Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Signature:

Kara Zimmerman April 24th, 2010

Hermeneutics and Heterotopias in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and the Cult TV Series *LOST*

by

Kara M. Zimmerman

Adviser Harry G. Rusche

Department of English

____

Harry G. Rusche
Adviser

____

John Bugge
Committee Member

____

Eddy Von Mueller
Committee Member

April 24th, 2010

Hermeneutics and Heterotopias in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and the Cult TV Series *LOST*

By

Kara M. Zimmerman

Adviser Harry G. Rusche

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2010

Abstract

Hermeneutics and Heterotopias in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and the Cult TV Series *LOST*
By Kara M. Zimmerman

This thesis is an analysis of the ambiguity inherent in *The Tempest,* which lends the play to a multiplicity of interpretations (*hermeneutics*). *The Tempest*'s nature as a play, and the thematic ambiguity of the play's narrative itself, are very similar to the manner in which TV land has become a hermeneutic heterocosm for the viewing audience. For this reason, I assert that *The Tempest* can be defined as a cult work. In addition, this thesis examines how *The Tempest* has changed over time to become, for modern audiences, a work of speculative fiction, because it takes place in a world that operates in a manner differently from the real world. Consequently, modern speculative fiction has appropriated various elements from *The Tempest.* Furthermore, to demonstrate the appropriative quality that the play has acquired, I compare it to an analogous cult TV series within the speculative fiction genre, the ABC series *LOST,* and attempt to answer why Shakespeare and *The Tempest* have become staples of the speculative fiction genre, and what has rendered *The Tempest* such an influential work. An analysis of their island heterotopias serves to demonstrate both works' endlessly interpretable nature, which is why both works have culminated extensive fan and critical interest.

Hermeneutics and Heterotopias in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and the Cult TV Series *LOST*

By

Kara M. Zimmerman

Adviser Harry G. Rusche

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2010

Table of Contents

1. Introduction…..1

2. *The Tempest*: A Brief History..6

“A Proliferation of Prosperos”..11

3. Fiction: Second Worlds & Heterocosms..18

4. Speculative Fiction: Utopias, Dystopias and Heterotopias..24

Utopia..27

Dystopia..28

Heterotopia..35

LOST’s Island is a Heterotopia “Par Excellence”..40

5. The Medium is the Message: Theater and “Cult” Media..44

Endlessly Deferred Narrative & Hyperdiegesis..45

The Cult of Shakespeare..49

6. *The Tempest* and its Influence..52

7. *LOST* (2004-2010)..63

Cult TV Series..65

Oceanic 815’s Fate & Prospero’s Fortune..66

The Island or “The Magic Box”..68

The Proliferation of Prosperos on Lost’s Island..79

John Locke..79

Benjamin Linus..80

Jacob..81

Ariel, the Loyal Servant Who’s “Always Been There”..85

Sycorax, Prospero's Dark Foil 89
"…This Island with Calibans" 90
Benjamin Linus 90
Charles Widmore 91
The Man in Black 93
Imprisonment 95
Checkmate 96
Jacob vs. The Man in Black: The Utopian and the Dystopian 98
The Endgame: Redemption 103
Conclusion 107
8. Conclusion 109
Endnotes 112
Works Cited 114
Bibliography 124
Appendices 128
Appendix A: Shakespeare, Early Media Critic? 128
Appendix B 136
Appendix C: *The Island of Dr. Moreau* 138
The Island (of Dr. Moreau) 140
"This Island with Calibans" 146
Ariel 152
Prospero 156
"Obsessional Catastrophe" 159

"Totalitarianism"..161

Wells's "Hostility to Science" 163

"The Mind Invasion" 166

Prendick: The New Moreau 168

1. INTRODUCTION

An Island. What comes to mind? I start to think of palm trees and ukuleles, margaritas and beaches, suntan lotion and sand—Paradise. Utopia. It is an image they sell in commercials about Bermuda, the Bahamas, Hawaii. A place where I can just *relax.* At least, being a college student, that is what I imagine. The concept of an island offers an escape from the reality of papers and mid-terms, books and stifling dorm rooms. However, upon further reflection, the insularity of the island can prove to be problematic. After all, it is separated from humanity, lonesome, and apart from technology. How would I be able to check out a new book at the library? How would I catch an episode of my favorite show *LOST*? Would the island prove far too removed from civilization? Would I go stir crazy? In a way, the island's nature makes it the perfect place for paradise and Hell. Its "apartness" renders it perfect for the "get away"—the vacation, holiday—pure *escapism,* yet it can also be an isolated, lonely prison. Just ask Robinson Crusoe.

William Shakespeare's use of the island in *The Tempest* is not without incident. The island, for Prospero, is a utopian escape from the pressing obligations of his dukedom in Milan, but it is, at the same time, a dystopian nightmare for the original inhabitants of the Island who become Prospero's slaves, specifically Ariel and Caliban. In addition, its location is a mystery, thus making it hard to get there… and to escape. Virginia Vaughan and Alden Vaughan write in the Arden *Tempest* that it is the play's "imprecise location" that gives it a "'second world' structure, in which faraway islands, imaginary and often 'enchanted', are ideal" and this attracts science fiction and fantasy writers to the story for modern adaptations and appropriations (74). It is the island's ambiguous location that yields its narrative to the speculative fiction genre, a genre which Orson Scott Card asserts it defined "by its milieu" (Card 19). The Vaughans also make

this point when they write, "[i]solated geographically or psychologically from the first world, and usually distanced as well by climate … and way of life …, the island setting provides artists and writers with an opportunity to comment on human relations without reality's constraints" (74). In this manner, the island provides a ground for *speculation* about the human condition within an "Other" space—or a heterotopia. For this reason, "Prospero's island … implicitly invites future utopian or dystopian reimaginings and reimagings of the same or other islands" (74).

The island is literally two worlds in one. It is a romantic space in this regard. Northrop Frye discusses this concept in *The Secular Scripture* (1978). Reality in romance is one's identity, and, in order for one to truly *know* themselves, one needs to confront his/her opposite—or to look in a mirror. G.K. Hunter examines this in his article "Northrop Frye's 'Green World': Escapism and Transcendence" when he says "[t]he effect of depth in Shakespeare's plays is, of course, regularly created by the co-existence of opposites, which can easily have value-bearing names attached to them: escapism, imaginative fulfillment, realism and so on" (Hunter 19). In romance, often there is the interchange between two worlds—the "idyllic" realm, which is "above ordinary experience" characterized by "happiness, security, and peace" while emphasizing childhood, and then there is the "nightmare world," which constitutes "exciting adventures" involving "separation, loneliness, humiliation, [and] pain" (Frye 53); often the "nightmare" world is merely the normal world, as Hunter states, "[Frye's] rhetoric defines green world with glowing ambiguity but his normal world is describe in term of stereotyped negatives" (19). In essence, the "normal" world of reality is desolate in relation to the wonders possible in the imaginative "utopian" realm. Hence, our world can often become the dystopian nightmare.

Contrarily, fiction can be used to show a realm that is far worse than our own, teaching us to value the real world.

Chad Walsh discusses these worlds in relation to the idea of "utopia" and "dystopia" in his book *From Utopia to Nightmare* (1962). In this case, he is not using utopia in relation to Thomas More's *Utopia*—he stretches the definition to signify "not merely an ideal or perfect society, but also any imaginary society presented as superior to the actual world" (25), and dystopia is simply the opposite—a society that is "inferior" to the world; Walsh relates utopia and dystopia to the concept of pre- and postlapsarian states of man. Adam and Eve fell not just downwards, but upwards as well. According to Walsh, this "downward fall was the loss of innocence" or a jaunt into dystopia following the expulsion from Eden, but they simultaneously "fell upwards into first-hand knowledge of good and evil, creativity and destruction" (150), which was what Frye would call the regaining of our identity. Before the fall, Adam and Eve did not know that their Eden was perfect, but having been cast into the "real" world, they became aware of what they had loss; by confronting something different, they were suddenly granted the ability to define their world.

Anthony Hecht in his article "Paradise and Wilderness: The Brave New World of *The Tempest*" explains how the island is the ideal setting for a utopia. He states that in medieval Europe, the conception of the *hortus conclusus* (enclosed garden) was an analogy to the Garden of Eden, because it is a singular space that is blocked off from the wilderness, thus making order out of disorder (357). Similarly, the island is a place set apart from the wilderness of a continent and most human civilizations. It is land enclosed by water, making it an ideal location within which to reconstruct society. However, the Island could also be easily swayed towards dystopian ends. Chad Walsh states that one of the most common "anti-Utopian" themes is that of the utopia

itself, because the facets that constitute utopia cannot possibly be homogenous for the entirety of the human populace, as one man's utopia may be another man's dystopia (74). In addition, the island can become not only an area that is like an "enclosed garden," making order from disorder, but it could also be a prison keeping one away from nature. Its dualistic quality renders it, in the words of Michel Foucault, a *heterotopia*—a place that is closed off, constituting more than one nature at once. This will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

It is the ambiguity inherent in *The Tempest* that lends itself to a multiplicity of interpretations (*hermeneutics*), all of which render the play itself a heterotopian space. The theater—a location that is ever-changing and removed from our time/space—is also a heterotopia wherein the play is performed in a variety of different manners and never in the same way. Its nature as a play, and the thematic ambiguity of the play's narrative itself, are very similar to the manner in which TV land has become a heterotopian heterocosm for the viewing audience. In addition, heterotopias are neither utopias nor dystopias—they are both at the same time. As previously mentioned, *The Tempest* demonstrates that Prospero's island is both spaces while being neither, and the play itself is neither a romantic island retreat nor a terrifying, illusory matrix. However, the play can be labeled in one genre that, as Orson Scott Card states, is defined by its milieu. *The Tempest* is a work of speculative fiction, because it takes place in a world that operates in a manner differently from the real world. This will be analyzed in chapters 4 and 6.

According to Ruth Morse, *The Tempest* has become one of the templates for modern speculative fiction. In order to examine *The Tempest* as a precursor to speculative fiction, or perhaps from a presentist perspective being regarded as a speculative work itself, and also the use of the heterotopia (in this case, the island) as the insular domain for the chess master character, this thesis will define *speculative fiction, dystopian* and *utopian* fiction, the notion of

the *heterocosm* as defined by Harry Berger Jr., and the concept of the *heterotopia* as defined by Michel Foucault and Robert Plank. I will also expand heterotopia to include the genre of the simultaneous utopia-dystopia. Furthermore, to demonstrate the appropriative quality that the Vaughans have ascribed to *The Tempest*, I have decided to compare it to an analogous cult TV series within the speculative fiction genre: the ABC series *LOST.* An examination of the medium of the play and the television serial will also be necessary, as well as terms used in media studies such as *hyperdiegesis* and *endlessly deferred narrative.*

My purposes is to look at *The Tempest* as a modern speculative work of fiction (specifically a *cult* work), wherein *The Tempest* is characterized by what a modern audience would call heterotopian features that provide the ambiguity necessary for the wide-variety of ergodic and hermeneutic play. Its "Other" location, coupled with this rampant hermeneutic participation, is what gives *The Tempest* a quasi-cult following. I assert that as modern audiences look back at *The Tempest* it strikes a chord with them as a tale eerily similar to that of a science fiction story even in spite of knowing that it was written in the seventeenth century. Prospero, now the mad scientist, the dark puppet master, and yet also the wizened, humanistic shaman, has become a chess master in an insular realm—a *heterotopic* realm—in order to change the characters. He uses illusion in a manner similar to an author uses his fiction to cast the characters into a world of fantasy. When they emerge and the "pageant" fades, they walk away having learned a lesson, such as we, as an audience, clap our hands to dispel the illusion. The journey into the second world will have offered us an experience to further reflect upon our present reality. In addition, an analysis of *LOST* will demonstrate how these qualities are prominent in cult media, and how *The Tempest* itself can be integrated into speculative fiction created in the modern era. Chapter 6 will attempt to answer the question—why *Shakespeare*? Why has the

Bard invaded speculative fiction? What about his Elizabethan and Jacobean plays speak to us today?

Where did it all begin? How did *The Tempest* traverse the gap from the Elizabethan stage to Altair IV of *Forbidden Planet*? I will begin by discussing the critical history of *The Tempest* and how interpretations of the play hinge on the reaction towards the enigmatic magician lording over the narrative—Prospero. Is he working his magic towards a redemptive purpose? Or perhaps because he finds his powers of manipulation, which remain neutered in Milan, can exceed the *deus ex machina* while on the enchanted Island? Power hungry or vengeful? Mad or passive? Bored or passionate? There is a multiplicity of perspectives spanning centuries, but for the modern audience? Prospero has become for us a source of anxiety—the chess master. His Island is the chessboard within which he can play the characters for his own purposes.

2. *THE TEMPEST*: A BRIEF HISTORY

Prospero "is clearly the play's central character. He has the most lines and manipulates the characters throughout. One's reaction to Prospero almost inevitably determines one's response to the entire play" (Vaughan 24). As a result, *The Tempest* has undergone many changes since the eighteenth century; usually because of the cultural attitudes towards Prospero. Critic Mark W. Scott emphasizes that *The Tempest* is a play full of "richness and complexity," and this has been the case throughout history. Like the Vaughans, Scott suggests that the play's complexity hinges on Prospero and an understanding of his character. He has been considered by modern critics as an "artist, magician, priest, visionary, and tragic hero" and has been connected to themes such as "reconciliation, education or nurturing, art and nature, and the connection between reality and illusion" (281). However, Prospero has not always been regarded with high esteem. According to the Vaughans, it is Prospero's consistent nature as an authoritarian that is the impetus for modern society's rejection or acceptance of his character (25). Yet Prospero can also be interpreted as the virtual "avatar" of Shakespeare who says farewell to his art/playwriting at the end (25). While this perspective has not been considered critically relevant for quite some time, it still crops up in critical studies and even fiction such as Neil Gaiman's graphic novel *Sandman*. In the same vein, the allegorical readings of the play, readings intent on symbolism, have become important to scholars (Scott 281), such as the popular psychoanalytic Freudian readings of the play. Scott makes note that scholars also focus on Miranda, the conflict of good and evil, the importance of religion and magic, and the play's overall construction (281). Scott states that before 1800, it was the dramatic structure of the play that critics focused on most and, in addition, paid special attention to the character of Caliban (282). Another critical interpretation is that Prospero is an answer to Dr. Faustus, as Harold Bloom writes,

> *The Tempest* is neither a discourse on colonialism nor a mythical testament. It is a wildly experimental stage comedy, prompted ultimately, I suspect, by Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.* Prospero, Shakespeare's magus, carries a name that is the Italian translation of Faustus, which is the Latin cognomen ("the favored one") that Simon Magus the Gnostic took when he went to Rome. With Ariel, a sprite or angel (the name in Hebrew for "the lion of God"), as his familiar rather than Marlowe's Mephistopheles, Prospero is Shakespeare's anti-Faust, and a final transcending of Marlowe (4).

Barring the colonialist interpretations, the Faustian look at the work, and the allegorical readings spattered throughout twentieth-century literary criticism, the past 50 years has shown an increased emphasis on the "dramatization of concepts and the strains of violence or tragedy" in *The Tempest,* and how these make the play unique and complex, and critics have largely turned the critical lens on Prospero's ambiguity (Scott 285), leading to an even more varied range of interpretations about the play as a whole. This will be analyzed further in Chapter 5 by looking at the role of the author-creator and the influence of "cults" within the speculative fiction genre.

In 1956, *Forbidden Planet* hit theaters. It was a science fiction appropriation of *The Tempest,* one that "used the technological magic of special effects to convey the play's visual qualities" (Vaughan 9). The use of *The Tempest* to demonstrate special effects breakthroughs emphasizes the modern look at the play's dramatic nature. As the Vaughans write, "Prospero's magic is consistently related to the staging of a spectacle: the storm, a disappearing banquet, the masque of Ceres and Juno, even the clothes stolen from Prospero's line—all signify Prospero's power to affect what people see through illusion" (8). According to Barbara A. Mowat, Prospero is a magus, and the magus is the homogenization of various literary traditions: "conjurer, con

man, witch, and wizard" (qtd. in Vaughan 8). Prospero's magic is fascinating—illusory and powerful, something that could easily be translated onto film in spectacular glory. It is for this reason that recent twentieth-century criticism is so interested in his magical abilities. Critics are looking at where his magic comes from, why it is used,[1] and why he relinquishes his power in the end, and what all these say about Prospero and the entirety of the play itself. These questions have many different answers depending on reader/audience perception, and this is demonstrated by the number of varying stage productions of *The Tempest* in recent times.

In a *New York Times* article from 1989, Michael Billington writes about the "proliferation of Prosperos" in British Theater. According to Billington, there were no fewer than five productions of *The Tempest* that year. Billington notes the wide range of viable Prospero adaptations; on the printed page, there is a set of three images each headlined with an application of Prospero from "Prospero as autocrat," "as stage manager," and "as colonialist." Billington contrasts the typical stage tradition that depicts Prospero as "a benign schoolmaster or a wizened sage who is a mixture of Santa Claus and Michelangelo's Noah" with Michael Bryant's Prospero at the National—"a tetchy autocrat turning purple with fury at the mention of his brother." The article describes Bryant's portrayal of Prospero's renunciation of magic and makes note of how it differs from the more 'traditional' renditions of the play:

> But the major insight of both director and actor came in Prospero's famous renunciation of magic: a speech often taken on a rising melodic curve so that we ignore what is being said; when, however, Bryant came to "Graves at my command have wakened their sleepers oped and let 'em forth by my so potent art," he stopped dead in his tracks as if haunted by his practice of Faustian

> necromancy. And when he "required some heavenly music" … it was in tones of a diabolist urgently seeking absolution (Billington).

Billington concludes his article by stating that while there may be a "perfect production of the *Twelfth Night* laid up for us in Heaven … *The Tempest* is too intractable a drama ever to yield up all its secrets in one production." Billington asserts that the 1980's inundation of *The Tempests* was a move towards banishing the "sentimental notion of the play as Shakespeare's farewell to his art and a thinly disguised piece of autobiography," and that "[instead] what has emerged is a play about a Faustian despot that combines myth, magic, and the occult with a reflection of Jacobean realties including power structure, philosophy, science, and exploration of the New World." The increasing number of *Tempest* adaptations, if anything, proves that there is a wide-range of viable interpretations from which to choose, and that, perhaps, the modern era is finding something new worth exploring in the text. Chapter 5 will discuss this idea further by looking at the function of the "endlessly deferred narrative" or what Matt Hills calls "perpetuated hermeneutic" in theater and speculative fiction—specifically *cult* speculative fiction.

As the Vaughans state, *The Tempest* "will remain a dynamic source of interpretation and debate. Appropriations and adaptations have highlighted *The Tempest*'s embodiment of power relations between father and daughter, master and servants, Europeans and natives" with literary critics "also realizing that [the play's] complex text embodies other topos, such as the proper uses of magic, alchemy, and technology; myth that envisions a more perfect world" (11). According to Russ McDonald, Shakespeare's intention was "to promise uncertainty and to insist upon ambiguity" (qtd. in Vaughan 24) so that the play would remain open to a wide variety of artistic interpretation. Most importantly, according to the Vaughans and Scott, the entirety of our reading of the play derives from our relation to the mysterious and ever-changing Prospero, and

as Billington has demonstrated in his theater review, Prosperos—more specifically *negative* Prosperos—have already begun to take front stage. As the Vaughans boldly state: "*The Tempest* for the twentieth-century, in sum, may be more conflict-ridden than ever before. Recent productions have emphasized the visceral over the lyrical, the text's underlying violence rather than its reconciliation" (124).

"A Proliferation of Prosperos"

Prospero has been one of the most widely appropriated characters from Shakespeare's canon, being spun into common character types such as the chess master, the mad scientist, and the white wizard. But what is appropriation? What does it imply? Is it a form of adaptation? Allusion? In *Adaptation and Appropriation,* Julie Sanders states that while the two terms are similar, their implications are significantly different. Adaptation "signals a relationship with an informating sourcetext or original," while appropriation usually "affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain" (26). She goes on to remark that an adaptation usually requires the "intellectual juxtaposition of (at least) one text against another that … is central to the reading and spectating experience," but in an appropriation, the original sourcetext does not need to be clearly acknowledged and "may occur in a far less straightforward context than is evident" (26). Thus, an appropriation, while still deriving elements from a source, can be entirely new. Additionally, Sanders writes that "adaptation and appropriation are dependent on the literary canon for the provision of a shared body of storylines, themes, characters, and ideas upon which their creative variations can be made" (45). Regarding Shakespeare, Sanders remarks that he was an "active adaptor and imitator, an appropriator of myth, fairy tale, and folklore, as well as of the works of specific writers" (46). This is one of the key reasons Shakespeare's works, *The Tempest* included, are so

widely and universally adapted, appropriated, and re-imagined. The mythical elements and frameworks of his plays are easily translatable and understandable.[2] In addition, this is also why his characters have been readily appropriated into a wide variety of media. They are, as Sanders states, becoming "new cultural products" for a new era. Chapter 6 will look into *why* Shakespeare is deliberately incorporated into speculative fiction. One of the most common, and applicable, archetypes that fits the positive/theurgistic Prospero model that permeated literary criticism of the seventeenth, early nineteenth and twentieth centuries is that of the shaman; however, even the shaman is regarded with immense suspicion in the modern era.

In "Pagan Survival: Why the Shaman in Modern Fantasy?" (1992), Roger C. Schlobin discusses the implications of the shaman in modern fantasy, and why this character, despite its positive role and godlike stature, is consistently feared and rejected by human society—specifically *modern* society. Schlobin describes the shaman as "one of the shadowy, most vital, and recurrent character types" and "one that strikes deeply into audiences with effects and powers" (39). Examples of shamans in modern fantasy are "J.R.R. Tolkien's Gandalf in the *Lord of the Rings*[3], Roger Zelazny's Sam in *Lord of Light*, Prospero and Roger Bacon in *The Face in the Frost*, C.S. Lewis' Merlin and Pendragon in *That Hideous Strength*, and Stephen Donaldson's Thomas Covenant in *White Gold Wielder*" (40). And despite the overwhelmingly positive role of the shaman—a role that was relegated to the theurgistic Prospero of yesteryear, modern fantasy still treats this character with "suspicion, antagonism, and prejudice – the standard fear reaction to the unknown" (42), because the shaman does not belong. His/her/its function is to be summoned when society is threatened (40). They are relegated to the role of protector in fantasy, yet they are simultaneously "the lightning rods of general social anxiety" for not only the characters, but for the readers (40), because of their enigmatic nature. The shaman is

an “uncomfortable ally” for society, because they are inherently “not social.” Thus, they are regulated to the role of “crisis creature” (41); yet their powers also place them on a pedestal above humanity, above the laws of nature, which, like any supernatural foe, make them a potential threat and thus intolerable. The “secret initiation rites” that breed shamans are also a cause for concern. The rites can be anything from “*deus ex machina* suddenness,” a hidden origin (from the reader and the characters) that automatically instills suspicion, the characters alienation – Schlobin cites that this is the reason that Shakespeare’s Prospero is mistrusted (42). Overall, Schlobin believes that the “greatest reason to distrust shamans’ otherness … is that they work in ways and with forces that are unintelligible to ordinary mortals” (42). For this reason, at the end of many fantasy stories, “when the monsters are gone, natural order [is] restored, and there is general celebration for the conquering heroes, shamans leave or are exiled” (43). This is to restore the natural balance of power and to eliminate the threat that the shaman inevitably poses to the whole of the human society. Similarly, Prospero in *The Tempest* breaks his staff at the end of the play as a symbol of his renunciation of magic. However, shamans are not the only archetypal figure regarded with suspicion—another is the mad scientist.

According to Robert Plank in *The emotional significance of imaginary beings; a study of the interaction between psychopathology, literature, and reality in the modern world* (1968), Prospero is “the original model of the mad scientist,” despite the fact that Prospero is not a mad scientist himself, because he is neither insane nor a scientist (168). However, the magic Prospero wields could be construed as a fictive precursor to “tech,” and thus Prospero could be relegated to the model of the mad scientist; furthermore, Prospero’s isolation does make him a carrier of “the germ of madness,” which means he has the potential to become “mad” (169). Due to the advances in technology, and our growing cultural anxiety regarding the future, Plank believes

that the mythic "mad scientist" has become "the epitome of our [modern/industrial] civilization" (169), because as humans we concoct fictional characters in a manner similar to Frankenstein or the magus; not only for our own amusements, or to mold characters with whom we can identify, but so that we can "form a world by which our world can be measured and oriented" (170). In essence, as a modern world, we are beginning to fashion our lives according to creations that cannot possibly exist, lending to our perpetual state of disillusionment and anxiety. After all, what can live up to a dream? Prospero fits this model accurately because he is able to shape his own environment according to his wishes, and his escapism into his magical world leads towards potential social disorder (as he is in a position of leadership and authority). In addition, when Prospero finally does abjure his magic, he does so reluctantly. After all, what could be better than being the lord of your own island?

Given the critical interest in Prospero's nature, it is no surprise that the character would eventually have generated (and been relegated) several character models—what Mowat calls the "magus" and Schlobin labels the "shaman." In addition, the Vaughans state that "Prospero's most controversial role is that of *master*" (Vaughan 26). Jean E. Howard remarks that Prospero has locked himself into the role of the "lonely … puppet master" (Howard 147) and, as previously discussed, Robert Plank asserts Prospero is the precursor to the "mad scientist." In Philip Gooden's *Name dropping: Darwinian struggles, Oedipal feelings, and Kafkaesque ordeals : an A to Z guide to the use of names in everyday language*, the definition of "Prospero-Like" describes someone who is "'controlling,' 'detached,' 'having magical powers', 'sage-like." In total, "*Prospero-like* suggests someone who is fundamentally wise and benevolent but capable of being severe" (158). *The Tempest*'s critical history indicates that Prospero's negative portrayals were primarily a result of modern criticism around the beginning of the twentieth

century, and, as Robert Plank suggests, Prospero has been “unmasked as an archetype of a colonialist” (158); hence, following the postcolonial criticism of the twentieth century, the central theme of incarceration in *The Tempest* lands Prospero in the role of “cultural gatekeeper” (Zabus 221)—or chess master.

Bryan Loughrey discusses the thematic strain of chess in *The Tempest* in the article “Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess” (1989):

> Like the chess player, [Prospero’s] mind is at home in the realms of the abstract calculation, and his specialized skills are equally irrelevant to the average citizen’s day-to-day concerns. … The spare, yet cunningly interlocked, plot which Prospero presides over itself resembles the progress of a game of chess (116).

Novelist Charlie Jane Anders would agree with this analogy when she writes, “science fiction [and fantasy] … [are] full of Prospero-type figures — older people who secretly manipulate events and treat other characters like chess pieces … [and] can see several moves ahead of everyone else.” Ratri Ray, editor of *The Atlantic Critical Studies* edition of *The Tempest,* also cites Prospero as a manipulator: “Prospero does control the entire action … like a puppet-master, [he] controls everyone, spirits and humans alike, and he does so through his magic, which some critics call his art” (134).[4] In *Svengali’s web: the alien enchanter in modern culture,* Daniel Pick cites Frederick Harrison’s[*] description of the “helpless collective state of public naivety in the face of scientific advances” when he writes, “an enchanted world, where everything does what we tell it in perfectly inexplicable ways, as if some good Prospero were waving his wand, and electricity were the willing Ariel” (qtd. in Pick 71); like Loughrey and Ray, Pick utilizes Prospero in order to depict someone pulling the strings. Pick’s book also refers to the hypnotist

---

[*] “a leader of the English positivist group who had followed and developed the scientific 'religion' first promoted by Auguste Comte” (Pick 71).

Svengali from George du Maurier's novel *Trilby* (1894) as "the story's own macabre 'Prospero'" (71), and Svengali is often regarded as the quintessential "puppet master" in literature. Margaret Atwood in *Negotiating with the dead: a writer on writing,* also asserts that Prospero and Svengali are somewhat interchangeable archetypal figures in literature by modern standards in the chapter "Prospero, the Wizard of Oz, Mephisto & Co.":

> [Prospero] is in a way the grand-daddy of all the rest [the Wizard of Oz, Svengali, Dr. Moreau, etc.]. We know his story. Betrayed... he fetches up on a tropical island, where he attempts to civilize the one native available to him … Caliban, and when this fails keeps him under control by aid of enchantment. ... Prospero calls up his familiar, the airborne elemental, Ariel, and proceeds to entice, confuse, and scare the pants off those erstwhile enemies whom Fate has now put into his power (115).

Atwood continues that "Prospero plays God." What's worse, if one does not conform or agree with Prospero, like Caliban, then one would be inclined to "call him a tyrant" (115). Atwood states that with a few minor narrative twists, Prospero could be called "the Grand Inquisitor" because he "[tortures] people for their own good" (115). Atwood also states that he could be called a "usurper," because "he's stolen the island from Caliban, just as his own brother has stolen the dukedom from his." However, usually, "[w]e — the audience — are inclined to give him the benefit of the doubt, and to see him as a benevolent despot" (115).

This wide array of viable interpretations of Prospero demonstrates that he is a magician who not only controls the characters on his fictive isle, but also sways our collective interpretation of *The Tempest,* and considering the recent proliferation of negative Prosperos taking control of the theater world and our minds, and the decidedly spectacular nature of Prospero's magic (or "art"), in so far as one could associate him with the archetypal "mad scientist," then perhaps the entirety of *The Tempest* could be regarded as *science fiction,* or more

broadly, *speculative fiction.* After all, Prospero is not only a mad scientist, but a magus like the worldly white wizard Gandalf in *The Lord of the Rings.* As Charlie Jane Anders writes at the end of "The Shakespearean Heroes Science Fiction Should Steal From," "Consider this a plea for more Prosperos, more shadow stage-managers, in science fiction — especially troubled ones, who repent and break their staffs at the end."

Besides his enigmatic characteristics and magical abilities, Prospero fits the speculative genre because he inhabits a mysterious "other" worldly place—the Island. According to Orson Scott Card, one of the primary characteristics of speculative fiction is setting. *The Tempest* is set on the island—a location that evokes images of Sir Thomas More's Utopia. It is a fascinating setting in that it is naturally set apart, or "Other," from the real/common world. It is a place surrounded on all sides by water, is hard to access, and difficult to escape. As a result, it is a location often shrouded in mystery; yet also a place that can become a paradisiacal escape from the ordinary. Its dualistic function renders it a "heterotopia," which will be analyzed in Chapter 4. Yet before looking into the role of the heterotopia in speculative fiction, first I must examine what it means to be *fiction.* What does *fiction* itself imply*?* Is it simply a text? Or is it literally another world within which we can escape? Perhaps it is an ambiguous heterotopia in and of itself—simultaneously real and imaginary.

3. FICTION: SECOND WORLDS & HETEROCOSMS

What is fiction? In *Second World and Green World: Studies in Renaissance fiction-making* (1988), Harry Berger Jr. begins his analysis of green worlds and second worlds by telling the reader the etymological meaning of the word: "*fiction* is etymologically and semantically related to terms meaning *invention, creation, construction,* and to terms meaning *illusion;* it suggests both *something made* and *something made up*" (7). Within fiction, two various worlds can be constructed. First, there is the second world *in* fiction and the second world *as* fiction (14). Green worlds usually overlap the "second worlds in fiction," because "second worlds in fiction" can also be dystopias, alternate histories, other planets, or any particular world built within fiction, like Middle Earth in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings.* When regarded as the second world *as* fiction, it is called a *heterocosm*[*]: "The second world as the imagery or hypothetical world of fiction … has been discussed extensively and brilliantly by Myer Abrams under the name of heterocosm, the second nature or second world 'created by the poet in an act analogous to God's creation of the world'" (14). Berger Jr. says that a second world can be "a playground, laboratory, theater, or a battlefield of the mind, a model or construct the mind creates, a time or place it clears in order to withdraw from the actual environment" (11-12). This process of world-building is reminiscent of the concept of *hyperdiegesis* that Matt Hill describes in *Fan Cultures*—a feature common in cult media. This will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Green worlds are usually constituted of two sides: "pure good and pure evil, wish fulfillment and nightmare" (Berger Jr. 15). Together, they make up a "mirror." Within each work, sometimes we are presented with both sides, and other times we are presented with one

[*] For example, "The second world of the *Utopia* is the total work, while the green world is Hythloday's island" (Berger Jr. 25-26).

side, but able to access the other, because without a basis for comparison, what does it matter if one world is "good" and one "bad"? According to Northrop Frye, romance as a genre is characterized by "its mental landscape," wherein the romance's "heroes and villains exist primarily to symbolize a contrast between two worlds" (Frye 53). There is the "idyllic world," upon which "happiness, security, and peace" are grafted, and there is an "emphasis … on childhood or on an 'innocent' … period of youth," and yet there is also the "demonic or night world" filled with "exciting adventures … which involve separation, loneliness, humiliation, [and] pain" (53). Generally, these romances will simply replace the "real world" with the "idyllic world," and the narrative storyline continually ascends toward "wish fulfillment" and then "sinking into anxiety and nightmare" in a manner that simulates "the world of waking consciousness" (53). Frye states that this "up-and-down movement of romance" indicates that the character of romance is comparing the idyllic world to his reality, hence "reality is equated with the waking world" and "illusion with dreaming or madness or excessive subjectivity" (53). This idea is used in a variety of media; for example, in the video game *The Legend of Zelda: A Link to the Past,* the main hero Link can traverse between two worlds—the Light World and the Dark World—through the use of a magic mirror. It is also in Stephen King and Peter Straub's novel *The Talisman,* where some characters are able to switch between the two parallel worlds—the known world and "The Territories." In the Trek franchise, there is a "mirror universe" that is closely tied with the "canon" universe of the series, where the world is much grittier and dangerous, wherein the commonly perceived Federation of Planets does not exist, and the Terrans (humans) have morally degenerated. However, this split between idyllic and nightmare is not always literal. The world of Edward Prendick in *The Island of Dr. Moreau* is turned on its head once he discovers Moreau's secret. What was once a utopian island with promise swiftly

turns into a nightmarish world where animals are tormented for the pursuit of some bizarre scientific goal (Hillegas 36). Usually, these fictive worlds provide balance and can be used against the other to define each other, and they oscillate between the two. Chapter 4 will discuss this oscillation in more detail with a closer look at the concept of *heterotopias*.

