⁷⁶ Burton, *Burdens of History*, 10.
- ¹⁷⁷ Mahanta, 'Race and Gender in Patriarchal and Colonial Discourse', 209.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁹ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 94.
- ¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 95.
- ¹⁸¹ Ibid., 94.
- ¹⁸² Behn, *Oroonoko*, 81.
- ¹⁸³ Ibid., 82.
- ¹⁸⁴ Shakespeare, *Tempest*, 35.
- ¹⁸⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁶ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 84.
- ¹⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 85.
- ¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 87.
- ^{189a} Fatima Mernissi, *Beyond The Veil : Male-Female Dynamics in Modern Muslim Society* (Cambridge : Schenkman , 1975), 143.
- ¹⁹⁰ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 86.
- ^{190a} Midgley, *Anti-slavery*, 166.
- ¹⁹¹ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 83.
- ¹⁹² Laura J. Rosenthal, "Oroonoko : Reception, Ideology, and Narrative Strategy" in *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*, ed. Derik Hughes and Janet Todd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 158.
- ¹⁹³ Behn, *Oroonoko*, 91.
- ¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* responds to the condition of women and the slaves through her characters. Through analyzing her feminist response to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, I came to the conclusion that as a female writer she revises the relegated status of women by her female narrator, Oroonoko, and Imoinda. The slave is used as a metaphor for the domestic confinement of women. Behn responds to Shakespeare's portrayal of Caliban through her description of Oroonoko. She revises the condition of the slave at the same time as she revises the condition of women both British and Oriental. Her revision is, in fact, used as a metaphor that hints to the parallel position that women and slaves possess in society. Women are subjugated to the patriarchal rules of their societies in the same way as slaves are subjected to their masters' service. Dialogism is prevalent in relation to Shakespeare's patriarchy, Behn's feminism and female representation. Behn looks for the improvement of the condition of both native and British women through her female characters: the white female narrator, Imoinda and other native women. She revises Shakespeare's patriarchal definition of Miranda and Sycorax through her female characters. She answers Shakespeare's portrayal of European women as submissive, emotive, and compassionate by her independent female narrator who as a white female is burdened with the responsibility of emancipating Oriental women. As for native women, Behn revises their condition through Imoinda and Onahal who are the prominent and the only native female characters through whom she achieves her response to Shakespeare's portrayal of Sycorax as a witch and prostitute. She also criticises the harem, the veil, polygamy, and marriage as she sees in them means of female commodification and objectification.

My analysis focuses on the dialogic nature of Behn's novella to Shakespeare's play. Having studied Behn's novella as a response to Shakespeare's play allowed me to provide an example of dialogism that exists between the two writers' literary productions. Behn's

intertextuality shows in her borrowing of the slave that is present in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The way she dealt with the slave in her novella hints to her personal ideology as a woman. Therefore, her revision of *The Tempest* allows her a special place in society which is her adherence to the male colonial enterprise.

Dialogism is considered as a type of intertextuality. A literary text is always said to be a response either by direct influence or by what is called literary affinities to another text. Writers who share the same historical background always share commonalities in their writings. Literary texts must be studied in terms of their relationship to their precursors and successors anticipating future responses of others on them. Behn's *Oroonoko* is not the only text that revises the condition of women in Shakespeare's play. Julie Taymor's adapted film *The Tempest* (2010) is another feminist response to Shakespeare's portrayal of women as weak creatures. The film highlights this intertextuality between both works. It may be considered as a feminist response to Shakespeare's play. Taymor's film parodies *The Tempest* simply because it stars Prospera rather than Prospero to serve her intentions as a female film director.

