

Domination over Nature and/or Domination over Woman? *The Tempest* and *The Taming of the Shrew* by William Shakespeare¹

*Seda ARIKAN

Department of Western Languages and Literatures, Firat University, Turkey
Corresponding Author: Seda ARIKAN

Abstract: Feminist studies of all ages have focused on the characters in plays of Shakespeare in order to constitute a canonical tradition and to reflect the patriarchal era in which they were written. The representation of women in Shakespearean plays has been harshly criticized as misogynist and so attributing to the propagation of this misogynist attitude with their effect on the collective unconscious. The “blow-up movement” of feminism in the eighteenth century opened the way to various alternative feminist analyses of Shakespeare’s plays. Among many feminist approaches, ecofeminism that derived from feminism and took its roots from ecocriticism appeared as a powerful alternative critique in the 1970s. Ecofeminist criticism mostly began with the purpose of analyzing male dominance over both nature and woman. As the relationship between nature and woman is a well-known phenomenon, ecofeminists analyze the place of male power over nature and women in literary works. In this study, the canonical works of Shakespeare will be analyzed parallel in light of this ecofeminist questioning. Domination of nature and woman by male ideology occurs in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and *The Taming of the Shrew* interconnectedly. By looking at these plays, the general tendency of patriarchal power to constitute a dichotomy such as reason-unreason, civilized-primitive, and domestic-wild and to attribute the inferior characteristics to the other will be deconstructed. While in *The Taming of the Shrew* the shrew of the play, Kate, is referred to as a wild animal that must be dominated by male power, in *The Tempest*, nature with its occurrences is identified as wilderness that should be defeated. In this respect, this study will examine *The Tempest* and *The Taming of the Shrew* in terms of ecofeminism, which will bring the relationship between domination of nature and domination of woman by male power to the fore.

Keywords: ecofeminism, *The Tempest*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, domination over nature and woman.

Date of Submission: 02-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 05-09-2017

I. INTRODUCTION

In the twentieth century, literary criticism added various sub-branches related to social theories that attempt to deconstruct the established dominated structures of earlier periods. This questioning of the binary oppositions constructed in favour of power-holders also reached into literary theories and resulted in a multi-dimensional deconstruction of meta-narratives. In order to give voice to those who were *suppressed* by meta-narratives, earlier dichotomies were re-evaluated especially in terms of power relations. In this respect, two cornerstones of binary oppositions, which are *culture/nature* and *male/female*, came on the scene intertwiningly. Out of recognition of these dichotomies, ecocriticism, which “designates a site at which material-discursive practices are invested with post-anthropocentric meanings” (Opperman, 2011: 459), and ecofeminism have appeared as social, political and literary criticisms of constructed anthropo- and androcentric ideologies. Ecocriticism, which defends “the idea that nature speaks” (Kull, 1998: 344), has opened the way to other voices that want to say a word on not only hierarchy but also patriarchy. In this respect, “[a] mind familiar with ecology cannot avoid the many profound and disturbing connections to be made here between women and western history, nature and western history” (Rueckert, 1996: 117). Western civilization, in aiming to civilize *wild* nature and *wild* woman, focused on the exercise of power over nature and woman and the perpetuation of narrations of all kinds that served to strengthen the excuses of that oppression. Deconstruction of these narrations that ignore the self-identity of nature and woman and oppress them under cover of improvement and civilization opened the way to the re-reading of earlier narrations. As ecocritic Robert Kern writes, this attempt

¹This article is a revised and expanded version of the paper presented with the same title at “First International Conference in Iran on Shakespeare Studies” held by University of Tehran on 26th-27th of November 2014.

is “reading against the grain”, meanwhile “to recover the environmental character or orientation of works whose conscious or foregrounded interests lie elsewhere” (Kern, 2000: 30). In this process, instead of an “ego-conscious” point of view”, the “eco-conscious” approach emerges (Love, 1996: 230), which is the main point of both ecocriticism and ecofeminism.

In established hierarchical order of western civilization, nature is viewed both as an object of domination and exploitation, and as a nurturing maternal place. Within this structure, woman’s place in the natural order is the one that is nearest to nature. From a patriarchal point of view, then, women exist at the bottom of the hierarchal pyramid. This is the intersection point where nature and woman are identified as similar entities that should be tamed on behalf of patriarchy, colonizer, reason, and civilization. In this respect,

Ecofeminism involves the recognition that [deep ecology and feminism] share a common ‘logic of domination’ (Warren, 1994: 129) or underlying ‘master model’, that ‘women have been associated with nature, the material, the emotional, and the particular, while men have been associated with culture, the nonmaterial, the rational, and the abstract’ (Davion, 1994: 9). (quoted in Garrard, 2004: 23)