Just as fictive worlds are used to compare one another, the same could be said of fiction itself. Heterocosms are where "fiction" is the one providing "actuality with its model" (Berger Jr. 37). It is used as a foil to the natural/non-fictional environment. Using this model, the artist creates a world which creates a discourse with the audience. This "dialectic" is divided into "three hypothetical phases": first, there is the enjoyment that the author/artist/creator is attempting to give the audience, secondly there is the aesthetic principle, and third, there is the notion of teaching the audience with the use of the heterocosm. It is in between the second and third phases that the audience finds "both continuity and disjunction." There is "continuity insofar as the moral return begins … midway through the second world with the prepared space of art and is then carried beyond art out to life," but the disjunction lies in the "disengagement from art." This is why there is usually some "gesture of release," which psychoanalysts have labeled *breaking the transference* (37). A fictive example of this would be Prospero asking the audience to release him with applause at the end of *The Tempest.* After disengaging from the fictional environment, "the play world turns to artifice … as the characters turn back into actors, we are asked to share the playwright's responsibility … to transform the bound moment of esthetic delight into a model or guide for moral action" (37). Jean E. Howard discusses this in the article "Shakespeare's Creation of a Fit Audience for *The Tempest*." According to Howard, "[a] dramatist must develop strategies by which to shape the responses of the audience; as a moral matter, he must determine to what ends, and to what extent, to use such power" (142). Similarly,

we are asked to close the book and walk away from the story having gleaned something from the author's work.

According to Harry Berger Jr., the implication is "that profit is immanent in the very nature of artifice and fiction, but that fiction can fulfill itself only by going beyond itself and invading life" (37). These second worlds, created by artists, are conceived as "only temporarily self-sufficient and ultimately as interpretations which (they hope) will revise the first world," because the audience/reader will leave the work having faced a virtuality they can subsequently compare to reality. For this reason, "the reader or observer, placed at a distance from the second world, is enjoined not to lose himself in the world, but to interpret[*] and move on" (38). Interpretation is the process that "lies between pleasure and profit, between passive … and active … understand" (38). As Margaret Atwood writes, Prospero's "aim is not revenge … he wants to bring about their repentance. … Prospero uses his arts—magic arts, arts of illusion—not just for entertainment, though he does some of that as well, but for the purposes of moral and social improvement" (*Negotiating,* 115). However, what happens if audiences do not disengage or break the transference? What is the audience becomes lost in the illusion? Then Robert Plank's assertion that the mad scientist is the epitome of modern civilization comes to fruition, because we are becoming lost to our creations. Andrew Evans warns of this in his book *This Virtual Life: Escapism and Simulation in Our Media World* (2001).

In the foreword to *This Virtual Life*, magician Jerry Sadowitz writes that "magic has always been [his] form of escapism" (xi), much in the same way that Prospero uses magic to escape from his duties in *The Tempest*. Sadowitz also writes that "[e]scapism means different things to different people;" for example, Arthur Schopenhauer believed that "art was not only *the*

---

[*] Interpret here meaning "what the mind does to what it receives, or feels it receives – what the mind conceives as its original response to the data of appearance, its contribution to the discovery of the real" (Berger Jr. 38)

form of escapism but the key to mankind's salvation" (xi), however, Sadowitz does states that "escapism has come to take on many new and often dangerous meanings" in the modern era, and it can no longer be ignored (xi). In *Virtual Reality: Through the new looking glass* (1993), Brenda Laurel is quoted saying, "Reality has always been too small for human imagination. The impulse to create an 'interactive fantasy machine' is only the most recent manifestation of the age-old desire to make our fantasies palpable—our insatiable need to exercise our imagination … in worlds … that are different from those of our everyday lives" (qtd. in Pimentel and Teixeira 19). We are beginning to develop new technologies to enhance our natural inclination towards escapism—towards opening new portals to access these heterocosms. But is this withdrawal a good thing? Or a potential disaster?

Berger Jr. regards the withdrawal from reality into fiction as a learning process, and Evans poses that "escapism" is "a dereliction of duty" (68), much in the manner that Prospero's enchantment and fixation towards his "secret studies" was regarded by his brother Antonio as negligence. Evans writes that "[e]scapism is essentially an ego-driven or hedonistic activity, and as such can be quite irresponsible, since responsibility is not its goal" (68). Many of the accusations Evans makes against escapists could be applied to Prospero. He states that an "escapist" is generally charged with "shunning unpleasant reality." Usually the escapists "withdraws into some safe corner where he can live in peace and occupy himself with activities unrelated to the vital struggles of his contemporary world, or else – unable to find actual escape – he solaces himself by constructing a dream world wherein he can live 'in imagination', a world after his own heart's desire" (98).

Prospero's island functions in a similar manner to the virtual reality Evans warns against. Prospero uses the island's insular space as a method to work his magic and create his own

utopias, which will be discussed in Chapter 4. According to the Vaughans in the Arden *Tempest,* the "second world" structure of his unknown island provides Shakespeare and other writers who employ these kinds of spaces "with an opportunity to comment on human relations without reality's constraints" (74), similar to how Berger Jr. describes the purpose of fiction. More importantly, it is for this reason that the Island and, of course, other second world spaces are perfect for "utopian or dystopian reimagings" (75).

The advancement of technology is a double-sided quandary for the modern world. We regard the new inventions in our lives as inextricable necessities, and yet we also regard them with suspicion. Will new technology bring a utopia or dystopia? Andrew Evans asks if humans can "cope with so much artificiality in their lives," or whether we will become "maladjusted," "aggressive," "simulation sick," and "unable to communicate with each other in the real world" (3). More importantly, will our new technology "dominate us"? (3). These are the same questions that are being raised in the new speculative (and generally dystopian) fiction of the modern era. As Woody Allen says, "More than any time in history, mankind faces a crossroads. One path leads to despair and utter hopelessness. The other, to total extinction. Let us pray we have the wisdom to choose correctly" (Evans 227).

4. SPECULATIVE FICTION: UTOPIAS, DYSTOPIAS AND HETEROTOPIAS

The Tempest could, from a modern perspective, be read as a work of science fiction. Barring the early precursor to the "mad scientist," Robert Plank asserts that the title *Brave New World*[*] is an appropriation that emphasizes the influence *The Tempest* has had on science fiction (168), and Vladimir Nabokov once noted that Shakespeare's work was eerily similar to a modern science fiction tale (Kaku 89). It would certainly not be a far-cry to make that assertion now. In 1956, *Forbidden Planet* was released and regarded as a science fiction adaptation of *The Tempest.* For many, the film signaled the transcendence of the sci-fi genre from the world of B-movie camp into mainstream cinema. But why did this happen? What themes, motifs, and imagery do we commonly associate with science fiction and, more broadly, *speculative fiction*? In addition, Chapters 5 and 6 will try to answer why Shakespeare is so readily included within this cult-favored genre, and what the inclusion of Shakespeare does for speculative fiction.

What is speculative fiction? Although widely regarded as the inclusion of genres bridging the gap between fantasy and science fiction, the genre has often been regarded as something indefinable. Orson Scott Card attempts to define the genre in his book *How to Write Science Fiction and Fantasy*, and he does so by specifying that the genre is defined "*by its milieu*" or setting. Card states that if "a story doesn't take the reader into an otherwise unknowable place, it isn't speculative fiction" (Card 19). Card's book includes a list of the most common settings within the genre: "All stories set in the future, because the future can't be known," "stories set in the historical past that contradicts known facts of history [that are] called 'alternate world' stories," "stories set on other worlds, because we've never gone there," and "stories supposedly

[*] Interestingly, there is an online hypertext of *Brave New World* named after Prospero's daughter Miranda—*MIRANDA*: *a hypertext of Huxley's* Brave New World.

set on Earth, but … contradicting the known archaeological record." In addition, "stories that contradict some known or supposed law of nature," like magic and psychokinesis, and "all the stories speculating about future technologies" fall within this genre (17). Although those elements do not necessarily include a foreign setting in their descriptions, there is the implication that something is different about the environment because of the laws of nature have been altered. In short, speculative fiction is any sort of fiction that *speculates* about something plausible or imaginary in some way or another, with the most common branches of speculative fiction being fantasy and science fiction. For this reason, one could definitely place *The Tempest* in the realm of speculative fiction. It is set on another world—technically, the Island—a place that is without geographic location, and the play contradicts our laws of nature because Prospero is able to use the spirits of the Island in order to create illusions. Simply put, magic does not exist in the real world, but it dominates the landscape of *The Tempest*. According to Robert Plank, "Prospero's Isle belongs to a world which is not ours in a matter of operation," because the "physical and psychological possibilities of that world are different" (162). Furthermore, a common attribute of cult media is *hyperdiegesis,* the creation of large second worlds that are usually only partially explored within fiction, is also a feature that is notable in a wide variety of speculative fiction; hence, the majority of cult TV, film, book, etc. are within this genre. This will be explored in the next chapter.

John Truby's *Anatomy of a Story* claims that the island setting is "ideal … for creating a story in a social context" and that the setting is very similar to the use of places like "the ocean and outer space." It is a narrative setting that is "highly abstract and completely natural … a miniature of the earth, a small piece of land surrounded by water. The island is, by definition, a separated place" (160). The book even goes so far as to state that these are the reasons the Island

is usually relegated to the place for "a laboratory of man, a solitary paradise or hell, the place where a special world can be built and where new forms of living can be created and tested." It is the Island's "separate, abstract quality," and that is also why the setting can often become a microcosm used to display dystopias and utopias (160), in essence, the same reasons the Island becomes relegated to the stage when Prospero is designated a stage manager. It is part of what gives it this "second world" quality, and also renders it the perfect heterotopian space. Truby also lists several classic examples of stories that use the island to great extent, including *The Tempest, Gulliver's Travels, The Island of Dr. Moreau,* and the TV series *LOST* (159). He attests that within the island setting are the potential for the most interesting storylines in comparison to any other natural setting because of the ways in which it can be used in a narrative (159-160). For example, the island is the perfect stage for "revelation of self-revelation" (160). One could argue that *The Tempest* does this. B.J. Sokol writes that "from the perspective of the outcome of *The Tempest,* the pursuit of knowledge can strive for nothing better than the great understanding or self-understanding equivalent to being more humanly effective" (165), and this is done by demonstrating Prospero's obsession with knowledge and his subsequent redemptive abjuration of his art.

Ruth Morse states that an isolated space such as an Island facilitates the creation of interesting ideas: "[t]he empty space of the island has to be filled, not only be people, but by government, which involved the care of the land" (167). And according to María Losada Friend in "El Discurso de la autoridad disfrazado: El poder en las islas imaginarias de Swift y Shakespeare[*]," the imaginary islands of Shakespeare and Jonathan Swift (*Gulliver's Travels*) are used to "portray two unreal systems of monarchy" (347). She mentions Prospero's rule over the

---

[*] Trans: "The Discourse of Authority in Disguise: The Power in the Imaginary Islands of Swift and Shakespeare"

"inhabitants and visitors of a magic island" and Gulliver's journey to the "flying island of Laputa, where a king and his people live obsessed with music and science" (347). It is by setting the narratives within "imaginary parameters" that allow "both authors to observe … the mechanisms of power and to examine the discourse of authority" (347); in addition, these alternate settings allow for more extraordinary possibilities and *speculating*.

According to Friend, the island's enclosed quality makes it the ideal setting to analyze the influence of power on inhabitants; in the same vein, it is for this reason that *The Tempest* is often scrutinized for its colonialist themes. As Ruth Morse states, the expansion "upwards" in the mid-twentieth century offered a new definition for colonization, because in today's world there are no uncharted islands. It is for similar reasons that Ray Bradbury set his *Martian Chronicles* on Mars. It was a space "apart from our reality," because while Homer's *Odyssey* and Shakespeare's *The Tempest* were able to place their worlds on uncharted parts of the globe, space is our alternative in the modern era (Kagle 283). However, unlike a lot of modern science fiction, Prospero's island is mostly "uninhabited"—it is not "peopled by a race of imaginary beings." Of course, there are a few beings on this magical island—Ariel, the sprite, who breaks reality's laws of physics, and Caliban—a creature akin to a Chimera—"half imaginary, half human" (162).

Fiction is deemed speculative with regards to its setting, and two common sub-genres of speculative fiction are utopian fiction and dystopian fiction. Utopian fiction provides a paradise world that literally means "no place," while the other sets its narrative within hellish landscapes. I will analyze these two settings/genres, what they signify, and how they have collapse into one genre in the modern era.

Utopia

The island setting evokes the notion of Sir Thomas More's Utopia—one of the most famous fictive islands. In the narrative, a foreigner, Hythloday, finds a strange, new world on an Island (Utopia) and subsequently begins to compare it to his old world—the Western European world. As Harry Berger Jr. asserts, setting utopia (the "idyllic" world) apart from reality (the "nightmarish" world) is part of what gives it meaning. This sort of travel literature has, according to Maureen Thomas, become a staple in the Western literary tradition—what Richard Gerber would call "the English Island myth," of which *The Tempest* is a part. Interestingly, shortly after the seventeenth century, the literature reminiscent of More's Utopia began to show a more pessimistic edge and "the vein of dire warning beings to predominate" (Thomas 162), much as Harold Berger describes speculative fiction of the mid-twentieth century which began to become much darker and forewarning disaster. Thomas notes that most of the works begin to mimic "the writers' own environment, caricatured and exaggerated to bring out the particular features they wish to comment upon" and, most importantly, "do not depict ideal states." Instead, they were beginning to depict "contemporary trends … pushed to their extreme and the evil consequences of wicked behavior" (Thomas 162). Basic to the concept of a utopian or dystopian piece is social commentary and ethical questions—which are what make "these 'impossible worlds' so engaging" (164). If there is nothing to set apart this world from a moral/ethical standpoint, then it cannot truly be classified as utopian/dystopian, because the crux of More's argument in his work was the notion that Utopia was somehow better because of the social equality within the island's culture.

Dystopia

The advancement of technology is a double-sided issue for the modern world. We regard technology in our lives as inextricable necessities, while we also regard them with

suspicion. Will new technology bring a utopia or dystopia? Andrew Evans asks if humans can "cope with so much artificiality in their lives," or whether we will become "maladjusted," "aggressive," "simulation sick," and "unable to communicate with each other in the real world" (3). More importantly, will our new technology "dominate us"? (3). These are the same questions that are being raised in the new speculative (and generally dystopian) fiction of the modern era.

Harold Berger writes in *Science Fiction and the New Dark Age* (1976) that "new science fiction," or science fiction of the 20th century, has become "prophetic" and "increasingly more concerned with disasters than marvels." Anymore, science fiction is becoming a genre that edges into the realm of "social criticism, satire, and philosophy" (ix). Berger mentions that some other critics have even begun calling science fiction itself "*social-science fiction*" (ix). Within new science fiction, the most common genre has become "*anti-utopian science fiction*," or works that depict a negative future, generally focusing on some great flaw within humanity (ix-x). According to Berger, the first science fiction wrote about the "happy triumph of technology [and] the reaching out to other worlds"—far more positive and optimistic about the dawn of the technological revolution; yet, in the years following the launch of Sputnik, the dominant theme of science fiction is "*not* the happy triumph of technology and the reaching out to other worlds, but the threat of technology and the peril of this very earth [and] the god of progress is more sinister than benevolent" (ix).

Science fiction has become the genre within which writers have begun to speculate disaster—*inevitable* disasters brought about by new technology—and consequently the vehicle through which the modern era's cultural anxiety about the technological revolution speaks,

especially in the Western world. As Sharona Ben-Tov writes in *The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality* (1995): “Science fiction belongs to a world that has become … ‘disenchanted,’ as it becomes increasingly technicized and rationalized. The global capitalist system requires that all aspects of our lives be entered into the calculation of productivity and profit … The myth of nature is the magic that has gone out of modern life” (23). Modern society’s rejection of magic is also, in effect, a reason that modern adaptations of *The Tempest* bleed into the science fiction genre. Prospero’s staff has been replaced by Prospero’s machine.

On July 6, 1954, *The Reporter* published a piece by journalist Karl Meyer titled “O Scared World, That Has Such Robots In’t!” In this article, Meyer reviews five recent works[*] that are indicative of a new trend that “Utopia is no more” and, more importantly, that “an even more sinister phenomenon has been its replacement with a new kind of imaginative society which, instead of evolving the possibilities of earthly bliss, serves only as a lens through which every barbarity of our age is magnified” (35). Meyer writes that “each of these Futopias” has one dominant recurring theme: “the plight of the individual.” In each story, the fictive society “is nothing less than an organized plot to stifle individuality, to press each personality in an iron metric of conformity” (36). Meyer’s article becomes less of a review and more like a commentary and the evolution of this budding “Futopian” literature, which Meyer speculates has arisen because of the “destructive arts of technology and the manipulative arts of propaganda … industrialism, with its standardization, and the blending of social science and mass media, with its manipulation” (36). Meyer asserts that the first true dystopian novel was *We* (1920-1921), and that subsequent “Futopian” novels are only elaborations, works that include themes such as the “regimentation of individuals, the rule of the mysterious elite, the tyranny of science, the closing

[*] David Karp’s *One*, Ray Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451*, Bernard Wolfe’s *Limbo*, Kurt Vonnegut’s *Player Piano*, and Frederik Pohl’s *The Space Merchants*

of all escapes" (37). These themes are scattered across the speculative genre, such as *Brave New World,* but also in films like *The Matrix* and TV series like *LOST*.

In his article, Meyer asserts that the "lesson" of dystopian literature is that "Science and abundance are not only instruments of liberation but of enslavement; conformity can be as dehumanizing as poverty" (37). In the same vein, Berger writes that H.G. Wells, who was once the "most ardent champion of scientific utopia" later became aware that the "new powers, inventions, contrivances, and methods" of the modern era are not "the qualified enrichment of normal life that we had expected," but rather "the cornucopia of innovation may perhaps prove far more dangerous than benevolent" (200). Berger also asserts that the dawn of science and the technological advancements in the modern era have "begotten an age of anxiety"—an anxiety regarding humanity's "survival," "integrity," "wholeness," and "compatibility with the natural universe." In essence, "dead is the dream of the scientific utopia" (200). At the end of *Science Fiction and the New Dark Age,* Berger claims that dystopian literature "springs from man's disappointment in the promise of scientific utopia," but more importantly from our "fear that 'progress' will carry [us] into some absurd hellish nightmare world in which the power of technique, directed by cold intellect, to debase value will be supreme" (200-201)[*]. Thus is appears Berger agrees with Walsh about the notion of a utopia itself—that utopia can be dystopian because it threatens man's existence; only in an imperfect world would we have the qualities that make us human—"creativity, courage, humility, repentance, righteous anger, charity, perseverance" (201). Thus, a perfect world is not utopia—in a perfect world, humans become nothing more than machines. Chad Walsh writes that one of the primary themes of dystopian literature is that of the utopia itself. This is discussed in *The Matrix: Reloaded* (2003),

[*] See Appendix A for an analysis of the idea of the "mediamorphosis" as defined by Roger Fidler and the hypothesis that Shakespeare was an early media critic forewarning the dangers of mass literacy.

when the Architect tells Neo that the human mind rejected two of the original matrixes—one a utopian paradise and the other a dystopian nightmare. The only world they accepted was something in the middle—a mix of the two. Humans cannot accept perfection, but they can also not accept a world that is nothing but misery. For this reason, Harold Berger asserts that science fiction has turned against science, because culturally we are becoming anxious about the potential "perfection" that technology can bring (3).

H.G. Wells is significant in that he was once a proponent of the utopian promise that technology could bring, but swiftly his scientific romances descended into nightmare. As Norman Nicholson says, "[s]everal of [H.G. Wells] romances are warnings of what may happen if technological development gets out of hand, and others deal with the destruction of civilization by cosmic catastrophe" (qtd. in Hillegas 17). It was not long before "cosmic pessimism" presided over his works. Mark R. Hillegas writes in *The Future as Nightmare: H.G. Wells and the Anti-Utopias* that Wells brought this "cosmic pessimism to its ultimate, saying … that civilization is only a thin disguise hiding the fact that man is … bestial in nature … a product of the cosmic process" (36). For example, *The Island of Doctor Moreau* showcases the exploits of a man who foreshadows the "anti-utopian nightmare state," wherein "rulers [are] free of all ethical considerations, employ biological, chemical, and psychological conditioning and manipulation in order to maintain total control over their citizens" (37). Modern cultural anxiety and the speculative fiction of the time is focused on this presumption of technology terror that technology might, in some way, remove us from our humanity, either literally or figuratively. As Harry Berger Jr. says in *Second World and Green World,* the second world can be a space that can even be fiction itself; after all, fiction is a place where we go to learn, escape, and retreat back to reality by *breaking the transference* (37). As a reader, we are to interpret and move on –

but what happens if we don't? What happens if we cannot escape from the grip of technology? Or, more accurately, the grip of the virtuality? *The Tempest* forecasts this with Prospero's warning to Ferdinand:

> Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
>
> As I foretold you, were all spirits and
>
> Are melted into air, into thin air:
>
> And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
>
> The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
>
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
>
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
>
> And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
>
> Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
>
> As dreams are made on, and our little life
>
> Is rounded with a sleep (IV.i.148-158).

Of course, it is not just cultural anxiety that supports this warning against the virtual. Today, as readers face the dawn of true virtual reality, when looking back at *The Tempest* it is not hard to read a speculative fiction tale—where Prospero's seemingly utopian island has become a modern dystopian virtual reality brimming with illusions and falsehoods meant to stitch characters onto some puppet master's marionette strings.

Chad Walsh's *From Utopia to Nightmare* (1962) gives solid definitions of anti-utopias (or dystopias), and he does so by re-examining the definition of what it means to be classified as a "utopia." He expands the word "utopia" to include not only "an ideal or perfect society, but also any imaginary society presented as superior to the actual world" (25), as a result, "[a]n

inverted utopia [Dystopia] would be the opposite," or "any imaginary society presented as inferior" to reality (25). Furthermore, utopian or dystopian fiction "must also, directly or indirectly, say something important about the human condition and man's possibilities" (27). Both Walsh and Berger claim that the genre has "acquired a stock-in-trade of devices and gimmicks" (136), some of which Walsh cites as being the unseen dictator, the synthetization of nature, loss of identity, etc. (137-139). In addition, Walsh claims that within the anti-utopian genre is a distinct religious strain (170), while one of the most common motifs in anti-utopian fiction is the Law of Reverse Effect, wherein "if you try too hard for something, or try for it at the disregard of other and equally valid goals, you are likely to get the opposite of what you want" (151). In addition, many dystopian works are an attack against the idea of Utopia itself, because Utopias "hold a number of implicit presuppositions about the human condition" (70). As a result, "one man's utopia" may be another man's dystopia (74).

Chad Walsh also expands on Frye's concept of the "cyclical movement of descent into a night world and a return to the idyllic world" (Frye 54) in order to recapture one's "loss of identity" after escaping into fiction. Without a concept of evil, one cannot define good. Without a concept of destruction, what does it mean for something be created? So even though they were cast out of "utopia" into the "real" world (a "dystopia" in comparison") they gained knowledge by creating meaning. Again, as Robert Plank asserts, the "mad scientist" has become "the epitome of our civilization" (169), because, as humans, we "can create imaginary beings, not as a mere play of fantasy, not only to identify with them, but to form a world by which our world can be measured and oriented" (170). Consequently, the role of these utopian dreamers (and schemers) has turned into that of the "puppet master"—the fabricator of second worlds that become alluring traps for the escape-hungry human mind. Thus, the second world of *The*

Tempest and many other works that promise utopia have also been rendered dystopian nightmare realms lorded over by tyrants. No longer is there a dichotomy, but rather a unity between these once contradictory domains and this has given rise to *heterotopias*.

Heterotopia

As stated earlier, works of fiction can within themselves be both utopian and dystopian in nature. In addition, utopian and dystopian fiction, although opposites, are actually exceedingly similar according to Raymond Williams in his article "Utopia and Science Fiction" (1978). He writes that utopias and dystopias are far more similar than they are different (204), while Chad Walsh similarly asserted that a dominant theme in dystopian fiction is the idea of utopia itself (Walsh 70).

Maureen Thomas's article "Utopia/Dystopia" comments on the use of outlandish settings in Utopian/Dystopian films that denote the impossibility of the screen by describing them as "worlds [that are] hidden beyond the everyday world, in folds of time, parallel universes or virtualities" that one can only visit through some sort of perilous voyage (Thomas 164). Thomas states that the idea of a dangerous journey is similar to "More's *Utopia,* Johnson's *Abyssinia* [and] Shakespeare's isle in *The Tempest"* which all "had to be reached by long and arduous voyages" (164). According to Thomas, this "difficulty of approach is not merely a geographical or topographical one – it signifies moral toil, testing the worthiness and developing the spiritual stamina of the adventurer, whilst setting up a contrast between the domain we left … and the unfamiliar domain we enter" (164). For example, in *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* it is by mere chance that Edward Prendick survived the wreck of *The Lady Vain* and is saved by Montgomery and brought to the Island; on *LOST,* the Island can be approached through specific coordinates that are always changing, through an unexpected crash, or by being brought to the

Island by the native inhabitants on behalf of the enigmatic person who controls the Island—Jacob. In *The Matrix,* it is hard to both escape and re-enter the "green world" of the matrix. You must be plugged in and consciously unaware of what is going on; to escape you must become aware that your reality is a lie. In C.S. Lewis's *The Chronicles of Narnia,* Narnia is reached via a magic wardrobe, but the wardrobe only extends into Narnia when the traveler is somehow "ready" to go, usually when they still believe in the power of the imagination. There are countless examples of these utopic/dystopic worlds that are hard to gain entry into because of loopholes, security, or the selectivity of the people allowed within its boundaries. This is a common feature of the Foucauldian *heterotopia*—a term meant to encompass an "Other" space that is simultaneously utopian ("no place") and real.

Ralph Goodman's "Problematics of Utopian Discourse: The Trim Garden and the Untidy Wilderness" is an examination of the ambiguity inherent within utopias and dystopias. Goodman claims that the entirety of *The Tempest* is a frame within which "[u]topian and dystopian discourses" can emerge, and that Prospero, in a role akin to the artist/playwright, is a "creator of Utopias [and Dystopias]" within this frame. Because of Prospero's transformative abilities, he is able to render his island a utopia for his own devices, thus becoming "a focal point for ideas such as fantasy and power" (Goodman). This casts Prospero in a role similar to Faustus, wherein he plays God "as he creates [utopic] systems which attempt stasis but cannot avoid the traditional vulnerability of Utopias" (Goodman).

Goodman, like Harry Berger, Jr., cites Prospero's escape to his "secret studies"—wherein Prospero treats his pursuit of knowledge as "a scholarly Utopia." However, Prospero's idyllic utopian retreat becomes the source of nightmare (and consequent dystopia) when Antonio, his brother, casts him out of Milan. Fortunately, Prospero once more is offered the chance to set up

his own utopic paradise on the Island he and Miranda discover, but as Goodman says, it is a utopia that relies on the enslavement of others, specifically of Ariel and Caliban. Unfortunately for the both of them, despite their servitude to "Prospero's Utopian commonwealth," they "are inscribed as Other," and consequently "denied its benefits" (Goodman). Generally, a utopia should, by definition, "promise to fulfil the needs of their citizens, but such freedom often comes at the cost of strict conformity and a hierarchical system which does not offer liberation for all;" thus, Prospero's personal Utopia is "a philosophy [of] coercion," wherein "he unwittingly produces a series of dystopias in which the human participants are either wooden in their obedience to him, or frequently disposed to rebellion" (Goodman). On the other hand, Caliban's conception of utopia is the pre-Prospero time of peace. Goodman states that Caliban's dream[*] of an Island without Prospero demonstrates that he has "real power" and "like Prospero, can appreciate utopias, long for utopias and … create utopias of the mind." Goodman cites Thomas Pavel's idea that the dreamers of utopia—"the romance writers of history"—attempt to center the energy of the human spirit "towards grandiose but chimerical goals" (qtd. Thomas Pavel), and Prospero is, of course, the most grandiose in the play. Furthermore, H.G. Wells, according to Goodman, believes that *The Tempest* was "Shakespeare's most self-conscious essay on changing, not human nature, but human behavior" (qtd. Wells). The idea of somehow changing human behavior is one of the underpinnings of utopian fiction, but is also a characteristic which can steep the genre in dystopian nightmare. Wells explores this concept in *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* a story where a mad scientist attempts to reform animals by contorting them into human form.

---

[*] Shakespeare III.ii.137-146.

As Goodman states, *The Tempest* showcases the "bewilderingly indefinable, often entirely subjective" nature of utopias and dystopias. It is "a narrative that is magical … not only in Prospero's formal sense, but also in the broad sense of projections and wish-fulfilment on the part of other characters in *The Tempest* who create Utopias and dystopias with dubious ontological authority" (Goodman). Neil H. Wright agrees when he writes: "The green world of *The Tempest* … has a dual nature … it is lush and fertile … [and] barren … wild and intraversible" (478). Goodman utilizes the Foucauldian conception of the "heterotopia," as does Robert Plank and Robert Shelton, to label the oscillation that occurs between utopia and dystopia in fiction—particularly in *The Tempest.*

The heterotopia in *The Tempest,* of course, is the Island itself. It is "an Other space," it is "without an owner," and "is capable of juxtaposing in a single real space several spaces, several sites that are themselves incompatible" (qtd. Michel Foucault in Goodman), or perhaps it is a homogenization of two incompatible natures—utopia and dystopia—being created simultaneously in the same heterocosm. In addition, heterotopias are open and closed, making them isolated, yet penetrable. One of the principles of a "heterotopia" as stated by Foucault is that they are not "freely accessible," and can only be entered by "compulsory means" or through a spiritual cleansing (Foucault). In the same manner, many of the islands from myth are hard to access, yet usually through chance or Fate they are reached. Maureen Thomas made note of this in her article "Utopia/Dystopia" when writing about both utopias and dystopias. In addition, Goodman writes that:

> Foucault's account ["Of Other Spaces"] ends on a playfully serious note which can be applied to *The Tempest*, since he suggests that heterotopia is about adventure on the high seas, complete with dreams and adventure: "The ship is the

> heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without boats, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates."

This is similar to Oscar Wilde's notion of utopia "as a land which humanity is forever both arriving and sailing from." In essence, Wilde attests that the realization of utopias is "Progress," because it is a land of Promise; however, since Progress is a continual action, it can never be reached.

Goodman comes to the same conclusion I do regarding the nature of Frye's cyclical view of the romantic narrative—that it is a mirror between the utopian world (often our own or what we strive for) and dystopia (the realm that is relegated the "nightmare" because it is the undesirable qualities that contrast the "idyllic"). Goodman concludes that Foucault believes that the concept of a heterotopia lies in the "certainty engendered by the conventional utopia / dystopia opposition," because instead of seeking knowledge and virtue in a static space, the audience is "setting … off on a very different journey of discovery … to seek the virtues of instability and shifting meaning." Like Frye, by traversing through these two realms we are able to reconcile the differences between the two and regain our identity. For this reason, *The Tempest* functions as both a utopian and dystopian work.

Shakespeare's *The Tempest* can be either a utopian work or a dystopian work for three reasons. First, the audiences' interpretation of Prospero can influence the entirety of the play. As previously discussed in Chapter 2, one can read him as benevolent mage or a Faustian despot. Secondly, the play is ambiguous. As the Vaughans write, "[m]agic is [Prospero's] technology, a means to an end to getting what he wants. But a central ambiguity in the play is *what* he wants" (23). Depending on Prospero's reason for raising the storm—revenge or redemption—the play's connotation is altered. Thirdly, the play's narrative itself lends itself to either being constructed

as a utopian paradise or a dystopian hell, because, as Goodman suggests, the characters are the masters of their own environment.