V. Bibliography

a. Primary Sources

- Behn, Aphra. *Oroonoko, or, The Rover and Other Works*. London: Penguin, 1992.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. London: Penguin, 1995.

b. Secondary Sources

- Allnat, Linsey D. *For Sex or Marriage: The Commodification of Women in William Shakespeare's Measure for Measure and Aphra Behn's The Rover*. Houston: University of Houston, 2008.
- Amore, Adelaide P. "Introduction", *Oroonoko, or, The Royal Slave: A Critical Edition*. The United States of America: University Press of America, 1987.
- Athy, Stephanie., and Cooper Alarcon, Daniel. 'Oroonoko's Gendered Economies of Honor/ Horror: Reframing Colonial Discourse Studies in the Americas', *American Literature* Vol.65, No. 3, 1993. 415- 443.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Brown, Laura. 'The Romance of Empire: Oroonoko and The Trade in Slaves' In *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993. 23-62.
- Burton, Antoinette. *Burdens of History: British feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915*. London: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Clarke, Richard L. W. 'Mikhail Bakhtin Discourse in the Novel', Viewed 3 April 2014.<
<http://www.rlwclarke.net/courses/LITS3304/20082009/07BBakhtinDiscourseintheNovel>

%28Overview %29.pdf >.

- Donaldson, Laura E. 'The Miranda Complex' in *Decolonizing Feminisms: Race, Gender & Empire Building*. The United States of America: University of North Carolina Press, 1992. 13-30.
- Enderson, Bonnie S. 'Frauenemancipation and Beyond : The Use of the Concept of Emancipation by Early European Feminists' In *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*. New Haven & London : Yale University Press, 2007. 82-95.
- Ferguson, Moira. *Subject to Others: British women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670-1834*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Gallagher, Catherine. 'Behn in the Canon', In *The Critical Fortunes of Aphra Behn* by Janet M. Todd. Columbia: Camden House, 1998. 105-113.
- Holmesland, Oddavar. 'Aphra Behn's Oroonoko: Cultural Dialectics and the Novel' *ELH*, V. 68 N. 1 (Spring 2001). 57-79.
- Ingalls, Rachel quoted in Colleen Regan. 'Feminist Readings of The Tempest'. Viewed 3 April 2014.< [http:// cmregan.iweb.bsu.edu/portfolio/resources//The-Tempest_Research-Paper_REVISED. pdf](http://cmregan.iweb.bsu.edu/portfolio/resources//The-Tempest_Research-Paper_REVISED.pdf)>.
- Lopez, Edrik Joel. 'The World Contracted to Recognizable Images '. PhD diss., Berkeley: University of California, 2008.
- Mahanta, Aparna. 'Race and Gender in Patriarchal and Colonial Discourse : The Case of the Foul Witch Sycorax in the Context of Modern Witch Hunting Practices in India' In *The Tempest*. India: Dorling Kindersley, 2009. 199-210.
- Mernissi, Fatima. *Beyond The Veil : Male-Female Dynamics in Modern Muslim Society*. Cambridge : Schenkman, 1975.

- Midgley, Clare. 'Anti-slavery and the Roots of 'Imperial Feminism' ' In *Gender and Imperialism*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1998. 161-177.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourses of Difference: an Analysis of Women's Travel Writings & Colonialism*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Offen, Karen. 'How (and Why) the Analogy of Marriage with Slavery Provided the Springboard for Women's Rights Demands in France, 1640–1848' In *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*, ed. Sklar, Kathryn Kish and Stewart, James Brewer. New Haven & London : Yale University Press, 2007. 57-73.
- Rosenthal, Laura J. 'Oroonoko : Reception, Ideology, and Narrative Strategy' In *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*, ed. Hughes, Derik and Todd, Janet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 151-164.
- Sills, Adam 'Surveying the Map of Slavery in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko', *Journal of Narrative Theory*, V.36, N.3 (Fall 2006). 314-340
- Spencer, Jane. *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Sussman, Charlotte. 'The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and Slave Culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko' In *Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism*, ed. Heidi Hunter. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993. 212-230.
- Theo, Tebbe. 'Young Women in Shakespeare's Comedies'. Bachelor thes., Auflage : Norderstedt Germany, 2008.
- Thompson, Ann. *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Tusan, Michelle. Review of Midgley, Clare, *Feminism and Empire: Women Activists in Imperial Britain, 1790-1865*. *H-Soz-u-Kult, H-Net Reviews*. May, 2009.

- Vaughan, Virginia Mason and Vaughan, Alden T. ed., *The Tempest: Third Series*. London: Black Publishers, 1999.
- Wyrick, Laura. *Facing Up to the Other: Race and Ethics in Levinas and Behn*. Texas: Texas Tech University Press, 2001.