WATER-IMAGERY IN *THE TEMPEST*

By

LINDA FLASCH REDMAN

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1962

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
August, 1965

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

NOV 23 1965

WATER-IMAGERY IN THE TEMPEST

Thesis Approved:

David Shelley Berkeley
Thesis Adviser

Samuel H. Woods, Jr.

[signature]
Dean of the Graduate School

592646

PREFACE

That Shakespeare was familiar with Holy Scriptures is well known. He often deals with Biblical ideas, and many studies have been made showing Biblical reflections in characters, themes, and plots of his plays. Somewhat overlooked has been the influence on Shakespeare of Biblical water-imagery.

Many Bible passages illustrate an association of moral evil with large bodies of water, and the purpose of this study is to examine Biblical passages which prove that such an idea does exist in both Old and New Testaments, and in the Apocrypha--all of which were well known and much referred to by Shakespeare; then to show Biblical influence upon *The Tempest*, through a study of characters, through a study of references to and descriptions of the scenery, and through a discussion of the action of the play.

In presenting a new statement of source and theme, I have not intended to contradict or discount all other sources and themes in the field. It is probable that Shakespeare used ideas from several sources in writing this play; indeed such is to be speculated from *The Tempest*, considering the complex structure of its characterization and action.

I want to acknowledge my thanks to Dr. David S. Berkeley, whose suggestion led to the formation of my thesis, and to Dr. Samuel Woods, Jr., whose considerations have strengthened my paper through revision, for their valuable guidance in the writing of this study. I am also

indebted to the librarians of the Oklahoma State University who assisted me in obtaining the Geneva Bible and other necessary works.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY IN *THE TEMPEST*.	10
III.	CALIBAN AS LEVIATHAN IN BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY	35
IV.	PROSPERO AS THE LORD IN BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY	68
V.	CONCLUSION	95
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As one of Shakespeare's last plays, The Tempest has received special attention. It has been generally accepted that Shakespeare, not copying any one source, used his own genius for the major ideas in the play, and created characters accordingly, relying only incidentally on outside sources. However, study to clarify such "sources" has produced much confusion regarding the basis of the play's action, characterization, and plot. Only through careful study of the play can one discern which of the conjectured sources bear significance. I believe that the Bible should be considered a chief source for The Tempest, since many vivid parallels of Biblical water-imagery are found in the water-imagery of this play--in characterization, in setting, and in theme.

Indeed many sources have been offered for this play, of which the two works most often pointed at are Jakob Ayrer's Die Schöne Sidea and Antonio de Eslava's Primera Parte de las Noches de Invierno. Although much discussed as sources, these are generally regarded as only of minor--if indeed of any--significance. It is often conjectured that these and The Tempest were from yet another, a common, source.[1] Also receiving much attention as a possible source has been the manuscript letter written by William Strachey, A True Repertory of the wrack, and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, Knight; upon, and from the island of

the Bermudas. This letter, although first printed in 1625, is dated July 15, 1610; and many speculate that Shakespeare saw it in circulation prior to the writing of The Tempest. Certainly the timeliness and availability of this letter assist in the acceptance of it as a source, but the main plot and the major characters go beyond the mere parallels of setting between this letter and the play. A recent article by Sharon L. Smith is quite clear in defining the status of much of the scholarship concerned with these and other works cited as sources for The Tempest. She establishes that each of the works thus far offered as being contributors to Shakespeare's play had only minor influence, if any certain effect, on Shakespeare's writing of this play.[2] She offers that no work thus far discussed presents as many parallels in The Tempest as the commedia dell' arte. Nevertheless, I believe that these scenari could not be considered as major sources for The Tempest either, although like the others they may have been of incidental importance to Shakespeare. The parallels Miss Smith mentions as existing between the scenari and the play are not comprehensive enough to explain the total action of the play. Even though she points to numerous parallels, most relate only to the "magic" used or referred to in the play: magic circles, a magic wand, magician's books (stolen by rogues), a magician with absolute power: he can become invisible, he can cast spells.[3] The plot, the main characters' actions, and indeed the important part of the setting, the water-imagery, do not figure into these parallels, and it is necessary that any major source should explain all important parts of the play.

Although critics do not agree that any of the works thus far presented in Tempest criticism should be considered as a major source,

each work may have had some part in the suggestion of minor details given in the play. It is clear that none of the sources thus far discussed has enough important parallels in the play to be dealt with as a chief contributor to Shakespeare's development of *The Tempest*. Primarily because no single, comprehensive source has been found for the plot of this comedy, as have been found for other Shakespearean plays, interpretations of this play, based on possible influences from different sources, have shown much freedom, especially evidenced in the large number of symbolical and allegorical interpretations. However, as this thesis shall reveal, the play does make use of a large number of Biblical parallels and on the basis of such, I believe that the Bible should be regarded as a major source of the play and that an interpretation of the play should be drawn with this in mind. One cannot deny that the water-imagery (including the tempest-imagery) of the play pervades all thought, all action of the play, and even the name of the play. That this imagery reflects the water-imagery given in the Bible will be discussed in the following chapters which demonstrate Shakespeare's handling of the setting, the characterization, and the plot--as relevant to the play's water-imagery.

Several *Tempest* critics have recognized certain Biblical allusions or parallels in the play; yet none of these recognizes a unified employment of such allusions in directing the theme of the play, nor considers the obvious Biblical reflections to be of major importance in delineating characterization or purpose of action of this play. One critic, Miss Honor Matthews, points out that "The theological overtones are very clear in *The Tempest* because of the close juxtaposition of the words grace and gods--a juxtaposition merely fortuitous when taken in

the context of plot or character, but significant in the realm of ideas."[4] Even in this acknowledgment Miss Matthews does not recognize the importance of the Biblical parallels in the major characters nor those reflections regarding the over-all action of the play. She connects these rather with extra-Biblical and pagan influences:

> The Tempest contains a full reflection of the Lucifer legend treated in the manner of a double fugue, with the assassination of Prospero and Alonso plotted by the Janus figure of Antonio-Sebastian and paralleled by the counter-subject of Caliban's rebellion.[5]

Although the actions and thoughts of the characters are quite significant to Miss Matthews, she does not relate them to the water-imagery in the Bible.

In another consideration of the significance of certain characters in this play, Douglas Bush refers to Prospero's "brief summary of the human condition"[6] in his speech regarding the dreamlike nature of men's lives and the figure of death as sleep. On the basis of the Christian ideas of death as temporary, as a sleeping, Bush calls the play a "miracle" play; but he does not dwell at length on any other feature of The Tempest which would help justify this classification. Apparently he misses entirely the vivid Biblical parallels in the play's water-imagery and the fuller Christian thought suggested by the action of the characters.

Roland Frye, too, recognizes an association in The Tempest of sleep and death that presents the Christian and therefore, Biblical, association regarding death;[7] but he, like Bush, does not elaborate on further Biblical parallels. Miss Caroline Spurgeon adds that the use of prayer in the play is in accord with Biblical uses. She notes that

prayers in The Tempest are uttered to bring mercy, peace, and calm to the people.[8] She associates the use of prayer with the function of music in the play; but she fails to emphasize the significance of the prayers as relevant to the theme of the play, as part of the water-imagery influenced by the Bible.

Commentators on Shakespeare's general knowledge and use of the Bible have also noticed his Biblical parallels in this play. Hamilton Colemen[9] finds only the illusory character of the world (and death as sleep) which Prospero alludes to as the complete Biblical influence on the play regarding ideological reflections.[10] He, too, misses the Biblical associations which are revealed in the theme.

Richmond Noble gives several parallels between Bible verses and passages from The Tempest, but he declares that in this play the "scriptural interest is small .... Prospero is not one of the scholar princes well versed in the Bible; his form of learning is magic."[11] He overlooks the influence of the Bible upon Prospero as related to the play's water-imagery but mentions the parallel between Ariel's report that "not a hair perish'd" and Luke 21:18 and/or Acts 27:44.[12]

Thomas Carter, too, finds evidences of Shakespeare's use of the Bible to be as minor as those mentioned above. He notes the parallels that Noble offers, but he does not contribute any commentary about similarities between The Tempest and Biblical water-imagery.[13]

Fuller discussions of Shakespeare's use of the Bible have pointed out more parallels between single passages of the play and Holy Scriptures. James Rees says:

> There is not to be found in any romance or play, prior to the production of The Tempest a more remarkable

> identification with scripture than that contained in this play, and which no other writer but a Shakespeare could have so reverently, and so admirably, blended with St. Paul's shipwreck on the Island of Melita.[14]

Although I agree that there are indeed vivid reflections of Paul's shipwreck in the play, I also see further extension of the Biblical influence into the characterization and theme, as not only the ship's wrecking seems to be Biblical, but other references to the seas and the purpose of raising the storms reflect the Bible.

It is William Burgess who comes closest to acknowledging the full significance of the Biblical parallels given in *The Tempest*. He notes all of the above parallels as well as several others,[15] and rightly recognizes that "whatever may have been the original source of the poet's plot, it is certain that much of its thought and language were suggested to his mind by the Bible."[16] Although he does not discuss the importance of Biblical influence upon the theme and characterization, he has assuredly realized that the play is permeated with thought from the Holy Scriptures.