Switching gears a little, I am going to examine how *LOST*'s island setting is a perfect example of Foucault's heterotopia, and how this setting places *LOST* within the speculative fiction genre—and how its "Otherness" lands it in the realm of "cult" television.

LOST's Island is a Heterotopia "Par Excellence"

Besides Goodman's analysis of Foucault's heterotopia in relation to *The Tempest,* I have applied Foucault's concept to the Island on *LOST*—an Island which Foucault would describe as "heterotopia *par excellence.*" In Michel Foucault's essay "Of Other Spaces" (1986), he "contests the traditional notion of linear time, asserting that concepts of time have been understood in various ways, under varying historical circumstances" (H. Evans). This idea is linked with our societal conceptions of space over time (space/time); Foucault proposes the existence of an "in-between space" – the *heterotopia* – that exists as a mediator between "real space" and "utopia" (a fundamentally "unreal" space). While a utopia is not real, a heterotopia is, according to Foucault, a real space—one that is "simultaneously mythic and real" (H. Evans). According to Foucault, there are two categories for these unique spaces—heterotopias of crisis and heterotopias of deviation.

Heterotopias of crisis are sacred or forbidden places; Foucault cites a "honeymoon trip" as an example, because it is where the act of a bride's "deflowering" occurs. Banishment also falls within this category. Heterotopias of deviation, on the other hand, are spaces where people are placed if they are "other"—or don't conform to the norm. An example of this would be a psychiatric hospital or prison. Coincidentally, in *LOST,* Hurley lives in a mental institution

before the crash of Oceanic 815. In addition, according to Foucault, heterotopias "exist outside the chronologies that dominate human life in real social space" (Sophia). They are "transitory," as in they can move from place to place "like a carnival," and they can also be "timeless, like the spaces in museums and libraries" (Sophia). They are characterized by what would appear to be antonyms, they can be "pristine" yet "corrupted," "novel" yet "corroded" (Sophia). More interestingly, the heterotopia is "a great time machine, a contraption that is part vacuum and bellows, simultaneously gobbling and abolishing as it preserves and hoards cultural concepts of time and identity, all the while accumulating, suspending, converging, and compressing space and time in its vortex" (Sophia). The *LOST* island is literally displaced in time. Daniel Faraday proved this by noting that time on the island is ahead of the space outside of the island, and, as previously stated, the island can jump through time as well. In addition, the Island is a domain that has accumulated cultural capital—from the DHARMA initiative's Hindu spiritualism, the Egyptian statue of Tawaret, and the wild northern polar bears that inhabit the island's jungle.

According to Foucault, the best example of heterotopia is the ship (Sophia). According to Foucault, the ship is a "floating piece of space, a place without a place," which is simultaneously "closed in on itself" and "given over to the infinity of the sea" (qtd. Foucault in Sophia). On *LOST*, we have not only an island, but an island that moves and has a ship's wheel embedded inside of it—a wheel that displaces the island in time. The *LOST* island is also a place that changes function with the society that takes over. For example, the DHARMA Initiative uses the Island because of its electromagnetic properties, the Others appear to use it as a home, while the Oceanic 815 survivors regard the island as a crash site. Even the balance of power between Jacob and the Man in Black seems to cast light or dark over the entirety of the Island, and this is visually presented to the audience in the season 5 finale. In "The Incident," Jacob dies and the

Man in Black appears to have an upper-hand. Concurrently, in the past, the characters in 1977 are successful in setting off the nuclear warhead Jughead, which causes a sideways-universe. As the episode closes, the usual "LOST" logo is inverted. Instead of white letters imposed over a black background, the letters have turned black and the background is white. This inversion is symbolic of the shift in the balance of power on the island—a balance which is also represented by the recurring image of balancing scales.

Regarding the fifth principle, the Island is "not freely accessible." Those who have entered the *LOST* Island have done so compulsorily or a ritually. Compulsory here means an unexpected crash or perhaps being brought to the island by Jacob, while the ritualistic entryway to the Island could be characterized by the Lamp Post. Once Eloise Hawking finds the coordinates of the Lamp Post, she tells the characters that they will have to recreate the circumstances of Oceanic Flight 815 to the best of their ability: "If you... want to return, you need to recreate as best you can the circumstances that brought you [to the Island] in the first place. That means as many of the same people as you are able to bring with you." And if they fail to perfectly mimic the flight, then the results can be "unpredictable" ("316"). This holds true. The characters attempt to make Ajira Flight 316 as close to the original as possible, but of course they are unable to make it perfect. Consequently, Jack, Kate, Hurley, and Sayid are warped to the Island, except to the year 1977, while Ben, Locke's body, Sun, and Frank and many of the other Ajira 316 passengers land in 2007.

As a television series, *LOST* features heterotopic qualities. It transcends time because it is a cult show with an active fan-based that actively participate, analyze, and keep the show alive after episodes air. DVDs, online services such as Hulu, and TiVo also render the air dates irrelevant. At any time, the series can be accessed by the audience, albeit through purchase or

Internet availability. In addition, according to Hal Himmelstein, "The Other place was none other than Television Land" (1), in effect, rendering the realm of "TV Land" a heterotopian domain because of its relegation to the "Other."

The *LOST* island setting is a clear example and representation of Foucault's philosophical "heterotopia." First, it is a space that is real (island). Secondly, it is real to the characters on the show while also being unreal, because it is fictional show *and* the characters within the show encounter illusions on the Island. Thirdly, the island oscillates between utopia and dystopia depending on who is in control—Jacob or the Man in Black. The conflict between these two characters will be discussed in depth in Chapter 7. Fourth, the island is comprised of a variety of cultures. Fifth, the island is displaced in both physical space and linear time. And finally, the island can only be entered through compulsory means or a ritual.

As previously hinted, media itself can also be heterotopic in nature; perhaps television is not a *pure* heterotopia, but it possesses similar traits. In addition, I would be remiss not to discuss the implications that media has over the narrative. Since I am discussing a play, *The Tempest,* and a television series, *LOST,* the disparity between these two mediums needs to be analyzed.

5. THE MEDIUM IS THE MESSAGE: THEATER AND "CULT" MEDIA

Marshall McLuhan is cited for the famous saying, "The medium is the message." As an early media critic, McLuhan stresses the importance of what media itself tells us. Here, media being the mechanism through which the commonly perceived "message" is told. For example, imagine "Drink Coca-Cola!" written in bold, black letters across a billboard. We might commonly associate the word "message" here with the advertisement "Drink Coca-Cola," but McLuhan wants to look at the other objects in play—the billboard as a medium, the letters as a medium, etc.—and what these are also telling us. The medium is important to the message, and in some instances it is the message itself. For this reason, before discussing the influence of *The Tempest* on speculative fiction across a wide range of media, specifically in this case at the television series *LOST,* a discussion about the two different media used—the play as a text and as performance and the TV serial—is necessary and very important to the hermeneutics of both works.

Prospero is welcome to the speculative genre because he inhabits a world viable to an endless amount of interpretations, and the genre, by definition, is about *speculation*. As Jeffrey Sconce writes in "*Star Trek,* Heaven's Gate, and Textual Transcendence," the combination of the anthology and the episodic narrative in *Star Trek* provided "a vehicle for centrifugal elaboration of a larger universe and centripetal elaboration of character and character relations" (212). This narrative openness characteristic to the television serial and the world of science fiction is also a part of the Shakespeare cult. Matt Hills writes in *Fan Cultures* that both TV media cults can "recuperate the author-function," which indicates the narrative control that the audience has over the text (or television show), and this can inscribe "cult status." In a similar manner, Hills states that Shakespeare's works "boast immense longevity" and "enduring interest in the absence of

'new' … works" (133). In addition, Shakespeare's audience is "complex," has a multicultural demographic, and a "very loyal and vocal readership" (133). In essence, Shakespeare's fans could almost be compared to *Star Trek*'s Trekkies. They are vocal, active, and stick to their fannish object through the ages. And while *Star Trek* fans write fan zines and collect action figures, Shakespeare's fans retell his plays, create film adaptations, and creatively appropriate his stories (133). For this reason, Hills writes that "Shakespeare, and the minutely detailed attention which many (academic) readers bring to these texts, could be identified as the perfect media cult … in terms of its expansion beyond an original point of textual and historical context" (133). In Chapter 4, the implication of Shakespearean texts as an influence and functioning within the speculative fiction genre was analyzed. In this chapter, I will examine the television series as a vehicle to explore the concept of the "endlessly deferred narrative," a hermeneutic process by which the audience/reader engages with a story that seemingly never ends—much in the same way that Shakespeare's plays are being reinvented time and time again.

Endlessly Deferred Narrative & Hyperdiegesis

Ambiguity bequeaths the audience with creative power. When left with a choice, or an inconclusive ending, the audience is left to fill in the blanks. Reader Response Criticism also cites the importance of the reader's engagement with the text (media) as the most important consideration when looking at fiction. Matt Hills writes in *Fan Cultures* that an important feature of cult TV is that its audience can replicate the *auteur*-Creator. In essence, fans are a prominent player in the continuation of a series' longevity and can yield insight/fan-produced media that can alter one's perception of the original series (133). As Lawrence Grossberg writes, "We have to acknowledge that, for the most part, the relationship between the audience and popular texts is an active and productive one. … A text does not carry its own meaning or politics already inside

of itself" (52). A reader's interaction with the text can potentially yield a variety of interpretations—each one of them equally valid. As Roland Barthes boldly says, "the author is dead." Readers are now the story crafters of the modern era; the cultivation of fan-based media and groups within electronic media like the Internet have fostered the development of this point of view and have even provoked critics to begin analyzing fan culture; for example, Henry Jenkins is a pioneer in this field of study.

Even though the reader and their participation with the media in question is important, the author is still a crucial and often lording figure in the cult world—especially if a fan wants to consider their fannish object/media "high culture." According to Hills, most of mass culture is "unauthored" and rendered "according to formulaic industrial guidelines," while high culture is authored by a trusted Creator figure. Cult TV, in essence, thus tries to formulate connections with the author figure in a large way (133). For this reason, fans often exalt their fannish medias' creators to the status of gods, similar to how fans of the series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* often follow series creator Joss Whedon's other works—going so far as to call themselves Whedonites.

Hills compares this cult TV "recuperation" of the "author-function" to the varied productions and re-tellings of Shakespeare's works. Hills writes, "In this sense 'Shakespeare,' and the minutely detailed attention which many (academic) readers bring to these texts, could be identified as the perfect media cult … in terms of its expansion beyond an original point of textual and historical context" (134). For example, Charles Marowitz responds to the myriad of modern Shakespeare adaptations by writing, "[A]nother 'author' has appeared, and he is saying things different from – sometimes at conflict with – the meanings of the first author, and this interloper is … the modern director; a man who insist on reading his own thoughts into those traditionally associating with the author whose work he is communicating" (3). In the modern

era more than ever readers of Shakespeare are the ones who are now reimagining the plays for their own purposes, whether by directing film adaptations or writing homoerotic fan fiction about Shakespeare's characters.

But what spawns a cult media? What creates the "cult" that certain films, books, and TV series seem to generate? Hills asserts that this is a result of cult media's "perpetuated hermeneutic," or "endlessly deferred narrative" (101). It is a narrative form that "operates across a single narrative," whereby the media is centered around "a singular question or related set of questions," and generally this is indicated by the media's title; for example, one of the leading mysteries behind the series *Doctor Who* is who is the Doctor? (101). Another important feature is the idea that the cult audience is not purely creating the cult text, but rather they are continuously finding it. The second worlds offered in their favorite media provide them with enough fuel to endlessly speculate about their favorite characters, fictional countries, etc. for a long time. For this reason, the cult form hinges on this idea of the endlessly deferred narrative. Hills warns that a "collapse" of this form, whether accidental or intentional, "can signal a crisis point" for the media in question (102). For example, "Moonlighting" failed once the series two protagonists finally got together, which had been the underlying question/mystery that provided the cult's speculative enjoyment (102).

Part of the endlessly deferred narrative that lends towards the active engagement of fans is *hyperdiegesis,* which Hills defines as "the creation of a vast and detailed narrative space, only a fraction of which is ever directly seen or encountered within the text, but which nevertheless appears to operate according to the principles of internal logic and extension" (104). In essence, the creation of a vast, complex second world in fiction. Hills writes that these "hyperdiegetic" worlds are a place where "the management of identity can be undertaken," and this process is

only possible when "a relationship of security has been established" (104)[*]. As a result, continuity errors "threaten the security of the viewer-text play relationship" (104). According to Hills, hyperdiegesis is prominent in the speculative fiction genre, because works within this genre is "best suited for the maintenance of endlessly deferred narrative" because of their other-worldly nature (104). They can bend the rules of reality. As a result, the overwhelming majority of cult media fall within the genre of speculative fiction.

Regarding cult media, Jeffrey Sconce writes that "[o]ne might argue that any narrative, regardless of medium, allows for extension at the margins and elaboration of a narrative world," but he makes a point that television is the medium more apt for "such elaboration" because of its nature as a serial:

> The serial elements of TV narrative, whether implicitly as in the original *Star Trek* or made explicit in the cumulative mode, encourage two forms of fantasy engagement in viewers. On the one hand, serial narratives by its very nature create gaps, hesitations, and delays that foster fantasy elaboration. … one encounters windows on a narrative world that omit as much as they include (214).

It is televisions natural gaps that lend it towards this form of fan culture expansion and render some of them "cult" media. As stated in Chapter 4, Hal Himmelstein ascribes television with the label "the Other place," which lands television in a quasi-heterotopian realm. Like the fiction the TV broadcasts, the nature of the television serial can leave us to fill-in-the-blanks and become active creators of our own fiction. As Hal Himmelstein asserts, when examining the relationship between the viewer and the television text, one needs to use myth analysis in order "to locate both the constructed meanings television produces for us and our individual struggles, as

[*] As discussed in Chapter 3, this is similar to how Frye and Berger Jr. describe the escape and subsequent return from fiction.

viewers, to make these texts 'our own' through the process of 'negotiating meaning' through appropriation of the texts offered up" (Himmelstein 10). In essence, central to understanding television as medium is to examine how viewers appropriate the television texts—and this is done by "negotiating meaning," or perhaps what viewers *find* within the hyperdiegetic worlds on the small screen.

The Cult of Shakespeare

The Tempest's seemingly inconclusive ending yields it an "unfinished" quality that also appeals to appropriators and adaptors. According to the Vaughans, the play's "action is elliptical, leaving readers and audiences to speculate about events that happened before the play begins and to wonder about what will happen after it ends" (75). Like fan fiction writers desiring alternate endings or speculating possible narrative for pre-existing characters within their respective fandoms, one could say that works analogous to *The Tempest* speculate upon possible universes that could have occurred in the play's storyline. As the Vaughans state, "No wonder so many *Tempest* appropriations attempt to fill the narrative gaps by providing new information about Claribel or Sycorax, new adventures for the Europeans after their return to Italy, or future destinies for Ariel and Caliban" (75), and Harry Berger Jr. writes that *The Tempest* offers many questions to be answered by the audience:

> What are we really to do with Ariel, Sycorax, and Caliban? Why was Ariel punished by being stuck in a tree, why does he continually ask for his freedom …. why the business about the witch's exile from Africa with its obvious echoes of Prospero's exile from Europe? … Why do we respond to qualities in Caliban which Prospero ignores, and why are we made to feel that the magician is more vindictive than he needs to be? (150).

The ambiguous and open-ended quality of the work lends it to being appropriated into a wide-variety of fiction, especially speculative fiction.

As Matt Hills writes, Shakespeare can be construed as one of the first "media cults" (133). Centuries after his death, people still attend his plays, retell his stories, quote his plays, and regard him with high esteem. Shakespeare has even fostered his own sort of fandom—Bardolatry. Beginning the mid-eighteenth century, a lot of Shakespeare societies began to form; some groups were merely formed as a way to discuss the plays, some were more fanatical—attempting to base their lives around Shakespeare's works (Felperin 85); this is similar to how some Trekkies plan their weddings to include Klingon regalia—going so far as to lather on latex forehead prosthetics. In the modern era, mainstream bardolatry has become a form of reverence that is not "elitist or nostalgic but democratic and progressive" (93). The new cult of Shakespeare clings to the romantic notion of Shakespeare—focusing on universal subjectivity (93). However there are still Shakespeare societies that adhere to a more stringent historical perspective and disregard hermeneutic interpretations of the play as irrelevant (93). This has caused some critical disagreements between the historical preservationists and the hermeneutic thinkers. In *Recycling Shakespeare,* Charles Marowitz states that Shakespeare is meant to be retold (15). In addition, he cites that this is facilitated with the advancements in technology. Marowitz asserts that films have an advantage over plays, because it forces "the original material be rethought and then expressed differently," while the theater is required to cling to some sort of "fidelity" (7). As a result, as time passes, the adaptations and appropriations of Shakespeare's works are becoming more "loosely" based on the original material, because media is changing (4). For this reason, in this next chapter, I am going to look into this Shakespearean expansion—how *The Tempest* has

transcended its seventeenth century context and become a staple of modern speculative fiction, primarily by looking at more modern media: movies, the novel, and the TV serial.

6. *THE TEMPEST* AND ITS INFLUENCE

As Virginia and Alden Vaughan state in the Arden *Tempest,* the "second world" structure of the play invites writers to employ the "idyllic" setting the Island provides—specifically the enchanted island that can set the story apart from reality, thus providing a wider range of possible story devices. This is why, as Orson Scott Card would probably suggest with his definition of speculative fiction, that *The Tempest* could be regarded as a modern speculative fiction tale. In addition, as the Vaughans write, Prospero's island "implicitly invites future utopian or dystopian reimaginings" (74). Furthermore, the play's ambiguity and the wide-variety of adaptations, appropriations, and influx of other media works peddling similar themes places, albeit loosely, it in the realm of *cult* media.

Ruth Morse in "Monsters, Magicians, Movies: *The Tempest* and the Final Frontier" (2000) offers a more direct examination of the connection between speculative fiction and *The Tempest.* Morse cites *The Tempest*'s common association with the colonialist interpretation of the play—an interpretation that has critics like Charles Mill Gayley and Robert Ralston Cawley attesting that the text is an allegory of English imperialism—as the root of this appropriative strain. Instead of a *Tempest* exploring a New World on the other side of the ocean, the movement is upwards into outer space—what *Star Trek*'s Captain Kirk would call the "Final Frontier." This adaptation of a colonialist narrative on an earthly level has now transcended to one on a universal level, as Ruth Morse states:

> For mid-century America, expansion upwards seemed to offer that combination of invitation and threat, possibility and necessity, in which science fiction has thriven. It cannot be surprising that *The Tempest* should have inspired writers of

> science fiction as much as it inspired other ambitious recreative works of the same period (164).

Like colonialist narratives, which after the fallout of the criticism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries could be applied to *The Tempest* as well, science fiction is about the exploration and subsequent colonization of extraterrestrial space.

According to Morse, the connections between *The Tempest* and speculative fiction have spurred the development of many classic characters and stories, primarily those of the deserted islander and the mad scientist. However, Morse does state that to “claim Crusoe or Frankenstein as descendants of Prospero may appear to assume a degree of indulgence”; however, she does believe that “the links are palpable” (165). In order to trace a fictive descendant of Prospero, there needs to be a demonstration of proof with three categories:

> First, there is the simplest: allusion, quotation, or direction imitation. Second, there is the catalogue of parallels, in which n-value counts: the more similarities the likelier it is that the second work imitates the first. But number is not everything, and the most interesting category, as well as the hardest to prove, is the third, in which original themes, questions, and attitudes find a response in a new work (165-166).

Morse later furthers this model by stating that “to identify a [fictive] descendant … is to suggest the following rules of thumb” – “a traffic between character and plot, problem and motif” which also includes “narrative elements only implied by the source,” as in the gaps within the original source that “invite expansion and explanation.” Regarding *The Tempest,* and specific to the “sub-genus” that is now called “science fiction,” Morse writes that:

> one would expect to find a male character of exceptional intellectual gifts who finds himself somewhere which is or seems to be isolated … where he needs to exert all the author of his power and intelligence in order to solve the problem of staying alive and subduing the recalcitrant life forms he finds. … Where this 'Prospero' is accompanied by his daughter the question of her marriage will arise. Food and shelter will be problems to be solved, as will intellectual work. The mechanical solution is robotic … and may displace both Caliban and Ariel (167-168).

For example, one would see *Forbidden Planet* (1956) or *Star Trek's* "Requiem for Methuselah" (1969). However, Morse does not know the exact reason that it was "*The Tempest* which inspired science fiction," but hypothesizes that it could have been anything from the potential "special effects" the sourcetext could expound, and perhaps it was mere cultural appropriation—a side-effect of infliction of Shakespeare on the young, and in the same manner, the proliferation of Shakespearean quotes in every day speech. Morse states that kids "are notoriously creative interpreters, ready to recognize that science *is* magic" (174). This new common interpretation of *The Tempest* as a science fiction tale is, in a way, like the transitive interpretation of *The Tempest* as a postcolonial text: "the science fiction reinterpretations demarcate their own territory, mainly that of knowledge and power, but they express their themes through the narratives of popular romance. Science fictions have always asked how we are to live. If they mark the anxiety in allegory, they continue to find in it a place to play out Gonzalo's dream" (174).

In *New Maps of Hell,* Kingsley Amis writes that *The Tempest*, if not an influence on science fiction, is definitely a "distant anticipation" (28). He states that until now it has been overlooked by speculative fiction critics because *The Tempest*'s features are "comparatively

factual," especially regarding the play's colonialist overtones; however, Amis cites some details that would indicate its speculative nature: "Caliban [is] an early mutant-'a freckled whelp,' … 'not gifted with a human shape,' but human in most other ways," "Ariel [is] an anthropomorphised mobile scanner," and "Prospero's attitude to them, and … his entire role as an adept, seems to some degree experimental" (28-29), implying that Prospero, like a mad scientist, scientifically studies the island natives. In addition, Amis describes the play's narrative as a "stereotype":

> On a cruder level, the eccentric scientist-recluse and his beautiful daughter are an almost woefully familiar pair of stereotypes in all but the most recent science fiction, and, incidentally, large areas of what I might call the *Tempest* myth reappear in one of the best of the science-fiction films (29).

Amis is referring to *Forbidden Planet.* According to his book, planets have become the "natural setting for this kind of writing," and if "we want to find early forms of it in days when the Earth as still incompletely explored and space was utterly inaccessible, the obvious place to look is not on other planets but in remote regions of our own, in particular, of course, undiscovered islands" (29). In particular, the undiscovered islands becoming a model for early speculative fiction can also be seen in *The Island of Dr. Moreau* by H.G. Wells and *Gulliver's Travels* by Jonathan Swift.

The online hypertext of Huxley's *Brave New World—MIRANDA*—states on its main page that its appropriation of Miranda's line[*] is to parallel Miranda's innocent naivety "to the reality behind the glittering vision [masque] before her," which is "not unlike out enthusiasm for the technology that is rapidly changing–and changing us." The cultural anxiety about the advent

---

[*] Shakespeare V.i.184-185.

of new technologies has created this desire to look back at the original model, *The Tempest,* a story about an enclosed space (the Island), which automatically causes alarm because of its claustrophobic nature, and a character who could be registered as anything from a benevolent mage—a figure akin to Gandalf from J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*—to a megalomaniacal, Faustian despot in the same vein as Svengali, Dr. Moreau, or Saruman.

Prospero's Island can be transformed into any sort of limited space that fosters "tech" or new advancements in society—a place that is, in some way, "other." In *The Tempest,* and in a wide-variety of science fiction, this space can be very close to our own, like an undiscovered island, or perhaps in a virtual reality—something as small as a computer chip. J.J. Abrams would probably call a space like this the "magic box," the metaphor he used to develop the illusory island in *LOST,* while the Wachowski Brothers would probably call it "the matrix." These places are, in Harry Berger Jr.'s words, "second worlds"—heterocosms of imagination that are characterized by an ever-changing nature, and are generally hyperdiegetic worlds that foster endlessly deferred narratives.

There are two famous science fiction appropriations of *The Tempest—Forbidden Planet* and *Star Trek'*s "Requiem for Methuselah"—but there are many works analogous to *The Tempest*, either by way of having similar themes, settings, and/or characters. Analogous works include *The Island of Dr. Moreau*[*] and *LOST.* Other works have merely been influenced by *The Tempest*, such as *Gulliver's Travels, Brave New World, The Matrix, Dark City Lord of the Rings,* and *Babylon 5.* Other writers and creators have used *The Tempest* (and its characters) in interesting ways by redefining their purposes and roles, such as Neil Gaiman using William

[*] See Appendix C for an in-depth analysis of the thematic similarities between *The Tempest* and *The Island of Dr. Moreau*.

Shakespeare in *Sandman,* and Alan Moore's *The League of Extraordinary Gentleman*[5] having an early incarnation, "Prospero's Men," where Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel are enlisted by Queen Gloriana (of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*) as a band of super-heroes.

Forbidden Planet is one of the most prominent examples of *The Tempest* appropriations. Various critics and writers have pointed out the similarities between the two works. It follows *The Tempest* model: there is a mad scientist, Dr. Morbius[*], and his daughter, Altaira. Dr. Morbius is obsessed with mysterious Krell technology that has been left on Altair IV, specifically a device called a "plastic educator," which killed the Captain of his ship and almost killed him. However, if one survives the device, it increases one's IQ. Since this experiment, Morbius has been steadily building up his resistance to the device, desiring more and more brain-capacity. In this manner, his obsession with knowledge is similar to Prospero's "secret studies," which inevitably lead to both their ends. The "plastic educator" is also responsible for creating "the Monster from the Id," because the device conjures anything the Krells could imagine; however, they did not account for the instinctive, dark nature lurking in their subconscious—the Freudian "id." The Ariel of this film is Robby the Robot—a mechanical creature that follows all of Morbius's commands and cannot hurt any humans. In addition, the movie's soundtrack is composed of the peculiar noises of a theremin, which could be a method that the composer employed in order to mimic the noises the characters describe in *The Tempest.* Chantal Zabus believes the reason *Forbidden Planet* adapted *The Tempest* lies in the colonialist implications of the play, in the same vein that Ruth Morse asserts that the colonialist movement has gone from the sea to the stars: "F. McLeod Wilcox, in *Forbidden Planet* (1956), has read the space island at the very outset of space conquest in Fifties America, as a metaphor for the early American

---

[*] Interestingly, there is a distinct similarity between the names Morbius and Moreau—Moreau being the "mad scientist" from *The Island of Dr. Moreau*.

colony. Space technology is therefore rewritten as a most 'rough' type of magic and exile onto a planet into a late pastoral retreat" (181-182).

Other movies having an element of *The Tempest* within their narratives are *Star Wars*[6], *Fantasy Island*[7], *Dark City, The Never-Ending Story,* the film adaptation of *The Mysterious Island* (1929), and *The Matrix* (1999)[*]. In the DVD commentary for *The Matrix Revolutions* (2003), Cornell West literally refers to "the matrix" within the movie as a "green world." Of course the saturation of the cyber environment is green-tinted, but the implication that it is a constructed, illusory world-within-a-world is there. As Morpheus says to Neo, "You've been living in a dream world." Within these two domains stand two Prospero-like characters: the Architect—the designer of the Matrix and a cold-calculating machine that rationalizes everything in numbers, and the Oracle—the human-sympathetic program that becomes an aid to Zion on their quest for redemption. In Chapter 4, I discussed the implications of the Architect's depiction of the matrix's history from *The Matrix: Reloaded* (2003), when he reveals that the matrix was originally engineered to be a utopian paradise, but the human psyche rejected it. Second, the Matrix was a dystopian hell, filled with vampires, werewolves, and demons. The human mind rejected this one as well. The third is a mix of the two, where "phantom" or "ghost" programs from the last two Matrixes still filter in and out, but overall it is in the middle ground between these two worlds, perpetually in the twentieth century and oscillating between the idyll and the nightmare, in other words—a heterotopia.

Gene Roddenberry says that *Forbidden Planet* was one of the primary influences to *Star Trek* (Kaku 89)—a television series that has a long history of appropriating Shakespeare. From episode and movie titles to plots and characters, the Bard is no stranger to loyal fans, or

[*] See Appendix B for more about *The Matrix* in relation to *The Tempest.*

"Trekkies," of the series. One of the movies, which is titled after a quotation in *Hamlet, Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country* (1991) depicts Klingons as avid fans of Shakespeare—"Shakespeare is good in English, but you need to read him in the original Klingon" (*Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country*). In the episode "Emergence" of *Star Trek: The Next Generation,* the holodeck is used to act out William Shakespeare's *The Tempest,* with Data, an android, pretending to be Prospero. In addition, this is the second to last episode of the series, and in a way, it seems the homage to *The Tempest* was used as a farewell to the series, just as Prospero's epilogue could be read as Shakespeare's farewell to the theater. In *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine,* the episode "Fascination" is a satirical space rendition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* The classic *Trek* episode "Requiem for Methuselah" is a virtual adaptation of *The Tempest.*

Besides television and film, literature has also been a source for *Tempest* adaptations and appropriations, and other works that follow in the "English Island myth" tradition. For example, *Gulliver's Travels*[8] is a work that uses the concept of travel and the Island very well. In *New Maps of Hell,* Kingsley Amis asserts that *Gulliver's Travels,* like its literary predecessor *The Tempest,* was "an ancestor of science fiction" and not only "on the grounds that Laputa is an early powered satellite" (29).

But what is it about Shakespeare that provokes adaptations, appropriations, and the inclusion of his quotations in everything from soap operas to cereal boxes? Well, he is a very important cultural icon and often regarded the best writer in the English language. Also, his name has enough cultural capital alone to provoke endless media studies about his works. In this next section, I will use critic Craig Dionne is try to piece together why Shakespeare is so actively

used in the speculative fiction genre. Why do speculative fiction writers, especially science fiction writers, want to include the Bard in their works?

In “The Shatnerification of Shakespeare: *Star Trek* and the Commonplace Tradition,” Craig Dionne postulates why Shakespeare is so often used in sci-fi, using Gene Roddenberry’s *Star Trek* as an example. He suggests possible reasons such as Shakespeare demonstrating “what … literary tradition [will] look like in the future,” to Roddenberry simply using Shakespeare as a vehicle to propel *Star Trek* from middlebrow camp to high culture stature (175, 176). Dionne touches upon similar ideas as Harold Berger, Maureen Thomas, and Karl Meyer when he says that Shakespearean allusions on *Star Trek* “mark moments where deeply felt anxieties about the effect of technology will have on our relation with canonical literature” (Dionne 176).

Contrary to this dire warning, however, Dionne writes that the inclusion of Shakespearean quotations, themes, and storylines demonstrates that “Shakespeare’s writing will preserve through the tempests of any or all postmodernities” (Dionne 176). Shakespeare is used in science fiction because he “not only survives in the future,” but still “remains in untouched form as an icon of poetic truth and authority for *all* cultures” (176). In *Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country,* for example, the political allegory of Shakespeare’s plays is used to elucidate the implicit Cold War themes in the film. As Dionne writes, “the allusions and references to Shakespeare tend to do the similar cultural work of enhancing the gravity and aesthetic allusion of its allegorical messages (Dionne 182)

However, Dionne admits that sometimes the Shakespeare references and quotations are nonsensical and do not fit the plot, themes or within any sort of allegory (178). It is possible that we are literally reading too far into things. Dionne warns that “if we rely on our scholarly instincts as hermeneutic critics trained to find hidden themes suggested in all of these parallels,

we are missing an important sociological piece of the puzzle … because we are trying to find a theme where theme as such may not exist" (180). In effect, the rampant proliferation of Shakespeare in *Star Trek* could merely be a result of American cultures vast appropriation of the "high brow" cultural capital Shakespeare possesses. Consequently, *Star Trek*'s use of Shakespeare could just be "a middle-brow audience attempting to distance itself even further from the popular lowbrow that defines mass culture generally, as a vaguely high-brow Shakespeare promises to help the series push its orbit even further from the aesthetic options located only a channel or film screen away (176). As previously discussed in Chapter 5, Bardolatry renders Shakespeare a corporate machine.

Shakespeare's use in science fiction is also a result of its *need* to be reinterpreted. Charles Marowitz suggests in *Recycling Shakespeare* that Shakespeare cannot be protected by the staunch academia forever. If anything, the late-eighteenth century romanticism provided the audience with their own power to reinterpret Shakespeare for contemporary audiences. Thus, Shakespeare is meant and should certainly be altered depending on the social context (Marowitz 15).

