

Trinity University

Digital Commons @ Trinity

The Expositor: A Journal of Undergraduate
Research in the Humanities

English Department

2020

The Postcolonial *Tempest*

Kaylee Avila

Trinity University, lavila2@trinity.edu

Jessie De Arman

Trinity University, jdearman@trinity.edu

Stephanie Gredell

Trinity University, sgredell@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/eng_expositor

Repository Citation

Avila, K., De Arman, J., & Gredell, S. (2020). Critical colloquy: The postcolonial *Tempest*. *The Expositor: A Journal of Undergraduate Research in the Humanities*, 15, 86-109.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English Department at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Expositor: A Journal of Undergraduate Research in the Humanities by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

CRITICAL COLLOQUY

The Postcolonial *Tempest*

THE CONTAGION OF COLONIAL CURSING:
REGURGITATED TYRANNY THROUGH
HYBRID LANGUAGES IN *THE TEMPEST*

Kaylee Avila

In Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Prospero occupies the role of oppressor and educator over Miranda and Caliban, distinct archetypal characters who share the role as the oppressed. The oppressed grasp at autonomy by trying to find their own voices against expectations of their subservience, but their anti-tyrannical voices ironically end up adopting and regurgitating the very tones and tactics of colonial cursing that first subordinated them. Rather than protesting tyranny, the oppressed in *The Tempest* learn to “curse” and thus oppress others in attempts to elevate themselves. Through Prospero’s instructional relationships with Miranda, Caliban, and even Ferdinand, language evolves into hybrid dialects as the oppressed are inadvertently taught to “speak” the language of their oppressor.

The perception of Prospero in the play evolves from “a good humanist and loving surrogate father” to an “oppressively patriarchal educator” through his unorthodox teachings, which encourage Miranda to speak up—but only in accord with his will.¹ While Prospero tells Miranda the story of their past, he asks her to confirm verbally that she is attentive three times (I.ii.78, 87, 106), which Hiewon Shin claims is “teaching his daughter what a young Re-

naissance woman was not supposed to be taught,” to speak.² Once Prospero finishes telling Miranda what he wants her to know, he commands her silence by saying, “Here cease more questions” (I.ii.185), and he sends her off to sleep. Miranda was originally quiet, but as Prospero encouraged her to affirm her attentiveness verbally, he pushed her—perhaps unintentionally—to develop a voice of her own and to inquire beyond what he intended to tell. As a result, she was silenced. When Miranda later uses this voice to plead for mercy in Ferdinand’s defense, Prospero again commands her, “Silence! One word more / Shall make me chide thee, if not hate thee” (I.ii.479–480), and so she obeys. Although Prospero continues to silence Miranda’s voice, his initial invitation for her to speak catalyzed the budding autonomy of defiance in her voice.

Prospero repeats his contradictory instruction of Miranda with Caliban, again requiring both submissive speech or silence. Prospero commands Caliban, “Thou earth, thou speak” (I.ii.317). Caliban truthfully expresses himself by cursing Prospero with the justification: “You taught me language, and my profit ‘n it / Is I know how to curse” (I.ii.366–367). Caliban likely was not taught the violent curses that he spouts at Prospero, but rather mimics what Prospero has previously said to him. Caliban’s regurgitation of colonial curses becomes more evident when Prospero retorts with unrivaled curses that subdue Caliban into the aside: “I must obey” (I.ii.375) out of fear of the familiar efficacy in Prospero’s threats. As Tom Lindsay observes, “Caliban’s education politicizes and empowers him” by granting him the words to curse his oppressor, but also “subordinat[es] him” beneath Prospero’s oppressive curses.³

Even before Prospero grew hostile toward Caliban, his earlier and more docile lessons still subliminally enforced hierarchical power relations and the oppressor-oppressed dichotomy.⁴ Caliban says he was taught “how / To name the bigger light, and how the less, / That burn by day and night” (I.ii.337–349). Lindsay claims that Caliban’s use of “bigger” and “less” are natural and appropriate words to refer to the sun and moon, but they are also hierarchical terms that could be substituted with other descriptions, like color or brightness.⁵ Prospero’s education politicizes and transforms Caliban’s perception: Caliban adapts to Prospero’s hegemony, but “retains a lingering commitment” to his apolitical worldview.⁶ Lindsay notes that Caliban’s statement evokes the biblical creation story: “And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night” (Genesis 1:16), but rather than the biblical phrasing that the sun and moon “rule” (as in the King James version), Caliban states they merely “burn.” Caliban’s education results in a hybrid language and worldview that are both “hierarchical and apolitical.” He speaks from a position of both “subordination and resistance.”⁷ Caliban internalizes his early education with hopes of freedom and empowerment, but learning and cursing only solidify his place in his educator’s tyrannical worldview of oppressive hegemony.

Language is crucial for communication, but the power imbalance of Prospero as Miranda and Caliban's educator turns language into a self-serving weapon of deceit. The implication that language is crucial for civilized society reveals Prospero's underlying motives for education: to translate the will of the oppressor to the oppressed. Miranda and Caliban have little-to-no power to counter their flawed, colonial-driven education, but rather than resisting it, they internalize and embrace the influence of tyranny in hybrid manifestations. Miranda is educated from Prospero's books and then educates Caliban, but both are also observational learners who adopt and act by the same twisted ideologies that they suffer under Prospero. Through this tyrannical education system, language is a dangerous medium that ingrains restrictive systemic roles into personal and shared unconscious ideologies of moral and social expectations. Prospero teaches his students norms and laws, but not without biases that dismiss his injustice and abuse as their oppressor. His students mimic his self-righteous blind-spot as they strive to find their own hybrid voices as oppressors through their understanding that power and oppression have roots in language.

Prospero's accusations of savagery against Caliban provide a starting point for an investigation into Prospero's semantic contortion of accountability through accusation. Probing beyond debates of whether or not Caliban raped Miranda, Frantz Fanon avoids insensitive racially essentialist qualities of Caliban's native archetype as a "savage" by instead attributing Caliban's characterization as reactionary to Prospero's tyranny.⁸ Viewing systems of education and language as methods of tyranny clarifies the intention behind Prospero's accusations: use words to assert power over others. John Kunat claims that Prospero uses accusational language to justify his exploitation and power over Ferdinand and Caliban.⁹ With accusations, Prospero provokes both men to violence or defiance in order to justify his coercive force against them: for Caliban's defensive response to the rape allegations and for Ferdinand's drawn sword. Words become provocative weapons that replace the expectation of physical violence and deceptively coat the perpetrator in false innocence. As a result, Ferdinand and Caliban both learn that accusational language, regardless of validity, can be used as a manipulation tactic to suppress others and acquire power for oneself.

Miranda's gendered relationship with Prospero also influences her unique incorporation of accusational language into her hybrid dialect as she simultaneously resists and employs habits of colonial cursing. Prospero uses harsh, male-oriented accusations to protect his position from the threat of male contenders. He provokes Ferdinand with accusations of violence, and Caliban with accusations of raping Miranda—an objectified extension of his land and power. While Prospero feels a masculine yet insecure desire to overpower other men, he merely maintains a misogynistic grip on Miranda. Prospero has been brainwashing his daughter since birth and does not feel threatened by her—if

anything, he uses her to threaten others and advance himself, such as through Caliban with the rape allegation, and through Ferdinand with the marriage. Prospero's words with her tend to be kinder, yet deceptively so, since she remains oppressed beneath commands sugar-coated with manipulation or magic. Prospero's role as Miranda's father and educator complicates her obligation to either thank or accuse her oppressor for her controlled education; as a result, Miranda is paradoxically both submissive and defiant. Prospero controls and exploits her by stripping her consent and prostituting her body as a political pawn: valuable for his plan, power, and protection, but ultimately dispensable. She protests at times, but never accuses him or his authority. Instead, Miranda redirects and softens her accusations as she mimics not only Prospero's words, but also his deceptive tone, and she becomes a deceived regurgitator rather than a deliberate deceiver.