Unquestionably, this association is a kind of fiction that functions to exercise power by *the master over the other* by constructing a slave. Ecofeminism not only attempts to display the fiction of that narrative, but also to take action to reverse the conventional attributions. “Ecological feminists (“ecofeminists”) claim that there are important connections between the unjustified domination of women, people of color, children, and the poor and the unjustified domination of nature” (Warren, 2000: 1). Ecofeminist criticism argues that “if women have been associated with nature, and each denigrated with reference to the other, it may seem worthwhile to attack the hierarchy by reversing the terms, exalting nature, irrationality, emotion and the human or non-human body as against culture, reason and the mind” (Garrard, 2004: 24). So, in ecofeminist critiques, as this, it is crucial to follow the traces of hierarchical constructions in canonical works in terms of nature and female oppression, and to decipher them by reversing the dichotomies on behalf of the *suppressed* from an ecological and feminist perspective. In this respect, Shakespeare’s two plays, as a part of western canon, give us the opportunity to conduct an ecofeminist re-examination of the place of nature and woman which western philosophy traditionally pictured as having a symbiotic relationship. Examining Shakespeare’s placement of *woman* in *The Taming of the Shrew* (2003) and *nature* in *The Tempest* (2006) illuminates the concerns of ecofeminism.

II. DOMINATION OVER NATURE AND/OR DOMINATION OVER WOMAN?

Ecocritics generally focus primarily on the main dichotomy of nature/culture. As a significant ecofeminist critic, Val Plumwood states that “[h]uman relations to nature are not only ethical, but also political” (1993: 13) and this political approach goes parallel to the prosperity of “the master”, “the colonizer”. So, nature/culture opposition appears as a tool to serve the benefits of the power-holder. This power that Plumwood labels as “master identity” states itself as the master of animals, slaves, savages, and women who are identified as non-humans (1993: 192). In this way, master identity legitimizes the exercise of *exclusion* and *control* over *the other* that is identified as inferior.

The category of nature is a field of multiple exclusion and control, not only of non-humans, but of various groups of humans and aspects of human life which are cast as nature. Thus racism, colonialism and sexism have drawn their conceptual strength from casting sexual, racial and ethnic difference as closer to the animal and the body construed as a sphere of inferiority, as a lesser form of humanity lacking the full measure of rationality or culture. (Plumwood, 1993: 4)

This kind of exclusion and control designates the ideological operation of the period in which *The Tempest* was written. The play is significant in that it reflects this “control” of nature especially in terms of colonialist ambitions. As Estok emphasizes, in *The Tempest*, “[i]t is a space whose Otherness, difference, exoticism, and promise of wealth make it very fertile ground for the seeds of colonialist ambitions and fantasies” (2011: 114). The new-comers of the island are similar to the invaders of nature in the play. This colonialist invasion is given by the words of Caliban, the native resident of the island, to Prospero, the main invader who is the representative of western civilization, as follows:

This island’s mine by Sycorax my mother,
Which thou tak’st from me: when thou cam’st first
Thou strok’st me, and made much of me. Wouldst give me
Water with berries in’t. And teach me how
To name the bigger light, and how the less
That burn by day, and night. And then I loved thee,
And showed thee all the qualities o’ th’ isle,
The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place, and fertile.
Cursed be I that did so! [...]
Which first was mine own King. And here you sty me

In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me
The rest o' th' island. (1.2.332-44)

As Prospero takes the island from Caliban's mother, a sorcerer like him, he becomes the "master" of all the living and non-living things on the island. In this process, as his name suggests, Prospero justifies his colonialist deeds by picturing both nature and Caliban as wild entities that should be tamed. Vera L. Norwood suggests, "[s]urvival in a hostile natural environment is an ego-gratifying achievement and feeds the achievement-oriented male psyche, enabling men to return to civilization and improve their culture" (1996: 323). In a similar way, in the name of civilization and culture, Prospero tries to shape Caliban as a "civilized" being in return for learning about the "qualities" of the island to exercise power over it later on. The power relations established in the master/slave dichotomy are prevalent in *The Tempest* and it operates parallel to the dichotomy of civilized/primitive.