As stated in Chapter 5, Marowitz asserts that Shakespeare's plays can and will continue to be "loosely" and "remotely" adapted (4). This is a result of Shakespeare's modern cult following—one that perpetuates a hermeneutic dialogue with his plays and continues to bend the texts as far as possible while still being recognizable. In the next chapter, I am going to analyze *LOST,* an American television series that is currently airing (so some analysis may be subject to change after the series finale airs on May 23, 2010). It features a heterotopian island, characters analogous to Prospero, Ariel, Caliban, and even Ferdinand and Alonso. Their main themes are redemption. Chess is a prominent feature in their construction. It is not a perfect adaptation of

Shakespeare's *The Tempest;* actually, it is not even an appropriation. Rather, it is a series that has cherry-picked thematic elements, characters, references, and other facets in order to render a palimpsestic TV serial engineered to captivate a select cult audience.

7. *LOST* (2004-2010)[*]

Although it may seem so, to associate ABC's *LOST* with William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is not a stretch. For one, they both deal with a crash caused by an invisible agent, the survivors being 'tested' and subsequently redeemed, a strange Island, and mysterious whisper-like noises. While that is just a surface comparison, it is enough to catch one's attention. In addition, *LOST* has pointedly referred to *The Tempest* on the show. In "The Other Woman," it is revealed that a DHARMA Initiative[9] station called The Tempest manufactured deadly toxic gas, which according to Juliet, is also "an electrical station that powers the Island," as though, perhaps on a metaphorical level, *The Tempest* is giving fuel to the *LOST* narrative. In addition, The Others (previously known as the Hostiles) used gas from The Tempest to wipe out the DHARMA Initiative sometime in the early '90's. "The Purge" was the Hostiles' attempt to reclaim the Island from the DHARMA Initiative who, as Benjamin Linus says, "couldn't even coexist with the Island's original inhabitants" ("The Man Behind the Curtain"). Interestingly, the conflict between the DHARMA Initiative and the Hostiles/Others mirrors the conflict between Prospero and Caliban for ownership of the Island in *The Tempest* for a very similar reason: who was there first? And who deserves the Island more? In addition, both contain the story of a separated father and son. In *The Tempest,* Alonso and Ferdinand remain apart throughout most of the story, while in *LOST,* Michael loses Walt to the Others at the end of season one and goes through many arduous tasks to get him back.

On the other hand, it is not unusual to look back on *The Tempest* and say, "Oh, this is like *LOST*." In the play's text, the word "lost" appears 11 times, "lose" appears six times, and "loss"

---

[*] As of episode ten of season six "The Package."

appears nine times. Being lost, wandering, and isolated is crucial in the context of the play and propels a lot of the action.

That is not to say that *LOST* is a direct *adaptation* of Shakespeare's play, but rather, that it *appropriates* facets of *The Tempest* for the modern audience. Besides *The Tempest*, the series is a conglomeration of various source materials, everything from Stephen King's *The Stand* (a source the writers claim has been the most influential), Alan Moore's *Watchmen* and, of course, William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The creators of *LOST*, J.J. Abrams and his fellow writer/producers Damon Lindelof and Carlton Cuse, have appropriated various thematic elements from the play and incorporated it into the series, perhaps as a method of re-imagining *The Tempest* for a contemporary audience. It is the re-telling of the tale with the inclusion of more plot-elements and characters and capitalizing on sci-fi and fantasy elements. As Sanders asserts in *Adaptation and Appropriation*: "Whatever ideological stance(s) of his adaptors, one inescapable fact is that Shakespeare was himself an active adaptor and imitator, an appropriator of myth, fairy tale, and folklore, as well as of the works of specific writers" (46). Like Shakespeare, *LOST* also seem to include many mythological elements to its framework as though it is paying homage to not only Shakespeare's work, but his thematic devices. *LOST* alludes to Greek mythology (with the Smoke Monster being named "Cerberus" by the DHARMA Initiative), and also heavily integrates Egyptian lore within the plot (the statue of Tawaret, the hieroglyphs, etc.), which further separates *LOST* from its roots and crafts it into its own singular identity.

In this manner, *LOST* is a cultural palimpsest—a work piled with pieces from works of the past in order to render the entirety of the story multidimensional and to provide its cult fan-base with plenty of fodder. Perhaps, as Craig Dionne suggests, Carlton Cuse and Damon

Lindelof's sampling of various media across centuries is an attempt to elevate the series from "middlebrow" to "high-brow" status (176). Furthermore, it is possible their inclusion of so many references to other media is a method by which they are extending the endlessly deferred narrative of the series. By providing a larger hyperdiegetic world brimming with mysteries, fans are left with more to speculate, which sucks the fans even more into the fictional world. However, as Lawrence Grossberg says, "The mode by which a text is produced, or the motivations behind it, do not guarantee how it is placed into the larger cultural context nor how it is received by different audiences" (Grossberg 51). Thus, although some things might have been intended by the writers from the very beginning, fans react and respond to the series differently. For example, I remember a post on a forum about a fan who asked one of the writers of the series whether the Smoke Monster was made of nanites—which during season one, was a very popular theory that made a lot of sense; however, the writer debunked the theory instantly. Fan interpretation and writer intention do not often coincide.

Cult TV Series

As previously discussed in Chapter 5, one notable difference between *The Tempest* and *LOST* is the medium by which they are presented. What does *LOST*'s medium say about it as a series? And what it is trying to do?

Hal Himmelstein cites that management and capitalism are the driving executive forces behind art in the modern world (16); usually, the artist, writer, creator, is at odds with the executives in charge of the networks (17). In addition, outsides influences such as advertisers, ratings, and perceived "appropriateness" can influence the decision to keep show on the air (18). As a result, there is a loss of authorial control. This lends towards the series narrative oscillation.

The writers may try to drive the story in one direction in season one, but are told by the network executives to change direction, remove a character, or something else catastrophic. Hence, the television serial by nature is prone to lapses in continuity and can suffer sudden plot re-directions. Metaphorically, this signals the death of the magic Prospero, because unlike Shakespeare's Prospero, Cuse and Lindelof have limited control over the Island and its characters.

Like many TV series, *LOST* harbors an extensive fan-base, which is part of why it is considered "cult." As a fan, I am an active participant in the *LOST* fan communities, from editing *Lostpedia* entries to reading blogs. My engagement with the series is much different than my friend, who told me he thought *LOST*'s island was purgatory. All I could do was laugh, because as an admittedly obsessive fan I had already read interviews with the series creators that debunked that popular theory in season one. My interaction and extratextual participation has given me a far different viewing experience than my friend. This demonstrates that the serial's hermeneutic qualities. Depending on the reader's knowledge, beliefs, and personal wishes, the entirety of the series can change.

The remainder of this chapter will be a thematic analysis of *The Tempest* inscribed over *LOST*'s narrative, from hidden clues to over-arching plot twists to imagery. This analysis will hopefully provided a look into how a cult series like LOST, and how fans engage with this mystery serial, is similar to the manner in which *The Tempest* is restaged and reimagined in the twenty-first century.

Oceanic 815's Fate & Prospero's Fortune

On *LOST,* an incredible amount of coincidences occur within the series. Ocean Flight 815 is in itself one incredible coincidence. Every character on the plane is in some way connected to one another. For example, John Locke's father was the man who conned James "Sawyer" Ford's parents. This con led to Sawyer's father shooting his mother, thus leading to Sawyer's life of crime. In this manner, the Island functions as a "battleground" where the crash survivors, and sometimes the Others, are drawn into conflict with one another. The Island is a place where the characters are forced to confront the demons of their past, generally through the interaction with another character or a "test." According to Carlton Cuse in the commentary for "The Man Behind the Curtain," the Island "can sort of conjure up these images of great importance from your life [and then] the characters on the show have to sort of deal with the consequences." According to Cuse, these tests are generally "visions." An example of this is Locke's dream of Boone covered in blood—a vision which shows Locke that Boone will have to become an Island "sacrifice" ("Deus ex Machina"). But sometimes the Island is just a place where the characters are forced to struggle with themselves; for example, just as Charlie Pace is overcoming his addiction to drugs, he finds a crashed drug smugglers' plane stockpiled with heroin. One the Island, Charlie is deliberately tempted and subsequently tested. Thematically, the idea of "Fate" is visually represented in the first episode. After bandaging his fingers, Charlie writes "FATE" on each strip of tape across his hand ("Pilot: Part 1"). In addition, in episode five, Locke ponders "What if everything happened here … for a reason?" ("White Rabbit"), indicating that, perhaps, all the coincidences on the Island are for a purpose—a purpose that is becoming clearer as the series progresses.

The Tempest is similar in a variety of ways. Fortune allows Prospero the chance to raise the tempest in order to get revenge against his enemies[10]: "By accident most strange, bountiful

fortune / (Now, my dear lady) hath mine enemies / Brought to this shore" (I.ii.178-180). It could be mere coincidence that so many people who plotted against Prospero happened to be at the same place at the same time; thus, Prospero raises the storm in order to bring the crew, unharmed, to the Island. This is similar to the crash of Oceanic Flight 815, in that it seems fate steered all the characters (and those who miraculously survived) for an explicit purpose on the Island—a purpose that is being unraveled as the series progresses, and that may also be left partially a mystery be series end on May 23rd, 2010. In addition, the Island of *The Tempest* is eerily similar to that of the Island on *LOST.* Both have illusions rendered in order to gage the survivors of the crash. In *The Tempest*, the banquet setting is used to taunt Prospero's enemies – specifically Antonio and Alonso. Similarly, the characters on *LOST* are confronted with illusions of characters and creatures from their pasts that draw them into action.

The Island or "The Magic Box"

> You do yet taste / Some subtleties o' the isle that will not let you / Believe things certain (V.i.123-125)

The writers of *LOST* did not choose the Island as a setting for this series without reason. The Island environment immediately evokes the memory of other islands of myth and fiction—*Utopia, Gulliver's Travels*[11]*, Treasure Island*, Atlantis, *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* Avalon (Arthurian Legend), *Fantasy Island* (TV series 1978-1984), *Gilligan's Island,* the island prison Azakaban (*Harry Potter* series), *The Mysterious Island* (sequel to *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea*)*,* Neverland (*Peter Pan*), Aldous Huxley's *Island* (follow-up to *Brave New World*), and, of course, Prospero's Island in *The Tempest*—the island setting that appears to have influenced the series the most.

The Island on *LOST* is one that is not easy to access, much like the other fictional isles and heterotopias[*]. *LOST*'s island is constantly moving, and the only way to make landfall is to know exactly where it is going to be. In order to know the Island's location, one needs to go the Lamp Post—the only DHARMA Station off the Island—that calculates a series of complex mathematic equations to locate the Island, or one needs to be brought to the Island by Jacob—one of the enigmatic, spiritual forces on the Island who admits he can "bring" people to the Island via the use of his Lighthouse, usually because they need to be there for a specific purpose. What at first seems to be Fate is actually Jacob's manipulations, similar to the method that Prospero employs to bring Alonso's ship to his isle. (However, Fate does seem to bring important people to the Island, like Desmond, Charles Widmore, and Richard Alpert—all of whom are not on Jacob's guiding Lighthouse dial).

In episode five of season six, "The Lighthouse," the audience is introduced to a mysterious lighthouse of the Island with a rotating mirror. The wheel that operates the mirror is marked by 360 degrees, each degree corresponding with a last name. These names correlate to the people who have come to the Island, and if a name is crossed off then it indicates they are no longer a Candidate. In order for people to reach the Island, or at least to make it *easier* for them to reach the Island, the lighthouse wheel needs to be rotated to their names; then, they will be somehow tethered on a path towards the Island.

Most of the characters on the show arrive through an unexpected "shipwreck" of some sort[*]. The main characters that the series follows in the first season arrive on Oceanic Flight 815, which appears to mysterious by break apart in mid-flight to land on the Island; however, later it

---

[*] As discussed in Chapter 4.

[*] In Chapter 4, I discuss the implications of these crashes. Since the *LOST* Island is a heterotopia, the only way to access the Island is through compulsory means, such as these crashes, or a ritual—like the scene I described where Eloise Hawking convinces them to reproduce the crash of Oceanic Flight 815 on Ajira Flight 316.

is revealed that the plane crashed because Desmond, who was station at the DHARMA station The Swan, forgets to press in the numbers (4, 8, 15, 16, 23, 42) in order to reset the clock—a clock that when it reaches 0 begins to spin, show hieroglyphic figures, and unleashes electromagnetic shockwaves. The shockwaves from this lapse cause the plane to crash on the Island. Desmond himself arrives on the Island because his boat crashed into the rocks surrounding the Island's jetties. Before the crash, he was sailing around the world to win back the heart of Penelope Widmore. The *Black Rock* is another vessel that crashes, bringing with it Richard—the mysterious immortal and advisor to the Others. In addition, Danielle Rousseau, a French scientist, lands on the Island when the hull of her ship breaches. The difficulty of finding the Island is emphasized by ex-leader of the Others Charles Widmore. Widmore, throughout the series, has been tirelessly searching for a way to get back to the Island after being exiled for having a child in a relationship off the Island. He was taken away via the submarine the Others had confiscated from the DHARMA Initiative after wiping them out in "the Purge" ("Dead is Dead"). In "Dr. Linus," it is shown that Widmore has managed to find the Island again with the help of Zoe—a geophysicist who managed to track the Island's distinct electromagnetic energy.

The Island is similar to Prospero's Island in other ways. Barring the fate that seems to tie all the characters together, and the manipulation behind the scenes by enigmatic powerful beings, the Island setting itself is familiar. Both echo of disembodied voices, they are embroiled by a conflict, shrouded in mystery, nameless, and serve as places of redemption. Furthermore, illusions thrive on both Islands' green pastures. When Stephano and Trinculo hear the music played by the "picture of Nobody" (Ariel), Caliban eases their fear by saying:

> Be not afeard. The isle is full of strange noises,
>
> Sounds and sweet airs that give delight and hurt not.

> Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
>
> Will hum about mine ears; and sometimes voices,
>
> That is I then had waked after long sleep,
>
> Will make me sleep again (III.ii.135-140).

Similarly, the Island is filled with “whispers.” Fans of the series have speculated endlessly about the nature of the whispers, which usually appear right before a character is killed, the Smoke Monster appears, or the Others are nearby, and have even used high-tech sound equipment to enhance and sometimes reverse the whisper soundtracks. Usually, the voices are spoken by unknown characters, but sometimes they are the voices of the dead or characters from “flashbacks.”[*] The voices appear to know of the main characters and their situations, and sometimes the voices argue about what to do to them. Other strange noises on the Island include the mechanical grinding noise that the Smoke Monster makes. Since the creature is comprised of Smoke (or at least appears to be), why is it making loud, robotic howling sounds? In addition, noises are what lead the characters to a lot of locations. In “Pilot: Part 2,” Sayid picks up a distress call from a French woman that has been playing for 16 years. The characters later follow this signal to a tower, and they eventually encounter the Frenchwoman, Danielle Rousseau. Similarly, in *The Tempest* Ariel sings to people while invisible in order to lead them around the Island or to send them to sleep, as when he leads Ferdinand away from the shore to Miranda and lulls Gonzalo, Francisco, Adrian, and Alonso to sleep in Act II, scene i. But the noises are not the only mysterious quality linking the two Islands. There is also the idea of “conjuring” and “illusions.” Both Islands are marked by the characteristic of having things magically appear before the characters eyes. On *LOST,* I call this quality the “magic box.”

---

[*] Each episode of seasons 1-4 have character-centric ‘flashbacks’ that show the characters’ lives before they arrived on the Island.

> BEN: Let me put it so you'll understand. Picture a box. You know something about boxes, don't you John? What if I told you that somewhere on this island there's a very large box... and whatever you imagined... whatever you wanted to be in it... when you opened that box, there it would be. What would you say about that, John?
>
> LOCKE: I'd say I hope that box is big enough to imagine yourself up a new submarine ("The Man from Tallahassee").

On *LOST*, the magic box was Ben's way of expressing the mysterious, magical properties of the Island. Simply put, it provides everything you need. Locke already seems to have an understanding of this, considering the Island provided him with a means to live his dream—the re-use of his legs. Ben uses the metaphor to preface introducing Anthony Cooper[*] to Locke, and pretend the island had somehow made him mystically appear; however, in actuality, Cooper was brought to the Island and locked in the brig of the *Black Rock* by the Others. While the appearance of Cooper is confusing, Locke understands that the Others had a method of transporting people to the Island. For him, Cooper's appearance is no act of mysticism, but for Sawyer, this is the influence of the "magic box." Sawyer's primary motivation in life has been the discovery and subsequent execution of "the real Mr. Sawyer," the man who is responsible for Sawyer's parents' death. Anthony Cooper is the real Mr. Sawyer. The appearance of Cooper on the Island gives Sawyer a chance to finish this life-long goal and avenge his parents' death, and it is also a step towards Sawyer's new life as "James," abandoning the name he adopted as a way of coping with the events in his past.

---

[*] Locke's biological father who conned Locke of one of his kidneys.

In *The Tempest,* the spirits create deceptions that taunt the survivors of the boat crash, generally as a way to prod them to confront their faults. Similarly, on *LOST*, deception plays a key element in many of the plots. Before crashing on the Island, Sawyer is a con-artist who makes his living on deceiving others. On the Island, the Others theatrically don rags and fake beards in order to disarm the survivors of Oceanic Flight 815, and, in general, the entire Island is illusory. Once the characters think they have figured out the Island's secrets, there is something new to be uncovered or they are proven completely wrong; for example, Sawyer is stunned to discover that there are, in fact, two Islands, not just one, which explained how the Others were able to move around so stealthily. But lies and deception are not the only forms of artifice in *LOST*. The Island is literally visited by beings that are not really there—ghostly apparitions from the characters' pasts.

Harold Berger writes in *Science Fiction and the New Dark Age* that one characteristic of the new speculative fiction of the modern era is the "synthetic experience," wherein, like in Huxley's novel *Brave New World,* there is a "synthesization of experience so extravagant that … people seldom live *in* their own lives" (38). According to Berger, the synthetic experience has several forms, but what they all hold in common is "an obliterated or diminished awareness of the self and the significance of experience by needless complication or mechanism, which excludes or distracts the self from reality and full participation in its own life" (38). And, more importantly, "a society can be controlled by those able to divorce it from reality by diverting amusements, so that the spectacular and illusory become the new realities" (39). This holds true both in *The Tempest* with Prospero's manipulation and Ariel's illusions that tease and prod the characters on the Island towards their redemption, or perhaps torment in the case of Caliban, and

also on *LOST,* where illusions/hallucinations serve as reminders and relics of the characters' pasts which aid in their maturation and development.

Mark Jay Mirsky asserts that Prospero's island—the paradise that Gonzalo dreams of—is all false. It is, as Prospero says of the masque, a "baseless fabric," an illusion (134). It is this illusory quality that creates tension; "Prospero wonders if the stuff of life is not illusion too. He is a master at manipulating illusion, yet he is equally subject to it and helpless before it and powerless, for even his books belong to that ooze or sea change as Ariel" (134). Mirsky asserts that while Prospero is the ultimate minister of this magic, he is helpless in his own illusions, in the same way that he delves too deeply in his magic. Like the escapist, or the man on the long holiday, his magic is becoming an addiction. Harold Berger mentions that many new speculative fiction writers who explore the concept of virtual reality and the synthetic experience depict humans as "naturally addicted" to this sort of escapism (42), and that in the modern era we do not desire authentic lives, because of the anxiety that breeds within our culture (42).

Illusions in *The Tempest* often appear in the form of Ariel's spritely magic, specifically in stage directions which indicate the sort of "puppetry" that is occurring. For example, when staging the masque, Prospero lurks at the top of the stage, cloaked by invisibility, watching the action unfold in a manner similar to a manipulator[*]: "Solemn and strange music, and PROSPERO on the top (invisible). Enter several strange shapes, bringing in a banquet, and dance about it with gentle actions of salutations, and inviting the King etc. to eat, they depart" (III.iii.17.sd). When the spirits disappear, Francisco announces that "[t]hey vanished strangely!" (III.iii.39), and the masque disappears when Ariel descends onto the banquet table like a harpy (III.iii.52.sd). All of these actions indicate the supernatural and illusory quality that the spirits

---

[*] A marionette's puppeteer.

cast upon the Island and how they are used to wonder and amaze the characters. These illusions, and the charms of the characters, are also completely under the control of Prospero, even though he is working through the natural magic of the spirits and Ariel; as Ariel says, “They cannot budge till your release” (V.i.11).

The illusions—the sounds, the noises, the masque—everything evaporates at the end as Prospero casts his books into the sea. He announces, “My charms I’ll break; their senses I’ll restore; / And they shall be themselves” (V.i.31-32), as a way of signifying that he’s no longer going to play “chess” with these people. He is preparing to “abjure” his magic. In Act V, scene i, all the characters stand in a circle that Prospero has drawn on the stage, and this breaks the spell. The characters are now under their own devices again. He feels he can release them because they are remorseful of the wrongdoings they committed: “They being penitent, / The sole drift of my purpose doth extend / Not a frown further” (V.i. 28-30). Now that his job has been done, Prospero abstains from his magic. One of the most analyzed and discussed parts of *The Tempest* is that he vows to break his staff and give up magic. Prospero’s interference is a method of *breaking transference* that Harry Berger Jr. describes. If interaction with the illusion/fiction/creation goes unbroken, then there can be no interpretation, moving forward, and improving from the experience. The characters have redeemed themselves, and thus the illusion has provided its purpose. Similarly, Prospero himself has seemed to change from his experience in his own illusion (or perhaps as a character in a work of fiction).

In *LOST,* illusions often appear in the form of apparitions and dreams. As of the season five finale, we discover that the Man in Black/the Smoke Monster is often responsible for these visions by taking on disguises in order to trick the characters into doing something for him or becoming a pawn in his game; for example, in “Ab Aeterno,” he takes the form of Richard’s

dead wife Isabella to make Richard believe he is in Hell. After convincing Richard of this, the Man in Black tells Richard that he can save his wife if he kills “The Devil” (Jacob). The Man in Black also takes the form of Ben’s dead daughter Alex in order to convince Ben to follow Locke—the physical disguise the Man in Black had adopted after Locke’s dead body was brought back to the Island. These were moves made in order to finally kill Jacob in “The Incident.” But the Man in Black is not the only one responsible for these illusions. Some are still a mystery. Other illusions (that may or may not be the Smoke Monster) are Kate’s black horse in “What Kate Did” and Hurley’s imaginary friend Dave from the Santa Rosa Mental Health Institute in “Dave.” In addition, young Ben follows an apparition of his dead mother into the jungle, which leads him to meet Richard for the first time (“The Man Behind the Curtain”), and Locke has a hallucinatory quest from the dead Boone that leads him to try and save Mr. Eko (“Further Instructions”). Even stranger, after turning the fail-safe key in the hatch[*], Desmond begins to see into the future[*]. These visions could also be glimpses into alternate realities. He uses these visions to repeatedly save Charlie’s life (“Every Man For Yourself,” “Flashes Before Your Eyes,” “Par Avion,” “Greatest Hits”), but Charlie is ultimately unable to escape his fate and dies receiving a message from the freighter (“Through the Looking Glass”). In the last season, the apparition of a young blonde boy (who many have speculated could be a younger Jacob), appears to the Man in Black and Sawyer. With the young boy’s second appearance, he warns the Man in Black that he “can’t kill him[*]” (“The Substitute”). But the “magic box” does not just represent the idea of a space wherein illusions can be conjured; it also emphasizes the nature of the series itself. The show is a mystery left to audience interpretation.

---

[*] The DHARMA station The Swan.
[*] It is hypothesized that Desmond is able to oscillate between realities because he has been “super-charged” with electromagnetic energy.
[*] It is unknown at this point who “him” is, but “him” could have been referring to Sawyer because he is a Candidate.

The "magic box" is a metaphorical construction. It simply means that the Island in both *The Tempest* and *LOST* is a "box" that automatically has whatever you need. This figurative term comes from J.J. Abrams, the creator of *LOST.* When he was a child, he received a "magic box" present. Essentially, it is a box adorned with a simple black question mark. The mystery written on the box is "what is inside the box?" But Abrams never opened it. He appreciates the idea of something still being wrapped up and hidden—waiting to be revealed. The mystery is more compelling than the answer. This was his original seed that sprouted *LOST.* Abrams wanted to create a mystery that, while providing some answers, would always leave a little to the imagination. As an audience, we experience some frustration at the lack of answers to some of *LOST*'s key mysteries, but the answers eventually come. For example, in one of the most recent episodes, "Ab Aeterno," one of the larger mysteries—Why does Richard Alpert not age?—was finally answered. But, as the series draws to a close, it is obvious that many mysteries cannot be answered completely—and as an audience, we are going to be invited to fill-in-the-blanks. The show, in a sense, becomes our very own magic box. This is part of what makes *LOST* a cult TV show. Fans endlessly speculate online about the nature of the island, what the literary references mean, and go so far as to map out repeating motifs on message boards and wikis. Part of the enjoyment of the show is *not* knowing, and attempting to offer the most insightful interpretation of the series' narrative.

Similarly, an understanding of *The Tempest* depends on individual experience, perception, and participation. This is the genius underlying many of Shakespeare's plays that makes them so universal. Everyone can read *The Tempest* and see something different. Some might say it is a dark, sordid tale of revenge, while another might say it is a light-hearted comedy full of slapstick. And, of course, someone in the 21st century might read the play and say it is like *LOST*.

It all comes down to interpretation, and what the individual makes of it. *LOST* is the same way. I believe the mysteries will be left standing at the end so that, as individuals and participants of the series, we can all walk away with our own perception of what happened on the Island. Even Prospero seems content with leaving the “accidents” on the Island a mystery for the characters: “Do not infest your mind with beating on / The strangeness of this business” (V.i.244-245). Similarly, the dichotomous play between utopia/dystopia is what makes these stories so dualistic and compelling to me. I can read *The Tempest* and see Paradise, but also register the idea of being a puppet in a Hellish matrix. Like the characters on *LOST,* the Island proves to be a space that can become both at the same time, or switch between the two in an instance. In the case of *The Tempest,* this usually hinges on the reader’s interpretation of Prospero, while on *LOST,* the will of the Island—and the enigmatic Jacob—could make your life peaceful or Hellish.

The idea of the island as utopia and simultaneously dystopia is also explored in the series. For Richard Alpert, the island proves to be “Hell.” He is convinced as such when he approaches the island, as one of his fellow slaves on the *Black Rock* sees the Island’s statue of Tawaret out the window of the ship and says, “Es el Diablo!” In addition, the Man in Black fuels Richard’s fear regarding the isle by saying they are, in fact, in Hell and that the Devil has Richard’s wife. Later, after Jacob’s death, the characters are gathered around a fire wondering what they are supposed to do next. Ilana says that Jacob told her Richard would know where to go from there. To this Richard says, “You wanna know a secret …? Something I've known a long, long time. You’re dead. … I mean literally. We are all dead, every single one of us. And this, this, all this, it's not what you think it is. We’re not on an island, we never were. We’re in Hell” (“Ab Aeterno”). This would not be far from the truth in his case. He is brought to the Island as a slave after the death of his wife, almost starved to death in chains in the *Black Rock*’s brig before being

freed only to be told he is in Hell, made immortal by Jacob, and then proceeds to live for over 180 years as a representative for Jacob without knowing anything about his purpose or the Island. For Richard, the Island is a place where he is meant to suffer, yet possibly achieve redemption.

Conversely, the Island proves to be a Paradise for other characters. For example, John Locke, a character who lived a Hellish existence in the United States as a man without a purpose, becomes a leader on the Island. The Island helps Locke fulfill his dream, which also renders him a Prospero-like figure in the series.

A Proliferation of Prosperos on *LOST*'s Island

John Locke

John Locke exemplifies several characteristics of Prospero. Before surviving the crash of Oceanic Flight 815, Locke lives an escapist lifestyle, perhaps as a result of his hard childhood. He plays *Axis and Allies* with his friends at work, and the game even carries itself outside of the game board; he is even referred to as "Colonel," despite never having been in the military. In addition, following the deterioration of his relationship with Helen, Locke begins to call a phone-sex service operator solely to imagine she is Helen. Yet, consequently, it is Locke's persistent delusions of grandeur that lead to his new life on the Island. The reason Locke is on the flight in the first place is because he was rejected from a "Walkabout," a journey of spiritual renewal in the Australian outback, and is heading back home to his boring existence. According to a Walkabout guide, Locke is physically unable to do the journey because of he is in a wheelchair. Considering Locke has been preparing for years for this spiritual journey, he does not take the rejection well and shouts, "Don't tell me what I can't do!" even though it is highly probable he cannot. Luckily for Locke, the Island's mystic setting and mysterious healing properties enable

Locke to live his fantasy and become a leader. The Island becomes, for Locke, an Australian outback for his own personal Walkabout. Like Prospero, Locke neglects "reality" for the more fantastic life. Prospero's preoccupation and fascination with what could be considered the occult (magic and his books) lead to his banishment from Milan, since he is, in a sense, neglecting his more pressing obligations. However, for Prospero, the Island and isolation allow him to master his magic and live in a world of his own design, enabling his eventual 'revenge.' In a similar manner, Locke's delusions lead him to the island, but the Island, in turn, makes Locke's fantasy a reality. At least, that is until Locke is manipulated into leaving the Island by the Man in Black, which leads to Locke's murder at the hands of Benjamin Linus.

Benjamin Linus

When Oceanic flight 815 crashes, Benjamin Linus is the leader of the Others (theoretically, which hints that he could possibly be the "leader" of the Island itself). At this point, barring Richard, Jacob and possibly Widmore, Ben knows the most about the Island. His position of leadership and his overwhelming knowledge of the Island make Ben a mild Prospero-like figure in *LOST*; however, he also has similarities to Caliban that will be explained later.

The most fascinating and compelling characteristic of Ben's is his penchant of lying. He spins stories to portray his leadership capabilities as superior, and, in addition, tries to paint his misdeeds as acts of kindness and good-will. While this seems rather malevolent, it actually highlights his more Prospero-like features. In a similar manner, Prospero spins his side of the story to his daughter, Miranda, in order to portray himself as the victim of his brother's betrayal rather than, perhaps, alluding to the truth. Prospero knows better than anyone the power of information and story-telling. Prospero is able to construct history with his stories—a history that his biased, surely, but he uses it to justify his revenge plot. While Prospero most likely deserved

to be ousted from his seat of power for dabbling far too much in the occult rather than doing his leadership obligations, Prospero manages to tell his daughter a story that portrays his plight as something beyond his control, and painted Antonio as the bad man.

Interestingly, if Ben is a metaphorical Prospero, this would make his adopted daughter, Alex, a Miranda figure. Ben is extremely focused on making sure she does not have a successful relationship with her boyfriend Karl in order to protect her from getting pregnant. On the Island, pregnancies never go to full-term, often resulting in the death of the expectant mother. For this reason, Ben locked Karl in Room 23 and attempted to brainwash him so that he would stay away from Alex. In a similar manner, Prospero's attention to Miranda and Ferdinand's blossoming relationship is focused, primarily, on his daughter's virtue, and Prospero even sets Ferdinand to slave-labor as a form of punishment.

Ben's power rapidly dissolves as the series progresses. Despite manipulating and playing the other characters for three seasons, in season six Ben is finally becoming as clueless as everyone else. After the death of his daughter, he unravels. He chose the Island over her, but then when he expects some sort of recognition from the Island's real "leader"—Jacob—then he is coldly dismissed when Jacob bluntly asks, "What about *you*?". As a result, Ben stabs Jacob with a knife ("The Incident"). This seems to indicate that Ben has lost his faith in the Island, but in "Dr. Linus," Ben finally resolves to join Jacob's side in the coming war against the Man in Black.

Jacob

Jacob is a pivotal figure in the *LOST*-verse and the White Player in the large chess game motif that encompasses the series. Even before he is visually revealed in the season five finale of *LOST,* he is brought up many times throughout the series, often by the Others in a fearful context

where he's ominously referred to as simply "He" or "Him." Like Prospero, he is also the reason the characters arrive on the Island. He brought the *Black Rock* aboard the Island by causing a storm ("Ab Aeterno") and he uses the lighthouse as a way of guiding people through some mystical means to the Island ("The Lighthouse"). He has brought them there for a purpose—some as "candidates" for his replacement and others for a yet unseen reason.

Like Prospero, Jacob has "magic." His touch can bestow gifts upon people, as Richard asserts in the episode "Dr. Linus." In Richard's case, in "Ab Aeterno," after Jacob offers Richard the job of being his mediator to humanity, Richard asks Jacob for something in return. After asking for two impossible things—his wife Isabella back and to be "redeemed"—he asks to live forever, and Jacob smiles and says, "That I can do." Then, just by touching Richard's shoulder, Jacob bestows him with eternal youth, and solidifies Richard's role as Jacob's spokesman on the Island. In addition, Jacob's touch also makes it impossible for one to kill oneself. For example, Michael could not kill himself when he left the Island, Locke was prevented from doing so when he tried to hang himself in "The Life and Death of Jeremy Bentham," and Jack tested this by lighting a stick of dynamite and watching the wick burn and flicker out on the *Black Rock* ("Dr. Linus").