Miranda's unorthodox education can also be seen in her hybrid colonial dialect when she accuses Ferdinand of cheating in chess. Miranda's ability to even play chess "contradicts conservative humanists' idea of women's 'proper' education," but Prospero taught her the strategic game anyway, along with the aforementioned lesson of showing engagement by speaking up rather than obeying traditional gendered expectations of women staying silent.¹⁰ This unorthodox education leads Miranda to rightfully accuse Ferdinand of cheating, but in a dismissive and flirtatious way: "Sweet lord, you play me false" (V.i.172). She then brushes it off by saying, "And I would call it fair play" (V.i.174), under the illusion of love, the habit of being silenced, or a complicit combination of both. Kunat states that Miranda's words are "harmless and endearingly naïve," but Ferdinand's reliance on cheating "points beyond the chessboard to a 'brave new world'" (cf. V.i.183) in which "deceit is necessary for survival."¹¹ Tactics of oppression are normalized through the language of "flirtation and courtship" to "grant gender a place in political narration."¹² Even if Miranda truly loves Ferdinand, Prospero's political precursor demands that she and Ferdinand transform from mutual lovers into a married pair with politically prescribed gender roles and distinct levels of power.

Patriarchal symbolism in the chess pieces also help clarify Miranda's decision to call Ferdinand's cheating fair and acceptable. Like the king in chess, Ferdinand creates Miranda's new objective purpose under the notion that "the male position"—defined as "kingship and the hegemony of the political"—must be attained at all costs, even risking endangerment or sacrifice of the "queen."¹³ Politics is portrayed as a game of strategy in which Prospero plays Miranda as a pawn: valuable for his master plan and protection, but ultimately dispensable. Miranda and Ferdinand both experience some oppression from Prospero, but once Miranda is handed over to Ferdinand, she is expected to fulfill the role of "queen" who may be sacrificed to protect Ferdinand, the valuable yet relatively

immobile “king” whose stability and longevity determine the outcome of the game. As Miranda is handed off from her father, educator, and oppressor Prospero to her new husband Ferdinand, she is promoted from a pawn to a queen, but her apparent mobility should not be mistaken for autonomy.

Miranda appears to take agency into her own hands when she proposes to Ferdinand, but even this act is subdued under the illusion of her free will. Prospero maintains the upper hand by arranging the conditions under which their connection occurs, and he deceptively convinces Miranda that she is able to decide for herself. Miranda’s internalized lesson of speaking up is seen in action, but so is her habituation of the silencing that comes after. She easily slips into speaking with the audacity of an oppressor, yet remains oppressed. As a queen chess piece, Miranda is granted speech, but with a censored word bank that restricts what she is expected to say, and where or how she is able to move. Her hybridity is a byproduct of contagious self-assertion as she develops her voice and the ability to speak up, but only to unwittingly regurgitate words that reaffirm her oppression.

An oppressor who also assumes the role of educator catalyzes the spread of colonial cursing through tyranny-tainted languages in the oppressed, who become mere mouthpieces repeating the words of their oppressor. The mouth is a fixed symbol for the oppressed, but language is a more fluid synecdoche of how ideologies can evolve and be expressed through speech, thoughts, and actions. Language and ideology can change, but the bodily confinement of oppression remains, like the mouth, materially attached. The oppressed may speak with the belief of defeating or even becoming an oppressor, but they remain trapped in an illusion as hybrid branches of colonial cursing—from intentional provocations to subtle, unconscious rhetorical strategies—continue to propel tyranny onward through a web of hopeful, developing oppressors whose power and positions rely upon their control of those they oppress.

ARIEL AND CALIBAN AS RESPONSES TO COLONIALISM IN *THE TEMPEST*

Jessie De Arman

Colonialist discourse surrounds Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, most often focusing on the dynamic between Prospero and Caliban as

colonizer and colonized. In this way, the play can be read as a commentary on Shakespeare's views on the general cultural practice of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century colonization as it occurred at the time of *The Tempest's* conception. This post-colonialist reading of the play can be developed further by expanding our critical ambit to include other characters and relationship dynamics. Instead of focusing on Prospero and Caliban, I will discuss the differences in characterization between Ariel and Caliban, the two potentially "colonial" slaves that live on the island. Drawing inspiration from the Uruguayan essayist José Enrique Rodó's allegorical discussions of Ariel and Caliban in his essay *Ariel*, I argue that Ariel and Caliban can be interpreted as two different responses to colonialism. Ariel, in working with Prospero and embracing humility, service, morality, and his own magic, avoids suffering as a victim of colonization and eventually achieves freedom. Caliban, by actively opposing Prospero and being ill-mannered, resistant to learning, and motivated by materialistic and vengeful desires, embodies what *The Tempest* puts forward as a self-defeating response to colonial rule. Caliban's behavior results in his own extended misery and the humiliation that occurs at the play's denouement.

Written in 1900, *Ariel* is presented as a speech delivered to a class of Latin American students.¹⁴ The essay is divided into six parts, each of which encourage the students, and thus the youth of Latin America as a whole, to cultivate specific aspects of individual character and societal virtues. In this manner, Rodó advocates for a cohesive Latin American identity that can stand against the utilitarian, imperialistic forces of the United States. The characteristics of this identity, all directly connected to Ariel from *The Tempest* as their ultimate embodiment, include "idealism and order in life; noble inspiration in thought; selflessness in morality; good taste in art; heroism in action; delicacy in customs."¹⁵ For Rodó, Ariel represents optimism and the pursuit of intellectualism, art, spirituality, and philosophical growth: Ariel is the "noble, soaring aspect of human spirit."¹⁶ Caliban, by contrast, represents barbaric sensuality, held back by material desire, resentment, and spiritual mediocrity. In the fifth section of the essay, the larger political connection is presented: Caliban is used to exemplify the threat of North American hegemony over Latin America. The menace of North "Americanism" is marked by a faulty utilitarian system, the empty pursuit of material success, and "egalitarian mediocrity."¹⁷ North America lacks a true culture—it has nothing that can evoke a deep and religious feeling towards the success of the nation among its citizens. Latin America, however, has the potential to harness a form of Greco-Roman humanism by developing its national spirit through intellectual enthusiasm, art, and philosophy, as opposed to temporal development, hierarchic austerity, and sterile order. *Ariel* is a call to action for Latin American youth to achieve this enlightened goal, as they are the ones capable of embracing their spry positivity to develop a cohesive iden-

tity against North America's threatening presence. For Rodó, the ideal form of such an identity is found in the figure of Shakespeare's Ariel.

While most of *Ariel* is concerned with Rodó's own beliefs as they pertain to Latin American identity, his Ariel-Caliban contrast is effective in the context of *The Tempest*. Rodó's description of Ariel as the personification of morality, intellect, artistic enterprise, and enthusiasm can also be compared to what Shakespeare may suggest as the best response to colonialism. Alternatively, Caliban's focus on material gain and hierarchies of power, as well as his barbarism and pessimism, are what keep him from thriving under Prospero's colonial presence. These characteristics result in Caliban's humiliating demise, and they support the argument that Shakespeare develops Caliban's character as an improper response to colonialism. This construction of the character of Caliban runs parallel to Rodó's claim that these same traits make North America insufficient, non-inspirational, and incapable of any meaningful international influence.¹⁸ The interpretations of Ariel and Caliban by Rodó, as beauty and wisdom contrasted by unsophisticated pragmatism, can apply to a post-colonialist analysis of the characters in *The Tempest*. Ariel and Caliban represent two opposite reactions to colonization by virtue of the same characteristics that Rodó identifies.

