



THE NEXUS OF POWER AND OPPRESSION: A FOUCAULDIAN AND GRAMSCIAN STUDY OF PROSPERO'S DOMINANCE IN *THE TEMPEST*

Elsa Lailatul Marfu'ah*, Arya Saputra², Tito Aryo Wicaksono³, Mariam Kusniah⁴, Hidayatul Nurjanah⁵

¹²³⁴⁵English Letters Department, UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Jl. Pandawa No.23, Dusun IV,

Pucangan, Kec. Kartasura, Kabupaten Sukoharjo

elsalailatulm@gmail.com¹, 11aryasaputra@gmail.com², witioaryo@gmail.com³,

iyahusni08@gmail.com⁴, hidayatul.nurjanah@staff.uinsaid.ac.id⁵

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the intricate power dynamics and hegemonic structures in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, focusing on Prospero's dominion over his subordinated subjects, Ariel and Caliban. Drawing from Michel Foucault's power relations and Antonio Gramsci's hegemony, the study reveals that power within the narrative transcends physical coercion, encompassing the manipulation of cultural, political, and ideological elements. The findings unveil the complex interplay of forces governing authority, subjugation, and the imposition of cultural and intellectual control in the context of the master-slave relationship. Prospero, as the master, employs language and narrative manipulation to assert his dominance over Ariel and Caliban, yielding both physical and psychological control. The themes of oppression and colonialism within the play are distinctly portrayed, notably through the enslavement of Caliban and Ariel, emphasizing their resilience against prevailing power imbalances. Moreover, this research extends beyond Shakespeare's work, functioning as a metaphor for contemporary societal challenges related to power, dominion, and resistance. Ultimately, the interplay of power and oppression within *The Tempest* provides a profound lens through which to examine the intricacies of power within the broader spectrum of human existence, enriching our understanding of power dynamics in literature and their significance in contemporary societal issues.

Keywords: Foucault, Gramsci, hegemony, power relation, *The Tempest*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini berfokus pada dinamika kekuasaan dan struktur hegemoni dalam karya William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, dengan berfokus pada dominasi Prospero atas subyeknya, Ariel dan Caliban. Berlandaskan pada teori relasi kuasa Michel Foucault dan hegemoni milik Antonio Gramsci, peneliti mengungkap kekuasaan Prospero dalam narasi *The Tempest* telah melampaui pemaksaan fisik, melibatkan manipulasi unsur budaya, politik, dan ideologis. Temuan ini membuka ruang bagi monopoli kekuatan yang diwujudkan melalui otoritas, penindasan, dan penerapan kontrol budaya dan intelektual dalam konteks hubungan tuan-hamba. Prospero, sebagai tuan, menggunakan bahasa dan narasi manipulatif untuk menegaskan dominasinya atas Ariel dan Caliban, berujung pada kontrol fisik dan psikologis. Tema penindasan dan kolonialisme dalam lakon ini diungkapkan dengan jelas, terutama melalui perbudakan atas karakter Caliban dan Ariel, turut disoroti pula perlawanan mereka terhadap ketimpangan relasi kuasa yang ada. Penelitian ini berkontribusi dalam memahami hubungan kekuasaan dalam karya sastra dan implikasi berkelanjutannya terhadap dinamika sosial kontemporer. Pada akhirnya, permainan kekuasaan dan penindasan dalam *The Tempest* memberikan pandangan mendalam untuk menilik ulang kerumitan kekuasaan dalam spektrum kehidupan manusia, memperkaya pemahaman kita tentang dinamika kekuasaan dalam sastra dan signifikansinya dalam isu-isu sosial kontemporer.

Kata kunci: Foucault, Gramsci, hegemoni, relasi kuasa, *The Tempest*

Received: 03 December 2023

Revised: 10 December 2023

Accepted: 17 December 2023

How to cite: Marfu'ah E.L. et,al (2023). *The Nexus of Power and Oppression: A Foucauldian and Gramscian Study of Prospero's Dominance in the Tempest*. ELITE: English and Literature Journal,10(2). 29-38.

This is an open-access article under



INTRODUCTION

“Drama” is a versatile term that finds application in various contexts. It serves as a descriptor for a particular genre of performance or film characterized by intricate plot developments and intense happenings (Klarer, 2013). Furthermore, it finds utility in portraying a person or an occurrence as exceptionally engaging and compelling. Expressing universal themes within local boundaries, Shakespeare’s plays have long been subjected to various interpretations (Tuğlu, 2016). Within the broad spectrum of literary scholarship, William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* stands out as a treasure trove of human complexity, serving as a compelling portrait of the complex interplay between power and human rights, force, knowledge, and liberation. The characters of Prospero, the exiled Duke of Milan, and his slaves, Caliban and Ariel, serve as iconic characters whose stories encapsulate the multifaceted dialectics of power, consciousness, and redemption. This research embarks on a journey of discovery through Michel Foucault’s power/knowledge and Gramsci’s hegemony, illuminating the complex dynamics that govern *The Tempest* and offering insight into the connection between power, knowledge, and liberation.