Jacob's touch can also heal. When Locke falls eight stories after being pushed out of a window by his father Anthony Cooper ("The Man from Tallahassee"), Jacob is waiting down below and touches him, which makes Locke's eyes open, indicating that Jacob's touch saved his life ("The Incident"). In a similar manner, Prospero's spirits restore everyone at the end of the play: "My charms I'll break; their senses I'll restore; / And they shall be themselves" (V.i.31-32) and he claims that he can raise the dead: "graves at my command / Have waked their sleepers, ope'd and let 'em forth / By my so potent art" (V.i.48-50), of course Jacob cannot raise the dead,

since he told Richard he could not bring Isabella back to life, but Jacob's powers to prevent death and heal are similar to Prospero's restorative abilities. In addition, when one strays from the path of Jacob, they are met with ill-fortune. When Locke started to lose faith in the Island, he lost the use of his legs. Ben's persistent misdeeds are the reason he developed a tumor on his spine, and Jack's loss of faith made his appendix burst. While it seems these were instances of the Island's "will," Jacob is potentially responsible for these actions.

Jacob is not always benevolent. He is capable of being severe in a manner that someone who is "Prospero-like" should be. In season three, when the audience is first introduced to "The Others," we see that the Others follow Jacob's orders because they appear to be afraid of him in the same way that Ariel fears Prospero's powers. In "Maternity Leave," Tom says to Ethan, "You know what he'll do when he finds out." This is an implicit threat that if things do not go according to plan, Jacob will punish someone. Words that have generally been used to describe Jacob are "great," "magnificent," "powerful," and "unforgiving." However, following "Ab Aeterno" and Jacob's reveal in "The Incident," it is possible the terror they feel is because of the Man in Black—Jacob's rival who also has magic/supernatural powers, but this is unlikely because Richard has been received direction/guidance from Jacob throughout the seasons, and he is even following Jacob's will after Jacob's death.

Even after Jacob's demise in "The Incident," he is still able to play his chess pieces and manipulate the characters by appearing to Hurley—a character gifted by being able to see dead people. By appearing to Hurley, Jacob convinces Hurley to take Jack far away from the Temple because he knows the Man in Black/Smoke Monster is going to come and kill everyone, and he wants to protect some of his valuable pieces: "I couldn't risk you not coming, Hugo. I had to get you and Jack as far away from that temple as I possibly could … Because someone's coming

there. Someone bad" ("The Lighthouse"). Furthermore, in same episode, it is revealed that Jacob has been watching the characters from the very beginning with the Lighthouse mirror. Jack turns the dial and it lands on 23 (Jack's number) and Jack sees his childhood home. He says, "He's been watching. The whole time. All of us. He's been watching us," and then demands to see Jacob, but Hurley says, "It doesn't work like that, I told you. He just kind of shows up whenever he feels like it." After this reveal, Jack shatters the Lighthouse mirror, thus disabling it from somehow guiding whoever is still supposed to find their way to the Island; however, when Hurley tells Jacob this, Jacob does not seem to care. He shrugs and says, "Well… I'm sure they'll find some other way." Hurley (sort of) catches on and says, "Did you want Jack to see what was in that mirror? … Why?" To which Jacob replies, "It was the only way for him to understand how important he is." Everything Jacob does is a planned move. Similarly, Prospero nonchalantly seems to play his pieces in *The Tempest*: "I'll to my book, / For yet ere suppertime must I perform / Much business appertaining" (III.i.94-96), and does not even seem the least bit concerned about Caliban's group coming to kill him, which could also parallel Jacob's cold attitude towards Ben in the face of the dagger that kills him.

However, Jacob is not a full-fledged Prospero. After all, the magic, omniscient Prospero died with the collapse of the Elizabethan World view. Similarly, Jacob dies. Nonetheless, even after his death, he is still able to manipulate the characters[12]. In this way, like Hurley says, Jacob is much like "Obi-Wan Kenobi" ("The Lighthouse"). Before his death, however, Jacob had his very own Ariel-like character to give orders to—Richard. In "Ab Aeterno," Jacob tells Richard that it would defeat the purpose of bringing people to the Island to tell them what to do, but he realizes Richard can do it for him: "Well, I don't want to step in. Maybe you can do it for me. You can be my...my representative and intermediary between me and the people I bring to the

island" ("Ab Aeterno"). This is similar to how Prospero manages the spirits on the Island in order to perform his magic. Prospero is not wielding the magic wand himself, but Ariel is doing it for him.

Ariel, the Loyal Servant who's "Always Been There"

> PROSPERO:
>
> What, Ariel! My industrious servant, Ariel!
>
> *Enter ARIEL*
>
> ARIEL:
>
> What would my potent master? here I am (IV.i.34-35).

Richard is the unconditional servant of the island and to Jacob. When the time calls for it, he is willing to ignore the so-called 'leadership' of the Others for what the Island/Jacob wants. In "Dead is Dead," Richard is reproached by Charles Widmore for bringing Ben back to the Other's camp, but Richard merely says, "Jacob wanted it done. The Island chooses who the Island chooses. You know that" ("Dead is Dead"). Similarly, Ariel performs all the tasks that Prospero asks of him, albeit reluctantly at the beginning of the play. As Prospero says, "Bravely the figure of this harpy hast thou / Performed, my Ariel; a grace it had, devouring" and has done everything "Of my instruction" (III.iii.83-86).

Ben describes Richard as "a kind of... advisor," and Richard's first character centric episode is titled "Follow the Leader," indicating that Richard's job for a long time has been around to merely follow orders. Furthermore, Richard's obligation to the Island is accentuated by his name[13]. According to Lindelof and Cuse, Richard Alpert is, in fact, named after the real life Dr. Richard Alpert, aka, Ram Dass, a noted Hindu spiritualist and writer. He was well-known for experimenting with LSD, which he believed to be an aid into attaining higher spiritual

awareness, and after a trip to India, he was given the name “Ram Dass,” which translates to “Servant of God.” In a similar sense, Richard seems to function as a spiritual-guide on the Island, rather than any sort of leader.

However, Richard is also subject to doubt. In “Dr. Linus,” he tries to kill himself by asking Jack to light a stick of dynamite for him (because he cannot die by his own hands). The reason is that he feels his servitude was in vain:

> I devoted my life, longer than you can possibly imagine, in service of a man who told me that everything was happening for a reason, that he had a plan, plan that I was a part of, when the time was right that he'd share it with me, and now that man's gone so...why do I want to die? Because I just found out my entire life had no purpose (“Dr. Linus”).

Like Montgomery after Moreau’s demise in *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* following Jacob’s murder, Richard falls in a disillusioned stupor[*]. Furthermore, both characters feel that their lives were meaningless[+]. In addition, both Richard and Montgomery made mistakes that caused him to be shipped to their respective Islands. Montgomery says that he “lost his head,” while, in a rage, Richard accidentally killed a doctor by tripping him, causing the doctor to knock his head on the corner of a table, and the events proceeding this led him to a life of servitude on the Island (“Ab Aeterno”).

After the *Black Rock* crashed on the Island after a horrific storm (presumably caused by Jacob in order to bring new people to the Island), all the slaves are killed by Jonas Whitfield

---

[*] “He had been strangely under the influence of Moreau’s personality. I do not think it had ever occurred to him that Moreau could die. This disaster was the sudden collapse of the habits that had become part of his nature in the ten or more monotonous years he had spent on the island” (Wells 160).

[+] “I haven’t had any life. I wonder when it’s going to begin. Sixteen years being bullied by nurses and schoolmasters at their own sweet will, five in London grinding hard at medicine—bad food, shabby lodgings, shabby clothes, shabby vice—a blunder—*I* didn’t know any better—and hustled off to this beastly island” (Wells 161).

because they have limited rations. However, before Whitfield is able to kill Richard, the Smoke Monster/the Man in Black sweeps through the ship and kills Whitfield. Richard then remains chained in the brig of the ship for several days, starving, and begins to possibly have a hallucination of his wife Isabella created by the Man in Black/Smoke Monster. When Isabella appears to Richard, she tells Richard he is dead and that they are in Hell. She flees and appears to be taken away by the smoke. Then, the Man in Black appears in human form and tells Richard the Devil has his wife, and that, in exchange for some services to him, he will free Richard so he can save Isabella. In this manner, Richard, like Ariel, is freed from horrific imprisonment only to be indebted to another for his services:

> … Thou, my slave,
> As thou report'st thyself, was then her servant,
> And – for thou wast a spirit too delicate
> To act her earthy and abhorred commands,
> Refusing her grand hests – she did confine thee,
> By help of her more potent ministers
> And in her most unmitigable rage,
> Into a cloven pine, within which rift
> Imprisoned thou didst painfully remain
> A dozen years, within which space she died
> And left thee there, where thou didst vent thy groans
> As fast as mill-wheels strike. Then was this island
> … not honoured with a human shape.
> … It was mine art,

> When I arrived and heard thee, that made gape
>
> The pine and let thee out (I.ii.270-293)

Of course, the Man in Black is less than honest. When he says “the Devil” has Isabella, he means Jacob. He is manipulating Richard to try and kill Jacob so he can be “free.” When Richard does approach Jacob with a knife to kill him, Jacob explains to Richard that he was tricked—that he is not the one who took Isabella or the Devil, and that Richard is not dead or in Hell. Following this, Jacob offers Richard the job of being his mediator to the humans on the Island, so that Richard can “advise” the current leaders in the human groups without interfering too much; hence, why the Others did something horrible like “purge” the DHARMA initiative. The people on the island are still free to make their own choices.

Richard, like Ariel, is also supernatural. He is a man who has “always been [there]” (“Jughead”). As the series as progressed, it has been revealed that Richard has one *very* interesting characteristic: he’s ageless, and not because he’s “time-travelling,” “a cyborg,” or “vampire” as Hurley suggests in “Dr. Linus.” Richard says that his immortality is a “gift” from Jacob. Furthermore, sometimes Richard has been shown to just appear out of nowhere, generally when he’s called for, much like Ariel. In the episode “Whatever Happened, Happened,” Sawyer is startled when Richard walks out of the brush after Sawyer asked to speak with Richard. Sawyer asks, “Where the hell did you come from?” and Richard just says, “You asked my people to bring you to me. Here I am[*].” The same sort of situation happens a season later in the episode “Dr. Linus.” Jack and Hurley are walking through the jungle when Richard seems to emerge from thin air. Richard just directs them towards the Temple, and Jack asks “Where did you come

[*] ARIEL: “What would my potent master? here I am (Shakespeare IV.i.35).

from?" to which Richard replies, "You wouldn't believe me if I told you[+]." Like Ariel, Richard appears when called for and needed by the characters on the Island.

Of course, Richard is not a perfect Ariel figure. He is a human, and, as Ariel says in Act V, he is *not* human and does not feel the same way that human beings can feel. Quite the opposite, Richard, who in early season appeared stoic and almost robotic, has one of the more heart-wrenching back-stories and is quite capable of human emotions. However, they are both unique, supernatural characters in their respective stories, following the orders of enigmatic chess masters, and yet also clueless to the grand scheme unfolding before their eyes.

Sycorax, Prospero's Dark Foil

The Man in Black still does not have a name[♦]. He is our Black player in the chess game that spans LOST—another Prospero-like figure—The Man in Black or the Smoke Monster. Or perhaps he is more analogous to Sycorax—the dark foil to Prospero in *The Tempest.* It is not until season six that we find out conclusively that the Smoke Monster is the Man in Black—a "judge" of sorts on the Island that functions as a security system to defend the Island from harm. In addition, the Monster enacts punishment for those who have done wrong. In addition, he can change shape depending on his task/duty. When he judges Ben, he confronts Ben with images of Ben's dead daughter Alex. Then, the monster becomes a physical manifestation of Alex and tells Ben that he is now going to follow Locke's (the Man in Black in disguise) leadership. Like Sycorax, the Man in Black is Prospero-like in nature, yet on the dark side. He is what the characters call "evil incarnate."

[+] He is alluding to his past aboard the *Black Rock,* but does not believe that Jack and Hurley would take his word for it when he says he's over 150 years old.
[♦] As of episode ten of season six "The Package."

Harry Berger Jr. writes that "Sycorax, who dies before Prospero reached the Island, belongs to the archetypal past and is therefore an absolute or pure figure of evil" (159). Very similarly, the Man in Black is described by Dogen in "Sundown" as "evil incarnate," and in order for Richard to understand the immensity of the Man in Black, Jacob described him using the word "Hell." Enough is said about the Man in Black to deduce that he is, in some way, the contrary to the good forces on the Island; however, there has been no direct evidence of this barring the Monster's unprovoked murders of non-Candidate characters like the pilot of Oceanic 815 ("Pilot: Part 1"), Nikki and Paolo ("Exposé"), and Mr. Eko ("The Cost of Living"). This is exemplified by Richard's terror of the Smoke Monster in "The Substitute." Richard runs out of the jungle and warns Sawyer, "You don't understand what you're dealing with! He [the Man in Black] doesn't just want you dead, he wants everyone dead! Everyone you care about! All of them! And he won't stop—!" ("The Substitute"). Sycorax is, similarly, described in purely negative terms by Prospero; which, of course, lends towards a biased opinion, but the only one we have besides that of her son.

"…This Island with Calibans"

Benjamin Linus

Ben is a schemer, mischief maker, and overall "bad guy." One of his unique qualities is his compulsive lying. In "The Package," this is made into a joke when Ben asks, "Why don't you believe me?" and Ilana replies, "Because you're speaking." His lying is his main tool when it comes to manipulating the characters—making him, on one-level, a Prospero-like story-weaver, and yet his lying is also his way of asserting a sort of right of ownership of the Island. When talking with Locke, Ben lies and says that he "was born here on this Island. I'm one of the last that was." Ben also reveals that it is for this reason that "Jacob talks to [him]. … He tells [him]

what to do" ("The Man Behind the Curtain"). Of course, as usual, this was later revealed to be a well-crafted lie that Ben used in order to validate his position on the Island, but the point remains that Ben feels as though he has more of a sense of entitlement if he were born on the Island, much like Caliban: "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou takest from me" (I.ii.333-334).

In addition, Ben is mistreated by Jacob to the point where Ben kills Jacob. All his life, Ben has been doing things in the name of Jacob and the Island without so much as a "good job." He has never been invited to talk to Jacob, and has never heard word back for his services to the Island, including sacrificing his daughter, Alex. Similarly, Caliban feels vengeful towards Prospero for his enslavement and suffering; in so far as Caliban plots to kill Prospero with Stephano and Trinculo. Of course, the different here being that Caliban failed, while Ben succeeded.

Ben is not the only character who claims ownership of the Island and has a grudge against the enigmatic forces on the Island. Charles Widmore, Ben's rival, is another character who claims that he is the sole leader, and will stop at nothing to get the Island back.

Charles Widmore

> WIDMORE: I was afraid Benjamin might fool you into leaving the Island, as he did with me. I was their leader.
>
> LOCKE: The Others?
>
> WIDMORE: They're not the "Others" to me. They're my people. We protected the Island peacefully for more than three decades. But then I was exiled... by him... just as you were ("The Life and Death of Jeremy Bentham").

Charles Widmore is another one of *LOST*'s central antagonist. It was revealed in "Jughead" that Widmore used to be an Other living on the Island in a position of leadership—a leadership which stretched until the early '90s (about 1992), following his exile from the Island for having relations with an outsider. Although we are told that Widmore was banished for having a relationship and child outside of the Island, Widmore holds a grudge against Ben and will tell anyone that Ben is the reason he is no longer allowed back, as he says to Ben in "The Shape of Things to Come," "everything you have you took from me" ("The Shape of Things to Come"). While it is possible that Widmore is lying, Ben does not refute Widmore's claim. The conflict between Ben and Widmore over the leadership of the Others is steadily being developed as the series progresses, and more and more we are shown glimpses into these two characters pasts.

Both feel entitled to the Island, Widmore because he was on the Island first (as far as we know, since 1954 and possibly earlier), but Ben firmly believes that he is special and the Island's chosen leader (also, Ben was healed by the Island for some purpose or another). Widmore's declarations of having been "fooled" are very reminiscent of Caliban's frustration: "As I told thee [Stephano] before, I am subject to a tyrant, / A sorcerer, that by his cunning hath / Cheated me of the island" (III.ii.40-43). Like Caliban, Widmore feels the Island was swept from under him by trickery. Of course, Ben's trickery is his masterful deception and story-manipulation, while Prospero's is literal sorcery.

Besides being pitted against Ben, Widmore is well-aware of the presence of Jacob and the Man in Black. Widmore is able to get back to the Island after Jacob's death, because Jacob is no longer able to protect the Island from those who want to tap the Island's source of power (speculated to be its electromagnetism), and is, as of season six, working to dispatch the Man in

Black. On the beach, Widmore's team installed sonic-pylons that can keep the Monster at bay, thus, protecting them from the Man in Black until they can craft a plan to take him down. Widmore also seems well-aware of the destructive power of the Man in Black, and, like Jacob, is desperate to keep him on the Island, because he tells Jin that if the Man in Black is able to escape, then everything they know and love will "cease to be" ("The Package"), similar to how Richard told Sawyer that the Man in Black would "kill everyone." Widmore's reasons would seem noble, if it was not for the fact that he seems hell-bent on using the Island for personal means.

The Man in Black

If the Man in Black is not Prospero or his dark foil Sycorax, then he could definitely also be seen as a Caliban figure. This comparison lies within the fact that the Man in Black's goal for a very long time is to kill Jacob—to seek revenge against Jacob for imprisoning him. As the Man in Black says to Jacob: "Do you have any idea how badly I want to kill you? … One of these days … I'm going to find a loophole, my friend" ("The Incident"). Caliban's desire is the same—to put an end to Prospero's power so he can be free from his enslavement: "I am subject to a tyrant, / A sorcerer" (III.ii.40-42). The Man in Black also compares himself to the chained Richard on the *Black Rock* when he says "I want to be free, too" ("Ab Aeterno"), because he says Jacob has trapped him on the Island. In order to be free, the Man in Black must somehow kill Jacob, but he is unable to do so because it is against the "rules". The only way to kill Jacob is to convince a mortal/human to do so. In "Ab Aeterno," in exchange for freeing Richard, Richard is told to stab Jacob with a knife. This attempt to kill Jacob fails. Later, the Man in Black finds a "loophole" by using the disguise of the deceased John Locke to convince Richard and the Others that he has somehow been resurrected for a higher purpose; he uses this conviction in order to

trick Benjamin Linus into killing Jacob for him by appealing to Ben's anger, because all his life Ben has been doing things in the name of Jacob, but has never seen him, talked to him, or received any sort of recognition for his loyalty to the Island. This is similar to Caliban vowing his servitude to Stephano, and then filling Stephano and Tinculo's heads with the notion of killing Prospero to get his powers:

> Why, as I told thee, 'tis a custom with him
> I'th' afternoon to sleep. There thou mayst brain him,
> Having first seized his books, or with a log
> Batter his skull, or paunch him with a stake,
> Or cut his wezand with thy knife. Remember
> First to possess his books, for without them
> He's but a sot [fool], as I am, nor hath not
> One spirit to command. They all do hate him
> As rootedly as I. Burn but his books.
> He has brave utensils (for so he calls them)
> Which, when he has a house, he'll deck withal. (III.ii.87-97)

In the Arden *Tempest,* Virginia and Alden Vaughan remark upon the twentieth-century psychoanalytic analysis of *The Tempest,* wherein Caliban becomes the "Id." They cite W.H. Auden's "representation of Caliban as Prospero's mirrored face—the magus's dark and secret self" as one of the influences to *Forbidden Planet,* wherein the Caliban figure is the Monster from the Id—a product of Dr. Morbius's scientific meddling with Krell technology (111). After all, Caliban is the result of Prospero's "art": "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" (I.ii.364-366). In

addition, Caliban can be compared to this monster because of his libidinous behavior; he does admit to trying to sexually assault Miranda and, in general, behaves in barbaric manners that characterize the Freudian Id. Similarly, *LOST*'s Smoke Monster has been compared to the Id monster from *Forbidden Planet* by one of the writers, David Fury: "Metaphorically, the Monster was just the great unknown threat, the imminent danger around the corner that potentially haunts us all… Some thought of it as a monster of the id, much like in *Forbidden Planet*—that maybe it appeared differently to everyone who saw it." The Id, of course, is the darkness of the human subconscious—pure carnal desire and primal urges. Similarly, Jacob describes "the Monster"/the Man in Black as evil/Hell/malevolence, while Dogen calls him "evil incarnate"—a force beyond imagination that cannot leave the confines of the "bottle," which is corked by the Island. The nature of the Monster is still being unraveled as the series progresses, but it is a safe bet to assume that the Monster is, in some way, like the Monster from the Id—a creature/spirit that believes in the inherent evil of humanity, and tries to appeal to this darkness, and thus, like Pandora's Box, he cannot leave the Island (the bottle) or else evil/the Id will be unleashed.

Imprisonment

It is not hard to see how imprisonment is crucial in *The Tempest*. Prospero, for one, is trapped on the Island with his daughter and unable to escape; furthermore, the survivors are stuck without any means of transport—believing their ship to be useless. Here, Ariel is addressing Prospero with information about the Island guests and refers to them as "prisoners": "Confined together / In the same fashion as you have in charge, / Just as you left them; all prisoners, sir" (V.i.8-10). Essentially, the survivors are stuck on that Island until Prospero feels like letting them go. Similarly, the survivors of Oceanic Flight 815 are stuck on the Island until further notice—potentially until their role is finished, as Eloise Hawking says to Desmond, "The Island's not

done with you yet" ("316"). In addition to the Island being hard to reach, it is also hard to escape or be rescued. Since the Island is always moving, it is hard for those on the outside to know where the survivors are. For example, Charles Widmore stages a fake Oceanic Flight 815 crash in order to protect the Island from prying eyes. The survivors try to escape the island a few times, once on raft before it was destroyed, and they also attempted to steal a submarine before Locke sunk it, and then, finally, eight of them managed to escape on a helicopter that had come on a freighter. Until this point, none of them have been able to get off, and only then were they able to escape because Richard promised Kate and Sayid that they could leave if they helped him save Ben from Widmore's hired guns. However, they all are inevitably led back to the Island—even in death. After Ben kills Locke, Locke's body is still placed on Ajira 316 as a stand-in for Christian's corpse. In the season five finale, Sawyer, Kate, and Juliet also tried to escape on a submarine with the DHARMA evacuees, but decided to leave after Jack concocted a plan to potentially send them back in time.

The thematic implication here is that the character must be detained in order to confront their pasts. They cannot keep running, otherwise they will never be able to come face-to-face with their pasts. Similarly, in *The Tempest*, Prospero's detaining of Antonio and Alonso is a method of having the two finally confront him and repent. This is why the insular quality of the Island as a narrative setting is so important. It is not easy to flee when trapped on all sides by water—just ask the Man in Black. Also, the difficulty of escape mirrors the arduousness of entering. In order to leave the island, one must go through a similar process to landing there—through some sort of compulsory means or through purification—in this case, release offered by the Island's will.

Checkmate

> Here PROSPERO discovers FERDINAND and MIRANDA playing at chess (V.i.sd)

The thematic importance and appearance of chess in *The Tempest* is not unintentional or without significance. Prospero is casting himself as a chess master in this play—pitting each player against the other, arranging them on the island like pieces across a board; after all, is not the object of chess to capture the King? To checkmate? In a sense, Prospero is working to "checkmate" his traitorous brother and King Alonso in order to reinstate his authority, and he does this through the insular quality presented in the Island.

In a similar manner, games[14] are a huge motif in *LOST*. Chess itself appears in seven episodes and plays an important role in the plot in the episode "Enter 77," where Locke must defeat a computer in a game of chess (which no one has done before) in order to unlock the Flame station video. There was even a *LOST* mobisode[*] dedicated to Ben and Jack playing a game of chess called "King of the Castle," which represents the symbolic rivalry budding between the two opposing forces of leadership in the show. In addition, in "316," Desmond storms into the Lamp Post Station and tells Jack, "These people… They're just using us. They're playing some kind of game, and we are just the pieces," which implies that they have been manipulated and prodded on certain paths throughout the series. The numbers also play into the chess motif. Each player (Black and White) begins with 16 pieces, which is the fourth number in the sequence of repeating numbers that appear throughout the series (4-8-15-16-23-42)[15]. Also – there is the continuing reference to enigmatic "rules" that preside over the action of the series. Charles Widmore and Ben mentions these in relation to their rivalry in "The Shape of Things to Come," while Jacob and the Man in Black are aware of the rules as well. When the Man in Black

---

[*] Short scenes filmed solely for online distribution and viewing.

is in the woods, he is visited by a mysterious blonde child (thought to be a younger Jacob) who says, “You know the rules”—implying that the Man in Black was planning to break them.

The metaphor stretches beyond simple rivalries. The entirety of the series could be interpreted as a chess game between two players: White (Jacob) and Black (the Man in Black). As the series draws to a close, the Man in Black is rallying to get people to his side for the endgame. Both players are trying to assemble their respective teams for the final battle between, what one could only assume, is good vs. evil (white vs. black)[16]. Jacob believes that humanity is inherently good, while the Man in Black asserts that humanity is naturally predisposed to ill-will. Jacob says in “Ab Aeterno” that the Island is a “cork” meant to keep the evil separated from the world; in this case, the Island is function to imprison the Man in Black/the Smoke Monster/evil in a sort of wine-bottle. However, the chess game is being played in order for the Man in Black to escape, perhaps in a manner similar to Pandora’s Box, to unleash unbridled evil into the universe.

Jacob vs. the Man in Black: The Utopian and the Dystopian

> JACOB: I take it you're here ‘cause of the ship.
>
> MAN IN BLACK: I am. How did they find the Island?
>
> JACOB: You'll have to ask them when they get here.
>
> MAN IN BLACK: I don't have to ask. You brought them here. Still trying to prove me wrong, aren't you?
>
> JACOB: You are wrong.
>
> MAN IN BLACK: Am I? They come. They fight. They destroy. They corrupt. It always ends the same.

> JACOB: It only ends once. Anything that happens before that is just progress (“The Incident”).

One key dichotomy propelling the conflict on the island is that between the Man in Black and Jacob—two men positing two different philosophical concepts. It appears their main argument is about human nature, where Jacob believes in *tabula rasa,* the thought that everyone begins with a blank slate, that “their past doesn’t matter,” and can be taught/learn to be humanitarians (“I [want] them to help themselves to know the difference between right and wrong without me having to tell them”), and the Man in Black, who, like Thomas Hobbes, believes that man is inherently wicked and will always go down the dark path. Their conflict stems centuries, with neither appearing to be a victor, even after Jacob’s death. Jacob’s final words were “They’re coming,” indicating that his “candidates” (or replacements) are coming to the Island and the battle will continue without him. On Prospero’s isle, the dichotomous nature of what could, at first glance, be perceived as “good” and “evil” is the parallel between Prospero and the dark witch Sycorax.

According to Harry Berger Jr., Sycorax is described a hoop, because she has “turned upon herself in envy” and is “raven black with malice.” She was exiled from the island for ‘mischief’s manifold and sorceries terrible’.” She “appears to be Prospero’s antithesis – the nightmare which compliments his wish-fulfillment” (156-157). As in, Prospero could be registered a “utopian” thinker, while Sycorax is the “dystopian.” However, Berger Jr. admits that the two are, perhaps, more alike than they are different. He writes that both of them were banished because of “the study or practice of magic,” although Sycorax appears to be “motivated by pure evil” while, by contrast, “Prospero’s motives… seem good, into themselves and have proved unfit for, or in adequate to, social and political existence” (157). In addition, “[i]f

Prospero withdrew for traditional reasons – extreme idealism and idyllism, contemplation and recreation," then Sycorax is the "contrary," though she too withdrew for the same "traditional" reasons, but she is a "have-not," which Berger Jr. says is a figure: "of envy and malice whose dissatisfaction with their lot produces hatred of self and others; who spend their time trying to violate others wither to possess their beauty and otherness or simply for the temporary relief and communion gained by seeing them suffer" (157). In essence, Sycorax wants to appeal to the darker side of life and revels in masochism.

The Man in Black and Jacob are individually characterized in a similar manner. Their antagonism could even be seen on a Miltonian level, where Jacob is representative of God, and the Man in Black of Satan (his smoke form even moves in a serpentine manner), and the Island is Paradise. Their relationship could also be seen as a classic dichotomous rivalry[17], a rivalry which can sometimes unfold into war, such as the battle between Hector and Achilles or Jupiter and his son Saturn, and this has been heavily implied in the series. Widmore says to John Locke in "The Life and Death of Jeremy Bentham," "A war is coming," implying that some sort of Island conflict is going to erupt, in all likelihood between the White forces (those on the side of Jacob) and the Black forces (those on the side of the Man in Black). Yet despite their ideological differences, they are very similar. Both possess Prospero-like characteristics, for example, Jacob can heal, while the Man in Black in the form of the Smoke Monster can uproot trees, which Prospero specifically states is within his "potent" powers: "and by the spurs plucked up / The pine and cedar" (V.i.47-48). In addition, both of them are "trapped" on the Island, and they both are players of a game wherein they manipulate the characters like pawns on a chessboard. Their differences stem in their ideologies—one is a utopian idealist and the other a dystopian realist.

In one of the last chapters to *From Utopia to Nightmare* (1962), Chad Walsh discusses the implications of the ideological war between "The Bourbon and the Jacobin," here he uses the words sans political affiliation (left-right), but rather to emphasize the inherent ideals each party possesses. Walsh defines them as such, The Bourbon "wants to keep things pretty much as they happen to be," while the Jacobin "wants to remake society to fit a blueprint" (175). In essence, Walsh labels the Jacob the "utopian thinker," and the "dystopian" is the Bourbon. The Bourbon "wants us to be aware of how strange, wonderful, delicate and perverse any society is, and how impossible it is for the dreamer and schemer to create, *ex novo*, a society that will not develop grave kinks and hitches" (176). The Jacobin "is simply the great theorizer, the planner, the apostle of the *tabula rasa*" (174). Walsh asserts that the two should not be at odds, but rather complement each other. The Bourbon is there to keep the Jacobin grounded within the bounds of what human beings can accomplish, while the Jacobin is there to make "Progress." Here, the Man in Black could be the Bourbon—the dystopian who believes that humanity is predisposed to staying the same, while Jacob is (appropriately enough) the Jacobin—the idealistic utopian who believes in the betterment of society and that "everything is just Progress." However, even thought the Jacobin (Jacob) appears to be a proponent of Progress, Jacob himself eschews technological advancement.

According to Ben in "The Man Behind the Curtain," Jacob is not a fan of technology, and this holds true when we see him for the first time in "The Incident." Jacob is seen using simple tools and hand-woven clothing. This seems contrary to a man who is a champion of human advancement; however, this is also emblematic of the pure "utopian." In "Atavism and Utopia," Eric S. Rabkin writes that "[o]ften the utopian world is a pastoral one by virtue of the exclusion of technology … Utopians have often prized … pastoral equanimity" (Rabkin, "Atavism," 3).

This would likewise place Jacob in the role of the “utopian thinker,” since his wardrobe and lifestyle is representative of a pastoralism. Rabkin also states that “Conversely, we often recognize dystopias for what they are by virtue of their anti-pastoral, post-Lapsarian nature” (4), which could be representative of the Man in Black’s perception of human nature—that they are bound to sin and, more importantly, they are *supposed* to. Furthermore, Jacob’s refusal to adapt technologically implies hostility towards science, which fits Harold Berger’s model for modern speculative fiction, wherein there is the implicit attack against the evolution of society through mechanical means.

There are several outcomes to their philosophical chess game of sorts. There could be a stalemate, and things remain the same—both kings remain standing. Then, there is the chance White/Jacob could checkmate Black/the Man in Black, an outcome in which the Man in Black is proved wrong by Jacob and is no longer a threat to humanity. Or Black is the victor, wherein potential chaos is unleashed upon the world. In addition, once a character is under the influence of the Man in Black, they begin to lose their minds. In season six, we are reintroduced to Claire who has somehow “changed.” She is not the sweet, caring mother of earlier seasons, but a wild, hateful woman who has no qualms in axing people to death. Sayid becomes “infected” at the beginning of season six, and later blatantly admits that he cannot feel anything anymore (“The Package”). After this declaration, he is comfortable in the role of the Man in Black’s “assassin,” at least he had no problems killing Dogen and Lennon in cold-blood on the Man in Black’s behalf (“Sundown”).

The issue of replacing Jacob also fits within the chess metaphor. Jacob is killed by Ben in the season five finale, “The Incident,” but he seems okay with his death, because the Candidates for his replacement are now on the Island. The Candidates are a list of people, including many of

the main characters, who can potentially take up the mantle of Jacob. They correspond to a group of numbers on two lists-one on a cave wall, and along the Lighthouse's rotary wheel/dial. The names are crossed off when a candidate dies or seems to turn against Jacob's will. For example, the name Linus is crossed off of the lists because Ben or even his father Robert were both prone to darkness. Similarly, Littleton (Claire) is crossed off because she has been taken over by the darkness. The Candidate could be analogous to a pawn reaching the end of the board game. However, hopefully a replacement will not be necessary and the Island can become a place where peace is eventually reached between Black and White. As Walsh states in the chapter "The Bourbon and the Jacobin," a balance is necessary in order for humanity to thrive—a balance between humanities carnal limits and idealistic progress towards a better future. Of course, in order to reform humanity—in order to play the game—one needs a board. If the space was limitless, no Progress could be made. There would be no points of reference. As a result—everyone remains a prisoner in the insular space provided by the Island.