Ariel is not often discussed in his role as a slave, and this comes as no surprise. He and Prospero function as a team, working together cooperatively to achieve Prospero's goal of defeating Antonio and returning to his rightful throne in Milan. Cooperation notwithstanding, Ariel still exists under Prospero's threatening command, as is made clear by Prospero's reminder to him after he requests his liberty: "If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak / And peg thee in his knotty entrails till / Thou hast howled away twelve winters" (I.ii.295-97). The question arises, then, of how Ariel elevates himself to such a level that allows him less suffering than the typical slave, and less than Caliban in particular. With the aforementioned threat functioning as an exception to the rule, Ariel experiences relative prosperity under an otherwise unfair regime. This relative prosperity can be attributed to his character and his behavior in response to colonization: Ariel is civil and generally willing to serve Prospero, and only serves in alignment with his own morality, avoiding excessive cruelty. Additionally, Ariel maintains his own autonomous power through the preservation and use of his magical abilities, despite accepting and implementing certain aspects of Prospero's "magic."

In discussing Johnathan Miller's 1970 production of *The Tempest*, Trevor Griffiths describes Ariel as "the accomplished servant who learnt European ways and literally picked up Prospero's broken wand."¹⁹ It is this willingness to work with his colonizer that helps contribute to Ariel's success as a slave. When Prospero first calls for him after he has successfully procured the storm,

Ariel says, “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” (I.ii.190–93). Evidently, Ariel is ready and willing to follow Prospero’s orders. Not only is he enthusiastic in his submission, but he remains polite in the face of Prospero’s harsh words. After Prospero reprimands Ariel for requesting freedom and issues his threat to “peg thee in his knotty entrails,” Ariel responds with courteous resignation: “I will be correspondent to command / And do my spriting gently” (I.ii.298–99). Ariel does not resist Prospero and maintains composure. In not retaliating or matching Prospero’s hostility, Ariel establishes himself as a poised and faithful servant, therefore avoiding any punishment or continued distrust from Prospero. The effect that Ariel’s deferential nature has on Prospero is not mere speculation—it is evident in how Prospero speaks of Ariel as the play continues. After Ariel creates the illusion of the banquet and delivers his morally castigating speech to Alonso, Stephano, and Antonio, Prospero applauds Ariel, saying, “Bravely the figure of this harpy hast thou / Performed, my Ariel; a grace it had devouring. / Of my instruction hast thou nothing bated” (III.iii.83–85). Prospero respects Ariel’s skill and admires the fact that he heeds his requests. In doing what Prospero asks of him, and in remaining level-headed in the face of threat and retaliation, Ariel maintains some control over his situation and places himself in Prospero’s favor. In this way, Ariel responds to colonialism in a manner that is conducive to his survival and eventual escape by building a relationship of rapport with his colonizer.

Ariel’s service to Prospero also exposes his sense of morality. Ariel’s pacifistic virtue is another contributor to his relatively peaceful existence under colonial rule. In determining the integrity of Ariel’s actions and use of magic, one can first look to his behavior on the island before Prospero’s arrival. In recalling what led to Ariel’s imprisonment by Sycorax, Prospero says, “And, for thou was a spirit too delicate / To act her earthy and abhorred commands” (I.ii.273–74). Ariel was not willing to use his powers for evil, and when Sycorax implored him to do so, he refused. This stands in contrast to the willing subservience that he provides for Prospero. Ariel would rather face punishment than give in to Sycorax’s “abhorred commands,” which speak to his moral scruples. In addition, Ariel avoids excessive cruelty when he does listen to instruction. At no point in the play does Ariel harm another person when using his magic, nor does he ever voice a desire to do so. Even with the initial shipwreck, Ariel ensures that all aboard make it to shore safely: “Not a hair perished. / On their sustaining garments not a blemish, / But fresher than before” (I.ii.217–19). Not only does Ariel exhibit kindness and propriety to Prospero, but he extends this courtesy to those that he is enlisted to fight against. His consistent non-violence and the use of his magic for good are what constitute his solid moral base. However, at Prospero’s request, Ariel does deceive, threaten, and intimidate all the ship-wrecked men on the island.

These last observations raise a question of whether supporting Prospero is truly a moral act. Support of Prospero seems to promote the resolution of the main conflict of *The Tempest*, which is Antonio's removal of Prospero from his position as rightful Duke of Milan. More importantly, the play itself "faithfully endorses" the reversal of this "deceitful and violent" seizure of the throne: "the play declares Prospero's restoration of Milanese political order to be unequivocally legitimate. ... The play strongly suggests that these goals have the blessing of heaven, and at no time does it bring into question the legitimacy of Prospero's rule as duke."²⁰ In this context, assisting Prospero can be considered a moral action, at least as it exists as part of the play's narrative of restoration of sovereign legitimacy in the face of destabilizing usurpation.

The politics of the English monarchy at the time *The Tempest* was published also support the validity of Prospero's goal within the play. England's Elizabethan era, during which Shakespeare produced many of his plays, was marked by significant controversy surrounding Queen Elizabeth I's rightful claim to the throne.²¹ King Henry VIII, by voiding his marriage to Elizabeth's mother Anne Boleyn in 1536 and giving rise to her execution, effectively designated Elizabeth as an illegitimate heir to the throne. However, the same statute also granted Henry the power to assign an heir via letters patent or his final will if he did not father any other legitimate children—this was an unprecedented provision that roused unease throughout the country. In 1544, Henry did authorize Elizabeth as a legitimate successor in a third statute, following Edward IV and her half-sister Mary I. Questions over Elizabeth's legitimacy, as well as her nomination as heir through unique legal maneuvers, served to mark only a beginning of change and debate regarding the appropriate progression of the English monarchy. Following Elizabeth, James VI of Scotland would come to rule England as James I. While this succession was considered a return to legal standards, as James I was a blood descendant of Henry VIII, his rise to the throne did not go uncontested. He was not directly part of Elizabeth's lineage, his relationship to Henry was brought into question, and some made a case in support of the English people's agency to elect a new leader that they considered more appropriate.²² This dispute led to retaliation from James I and his own justification for his rule, which he called the "divine right of kings."²³ This theory of divinely ordained rule set kings at a higher rank than other men, their authority determined by God and sustained by biblical reason. Evidently, the legitimacy of royal succession already carried much weight among the public in England, and the turmoil surrounding Elizabeth's rule coupled with the debates leading into James's succession stirred popular awareness of the monarchy's contested nature—it is not surprising that the topic would make its way into at least one of Shakespeare's works. Prospero, in this historical context, serves as an expression of the English anxiety surrounding succession

at the time. Unrightfully usurped from his throne by an illegitimate heir, Prospero seeks to return to his ruling position, effectively fighting to restore legal, natural, and now divine order.