Michel Foucault, the famous French philosopher and social theorist, proposed a revolutionary conceptual framework through his Power/Knowledge theory. According to Foucault (1982), power is not a monolithic coercive force; On the contrary, it is closely linked to knowledge, creating a symbiotic relationship in which the two elements form and exist together. Shakespeare’s characters often demonstrate a desire to be recognized as something more than they “seem” to be, i.e., to belie the visible and audible evidence of their presence on stage by showing that it does not and cannot adequately represent who they are (Weller, 1982). In *The Tempest*, we encounter Prospero, exiled and abandoned on an island, exercising power through networks of knowledge, whether linguistic, magical, or epistemological. In contrast, Ariel and Caliban symbolize voices on the margins of the intellectual hierarchy, marginalized and subjugated by Prospero’s power, as well as the authoritative works of knowledge that form a foundation for their world.

To move the analysis beyond simply viewing power as the oppression of the powerless by the powerful, Foucault argues that it is incorrect to view power as something that institutions possess and use oppressively against individuals and groups. Instead, he seeks to examine how power functions in daily interactions between individuals and institutions (McHoul & Grace, 2002). In his works, Sergiu (2010) stated that he makes the case that we must reject the notion that oppression is the result of having power because, even in their most extreme manifestations, oppressive methods are not merely repressive and suppressive; they are also constructive, leading to the emergence of new behaviors.

According to Foucault (1980), there are two ways to express power. In the network of public resources, this power functions subconsciously with awareness. Since power is generated within and not externally, for instance, internal relationships, structure, and regulations can be discussed. The spouse is the one who takes responsibility for the normalization of family ties and has to work to support themselves; at the same time, the wife is only responsible for caring for the maintenance of the home and looking after the kids (Jannah, 2022). The limits of power should be examined, along with its ultimate locations and the places “where it becomes capillary” or in its more regional and local institutions. In reality, its primary focus should be on the moment when power transcends the legal norms that organize and delimit it, extending itself beyond them, in institutions, becoming embodied in practices, and arming itself with tools and, ultimately investing, violent means of material intervention (Taylor, 2011; Smart, 2002; Oliver, 2013).

Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Marxist theorist, proposed the concept of hegemony during his imprisonment by Mussolini's regime. Born in 1891, Gramsci’s early life and political

activism led to his incarceration. His theory of hegemony posits that power is not merely enforced through coercion but is also embedded in cultural and ideological aspects, shaping societal norms (Femia, 1987). Hegemony, in Gramsci's perspective, extends beyond the traditional understanding of domination solely through force or coercion. It encapsulates a more nuanced form of social control, where ruling elites not only exercise authority through political and economic means but also shape and control the prevailing ideas, values, and cultural norms within a society (Gramsci, 1987). Gramsci argues that the ruling class establishes and maintains its dominance by influencing and shaping the cultural and ideological landscape, thereby garnering the consent and support of the subordinated classes. This cultural hegemony, achieved through institutions like education, media, and civil society, becomes a powerful tool for the ruling class to legitimize its rule and maintain stability (Adamson, 2014).

Through this notion, Gramsci also highlights the potential for resistance and counter-hegemonic struggles. While the dominant class seeks to establish its worldview as the common sense or 'organic' ideology, Gramsci acknowledges the possibility of counter-hegemonic forces emerging from the subaltern classes. These counter-hegemonic movements involve challenging the prevailing ideologies and constructing alternative narratives that question the existing power structures. In essence, Gramsci's concept of hegemony invites a comprehensive examination of power dynamics, emphasizing the crucial role of culture and ideology in maintaining social order and the potential for transformative resistance from those historically marginalized (Lewis & Jhally, 1994).

While countless scholars have explored the depths of this literary masterpiece, the integration of Michel Foucault's Power/Knowledge and Gramsci's hegemony theory into this narrative left a notable gap in the research landscape. Existing studies have examined power dynamics, explored character struggles, and interpreted the play's themes of liberation and oppression, but few have ventured into Foucauldian and Gramscian analysis. For instance, Skura's (1989) article provides a comprehensive examination of *The Tempest*, emphasizing intricate connections among characters, language, power dynamics, and overarching themes, particularly focusing on colonialism in Shakespeare's works. Another discussion about *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's play written by Arcilla (2023), offers an in-depth examination of the play's internal components, with a primary focus on the interplay between power and oppression. The other one is entitled "Supernatural Power in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*" (Efrizah, 2018). This research discussion focuses on the supernatural elements of *The Tempest*, research in this area provides insight into the play's themes, character motivations, and broader meanings of it. This helps shed light on how Shakespeare uses the supernatural to convey complex ideas about power, control, and the human condition in this particular work.

In this study, the researcher draws upon the intellectual foundation laid by Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci, two prominent theorists whose insights on power, knowledge, and domination have helped shed light on how social structures work and how they are reproduced or questioned. Foucault's concept of productive and omnipresent power, operating through different institutions and systems of knowledge, will allow us to dissect Prospero's most sophisticated mechanisms of domination. At the same time, the researchers also use Gramsci's notions of cultural hegemony and resistance to explore how the enslaved characters, Caliban and Ariel, overcome their enslavement and yearn for liberation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the realm of literary discourse, William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* has long been revered for its exploration of intricate power relations and the dynamics of oppression and inequality (Krueger, 2010; Egan 2007). As Bloom (2008) stated *The Tempest*, widely recognized as one of Shakespeare's most complex works, highlights themes of power, control, freedom, and colonization, each of which demonstrates Shakespeare's nuanced understanding of human relationships and the hierarchy of society. At its core, the play delves into the

complex interactions between Prospero, the master, and his subservient subjects, Ariel and Caliban. These power dynamics, steeped in varying degrees of repression and control, offer a rich terrain for examining the implications of power relations on social interactions and the perpetuation of hegemonic structures. In the quest to comprehend the underlying forces at play, this literature review draws from the foundational works of Michel Foucault on power relations and Antonio Gramsci on hegemony. By applying Foucault's concept of power relations and Gramsci's notion of hegemony, this review aims to unravel the intricate tapestry of power within *The Tempest* and shed light on its profound impact on social order, resistance, and the perpetuation of unequal structures of authority.