Despite the large number of studies that have dealt with *The Tempest*, there appears to be none, so far as my investigation shows, that adequately treats Biblical reflections in the water-imagery of this play. Because the water-imagery, as the dominant imagery of *The Tempest*, is certainly important in an interpretation of the play, a thorough understanding of Biblical water-imagery is therefore necessary. It is the purpose of this thesis to explicate Bible passages which best reveal all associations with its water-imagery, then to illustrate that much of the water-imagery of *The Tempest* derives from the Bible and that the associations of this Biblical water-imagery in *The Tempest* are

therefore significant in the interpretation of the play. The following chapters demonstrate this influence upon the water-imagery of the play; upon the characters related to the water-imagery--Caliban as paralleling the Biblical sea-monster leviathan, Prospero as God; upon the theme of the play--Christian repentance and forgiveness.

NOTES

[1] See Sharon L. Smith, "The commedia dell' arte and Problems Related to Source in The Tempest," Shakespeare and the Renaissance: The Emporia State Research Studies, XIII (September, 1964), 11-12.

[2] Also included among the works treated and dismissed by Miss Smith are the following: The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune (1589), Historie of Italie (Thomas), History of Travayle (Eden), Discoverie of Guiana (Raleigh), A Discovery of the Barmudas (Jourdain), and A True Declaration of the estate of the Colony of Virginia (Report of the Council of Virginia), pp. 12-15.

[3] Ibid., pp. 17-23.

[4] Honor Matthews, Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays. (London, 1962), p. 205.

[5] Ibid., pp. 181-182.

[6] Douglas Bush, Themes and Variations in English Poetry of the Renaissance: Time and Man (Claremont, California, 1957?), p. 31.

[7] Roland M. Frye, Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine (Princeton, New Jersey, 1963), p. 54.

[8] Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery, and What It Tells Us (New York, 1936), p. 304. John Henry deGroot, The Shakespeare's and "The Old Faith" (New York, 1946), who is interested in tracing possible expressions of Shakespeare's reflection of Roman Catholicism, calls attention to the prayer Prospero utters in the Epilogue (lines 13-20): "This prayer deserves special mention as seemingly to refer to the Catholic doctrine of Indulgences and as being a plea for prayers on Prospero's behalf after death" (p. 174). Continuing, he mentions another instance in which he thinks Shakespeare exhibits a knowledge of the Roman Catholic beliefs and practices: "In ways unnecessary to plot or the dramatic situation, Shakespeare sometimes seems to pay tribute to the intercessory powers of the Virgin Mary .... The counsel which Prospero gives Alonso in The Tempest [when Alonso is unconsolable in the belief that he has lost his son, Ferdinand] also reflects Roman Catholic awareness" (p. 175).

[9] Hamilton Coleman, Shakespeare and the Bible (New York, 1955).

[10] Coleman also notes parallels between the phrasing of Ariel's report about the people aboard the ship and the account of Paul's shipwreck in Acts (as discussed below), but he does not offer an explanation of its significance.

[11] Richmond Noble, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer (New York, 1935), p. 249.

[12] This parallel is also noticed by Thomas Carter and William Burgess, as well as deGroot, who sees the play's remark as coming from Luke 21:8. deGroot makes the parallel exist between the play and Luke rather than another passage because he found that the Bible used by the Catholics during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries gives the word "perish" in Luke, as do other translations, but it does not use "perish" in the accounts of Paul's shipwreck, although the Geneva version did.

[13] Thomas Carter, _Shakespeare: and Holy Scripture: With the Version He Used_ (London, 1905).

[14] James Rees, _Shakespeare and the Bible_ (Philadelphia, 1876), cited in Burgess, p. 55.

[15] William Burgess, _The Bible in Shakespeare_ (Chicago, 1903), mentions several additional parallels. The description of the "cloud-clapped towers" and the following comments given by Prospero recall I Peter 3:10, 11, Burgess asserts. Also in the portrayal of the airy spirit Ariel, Shakespeare drew from the Bible, Burgess maintains. He says, "To the poet's art, the passage of thought from Ariel, the city--an exhibition of divine justice, to Ariel, a spirit of the air, with a similar mission was simple and easy, while the entire conception of Shakespeare's Ariel is suggested in the twenty-ninth chapter from Isaiah (vs. 1, 2, 3, 6)" (pp. 55-56).

[16] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

CHAPTER II

BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY IN *THE TEMPEST*

The Tempest seems to reflect the Bible as a main source. Throughout the Bible there is a definite association of evil with large bodies of water. The Bible often depicts these bodies of water as being demonic, and this idea is apparently reflected in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Although many articles and books have been written about Shakespeare's knowledge and use of the Bible, no one, so far as my research shows, has yet discussed this play's reflection of Biblical water-imagery. Nevertheless, consideration of the close parallels of major *Tempest* characters with Biblical figures and of the moral and spiritual tendency of this play, supplemented with the knowledge of Shakespeare's pervasive use of the Bible in other plays, must cause one to realize the suggestions that *The Tempest's* sea-imagery, too, could reflect a Biblical background.

That the Elizabethan audiences would understand a Biblical orientation to the *Tempest* sea is clear. The typical citizen of England during the sixteenth century was familiar with such stories as Noah's flood, the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites, and other Biblical episodes involving such men as Jonah and Peter. He not only heard about these at church, he also remembered them from mystery plays, and he saw pictures of such stories in his Geneva Bible.[1] Certainly the associations of moral evil with the waters of the Bible was well

known by the Elizabethan, and it is likely that he would recognize similar presentations of water-imagery and associate them with Biblical treatment of sea waters rather than relate them, for example, to the less familiar Roman view of the sea. Because the Elizabethan knew the distinctions between the two, he could identify Biblical reflections as being connected with moral evil, in contrast to the purely raging or furious evil of the waters as seen in the other view. He knew that the Bible clearly shows the waters as being instrumental in bringing sinners to repentance or in meting just punishment to those who are impenitent, and this imagery is reflected in The Tempest. The Romans did not regard the seas in this manner, although they, too, feared the waters and described them as furious and boisterous. To them, the fate that awaited the men at sea was simply a matter of luck--good or bad. The sea was recognized as unstable, as luck is, and was considered to be something one challenged only when he could not avoid contact with it or when one avidly sought what awaited him across the seas. Such a man was so desirous of what could be gained, he dared risk any loss which might occur on the windy, shifting waters. Naturalistic views also show waters as fearful and raging. The waters are regarded as evil because their natural state is one turbulent and boisterous. Accordingly one can never be certain of safety when he is asea because the seas are never naturally calm, and troubles are a part of the seas. In neither the Roman or naturalistic attitude exists the element which distinguishes Biblical water-imagery and the imagery expressed throughout The Tempest: the sea as symbolic of the morally unstable quality of human nature and the appropriate judgment by action of the waters. The Elizabethan who read his Bible or heard sermons about Biblical

figures dealing with the action of waters in the Bible would indeed be familiar with this distinct feature of Biblical water-imagery and see the reflection of this in Shakespeare's works, notably here in The Tempest. Close parallels would be easily identified by Shakespeare's audiences.

Although critics have ignored Biblical associations with Tempest water-imagery, they have recognized that references to water and tempests pervade the play and have given much attention to this dominant imagery. The significance of the sea-tempest imagery constitutes the theme as John M. Murry[2] interprets the play. He sees the imagery of The Tempest as expressed in another of Shakespeare's plays, Pericles, wherein Thaisa questions, "Did you not name a tempest,/ A birth and death?" Murry does not relate the "birth" and "death" to Biblical conceptions; rather he distinguishes the tempest as responsible for the beginning and concluding of the play's action. He offers no explanation that indicates the possible Biblical connotations here. Another commentator on Shakespeare's imagery, Miss Caroline Spurgeon, also recognizes that the sea and the storm are important in the play, for she believes that "The dominant image is sound which comes from the background and scenery."[3] The elements which make up this "sound imagery" include sea roar, storm, wind, and thunder--all of which are merely specific parts of the natural surroundings of the play, its setting. These parts of her sound imagery are also important to the water-imagery discussed below; but there they are noted as paralleling the Biblical handling of them as part of its water-imagery.

Others more nearly grasp the significance of the tempests, the water-imagery of the play. Wolfgang Clemen and E. M. W. Tillyard agree

that the two tempests become "connected by a relation between guilt and redemption,"[4] thus acknowledging Prospero's intended effects of the storms, but without realizing the Biblical associations these storms bring out.