It could appear overly hasty to assume that Shakespeare was supportive of such a system or of a theological argument for rightful kingship. However, there is considerable evidence demonstrating Shakespeare's sympathy with Elizabethan and Jacobean political theology, or at the least showing that these lines of thought are woven into many of his works, including *The Tempest*.²⁴ Religious themes appear early in *The Tempest*, including Prospero's mention of the "Providence divine" that delivered him and Miranda safely to the island (I.ii.159) as well as the roles of Fate and Destiny and Ariel's status as an angelic minister of such forces (III.iii). More importantly, it is the concept of a divine order, vocalized by James I but subtly existent before him in the Elizabethan mindset, that shapes the plot of *The Tempest*.²⁵ Prospero's exile and replacement has thrown off the correct "order" in Milan, and a disruption of God-mandated order was believed to have disastrous effects. It is therefore the restoration of this order that will bring harmony back to the world and serve as the resolution of the main conflict of *The Tempest*. Shakespeare's repeated implementation and support of this trope, as well as *The Tempest*'s specific use of divinity related to kingship, both support Prospero's goal as one that is morally privileged within the narrative of the play.²⁶

With these contexts in mind, the end goal of the play can be seen as a rightful one for the world of the play itself. Thus, by working for Prospero, Ariel is carrying out a rightful goal. This sense of morality, when coupled with his willingness to assist Prospero, serves to further solidify Ariel's fruitful role as a subject of colonization, rather than one of mere suffering. His moral compass as a properly constituted subject of monarchy is the backbone of his actions: rather than focusing on immediate freedom and resisting Prospero to achieve this end, Ariel's morality drives him to fight against the larger conflict at hand, thus putting him in the favor of his colonizer. He does not, as Rodó points out, fall victim to "the fervent pursuit of well-being that has no object beyond itself."²⁷

Ariel demonstrates an ability to adapt to his conditions by working for Prospero, backed up by his firm sense of morality. In adjusting to his conditions, he holds on to his understanding of right and wrong. However, this is not the only characteristic that Ariel is able to maintain and adapt in the face of large-scale change. His magical powers go through a similar transformation, also playing a role in Ariel's good fortune. Ariel's magic allows him to hold on to his individual power, and while he does learn from Prospero and integrate aspects of European culture and "secret studies," his own magical practice endures throughout the play. In terms of his good fortune, it is the potential and strength of Ariel's magical capabilities that appeal to Prospero and secure their

relationship, as they work together with their magic throughout the play. This power is demonstrated through all of Ariel's illusions, but it is especially reflected in the monologue he delivers to Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio:

You fools! I and my fellows
 Are ministers of Fate. The elements
 Of whom your swords are tempered may as well
 Wound the loud winds, or with bemocked-at stabs
 Kill the still-closing waters, as diminish
 One dowl that's in my plume. (III.iii.60–65)

Ariel describes the futility in fighting against him and reveals the power he holds within his magic. Attempting to challenge Ariel's illusions is comparable in futility to swinging at empty air or stabbing water. Additionally, in comparing himself to Fate, he puts himself in a position of almighty ability and omniscient authority over the three men. And it is not just Ariel who is aware of his power, as Prospero expresses his pride in Ariel's skill as well. When Ariel details the events of the storm and the shipwreck, Prospero interjects with admiration: "My brave spirit!" and "Why, that's my spirit!" (I.ii.207 and 215). By continuing to practice his magic and demonstrating its capabilities, Ariel wins the respect of his colonizer. This results in the interdependent nature of their relationship despite the overarching structure of colonization. The other value of Ariel's magic lies in how it reflects his preservation of his own culture. While part of Ariel's success under colonial rule has to do with embracing European values impressed upon him, he does this cooperatively and to his advantage, while remaining rooted in his own culture of magic as an airy spirit. Discussing, again, the Miller production of *The Tempest*, in which Caliban and Ariel are both black slaves, Griffiths explains that "Ariel was the accomplished servant who learnt European ways and literally picked up Prospero's broken wand at the end, dressing in European breeches but carrying a Kenyatta fly-whisk."²⁸ Ariel is willing to assimilate and eager to learn, but not without holding on to important parts of his cultural identity. This is what gives him the strength to work and thrive within the otherwise defeating structure of colonialism. Just as Rodó claims this quality is paramount for a society to maintain a national identity in the face of hegemonic domination, Ariel is in possession of an "inspiration powerful enough to maintain cohesion."²⁹

By humbly obliging Prospero's commands, acting in line with his sense of political and moral virtues, and retaining his magic in conjunction with his cooperative cultural assimilation, Ariel represents what *The Tempest* casts as the most productive way to respond to colonialism. Working within his condition, Ariel does not deny or resist his situation—he is "a spritely ghost who is the hero of all men striving for spiritual prosperity and holy freedom."³⁰

In direct opposition to this perspective stands Ariel's companion slave, Caliban. Unlike Ariel, Caliban does attempt to fight against his colonial reality. Denying this reality is, as David L. Miller explains, "a substitute gratification" that "merely compensates for the inability of the person to come to grips with the real situation of his life's meaning. Hence, the whirlwind, the tempest ... produce[s] a topsy-turvy in which one finds himself fighting illusory battles—while the real war is raging in his own reality."³¹ Caliban's attempts to resist colonization and acculturation are only one example of his impulses driving him to act in self-defeating ways. Additionally, he is motivated by selfish and base material desires, uncontrollably violent, and easily taken advantage of—all factors directly contributing to his anguish.

While Caliban actively attempts to combat colonization, verbally and through plots of violence, his defiance also manifests itself in his resistance to European culture and education. Miranda complains of trying to educate him, and although successful in teaching him language, this did not compensate for what she perceives as his evil nature; his "vile race" (I.ii.355–65). Immediately following her lamentation on these circumstances, Caliban responds, "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.366–68). While apparently capable of learning, Caliban refuses to embrace this culture of education fully enough to overcome his resentment of Prospero. Further, he takes what he has learned and devalues it, using it only for vulgar means. In doing so, he disrespects and opposes Prospero, which results in his misery under Prospero's rule. This can be directly contrasted with Ariel's use of formal education. Ariel, the agreeable and humble, took to education and the arts. This is demonstrated by his song performance in the final scene, to which Prospero responds, "Why, that's my dainty Ariel! I shall miss thee" (V.i.95). Given Prospero's praise, it is evident that Ariel has achieved some degree of mastery in language and song, and it is likely that some of this was learned from Prospero himself. Caliban's education can also be compared to Miranda, as they were both raised on the island from a young age by Prospero. Miranda is receptive to learning and develops into a capable and polite (albeit isolated) young woman, while Caliban embodies "the wild which rejects cultivation."³² Caliban's resistance to the culture of his colonizer demonstrates his antagonistic relationship with Prospero and the colonial structure. This relationship, rather than culminating in a battle that Caliban wins, only awards him the contempt of his colonizer and exacerbates his struggle as a colonial slave.