According to Foucault (1980), power is not a monolithic coercive force. On the contrary, it is closely linked to knowledge, creating a symbiotic relationship in which the two elements form and exist together. Caliban and Ariel symbolize voices on the margins of the intellectual hierarchy, marginalized and subjugated by Prospero's power, as well as the authoritative works of knowledge that form a foundation for their world. Michel Foucault's concept of power relations is indispensable in understanding this complex dynamic. Foucault posits that power is not a static, hierarchical structure but a dynamic network interwoven into social practices and interactions. He emphasizes that power operates at the micro-level of everyday existence, shaping relationships and governing individual behavior. He proposed that power relation signifies an intricate and pervasive network of authority and control embedded within social interactions and practices (Macey, 2004). It views power as a dynamic, fluid force that operates beyond traditional hierarchical structures, seeping into the micro-level of everyday existence. Foucault's approach emphasizes that power is not solely a repressive force but also a productive one, shaping individual behaviors and their relationships' dynamics (O'Farrell, 2005). The power relations depicted in *The Tempest* illustrate the multifaceted ways in which power is exercised, resisted, and negotiated, reflecting the complexity and adaptability of this concept within the context of Shakespeare's narrative. The application of Foucault's concept offers a vital lens through which to scrutinize the multifaceted dimensions of authority, resistance, and the pervasive influence of power relations within the play's narrative.

Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony encompasses an understanding of power dynamics that goes beyond mere physical coercion or force (Holub, 1992; Santucci, 2010). According to Gramsci, dominance is not solely achieved through overt subjugation but instead through the manipulation of cultural, political, and ideological elements (Gramsci, 1987). Hegemony involves the capacity of one social group or class to exert control and influence over others by shaping their beliefs, values, and worldviews. This results in the maintenance of a power structure that often remains unquestioned (Ives, 2004; Jones, 2006). This concept offers a crucial framework for comprehending the subtle and widespread methods through which authority is established and sustained within a society, primarily through the dissemination of ideas and values. In the context of the play *The Tempest*, Prospero's control over Ariel and Caliban exemplifies this hegemonic authority. While physical dominance is evident, Prospero can instill a cultural and intellectual framework that perpetuates their subordination. He shapes their beliefs and perspectives, cementing a hierarchy where his supremacy remains unchallenged. Gramsci's framework clarifies how Prospero's cultural and intellectual dominion over Ariel and Caliban upholds their servitude and perpetuates the imbalance of power. This perspective highlights the intricate dynamics at play in *The Tempest*, emphasizing the profound impact of cultural and ideological manipulation in sustaining Prospero's authority, which goes beyond physical force.

RESEARCH METHOD

William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is a renowned work in English literature, situated as one of his last plays, and is often considered a tragicomedy (Bloom, 2008). The story revolves around Prospero's quest for vengeance, redemption, and restoring his daughter,

Miranda, to her rightful place. The island is inhabited by the spirits, both of whom Prospero has subjected to servitude, Ariel and the native Caliban. This study is centered on analyzing power relations in *The Tempest*, focusing on the characters of Ariel and Caliban, who exist as enslaved people in Prospero's labor force. The researchers aim to explore the intricate dynamics of power balance that shape their relationships with Prospero, who assumes the role of master, whose needs they serve.

The researchers adopt a research approach drawing from Miles and Huberman's methodological framework for this study. This qualitative methodology framework emphasizes the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to uncover patterns, themes, and relationships. It employs a combination of visual displays and matrices to facilitate a holistic understanding of complex phenomena in social science research (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researchers employ data collection techniques such as close textual analysis, character mapping, and thematic content analysis to dissect *The Tempest*. This approach examines the nuances of the power dynamics at play within the text. The researchers also incorporate Michel Foucault's theory of power relations, providing a lens through which the researchers can scrutinize the unequal distribution of power within the play. The theory helps uncover the mechanisms through which force is exerted, negotiated, and resisted in the relationships between Prospero and his servants. Moreover, the researchers employ Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony to explore the implications of unequal power relations. This lens enables us to delve deeper into the ideologies, beliefs, and cultural aspects that shape the power imbalances between Prospero and his subordinates, Ariel and Caliban.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this research, the researchers have uncovered a total of 27 data that vividly portray the profound disparities in power dynamics and the prevailing influence of hegemony within the interactions involving Prospero and his subjugated subjects, Ariel and Caliban. These discoveries offer a comprehensive depiction of the intricate dynamics characterizing power equilibrium and dominion within the context of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The main goal of this study is to examine the power dynamics between Prospero, the play's protagonist, and the slave characters to understand the power imbalance and hegemony in the play and conduct a comprehensive analysis of the power dynamics and mechanisms of oppression committed by Prospero towards his slaves; Ariel and Caliban. To delve deeper into this multifaceted relationship, the researcher has harnessed Michel Foucault's power relations theory alongside Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony. These theoretical frameworks have proven to be invaluable perspectives for discerning the underlying patterns of authority, subjugation, and the utilization of cultural, political, and ideological mechanisms that configure the master-slave relationship. This section delves into the thorough examination of these findings, elucidating the intricate interplay of forces and their implications within the narrative, as follows:

PROSPERO: Shake it off. Come on,
We will visit Caliban, my slave, who never
Yields us kind answer.