A much more thorough treatment of the importance of this sea-tempest imagery is given by George Wilson Knight. He, too, finds that the storm, the tempest, "is in part a means of redressing an old wrong,"[5] as do Clemen and Tillyard. Indeed, this purpose of the storm is clear from Ariel's comment to the men that the sea had "requit it" (the foul play done Prospero and Miranda), the deeds they had done. Recognizing the importance of the storm in Shakespeare's writing, Knight compares the use of thunder and lightning in Cymbeline and Macbeth to that in The Tempest. He says that in The Tempest

> We have the thunder of divine wrath, roused and conditioned by human sin .... Tempestuous evil is suggested by all [three plays]: which evil may be variously considered the responsibility of God, man or the devil. In each instance the tragedy-tempest association is implicit. Observe here [in The Tempest] the fine sea and air imagery; and the suggestion that one sea tragedy is to requite another. Finally we should note that human sin has incensed "the sea and shores" and "all the creatures" against man's peace.[6]

In addition to the tempest-imagery, Knight considers the sea as also an important image in the play. He mentions that much of the significance of this image is that Shakespeare uses the sea to suggest his own inner feelings. Relating this play to still another play, Knight discusses the sea in Timon as comparable to the sea and its function in The Tempest (in keeping with Knight's view that the plays of Shakespeare's "last phase" are very closely connected in thought and action). He says that in Timon "The utter darkness, the vast emptiness

and unending age he [Shakespeare] would suggest, are incarnated in a very lively symbol, the sea."[7] In Timon, as well as in The Tempest, his interpretation of the seas shows them as full of dangers and inevitable tragedy and as "love-opposing."[8] He sees that in all cases there is a great loss foreshadowed in the infinite deeps of the waters.[9]

I agree with Knight so far as he goes: the sea images are surely the dominant images of The Tempest. As Knight points out, the sea-imagery reflects much evil and tragedy: the seas are always tempestuous and dangerous. The name of the play even suggests such understanding, as "tempest" connotes raging winds, rough seas, and nature in opposition to peace. But this is merely an expression of naturalistic views of the waters. Knight does not seem to notice the Biblical source or background of the water-imagery of this play, since he fails to mention such parallels in his explanation of Shakespeare's imagery. He thereby misses the richer meaning of The Tempest.

A clear understanding of the imagery Shakespeare uses in this play must, then, come from knowledge of Biblical water-imagery. Certainly, the water-imagery of the Bible is made quite plain in many verses of both the Old and New Testaments. The quality of terror associated with the judging seas is repeated throughout the Bible. The shipwreck of Paul at Melita is surely a vivid expression of this association.[10] Waves are merciless and bitter; they lash to pieces that which is helpless against them. The tempest roars about wildly, and the ship is torn apart, but the men see in their fright that they have erred and their lives are spared, although they are forced to swim through the seas to be saved. The same violent forces are seen in the story of Jonah's experiences in a similar tempest (Jonah 1 and 2).[11] The rough

seas are sent to frighten the sailors because Jonah ran from God.[12] That the tempest is indeed considered to be something fearful and evil is given in the questions of the anxious crew: "Tell us, we pray thee, for whose cause this evil is upon us" (1:8). Destructive waves begin to tear up the ship before Jonah is put overboard to calm the seas, and the sailors act quickly in their panic; they want to appease the wrath of the seas which aim to punish the guilty.

Also showing the furious, punitive action of the water is the incident of the Red Sea's closing on the Egyptians (Exodus 14:9-21).[13] An additional incident, the Noahic flood, is given prominent notice in the Geneva Bible. This Bible included an illustration of this flood, and the horrors of it, explaining the necessity of it. Certainly the destructive judgment dealt by the powers of these waters and the reasons for their being used were made familiar to the Elizabethans through Bible readings and church lessons or sermons.

Thus, through analogy and often through metaphor, the Bible makes associations of moral evil with large bodies of water. Ezekiel writes that the troubles, difficulties, and misfortunes that prevailed against Tyrus were as "the sea which mounteth up with his waves" (26:3). The fact that "his" was sometimes the genitive of "it" and at other times personification helped fortify the demonic association of large bodies of water. The psalmist acknowledges that "floods of wickedness made me afraied" (18:4). Job writes that the rich man who regarded not the Lord's will, who took pleasure only in the treasures of this world, found that such could not afford him peace: "Terrors shal take him as waters, and a tempest shal carie him away by night" (27:20).

In addition to the above passages, verses from the Apocrypha and

the canon also reveal identification of this moral evil with water. The Wisdome of Salomon records that "the hope of the unthankeful shal melt as the winter yce, and flowe away as unprofitable waters" (16:29). Another passage in the Apocrypha makes the following association: "Suretieshippe [feeling too self-reliant, not dependent on God] hathe destroyed manie a riche man, & removed them as the waves of the sea .... a wicked man, transgressing the commandments of the Lord shal fall into suretieshippe" (Ecclesiasticus 29:20-21). Other evildoers, perverters of the truth, are also likened to the waves. As the wicked man, the unthankful man, is compared to the troubles of the seas, so are the men who corrupt the truth given in God's word. They are blown with the wind of many false doctrines, and they are like "ragying waves of the sea, foming out their own shame" (Jude 13). Such association shows that the waters are indeed characteristically evil--as they both hide and expose the "shame" of sin.

Further implications of the connection of wickedness and water are given in the gospel of Matthew. "When the uncleane spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh throughout drye places, seeking rest, and findeth none" [no place to rest] (12:43).[14] To feel at ease, in place, the "uncleane spirit," the wicked one, must then find a watery place to stay. The evil one's natural habitat would match his own nature--rebellious and false. And such would be his deserved place until he realized his erring ways and become clean.

In addition to the impersonal Biblical accounts which relate seas and evil as reason for one's being afraid of the waters, there are personal incidents which illustrate the apprehension felt toward tempestuous or angry seas. Certainly, the attitude with which many

Biblical characters view the seas reveals the fear, the terror of the waters, felt by persons at sea. Peter "sawe a mightie wind" on the sea and was afraid (Matthew 14:30). The waves made him realize that he could not be self-reliant; he needed the Almighty to direct his life. This same type of frightening, heart-felt terror is present in the water and seas in the records of the experiences of Jesus and his disciples in the seas of Galilee:

> There arese [sic] a greate tempest in the sea, so that the ship was covered with the waves .... Then his disciples came, and awoke hym, saying, Master save us: we perish (Matthew 8:24-26).[15]

The disciples feared the action of the seas; they were afraid that they would be lost in the seas, relying only on their ability to secure themselves. To them, the sea was a strong, evil force that could not be controlled, especially when storms raged on the waters.[16] Given the Hebraic attitude toward the sea, the fear of the disciples is of a different quality and of another source than that felt in the same circumstances by, for example, their Roman contemporaries.

When the disciples on the sea of Galilee were "tost with the waves" and became fearful, they were of "little faith," Jesus tells them; for their strength had been established on a weak, worldly basis. When the disciples could realize that they were not able to calm their own fears, they would at last understand that they needed to trust in something other than their own frail, faulty beliefs. Then, because the dangers of the waters caused them to scrutinize their beliefs, they knew hope was to be found only in God Almighty. It was then that the wind and the waves were caused to cease, for the men had recognized

their frailties and asked God to help them (Matthew 13:24-32).[17]

The businessmen in Psalm 107 who are concerned with worldly gain are carried with the waves of the tempest so that "their soule melteth for trouble. They are tossed to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and all their cunning is gone" (vs. 26-27). Only after "They crye unto the Lord in their trouble" (v. 28) do they reach "the haven, where they wolde be" (v. 30).[18] The implied analogy is apt: the waves rage; the men do not seek God, and are therefore evil. The calm comes only after they are honest with themselves and acknowledge their wrongs.

As disorder is connected with unbelief or wickedness, so calmness and serenity are associated with belief, for the Christian rejoices because the Lord "leadeth me by the stil waters" (Psalm 23:2), that is, a desirable place, as contrasting an undesirable, repulsive place with raging, judging seas.

Thus the seas represent that which is inharmonious to order; they reveal opposition to an ideal condition. Interpreted in this way, raging waves are often compared or associated with moral evil in the Bible. Isaiah 57 compares them, "But the wicked are like the raging sea, that cā not rest, whose waters cast up myre and dirt" [but when these people realize the "myre and dirt" of their natures, they repent of their sins] (v. 20). The evil rich man in Job 27 is said to have "terrors take hold on him as waters" (vs. 20-21). In another verse one reads that "He that wavereth, is like a wave of the sea, tost of the winde and caryed away" (James 1:6). As deviation from order is resented in man, so it is in nature. The man who "wavereth" and the waves are both imperfect, undesirable. Because one "wavereth" from the ways of good, he must be punished or seek the grace of God--but in his

impenitent state he is evil and rebellious.

Most revealing of the contrast between the evil, punishing seas, and the calm, peaceful seas are passages discussing the signs of the second coming of Christ. In the last days evil will prevail upon the earth, as presented in Luke 21; and one of these evil signs is that the "sea and water shal roar" (v. 25). They will continue to mete out the punishment the unjust deserve and to alert the sinners of the need for repentance. Such would be the state of a world completely inharmonious to an existence of perfect peace, as mentioned above, an ideal state. In contrast to this, John of Patmos discloses that in the new earth established by God during the millennium, there will be nothing that is not in perfect harmony with His will or anything that will cause men to fear. God's heaven will have no need of punishment or warning for sinners. The final judgment being over, all need for such would be gone (see Revelation 20). Consequently, in John's revelation, "there was no more sea" (Revelation 21:1).[19]

With a clear understanding of the Biblical water-imagery, one can see, through a study of the water-imagery of The Tempest, that Shakespeare was familiar with this Biblical association of moral evil with large bodies of water, as the parallels between the play and the Bible are numerous. Although the dramatic use of storms, tempests, and shipwrecks for their striking effect was not novel (that is, Shakespeare had many sources available to him concerning tempest adventures), the tempest and shipwreck of The Tempest seem to be especially reflective of certain Biblical accounts of storms and other troubles asea, rather than simply physical evils; and these parallels would have been noticeable to the audiences of the play during

Shakespeare's time.[20]

It should be apparent that the sea- and tempest-imagery are main images in The Tempest. There are numerous references and allusions by many of the characters to both the sea and the storm. The action of Prospero's removal from Milan is related as a "sea-sorrow" as he tells his daughter.[21] In terms of "sea-storm" Miranda talks of the tempest and thus draws the fury of the storm into the water-imagery. The character of Alonso, as mentioned above, is presented as undergoing a "sea-change" in Ariel's song (I, ii, 400); but this may perhaps apply to all the characters. That the men "were all sea-swallowed, though some cast again" adds to the idea that all are indeed affected by the sea and the imagery carried with the conceptions regarding it. Prospero acknowledges in one of his last speeches that the "green sea" has figured as one of the bounds of his control. It has been of much use in his gaining the effects of his carefully planned "roaring war" (V, i, 43-44).