Unlike Ariel, who is motivated to practice his magic and to help restore proper political order in Milan for Prospero, Caliban is driven in the play by lower "natural" impulses, which stand in direct opposition to the beauty and nobility personified by Ariel, as well as Prospero and Miranda.³³ For example,

it is only the second time Caliban speaks that he reminds Prospero and the audience, “This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak’st from me” (I.ii.334–35). Caliban has revenge on the forefront of his mind even after twelve years under Prospero’s authority. He is blind to any other approach: for Caliban, the immediate goal of ownership of the land is his only motivation, which results in an invariable schism between himself and Prospero. This desire is expressed further when Prospero accuses Caliban of attempting to violate Miranda. Caliban responds, “Oh ho! Oh ho! Would ’t had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans” (I.ii.352–54). Again, Caliban cannot see past his claim to the island and his desire to populate it as his own kingdom. He is focused on a basic desire for land and a continued bloodline, hoping to reap these eventual rewards. Unfortunately, this “eternal preoccupation with material triumphs” can only result in “insufficiency and emptiness.”³⁴ These preoccupations, which place Caliban in direct competition with his colonizer, manifest themselves in a compulsion for revenge. Shortly after meeting Trinculo and Sebastian, Caliban tells them of this ambition in order to hatch a plan: “As I told thee before, I am subject to a tyrant, / A sorcerer, that by his cunning hath / Cheated me of the island” (III.ii.40–42). At the end of the group’s discussion, Caliban emphasizes that they can create their own kingdom on the island “When Prospero is destroyed” (III.ii.141). Caliban’s focus on the material and what he feels he deserves has created within him a deep hatred for Prospero. Because of this, his most immediate goal is revenge, which has blinded him such that he depends upon the alliance of strangers. This vengeful focus eventually results in his capture at the hands of Prospero. If Caliban had taken the time to learn from Prospero, perhaps he would possess more developed abilities to fight against him. Caliban’s preoccupation with reclaiming the island creates hostility between colonized and colonizer, which results in ignorance, increased punishment, and defeat. Rodó captures the awareness that Caliban lacks: “To rise above necessity ... is to be redeemed.”³⁵

Caliban’s discussions of revenge begin to expose another trait that contributes to his struggle: his propensity for violence. This tendency contrasts with the humility and morality exhibited by Ariel, and just as Ariel’s good-will supports him within the structure of colonialism, Caliban’s violent tendencies serve to entrench him further in his victimhood. The brutality of his ideas can be seen in his suggestions for the intended murder of Prospero to Trinculo and Stephano:

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 weasand with thy knife. (III.ii.82–86)

Caliban's fantasies about Prospero's death are detailed and gruesome, demonstrative of the level of violence he is capable of, or at least has the capacity to imagine. This description also reveals the amount of thought he has put into his plan, as he has determined the best timing and methods for the murder. Or, at the very least, plans of excessive violence come to him with relative ease on a moment's notice. But it is not merely the thoughts of cruelty that take their toll on Caliban's moral personhood, as this effect is generated by the fact that he expresses these thoughts to Prospero himself. As previously mentioned, Caliban wishes for Miranda and Prospero to be ravaged by a plague as punishment for teaching him language (I.ii.367–68). In expressing such violent wishes, Caliban constructs himself as a direct threat to Prospero, which in turn elicits Prospero's hostility towards him. Because Caliban voices his threatening fantasies to Prospero, Prospero has little choice but to defend himself through inflicting punishment and restraint upon Caliban. This, in turn, further worsens Caliban's enslavement.

Caliban shows a lack of inhibition in his speech by directly threatening his superior and freely expressing his thoughts of revenge to anyone who will hear him. However, this absence of restraint reveals itself not only in Caliban's words and actions, but also in his interpersonal relationships. His wild nature is easily taken advantage of by others: as Caliban lacks control over himself, he derives it from the control of other people. Shortly after meeting two new men that have appeared on his island, Caliban drinks their alcohol and willingly submits to them, bewildered by their drunken confidence. In attempting to comprehend Stephano and Trinculo's unfamiliar presence, Caliban says, "These be fine things, an if they be not spirits. / That's a brave god, and bears celestial liquor. / I will kneel to him" (II.ii.111–13). Rather than being wary of the strange men on his island, fighting off this potential threat, or alerting Prospero of possible intruders, Caliban submits to them entirely and raises them to a level of divinity. His natural reaction to new and influential men is to offer himself as a slave to them, as he seeks the leadership of those he views as more dominant and in control than he. This is demonstrated further once the three join forces and begin to enact their scheme to usurp Prospero. After Stephano and Trinculo express their doubts about the plan, Caliban says,

Prithee, my king, be quiet. Seest thou here,
This is the mouth o' the cell. No noise, and enter.
Do that good mischief which may make this island
Thine own forever, and I thy Caliban
For aye thy footlicker. (IV.i.214–18)

First, Caliban refers to Stephano and Trinculo as royalty, and while this is a step down from the previous "god," it is still indicative of the reverence Caliban has

for them. In addition, this passage demonstrates that Caliban is willing to pass over ownership of the island to them—ownership that Caliban had defended intensely and claimed as his own to Prospero. He has now sacrificed the driving force of his vengeance to two men that he has just met. Finally, the end of his statement is a testament to how fully he has given himself to Stephano and Trinculo as their slave. Considering how little effort Stephano and Trinculo had to put in to convince Caliban to work for them, his sentiment is more reflective of his own disposition. Caliban, unfiltered, immature, and willing to serve anyone who impresses him, is easily taken advantage of. His personality is conducive to his subjugation, and his behavior reflects this in how freely he forfeits himself. As Griffiths, suggests, it is “Caliban who demands a master to worship and serve.”³⁶ It is because of this that Caliban is captured and subsequently admonished at the end of the play: the plan that he depended on his new masters to carry out unsurprisingly falls through. If he had taken the time to analyze their temperaments rather than so quickly decide to work with them, perhaps he would have decided against attempting to overthrow Prospero, avoiding capture and reprimand, both of which reinforce his subjection as a slave.

In describing Caliban’s behavior and emotions as failures of judgment, my intention is not to de-emphasize his at times appalling treatment at Prospero’s hand or support Prospero’s colonialism in *The Tempest*. The play was published during a significant period of Western imperialism and reflects that imperialist ideology.³⁷ However, it cannot be assumed that even Shakespeare approved of Caliban’s treatment, in part because he is eventually granted his freedom at the play’s end. In any case, Caliban’s anger at his situation is well-founded, and it is evident that Prospero is unduly cruel to him. The play’s characterization of Caliban does not necessitate that Shakespeare supports Caliban’s exploitation, and it certainly does not justify the practice as a whole—the present argument is that Caliban’s *means of retaliation* are criticized in *The Tempest*, not his intended ends of freedom from Prospero. In an era after colonialism, during which slavery and abuse of native populations are viewed with hindsight and condemnation, Caliban’s rage is easily defensible.

Ariel and Caliban, the two colonial slaves of Prospero, make different choices based on their contrasting personalities, and these choices lead to opposite experiences of slavery for the two characters. In this way, one can interpret Ariel and Caliban as manifestations of different responses to colonialism. One response contributes to harmony and individual prosperity; the other results in extended struggle, punishment, and self-defeat. Through Ariel, *The Tempest* constructs an effective response to colonialism, at least inasmuch as this could be believed by Shakespeare or his audience. Ariel is willing to work alongside his colonizer and follow his demands, as Prospero’s goal of reclaiming dukedom aligns with Ariel’s sense of morality. Ariel’s dutiful work and virtue both put

him in Prospero's good graces, which allows Ariel to avoid the struggle typically associated with slavery. Caliban, however, is not motivated by any sense of right and wrong or desire to cooperate, but by brute materialism and violent revenge. His singular focus on winning the island back from Prospero, as well as his vocalization of these desires, only serve to deepen the divide between colonizer and colonized. This attitude makes Caliban blind to any larger goals and more susceptible to false alliances. As a result, he is constantly berated by Prospero, taken advantage of by Stephano and Trinculo, and ultimately fails in his plan of revenge. Finally, it is Ariel and Caliban's reactions to cultural influences that help determine their success. Ariel embodies a mastery of additive acculturation: he maintains his powerful autonomy through the preservation of his cultural magic, but is still receptive to colonial influence, integrating aspects of European education and Prospero's own sorcery. Caliban, resistant to colonization and determined to reclaim the island, makes ill use of his education and cannot overcome his incivility until the end of the play, when Prospero "acknowledges" him and Caliban dedicates himself to the pursuit of "grace." Within the narrative of *The Tempest*, colored by the support of a divine order and Prospero's inherent political victimage, the rigid Caliban represents the futility of vengeful anti-colonial struggle, while Ariel, the flexible, sophisticated, and cooperative one, represents a much more rewarding response. Indeed, it is in working with and deriving benefit from the tempest of colonialism that Ariel achieves his prosperity and freedom. This is one interpretable lesson from *The Tempest* that is still compelling in a post-colonial world, a message of cultural syncretism, acceptance, and personal cultivation. As Rodo put it, "We are capable of progress only to the degree that we become capable of adapting our acts to conditions that are increasingly distant from us in space in time."³⁸