MIRANDA: 'Tis a villain, sir, I do not love to look on.

PROSPERO: But, as 'tis,
We cannot miss him. He does make our fire,
Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices
That profit us.—What ho, slave, Caliban!
Thou earth, thou, speak!

CALIBAN: There's wood enough within.

PROSPERO: Come forth, I say. There is other business for thee.
Come, thou tortoise. When?"

(Act 1, Scene 2)

In the first data, the presence of imbalanced power dynamics becomes evident during the interaction between Prospero and Caliban. In his role as the master, Prospero asserts his authority over Caliban, underscoring Caliban's subordinate position. The language and directives employed by Prospero resonate with Foucault's concept of micropower, where power is operational at the micro-level of daily existence (McHoul & Grace, 2002). He dismissively instructs Miranda to "shake it off," accentuating his superiority and the expectation that his directives are to be unquestioningly obeyed. The term "villain," used by Miranda about Caliban, further serves to illuminate the hierarchical power structure, highlighting the use of pejorative labels to reinforce dominance (Foucault, 1980). Prospero's characterization of Caliban as a "slave" and his command to "speak" not only emphasizes his dominion over Caliban but underscores his imposition of discourse, aligning with Foucault's emphasis on the formation of discourses and language as a tool of power). Prospero's capacity to prescribe Caliban's tasks, including wood-fetching, further reinforces his authority and control in the context of this master-slave relationship (Foucault, 1980).

Moreover, the dynamics within this exchange correspond with Gramsci's notion of hegemony (Gramsci, 1987). Prospero's role as the master exemplifies the prevalence of one social group's dominance over another. Caliban's servitude is not solely contingent on physical coercion; instead, it is sustained through the manipulation of cultural and ideological elements (Femia, 1987). Prospero delineates the roles and expectations, providing a tangible illustration of the role of civil society institutions within Gramsci's framework. The reference to "other business" alludes to the construction of a historical bloc, where Prospero amalgamates various elements to fortify his supremacy. Furthermore, Prospero's ability to shape Caliban's self-perception and his directives underscore the exercise of power through cultural and intellectual control. This passage effectively showcases the intricate interplay between unequal power relations and hegemony within the Prospero-Caliban relationship, as depicted in the narrative of *The Tempest*.

PROSPERO: Hagseed, hence!

Fetch us in fuel, and be quick, thou 'rt best,
To answer other business. Shrugg'st thou, malice?
If thou neglect'st or dost unwillingly
What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,
Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.

CALIBAN: No, pray thee.

I must obey. His art is of such power
It would control my dam's god, Setebos,
And make a vassal of him.

PROSPERO: So, slave, hence."

(Act 1, Scene 2)

In this exchange between Prospero and Caliban, there is a clear manifestation of unequal power dynamics, echoing Michel Foucault's perspective. Prospero, positioned as the master, employs authoritative language and the threat of physical suffering as means of ensuring Caliban's compliance. The command "Hagseed, hence!" serves as a stark illustration of Prospero's dominance, underscoring his expectation for immediate obedience. Prospero's ominous warning about the possibility of Caliban experiencing "old cramps" and enduring excruciating pain if he dares to defy further accentuates the punitive nature inherent in the power dynamic. This notion of punitive consequences closely aligns with Foucault's notion that power operates at the micro-level of everyday life, steering behaviors through the fear of retribution and control mechanisms (Foucault, 1980). Caliban's resigned response, "No, pray thee. I must obey," highlights Prospero's supremacy, which is not solely rooted in physical

coercion but is equally fortified by the imposition of fear, by Foucault's framework of power relations (O'Farrell, 2005).

Prospero's role as the master exemplifies the hegemonic authority of one social group over another, defined by his ability to mold not only their roles and expectations but also their belief systems. The use of the term "slave" and the reference to "other business" vividly demonstrate the cultural and ideological manipulation that lies at the core of Gramsci's hegemony theory (Femia, 1987). In this context, Prospero's dominion is upheld by imposing specific beliefs and norms and instilling fear among his subservient subjects. Caliban's acknowledgment of Prospero's extraordinary magical power, which is potent enough to subdue even "Setebos," his mother's god, further underscores the pervasive nature of cultural and intellectual dominance. Within Gramsci's theoretical framework, Prospero's ability to shape Caliban's self-perception and dictate his actions exemplifies the application of power through cultural and intellectual control, thus perpetuating the disparities in power relations.

CALIBAN: "I'll show thee every fertile inch o' th' island.
And I will kiss thy foot. I prithee be my god."