According to Plumwood, the master identity, "which is more than complot, rather a heritage, a constructed form of culture and rationality, shapes all of the entities" (1993: 190). Designating other entities as "primitive" and the self as "civilized" is the main method of exercising power over *the other*, and thus colonizing it. "The master's colonization denies the other he calls nature in two main ways, both by denying self's dependency on and relationship to it, and by denying and cancelling its independence of self" (Plumwood, 1993: 191). The denial of the other as a self-sufficient entity gives the master the right to create a slave for himself. At this point, the master's attitude towards nature conceived as female and woman is based on the dialectic of civilization and primitiveness. In *The Tempest*, Prospero's approach towards the first inhabitant of the island that is Sycorax, the mother of Caliban, reflects the political manipulations of the master both on nature and woman. The civilized colonizer Prospero justifies his deeds against Sycorax, whom he calls "the foul Witch," and Caliban, whom he designates as native, born in nature, so uncivilized. The real owners of the island are pictured as uncivilized animals by civilized westerners. Prospero's daughter Miranda calls Caliban as "abhorred slave" and she mentions that he didn't know a word but "wouldst gabble, like / A thing most brutish" (1.2.357-8) until she taught him the language. The criterion of civilization that is designated by the power holder is imposed on the other; in the play both on nature and its components. In this respect, the colonizer's control and domination operates on nature in general and on "lower" beings in particular. As Plumwood states, "[k]ey aspects of environmental critiques are centered on the way that control over and exploitation of nature contributes to, or is even more strongly linked to, control over and exploitation of human beings" (1993: 13). When viewed through an ecofeminist perspective, the control by both Prospero and the other representatives of western society of the island and Caliban clearly shows civilized colonizer posing nature against reason. This ideology conceives nature as follows:

Nature, as the excluded and devalued contrast of reason, includes the emotions, the body, the passions, animality, the primitive or uncivilized, the non-human world, matter, physicality and sense experience, as well as the sphere of irrationality, of faith and of madness. In other words, nature includes everything that reason excludes. (Plumwood, 1993: 19-20)

Without doubt, by attributing irrationality to nature, the master colonizer establishes a significant excuse for his colonialist deeds. Just like the domination over woman is generally dismissed as outside of the field of male reason, domination over nature and its non-human world is defined as an inevitable act in the history of civilization. As Plumwood states, "[t]he reason/nature story has been the master story of western culture" (1993: 196) and in *The Tempest*, Prospero's control of the island and Caliban could be conceived as a part of that story.

While *The Tempest* reflects this colonialist point of view on nature, it also presents a dissident approach to the *civilized* colonialist ideal via *kind* Gonzalo. Gonzalo creates a utopic island ideal in contrast to that of colonialist sovereignty and he defines this ideal as follows:

Had I plantation of this Isle my Lord-
[...]
And were the King on 't, what would I do?
[...]
I' the' Commonwealth I would (by contraries)
Execute all things: for no kind of traffic
Would I admit: no name of magistrate:
Letters should not be known: riches, poverty,
And use of service, none: contract, succession,
Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard none:
No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil:
No occupation, all men idle, all:
And women too, but innocent and pure.
No sovereignty. (2.1.138-51)

Gonzalo's ideal country, presented as resembling socialism or even anarchism, is clearly contrary to any dominant European feudalism, and deconstructs the main institutions of an average western state. The main point is that his ideal country is not based on binary oppositions or master-slave dialectic. The emphasis on the innocence and pureness of women sounds like a criticism of abuse of women under the power of western male sovereignty. His following statement in favour of nature and its equal usufructuary is related to his attitude towards women and all other entities accepted by male-dominant ideology as inferior beings, born with the nature to render service to the master. Gonzalo's following speech is totally contrary to that of other western males in the play in terms of being eco-conscious not ego-conscious one.

All things in common Nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavor. Treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine
Would I not have. But nature should bring forth
Of it own kind, all foison, all abundance
To feed my innocent people. (2.1.153-8)

Ecocritical point of view generally accepts that "in the dominant Euro-American culture, humans are not only *distinguished* from nature, but *opposed* to it in ways that make humans radically alienated from and superior to it" (Garrard, 2004: 25). To ecocriticism and ecofeminism, the main conflict lies in this alienation. In *The Tempest*, while Prospero and other Europeans have the aim both to distinguish themselves from nature and exercise power on it, Gonzalo believes not in the sovereignty of man but of nature.

Gonzalo's warning against the interference of the male in nature and woman identity recalls the ecofeminist point of view on man's *penetration*. David Mazel writes, "[t]o use a suggestive term deliberately, originary acts of environment correspond to simultaneous and logically complementary acts of penetration – a word I use consciously to suggest an analogy between the discourses of environmentalism and sexuality" (1996: 140). In this sense, the apparatuses of penetration as a deliberate domination over nature and woman can be examined from an ecofeminist point of view in the play. Some critics, such as Louise Westling analyze "the strange combination of eroticism and misogyny that has accompanied men's attitudes toward landscape and nature for thousands of years" (1996: 5) and to stand against ecological destruction, racial and sexual discrimination, the functioning of colonialist ideology should be deconstructed.