That Ariel is to be like a "nymph of the sea" through much of the action of the play also enhances the idea that the images of the sea permeate the play so greatly that they must be taken into consideration as a major part, affecting the interpretation of the play and understanding of the theme.

Indeed, the attitude that the Tempest characters have toward the sea is significant in the play. In all cases, this view seems to be fearful, as expressed in Roman, and naturalistic, and the Biblical views. But there is a deeper meaning in the water-imagery of this play, as is shown by the vivid parallels between it and Biblical water-imagery. The opening scene shows how the tempest creates disorder aboard the

king's ship:

> Alonso: Good boatswain, have care. Where's the master? Play the men.
> Boatswain: I pray now, keep below.
> Antonio: Where is the master, bos'n?
> Boatswain: Do you not hear him? You mar our labour. Keep your cabins; you do assist the storm.
> Gonzalo: Nay, good, be patient.
> Boatswain: When the sea is! Hence! What cares these roarers for the name of king? To cabin! Silence! Trouble us not!
> Gonzalo: Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.
> Boatswain: None that I more love than myself ... (I, i, 10-20).

All aboard the ship seems to be confusion and self-interest during the storm, much as the Biblical accounts of Jonah, Paul, and others reflect.

Later the ideas about the sea pervade the action and dialogue again when Alonso notes: "The sea mocks/ Our frustrate search on land" (III, iii, 9). It is a mocking sea--one that cares not for rank or place. The sea defies the laws of order God established and has become a terrible force against the men. It mocks their futile efforts to devise a course of action, to continue on their way.

Ariel, when admonishing Antonio, Sebastian, and Alonso, again acknowledges a relationship of evil with the sea:

> you three
> From Milan did supplant good Prospero;
> Expos'd unto the sea ... (III, ii, 69-71).

The very nature of their deeds was evil: their action of usurping the dukedom, followed by their exposing Prospero and his child to the open seas, was a serious crime. Accordingly, the sea is sympathetic with evil.

As Ariel continues, he admits that these men are to be punished as they treated Prospero--the "powers" have "incens'd the seas and

shores, yea, all the creatures,/ Against your peace" (ll. 74-75). The men were to be punished or led to repentance by the seas which would mock the men until the purpose for which they were stirred up would be achieved. In this way the sea "hath requit it" [the foul play done Prospero] (l. 71).

In another reference to the sea, Ariel calls it the "never-surfeited sea" which "hath caus'd to belch up you" (III, iii, 55-56). According to his comment, the sea seems to be a quite powerful, awful, and terrible force. As long as evil exists, the seas' raging will continue--their judgment will be meted to those who deserve it.

That all men are powerless against the waters Ariel discloses as he implores Alonso, Sebastian, and others who draw on him in III, iii, that they "may as well; ... with bemock'd at stabs;/ Kill the still-closing waters ...." Because he is a spiritual being, Ariel cannot be hurt or even handled by mortal men. These men are surely "fools," as Ariel calls them, to think they could attack the spirit--and even less successful could they be at trying to control or compete with the seas.[22]

In speaking of the sea, Prospero relates to Miranda that they were put in a "rotten carcass of a butt, not rigg'd,/ Nor tackle, sail nor mast .../ To cry to th' sea, that roar'd to us ..." (I, ii, 146-149). There is found no comfort, rather unrest and terror in the sea, Prospero realized.

Miranda complains about the raging waters, referring to them as "wild waters." She shows that she is moved in sympathy with "those that I saw suffer" at the mercy of the furious sea. It is then that she would be rid of so unmerciless a thing as the sea, for she, perhaps

in reminiscence of John of Patmos, "would/ Have sunk the sea within the earth ..." (I, ii, 6, 10-11) before it could do any damage to property or allow lives to be threatened or lost. But the seas remain boisterous according to the will of Prospero, who intends that these men from Milan become penitent or be punished for their evil deeds.

Recognizing what it is that is taunting the party on the ship, Ferdinand remarks about the seas that "threaten" (V, i, 178). He seems to believe that there is some connection between the fate his father, Alonso, and his party (Ferdinand believes that all except himself have foundered in the sea) and their earlier actions against the true Duke of Milan, Prospero. The sea, then, symbolizes the evil of the usurping duke and of man in general.

Surely as in the Bible, The Tempest associates moral evil with the seas. The various episodes of the men asea that are recorded in the Bible seem to be presented in this play. The reactions of the ship's crew is not unlike that of Jonah's crew or Paul's crew, as mentioned above. When the ship begins to toss wildly in the waters, the sailors begin to shout wildly, too.

> Mariners: All lost! To prayers, to prayers! All lost!
>
> .... A confused noise within: Mercy on us!--We split, we split!--Farewell my wife and children!--Farewell, brother!--We split, we split! (I, i, 54, 63-65).

The mariners are truly afraid; they are thoroughly confused. They intend to give up the ship in terror exhibiting much the same reactions expressed by the crews aboard both Paul's and Jonah's ships. Miranda, too, believes that hope for saving the ship is vain, as she watches

from the shore. She, like the crew, grieves over "a brave vessel .../ Dash'd all to pieces" (I, ii, 6, 8), as was Paul's ship at Melita. Emphasizing the parallels between the Bible and The Tempest's action, no lives were lost from any of the ships, although the fear was great among the men that such would happen. The crew and Paul "came all safe to land" (Acts 27:44), surviving their ship's wreck, as did the members of the king's ship in The Tempest. Prospero's assurance to Miranda that

> there is no soul
> No, not so much perdition as an hair
> Betid any creature in the vessel (I, ii, 28-30).

and Ariel's report that "not a hair perish'd" (I, ii, 217) recall Acts 27:22, 34, "There shall be no losse of any man's life among you save the shippe onely .... For there shal not an heere fall frome the heade of anye of you," and Luke 21:18, "And there shal in no case one haire of your heade perish." The possibility that indeed the parallels between Acts 27:34 and Ariel's speech I, ii, 217 are to be considered intentional has been brought out in many studies--Coleman, Carter, Noble, and Burgess all make note of it.

Further parallels are found in Antonio's speech Act II, i, 251. "We all were sea-swallowed, though some cast again." It seems to be miraculous that not one of the men was drowned, that the sea allowed them to come out again. Very similar language is used in the Bible in relating Jonah's experience in the great fish. It was sent to "swallow up Jonah"; then later it "cast out Jonah upon the dry land" (Jonah 1:17; 2:10).

As Jonah's experience was accountable for his change of plans or

"change of heart," so it seems that the characters in The Tempest undergo a similar sea-change. Ariel's song (I, ii) introduces the idea that suffering is to work some transformation on the people. Truly Alonso suffers, believing his son and heir drowned, and he does change.

That the sea is somewhat connected with Alonso's change is mentioned in several studies of this play. Stephen Orgel says, "Alonso suffers a sea-change so he can be able to recognize that what he did was monstrous."[23] Theodore Spencer sees that all "three men of sin" change from the effects of the sea. They all "lose their human faculties for a time [under Prospero's direction] to emerge purified as rational beings."[24] The effects of all the island surroundings and the noise of the tempestuous seas both seem to add to the "charmed" state of mind these men are in. Elmer Edgar Stoll recognizes, too, that the island's noises and the seas' fury are significant in the alteration of the characters' lives: "Conscience awakens only when they suffer or when they are troubled by supernatural voices or visitations."[25]

These critics all point out an important part of the action, but none explains the change as being part of God's plans, as shown in the Bible. It should be noted that Alonso, in particular, reacts much the same as many penitent sinners mentioned in the Bible act. It seems that in his being forced into the sea he has undergone in effect a baptism which cleanses him. He becomes quite solemn after his immersion into the sea, and later he suffers mentally under the haunting thoughts of his son's being drowned. Then, when Prospero faces the men with an accusation of their guilt in usurping his dukedom, it is Alonso who most clearly acknowledges blame and pleads for Prospero's forgiveness. He announces to the right duke "Thy dukedom I resign"; he further begs

that Prospero "pardon me my wrongs . . ." (V, i, 118-119). His conscience is laden with the guilt he felt from an action done twelve years earlier; he feels impelled to beg forgiveness for the deed.