TRINCULO: "By this light, a most perfidious and drunken
monster. When 's god's asleep, he'll rob his bottle."

CALIBAN: I'll kiss thy foot. I'll swear myself thy subject."

STEPHANO: "Come on, then. Down, and swear."

(Act 2, Scene 2)

Meanwhile, in this dialogue, Foucault's perspective on power relations is seen in Caliban's desperation for freedom and imbalance of power, which signifies the aspect of power dynamic. Caliban, a native of the island, is oppressed by Prospero, who holds power over him. Caliban's offer to show "every fertile inch o' th' island" is an act of desperation, as he is seeking freedom from Prospero's dominance. His willingness to share knowledge about the island emphasizes his desire to be free. The fact that Caliban is willing to prostrate himself and treat Stephano as a god demonstrates the power imbalance in the play. Caliban is marginalized and dehumanized by both Prospero and, in this case, Stephano, highlighting the stark differences in social status and power. Caliban's declaration, "I will kiss thy foot. I prithee be my god," shows his willingness to submit to Stephano and treat him as a god. It is a striking illustration of Caliban's obedience and willingness to replace one oppressor (Prospero) with another (Stephano). Caliban's appeal to Stephano highlights his desire for a new master who will protect him from Prospero's abuse. He points out that oppressed people often seek to exchange one form of power for another (Lewis & Jhally, 1994).

In this dialogue, Caliban is ready to serve Stephano, a newcomer to the island. Caliban's desire to serve Stephano and his willingness to "kiss thy foot" represent a form of ideological agreement. Not only is he forced into slavery, but he actively seeks it because he sees Stephano as a liberator from Prospero's oppressive rule. This shows how cultural and ideological influences can shape the behavior and choices of followers, which is consistent with Gramsci's idea of hegemony (Femia, 1987). Caliban's request to Stephano to be his god symbolizes a counter-hegemonic impulse. According to Gramsci's theory, counter-hegemonic movements or protests can emerge from conquered groups as they seek to challenge dominant ideologies and power structures (Gramsci, 1987). In this case, Caliban attempts to free himself from Prospero's power, which stems from knowledge and control, and replace it with a new authority figure, Stephano. The dialogue thus demonstrates aspects of hegemony by depicting the dynamics of cultural influence, ideological sympathies, counter-hegemonic tendencies, and resistance to oppressive authority (Holub, 1992; Santucci, 2010). Caliban's desire to serve Stephano represents a complex response to the hegemonic power exercised by Prospero and illustrates the multifaceted nature of power relationships in the play.

PROSPERO: "Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself
Upon thy wicked dam, come forth!"

CALIBAN: "As wicked dew as e'er my mother brushed
With raven's feather from unwholesome fen
drop on you both. A southwest blow on you
and blister you all o'er."
(Act 1, Scene 2)

In this subsequent data, Foucault's perspective on power relations is seen in the dehumanization of Caliban and derogatory language (Valentine, 1998). In this dialogue, Prospero dehumanizes Caliban by referring to him as a "poisonous slave" and suggesting that he is the offspring of the devil. These derogatory terms and accusations strip Caliban of his humanity and emphasize his lower social status, making him subservient to Prospero. The use of terms like "poisonous" and "wicked" when describing Caliban reinforces the power imbalance. It illustrates how Prospero views Caliban as morally inferior and dangerous. This derogatory language is a means of asserting dominance and control over Caliban. Prospero's use of the command "come forth" is a direct order, emphasizing his ability to command Caliban. This reflects Prospero's control over Caliban's movements and actions, further reinforcing the power differential. The phrase "Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself Upon thy wicked dam" highlights Prospero's role as Caliban's father figure. By reminding Caliban of this family connection and using it to insult him, Prospero emphasizes his authority and power over Caliban.

On the other side, in this dialogue, Prospero, who represents the ruling, uses derogatory language and labels such as "poisonous slave" and accuses Caliban of having been "got by the devil." This represents an exercise in cultural and linguistic hegemony, where Prospero seeks to impose his interpretation of reality and morality on Caliban (Adamson, 2014; Femia, 1987). Through offensive language, he asserts his cultural and moral superiority to shape how Caliban views himself and his own identity. Although this dialogue is an example of Prospero asserting his hegemony, it also highlights Caliban's resistance. Caliban's reaction to this verbal abuse and his subsequent desire to serve Stephano reflect a counter-hegemonic tendency. He challenges Prospero's authority and seeks an alternative power structure, demonstrating that resistance to hegemony can emerge from the slave class (Lewis & Jhally, 1994). Essentially, Gramsci's concept of cultural and linguistic hegemony provides a framework for understanding how power operates beyond the political and economic spheres, penetrating the cultural and linguistic spheres. It encourages consideration of how language and culture are used as tools of control and how resistance to hegemonic forces can manifest in alternative cultural and linguistic expressions.