The Endgame: Redemption

> "The show is about redemption. All the characters on this island are confronting the failures of their past and revisiting issues that go to the core of their emotional make up." - Carlton Cuse ("Carlton Cuse and Damon Lindelof Explain")

On *LOST* the theme of redemption underlies many of the characters' storylines. Seeking forgiveness and forgiving play into practically every character on the show in one way or another, and the Island seems to be a way of offering the characters a chance to repent for their misdeeds in the past. Similarly, Gonzalo says, "All three of them are desperate: their great guilt, / Like poison given to work a great time after, / Now 'gins to bite the spirits" (III.iii.105-107), implying that the guilt has been eating away at Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio for a while and

Prospero's illusory puppetry drawing them towards their redemption is, in fact, a relief. On *LOST*, the Island appears to judge the characters either worthy or unworthy of forgiveness and, subsequently, kills them, as with Mr. Eko and his judgment by the Monster in "The Cost of Living." While it would be nearly impossible to cover every instance of redemption in *LOST*, there are a few key examples that can be touched upon to show a general idea of how this theme presents itself in the series.

In "Ab Aeterno," Jacob says "their past doesn't matter" as a way of saying that one's life begins anew on the Island. An example can be clearly seen in Desmond Hume. Throughout his life, Desmond was called a coward. He backed out of marrying Penny because he was scared and did not feel worthy enough, and he ran off to join a monastery for a short-time as a result before -backing out of that commitment as well. However, after turning the fail-safe key in the hatch following a lapse in pressing the numbers, Desmond is metaphorically 'reborn.' The next time we see him after the implosion is Desmond running naked through the jungle, and, all of a sudden, Desmond's gained the ability to see into the future, because his consciousness is travelling through time. Desmond acting bravely in order to save everyone from the hatch's implosion allowed for him to become something akin to a superhero on the Island.

Similarly, Jin Kwon's redemptive process begins on the Island. Before crashing on the Island, Jin became an enforcer for his wife's father Mr. Paik. He would beat up men who owed money to Paik Industries, and subsequently became bitter, angry, and vengeful towards his wife. He distanced himself emotionally from Sun, and as a result, she began to have an affair behind his back. At the beginning of the series, Jin and Sun have a very strained relationship. He asserts masculine dominance over her, orders her around, and generally will not listen to her, but as time goes on, he begins to learn to love her again, and their relationship blossoms. In season four, they

even have a child together, albeit Sun begins to raise their baby off the Island after being rescued while Jin remains trapped on the Island.

But redemption does not always end so well for the characters. Charlie Pace has struggled with drug addiction for a long time. Off the Island, he is a lead band member in a one-hit wonder band called DriveShaft. While music is his passion, the band inevitably led him on a path towards drug-use and womanizing. When he crashes on the Island, he is struggling with withdrawal, and manages to eventually kick the habit with the help of Locke; however, after finding the drug smuggler plane on the Island, he suffers a relapse. By the end, Charlie is clean and has conquered his drug-battle. But Charlie has more than one redemption story. Another example is Charlie's death. In "Through the Looking Glass," Charlie sacrifices himself to save Desmond and to inform the other characters of incoming trouble on the freighter. This is his final act of redemption – self-sacrifice for the good of the collective, and also as a way of paying Desmond back for the multiple attempts to save Charlie from his fate. Similarly, Eko dies as a result of his redemption, because the Monster deemed that he was guilty of Yemi's death.

In *The Tempest*, the idea of redemption is very similar. Prior to the boat crash, Antonio and Alonso are guilty of having cast Prospero out of Milan, casting him and Miranda on the seas—essentially leaving them for dead. Once on the Island, there is the chance for them to interact with Prospero again and make amends. Prospero's magic and the aid of the spirits functions as a way of testing the survivors and leading them to realizing their wrongdoings; for example, when Ariel confronts them at the banquet and admonishes them for all they have done wrong:

> You are three men of sin, whom destiny,
>
> That hath to instrument this lower world

And what is in't, the never-surfeited sea

Hath caused to belch up you, and on this island

Where man doth not inhabit – you 'mongst men

Being more unfit to live – I have made you mad;

…

You fools! I and my fellows

Are ministers of fate. …

… remember

… that you three

From Milan did supplant good Prospero,

Exposed unto the sea, which hath requite it,

Him and his innocent child; for which foul deed,

The powers delaying, not forgetting, have

Incensed the seas and shores (III.iii.53-74).

Lucky for them, there is, as Ariel said, the chance for a "clear life ensuing." Following the events of the play, Alonso is repentant for what he has done (part of this relief is wrought by Alonso's reuniting with his son). Prospero even decides to forgive his brother, Antonio, who does not make any outward declarations of guilt:

Flesh and blood,

You, brother mine, that entertained ambition,

Expelled remorse and nature…

… I do forgive thee,

Unnatural though thou art (V.i.74-79).

In the end, everyone is redeemed and able to move on with life towards a better future barring, perhaps, Caliban, but in the end Caliban is left to the Island, so perhaps he gets what he wanted in the end after all. The Island provided a means for the characters to absolve themselves, reach an understanding, and move forward. Prospero finally lets them leave the Island, promising them "calm seas, auspicious gales" (V.i.315). Even Prospero grows as a result of his stay on the Island. The 13 years have taught him to let go. At the end, Prospero rejects magic and his books once and for all, drawing himself away from the occult, and perhaps learning to accept his role as a proper leader.

Conclusion

LOST is a series that has integrated elements of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* into its narrative framework. This appropriation is indicative of the palimpsestic nature of the series as a whole. As Craig Dionne states in "The Shatnerification of Shakespeare," it is possible this sort of blatant inclusion of Shakespearean elements is mere artifice in an attempt to elevate series from high brow to low brow; also, perhaps Cuse and Lindelof are providing building blocks to expand the hyperdiegetic world that is the Island. The show does take place in an "Other" world that can confuse us yet simultaneously lure many captivated viewers. That is why the show has developed a cult following, and why the series has been so marketable. One can buy DHARMA jumpsuits on the ABC store's website, and Dragon*Con featured a *LOST* fan panel in 2009; the series has been parodied on Late Night TV shows, been mentioned in comic-strips, and has graced the cover of a multitude of entertainment magazines. This cultish mentally is bred upon the multitude of secrets and mysteries that the island offers, and yet fails to answer—yet the creators leave us with enough information to speculate about them endlessly.

As stated in Chapter 4, the Island is a heterotopia—one that flips between nightmare and idyllic. The ideological battle between The Man in Black and Jacob epitomizes this utopian and dystopian oscillation. In addition, the Island is porous yet impenetrable, and literally travels through time/space. It is very similar to Prospero's Island in *The Tempest*, which is an Island that has traveled from theater to theater, movie screen to small screen, and has transformed across cultures and eras. It is a place that is both a utopia, as it is for Prospero, and a dystopia, as it is for the slave Caliban. Prospero's magic and shadowy nature lends him to be grafted into the speculative fiction genre as Charlie Jane Anders asserts in her article, and for this reason Jacob on *LOST* can be ascribed Prospero-like characteristics. He is an enigmatic chess master lording over an Island.

This chapter has also proven that *The Tempest* and *LOST* also share many similar themes, especially redemption. The heterotopic island proves beneficial as a domain within which characters can achieve redemption—by confronting the demons of their pasts. Only by being trapped in this space are the characters in both *The Tempest* and *LOST* able to look inwards and see the error of their ways. As Berger Jr. says in *Second World and Green World,* these illusory worlds, manipulated by a creator, are meant to impart a lesson to the one stepping into its fictional boundaries.

8. CONCLUSION

An Island. What comes to mind? I start to think of volcanoes and desolate wastelands, poisoned wells and water on all sides, sunburns and sharp rocks—Hell. Dystopia. A place where I cannot escape. At least, that is what I think as a student who just analyzed, dissected, and prodded the concept of the island as a place of idyllic dreams and torturous nightmares. It is a setting that has transcended from the "idyllic" political state envisioned by Thomas More in *Utopia* to become a place wherein enigmatic Prospero figures can reign supreme with their "art." It has become a heterotopic domain characterized by the dualistic natures of wish-fulfillment and nightmare. The island is also a natural setting that can be adapted into an unreal domain, such as the matrix in *The Matrix* or the virtual reality machine in *The Lawnmower* Man—places where reality fades away in place of illusion and characters are irrevocably altered by their interaction with these spaces. The island has moved from its utopian and colonialist roots on a trajectory through time/space, morphing with contemporary cultural climates.

The modern era has merged the polar utopia and dystopia into the modern heterotopia—an "Other" space that exists as fiction itself and second worlds in fiction. It is a place where the audience can reconcile both utopian and dystopian realities simultaneously to uncover one's identity in a manner similar to how Adam and Eve became aware of good and evil. The modern *Tempest* is an example of how this process has spanned centuries through the examination of Prospero in Chapter 2. From benevolent despot to Faustian black mage, Prospero has become a figure that thematically unites cultural perceptions of *The Tempest* as a whole. In addition, the more sinister Prosperos have proliferated the speculative genre in the role of mad scientists, shamans, aliens, and tyrants. As Ruth Morse suggests, *The Tempest* itself has become a model for many science fiction tales—specifically *Forbidden Planet* and *Star Trek*'s "Requiem for

Methesulah," while Kingsley Amis has suggested that *The Tempest* is a precursor to the sci-fi genre.

As I wrote in the Introduction, Virginia Vaughan and Alden Vaughan suggest Prospero's island has a "second world structure" (74). In Chapter 2, I discussed the concept of "second worlds" and "heterocosms"—two fictional spaces the artist can use to let the audience "escape" into another universe, and then leave the fictive reality (*break the transference*) in order to learn a lesson of some sort. *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare features an island that is inhabited by invisible spirits that can render the landscape "green" or, on the other hand, barren and desolate. The setting is determined by the magus Prospero—the deposed Duke of Milan who uses the Island's insular quality for a "chess game" against his enemies. Neil H. Wright writes in "Reality and Illusion as a Philosophical Pattern in 'The Tempest,'" that Prospero is a "creator and manipulator of illusions" and "ruling lord in a preternatural world," making him "an artist whose medium is the imaginary … [and who] reveals truth through illusion" (447). Prospero manipulates the characters with his deceptive magic in order to make them realize the error of their ways in the same way that an author uses "second worlds" in order to engage their audience and impart a lesson.

In Chapter 3, Orson Scott Card's lengthy consideration of the speculative genre as one defined by its setting would definitely bolster the Vaughan's argument. After all, *The Tempest* takes place in a world very different from our own. Consequently, *The Tempest* has also undergone the same transformative considerations that other speculative fictions have had as a result of mounting uncertainty regarding technological advancement. Hence, Prospero's magic has become analogous to modern science, while his island is the experimental laboratory of

nightmares. As Charlie Jane Anders suggests, Prospero has found a long-lasting place in the realm of speculative fiction, becoming for the modern audience Doctor Who, Gandalf, Jacob, Obi-Wan Kenobi, the Wizard of Oz, and other enigmatic manipulators that cast us into second worlds—imparting us with islands to escape to, that can relax us, terrify us, and teach us something about our present reality. Prospero can be the lord of a utopia and a dystopia—and for the modern era he is the master of the heterotopia. As the Vaughans assert, Prospero's island certainly offers speculative fiction writers to "utopian or dystopian reimaginings" (74). For this reason, *The Tempest* has been interpreted in a multitude of ways. In Chapter 2, Michael Billington's article was provided to demonstrate how Prospero was reimagined in just one theater year. In addition, Chapter 6 looked into the influence *The Tempest* has had on speculative fiction.

Cult television, like theater, provides worlds where authors/playwrights can re-tell and restage the sourcetext in a manner of ways—similar to how Julie Sanders asserts works undergo a transformative process when they are rendered "adaptations" and "appropriations." As a result, Shakespeare is often peppered across a multitude of cult shows as a method of elevating them to "high culture" status. Like *LOST,* many cult shows have become palimpsest for the centuries of cultural capital that has expanded with the passage of time.

As Chapter 4 demonstrates, the island on *LOST* is a heterotopian domain, while Chapter 5 describes how the medium of television itself could be registered as heterotopian in nature. In addition, Chapter 7 offers a lengthy analysis of how *LOST* is a cultural product of the modern era—a show mixing various literary ancestors, myths, and random mystery in order to construct an endlessly deferred narrative. This narrative form has provoked the development of *LOST*'s

very own cult following—similar to how Shakespearean critics continue to analyze, investigate, and discuss Shakespeare's works today.

However, I must heed Craig Dionne's warning that perhaps, as a scholar, I am *too* hermeneutic—exceedingly willing to cherry-pick clues and hidden themes from any work (Dionne 180). It is always possible that nothing is there, or as a child in *The Matrix* (1999) says to Neo, "Do not try to bend the spoon — that's impossible. Instead, only try to realize the truth. … *There is no spoon*." However, Shakespeare *is* there, ready to be found in a variety of speculative fiction because "Shakespeare not only survives in the future but remains in untouched form as an icon of poetic truth and authority for *all* cultures" (176). He has proliferated speculative fiction in an inextricable way, and his lording chess master Prospero and the illusory Island are there to stay, because Shakespeare not only speaks to the past, but to the present and the future.

So, where did it all begin? Prospero's Island… and it is still traveling in the indefinable, un-chartable human imagination—leaping from Altair IV to Fantasy Island to the Island of Dr. Moreau to Laputa and the site of the crash of Oceanic Flight 815.

---

[1] For example, Kathryn Barbour in "Flout 'em and Scout 'em and Scout 'em and Flout 'em: Prospero's Power and Punishment in *The Tempest*" asserts that the "apparatus of power on the island [is] magic" (290), and that Prospero assumes the role of a tyrannical monarch on the island, which is why he uses his magic – to assert power over others.

[2] In an article titled "The Villain of the Piece" by Nigel Honeybone on HorrorNews.net, in the "semi-sequel" to *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea* (1870)—*The Mysterious Island* (1875)—Captain Nemo has hidden himself away underneath an unmapped island, becoming a "Prospero-like figure for the castaways there, working scientific wonders which enable them to survive."

[3] To see the thematic similarities between *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Tempest*, see: Riga, Frank P. "Merlin, Prospero, Saruman and Gandalf: Corrosive Uses of Power in Shakespeare and Tolkien" and Petty, Anne C. "Prospero's Books, Gandalf's Staff" in *Tolkien and Shakespeare: Essays on Shared Themes and Language*, ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2007.

[4] Ray goes even further to suggest that Prospero extends beyond the powers of the *deus ex machina.*

[5] Gordon, Damian. "Prospero's Men [1680s]." *The 1680s League of Extraordinary Gentlemen.* Web. 2010. < http://www.comp.dit.ie/dgordon/League/OtherLeagues/1680s/1680League.html>

---

[6] For more about this, look at Hawkins, Harriett. *Classics and trash traditions and taboos in high literature and popular modern genres*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.
[7] Hawkins 101.
[8] María Losada Friend, "El Discurso de la autoridad disfrazado: El poder en las islas imaginarias de Swift y Shakespeare." *Actas del XXI congreso internacional de A.E.D.E.A.N., Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos: Sevilla,* 18, 19, 20 diciembre 1997. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1999. 347-352. Print.
[9] The DHARMA Initiative is an organization that set up stations on the Island in order to perform experiments harnessing the Island's electromagnetic energy.
[10] B.J. Sokol brings into question the ambiguity of Fortune in *The Tempest*, because Prospero says that his power depends on a 'most auspicious star' (Shakespeare I.ii.181-182), yet then later says that Ariel helped him 'raised the tempest' (V.i.6); this is also evoked when he abjures his magic at the end of the play. Yet, Prospero also thanks Fortune, and decidedly labels the shipwreck an 'accident' (Sokol 137-138).
[11] Indicative of, perhaps, an acknowledgement of other island myths is the inclusion of some name dropping. Richard Head's *The Floating Island* was written under the pseudonym of Frank Careless, while another famous floating island was Laputa in *Gulliver's Travels.* One of the characters on *LOST,* the pilot of Ajira 316 and the original pilot of Oceanic 815 is named Frank Lapidus.
[12] This is similar to Moreau's influence after his death in *The Island of Dr. Moreau.* After Moreau's death, the beast-like creatures become concerned that the Law does not matter anymore. In order to prevent chaos, Prendick says "Children of the Law … he is *not* dead … He has changed his shape—he has changed his body … For a time you will not see him. He is… there" and Prendick points upwards and continues, "You cannot see him. But he can see you." (Wells 158). He then says that Moreau "cast away" the body because "he had no more need of it" (160).
[13] "Ariel" can be spelled with the letters comprising Richard Alpert's name. While this might seem like erroneous data, the writers of the show have said that anagrams and hidden clues are an integral part to audience participation with the series.
[14] Besides chess, there are many other reference to strategy games, including Axis and Allies, backgammon, checkers, and even Connect Four.
[15] 108 is also considered an "important" number, which is the sum total of these numbers.
[16] This "black vs. white" conflict also stretches back to the rivalry between Randall Flagg (the Man in Black) and Mother Abigail in *The Stand* by Stephen King, which the *LOST* writers have cited is one of their main influences.
[17] Other examples include: Jupiter and Saturn. The Architect and the Oracle (*The Matrix*). Saruman and Gandalf (*The Lord of the Rings*). Heat Miser and Snow Miser (*The Year Without a Santa Claus*). Spy vs. Spy (*Mad*). Randall Flagg and Mother Abigail (*The Stand*). Harry Potter and Draco Malfoy (*Harry Potter*). The Sith and the Jedi (*Star Wars*). Magneto and Professor X (*X-Men*). IT (Black Thing) and the Witches (*A Wrinkle in Time*). Hector and Achilles. Inspector Gadget and Doctor Claw (*Inspector Gadget*).

Works Cited

“MIRANDA: a Hypertext of Aldous Huxley's Brave New World.” *University of Richmond Writing Center & WAC Program*. 2010. Web. <http://writing2.richmond.edu/writing/miranda/home.html>.

Amis, Kingsley. *New Maps of Hell; a survey of science fiction.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1960. Print.

Anders, Charlie Jane. "The Shakespearean Heroes Science Fiction Should Steal From." *Io9*. 19 Aug. 2009. 2010. Web. <http://io9.com/5129093/the-shakespearean-heroes-science-fiction-should-steal-from>.

Annas, George J. *Standard Care: The Law of American Bioethics.* New York: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. *Negotiating with the Dead: a Writer on Writing*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. *Writing with Intent: Essays, Reviews, Personal Prose, 1983-2005.* New York: Carroll & Graf, 2006. Print.

Bailey, K.V. “The Mines and Quarries of Arcady.” *Transformations of Utopia* : *changing views of the perfect society.* Ed. By George Slusser, Paul Alkon, Roger Gaillard & Danièle Chatelain. 195-204. Print.

Ben-Tov, Sharona. *The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995. Print.

Berger, Harold L. *Science fiction and the new dark age.* Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1976. Print.

Berger Jr., Harry. *Second World and Green World: Studies in Renaissance fiction-making*. Berkeley: University of California, 1988. Print.

Bergonzi, Bernard. *The early H.G. Wells: A Study of the scientific romances.* Manchester: University Press, 1961. Print.

Billington, Michael. "In Britain, a Proliferation of Prosperos." *The New York Times* 1 Jan. 1989, sec. H: 5. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1951 – 2006)*. Web. 13 Nov. 2009.

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare's The Tempest*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2005.

Card, Orson Scott. *How to Write Science Fiction & Fantasy*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Writer's Digest, 2001. Print.

Cuse, Carlton. "Commentary for 'The Man Behind the Curtain'." *LOST Season 3.* DVD. 2008.

Cuse, Carlton and Damon Lindelof. "Carlton Cuse and Damon Lindelof Explain Lost: The Complete Third Season." *MovieWeb.* Web. <http://www.movieweb.com/news/NEuxzxxAYwtGyz>

Delahoyde, Michael. “H.G. Wells: The Island of Doctor Moreau.” Washington State University. 2010. Web. < http://www.wsu.edu:8001/~delahoyd/sf/wells_idm.html>.

Dionne, Craig. “The Shatnerification of Shakespeare: *Star Trek* and the Commonplace Tradition.” *Shakespeare After Mass Media*. Ed. Richard Burt. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.

Evans, Andrew. *This Virtual Life: Escapism and simulation in our media world*. London: Fusion, 2001. Print.

Evans, H. Nasstrom. “Cultural Landscapes Bibliography.” University of Maryland. Feb. 8 2010. Web. < http://www.amst.umd.edu/Research/cultland/annotations/Foucaul1.html>

Fidler, Roger F. *Mediamorphosis: understanding new media*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Pine Forge, 1997.

Felperin, Howard. “Bardolatry: Then and Now.” *Institutions in cultures: theory and practice.* Ed. Robert Lumsden and Rajeev S. Patke. Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1996. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." Trans. Jay Miskowiec. *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité* (1984). *MICHEL FOUCAULT, Info.* Web. <http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html>.

Freedman, Carl Howard. *Critical Theory and Science Fiction*. Hanover: Wesleyan UP, 2000. Print.

Friend, María Losada. “El Discurso de la autoridad disfrazado: El poder en las islas imaginarias de Swift y Shakespeare.” *Actas del XXI congreso internacional de A.E.D.E.A.N., Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos: Sevilla,* 18, 19, 20 diciembre 1997. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1999. 347-352. Print.

Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: a Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976. Print.

Gooden, Philip. "Prospero-like." *Name Dropping: Darwinian Struggles, Oedipal Feelings, and Kafkaesque Ordeals : an A to Z Guide to the Use of Names in Everyday Language*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008. 158. Print.

Goodman, Ralph. “Problematics of utopian discourse: the trim garden and the untidy wilderness.” *English Studies in Africa* (46:1) 2003, 1-13. *Literature Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.882003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&r es_id=xri:lion-us&rft_id=xri:lion:rec:abell:R03465533>

Grossberg, Lawrence. “Is there a Fan in the House?: The Affective Sensibility of Fandom.” *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*. Ed. Lisa A. Lewis. New York: Routledge, 1992. 50-65.

Haber, Karen. *Exploring the Matrix: Visions of the Cyber Present*. New York: St. Martin's, 2003. Print.

Harris-Fain, Darren. “Introduction.” *The Island of Doctor Moreau.* New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2004.

Himmelstein, Hal. *Television Myth and the American Mind*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1994. Print.

Hawkins, Harriett. *Classics and trash traditions and taboos in high literature and popular modern genres*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1999

Hecht, Anthony. "Paradise and Wilderness: The Brave New World of *The Tempest*." *The Yale Review.* Vol. 82, No.2. (April, 193): 76-93. Rpt. in *Shakespearean Criticism Yearbook*. Ed. Michael Magoulias. Vol. 25. Detroit: Thomson Gale, 1994. 357-62. Print.

Hillegas, Mark R. The Future as Nightmare: H.G. Wells and the Anti-utopias. New York: Oxford University Press. 1967. Print.

Hills, Matt. *Fan Cultures.* London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Honeybone, Nigel. “The Villain of the Piece.” *HorrorNews.Net*. 2010.

Howard, Jean E. “Shakespeare’s Creation of a Fit Audience for *The Tempest.*” *Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Approaches.* Ed. Harry Raphael Garvin and Michael Payne. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell UP, 1980. Print.

Hunter, G.K. "Northrop Frye’s ‘Green World’: Escapism and Transcendence." *Shakespeare, Le Monde Vert: Rites Et Enouveau* (1995): 39-47. Rpt. in *Shakespearean Criticism*. Ed. Michelle Lee. Vol. 103. Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2007. 17-21. Print.

James, D.G. *Dream of Prospero.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Kaku, Michio. *Physics of the Impossible*. London: Allen Lane, 2008.

Linton, David. "Shakespeare as Media Critic: Communication Theory and Historiography." *Mosaic* 29.2 (June 1996): 1-21. *Literature Online*. Web. 20 Nov. 2009.

LOST. ABC. 22 Sept. 2004. Television.

Loughrey, Bryan. “Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess.” *Shakespeare Survey Vol. 35: Shakespeare in the Ninenteeth Century.* Ed. Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Marowitz, Charles. *Recycling Shakespeare.* New York, NY: Applause Theatre Book, 1991. Print.

McLuhan, Marshall, Eric McLuhan, and Frank Zingrone. *Essential McLuhan*. New York, NY: Basic, 1995. Print.

Meyer, Karl. “O Scared Old World, That Has Such Robots In’t!” *The Reporter,* July 6, 1954, 35-37.

Mirsky, Mark Jay. *The Absent Shakespeare*. Rutherford, N.J: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, Associated UPes, 1994.

Morse, Ruth. “Monsters, Magicians, Movies: *The Tempest* and the Final Fronter.” *Shakespeare Survery Vol. 53: Shakespeare and Narrative*. Ed. Peter Holland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 164-174. Print.

Moylan, Tom. *Scraps of Untainted Sky: science fiction, utopia, dystopia.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000.

Nelson, Victoria. *The Secret Life of Puppets*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2001. Print.

Pick, Daniel. *Svengali's Web: the Alien Enchanter in Modern Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2000. Print.

Pieters, Jürgen. "The Wonders of Imagination: *The Tempest* and Its Spectators." *European Journal of English Studies* (4:2) 2000, 141-154.

Pimentel, Ken, and Kevin Teixeira. *Virtual Reality: through the New Looking Glass*. New York: Intel/McGraw-Hill, 1995. Print.

Plank, Robert. *The emotional significance of imaginary beings; a study of the interaction between psychopathology, literature, and reality in the modern world*. Springfield: Thomas, 1968. Print.

Rabkin, Eric S. "Atavism and Utopia." No Place Else: Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction . Ed. Martin H. Greenberg and Joseph D. Olander. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. 1983.

Rabkin, Eric S. "The Utopian Paradox: On the Necessity of an Impossible Dream." *Transformations of Utopia* : *changing views of the perfect society.* Ed. By George Slusser, Paul Alkon, Roger Gaillard & Danièle Chatelain. 305-316.

Ray, Ratri. *William Shakespeare's The Tempest*. New Delhi: Atlantic & Distributers, 2007. Print.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Schlobin, Roger C. "Pagan Survival: Why the Shaman in Modern Fantasy?" *The Celebratin of the Fantastic.* Ed. Donald E. Morse. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1992. 39-48. Print.

Sconce, Jeffrey. "*Star Trek,* Heaven's Gate, and Textual Transcendence." *Cult Television*. Ed. Sara Gwenllian-Jones and Roberta E. Pearson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2004. 199-222.

Scott, Mark W. "The Tempest." *Shakespearean Criticism*. Vol. 8. Detroit: Thomas Gale, 1988. 280-286. Print.

Sexson, Michael. "The Déjà Vu Glitch in the Matrix Trilogy." *Jacking in to the Matrix Franchise: cultural reception and interpretation.* New York: Continuum, 2004. 115-124. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. *The Tempest*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000. 139-286. Print.

Shelton, Robert. "Aesthetic Angels and Devolved Demons: Wells in 1895." *Utopian Studies II* ed. Michael S. Cummings and Nicholas D. Smith. New York: University Press of America. 1989. 1-11.

Slusser, George Edgar., and Eric S. Rabkin. *Aliens: the Anthropology of Science Fiction*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.

Sokol, B.J. *A Brave New World of Knowledge: Shakespeare's* The Tempest *and Early Modern Epistemology*. 2003. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003. Print.

Sophia, Ace. “Foucault’s Heterotopia: The “Other” Spaces Between What is Real and Utopian.” *SocyBerty*. 13 Feb. 2008. Web. 8 Feb. 2010. < http://socyberty.com/philosophy/foucault%E2%80%99s-heterotopia-the-%E2%80%9Cother%E2%80%9D-spaces-between-what-is-real-and-utopian/>

Star Trek VI: The Undiscovered Country. Dir. Nicholas Meyer. By Nicholas Meyer, Leonard Nimoy, and Hiro Narita. Prod. Ralph Winter and Leonard Nimoy. Perf. Leonard Nimoy, William Shatner, Christopher Plummer, and Kim Cattrall. Paramount Pictures, 1991.

Tamar Jeffers. "The Matrix." *Organization & Environment* 14.2 (2001): 238-240. ABI/INFORM Global, ProQuest. Web. 28 Mar. 2010.

The Lawnmower Man. Dir. Brett Leonard. Perf. Pierce Brosnan and Jeff Fahey. New Line Cinema, 1992. DVD.

The Matrix. Prod. Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski. Dir. Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski. By Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski. Warner Bros. Pictures, 1999. DVD.

Thomas, Maureen. “Utopia/Dystopia.” *Imaginary Worlds: the architecture of perfection.* Ed. Stephen Coates and Alex Stetter. Basel: Birkhäuser, for Architecture, 2000. Print.

Truby, John. *The Anatomy of Story: 22 Steps to Becoming a Master Storyteller*. New York: Faber and Faber, 2007. Print.

Various episodes. *LOST*. ABC. 22 Sept. 2004. Television.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason and Alden T. Vaughan. "Introduction." *The Tempest*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000. 1-133. Print.

Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare.* London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd. 1962. Print.

Wells, H.G. *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. *Seven Science Fiction Novels of H.G. Wells*. New York: Dover, 1950. 77-182. Print.

Wright, Neil H. "Reality and Illusion as a Philosophical Pattern in 'The Tempest'." *Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews.* Vol. 10. (1977): 241-270. Rpt. in *Shakespearean Criticism*. Vol. 8. Detroit: Thomson Gale. 447-54. Print.

Zabus, Chantal J. *Tempests after Shakespeare.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Bibliography

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Trade, 1999.

Bruce, McConachie A. *Engaging Audiences A Cognitive Approach to Spectating in the Theatre*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Burt, Richard. *Shakespeares After Shakespeare: An Encyclopedia of the Bard in Mass Media And Popular Culture*. Ed. Richard Burt. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2007.

Cartmell, Deborah and Michael Scott. *Talking Shakespeare: Shakespeare into the millennium.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.

Chapple, Freda, and Chiel Kattenbelt, eds. *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance (Themes in Theatre 2) (Themes in Theatre)*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Doxiadis, Constantinos. "Dystopia." *Glossary*. Constantinos A. Doxiadis. Web. <http://www.doxiadis.org/files/pdf/GLOSSARY-ad.pdf>.

Farmer, Frank. *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing Volume 13 (Landmark Essays, Vol 13)*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Frye, Northrop. *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Shakespeare After All*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2004.

Halpern, Richard. *Shakespeare among the Moderns*. Cornell UP, 1997.

Hare, Elissa. *Enchanted Shows: Vision and Structure in Elizabethan and Shakespearean Comedy About Magic.* New York: Gardland Publishing, 1988.

Harris, Cheryl, and Alison Alexander, eds. *Theorizing Fandom: fans, subculture, and identity*. Cresskill, N.J: Hampton, 1998.

Hellekson, Karen, and Kristina Busse. *Fan Fiction and Fan Communities in the Age of the Internet: New Essays. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland &, 2006. Print.*

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2006. Print.

Jenkins, Henry, ed. *Hop on Pop: The Politics and Pleasures of Popular Culture*. New York: Duke UP, 2002.

Jonathan, Glassner. "The Gamekeeper." *Stargate SG-1*. Dir. Martin Wood. Showtime. 17 July 1998. Television.

Keterrer, David. *New World for Old: The Apocalyptic Imagination, Science Fiction, and American Literature*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1974. Print.

L'Engle, Madeleine. *A Wrinkle in Time.*

Lewis, Lisa A. *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Lostpedia - The Lost Encyclopedia. Wikia. Web. <http://lostpedia.wikia.com/wiki>.

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

Murray, Janet Horowitz. *Hamlet on the holodeck the future of narrative in cyberspace*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT, 1998.

Murray, Patrick M. ed. *The Tempest: Critical essays.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Nelson, Victoria. *The Secret Life of Puppets*. New York: Harvard UP, 2002.

Petty, Anne C. "Prospero's Books, Gandalf's Staff." *Tolkien and Shakespeare Essays on Shared Themes and Language*, ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2007.

Riga, Frank P. "Merlin, Prospero, Saruman and Gandalf: Corrosive Uses of Power in Shakespeare and Tolkien." *Tolkien and Shakespeare Essays on Shared Themes and Language*, ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2007.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Narrative as Virtual Reality: immersion and interactivity in literature and electronic media*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.

Schoenbaum, S., R. B. Parker, and Sheldon P. Zitner. Elizabethan Theater: Essays in Honor of S. Schoenbaum. Newark: University of Delaware, 1996. Print.