SHAKESPEARE'S HOW-TO GUIDE FOR PATRIARCHIES

Stephanie Gredell

Postcolonial criticism tends to read *The Tempest* as a commentary on the imperial actions of the English crown in Shakespeare's lifetime. The shipwreck is reminiscent of a well-known one in 1609, when Sir Thomas Gates (the appointed governor of Virginia) and others traveled to the

New World but were wrecked in the Bermudas, where they stayed there for a year.³⁹ Many scholars interpret *The Tempest's* political intrigue and Prospero's actions towards Caliban and Ariel as reflections of colonialism in the real world.⁴⁰ Taking a different approach, *The Tempest* is one of Shakespeare's plays well-known and studied for its female characters, who occupy a fair amount of time on the stage with their complicated narratives and personalities. Clara Claiborne Park, for example, argues that Shakespeare can get away with such characters in the very patriarchal Elizabethan England, specifically because he combines feminine wit and pride with just the right amount of submission.⁴¹ Yet he does not create the same balance with Miranda in *The Tempest*, and the play further confirms the cultural belief in the inferiority of women in many other ways. It is important for the portrayal of the creation of a colony and a new civilization on the island to display all the masculine powers it can, a priority driven by the hegemonic power of the interpenetrating discourses of gender and colonialism in the early modern period. Indeed, the same factors that make *The Tempest* so readily analyzed by postcolonial criticism—chiefly the isolation of its two major male characters, one a white European and the other presented as indigenous and savage—can be used to support a related feminist reading. Miranda's position in the isolated mini-society of the island aids helps to cast light on the struggle between the genders and the expression of ideologies of masculine dominance and potential feminine resistance. *The Tempest* displays a systematic, painstaking removal of all feminine power in order to recreate the supposed superior patriarchal order.

The first act of colonization on the island includes the defeat of the already established gynocracy of Sycorax. Sycorax threatens Prospero insofar as she is an existing power on the island he must inhabit. When Prospero rants to Ariel about their relationship, he reveals that Sycorax "from Argier ... was banished," hinting at an African origin and placing her firmly in an archetypal role as a colonized being (I.ii.266–67). Yet Sycorax is even more of a threat to Prospero because of her gender and the power she therefore embodies: she endangers many of the tenets of patriarchy, and therefore the play must largely efface her presence. Not only does she rule the island as a woman, but she expresses a freedom of sexuality that is unacceptable to the morals of a civilized society. In this regard, it is crucial that Shakespeare never writes about the male contribution to Caliban's conception, and the general consensus among scholars therefore speaks of Caliban as illegitimate.⁴² Prospero suggests as much when he speaks of her "mischiefs manifold" and the "one thing she did" for which "they would not take her life," suggesting that she conceived outside of marriage and the woman's patriarchal duty of producing an heir (I.ii.265–68). Sycorax scandalously had sex for its own sake and demonstrates female sexuality outside of patriarchal confines. Furthermore, the act of her giving birth and raising Cal-

iban on her own represents the creative powers that women possess but that men cannot claim. She is therefore the very “embodiment of evil in the eyes of Prospero the patriarch,” and all of her power is slowly dismantled to make room for the new order on the island.⁴³ Shakespeare raises Sycorax’s gender in every insult: she is a “foul” and “damned witch” as well as a “blue-eyed hag” (I.ii.258, 264, and 270). The title “witch” relays the possession of magic, but with the extra detail of her femininity—no one ever refers to Prospero as a witch—and “blue-eyed” could refer to the dark circles around the eyes that implies pregnancy.⁴⁴ Her moral inferiority is not separated from her sex. Prospero works to eliminate her value, describing “the son that she did litter here” (I.ii.283), with “litter” carrying an obvious animalistic connotation, removing any respect for a woman’s procreative ability, and further expressing her natural inferiority. Prospero then expresses his control when he reminds Ariel of how he became the new master of the island. He overcomes the gynocracy and belittles any other claim to dignity Sycorax could have had. Colonialism brings with it the destruction of female power and importance.

Likewise, Miranda’s femininity is crucial to the narrative, but the play carefully constructs her such that she can only be what is needed for the plot and nothing more. As Lorrie Jerrell Leininger observes, Prospero molds Miranda into an extension of himself.⁴⁵ Likewise, in her discussion of Miranda’s schooling and its duplicity of purpose, Ania Loomba argues that Prospero is able to guarantee her obedience by assuring her ignorance, indoctrinating her into his agenda.⁴⁶ In every other scene, Miranda is meek and generous, but when her father and Caliban confront one another, she parrots Prospero’s racist and colonialist jargon.⁴⁷ She calls Caliban “a savage” and attributes his inability to learn language to his “vile race” (I.ii.358 and 361). These lines quickly follow the discussion of her sexual assault, arguably giving good reason for her vitriol, but *The Tempest* does not supply any further reflection on Miranda’s experience. Moreover, Prospero’s colonial agenda thoroughly taints the accusation. When Prospero and Miranda prepare to visit Caliban, Miranda reports that he is “a villain” whom she does “not love to look on,” and Prospero addresses her fears by shutting her down (I.ii.312).⁴⁸ Miranda does not express the anger or confidence that she has when scolding Caliban. Prospero taught her everything she knows, and she falls back on it when she confronts the man who scares her. She has been molded by her father to fit his purposes, and he makes sure that she knows her place. Whenever she tries to stand up for Ferdinand, Prospero silences Miranda and addresses her as “my foot,” implying that he is the head and she is there to be walked on and utilized by the brain when needed, or when Prospero cannot accomplish the task for want of the right body parts.⁴⁹ Indeed, he needs her to act as “sexual bait” for his plan to reconnect with the political powers in Italy.⁵⁰ Her virginity and fertility are necessary for

this plot, and neither Prospero himself nor his spirits can provide these things. Prospero emphasizes the importance of these bodily details in his plan when he threatens Ferdinand to not “break her virgin-knot before” the wedding (IV.i.15), and Ferdinand responds with his desire to have “fair issue” (or legitimate heirs) and mollifies Prospero (IV.i.24). She is a tool that both men use to get what they want.