PROSPERO: Come away, servant, come. I am ready now.
Approach, my Ariel. Come.
ARIEL: All hail, great master! Grave sir, hail! I come
To answer thy best pleasure.
Be 't to fly, To swim, to dive into the fire, to ride
On the curled clouds, to thy strong bidding task
Ariel and all his quality.
PROSPERO: Hast thou, spirit,
(Act 1, Scene 2)

This became the fifth finding in this research; this line of dialog reveals Foucault's perspective on power relations revolves around the dynamics of authority and control (O'Farrell, 2005). In this passage, Prospero, who holds a position of power and authority, summons Ariel, addressing him as a "servant." The way Prospero commands Ariel's actions ("Come away, servant, come") reflects the unequal power relations, where Prospero exercises dominance over Ariel, emphasizing their hierarchical relationship. Prospero's control is evident as he initiates the interaction, and Ariel complies with his command. Ariel's service to Prospero is linked to the promise of ultimate freedom. This conditional arrangement further

highlights the power imbalance. Although Prospero promises to free Ariel, this is ultimately his decision, thus strengthening Prospero's power. Ariel's response to Prospero's summons demonstrates her submission. He quickly approaches Prospero, showing that he is willing to grant Prospero's wishes. Ariel's compliance with Prospero's commands reflects the inequality of power as Ariel's agency is limited, and he is beholden to Prospero's authority.

Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony involves the domination of a specific group's values, norms, and worldviews over others (Jones, 2006). Here, Prospero represents the dominant figure in the situation, and Ariel addresses him as a "great master." Ariel's use of phrases like "All hail" and "grave sir" demonstrates the internalization of Prospero's authority and the prevailing cultural and social norms. This reflects the concept of hegemony, where the ruling authority influences and shapes the subordinate's perception of the world (Gramsci, 1987). Gramsci's concept of hegemony involves the dominant group's control over language and its ability to shape its use and interpretation (Ives, 2004). Prospero's calling of Ariel is a demonstration of his power over language, as he commands Ariel to come, signifying his submission. This control of language strengthens Prospero's dominance. Although this dialogue appears courteous on the surface, it reflects a more subtle form of hegemony. Prospero's control does not rely solely on coercion or force; it also relies on cultural norms and the ability to shape language and behavior. This is consistent with Gramsci's idea that hegemony can manifest in more subtle and nuanced ways beyond overt oppression (Holub, 1992).

PROSPERO: This was well done, my bird.
Thy shape invisible retain thou still.
The trumpery in my house, go bring it hither
For stale to catch these thieves.

ARIEL: I go, I go.
(Act 4, Scene 1)

In the following data findings, the power relations perspective revolves around the dynamics of authority and control. In this passage, Ariel immediately carries out the orders of Prospero. Ariel's immediate answer ("I go, I go") reflects the power relationship in which Prospero exercises dominance and superiority, which is why Ariel cannot resist it. Prospero calling Ariel "my bird" is a term of endearment, but it also denotes a hierarchical relationship. Ariel is likened to a possession, showing that it is owned and controlled by Prospero. This emphasizes Prospero's dominance and power. Prospero's phrase, "This was well done," demonstrates his role as a judge of Ariel's actions. He evaluates Ariel's performance and expresses approval, emphasizing his position as the judge and appraises Ariel's actions. In this line of dialogue, Prospero approves of Ariel, praising her actions. By calling Ariel "my bird," Prospero shows a degree of familiarity and ownership over her. This language not only illustrates their master-servant relationship but also illustrates Prospero's cultural influence and ideological control over Ariel. Prospero's command for Ariel to "retain thou still" an invisible form, is an assertion of power. This emphasizes Prospero's control not only over Ariel's actions but also over her appearance. This control goes beyond the physical realm and into the realm of magic and ideology, reflecting how those in power shape reality, corresponding to the concept of cultural and ideological domination of Gramsci. So, Gramsci's concept of cultural and ideological domination emphasizes the role of culture and ideas in maintaining social hierarchies. It shows how the ruling class not only controls institutions but also influences how people think and perceive reality, ultimately forming a consensus that supports existing power structures (Gramsci, 1987). This demonstrates Prospero's power and control not only over Ariel's actions but also over cultural artifacts, ideology, and the narrative framework of events (Femia, 1987).

TRINCULO: Where should they be set else? He were a
brave monster indeed if they were set in his tail.

STEPHANO: My man-monster hath drowned his tongue
in sack. For my part, the sea cannot drown me. I
swam, ere I could recover the shore, five-and-thirty
leagues off and on, by this light.—Thou shalt be my
lieutenant, monster, or my standard.

TRINCULO: Your lieutenant, if you list. He's no
standard.

We'll not run, Monsieur Monster.

TRINCULO: Nor go neither. But you'll lie like dogs, and
yet say nothing neither.

Mooncalf, speak once in thy life, if thou
be'st a good mooncalf.

CALIBAN: How does thy Honor? Let me lick thy shoe. I'll
not serve him; he is not valiant

(Act 3, Scene 2)

In this dialogue, Foucault's perspective on power relations is seen in authority and control and the threat of violence, which illustrates the inequality of power relations (Foucault, 1980). Stephano, a newcomer to the island, quickly assumes authority over Caliban and establishes his dominance. He warns Trinculo to "keep a good tongue in your head," which is an order to remain submissive and respectful. This emphasizes that Stephano is the one in control. The phrase "If you prove a mutineer, the next tree!" conveys that Stephano is willing to resort to violence to maintain his authority. This threat highlights the power imbalance as Stephano can decide the fate of others, even to the extent of executing them. Stephano's calling Caliban a "man-monster" highlights Caliban's unequal status. This demeaning term highlights the power relationship between Stephano, a newcomer to the island, and Caliban, who lives there. This characterization views Caliban as inferior and is given derogatory labels. Stephano's statement that Caliban "shalt be my lieutenant, my monster, or my standard" reveals the power dynamic at play. He offers Caliban a position of power under his command. However, this offer is conditional and is ultimately subject to Stephano's control, thus cementing his dominance.