Sheckels, Theodore F. *The Island Motif in the Fiction of L.M. Montgomery, Margaret Laurence, Margaret Atwood, and Other Canadian Women Novelists*. New York: P. Lang, 2003. Print.

Star Trek: The Next Generation. CBS. 1987-1994. Television.

Star Trek Wiki - Memory Alpha. Web. <http://memory-alpha.org/>.

Traister, Barbara Howard. *Heavenly Necromancers: The Magician in English Renaissance Drama*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984.???????

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Escapism*. Baltimore: JHU, 2000.

Vickers, Brian. *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

Walch, Günter. "Metatheatrical memory and transculturalism in *The Tempest*." *Travel and drama in Shakespeare's time*. Ed. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Wilson, R. Rawdon. *Shakespearean Narrative*. Newark: University of Delaware, Associated University Presses, 1995.

Yates, Frances Amelia. *Occult philosophy in the Elizabethan age*. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1979. Print.

APPENDIX A: SHAKESPEARE, EARLY MEDIA CRITIC?

In *Mediamorphosis: Understanding New Media,* Roger Fidler discusses the process of mediamorphosis, the three evolutionary waves of media, and the consequences of each subsequent technological jump. Mediamorphosis is, according to Fidler, the "transformation of communication media, usually brought about by the complex interplay of perceived needs, competitive and political pressures, and social and technological innovations" (Fidler 22-23). Basic to these transformative processes is language—the primary agent of change (24). Fidler states that in today's society, our culture is being built upon a digital language and we are still riding the third wave of mediamorphosis—the digital age. The first wave was spoken communication, and the second wave was print-based media. Central to Fidler's book is the question—what are the consequences of these mediamorphosis? What do they mean for society? If even our basic methods of communication are changing into something digitized, what does this imply? Fidler states that this is causing great social concern, especially after studies and polls that have depicted a steady decline in literacy, writing skills, and overall percentage of people reading on a daily basis. This has subsequently influences society's basic knowledge of subjects like history and science (116). Interestingly, some believe that this indicates that literacy is no longer important—that "emerging forms of computer-based aural/visual media would soon relegate written language and print media to an elite form of communication" (116. While others, like politicians, are supporting a movement to return to the basics—in essence, a form of technological regression in order to retain old ideals (116).

Fidler's book heavily details the developments of third wave—the advent of digital language and technology, specifically the television. In Fidler's words, the television is a great

tool both "revered and reviled." It is a technology that has had many great triumphs in our society by remapping human sociological trends and spreading news to a great range of people immediately, but at the same time it is a "wasteland" riddled with vitriol (Fidler 117). In the book, Fidler discusses the social anxiety surrounding the advent of new media technologies – the fact that the TV is thought of as an Orwellian "Brave New World." However, according to Fidler, this anxiety is perhaps a result of the sociological "boredom" that has been induced through constant stimulation of new information. Everything has been engineered to be quick, rapid, and as stimulating as possible. Things like the "sound bite" have been created to swiftly pump us with information, but by nature they are disconnected and usually skewed to lend us to believe a certain 'truth.' (118); in addition, this anxiety is perpetuated by the feeling that technology may one day extend beyond just the flat plane of our TV screen. In the 1992 film *The Lawnmower Man* directed by Brett Leonard, a "mad scientist"—Dr. Lawerence Angelo (Pierce Brosnan)—uses virtual reality in order to stimulate the neural pathways of Jobe Smith (Jeff Fahey), and Jobe is rendered a God-like being with telekinetic powers and is able to conjure nightmarish images. As Jobe says near the end of the film, "This technology [virtual reality] has peeled back a layer to reveal another universe." Jobe also depicts virtual reality in terms of an evolutionary virus when he says, "Virtual reality will grow. Just as the telegraph grew to the telephone. As the radio to the TV … It will be everywhere" (*The Lawnmower Man*). Jobe makes note of the evolutionary trend that technology has taken—to finally culminate into virtual reality, which in the film is rendered to be the dangerous catalyst for awakening ancient powerful abilities that were used years ago by "conjurers" and "magicians".

Like *The Lawnmower Man,* Fidler suggests that that potential fourth mediamorphosis will be a movement when human beings' neural networks are (through human evolution or

technological aid) somehow connected, bringing humanity into a collectivized shared experience. According to Fidler, science fiction has touched upon this possibility by depicting worlds where "life and media are virtual indistinguishable" (Fidler 121). Usually, these films render an audience with feelings of apprehension, but Fidler believes that this is normal. After all, society was also resistant to the third mediamorphosis—digital technology—but has since embraced it and made it an inextricable part of our daily lives (121)

Spoken word, to written language, to digital communication. The three waves of mediamorphosis. Karl Meyer's article asserts that dystopian literature began in the 20th century following the industrial revolution and the development of the communist USSR; yet, why does did he adapt the title of his article from a line spoken by Miranda in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*? A work written in the early seventeenth century? Interestingly, the website *Miranda: a hypertext of Huxley's Brave New World* cites the reason for its name on its homepage:

> The title is derived from Shakespeare's play 'The Tempest' when Prospero's daughter, Miranda, sees another man for the first time and utters the misunderstood words: 'O brave new world that has such people in it'. In this scene, Miranda is an innocent, naive to the reality behind the glittering vision before her. This is not unlike our enthusiasm for the technology that is rapidly changing - and changing us (*Miranda: a hypertext*).

The website's description subtly implies that, like *Brave New World,* there is something within *The Tempest* itself that is wary of technology—perhaps if one were to look at Prospero's magic as a form of technology this analogy could be made. In the Arden Shakespeare's *Tempest*, under the subsection "Brave New World," the Vaughans state: "The extensive and varied discourses of colonialism, many critics argue, are deeply embedded in the drama's language and events.

Prospero commandeers a distant island and imposes his superior technology (books, magic) and his language as tools of conquest and domination" (Vaughan 39). The Vaughans assert that Prospero's books and magical capabilities are a form of technology—one that causes the other inhabitants of the isle (Ariel, Caliban) anxiety and submit them to his authority. Technology, in this case, is a method through which control is exerted and personal liberties are jeopardized—a theme that Karl Meyer asserts the "Futopia"/dystopia is based.

If both Meyer and Harold Berger cite technological advancement as one of the core roots of dystopian fiction, why do they both focus on modernizations of the past 100 years? If one were to look back even further, media took off with the development of the printing press in 1454—when literacy began to rise and books were becoming widely available—with the *second* mediamorphosis. Our modern perception is so focused on the *now*—the *third* wave. However, in William Shakespeare's time, the printing press had been around, and literacy was becoming a widespread phenomenon. Could this have been a cause of social anxiety? A new mode of perception? Of knowledge acquisition? Mass literacy has changed our world—and this change definitely could've yielded societal apprehension.

According to Marshall McLuhan, a famous media critic from the mid-twentieth century, media is our communication network, and it is now becoming a domain in which we continually transplant our bodies and senses (100-101), and this could be a cause for concern. Although McLuhan states that technologies (especially communicative technologies) have the potential to unite us, they also have the potential to dehumanize us by integrating our world with that of machines via the process of "amputation." McLuhan believes that William Shakespeare, even during the seventeenth century, was aware of the societal changes occurring as a result of the

printing press, and demonstrated this shift in his plays. For example, "*King Lear* offers a complete demonstration of how it felt to live through the change from medieval to Renaissance time and space, from an inclusive to an exclusive sense of the world" (110). In addition, Shakespeare attempts to illustrate the psychological effects of literacy in *King Lear* when Edgar describes a vista to the recently blinded Gloucester. Shakespeare attempts to describe three dimensions through words, and there is a "stripping of the senses and the interruption of their interplay in tactile synesthesia may well have been one of the effects of the Gutenberg technology." According to McLuhan, this is a process of "separation and reduction of functions" (112); this is caused by the inherent "interiorization of the technology of the phonetic alphabet" as a result of literacy, which, in turn, "translates man from the magical world of the ear to the neutral visual world" (113). McLuhan has a rather grim perspective on this phenomenon, and believes the "victim" of the literate world is the schizophrenic or "split man," because of this mixing and interiorization of visual and auditory information (117).

David Linton in "Shakespeare as Media Critic: communication theory and historiography" (1996) argues that "Shakespeare's understanding of communications and the media of his times entitles him to recognition as a formidable media commentator," that Shakespeare's plays offer a "critique of the effects and uses of print media and literacy, both of which were rapidly reshaping social practices in 16th-century England." Media criticism is fairly popular today, with critics such as "McLuhan, Goody, Graff, Havelock and Ong," who believe that "literacy not only changes the amount and kinds of information to which one has access but that it also has far-reaching social and psychological significance." Linton's article illustrates "the scope of Shakespeare's presentation of media and literacy issues by presenting a wide range of examples from all the dramatic forms in which Shakespeare wrote and by showing that his

concern is sustained for the full span of his career," and Linton invokes the words of Marshall McLuhan to further his critical stance. Linton utilizes McLuhan's *Understanding Media* and his analysis of *King Lear* in order to demonstrate that other critics have noticed Shakespeare's "use of media themes."

According to Linton, there is textual evidence to suggest Shakespeare was a media critic, such as the fact that "[i]n every one of the 37 plays attributed to Shakespeare, within the first act of each there are references to some aspect of literacy or media (reading, writing, letters, documents, books, etc.)" and "28 of the plays contain such references in the first scene." Some examples are "the letters which call Othello off to war" and "the party list which Romeo and Mercutio intercept from Lord Capulet's nonliterate servant." Linton makes a point of stating that letters are in all but six of Shakespeare's works. It is this overwhelming "presence of such a large number of media-related references" that emphasizes critic David Cressy's argument—that "Shakespeare was in all probability a first-generation literate," and that "[u]nder the circumstances, it would not be surprising if Shakespeare were sensitive to the differences literacy could make in people's lives."

Linton states that Shakespeare, despite being often regarded as the pinnacle of English literature, was probably not so fond of mass literacy sweeping the nation. But why? Why does Linton believe this? The evidence is in Shakespeare's extensive canon:

> Literacy and its trappings tend to be associated with weak and ineffective individuals or evil, manipulative ones, whereas the idyllic characters and those identified with pastoral utopian visions are almost invariably non-literate or semi-literate at best. … While there are advantages to be had from the media associated

> with literacy, the preponderance of evidence leads to Pericles's opinion that books have a Pandora's box quality to them.

Specifically relevant to *The Tempest,* Linton states: "*The Tempest* is unique when it comes to media issues," because it is the first and only play that shows "members of the literate elite actually question the good of the book." For example, Gonzalo and Prospero both question the value of literacy, even though both appreciate books themselves. According to Linton, Gonzalo's dream indicates his distrust of literature, when he says that, in his ideal world, "Letters should not be known," while Prospero physically casts his books and scrolls to the sea. Furthermore, Linton asserts that in *The Tempest* there is the deliberate "counterpoising of the literate elite in the person of Prospero and the non-literate commons in the person of Caliban," paired with the line: "You taught me language, and my profit on it is, I know how to curse." In addition, Caliban instructs Stefano and Trinculo to "seize [Prospero's] books" and then "burn his books." But Linton writes that Stefano and Trinculo "miss his point," and "have already mockingly expressed their subservience to the book in their drunken enactment of the religious ritual of kissing the book, which they do twice by placing their lips on a bottle of sack and swilling it down while pretending it is a Bible." However, *The Tempest* and *King Lear* are not the only Shakespearean works to warn against the book.

Linton cites David Olson's *The World on Paper* which states that Shakespeare's depiction of Cade's rebellion in *Henry VI* was against "a world confined to the page, a world which limited participation to those who had the educational, cognitive and economic wherewithal to become what might be called one of the "paper people." Linton concludes by stating that Shakespeare's plays are demonstrative of the views later echoed by critics like "McLuhan, Goody, Graff, Havelock and Ong," all "who claim that literacy not only changes the

amount and kinds of information to which one has access but that it also has far-reaching social and psychological significance." Linton was not the only one to make this claim. Leslie A. Fiedler in *The Stranger in Shakespeare* wrote: "[*The Tempest*] prophesies […] like some inspired piece of science fiction before its time, the revolt against the printed page, the anti-Gutenberg rebellion for which Marshall McLuhan is currently chief spokesman" (Fiedler 238-239). If Shakespeare was forecasting the dangers of new technology, then that anxiety could definitely manifest in his plays—especially *The Tempest* which focuses on a man who exerts control and authority over the inhabitant of an island with "technology"—in this case, his books.

APPENDIX B

In my research, I found three articles which incorporated a quote from *The Tempest* to segue into an analysis of *The Matrix* films. In *Exploring the Matrix: Visions of the Cyber Present* (2003) by Karen Haber, the chapter "Dreaming Real" opens with three quotes, one of which is "We are such stuff as dreams are made on…" (252). She goes on to ask the question: "What is freedom? What is illusion? What is freedom in illusion? Are we free without illusion, and are we ever not living in a dream?" (252). A review of *The Matrix* by Tamar Jeffers in *Organization & Environment* opens with "... the baseless fabric of this vision, The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces, The solemn temples, the great globe itself, Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve And, like this insubstantial pageant faded, Leave not a rack behind" (Jeffers). Jeffers review then remarks that, behind all the "glossiness of … black leather [and] dazzling special effects," *The Matrix* is about "rebels" that strive to "destroy the simulation in order to rebuild a real world" (252). In addition, an article titled "The Déjà Vu Glitch in the Matrix Trilogy" from *Jacking in to the Matrix: franchise cultural reception and interpretation* (2004) by Michael Sexson opens with "These our actors / As I foretold you, were all spirits, and / Are melted into air, into thin air—" (115). The fact that three articles filled with discourse about *The Matrix* (usually about the virtual reality used within the narrative) open with a quotation from *The Tempest* indicates the thematic similarities—especially regarding the warning to Ferdinand by Prospero about the dangers of illusion.

Victoria Nelson writes in *The Secret Life of Puppets* (2002) that *The Matrix* and *Dark City* both depict "human protagonists assuming the roles of formerly occupied by their virtual daemon antagonists," who are able to "break out of the illusory world in which they are imprisoned, but with a significantly more positive outcome" (286). In these films, the mad

scientist is not the villain or the megalomaniac hell-bent on world domination, rather "the mad scientist takes a secondary role to the Brunonian heroic enthusiast who becomes master of his own fate" (286). According to Nelson, John Murdoch in *Dark City* has demiurgic powers that are "potentially inflationary but curiously un-Faustian," and by the end of the film "he has become a super-Prospero." Nelson cites Frances Yates's words when defining the "super-Prospero," as the "magically powerful personality tuned in… to the powers of the universe." In a similar manner, Neo in *The Matrix* uses his powers to "break the bonds of [his] fabricated personal [history] (false memory being the defining feature of the illusory world)," and he and Murdoch both do this by, strangely, "transgressing the laws of nature" (286). Thus, *The Matrix* and *Dark City,* like *The Tempest,* hinge upon the oscillation between Utopian and Dystopian realities—and the ambiguity inherent within the main protagonist (who usually has some sort of supernatural powers).

APPENDIX C: *THE ISLAND OF DR. MOREAU*

Robert Plank asserts that Prospero was the model for the mad scientist, while Ruth Morse alludes to the thematic importance of the secluded island in order to perform experiments; these ideas appear in H.G. Wells's *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* a novel which Professor Darren Harris-Fain writes was influenced by William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (x). It is a story about a scientist, Dr. Moreau, who utilizes an island's insular properties to perform his "vivisection" in private. On the website "H.G. Wells: The Island of Dr. Moreau" published by Washington State University, the section "influences" cites the importance of *The Tempest*: "18th-century romances about 'the natural goodness of man' were often set on tropical islands, so this setting is nicely ironical." In addition to the setting, the character Caliban, "the malicious wretch-creature," is cited as another important influence, however in the manner than Browning adapted him in his poem "Caliban upon Setebos" (Delahoyde).

George J. Annas writes in *Standard Care: The Law of American Bioethics,* that *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* despite having been written in 1896, was a precursor to the modern advancements of the 20th century, even before the word "gene" was invented. Annas describes Moreau as Prospero-like because Moreau is portrays himself in a God-like manner, "if not as God himself," and "rules over his island." In addition, Annas states that Moreau is similar to Dr. Frankenstein because they both create "humans" through inhumane/unnatural means (147). Moreau's animal-human hybrids are "grotesque in appearance" and their transformations into these states are "not permanent" (148). Like Prospero in *The Tempest,* Dr. Moreau is trying to improve creatures he sees as inferior in some way to himself through the use of technology. For Prospero, it was his magic and illusion, and, for Moreau, it is the use of his vivisection. Carl Howard Freedman in *Critical theory and science fiction* states that *The Island of Dr. Moreau* has

a "Prospero-like hero," and that it echoes post-colonial attitudes towards *The Tempest,* specifically the novel evokes the "binary opposition between human and beast" in order to Deconstruction the Darwinian mythos (53). This is similar to the nineteenth century criticism that started around the time of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859).

Bernard Bergonzi wrote in *The Early H.G. Wells: A Study of Scientific Romance* (1961), that:

> It is in this tradition [English Island myth] that *The Island of Dr. Moreau* takes its place; it may even be a demonic parody of another and older island story, *The Tempest* … for Moreau as king of the island, seems to be a perverted image of Prospero, while his drunken assistant, Montgomery, stands for Ariel, and the humanized bear, M'ling, for Caliban (100).

Similar to Freedman, Bergonzi implies that Wells's novel "takes place in a long and venerable line of 'island myths,' the myth, in this particular instance, is given vitality by the meaning which it conveys," and in this case, that meaning is found in "the implications of Darwinism" (Bergonzi 100). Margaret Atwood has also noted the similarities between *The Tempest* and *The Island of Dr. Moreau.* In *Writing with intent essays, reviews, personal prose, 1983-2005* (2005), she lists "Ten Ways of Looking at *The Island of Dr. Moreau*" – and number five is "The Enchanted Island." The island setting of the novel "has many literary antecedents and several descendents," and *The Tempest* could be considered a literary grandparent to *Moreau*, because "Doctor Moreau could be seen as a sinister version of Prospero, surrounded by a hundred or so Calibans of his own creation" on the Island that is their grounds for experimentation (392).

Robert Shelton, in his article "Aesthetic Angels and Devolved Demons: Wells in 1895," writes that *The Island of Doctor Moreau* is part of the "heterotopic" (as defined by Robert Plank

and not Michel Foucault) literary tradition. Shelton quotes Plank's definition of heterotopic as "literature which, in contrast to realistic [literature], invents not only characters but also settings[*]" (qtd. Plank in 8). This definition leads Plank to conclude that "*The Tempest* is a heterotopic play, while Hamlet is in essence realistic" (Shelton 8). Furthermore, Shelton states that *The Island of Doctor Moreau* and *The Tempest* are thematically parallel as heterotopic works. Primarily, because of their use of the island. Shelton refers to the island of *The Tempest* as a "paradise," which is debatable, but in comparison to Wells's work, Moreau's Island is certainly a "hell." Secondly, in both works, the action hinges on the idea of "metamorphosis[*]." In *The Tempest,* this is the "sea change" that the weather and the characters go through, while in *Moreau,* the transformations are of a physical nature via Moreau's vivisection of the animals, and of Prendick's decaying state of mind. Thirdly, Shelton cites that, like Prospero, Moreau has unnatural powers, but Moreau's powers are "through science (his laboratory)," which Prospero's power of nature is through "magic (his books)" (8). The laboratory, for Moreau, being place on the Island—"an enclosed space," or a "microcosmos," where Moreau "experiments on beastly demons in an attempt to elevate them, past his own condition, to that of cauterized angels" (7).

The Island (of Doctor Moreau)

I could have imagined I was dead and in another world (Wells 121).

About half-way through the novel, Prendick informs the audience with as many facts as he can gather about the Island he has become an unwitting inhabitant of:

[*] Ralph Goodman's "Problematics of Utopian Discourse: The Trim Garden and the Untidy Wilderness" also examines the heterotopic qualities of *The Tempest,* but uses Michel Foucault's definition, while Shelton here is using an altered definition provided by Robert Plank in *The emotional significance of imaginary beings; a study of the interaction between psychopathology, literature, and reality in the modern world.*

[*] This could be registered as the oscillation between utopia and dystopia that occurs (Goodman 2003)

> And here perhaps I may give a few general facts about the island and the Beast People. The island, which was of irregular outline and lay low upon the wide sea, had a total area, I suppose, of seven or eight square miles. It was volcanic in origin, and was now fringed on three sides by coral reefs; some fumaroles to the northward, and a hot spring, were the only vestiges of the forces that had long since originated it. Now and then a faint quiver of earthquake would be sensible, and sometimes the ascent of the spire of smoke would be rendered tumultuous by gusts of steam. But that was all (Wells 139).

Prendick offers more facts about the local than we glean from the text of *The Tempest,* however both islands' latitudinal and longitudinal locations are a mystery. Moreau's Island has a volcano (considering it is of volcanic origin), and is near Hawaii, so perhaps located in the Pacific Ocean—this is implied because Montgomery mentions that they are sailing near Hawaii, but will stop at his Island home.

According to Moreau, the "island is full of… inimical phenomena. …" (Wells 128). There is the persistent threat of the Beast People at every corner, and the island's dark, uncivilized terrain is foreign and causes Prendick anxiety: "I turned suddenly and stared at the uncertain trees behind me. One black shadow seemed to leap into another. I listened rigid, and heard nothing … I thought my nerves were unstrung, and that my imagination was tricking me" (110). Just as Prospero's isle is filled with illusions born from his fantasy, Prendick begins to see things mingling in the shadows, and hear strange noises because of his decaying state of mind: "The thicket about me became altered to my imagination. Every shadow became something more than a shadow, became an ambush, every rustle became a threat. Invisible things seemed

watching me" (106). Thus, both island's landscapes can be transformed with the power of the imagination.

In Maureen Thomas's article "Utopia/Dystopia", she states that Utopias and Dystopias are often enclosed spaces and hard to enter (and hard to escape), while Ralph Goodman notes that the Island's natural "heterotopic" character makes it "open and closed." The difficulty of reaching the shores of these Islands emphasizes their "apartness" from the rest of the world. A special task, or perhaps accident of fate, needs to occur in order for the traveler to reach their destination. In Prendick's case, he was a survivor and an unwitting acquaintance of Moreau's counterpart Montgomery. More importantly, Prendick was never invited to the Island, as Moreau says, "I want you to think over things, Prendick. In the first place, I never asked you to come upon this island" (Wells 128). As Bergonzi writes, "Later the dying Prendick is picked up by a ship, and he is restored by the dissolute young doctor Montgomery […] The theme of chance is now made explicit" (101). This is similar to Prospero's isle, a place where Prospero landed by chance, and later he employs the spirits to shipwreck his enemies on the Island's shore. It is not an Island that one is readily able to visit.

Besides being hard to enter, it is hard to leave. Escape is difficult on the Island of Dr. Moreau. Each time Prendick explores the Island, he is unable to see a way off. When he meets the Beast People, they blatantly tell him, "None escape" (Wells 122), and one beast-creature was branded for trying to flee. Prendick describes the thought of escape as "unreasonable hope" (115). Prendick finally escapes after Montgomery and Moreau have been killed, and the Beast People have begun to revert back to their animal instincts by finding a raft that has fortunately washed up on shore, but unfortunately is carrying two dead passengers.

Moreau's Island, like Prospero's isle, does not have a name. It is in an unknown location, and for that reason it is also hard to find. When Prendick looks out at the sea where the Island should be, he could not see anything: "Then I looked out at the darkling sea, where in the dimness his [Montgomery's] little island was hidden" (89). It is uncharted and barely visible, lending to its insular quality—which makes it perfect for Moreau to perform his secret experiments.

Dr. Moreau fondly remembers his first arrival to the Island, which was eleven years ago: "I remember the green stillness of the island and the empty ocean about us, as though it was yesterday. The place seemed waiting for me" (Wells 134). This is similar to Prospero's arrival to the island. Berger Jr. states that Prospero "had renounced the dukedom in his mind before handing it over to Antonio," because he suffers from an "unhealthy attitude towards labor" (155). Prospero believes manual labor to be the "evil man's burden," and this is represented by the punishments he deals Ferdinand and Caliban—log bearing and physical chores. Berger Jr. also notes that Prospero's "boundless confidence and careless trust in Antonio suited his impulse to retirement[*]." In effect, Prospero should not have been angry about being "set adrift," because his mind was already elsewhere as he plainly admits to "neglecting worldly ends" and becoming "transported / And rapt in secret studies" (I.ii.76-77), as though the knowledge within his books was able to offer him escape before he was physical expelled from the country. Even more fortunate for Prospero, his expulsion "committed [him] to a course which washed away the old burdensome world of civilization and translated him magically to a new world, unpeopled and unreal—this removal and isolation fulfill the process by externalizing his self-sufficient

[*] Prospero: "I thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated / To closeness and the bettering of my mind / With that which, but by being so retired, / O'er-prized all popular rate, in my false brother / Awaked an evil nature" (I.ii.89-93)

insularity" (Berger Jr. 155-156), thus, Prospero's removal was not so much a punishment, but rather a gift. He received what he wanted—a place untainted by man wherein he could attempt to realize the "golden age." However, Caliban throws a wrench in his plan, because Caliban is emblematic of the inherent "base" nature of mankind (not to say Caliban is *evil,* just not *ideal*), which is what fuels Prospero's vitriol towards the Island native (156).

The insular space is a retreat where Moreau can be allowed to perform his experiments away from civilization—a civilization that does not understand (or accept) his vivisection. Moreau calls the Island a "biological station—of a sort" (Wells 97). It is where he can have his "wish-fulfillment." However, the outside world regards his activities as "nightmare." Like Prospero who had divorced himself from his dukedom before being set adrift, Moreau had already renounced civilization because they did not adhere to his scientific dream. To him, his science is a method of "humanizing"—he "experiments on beastly demons in an attempt to elevate them" (Shelton 7). The fact that humanity cannot fathom the "good" he is doing in his own mind has already set him apart in his own self-imposed "insularity."

The island's population is also a source of concern—being only comprised of "two vivisectors and their animalised victims" (Wells 116). As Prendick stays on the Island, he begins to lose more and more of his mind—beginning to identify more with the Beasts on the Isle than with the two humans:

> I must confess I lost faith in the sanity of the world when I saw it suffering the painful disorder of this island. A blind fate, a vast pitiless mechanism, seemed to cut and shape the fabric of existence, and I, Moreau by his passion for research, Montgomery by his passion for drink, the Beast People, with their instincts and

> mental restrictions, were torn and crushed, ruthlessly, inevitably, amid the infinite complexity of its incessant wheels (152).

By the end, Prendick has become the creature that Moreau's experiments have "changed." The Beast People revert back to their natural state, but Prendick's mind has been irreversibly altered by the horrors on the Island. He becomes the new Prospero-like figure seeking "self-sufficient insularity" as he retreats away from a mankind he no longer understands:

> For that reason I live near the broad free download, and can escape thither when this shadow is over my soul … Why I lived in London the horror was well-nigh insupportable. I could not get away from me … Particularly nauseous were the blank expressionless faces of people in trains and omnibuses; they seemed no more my fellow-creatures than dead bodies would be … I did not dare travel unless I was assured of being alone. .. I have withdrawn myself from the confusion of cities and multitudes, and spend my days surrounded by wise books … My days I devote to reading and to experiments in chemistry, and I spend many of the clear nights in the study of astronomy. … There it must be, I think, in the cast and eternal laws of matter, and not in the daily cares and sins and troubles of men, that whatever is more than animal within us must find its solace and hope. I hope, or I could not live. And so, in hope and solitude, my story ends (Wells 181-182).

Following his descent into what would be his "nightmare world"—the Island of Dr. Moreau—he ascends to rejoin the "idyllic world" (London), and yet his mind has undergone its own form of *perverse* transformation, wherein he no longer feels human or animal—but rather a harbinger of science and knowledge, much in the same way Moreau started his experimentation. The

implication is, of course, that the cycle will start all over again, and Prendick will somehow become obsessed with the pursuit of knowledge.

In a Darwinian sense, the island is a limited space within which evolution can occur. Shelton writes that Dr. Moreau is like another Wellsian character—the Time-Traveler in *The Time Machine*; however, only Moreau's movement through the fourth dimension is not done through a machine (or through literally passing through time), but rather through the physical alteration. Moreau manipulates the flesh and minds of animals in order to try and "elevate them" into "*ersatz* men and women." His "humanizing" vivisection is an acceleration and perversion of "Nature's evolutionary process" via the "intensifying … of pain" (Shelton 7). Similarly, *The Tempest* can also be interpreted as a Darwinian allegory, with Caliban in the role of the early *homo sapiens* and Prospero as the fully evolved man trying to teach Caliban in order to provoke a sort of evolutionary leap. In both cases, the evolution backfires.

"This Island with Calibans"

Another significant character in *The Tempest* that lends to the science fiction genre is Caliban, who in speculative fiction often becomes the "alien" or "monster," for example, in *Forbidden Planet,* the invisible monster built upon Dr. Morbius's "Id" is a product of Morbius's meddling in science above his knowledge (the Krell's machine); similarly, Caliban is a product of Prospero's teaching: "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" (I.ii.364-366). In *Aliens: the anthropology of science fiction* (1987), George Edgar Slusser and Eric S. Rabkin write that if one were to follow the colonialist interpretation of *The Tempest,* one could make the link between Caliban and "cannibal" and "Carib" (ix)—perhaps also lending towards the anxiety that the monstrous character is supposed to evoke in the audience. Caliban could be also registered as a

character similar to the "Cyclops—the humanoid monster who one eye signified lawless individuality and alien singularity" (ix). Slusser and Rabkin assert that Prospero's island in the play functions as a neutral ground—it is not a battleground or a place where there is a direct "confrontation of savage and civilization," but the neutrality is "not of nature, but of high artificiality"—because the play takes place a "world of romance." It is within this world that Caliban "can, against the very condition of his birth and shape, be miraculously incorporated into a polity by Prospero," even though he can "never be civilized," which renders Prospero a "scientist" (xi). In a sense, Prospero could be registered as a "mad scientist" within this analysis of the planetary invader. With Caliban as "alien," or perhaps "experiment," then Prospero's cruel interaction with him could be seen as that of cold, calculating scientist—or even a genetic engineer or vivisector like Dr. Moreau.

It is the untouched, native quality of Caliban that makes him so appealing to science fiction writers. It is his interaction with "educated" mankind that lends Caliban towards a destructive path. By learning language, which Prospero worked to teach him, Caliban develops the ability to curse. Prospero attempts to "humanize" Caliban, but when Caliban says what he really wants to say, Prospero doesn't like what he has to hear, and begins to mistreat Caliban (beating him, torturing him, and treating him in the manner of a slave): "Fetch us fuel, and be quick …/ If thou neglect'st, or dost unwillingly / What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps, / Fill thy bones with aches, make thee roar" (I.ii.367-371). Prospero is, in effect, punishing Caliban for free speech and adapting "human" characteristics.

Caliban is also registered as an *inhuman* creature by Trinculo. When Trinculo first sees Caliban, he is not quite sure who or what Caliban is: "What have we here? a man or a fish? dead or alive?" (II.ii.24-25). Trinculo also says: "there [in England] would this monster make a man"

(30-31). He could disguise Caliban to look like a man—a unique and exotic man—but a man nonetheless, implying that he somehow is *not* a man. He then refers to physical attributes by stating that Caliban is "[l]egged like a man" (32-33) but has "fins like arms!" (33) Finally, Trinculo concludes: "I do now let loose my opinion; hold it no longer: this is no fish, but an islander, that hath lately suffered by a thunderbolt" (35-36). These images give us a mixed perception of Caliban. While many stage managers have given Caliban the appearance of a human (albeit typically a "native" one to fit the mid-twentieth century post-colonial interpretation), Trinculo's depiction is of that of a man that is somehow *not* human—either part fish or has "suffered by a thunderbolt" and in all ways a monster.

Similarly, Moreau's Island is populated by a wide-variety of beast-like creatures of Dr. Moreau's creation. Animals that have been "vivisected" in an attempt to humanize them. They are grotesque creatures that Prendick needs to adjust to, and they are prone to breaking the Laws set up by Moreau and Montgomery to (hopefully) prevent them from reverting to savage-like states (such as eating the Island's rabbits). There is not one Caliban, but, according to Montgomery, there are around sixty of these half-man, half-animals—not counting "the smaller monstrosities which lived in the undergrowth and were without human form" (Wells 139). Prendick notes with horror that Moreau, however, had "made nearly a hundred and twenty; but many had died, and others, like the writhing Footless Thing of which he had told me, had come by violent ends" (139). And, according to Montgomery, the creatures could breed, and often do, but usually the offspring do not survive, and "When they lived, Moreau took them and stamped the human form upon them [because] [t]here was no evidence of the inheritance of their acquired human characteristics" (139-140). Interestingly, in *The Tempest,* Caliban says that if Prospero

had not stopped him from violating Miranda, he would have “peopled else / This island with Calibans” (I.ii.351-352).