As nature is labelled as feminine in patriarchal understanding, it is thought that nature should serve for the physical needs of the male. Thus, instrumental connotations are attributed to woman and nature in patriarchal societies. In other words, the perception that nature and woman are valuable to the extent that they serve man is a dominant idea. (Kümbet, 2012: 191)

In *The Tempest*, both nature and woman, Miranda as the representative, are also valuable to the extent that they serve the male master. However, Gonzalo's attitude appears as a challenge to that patriarchal understanding and gets closer to ecofeminist approach. So, the play puts two contradictory approaches towards nature and woman, the one of Prospero and the others who want to own the island picturing "[t]he natural world as dangerous, unpredictable, untamed" (Estok, 2011: 115) and the other of Gonzalo which favors what nature produces.

Ecofeminism "implies creating a democratic culture beyond dualism, ending colonizing relationships and finding a mutual, ethical basis for enriching coexistence with earth others" (Plumwood, 1993: 196). That's why, as a critical approach, it presents the diverse nature of all beings in terms of equal existence. The diversity that is necessarily derived from ecology, as argued by Ynestra King, should be mentioned here:

A healthy, balanced ecosystem, including human and nonhuman inhabitants, must maintain diversity. [...] the wiping out of whole species, corresponds to reducing human diversity into faceless workers, or to the homogenization of taste and culture through mass consumer markets. (1989: 26)

So, the wiping out of women, racially "disadvantaged" people and all non-human beings by mastery model is related to the defect of not accepting diversity in nature. The mastery model, which legitimates not only anthropo- but also androcentrism, can be traced also in both of Shakespeare's plays.

In both *The Tempest* and *The Taming of the Shrew*, anthropocentrism and androcentrism run parallel with. In *The Tempest*, not only nature, as mentioned above, but also woman, Miranda, is accepted as a desired subject and even commodity. In *The Taming*, besides Katharina, nature and its elements such as animals are pictured as wild beings that should be tamed. So, the binary opposition between man/woman, culture/nature, civilized/primitive, desiring subject/desired object, wilderness/domesticity, and human/animal are constructed from an anthropo- and androcentric point of view against eco-gynocentric one. Sharon Doubiago asserts that ecofeminism should examine these dichotomies, as "ecology consciousness is traditional woman consciousness" (1989: 41, 42). So, the conception of the status of nature and woman as overlapping each other should be re-examined. In *The Tempest*, besides nature's being accepted as a commodity and material that should be colonized, Miranda is also presented as a kind of goods that serves in favour of man. Her presence just serves to make a new agreement between power holders. Greg Garrard mentions that "[e]cofeminism would appear to

present us with a mirror-image of patriarchal constructions of femininity that is just as limited and limiting” (2004: 23). This construction is apparent in *The Tempest* especially in terms of Miranda. In the play, that Miranda mentions she is “certainly a maid” (1.2.429) recalls the virgin island which is also expected to be as such by the male colonizer. Ferdinand’s aim is significant in this respect, as he says that he wants to make Miranda “Queen of Naples”, “if [italics mine] she is a virgin” (1.2.450-1). Furthermore, Prospero, as the patriarchal power, controls both nature and woman and he treats them as passive subjects. It resembles to a common patriarchal story “which has spoken mainly of conquest and control, of capture and use, of destruction” (Plumwood, 1993: 196). While Prospero says to Miranda: “Obey, and be attentive” (1.2.38), it sounds like his control also over nature.

In *The Tempest*, the masculine culture wants to control the feminine domesticity in terms of nature and woman. By “eroticizing the landscape”, the characters want to “embrace the scene [here, the island and Miranda] intimately, deeply, totally, as a man desires a beautiful woman” (Abbey, 1992: 5). Not only western males, but also Caliban frequently mentions his erotic desires for Miranda. He mentions that if Prospero had not prevented him from seducing Miranda, he “had peopled else / This Isle with Calibans” (1.2.351-2). The males’ fantasy and desire on the island and Miranda overlaps with what Annette Kolodny names as colonialist America’s “oldest and most cherished fantasy”:

[...] a daily reality of harmony between man and nature based on an experience of the land as essentially feminine—that is, not simply the land as mother, but the land as woman, the total female principle of gratification—enclosing the individual in an environment of receptivity, repose, and painless and integral satisfaction. (1996: 171)

The role attributed to land and woman as items for men’s satisfaction is the main point that is criticized by ecofeminists. The demand for satisfaction opens the way to what Edward Abbey calls “usufructuary”. Usufruct on land and woman is an unofficial but very operative request of androcentrism that ecofeminists aim to abolish. In this respect, the male characters’ wish to dominate both nature and Miranda in *The Tempest* is a result of the notion of usufruct of men on land and female body over history that has not been totally ruined yet.