This dialogue can then also be analyzed about Gramsci's concept of hegemony, although the character of Stephano is more of a disruption of the power structure than a hegemonic force. Gramsci (1987) states that in essence, disrupting power structures involves a multifaceted approach, combining intellectual, cultural and political efforts. By challenging dominant cultural narratives, promoting alternative perspectives, and mobilizing collective action, counterhegemonic movements seek to change the ideological landscape and ultimately the distribution of power force in society. Stephano, by declaring himself leader and giving Caliban a position of power, disrupts the established power structure represented by Prospero. This can be seen as a challenge to the dominant hegemony, as he seeks to displace Prospero's dominance and establish his hegemony. In this dialogue, Stephano's intention for Caliban to become his "lieutenant" or "standard" represents a counter-hegemonic impulse. He offers an alternative to Prospero's regime, demonstrating resistance to the existing order. The dialogue also reflects a cultural clash and ideological conflict. Stephano, who represents the crew, arrives on the island with different cultural norms and values than Prospero. His desire to make Caliban his second-in-command challenges the cultural and social norms established by Prospero. This cultural disruption is consistent with Gramsci's idea of hegemony because it involves the clash of competing worldviews (Adamson, 2014).

CALIBAN: Lo, how he mocks me! Wilt thou let him, my
lord?

TRINCULO: "Lord," quoth he? That a monster should be
such a natural!

CALIBAN: Lo, lo again! Bite him to death, I prithee.

STEPHANO: Trinculo, keep a good tongue in your head.

If you prove a mutineer, the next tree. The poor
monster's my subject, and he shall not suffer
indignity.

CALIBAN: I thank my noble lord. Wilt thou be pleased
to harken once again to the suit I made to thee?

STEPHANO Marry, will I. Kneel and repeat it. I will
stand, and so shall Trinculo.

(Act 3, Scene 2)

This subsequent data finding has revealed that Foucault's view of power relations expressed in power, control, and the risk of violence illustrates the inequality in power relations (Foucault, 1980). Stephano, a newcomer to the island, quickly took control of Caliban and established his rule. He warns Trinculo to "keep a good tongue in your head," which is a command to obey and respect. This emphasizes that Stephano is in control. The phrase "If you prove a mutineer, the next tree! This shows that Stephano is willing to resort to violence to maintain his power. This threat highlights the imbalance of power because Stephano can decide the fate of others or even execute them. Caliban calls on Stephano for help, saying, "Wilt thou let him, my lord? 'Lord,' quoth he? That a monster should be such a natural!" reflects the mocking and insulting language used by Trinculo and Stephano. They degrade Caliban based on his appearance and origins, emphasizing their perceived superiority (Adamson, 2014). Stephano's use of terms such as "my lord" and "noble lord" when addressing Caliban further reinforces the inequality. He positions himself as noble and influential, while Caliban and Trinculo are relegated to subordinate roles.

Then, the mentioned dialogue, which also demonstrates the concept of hegemony by calling Stephano "my lord" and asking his permission to answer, demonstrates a form of submission and respect for authority. This submission is consistent with the concept of hegemony, in which the dominant group (Stephano) exercises power, and the submissive group (Caliban) obeys it. Stephano's declaration that "the poor monster's is my subject, and he shall not suffer indignity" emphasizes his position as ruler. He considers Caliban his subject and declares that Caliban should not be humiliated. This reaffirms the power relationship between Stephano, the colonizer or invader, and Caliban, marginalized and subject to the rule of the newcomers. It illustrates Gramsci's concept of hegemony by depicting the domination of one social group (Stephano) over another (Caliban and Trinculo) through expressions of power, conformity, and preservation of existing power structures (Taylor, 2011; Smart, 2002; Oliver, 2013).

From the data presented earlier, it reveals the existence of complex power hierarchies in the play. Prospero, as the rightful Duke of Milan and practitioner of magic, exercises his power over Caliban and Ariel. This power is exercised through both physical control and psychological manipulation, highlighting the multifaceted nature of power relationships (O'Farrell, 2005). The analysis also shows that Prospero exercises hegemonic power throughout the play, drawing on Antonio Gramsci's concept of cultural and ideological domination (Femia, 1987). Prospero uses his knowledge of magic, control of language, and manipulation of narrative to establish his power over other characters, including Ariel, Caliban, and Ferdinand.

Prospero's oppression of Caliban and Ariel is evident in a variety of ways, including enslaving Caliban and imposing slavery on Ariel. Caliban, in particular, suffered brutal slavery, symbolizing colonialism and the suppression of indigenous cultures (Gramsci, 1987). The analysis also highlights the themes of oppression and colonialism present in the play. In particular, Prospero's treatment of Caliban reflects the colonialist's oppressive and imperialist tendencies, while his disregard for Ariel's wishes illustrates a form of patriarchal oppression.