The play appears to give Miranda some agency, but her actions continue to represent male dominance. When she and Prospero first enter the scene, Miranda is discussing the tempest and asking her father to “the wild waters in this roar, allay” (I.ii.2). She argues against his actions and imagines herself as “any god of power” who could sink the sea (I.ii.10). These opening lines certainly provide Miranda with a strong start to her character, and they could speak to her being “ambitious for a compassionate power of her own.”⁵¹ However, their initial assertiveness ultimately only serve by way of contrast, stressing what ultimately proves to be her submissiveness. The manner in which she talks to her father thus in retrospect seems to be more begging than arguing. She takes a passive approach when she tells him, “I have suffered / With those I saw suffer” (I.ii.5–6). She pleads with her father using his care for her and makes herself a vulnerable recipient of the violent act. Moreover, her comparison to “any god of power” only emphasizes her lack of power in the situation. Magic abounds in the play—but not in Miranda, even though Prospero has educated her in other subjects, and because she has no control over the events in her life, she must imagine a mystical situation in which she could have power. This lack of control expands to include her future as a wife. In contrast to the typical courting practices of Elizabethan England, and to the other marriage discussed in the play, Miranda takes the first step to further her relationship with Ferdinand. She offers herself in marriage instead of waiting passively for him to ask her. Again, this all points to feminine agency, but her proposal is anything but independent. She begins by citing “mine unworthiness” (III.ii.77), indicating that, before she can even approach the idea, she must declare her inferiority. She then goes on to define what the relationship would look like: she would “desire to give, and much less take” (III.ii.78). She demonstrates equality by turning patriarchal norms on their head, but this becomes a non-issue when Miranda herself stresses the clear inequality of the relationship. By no means is she to be independent, because (as she tells Ferdinand) she will be his “maid” if he does not want her to be his wife (III.ii.84). The patriarchal term of “maid,” with its connotation of virginity as well as low social status, continues to crush any appearance of feminine power that could have been extracted from this scene of the play. The most important blow, however, comes from the nature of Prospero’s plan itself. He needs the two to get married in order to support his return to the political scene of Italy, and he has been manipulating everything

on the island to lead to this outcome. Immediately after Ferdinand accepts Miranda, Prospero makes an aside and talks about “they . . . who are surprised with all,” contrasting this to himself and his “business” (III.ii.93 and 96). He is not surprised like they are, because he planned it all as part of this “business.”

David Schalkwyk makes the argument that Miranda’s love for Ferdinand is valid insofar as Prospero’s magic cannot change emotions, pointing to Prospero’s treatment of Caliban and his failure to use magic to induce any feelings of obedience. Instead, Prospero exerts his power over Caliban through pain.⁵² Yet the differences between Caliban and Miranda’s characters makes this argument difficult to maintain. Caliban is a slave and a purported rapist; Prospero’s magical handling of him is meant to punish him for being a threat as much as it is to rid the island of his threat in the first place. Miranda is in a similarly submissive position, but she is not the object of racial derision, and her father therefore approaches her quite differently. The question of whether she truly loves with her own free will is therefore open, and Miranda’s personal power remains unclear. The only thing Miranda accomplishes in the end is giving herself away as a submissive partner and completing her patriarch’s plans for the recouping of political power.

The plans of patriarchy and the methods for achieving them do not stop at the submission of actual women, and *The Tempest* continues to efface all feminine ideology at the periphery. As an embodiment of chaos and a reflection of a watery womb, the tempest and the ocean itself represent the feminine. When Antonio describes them all as “sea-swallowed, though some cast again,” he describes the ocean as a force that encompasses beings in water and then brings them forth (II.i.245).⁵³ The ocean is a destructive and live-giving force that expresses a strong feminine power through this pseudo-birth, but *The Tempest* reinstates the masculine control over the threatening entity for which it is named, having Prospero, the play’s exemplar of masculine power, use it for his plans. And Miranda and the tempest are not the only feminine facets of Prospero’s plan. As part of her postfeminist reading of the play, Natali Bogosyan argues that Ariel has “plural identity” and “blurs the binary opposites prescribed by the patriarchy.”⁵⁴ For Bogosyan, Ariel represents female power, especially insofar as he carries out the displays of power for Prospero’s plot and is a servant working for his freedom rather than a slave without agency.⁵⁵ Ariel shifts into feminine forms, and Prospero describes him as “delicate” and “dainty,” both modifiers connotating a patriarchal female identity (IV.i.49; V.i.95).⁵⁶ However, Ariel is firmly under Prospero’s control throughout the play: every impressive magical trick, feminine or not, is done at the behest of Ariel’s masculine master, and he has barely appeared on the stage when Prospero reminds him of his position (I.ii.250–300). Even the smallest details point to the systematic suppression of femininity. Female sexuality, as we have seen, when

expressed outside the bonds of traditional marriage, is dirtied and expressed through masculine selfish pride and disdain. During the storm, Gonzalo, a respectable character and wise old man, describes the ship “as leaky as an unstanched wench” (I.i.43–44), referring to the sexual fluids of a woman in the middle of the storm. Further, “unstanched” connotes the necessary repression of female desire: when not “stanched,” female desire will lead to destruction and puts male power, like that of those sheltered on the ship, in danger. Gonzalo casually derides female desire and, as a result, implicitly represses female desire through the use of shame. This interjection, while thoroughly unnecessary for the flow of the dialogue and the mood portrayed in the scene, perpetuates the thematic removal of any female dignity. This continues when Antonio and Sebastian jokingly interrupt Adrian’s description of the island as “uninhabitable and almost inaccessible” and having to be “of delicate ... temperance (II.i.39 and 43–44). Adrian’s characterization of the island as something to be penetrated leads the two other men to banter about a hypothetical “delicate wench” named “Temperance” (II.i.45). (In this case, “delicate” seems to mean something closer to the Latin root *delicatus*, “wanton.”) Once again, *The Tempest*’s male characters mention female pleasure within the context of male conquest. The island is metaphorically a lusty woman needing to be “accessible” to the men. The play systematic strips the ocean, the island, and the spirit of freedom and respect, causing these feminine aspects to be impotent. The entities in the play have the potential to be very strong forces of femininity, beyond the limits of humanity. However, *The Tempest* proves the domination waged throughout the play to be unstoppable, and the patriarchal violations continue.

Prospero’s plot to use his daughter to get back his power is not the only agenda executed within *The Tempest*. Thinly veiled below the play’s romantic political intrigue is the creation of a white civilization where there was not one before, echoing the colonization of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Ania Loomba draws the connection between colonialism and patriarchy quite starkly when she evokes the British conquest of Burma. In order to make a civilization, the British believed that the Burmese woman, who originally had their own property and sexual rights, needed to “surrender their liberty in the interests of men,” and colonization was often accomplished through repeated sexual assault and forced marriage of the native women.⁵⁷ These patterns expose the dominant belief within imperialism, that civilization cannot exist without the subjugation of women and a resulting patriarchy. *The Tempest*’s portrayal of women differs from Shakespeare’s other plays because of this emphasis on colonialism, performed in Prospero’s takeover of the island. This colonialism cannot exist without the systemic oppression of female liberties. Prospero manipulates his daughter from the beginning of her education to suit his needs and then starts to control all of the other threateningly feminine

aspects of his new home. The other characters represent the power Prospero desires to regain, and so they must exhibit a disdain for feminine freedoms as well. Regardless of Shakespeare's intentions, his play captures the realities of his world within the literary lives of its characters, realities that still permeate society today.

Kaylee Avila and Stephanie Gredell are sophomores majoring in English, and Jessie De Arman is a junior majoring in Religion. They prepared these essays as part of Professor Willis Salomon's Literary Methods seminar (ENGL 2311) in Fall 2019.