Because the change in the characters is effected by the seas, the island becomes a significant place, as surrounded by the judging, troublesome sea. It is a place on which the men are able to become aware of their guilt and truly express a "heart's sorrow" and later promise a "clean life ensuing." It is as the ship which is kept safe in Psalm 107: the businessmen realize their lack of tribute to God and raise their petitions to Him; it is as the ship of the disciples when they plead with Christ to save them when tossed by a tempest in the Sea of Galilee; it is a place which is surrounded by the sea whose threatening waves remind the men of their mortal--and sinful--natures.[26]

Only after everything is taken care of, after the reconciliations are made and forgiveness is given, does Prospero change the picture of the seas. He then announces: "I'll deliver all; and promise you calm seas, auspicious gales" (V, i, 314-315), much as Christ causes the boisterous waves to calm and the winds to cease when His disciples call upon Him to save them from their troubles. Because the purpose of the storm and tempest has been achieved, order can be restored to the seas.

It appears to be clear, then, that Biblical water-imagery pervades _The Tempest_. Shakespeare's use of this association of moral evil with large bodies of salt water reflects the Biblical relationship between men and sea: a relationship which ultimately works to alter the lives of those who attempt to free themselves of the evil of the waters, and realize their weak and sinful natures in failing to do so. This idea of water-imagery is used consistently throughout _The Tempest_.

This was not a new use of water-imagery by Shakespeare. In many of his earlier plays, he presents parallels of the water-imagery found in the Bible. Othello brings to mind Genesis 49:4 in commenting that Desdemona is as "false as water."[27] Proverbs 27:34 is suggested in the phrasing "fatal bowels of the deep" (Richard III, III, iv, 103). This same picture of the sea as associated with evil, as contrary to the order of nature, as raging and furious in its judgment is given time and again in Shakespeare. There are accounts of judgment by water implied in Richard II, particularly when Richard says, "Not all the water in the rough rude sea/ Can wash the balm off from an anointed king" (III, iii, 54-55). The "rough rude sea," i.e., the turbulent populace, can never remove the divine ordination of a true king.

The cleansing powers of such a body as the sea are shown to be powerful, though at times the seas are seemingly sympathetic with evil. Most often the waters are presented as having the effect of a type of baptism on the individual exposed to them. This idea is expressed in Much Ado when Leonato says about Hero that "the wide sea/ Hath drops too few to wash her clean again" (IV, i, 141-142). He has judged Hero according to his own standards, dismissing her as being so vile that she is incapable of purgation. Comparisons of evil to seas are also made in III Henry VI when Margaret asks: "What is Edward but a ruthless sea?" (V, iv, 25). In Twelfth Night, the Duke uses the phrase "as hungry as the sea" (II, iv, 103), implying that the sea is ever waiting to take the life of a person who ventures out on the waves, or waiting to mete out other punishment to those who defy God's will. Because so many persons are lost at sea, the fearful attitudes held for it increase. Reflections of this same water-imagery may be found in

Richard III, II, iii, 42-44:

> By a divine instinct men's minds mistrust
> Pursuing danger; as by proof we see
> The water swell before a boisterous storm.

Analogies linking danger and sea-storms help clarify Shakespeare's regard for water-imagery, as seen throughout his plays.[28]

Perhaps the best example of Shakespeare's paralleling Biblical water-imagery is given in Troilus and Cressida, II, iii, 129-130, with the comment Agamemnon makes about Achilles:

> ... yea, watch
> His pettish lunes, his ebbs, his flows, as if
> The passage and whole carriage of this action
> Rode on his tide ....

The haughty, over-proud Achilles was spoken of as a sea, as full of danger and evil.

Several other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers also present water-imagery which seems to be derived from Biblical water-imagery. Humfrey Gifford in "A Prayer" remarks:

> In stinking pools of filthy vice
> So deeply was I drown'd,
> That none there was but thee [God] alone,
> To set my foot on ground.[29]

The suggestion here that there is an association between waters and moral evil, "filthy vice," corresponds to Biblical water-imagery. Also, the attitude presented by Gifford--that only God can improve such situations wherein one is "drown'd" in evil--is distinctly Biblical.

Further parallels are found in John Donne's "A Hymn to Christ, at the Author's last going into Germany":

In what torn ship I embark
That ship shall be my emblem of the Ark;
What sea soever swallow me, that flood
Shall be to me an emblem of thy blood ....
When I have put our seas twixt them
[worldly desires and ties] and me,
Put then thy sea betwixt my sins and thee.[30]

Donne clearly presents the seas as issuing God's judgment or giving warning to the sinner.

In yet another passage one can see the influence of Biblical water-imagery. Thomas Heywood in "The Search for God" employs ideas similar to those used by Shakespeare, Gifford, and Donne as mentioned above. The verse states:

I asked the seas, and all the deeps below,
My God to know:
I asked the reptiles, and whatever is
In the abyss:
Even from the shrimp to the leviathan
My inquiry ran:
But in those deserts, which no line can sound
The God I sought was not to be found.[31]

The idea that the seas always rage shows the natural evil that exists in them, for as the Bible also shows, that which is against order and harmony is opposed to God's plans and therefore must be morally evil. It is clear from the many vivid parallels between Biblical and *Tempest*-treatment of seas and tempests presented above that Shakespeare used Biblical ideas in expressing his water-imagery in *The Tempest*, as he had done with less emphasis in many of his earlier plays. Indeed this water-imagery, since it permeates *The Tempest*, must be regarded as significant in any interpretation given the characters and the theme of the play; and one must also recognize the Biblical influence upon them.

NOTES

[1] One feature of the Geneva Bible that was popular with its readers was the number of illustrations included in the text. Of this number, many were of bodies of waters and creatures therein; also the great flood, the Israelites' crossing of the Red Sea, and such incidents were pictured.

[2] John Middleton Murry, Shakespeare (London, 1948). Agreeing with Murry on the importance of the water-imagery is Clemen: "The 'sea-storm' lingering in our memory, together with the recollections of wind, storm, and conflicting elements ... constitutes one of the main streams of imagery, which from the second scene onwards, follow through the play" (Wolfgang H. Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery [London, 1931], p. 183).

[3] Spurgeon, p. 300.

[4] Clemen, pp. 183-184; E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's Last Plays (London, 1938); also seeing such reflection in the tempest is John Erskine Hankins, Shakespeare's Derived Imagery (Lawrence, Kansas, 1953), pp. 78-79, wherein he considers the storm to be likened to affection against reason or soul.

[5] George Wilson Knight, The Shakespearean Tempest (3rd ed., London, 1953), p. 248.

[6] Ibid., p. 256. As Knight finds parallels between the storms of The Tempest and those in Cymbeline and Macbeth, Donald A. Stauffer, Shakespeare's World of Images (New York, 1949), pp. 304 ff., and Stephen K. Orgel, "New Ways of Adversity: Tragic Experience in The Tempest," In Defense of Reading, ed. Reuben Brower and Richard Poirier (New York, 1962), consider it to be much like the storm in Lear. Orgel says that in both plays "an image of disordered nature which served King Lear as an image for the chaos of his state and of his mind" (p. 112), is found in the tempests.

[7] Knight, The Christian Renaissance (New York, 1962), p. 179. The view that this play is autobiographical is held by many, and will be discussed further below.

[8] Knight, The Shakespearean Tempest, p. 253.

[9] Miss Honor Matthews, contrasts sharply with Knight here. With some rays of hope, Miss Matthews sees the "water [that is] so often the image of estrangement and calamity, is also the bringer of life to the wintery land of the aged 'Fisher King,'" (p. 193). Because the water brought Marina to the shores, the water is not to be considered a symbol of evil, but of hope, joy, according to Miss Matthews.

[10] Acts 27:14-44, Geneva Version. All subsequent Biblical quotations will be from this translation; and book names, chapter and

verse numbers will be given parenthetically in the text. Obsolete letters have been modernized, but the spelling is that of the Geneva translators.

[11] Descriptions of the tempest are given in the following passages: "There was a mightie tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken .... The men rowed to bring it to the land, but thei colde not; for the sea wroght, and was troublous against them" (Jonah 1:4, 13).

[12] Jonah 1:2-3 explains the prophet's fleeing. The Lord had said to him "Arise, go to Ninevah, that great city and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me. But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord ...." It is clear that Jonah attempted here to avoid doing God's will.

[13] An account of the incident is given in the following verses: "Then Moses stretched forthe his hand upon the Sea, and the Sea returned to his force early in the morning, & the Egyptians fled against it: but the Lord overthrewe the Egyptiās in the middes of the Sea. So the water returned & covered ye charets and the hors-men, even all the hoste of Pharaoh that came into the Sea after thē: there remained not one of them" (Exodus 14:27-28). The Geneva Bible gave added emphasis to this incident by including an illustration of this scene. A caption calls attention to the chief points to be considered in the event. An identical picture is printed on the title page of the 1560 edition, so the Elizabethan readers were most surely familiar with this incident.

[14] Italics used here are mine.

[15] This is also given in Mark 4:37-41.

[16] The Litany of the Church of England also reflects this fear of tempests as one of the petitions is "From lightning and tempest, preserve us, Dear Lord." It is the desire of all Christians to be Christlike, without sin. Thus they also desire help from the Lord to be saved from the judgment of the waters.

[17] This is from the account of Jesus' walking on the water, an incident which is given also in Mark 6:48-51 and in John 6:18-21.

[18] That indeed God has the strength to control the seas and all things is discussed at greater length below.