Despite their enslavement, Caliban and Ariel still demonstrate forms of resistance and subversion. Caliban's efforts to gain freedom and Ariel's request for freedom from Prospero's control reflect their resilience and desire for autonomy. Then this study also reveals the play's redemptive and transformative potential. Prospero's decision to free Ariel and Caliban from slavery demonstrates the possibility of reconciliation and redemption. This transformation offers hope in a world characterized by power imbalances, which is portrayed in various forms of power imbalances, including magical control, colonial dominance, social class disparities, and gender dynamics. The play provides a nuanced exploration of how these imbalances intersect and evolve, ultimately culminating in a resolution that hints at the possibility of redemption and a more equitable distribution of power.

By employing Foucault's theory of power relations, this research also digs into how power operates at different levels of the play. Prospero's control over Caliban and Ariel fits Foucault's concept of disciplinary power, while their resistance demonstrates the possibility of resistance and subversion in the face of oppressive power structures (Lewis & Jhally, 1994). This research juxtaposes Foucault's notion of power as a discipline with Gramsci's concept of cultural hegemony, showing how these theories converge in Prospero's characterization (Foucault, 1980; Gramsci, 1987). Prospero's use of power combines the ideological manipulation associated with Gramsci and the disciplinary mechanisms described by Foucault. The study highlights the colonial undertones of the play, with Prospero representing the colonizer and Caliban and Ariel representing the colonized. This colonial context adds depth to the analysis, highlighting the historical and political significance of power relations (Femia, 1987). The discussion of power and oppression in *The Tempest* is a metaphor for contemporary issues of power, domination, and resistance. Its results encourage reflection on how these dynamics persist in modern society, from colonial legacies to authoritarian control.

CONCLUSION

The dynamics of power and oppression that occur in the play *The Tempest* show an exploration of the social contexts that exist in Shakespeare's works and how the history of these works was created. The power dynamics depicted in *The Tempest* exhibit multifaceted characteristics, reflecting both Foucault's notion of disciplinary power and Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony. Prospero, occupying the role of a master, wields his authority through language and the manipulation of narratives, effectively shaping the beliefs, perceptions, and behaviors of Ariel and Caliban. This power dynamic encompasses both physical and psychological domination. Furthermore, the play serves as a vivid portrayal of themes related to oppression and colonialism, particularly evident in the enslavement of Caliban and Ariel. Their endeavors to secure freedom serve as a testament to their resilience in the face of imbalanced power relations. By merging the insights of Foucault and Gramsci, this study emphasizes the relevance of these power dynamics in the modern world, encompassing the lasting impact of colonial legacies and authoritarian rule. Ultimately, the interplay of power and oppression within *The Tempest* offers a profound perspective through which to contemplate the complexities of power within the broader spectrum of human existence.

REFERENCES

- Arcilla JR, F. E. (2023). Exploring the Dichotomy of Power and Oppression in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*: A Formalistic Analysis. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 34, 1016-1034. <https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v34i.2071>
- Adamson, W. L. (2014). *Hegemony and Revolution: Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory*. Vermont: Echo Point Books & Media.
- Bloom, H. (Ed.). (2008). *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: The Tempest*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

- Cheney, D. R. (1999). [Review of Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human, by H. Bloom]. *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, 53(1), 103–105. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1347964>
- Efrizah, D. (2018). Supernatural Power in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. *KnE Social Sciences*, 266-277. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1938>
- Egan, G. (2007). *Shakespeare*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Femia, J. V. (1987). "The Concept of Hegemony", *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process*". Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge, Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*. London: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197>
- Gramsci, A. (1987). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers Co.
- Holub, R. (1992). *Antonio Gramsci: Beyond Marxism and Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Ives, P. (2004). *Language and Hegemony in Gramsci*. London: Pluto Press.
- Jannah, I. (2022). *Power Relation in The Best of Me by Nicholas Sparks*. Thesis. Malang: UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim. <http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/42775/1/17320038.pdf>
- Jones, S. (2006). *Antonio Gramsci*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Klarer, M. (2013). *An Introduction to Literary Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Krueger, S. H. (2010). *The Tempest (Shakespeare Explained)*. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark.
- Lewis, J., & Jhally, S. (1994). The Politics of Cultural Studies: Racism, Hegemony, and Resistance. *American Quarterly*, 46(1), 114–117. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2713361>
- Macey, D. (2004). *Michel Foucault*. London: Reaktion Books.
- McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (2002). *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power, and The Subject*. London: Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- O'Farrell, C. (2005). *Michel Foucault*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Oliver, P. (2013). *Foucault - The Key Ideas (Teach Yourself)*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Santucci, A. A. (2010). *Antonio Gramsci*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sergiu, B. (2010). M. FOUCAULT'S VIEW ON POWER RELATIONS. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 55-61.
- Skura, M. A. (1989). Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40(1), 42–69. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2870753>
- Smart, B. (2002). *Michel Foucault*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. Durham: Acumen.

- Tuğlu, B. (2016). Identities in *The Tempest*, Tempests in Identities. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 7(5), 62-68. <https://academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text-pdf/280722E58642>
- Valentine, J. (1998). Naming the Other: Power, Politeness and the Inflation of Euphemisms. *Sociological Research Online*, 3(4), 37-53. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.184>
- Weller, B. (1982). Identity and Representation in Shakespeare. *ELH*, 49(2), 339–362. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2872987>