The masculine desire for domination over nature and woman is also the main topic in *The Taming*. In the Induction scene of *The Taming*, the words of Page reflect the role of obedient woman such as in *The Tempest*: “My husband and my lord, my lord and husband; I am your wife in all obedience” (Induction 2. 107-8). The main idea of the play that the true nature of woman is as obedient not wild operates through the play, and the dichotomy of masculine dominance and feminine obedience appears in relation to nature/culture opposition. That is the general notion of the civilized male culture, which accepts female nature as a primitive wilderness that should be tamed. The need to tame the female nature in *The Taming* resembles the need to tame natural wilderness in *The Tempest*. The imperialist nostalgia that lies in the heart of the pastoral island of *The Tempest* appears as “a masculine gaze at a feminized landscape and its creatures that masked the conquest and destruction of the ‘wild’ continent” (Westling, 1996: 52) and in *The Taming* this wild continent is Katharina. The wish of androcentric power to tame the wild is then pictured in *The Tempest* in terms of nature and in *The Taming* in terms of woman. So, cannibalism in *The Tempest* and wilderness in *The Taming* are presented as primitive situations belonging to nature that should be destroyed by the hands of civilized male power.

As mentioned above, in *The Tempest*, Prospero and Miranda aim to civilize Caliban, described as a savage and a deformed slave. The attitude of western civilized man towards *the other* is apparent in the play in terms of cannibalism and Caliban. Val Plumwood, in her book *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*, relates this kind of attitude to “the labour of colonized non-westerns and non-whites”:

As Vandana Shiva points out, it is not only women’s labour which traditionally gets subsumed ‘by definition’ into nature, but the labour of colonized non-western, non-white people also. The connections between these forms of domination in the west are thus partly the result of chance and of specific historical evolution, and partly formed from a necessity inherent in the dynamic and logic of domination between self and other, reason and nature. (1993: 4)

So, the opposition constructed by western male ideology between self/other and reason/nature is supported by anthropo- and androcentric discourses, one of which is colonialism. In *The Tempest*, “[m]ost of the work with cannibalism takes postcolonialist approaches that largely overlook interrelationships between ecophobia and colonialism” (Estok, 2011: 77). Caliban is continuously identified with pejorative terms, especially with animalistic characteristics and adjectives both by westerners and by himself. He is called “poor monster”, “a most delicate monster” (2.2.148, 84) frequently. The internalized inferiority is also verbalized by Caliban himself when he mentions he is a “sot” (3.2.89) or “thrice-double ass” (5.1.298). The pejorative discourses of the colonizer towards *the other* accepted as wild and primitive and the ecophobic colonialism of England is given ironically with Trinculo’s following words about Caliban:

What have we here, a man, or a fish? Dead or alive?

[...] A strange fish!

Were I in England now (as once I was) and had but this fish

Painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece
of silver. There, would this monster make a man. Any
strange beast there makes a man. When they will not give a
do it to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a
dead Indian. (2.1.24-32)

In ecofeminist approach, although “[d]estructive ‘hyper-separated’ and hierarchical gender oppositions are fundamental to the pastoral vision, (...) it also has a highly problematic racial dimension” (Garrard, 2004: 54). So, the colonialist gaze towards Caliban should also be examined in terms of ecofeminist defense in favour of precluded others of nature. It is significant to realize that the ecofeminist analysis of master identity is related not only to gender but also to class and race. Plumwood expresses this master identity as follows:

Much feminist theory has detected a masculine presence in the officially gender-neutral concept of reason. In contrast, my account suggests that it is not a masculine identity pure and simple, but the multiple, complex cultural identity of the master formed in the context of class, race species and gender domination, which is at issue. (1993: 5)

So, the master’s point of view towards Caliban in *The Tempest* operates in relation to the domination of the other who has a different race and class origin. In the play, the “civilized master” aims to tame Caliban, a son of primitive nature. Stephano says about Caliban: “If I can recover him, and keep him tame, and get to Naples with him, he’s a present for any Emperor that ever trod on neat’s-leather” (2.2.65-7). Ecocritics and ecofeminists examine the identity that is similarly constructed for colored people and animals by the master ideology as a political project; thereby deconstructing the animal/human dichotomy which is parallel to emotion/reason opposition. Greg Garrard, in his book *Ecocriticism*, takes the origin of this dichotomy to Descartes and mentions:

Descartes hyperseparated mind and body, and denied to animals not only the faculty of reason, but the whole range of feelings and sensations that he had associated with thought. As a result, he saw animals as radically different from, and inferior to, humans (...) ‘reason’ has so often been called upon the hyperseparate both men from women and humans from animals, and so can stand in for both dominant terms. (2004: 25)

This gendered reason/nature dualism founds the basis of ecophobic attitudes of the characters both in *The Tempest* and in *The Taming*. While in *The Tempest*, “civilized western man” tries to tame Caliban –pictured as animal, inferior but still a member of nature–, in *The Taming*, woman is conceived as a being that should be tamed such as the uncivilized Caliban, like an animal.