NOTES

- 1 Hiewon Shin, "Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda," *Studies in English Literature* 48 (2008): 373–93, at 373. Shin claims Prospero "reinforces some of the humanist ideas about women's education in the period" and clearly "accepts the Christian notion of women's virtues, such as obedience, silence, and virginity" (382), but crucially diverges from orthodox teachings through his "androgenous role" as her school master and single parent, with both fatherly and motherly roles. As a result, he inculcates both feminine and masculine ideas in Miranda (cf. 387).
- 2 *Ibid.*, 382. Throughout this and the following essays, quotations and citations of Shakespeare's play refer to *The Tempest: A Case Study in Critical Controversy*, ed. Gerald Graff and James Phelan, 2nd edn. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009).
- 3 Tom Lindsay, "'Which First Was Mine Own King': Caliban and the Politics of Service and Education in *The Tempest*," *Studies in Philology* 113 (2016): 397–423, at 422.
- 4 Shin, "Single Parenting," 373," notes that while Prospero "successfully inculcates both feminine and masculine ideas in Miranda, [he] fails to provide Caliban the values of masculinity." Prospero liberates Miranda from domestic duties, but reassigns the "inappropriate chores" to Caliban who desires "outdoor work" instead. Prospero subordinates Caliban through emasculating tasks before progressing to curses and physical abuse.
- 5 Lindsay, "Politics of Service," 412.
- 6 *Ibid.*
- 7 *Ibid.*, 413.
- 8 Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (London: Pluto Press, 1986), 107. In contrast, Octave Mannoni's "Prospero Complex" attributes colonialism's reason for existence to "the sum of those unconscious neurotic tendencies that delineate" between the colonizer's feelings of paternalistic obligation to protect his daughter and the desire to racially oppress an inferior "other"; Mannoni, *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization*, trans. Pamela Powesland, 2nd edn. (New York: Praeger, 1964), 40. Fanon responds by noting that "colonizers are responsible for instilling feelings of inferiority in the colonized, and that these feelings did not exist prior to colonization" (107).
- 9 John Kunat, "'Play me false': Rape, Race, and Conquest in *The Tempest*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 65 (2014): 307–27, at 322–23.

- 10 Shin, "Single Parenting," 387.
- 11 Kunat, "Rape, Race, and Conquest," 315.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 320.
- 13 *Ibid.*
- 14 *Ariel* was written two years after the Spanish colonies in Latin America achieved their freedom, at a time when they were faced with the new threat of impending North American control. This essay was Rodó's optimistic solution to this threat and encouraged a "pan-American" approach to Northern imperialism. Although a poetic and philosophical text, it still served as an intellectual inspiration for Latin Americans seeking to develop a unified cultural identity and "regenerate" their continental integrity while moving into a new era. For more on *Ariel*, see Michael Aronno, "*Pueblos Enfermos*": *The Discourse of Illness in the Turn-of-the-Century Spanish and Latin American Essay* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 87–134; Gustavo San Román, "Political Tact in José Enrique Rodó's *Ariel*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 36 (2000): 279–95.
- 15 José Enrique Rodó, *Ariel*, ed. Carlos Fuentes et al. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988), 98.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 31.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 70.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 87.
- 19 Trevor R. Griffiths, "'This Island's Mine': Caliban and Colonialism," *Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983): 159–80, at 177.
- 20 Deborah Willis, "Shakespeare's *Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," *Studies in English Literature* 29 (1989): 277–89, at 280.
- 21 On the controversy surrounding Queen Elizabeth I, Henry VIII's succession acts, and James I, see Eric William Ives, "Tudor Dynastic Problems Revisited," *Historical Research* 81 (2008): 254–79; Rei Kanemura, "Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I," *Journal of British Studies* 52 (2013): 317–42.
- 22 The argument made in support of the people deposing their ruler was more a reflection of tensions between Catholics and Protestants, and the resentment that a few English Catholics held towards the prospect of accepting another Protestant ruler; see Kanemura, "Kingship by Descent," 318–20.
- 23 James I put this theory forward in *The True Law of Free Monarchies*, published in 1598. See David Harris Willson, *King James VI & I* (London: Johnathan Cape, 1963), 321.
- 24 See Eustace M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1959), 3–4, 9–17, and 25–35.
- 25 *Ibid.*
- 26 As argued by Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations* (London: Routledge, 1999), 98, *The Tempest* "align[s] with Shakespeare's massed statements elsewhere in definition of true sovereignty."
- 27 Rodó, *Ariel*, 79.
- 28 Griffiths, "Caliban and Colonialism," 177.
- 29 Rodó, *Ariel*, 89.
- 30 David LeRoy Miller, "Ho Ariel: A Meditation on Saint Paul, Isaiah, and Shakespeare," *Brethren Life and Thought* 12 (1967): 42–46, at 44.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 43–44.
- 32 Frank Kermode, "*The Tempest*," in *William Shakespeare, the Final Plays: Pericles; Cymbeline; The Winter's Tale; The Tempest; The Two Noble Kinsmen* (London: Longmans, 1963), 44.
- 33 *Ibid.*
- 34 Rodó, *Ariel*, 79.

- 35 *Ibid.*, 88.
- 36 Griffiths, “Caliban and Canibalism,” 178.
- 37 Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare*, 95.
- 38 Rodó, *Ariel*, 96.
- 39 William Strachey, “A True Repertory of the Wrack” (selections), in *Critical Controversy*, ed. Graff and Phelan, 122–24, at 122.
- 40 Paul Brown, for example, recognizes the acknowledged connections between *The Tempest* and the British colonialism contemporary to the play’s creation, and then he goes a step further, arguing that *The Tempest* is an “intervention” in the colonial discourse of the period and using its characters and their narratives to display the ideas of “masterlessness” and “savagism” as important concepts to the framing of colonialism. See Brown, “This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine”: *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism,” in *Critical Controversy*, ed. Graff and Phelan, 268–92.
- 41 Clara Claiborne Park, “As We Like It: How a Girl Can Be Smart and Still Popular,” in *The Woman’s Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz et al. (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 100–116.
- 42 See Natali Bogosyan, *Postfeminist Discourse in Shakespeare’s The Tempest and Warner’s Indigo: Ambivalence, Liminality and Plurality* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2012), 107. Bogosyan discusses the connection between the feminine struggle from the first chapter and the function of colonization within *The Tempest*. Sycorax is the perfect example, since her character is made of everything that is a threat to Prospero’s patriarchal colonialism. She displays the power of pregnancy that men cannot possess in reality, and she depicts a woman’s sexual desires free of connections to marriage and familial obligations.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 113.
- 44 Leah Marcus, “The Blue-Eyed Witch,” in *Critical Controversy*, ed. Graff and Phelan, 244–64, at 253. Marcus discusses the many interpretations of epithet “blue-eyed,” most aligning with William Aldis Wright’s 1874 edition of *The Tempest*. Many take it to mean the blue skin around the eyes, indicating exhaustion and more specifically pregnancy. Marcus however questions this uniformity, which speaks to a simplification that avoids questioning cultural assumptions and racial categories.
- 45 Lorie Jerrell Leininger, “The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*,” in *The Woman’s Part*, ed. Lenz et al., 285–92, at 289.
- 46 Ania Loomba, “Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama,” in *Critical Controversy*, ed. Graff and Phelan, 389–400, at 396. Loomba argues that Miranda’s education has two purposes: to teach her submissiveness and to indoctrinate her into the colonial agenda. She makes an important observation that her indoctrination and subordination combine to place Miranda in an interesting dichotomy, between inclusion and exclusion in the colonial agenda.
- 47 *Ibid.*
- 48 See Leininger, “The Miranda Trap,” 288
- 49 *Ibid.*, 287 and 289.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 289.
- 51 Bogosyan, *Postfeminist Discourse*, 76.
- 52 David Schalkwyk, *Shakespeare, Love and Service* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 107.
- 53 See Bogosyan, *Postfeminist Discourse*, 42–43.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 97.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 99.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 97
- 57 Loomba, “Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama,” 394.