[19] Other passages revealing associations of water and moral evil include the following ones: "And I, beholde, I wil bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroye all flesh, wherein is ye breath of life under the heaven: all that is in the earth shal perish" (Genesis 6:17). The evil upon the earth was so great that it was destroyed by the waters; they served final judgment when purgation did not appear to be acceptable to the evil people. That nothing watery or like water can succeed is implied in Jacob's words to Reuben: "Thou wast light

as water: thou shalt not be excellent ..." (Genesis 49:4). When Jesus cast some devils out of two persons, he caused the devils to go into a herd of swine "and beholde, the whole herd of swine was caryed wyth violence from a stiepe down place in the sea, and dyed in the water" (Matthew 8:32; also found in Mark 5:13). Again, it is "The myrie places [those wicked and reprobate] ... [that] shal be made salt pittes" (Ezekiel 47:11). It seems here that the salty water is associated only with undesirable things. Continuing in this same image, David complains of his evil times; he writes: "one depe calleth another depe by ỹ noise of thy water-spoutes: all thy waves and floods are gone over me" (Psalm 42:7). A marginal note given in the Geneva Bible explains the passage as "afflictions came so thicke upon me, that I felt my self as overwhelmed." Indeed the sea is a dread place, and a bad punishment would be drowning, as it would indicate that the person had done an evil act, and chose not to repent, even though the waters threatened him. With this in mind, Jesus warns that those who "offende one of these little ones which beleve in me, it were better from him, that a mylstone were hanged about his necke, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea" (Matthew 18:6; also given in Mark 9:42).

[20] As mentioned earlier, through emphasized reading in the newly available English translations of the Bible, the Elizabethans gained personal knowledge of Biblical stories and characters. Such study was enhanced by the many illustrations in these early translations and repeated in sermons they heard at church. Studies of the audiences Shakespeare had reveal the following information about what they could be expected to understand: Edwin Goadby, The England of Shakespeare (London, n.d.) observes that the common people of sixteenth-century England were generally densely ignorant of many subjects because few books were available to them. What they did learn was taught to them through the church, Goadby points out (p. 116). A. L. Rowse, William Shakespeare (London, 1963), p. 41, too, credits the church with educating the general Elizabethan population, "from regular attendance at its services from earliest childhood, catechizing, teaching, sermons, singing the psalms, saying the prayers." He further emphasizes: "The Bible provided the foundation and bed of popular culture; everybody had to go to church. Quotations, allusions, sentences, phrases, tags, sometimes turned round to make jokes, would be almost as familiar to the audience as to the author: they came out of the same bed. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance, then, of this grounding in childhood; for the adult writer the Bible and Prayer Book formed the deepest, most constant and continuing influence and inspirations" (p. 47). He repeats that "of all Shakespeare's 'sources' the Bible and the Prayer Book come first and are the most constant" (p. 41). Agreeing that the Bible was indeed important to the writers of the day, as well as to Shakespeare, F. E. Halliday, Shakespeare In His Age (London, 1956) offers the following generalization about the versions used. "The Bible most commonly read and studied at home was the Genevan versions--although the Bishop's Bible and Great Bible were used at church" (pp. 31-32). It seems probable then that Elizabethans were familiar with Genevan wording of and emphasis on certain Biblical incidents.

[21] The Tempest, ed. George Lyman Kittredge (Boston, 1939), I, ii, 170. All further quotations from this play will be from this edition; and act, scene, and line numbers will be given parenthetically in the text.

[22] Even in Stephano's drunken song, the fear of the sea is shown. He declares that he "shall no more to sea, to sea." He had had enough of the evil that the sea bestows and decided that he would not defy the hungry sea any longer. Though he boasts later to Caliban and Trinculo that "the sea cannot drown" him because he has superior swimming ability, one is inclined to believe that he falsifies the truth then. He truly has no more power over the sea than any other of the king's men who were also saved from death asea.

[23] Orgel, pp. 119-120.

[24] Theodore Spencer, Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (New York, 1942), p. 196.

[25] Elmer Edgar Stoll, Shakespeare Studies (New York, 1942), pp. 353-354.

[26] Miss Matthews says, "In The Tempest the island is a poet's dream, neither more nor less" (p. 193). Murry says, "The Island is a realm where God is Good, where true Reason rules; it is what would be true Humanity--the best in man controlled the life of man. And Prospero is a man in whom the best in man has won the victory! Not without a struggle, of which we witness the reverberation as presented by Ariel V, i, 19-32" (p. 395). He continues: "... the Island is a realm where by Art or Nurture Prospero transforms man's nature to direct human Nature" (p. 396).

[27] Othello: Complete Works of William Shakespeare, ed. George Lyman Kittredge (Chicago, 1958), V, ii, 134. All references to Shakespeare's other plays, excluding The Tempest, are taken from this edition; and act, scene, and line numbers will be given parenthetically in the text.

[28] The tempest-imagery is also found in other of Shakespeare's plays. Stauffer and Orgel, as mentioned above, consider that the storms in Lear and in The Tempest are similar in the imagery reflected upon the characters. Knight above was presented as identifying the storm of The Tempest with those in Cymbeline and Macbeth. Geoffrey Bush, Shakespeare and the Natural Condition (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1956) notices that in Othello the reaction of the winds and waters is somewhat like that in The Tempest, especially when the waves change their mortal natures, i.e., they calm to allow the "divine Desdemona" to go safely by. Bush notices that Cassio believes that "a sense of her beauty alters even the forces of the storm" (p. 59). There are additional accounts of Shakespeare's use of water-imagery in many of his other plays: in Two Gentlemen of Verona we are told of "raging seas" (I, ii, 122) and of "wild wat'ry seas" in Comedy of Errors (II, i, 21). Antonio

speaks of the "rude sea's enraged and foamy mouth" (Twelfth Night; V, i, 81). In other plays are references to "terrible seas" (Cymbeline, III, i, 26); "dangerous seas" (II Henry IV, I, i, 181); and "breaking seas" (Richard II, III, ii, 3).

[29] Humfrey Gifford, "A Prayer," The Oxford Book of Christian Verse, ed. Lord Cecil David (Oxford, 1940), pp. 57-58.

[30] John Donne, "A Hymn to Christ," Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[31] Thomas Heywood, "The Search for God," Ibid., p. 127. Other authors who seem to parallel Biblical water-imagery in their works include William Drummond and Thomas Campion.

CHAPTER III

CALIBAN AS LEVIATHAN IN BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY

Not only in references to the sea does Shakespeare reflect Biblical water-imagery, but also in characterization he shows this Biblical influence, notably in the figure of Caliban.

As one of the key figures in the play, and as perhaps the most unusual character in any of Shakespeare's plays, Caliban has received much attention. He has been interpreted as a symbol of the depression Shakespeare experienced, as a symbol of the animal nature of all men, and as an "elemental being," earth. I also believe that Caliban's significance can best be considered allegorical; but I see him as part of the water-imagery of the play, projecting Biblical influence.

That the unusual figure, Caliban, is an original character with Shakespeare is generally accepted. Nicholas Rowe acknowledged: "Shakespeare not only found out a new Character in Caliban, but also devis'd and adapted a new manner of Language for that Character."[1] Levin L. Shücking, too agrees, as he expresses the position of most critics in saying, "Caliban evidently belongs to the part of the action for which Shakespeare is more personally responsible."[2]

Thus it is not the source from which the character may have been borrowed; rather it is the nature of this figure that is the concern of many critics. Beginning with Frederick Schlegel,[3] who early

identified Caliban with the element earth, many view this character as elemental, contrasting with the airy spirit, Ariel. William Hazlitt, too, regards Caliban as a character related to the earth:

> The character grows out of the soil where it is rooted uncontrolled, uncouth and wild, uncramped by any of the meanness of custom. It is of the earth, earthy--but not vulgar. It is a character naturally coarse.[4]

Hazlitt thus sees the elemental figure of Caliban as earthy, but not at all undesirable or evil. He seems to view the character romantically, as something a part of nature. He does not probe into the personality shown in the role of Caliban to see the basis of the creature's actions and ideas, in which lies the evil which can be seen as paralleling Biblical monsters.

Edward Dowden understands the nature of Caliban similarly. He sees in him a coarseness but also detects a finer nature that could explain the beautiful description of the island's sounds that he gives. Dowden thus discerns

> the duller elements of earth and water in his composition, and no portions of the higher elements, air and fire, though he receives dim intimations of a higher world--a musical humming or a twangling of a vision experienced in sleep.[5]

Again, the natural view of Caliban is presented. This earthy figure is not to be thought of as evil; rather his good points--mentioned here as being sensitive to the delicate scenes on the island--are emphasized.

Contrasting the optimistic views of these men, Miss Matthews finds that Caliban is an evil character. He is sensual, misshapen, and wicked, although he is still called "earthy" by Miss Matthews.

> The part of man's nature externalized in Caliban is an essential of life within the limitations of the human condition .... But Caliban is not only earthbound and a symbol of man's bodily faculties; he is also wicked. His gloating over Prospero's murder is truly repulsive and befitting a thing most brutish.[6]

Miss Matthews observes the unusual character somewhat as Dowden and Hazlitt did. However, with the idea that there exists within the creature a brute nature, Miss Matthews is allied to those critics who see Caliban as animal-like, or bestial; those who interpret Caliban as being a savage-human, a half-beast, half-man, the lowest form of human life or animal life.