The most apparent metaphors in *The Taming* are related to animals and the master’s taming of them. As Shea and Yachnin mentions, “*The Taming of the Shrew* is habitat to a diverse range of animal life. More or less from largest to smallest” (Shea and Yachnin, 2011: 108). Katharina is compared to the animals while the play also presents “predominantly male, upper-class activities of hunting, coursing, and hawking” (Shea and Yachnin, 2011: 110). Katharina’s disobeying nature brings her the infamous title, *the shrew*. Besides, she is frequently called “stark mad”, “wonderful forward”, “fiend of hell”, “a devil”, “wild cat”, “waspish with a sting”, “a soldier with iron”, and “Katharina the curst”. According to Plumwood,

That women’s inclusion in the sphere of nature has been a major tool in their oppression emerges clearly from a glance at traditional sources: ‘Woman is a violent and uncontrolled animal’ (Cato, 1989: 193); ‘A woman is but an animal and an animal not of the highest order’ (Burke, 1989: 187); ‘I cannot conceive of you to be human creatures, but a sort of species hardly a degree above a monkey’ (Swift, 1989: 191). (quoted in 1993: 19)

Plumwood’s list of quotations is long; however, the examples above are enough to reflect not only the patriarchal discourse against woman but also the anthropocentric discourse against animals. Similarly, elements of nature including both animals and women are illustrated as passive primitive objects that should be civilized or tamed in *The Taming of the Shrew*. Petruccio, who is described as *the master of taming-school*, summarizes his aim for Katharina as follows:

Thou must be married to no man but me;
For I am he am born to tame you Kate,
And bring you from a wild Kate to a Kate
Conformable as other household Kates. (2.1.268-71)

Petruccio’s aim reflects the archaic master-male ideology, which considers any non-obedient characteristic of woman as against her nature. In wanting to shape non-obedient Kate as other “conformable household Kates”, he reflects the dominant ideology of master-male trying to form female as a *pure goodness*. Val Plumwood accepts this formation of woman identity as threatening and misleading and she excludes this formation from her ecofeminist theory:

Like any other diverse position, ecological feminism is amenable to careful and less careful statements, and some versions of ecofeminism do provide a version of the argument that is the

goodness of women which will save us. (...) [However;] [w]omen do not necessarily treat other women as sisters or the earth as a mother; women are capable of conflict, of domination and even, in the right circumstances, of violence. (1993: 9)

However, Kate's non-obedient nature is accepted as wild and against the true nature of woman by the male characters in the play. They attempt to change and tame her protesting nature, in their words, by dominant male culture. At the beginning, Kate stands against all of the attempts to restraint her identity. While Hortensio says that she will not find any mates unless she is gentler and milder, her answer is as follows:

I'faith, sir, you shall never need to fear.

I wis it is not half way to her heart.

But if it were, doubt not her care should be

To comb your noddle with a three-legg'd stool,

And paint your face, and use you like a fool. (1.1.61-5)

Upon those words, Hortensio prays "From all such devils, good Lord, deliver us!" (1.1.66) So, Katharina's non-obeying attitude towards marriage and her defensive discourses make her being accepted as "devil", "stark mad" or "wonderful forward" (1.1.66, 69) by males. Her attitude towards marriage is oppositional in the same way. She reproaches her father for his attempts to match a mate for her with the following words: "I pray you, sir, is it your will / To make a stale of me among these mates?" (1.1.57-8) Although she has no intention to get married with those mates, we witness the taming process of Katharina through the play. This attitude is mostly the general patriarchal notion of the period that accepts woman as commodity. In a similar way, the males of the play describe women as their commodities, such as their lands or their animals. The master identity of the play, Petruchio, mentions this idea as follows:

She is my goods, my chattels, she is my house,

My household stuff, my field, my barn,

My horse, my ox, my ass, my any thing, (3.2. 228-30)

So, similar to Caliban's being accepted as a commodity and his representation as a wild animal, women's place in *The Taming* is stated as being an obedient and animal-like domestic object for the sake of cultured, civilized, desiring masculine subjects.