In *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, Prendick’s reaction to the beast-like creatures (specifically M’ling in this instance) is very similar to Trinculo’s reaction to Caliban, but less comedic and more wary. However, Prendick does initially recognize and identify the creature as a “man,” unlike Trinculo who identifies Caliban as “man or fish”: “He was, I could see, a misshapen man, short, broad, and clumsy, with a crooked back, a hairy neck, and a head sunk between his shoulders. … He turned with animal swiftness” (Wells 84). Later, Prendick gets a better look at M’ling’s face: “In some indefinable way the black face thus flashed upon me shocked me profoundly. It was a singularly deformed one. The facial part projected, forming something dimly suggestive of a muzzle, and the huge half-open mouth showed as big white teeth as I had ever seen in a human mouth” (84). Later, Prendick is a bit more frightened when he encounters a beast creature again, and asks Montgomery: “what was that thing that came after me? Was it a beast or was it a man?” (113). Prendick comes to the conclusion that this creature he has just seen is, in fact, not a man—or cannot possibly be a man. The man is too marked by animal-like features—“muzzle,” “big white teeth,” “thick, coarse, black hair,” and even the man’s movements are “animal.” While Prendick has not become terrified of the Island yet, this is his first indication that something bizarre is taking place on the island.

On the island, these creatures are treated in a manner similar to slaves. They are whipped and beaten for transgressing the laws, and told it is for their own good. Even Montgomery, who is the more sympathetic of the two vivisectors, says to M’ling: “Confound you! … Why the devil don't you get out of the way?” and according to Prendick’s account: “Sometimes [Montgomery]

would notice [M'ling], pat it, call it half-mocking, half-jocular names, and so make it caper with extraordinary delight; sometimes he would ill-treat it, especially after he had been at the whiskey, kicking it, beating it, pelting it with stones or lighted fuses" (Wells 141). Both Caliban and the Beast Folk are also regarded as "dumb". As Trinculo says about Caliban, "By this good light, this is a very shallow monster. I afeard of him? A very weak monster. The man i'th' moon? A most poor credulous monster!" (II.ii.141-143), and he also refers to him as "mooncalf" and other derogatory terms to undermine his intelligence, like "puppy-headed," and "The folly[1] of this island!" (III.ii.4). The idea of intelligence is an important one, especially within the context of Darwin and the idea of evolution. Moreau and Montgomery believe they have the right to mistreat the Beast People because they are dumb, thus, they do not know any better (and will not know any better). Their "human"-status hinges upon their brain capacity. In a similar manner, Caliban's mistreatment by Prospero stems from Prospero's refusal to acknowledge that Caliban can exist in his idyllic "golden age" island (Berger Jr. 155).

M'ling is the only beast character with a name, and is, according to Prendick, "Montgomery's attendant," who unlike the other beasts, "did not live … across the island, but in a small kennel at the back of the enclosure." Prendick states that M'ling is "far more docile, and the most human-looking of all the Beast Folk." Montgomery has trained M'ling "to prepare food, and indeed to discharge all the trivial domestic offices that were required." Interestingly, Prendick regards M'ling as "a complex trophy of Moreau's horrible skill,—a bear, tainted with dog and ox, and one of the most elaborately made of all his creatures" (Wells 141), thus labeling M'ling a product, a creation, of Moreau's "art" (or what could be called his "science," like

[1] The Arden makes note of the use of the word "folly," stating that Frank Kermode believes that it is synonymous with 'freak' in this usage rather than "generalized foolishness." The note also states that "folly" could be applying to "Stephano's foolery" or the "the general absurdity of the island, in Stephano's drunken perception" (Vaughan 225).

Prospero's "magic"). In a similar manner, Prospero has taught Caliban English in an attempt to humanize him, but subsequently enslaves Caliban because Caliban proves untameable. Prospero even calls Caliban a "beast" (IV.i.140), which is thematically similar to the nature of the Beast People.

Also similar to the Beast People, who adopt Prendick as their "Master" after Moreau's death, Caliban seems more than willing to follow certain people. When he comes across Trinculo and Stephano, he tells them about Prospero's magic is a by-product of Prospero's books, and if they take Prospero's books, they will inherit the Island. Caliban promises Stephano: "Thou shalt be lord of it, and I'll serve thee" (III. ii.55) if Stephano manages to dismantle Prospero, thus pigeonholing himself in the role of servant. However, this could also be registered as an attempt to con Stephano and Trinculo into carrying out a (somewhat) dangerous mission against Prospero—a powerful mage. Or perhaps it is merely the by-product of his inebriated state now that he has fallen in love with alcohol: "These be fine things, an if they be not sprites; / That's a brave god and bears celestial liquor. / I will kneel to him" (II.ii.114-116).

The Beast People and Caliban are regulated the role of the "alien," the "creature," "beast," "monster"—in sum, "the Other." Darwinian implications place them in the realm of the early *homo sapiens,* while the post-colonial implications of both *Moreau* and *The Tempest,* Caliban and the Beast People could also be interpreted as natives who are being tyrannically lorded over by the European force (Moreau and Prospero). In addition, given works such as *Forbidden Planet,* the idea that Caliban and the Beast Folk are something akin to "the Monster from the Id," the dark result of scientific experimentation, the by-product of the utopian wish-fulfillment turning to dystopian nightmare.

Ariel

> [Montgomery] had been strangely under the influence of Moreau's personality. I do not think it had ever occurred to him that Moreau could die. This disaster was the sudden collapse of the habits that had become part of his nature in the ten or more monotonous years he had spent on the island (Wells 160).

Ariel is in a role similar to being the leader of the spirits of the Island. Being a spirit of the Isle, he is one of many that is (perhaps) manipulated and utilized by Prospero in order to create illusions to confuse and prod the humans who crashed there (a crash that was caused by the "tempest" that Ariel and his spirits raised under Prospero's command). In many ways, Ariel is just as much a slave as Caliban. He is treated a bit better, but it still under constant threat to be imprisoned again, and even Caliban states that Prospero's tyranny has evoked the hatred of not only him, but the spirits (Ariel included) as well: "They [the spirits] all do hate him / As rootedly as I" (III.ii.94-95). Ariel's enslavement is more so a result of being "rescued"—he owes his life to Prospero because otherwise he would have been locked in the tree forever. In science fiction, he becomes the unwitting servant with unusual properties, for example, Robby the Robot in *Forbidden Planet,* Montgomery in *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* and Richard Alpert in *LOST.*

Montgomery is Moreau's loyal servant on the Island and the only one who seems to be his companion; however, he is still subservient. In the same manner, Ariel is often regarded as Prospero's loyal spritely companion who aids him in his revenge; however, he is still a slave and wishes to be free. According to Harry Berger Jr., Ariel is "the picture of the Nobody" and Prospero's "only confidant" (156). Berger Jr. also states that Ariel and Prospero are both "recreative" and "self-delighting," who both "share a delight in art" (154). As Margaret Atwood states in *Negotiating with the dead,* Prospero has a "familiar" in the character Ariel, who helps

him “entice, confuse, and scare … enemies” (115), much like how Montgomery is there to help Moreau wrangle the Beast Folk (the scientific creations), and attend to other duties on the Island.

The little we know of Ariel is that he was imprisoned in a tree by Sycorax, and Prospero freed him, thus Ariel is indebted to Prospero and became his servant. Similarly, Montgomery is not given much of a back-story. Prendick describes him as a man from “Immensity”: “This man, it seemed to me, had come out of Immensity merely to save my life. To-morrow he would drop over the side and vanish again out of existence. … But in the first place was the singularity of an educated man living on this unknown little island” (Wells 89). In addition, we learn throughout the novel that he is a medical student from London who had to leave for some reasons (possibly criminal in nature). He is rather reluctant to say anything explicit to Prendick, but he says enough by his silence and the little amount he does reveal: “It’s a chance, I tell you … as everything is in a man’s life. … Why am I here now—an outcast from civilization—instead of being a happy man enjoying all the pleasures of London? Simply because—eleven years ago—I lost my head for ten minutes on a foggy night” (89). Furthermore, Moreau states that Montgomery was once like Prendick in nature, but eventually came to his side of things (134). Near the end of the novel, after Moreau’s death, Montgomery becomes disillusioned and rambles about how his life was worthless:

> This silly ass of a world … What a muddle it all is! I haven’t had any life. I wonder when it’s going to begin. Sixteen years being bullied by nurses and schoolmasters at their own sweet will, five in London grinding hard at medicine—bad food, shabby lodgings, shabby clothes, shabby vice—a blunder—*I* didn’t know any better—and hustled off to this beastly island (161).

So, unlike Ariel, Montgomery does not know where to go or how to function after Moreau's death (and subsequently earning his "freedom"). In addition, despite Montgomery's loyal servitude, he yearns to return to London and believes the Island to be "an infernally rum place" (Wells 97). He is also wary of Moreau: "'I'd watch my goings carefully, if I were you. *He*—' He hesitated, and seemed to alter his mind about what was on his lips. 'I wish you'd help me with these rabbits' he said" (97). Ariel's feelings appear to mirror this wariness of one's master. As Prospero's servant, he seems willing to carry out tasks (in order to eschew punishment, which makes him wary of Prospero's fury). In Act I, scene ii, of *The Tempest,* Ariel seems reluctant to perform more tasks for Prospero after having caused the storm that crashed the boat: "Is there more toil? Since thou dost give me pains, / Let me remember thee what thou hast promised, / Which is not yet perform'd me" (I.ii.242-244). Ariel appeals to Prospero for his freedom, and Prospero brings up Ariel's imprisonment in the tree in order to re-impose the debt that Ariel owe, and when Ariel feigns ignorance, Prospero calls him a "malignant thing." Prospero further warns that if Ariel offers any more resistance to his orders, he "will rend an oak / And peg [Ariel] in his knotty entrails till / [He] hast howl'd away twelve winters" (294-296). In a similar manner, Montgomery seems to fear Moreau's madness—and hesitates to draw his ire; hence, why he does tasks that he might otherwise be opposed to, such as punishing the Beast Folk.

Montgomery, despite being Moreau's aid, harbors a more sentimental and protective treatment towards the Beast People. He even teaches M'ling to be his attendant (Wells 137), and defends him when the captain of the ship insults him by preparing to fight the captain in a rage. However, Montgomery does show moments of savagery against the creatures: "Montgomery cracked his whip at them, and forthwith they all turned and fled helter-skelter into the trees" (129). Similarly, Ariel in *The Tempest,* seems, if anything, rather neutral towards the

unsuspecting beached humans on the island, but casts illusions and sicks "dogs" on them under Prospero's orders to drive their reform (IV. i.254.sd).

After Prendick flees Moreau and Montgomery's base, he becomes nervous and rattled. Despite having calmed a little after Moreau says they're not going to kill him, he is none the less put to sleep by Montgomery to help put his nerves at ease: "Your nerves are worked to rags. Let me give you something that will make you sleep" (Wells 113). In *The Tempest,* it is Ariel who is the agent of sleep. "The mariners all under hatches stowed, / Who, with a charm joined to their suffered labour, / I have left asleep" (I.ii.230-232). In Act II, scene i, he plays music while invisible to bring everyone (except Sebastian and Antonio) to sleep. However, both function in a different manner. Montgomery's aid to Prendick was in order to calm him, while Ariel's lullaby was in order to provoke the action of the play.

Montgomery is not only an Ariel figure. His alcoholism could be registered as a very Stephano-like quality. Both of them share their alcohol with the creatures on the Island—Stephano with Caliban[2] and Montgomery with the Beast Folk (Wells 161)—but both lead towards very different conclusions. Caliban becomes awed by Stephano's "celestial liquor" and vows his loyalty to Stephano (who he has mistaken for the man on the moon), while Montgomery's alcohol drives the Beast Folks to embrace their inherent animalistic nature—and they kill Montgomery.

I believe that Montgomery and other analogous-Ariels are emblematic of the Prospero's that are unable to reach full-Prospero-like status. They are either hindered by their form—like

---

[2] "Four legs and two voices – a most delicate monster! His forward voice now is to speak well of his friend; his backward voice is to utter foul speeches and to detract. If all the wine in my bottle will recover him, I will help his ague" (Shakespeare II.ii.88-92)

Robby the Robot in *Forbidden Planet*—who, as a robot—is unable to further his intellect with the Krell machine, or they are held back by some flaw. For Montgomery, this would be his alcoholism and his initial introduction to the Island—wherein he did not seek the Island himself, but was rather transported there with Moreau (subsequently it is not his domain to control/create). Similarly, Richard in *LOST* is a character who could seemingly reach a sort of mythic status, if it were not for the manner in which he came to the Island—it seems that he was not supposed to be there in the first place. But what does it mean to be a Prospero? And why could one call Dr. Moreau "Prospero-like"?

Prospero

> I could have forgiven [Moreau] a little even had his motive been hate. But he was so irresponsible, so utterly careless. His curiously, his mad, aimless investigations, drove him on… (Wells 152).

Doctor Moreau is the novel's Prospero-like figure. As Philip Gooden defined the word, Prospero-like indicates someone who is "'controlling,' 'detached,' 'having magical powers', 'sage-like," and suggests "someone who is fundamentally wise and benevolent but capable of being severe" (Gooden 158). In the same vein, Moreau is a scientist who, while seeming to be horribly severe to the beast-creatures he has concocted on the Island, he is also a hospitable man who seems to wish the best for his creations.

Margaret Atwood wrote in *Negotiating with the dead,* that Prospero was a literary "grand-daddy" to Doctor Moreau. Prospero became the fictive model for the mad scientist who "fetches up on a tropical island, where he attempts to civilize the one native available to him," (115) of course, in Moreau, there is not just one native (Caliban), but several (the Beast Folk). As

Atwood states in *Writing with intent essays, reviews, personal prose,* Moreau is a Prospero, except with a hundred or so Calibans at his disposal (392). In addition, Atwood writes in *Negotiating with the dead,* that Prospero has a "familiar" in the character Ariel, who helps him "entice, confuse, and scare … enemies" (115), similar to Montgomery working with Moreau. Atwood also writes that Prospero believes his aim "is not revenge," but rather "repentance." He does this using his "arts"—or magic (115). This is similar to Moreau throughout the story. Moreau believes in his actions—fervently so. He does not believe he is a butcher, rather a humanizer: "*Hi non sunt homines; sunt animalia qui nos habemus*—vivisected. A humanising process" (Wells 128). Like Prospero, Moreau is using his art—his vivisection—as a method of reforming, although in this case he is attempting to humanize beasts (pumas, dogs, etc.), while Prospero is working to morally reform those who have wronged him in the past.

Contrarily, Slusser and Rabkin in *Aliens: an anthology* write that Prospero's "search for knowledge" is only "artifice," and that his magical abilities give him "an excuse for repentance, thus a cause for tempering something even more dangerous than the Indian per se: the drive to explore nature openly" (xii). Furthermore, Slusser and Rabkin assert that Prospero's art is not for a form of "science," but is art because it "invokes divine sanction in order to guarantee permanent control over the natural world and its potential aliens" (xii). Moreau's "art" functions in the same way. Moreau utilizes his "vivisection" in order to supercede the power of nature and alter it according to his will. In the story itself, Prendick narrates that the "strange creations" are "of Moreau's art" (Wells 139), and they are "without human form." He is attempting to become a God—and this leads to his demise.

Prendick has a sort of admiration for Moreau's science and his experimentation, but he does believe that he has gone too far. In the novel, Prendick relays Moreau's message that

vivisection—the sort of science that Moreau is doing on the Island—is ultimately beneficial and humanizing. Prendick states that Moreau said that “the possibility of vivisection does not stop at a mere physical metamorphosis,” in the manner that a “pig may be educated. The mental structure is even less determinate than the bodily,” but with the dawn of sciences like hypnotism, humanity is beginning to “find the promise of a possibility of superseding old inherent instincts by new suggestions, grafting upon or replacing the inherited fixed ideas” (132). According to Moreau (through the words of Prendick): “Very much indeed of what we call moral education, he said, is such an artificial modification and perversion of instinct; pugnacity is trained into courageous self-sacrifice, and suppressed sexuality into religious emotion” (132). Moreau uses this in order to force his Laws into the minds of his beast creations—a form of scientific brain-washing and mind-control.

After recollecting the pamphlet about the “Moreau Horrors,” Prendick recounts that: “…Moreau was, I suppose, about fifty ; a prominent and masterful physiologist, well known in scientific circles for his extraordinary imagination and his brutal directness in discussion” (Wells 101). More importantly, Moreau had been experimenting with some new science, specifically with “the transfusion of blood.” Prendick remembers that Moreau suddenly “had to leave England,” not because a journalist had uncovered some information about Moreau’s laboratory experiments and “a wretched dog, flayed and otherwise mutilated, escaped from Moreau’s house,” and Moreau “was simply howled out of the country” afterwards (101) Prendick admits that he himself had a more sympathetic reaction to Moreau’s plight, and actually blames the idea of “conscience” impeding the advancement of science: “It was not the first time that conscience has turned against the methods of research” (101). He further states that “It may be that he deserved to be; but I still think that the tepid support of his fellow-investigators and his desertion

by the great body of scientific workers was a shameful thing" (101). However, Prendick does state that some of Moreau's experiments were "wantonly cruel." He believes that Moreau could have made "peace" with the public if he had abandoned his barbaric research, but he asserts that Moreau did not care, because he had "fallen under the overmastering spell of research" and "had indeed nothing but his own interest to consider" (101). In this way, Moreau became driven by the idea of learning more, overcoming his failures, and this obsession inevitably leads to his demise.

After Moreau's death, Montgomery ardently holds on to the hope that all is not lost—that the reformation of the beasts will remain: "I suppose those that were made of beasts of prey will make silly asses of themselves sooner or later. We can't massacre the lot,--can we? I suppose that's what *your* humanity would suggest?... But they'll change. They are sure to change" (Wells 161), but his hope is lost on the Beast People, who swiftly revert back into their animal nature. The one who changes by the end is Prendick, who appears to withdraw from society and take up Moreau's mantle as the "mad scientist."

"Obsessional Catastrophe"

> Knowing I loved my books, he furnish'd me / From mine own library with volumes that / I prize above my dukedom (I.ii.193-195).

Mark Jay Mirsky states in *The Absent Shakespeare* that Prospero is a daydreamer—wrapped in his own thoughts and fantasies. Harry Berger Jr. makes the same sort of statements, remarking in the section "The Miraculous Harp" of *Second World and Green World* that Prospero finds the escape to the Island refreshing because it frees him from pressing obligations and allows him to escape. Prospero, in a way, is something similar to what we would call a bookworm, a couch potato, or maybe even a video game addict. Mirsky writes that "[t]o the

outsider, it seems like a form of possession not action" that Prospero is enveloped in his illusory reality because "[it] is the métier of all magic" (133). Similarly, in the foreword to *This Virtual Life: Escapism and Simulation in Our Media World* (2001) by Andrew Evans, Jerry Sadowitz, a magician, claims that "magic has always been [his] form of escapism," in that it allows one to flee the confines of reality for a moment and believe that something extraordinary, like magic, could exist through the manipulative power of illusion (xi). In *The Dream of Prospero* (1967), D.G. James calls Prospero's stint on the Island a "long holiday," and that he has "neglected his plain duties" (126). James sees Prospero as a man who has been using his magic and his isolation as a way to get away from reality for a while—it has become for him a virtual reality of possibility wherein he can flourish and be dictator.

According to Harold Berger in *Science Fiction and the New Dark Age*, the obsessional scientific urges of the scientist (and others) can cause disasters. According to Harold Berger, a "sizable body of dystopian fiction deals with catastrophes of obsession" or "….the drive for knowledge, the will to dominate" (176). Generally, dystopian works that deal with an "obsession" are post-war stories because society is trying to repair itself or perhaps fix whatever caused the war in the first place, but sometimes the obsession itself *is* the catastrophe (185). In both *The Tempest* and *The Island of Dr. Moreau,* the characters are both obsessed with knowledge. Prospero neglects his dukedom in order to delve further into his studies in a manner reminiscent of Dr. Faustus, while Moreau is driven to perfect his horrific vivisection.

Like Prospero, Moreau is obsessed with knowledge—the pursuit of discovery. The Island, like Prospero's isle, provides Moreau with the isolation needed to surround himself by his experiments. Like an addict, he does not see any sort of problem with his experimentation, despite the fact that it causes pain (however, Moreau believes that pain is a necessary side-effect

of advancement). Moreau says, “I have never troubled about the ethics of the matter,” and that “The study of Nature makes a man at last as remorse-less as Nature. I have gone on, not heeding anything but the question I was pursuing; and the material has—dripped into the huts yonder” (Wells 134). He sees his study as deliberate shaping—like molding: “These creatures you have seen are animals carven and wrought into new shapes. To that—to the study of the plasticity of living forms—my life has been devoted. I have studied for years, gaining in knowledge as I go. I see you look horrified, yet I am telling you nothing new” (131). The length of time Moreau has been doing this has also cemented him into the role of scientist. He says that he has been doing his experiments and research “for twenty years altogether—counting nine years in England.” Part of the reason one could call him “obsessed” is how he views these long years. No matter how long he has been doing it, or how many accomplishments he has made, he still says there is something that always “defeats [him], makes [him] dissatisfied, challenges [him] to further effort” (136). He says, “always I fall short of the things I dream” (136). He is not Prospero-like in the way that he does not absolve to quit or give up his experimentation. Like an addict, or a perfectionist, he is unable to relinquish the quest for more knowledge, which inevitably leads to his grisly end at the hands of his experiments. While Prospero, on the other hand, releases his powers and takes responsibility for what he did to Caliban: “this thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine” (V.i.275-276); thus, Prospero is spared a disastrous fate at the hands of his own creation (as Moreau, Morbius, and Frankenstein do).

“Totalitarianism”

Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Vaughan wrote in the Arden *Tempest,* that Prospero’s most controversial role was that of the “master,” which could be registered as Prospero the

tyrannical despot. In addition, Michael Billington stated that one theatrical adaptation of Prospero in 1988 was Michael Bryant's Prospero at the National—"a tetchy autocrat turning purple with fury at the mention of his brother."

According to Harold Berger, despotism is a feature of a wide-variety of modern speculative fiction. Totalitarianism is the same as despotism, however, they are very similar. Berger writes that totalitarianism is a "new form of government" (86). Berger cites Hannah Arendt's *The Origins of Totalitarianism* when he goes about describing the system. Totalitarianism begins from "its absolute obedience to the suprahuman laws of History or Nature" and unlike "formal law, which seeks to ascertain what *is* and what promises stability, totalitarian law is the law of movement, using past and present as clues to what History or Nature has ordained for the future" (87). The goal of this new system is a drive "to evolve mankind as a finished product," and as a result "erases the tradition distinction between man and law. No longer does man function as a separate entity within the framework of the law: Since he is to be the finished product of law, he is also its embodiment" (87).

Totalitarianism is also a form of terrorism, because one of its basic requirements is the creation of terror "as a means of winning and maintaining power, but that terror needs to be continuous" (Berger 87). Regarding the idea of "tyranny of logicality," Berger cites Arendt: "tyranny of logicality begins with the mind's submission to logic as a never-ending process, on which man relies in order to engender his thoughts. By this submission, he surrenders his inner freedom" "Total terror … and the self-coercive force of logical deduction … correspond to each other and need each other in order to set the terror-ruled movement into motion and keep it moving" (qtd. Arendt 87). In effect, totalitarian dystopias are marked by their "hostility to freedom … primarily personal freedom" (92).

In *The Tempest,* Prospero does not hold back when proclaiming his power: “My high charms work, / And these, mine enemies, are all knit up / In their distractions. They now are in my power” (Shakespeare III.iii.88-90). Prospero utilizes his power as a method of terrorizing his brother Antonio and the other people who had wronged him. He also enslaves the spirits on the Island in order to cast illusions to frighten them, and hopefully push them towards redemption. Prospero is further characterized as a totalitarian in how he personally treats the characters. He sets Ferdinand to work at the end of Act II, scene ii, threats Ariel with imprisonment (II.ii.294-296), and abuses Caliban (II.ii.1-17).

Moreau is also stringent and tyrannical in the manner of a totalitarian. When Prendick encounters the Beast People on the Island, he is stunned by the manner in which they behave and how brainwashed they are. They tell him that “Punishment is sharp and sure. Therefore learn the Law …” (Wells 123). One creature was branded, and there is also the potential of getting whipped. Furthermore, they say that Moreau’s laboratory is “the House of Pain,” and that his hands are what “makes… wounds… heals” (121). The creatures have been taught to revere Moreau as a person akin to a God—and that is what Moreau peddles himself to be to the Beast People. He is their creator. He can make their life, and he can take it away. Furthermore, following a Darwinian interpretation, his drive towards furthering evolution also plays into this idea that he is somehow trying to fashion himself as “God-as-Man.” For this reason, H.G. Wells could be regarded as a champion against the notion of advanced technology—this idea that, somehow, science will open a door to a world where Men are Gods, and the entire balance of Nature is thrown out of balance.

Wells’s “Hostility to Science”

As Harold Berger writes, “The debasement or annihilation of man by the sophisticated inventions of modern science or a power elite armed with them constitutes one of the dominant features of dystopian fiction” (Berger 3). Unlike science fiction of yesterday, the science fiction of today now cast’s science “in a villain role” (3). While, coupled with the old-school sci-fi, the scientist used to be an “intellectual titan, enemy of superstition and tyranny, and selfless benefactor” and yet now he is more commonly portrayed as a mad despot—because it is not the “science” that is the problem—but it’s “misuse by man” (3). that causes the problems. However, anymore there is also the fear that tech—and its mechanical spawn—will threaten us—the “masters” (3). Berger quotes an observer of the Dystopian trend in 1955 as saying: “What I don't understand about science fiction is the way it has turned against science... Its authors typically view their worlds-to-come as everything they detest in the world-as-it-is; and what they detest [is] is everything that makes the modern world modern” (4).

Berger asserts many times that science itself is not bad, but it can be “incompatible.” If there are no boundaries placed on it, or restraints, then technology’s rapid evolution will “outstrip plodding human evolution” and, consequently, “diminish … man’s control of his life” (Berger 8). Berger states it rather aptly when he writes:

> The man at the *thing's* control switch may enjoy only the illusion of control; the mores, drives, and need that bring his *thing* into being, that determine his function, and that create a market for his service could be almost wholly outside him, making him the switch that tends to switch and consequently blurring the distinction between man and thing. This blurring – this is the fundamental target of literature's anti-scientism (8).

This is perhaps why the modern "mad scientist" is all too often portrayed as a robot himself—cold, detached, unnervingly obedient to his obsessive desires to know more, build more—sometimes branching into the desire to control the world (megalomania/tyranny) and "human engineering" (56). Moreau is the same way. He barely registered any emotion throughout the novel, and his cold-treatment of the Beast Folk and his continuing House of Pain are indicative of his (practically) soul-less nature. In addition, his vivisection is a perversification of nature. He is trying to jump-start "evolution" in animals by physically contorting them into the shape of human beings. On another level, Moreau's obsession with science and consistent manipulation of Nature is his own form of self-evolution—wherein he is trying to ascend to "God."

In *The Tempest,* Prospero within the original play itself could also be registered as emotionally unavailable. He seems rather blasé about his life potentially being in danger, because he believes so ardently in the power of his magic—and he could also be registered as *bored.* Boredom as a result of too much power. If he is able to conjure any images he wants—masques, spirits, food—then what use is life? His Utopian paradise could, in effect, be *too* good (in fact, as previously asserted in my thesis, a common characteristic of dystopian novels is the utopia itself—wherein everything is too perfect for humanity to enjoy it). According to Anthony Schorr, Andrew Evans states, "[t]he double-edged sword of imagination … contains the unavoidable disappointment of man's environment never perfectly meeting his needs or fulfilling his desires for perfect happiness" (Evans 145). This is the problem with self-fashioned Utopias (as can be accessible through modes such as virtual reality wherein we are the masters of our own environment). Complete control offers disappointment, because we can never be satisfied. This is the cause of Moreau's dissatisfaction—and his obsession. His experiments continue because he cannot reach a state of perfection, no matter how close he gets or how much progress

he has made. Even though he fashions his own "utopia" on the Island—a realm where he can perform his "art"—he is miserable.

Eric S. Rabkin writes in "Atavism and Utopia" that one key consideration with regards to the rise in dystopias is the role of knowledge. Quite the contrary, usually Utopian works flourish when there is a distinct *lack* of knowledge (6). Rabkin cites *Anthem*'s homogenized population, who are forbidden "the knowledge of self," which is "the kind of knowledge that leads to the assessment of responsibility," which is the kind of "knowledge necessary for self-assertion and thus potentially for disobedience and shame" (6). As the old adage goes—ignorance is bliss. Prendick could say the same. Once he becomes aware of what is happening on Moreau's Island, he is tormented and desperately tries to escape his Hell. Moreau's knowledge, on the other hand, has never reached capacity—he still desires to know more and more. This is why, according to Harold Berger, that "H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw, once spokesmen for man's bright destiny, [renounce] mankind as a failure doomed to some imminent catastrophe of his own making" (Berger 55), because the more we know, the more we are doomed to catastrophe—potentially by the hands of our own creations (technological or biological).

"The Mind Invasion"

> [Montgomery] explained to me that the comparative safety of Moreau and himself was due to the limited mental scope of these monsters. In spite of their increased intelligence, and the tendency of their animal instincts to reawaken, they had certain Fixed Ideas implanted by Moreau in their minds which absolutely bounded their imaginations. They were really hypnotized, had been told certain things were impossible, and certain things were not to be done, and these

> prohibitions were woven into the texture of their minds beyond any possibility of disobedience or dispute (Wells 138-139).

According to Harold Berger, part of our cultural anxiety regarding new technologies is the threat it imposes on our free will—on our minds. Subliminal ads, psychology, drugs, all of these could in effect, manipulate our true feelings, decisions, and consequently make us puppets (Berger 103). The paranormal is also a source of constant wariness. Psychics, telekinesis, and such are a threat to our physical and mental will. According to Berger, these methods of mind control are a manifestation of "modern anxiety regarding the preservation of freedom" (108), which are feelings that have only intensified as we advance (103). The new technology at our fingers today—truth serums and electronic eavesdropping—have "given man a sense of real vulnerability" (103). Within speculative fiction, this is demonstrated by the fear of "being the pawn of an alien intelligence" (103); or perhaps brainwashed through torturous means. Berger cites Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* when discussing the idea of rendering physical and mental trauma in order to "control" one's mind. In the novel, Alex, the main character, is reformed through a horrific form of Pavlovian conditioning, wherein he is hurt whenever he is confronted by images or thoughts of misdeeds, thus when he even thinks about committing a malicious act, he feels agonizing pain (106). This is not unlike the manner in which Moreau warps the minds of the Beast People, or how Prospero's spirits unleash hell upon Caliban when he does something wicked.

In *The Tempest,* the characters could be interpreted as pawns in a game of chess—placed and pushed around the game board by an invisible player. Caliban and Ariel are both under Prospero's will as slaves, while Miranda is his daughter (and his art) and thus under his rule, while the other characters who have survived the shipwreck are being manipulated by the spirits

by illusions and whispers that tell them where to go—hopefully, leading them on a path towards their eventual redemption. For example, Ariel is used to literally tug the characters into scenes via the use of stage direction: “Enter ARIEL, with the Master and Boatswain amazedly following” (V. i.215.sd), and also through music. Ariel’s music leads Ferdinand from the shore into the mainland. He says to himself: “Where should this music be? I’th’ air, or th’earth? / It sounds no more, and sure it waits upon / Some god o’th’ island” (I.ii.388-390). “This music crept by me upon the waters, / Allaying both their fury and my passion / With its sweet air. Thence I have followed it / (Or it hath drawn me, rather) (I. ii.392-395).

Moreau is responsible for brainwashing the Beast People with a series of Laws that he has practically etched into their cerebrum. When Prendick encounters them, they are repeating the Laws like a perverse mantra: “Not to go on all-Fours … Not to suck up Drink … Not to eat Flesh or Fish … Not to claw Bark of Trees … Not to chase other Men …” (Wells 121). Prendick even describes “[a] kind of rhythmic fervour fell on all of us ; we gabbled and swayed faster and faster, repeating his amazing law” (121). Prendick even imagines that “Moreau, after animalising these men, had infected their dwarfed brains with a kind of deification of himself” (121). Again, we are presented with the idea of Moreau-as-God, this time it is a purely imaginary construct he is grafting onto the minds of the Beast People via this form of brainwashing. Not even Prendick is immune to a mind invasion. His mind is irrevocably altered by what he sees on the Island, and consequently carries on off the Island when he returns to London.

Prendick: the New Moreau

At the end, Prendick becomes for us a new Prospero-like figure—one rapt in his studies, withdrawing from society, but this time he is delving in to chemistry and astronomy—subjects

could be regarded as far more benign topics of study than vivisection, however, there is the implication that he has not fully escape the Island, because “none escape,” and he has carried with him the germ of madness that will inevitably transform him into a mad scientist. His retreat to create his own “utopic” space invites the potential that, once more, there is the possibility of a Dystopian door opening.