Such view is also held by Schücking, who points out that "He [Caliban] betrays his sub-human nature when he incites another person to bite his enemy to death ...."[7] Yet it is Knight who most thoroughly presents arguments for this animal interpretation of the slave. He regards Caliban as the "perfect personification of the beast-image of the play."[8] He further explains:

> Throughout Shakespeare the tempest-beasts are to be clearly related to Shakespeare's symbolism as a whole. Animals often suggest the inhuman and bestial qualities in man by association or contrast .... All Shakespeare's intuition of the untamed beast in man is here crystalized in the person of Caliban. Now sea monsters are especially abhorrent in Shakespeare, clearly partaking of the tragic violence of the sea and fierce animals. And it is suggested that Caliban is in some sense, a sea monster.[9]

Thus the picture of an animal-man is given--an evil, fierce type of being. And Caliban is that, but even more to Knight. He becomes a symbol for all "brainless revolution" that is associated with mob mentality. Knight sees definitely a condensation of Shakespeare's concern with animal aspects of man in the character Caliban: "Man,

savage, ape, water-beast, dragon, semi-devil--Caliban is all of them."[10] Knight, then, does stress the significance of the animal nature seen in the "deformed slave."

Assuredly, Knight sees Caliban as a key figure in the play. He treats Caliban as related to the brute nature of beasts, even with monstrous water beasts. He thus pictures the character as part of the water-imagery and the tempest-imagery. Yet he never touches on the Biblical reflections in Caliban's relationship to that water-imagery. Likewise Colin Still acknowledges Caliban's part in the play's water-imagery, and also the rebellious nature of the slave, in likening him to "the Tempter, who is Desire." He further adds "... The Tempter ['s] ... typical form which he assumes in myth and legend is that of a monstrous Serpent or Dragon, as in the myths of Cadmus, of Perseus, and of St. George. This creature is native to water, whence he emerges to assail his victim .... Caliban, like the mythical Dragon, is explicitly a monster and implicitly amphibious; for, although he lives upon the Island, he has the appearance of a fish."[11] In likening Caliban to the Dragons of mythology, Still treats him as the sea-monster he is, but the significance of Caliban's glaring similarities to the leviathan of the Bible is not discussed.

In most of the literature concerning the nature of Caliban, then, his lowly status is emphasized--whether elemental or animal-like.[12] He is seen as having certain characteristics which place him below the level of human beings. He is as brutal and evil as a savage man; he is as unfeeling and loathsome as a semi-devil. However, it should be noted that his association with the water-imagery of the play must be considered in viewing his character and actions. Shakespeare's

water-imagery here has been discussed above as being derived from Biblical water-imagery. Another point of influence seems to be found in the Shakespearean treatment of sea creatures' association with the evil of the Biblical seas. Caliban is a modification of the best known of the Biblical sea monsters, leviathan.

Although leviathan is given a rather inconsistent description in the Bible passages picturing him, his image as commonly thought of by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century people seems to have been that of a water creature. Yet a definite description of such a creature was confused during that time, since the possibility of this figure's being a land animal was also considered. Carl Schmitt comments specifically on the many different contemporary ideas of leviathan:

> Auf die verschiedenen Meinungen und Kontroversen der alttestamentlichen Theologen und Historiker braucht hier nicht eingegangen zu werden, da sie für den politischen Mythos, an den Hobbes anknupft, nicht unmittelbar von bedeutung sind. Wichtig ist hier nur, daß trotz mancher Unklarheiten und Verwirrung der Leviathan in den eigentlich mythenkraftigen Vorstellungen immer als ein großes Wassertier, als Krokodil, Walfisch, oder allgemein als ein großer Fisch, der Behemoth aber als Landtier, z.B. als großer Stier order Elefant erscheint.[13]

This mixture of images called forth by the name leviathan is reflected in the Bible verses concerning the creature. Miss Lulu Wiley observes that the word "leviathan" is Hebrew and was left untranslated in the English Bible text four of the five times that it is mentioned there;[14] she points to the only translation offered by the English Bible, a mistranslation, that is found in Job 3:8. Here the term is given as meaning "mourning."[15] Miss Wiley continues to give her own translation of the term, listing meanings as "'a wreathed animal,' a 'twisted

animal (gathering itself into folds),' 'one spirally wound,' and 'the whale.'" She says the word could also be used as "a general term for all cetacean, serpentine and saurian aquatic monsters in no restricted sense."[16] The mentioning of a meaning of leviathan as wreathed, twisted, spiral suggests the serpent connection considered in the Bible, but that is merely one of the three major pictures the term "leviathan" may have suggested. It also was linked with dragons and whales; and all four were only vaguely distinguished.

To be sure, that leviathan may have been regarded as a dragon and/or serpent should be considered. The Bible passages which mention dragons often include leviathan's name. Miss Wiley further points out:

> There are thirty-five references in the Bible to dragons; some references to the purely fabulous variety .... This symbolical kind is translated from the Hebrew word _tannin_ (a long animal), meaning any great monster of land or sea, usually a serpent or reptile. This is apparently synonymous with leviathan and means a creature with feet.[17]

Certainly, the figure of the dragon does embody many ideas, but most of them usually typify the power of evil. Even in the East such connections were part of the dragon picture, as Henry Tristram makes clear:

> The dragon, a huge reptile, with enormous jaws and short legs ... was held to symbolize the union of gigantic power with subtility and malignity, and an enmity against the human race. The idea probably was founded on the tradition of the agency of the Serpent in compassing the fall of men.[18]

This close association of the dragon and serpent involved, then, the interchanging of terms--they were regarded as synonymous--with leviathan yet a third synonymous term. All three were thought of as loathsome,

evil creatures, antagonists of God Almighty.

Furthermore, as the dragon is often called Satan in the Bible,[19] so leviathan is more clearly associated with evil. The parallel between leviathan and the dragon is even more greatly enhanced since both are regarded as the king of sinners: Job 41:20[20] calls leviathan "king of all the children of pride," and the serpent or dragon that tempted Eve is "named 'Devil' and 'Satan' and is the first embodiment of sin, the father of lies, the agent in the temptation."[21]

Such a picture of the evil dragon would agree with the picture of an evil leviathan. It is this point Schmitt brings out: leviathan was indeed regarded as the same type of being as the dragons or serpents.

> Leviathan wird aber auch allgemein mit "Drache" übersetzt und geht dann in die Bedeutung von Schlange oder Drache über, die beide meistens gleichbedeutend sind. "Es ist wohl möglich," sagt Wolf Baudissen, "daß ürsprünglich der Mythos zwischen den vier Drachenbezeichnungen: Schlange, Livjathan, Rahab, Tannin unterschieden hat, die alttestamentlichen Schriftsteller aber zeigen kein Bewußtsein der Verschiedenheit."[22]

According to Schmitt and Baudissen, then, it is likely that leviathan may have been thought of as a dragon or serpent, and certainly his character did have more than one animal association concerned with its identification.

A third picture related to an understanding of leviathan is shown in still other Bible passages. These verses give a picture of perhaps an amphibious animal, or aquatic one. Job 40 and 41 reflect such a description of this creature called leviathan, as does Psalm 104. That this picture of leviathan was popular is also noted by

Schmitt. In tracing the early ideas of leviathan to the concept of the animal that Hobbes employs and into the more general pictures of the beast shown since then, he recognized that Biblical descriptions of leviathan had much to do with the shaping of public opinions concerning the aquatic nature of it.[23]

Many modern commentators have understood that the description of leviathan given in Job 40 and 41 is befitting a creature much like a crocodile.[24] However, as far as my research shows, leviathan was considered to be a huge sea-creature by Shakespeare and his contemporaries except Beza, not at all a figure similar to a crocodile or alligator. Notes on the word "leviathan" in Job are given in the Bibles of the period I checked as "whale," "whirlepoole"[25] or "great and monstrous fish."[26] Richmond Noble also noticed this, as he defines leviathan in the following way: "A monster in the water identified in the Genevan and Bishops' [Bibles] as the whale .... in all cases contemporary Bibles treated the creature as a whale."[27] It should be remembered, however, that whales were not then conceived precisely as they are now.

Surely, it does seem likely that the Elizabethans could have regarded leviathan as a type of whale, for their pictures of whales differ greatly from modern conceptions of the animal. Edward Topsell discusses the whale as the "biggest and most monstrous Creature in the Indish Ocean ... [which] comes into our seas also."[28] In his description of the sea-creature, Topsell pictures it as "a mightie masse and lumpe of flesh without all fashion, armed with most terrible, sharpe and cutting teeth."[29] An illustration accompanying his chapter on whales shows these creatures as ferocious animals with long,

sharp-looking teeth protruding from the lower jaw to above the upper lip. The pictures also reveal paws on the front of the whales' bodies, just below the widest part of their chests. Indeed in illustrations in the Geneva editions I used there were pictures of sea creatures of all types, most with sharp teeth, some horned, others with forepaws--and these were labeled whales.

Relationship between leviathan figures and whales seems probable, as terms used for these two animals were indicated as synonymous. Robin acknowledges that the whale was popular as a literary figure and leviathan may have been a term denoting "whale." He discusses that just as the mythical creatures serpent and dragon lent evil associations to the picture of leviathan, so did the real creature the whale indicate connections with things considered evil and loathsome.