At the end of the play, androcentric ideology announces the victory of the dominant masculine subject managing to *tame the shrew*. There are three married women at the end of the play: Hortensio's widow, Katharina (now married to Petruchio) and her "good-tempered" sister Bianca (now married to Lucentio). Although at the beginning Katharina was the shrew of the play, at the end, ironically, she allows her husband Petruchio to win the wager and she is titled as "the most obedient" by coming at once upon her husband's call. Petruchio summarizes Katharina's transformation from a wild shrew into a tamed obedient as follows:

Marry, peace it bodes, and love, and quiet life,

And awful rule, and right supremacy,

And, to be short, what not that's sweet and happy. (5.2.109-11)

Katharina's father Baptista celebrates his son-in-law and he gives twenty thousand crowns more as "Another dowry to another daughter, / For she is chang'd, as she had never been" (5.2.115-6). To celebrate his victory even more, Petruchio wants to display even more Katharina's "new-built virtue and obedience" and he charges Katharina "tell these headstrong women /What duty they do owe their lords and husbands" (5.2.131-2). Katharina's long speech reflects the internalized inferiority and obedience of women to the greatest degree:

Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,

Thy head, thy sovereign; one that cares for thee,

And for thy maintenance; commits his body

To painful labour both by sea and land,

To watch the night in storms, the day in cold,

Whilst thou liest warm at home, secure and safe;

And craves no other tribute at thy hands

But love, fair looks and true obedience;

Too little payment for so great a debt.

Such duty as the subject owes the prince

Even such a woman oweth to her husband.

And when she is froward, peevish, sullen, sour,

And not obedient to his honest will,

What is she but a foul contending rebel,

And graceless traitor to her loving lord? (5.2.147-61)

Katharina both blames the other women for *wounding* their "lords", "governors" with their fury and recommends them to "kneel for peace":

I am asham'd that women are so simple

To offer war where they should kneel for peace,
Or seek for rule, supremacy, and sway,
When they are bound to serve, love, and obey. (5.1.162-5)

It is significant that the roles change at the end of the play; however, Katharina's deviation from a rebellious woman to an obedient wife –in Petruccio's terms "Her new-built virtue and obedience" (5.2.119)– is not approved of by all of the characters. Hortensio's widow and even good-tempered Bianca criticize Katharina's transformation as follows:

Widow.

Lord, let me never have a cause to sigh
Till I be brought to such a silly pass.

Bianca.

Fie, what a foolish duty call you this? (5.2.124-6)

Nevertheless, the last speech of the play by Hortensio seals the androcentric message in the play: "Now, go thy ways; thou hast tamed a curst shrew" (5.2.189). This occasion is similar to Caliban's will to acquire a master for himself in *The Tempest*. He accepts to show every fertile inch of the Island in exchange for "a new master". He internalizes his slave-like position that he conceives being separated from Prospero and gaining a new master as "freedom, high-day, high-day freedom" (2.2.175).

III. CONCLUSION

Consequently, in the most general sense, an ecofeminist approach aims to deconstruct the notion of dominating and taming both nature and woman by anthropo- and androcentric approaches. Besides, competitive individualism, human chauvinism, instrumentalism, hierarchy, and power ambition that are thought of as the reasons of the modern environmental crisis are criticized by ecofeminism (Kümbet, 2012: 190). In this sense, literature as a significant apparatus of ideological domination should be reconsidered in terms of ecofeminist approaches. The words of Nature should be listened to attentively when it speaks: "I am here still, at the bottom of things, warming the roots of life; you cannot starve me nor tame me nor thwart me; I made the world, I rule it, I am its destiny" (Cather, 1966: 95). What Nature defends is similar to the speeches and attitudes of Katharina in *The Taming* at the beginning of the play. However, the dominant patriarchal ideology does not give permission for this voice to continue until to the end. While masculine culture "sees wilderness as a place for defining virility, for playing out aggressive, adventure-seeking, sometimes violent impulses" (Norwood, 1996: 323), it also places women in a status away from wild and wilderness, such as in the examples of Katharina and Miranda. Without doubt, "women's separation from pristine nature can be traced to the belief that woman is to man as nature is to culture" (Norwood, 1996: 324). So, ecofeminist awareness is crucial on behalf of both nature and woman identity. According to Garrard, "ecofeminism emphasizes environmental justice to a far greater degree than deep ecology. The logic of domination is implicated in discrimination and oppression on grounds of race, sexual orientation and class as well as species and gender" (2004: 26). In this respect, from an ecofeminist approach, *The Tempest* and *The Taming of the Shrew* intersect in terms of the inherited logic of anthropo/androcentric domination over nature and woman. In addition, this domination operates related to racial, sexual, and class discriminations that are constructed to divide species and gender in a hierarchical order, such as in the examples of Caliban and Katharina.

The operation of domination identified by power relations should be detected and reexamined in literary discourses in this sense. To Plumwood, "[w]e do have still some power to reject the master's definition of us as passive bodies to be subsumed by his agency, mutilated, imprinted and conditioned. We remain active and intentional subjects, and we can still effect change" (1993: 195). Thus, to stand against the master's definition of nature and woman generally within master-slave dialectic, ecofeminist resistance is a crucial way out. This is the resistance that will prevent the abolishment of nature and so all of the otherized species within it. Plumwood theorizes that the end of the domination will come with the failure of tyranny as the master denies his dependence on the other and as he is insensitive to the limits of resistance. So, it is inevitable that this attitude would bring self-destruction of the master: "Since he is set on a course of devouring the other who sustains him, the story must end either with the death of the other on whom he relies and therefore with his own death, or with the abandonment of mastery, his failure and transformation" (Plumwood, 1993: 195). The latter seems more possible as new approaches in social theory, such as ecofeminism, have created ways for transformation and deconstruction of binary oppositions. As "[b]oth the women's movement and the ecology movement are sharply critical of the costs of competition, aggression, and domination" (Merchant, 1990, xvi), it is significant to analyze these costs in canonical works and to turn inside out for an eco-gynocentric understanding.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abbey, E. (1992). *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*. London: Robin Clark.
- [2]. Cather, W. (1966). *The Kingdom of Art: Willa Cather's First Principles and Critical Statements 1893-1896*. Ed. Bernice Slote. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- [3]. Doubiago, S. (1989). "Mama Coyote talks to the boys". In: J. Plant (Ed.): *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*. London: Green Print, pp. 40-44.
- [4]. Estok, S. C. (2011). *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [5]. Garrard, G. (2004). *Ecocriticism*. London&New York: Routledge.
- [6]. Kern, R. (2000). "Ecocriticism-What Is It Good For?". *ISLE* 7.1: 9-32.
- [7]. King, Y. (1989). "The Ecology of Feminism and the Feminism of Ecology." In: J. Plant (Ed.): *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*. London: Green Print, pp. 18-28.
- [8]. Kolodny, A. (1996). "Unearthing Herstory." In: Cheryll Glotfelty&Harold Fromm (Eds.): *The Ecocriticism Reader- Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens&London: The University of Georgia Press, pp. 170-181.
- [9]. Kull, K. (1998). "Semiotic Ecology: Different Natures in the Semiosphere". *Sign System Studies*, 26: 344-371.
- [10]. Kümbet, P. (2012). "Ekofeminizm: Kadın, Kimlik ve Doğa [Ecofeminism: Woman, Identity and Nature]". In: Serpil Oppermann (Ed.): *Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat [Ecocriticism: Environment and Literature]*. Ankara: Phoenix, pp. 171-206.
- [11]. Love, G.A. (1996). "Revaluing Nature: Toward an Ecocritical Criticism." In: Cheryll Glotfelty&Harold Fromm (Eds.): *The Ecocriticism Reader- Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens&London: The University of Georgia Press, pp. 225-240.
- [12]. Mazel, D. (1996). "American Literary Environmentalism as Domestic Orientalism." In: Cheryll Glotfelty&Harold Fromm (Eds.): *The Ecocriticism Reader- Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens&London: The University of Georgia Press, pp. 137-146.
- [13]. Merchant, C. (1990). *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*. San Francisco: Harper.
- [14]. Norwood, V.L. (1996). "Heroines of Nature." In: Cheryll Glotfelty&Harold Fromm (Eds.): *The Ecocriticism Reader- Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens&London: The University of Georgia Press, pp. 323-350.
- [15]. Oppermann, S. (2011). "A Roundable Discussion on Ecocriticism". In: S. Oppermann, U. Özdağ, N. Özkan and S. Slovic (Eds.): *The Future of Ecocriticism*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 459-479.
- [16]. Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London&New York: Routledge.
- [17]. Rueckert, W. (1996). "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism." In: Cheryll Glotfelty&Harold Fromm (Eds.): *The Ecocriticism Reader- Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens&London: The University of Georgia Press, pp. 105-123.
- [18]. Shakespeare, W., Proudfoot, R., Thompson, A., Kastan, D. S., & Morris, B. (Eds.). (2003). *The Taming of the Shrew*. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- [19]. Shakespeare, W., Raffel, B. and Bloom, H. (Eds.). (2006). *The Tempest*. New Haven&London: Yale UP.
- [20]. Shea, J. A, Yachnin, P. (2011). "The Well-Hung Shrew". In: Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton (Eds.): *Ecocritical Shakespeare*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, pp. 105-122.
- [21]. Warren, K. (2000). *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters*. New York&Oxford: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers.
- [22]. Westling, L. (1996). *The Green Breast of the New World: Landscape, Gender, and American Fiction*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

*Seda ARIKAN. "Domination over Nature and/or Domination over Woman? *The Tempest* and *The Taming of The Shrew* by William Shakespeare." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, vol. 22, no. 09, 2017, pp. 36-44.