> In the Exeter Book there is an Old English poem, "The Whale,"[30] which gives two legends about that animal, and like the Bestiaries appends a religious application. One is the story of sailors landing and lighting a fire on a floating whale and being drowned when the monster dived. The implications were that "so plays the Fiend with the souls of men."[31]

A similar incident is presented in Milton's Paradise Lost, Book I, in a simile describing Satan. This use of the same scene can only prove that leviathan and whales were regarded as identical evil beings. Milton likens the devil to:

> that sea-beast
> Leviathan, which God of all his works
> Created hugest that swim th' Ocean Stream;
> Him haply slumbering on the Norway foam,
> The pilot of some small night-founder'd skiff
> Deeming some island, oft, as seaman tell,
> With fixed anchor in his scaly rind
> Moors by his side under the lee, while night

> Invests the sea and wished morn delays:
> So stretched out huge in length the Arch-Fiend lay ....

Milton clearly sees leviathan as a creature of the seas, and as the hugest of all them. His description of leviathan thus parallels that of the picture of the whale except for the "scaly rind." It should also be noted that, by comparing the devil and leviathan, Milton associates moral evil with these sea-beasts. He relies on the reader's making this association. P. Ansel Robin, in commenting on Milton's passage, adds this observation:

> Milton, by applying to the whale the name Leviathan, identifies it with the monster described in the Book of Job as did the translators of the Authorized Version, who added in the margin, "that is, a whale or a whirlpool."[32]

Showing further associations between leviathan and the whale, Stopford Brooke paraphrases the picture of the huge sea-beast as it is found discussed in the second legend of "The Whale":[33]

> When he is hungry, this Ocean-Ward opens his wide lips, and so winesome an odour pours forth that the other fishes stream into his mouth until it is filled; then quick together crash the grim gums around his prey. So, too, it is with men and the accursed one. When life is over, he claps his fierce jaws, the gates of hell, behind them.[34]

Although what comes from the mouth of the whale differs from what is expelled from leviathan's, [35] both count as chief means of snaring their victims the huge mouth-traps they have. These gaping jaws of the whale became a symbol of hell's gates during the Middle Ages, as seen in some stage accessories for the miracle plays.[36] Thus evil is as closely associated with the whale as it is with the dangerous

leviathan discussed in Job 40 and 41.

One sees, then, that there were three chief concepts of the creature leviathan: it was associated with the dragon, the serpent, and the whale. Indeed, its description was quite confusing; but contemporary reflections of the physical appearance tend to show it as a water-creature, regardless of any other characteristics which may have been attributed to it.

Edmund Spenser describes terrible sea-monsters in his Faerie Queene, creatures which deepen the horrors of his "perilous seas," but he mentions leviathan by name in Visions of World's Vanities. In giving his description of the animal, Spenser elaborates on the creature's size and awful appearance:

> Toward the sea turning my troubled eye,
> I saw the fish (if fish I may it cleepe)
> That makes the sea before his face to flye,
> And with his flaggie finnes doth seem to sweepe
> The fomie waves out of the dreadfull deep,
> The huge Leviathan, Dame Natures wonder,
> Making his sport, that manie makes to weep.[37]

Leviathan is certainly seen here as a terrible animal, an evil one. Spenser draws a picture of the beast much similar to that which other writers of the period reflect, as they, too, see the evil, fearful characteristics of the animal.[38]

From such early pictures of sea-creatures, it appears likely that leviathan, as greatly paralleling them, was thought of as one of the huge water-animals. Shakespeare assuredly regarded the animal as some type of sea-creature. The editors of Shakespeare's England note: "The huge monster of the sea, called leviathan, in ancient Hebrew poetry is a favourite theme for metaphor and simile, and it would have been

surprising if Shakespeare had given us no instance of it."[39] Schmitt also comments on Shakespeare's ideas concerning leviathan. He says:

> In Shakespeare's Dramen wird der Leviathan einige Male zitiert, aber immer nur sachlich, als ein mächtiges, ungeheuer starkes oder schnelles Seeungeheuer, ohne eine ins Politisch-Mythische weisende Symbolik.[40]

There are three direct references to leviathan, the sea-monster, in Shakespeare's plays. In *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Proteus talks of Orpheus' golden touch of the lute which could "make tigers tame and huge leviathans/ Forsake unsounded deeps to dance on sands" (III, ii, 80-81). The picture here reveals not only the marine nature and the large figure of the creature, but the great power of the fearful beast is implied in that it would be futile for a mortal man to attempt to bid the creature do anything other than it wanted to do.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Oberon orders Puck to do his bidding, and to be "here again/ Ere the leviathan can swim a league" (II, i, 173-174). Again the figure's appearance is one of a sea-creature, one whose large size and speed in swimming are emphasized.

About the source of the leviathan references that Shakespeare gives in his plays, Noble observes the following:

> Since the leviathan of Job 41:1 [KJV] appears to be a river monster, [one might tend to assume] Shakespeare's allusions would be most appropriate to Psalm 104:26, where it [leviathan] is definitely associated with the sea, but as in all cases contemporary Bibles treated the creature as a whale, this may be discounted.[41]

Noble rightly recognizes that Shakespeare regards the leviathan as a sea-creature, as this is clear from the above examples of the uses Shakespeare makes of the term. Even in the third instance of his using

the term leviathan, Shakespeare parallels Job 40 and 41, and does not in any way indicate that the creature in mind is not the same type of sea-creature as mentioned in other passages. Shakespeare, in the passage below, uses the term "leviathan" to picture a creature again, in this case clearly paralleling a Biblical reference to the animal.

The passage in which Shakespeare most clearly shows this interpretation of the leviathan of the Bible is given in Henry V where the King says:

> We may as bootless spend our vain command
> Upon th' enraged soldiers in their spoil
> As send precepts to the Leviathan
> To come ashore (III, iii, 24-27).

The hopelessness of having the men come to order in the midst of their victory looting is compared to man's inability to control the huge leviathan or make him come ashore from the sea, as this passage parallels Job 40:20[42] which asks, "Canst thou draw out leviathan ...." It becomes clear, then, that in regarding leviathan as a sea-creature, Shakespeare must have seen him as related to the water-imagery of the Bible.

Thus the Biblical treatment of leviathan needs to be carefully reviewed. It is to be understood that the Bible does discuss creatures such as leviathan with some connection to the seas. One of the clearest associations between the two is given in Psalm 104, which reads as follows:

> So is this sea great and wide [full of God's wonders]: for therein are things creeping innumerable, bothe smale beastes and great. There ... [is] that liviathan, whome thou [God] hast made to play therein.[43]
> All these wait upon thee ... (vs. 25-27).

Leviathan is a creature of the seas, a creature who is playful and regarded as a plaything to God. By this very nature, leviathan and other creatures of the sea must be subject to the supreme power of God, as "all these wait upon" Him. They are in the service of God, and He can command or control them with His power. God has power over them: He can "draw out liviathan with an hooke" (Job 40:20). He can cause leviathan to "make manie prayers" or "speake faire" to Him (v. 22).[44] He can "take him as a servant for ever"[45] or "play with him as with a bird" (v. 24).

As evil is associated with the action of the seas, so evil is associated with leviathan. God says that leviathan is "king over all the children of pride" (Job 41:23). As pride was regarded as being one of the chief sins, leviathan would thus be assimilated to Satan. This identification is given by several writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Lydgate's Chronicles mention "the Vile Serpent, Leviathan," and Barnabe Barnes, who wrote spiritual sonnets in the latter part of the sixteenth century, also calls leviathan Satan: "Breake thou the jawes of Olde Levyathan, Victorious Conqueror!" he asks of the Almighty.[46] Schmitt, too, notices that there were many who associated the sea-beast leviathan with the devil:

> So erklärt es sich, daß der Leviathan als Schlange oder Drache zu einem Schreckbild gefährlicher Kraft und schließlich zum bösen Feind schlechthin wird. Er kann sowohl die Macht des Teufels in ihren verschiedenen Erscheinungsformen, wie auch den Satan selbst bedeuten. Dadurch kommt er, ebenso wie der mehr "chthonische" Behemoth, in die Nähe der apokalyptischen Tiere, die in der Offenbarung Johannes erscheinen: der Drache, die Schlange, das "Tier aus dem Abrund", das "Tier aus der Erde" und das "Tier aus dem Meere."[47] Auch die Mythen des Kampfes gegen den Drachen und alle Sagen und Legenden

> von den Drachentötern, wie Siegfried, Sankt Michael und Sankt George, konnen auf den Leviathan bezogen werden.[48]

Noble gives additional comment on the early association of leviathan and the devil, drawing upon the Book of Homilies of the Church of England, which may have in some way made such identification broader. Noble comments on the nature of rebellion in the devil:

> There was also the Homily on Rebellion, which identified Lucifer with Revelations 9:1.[49] "The first author of which rebellion .... was Lucifer; first God's most excellent creature, and most bounden subject; who, by rebelling against the majesty of God, of the brightest and most glorious Angel, is become the blackest and most foul fiend and devil; and from the height of heaven is fallen into the pit and bottom of hell."[50]

Here Noble emphasizes the views of Lucifer who is the "foul fiend and devil" and Leviathan, who is indeed evil and devilish when he makes the mighty afraid, when he considers others' sorrows as his joy, as brought out in Job 41. Both Lucifer and leviathan are rebels and both regarded as fallen.

That Shakespeare was familiar with the ideas presented in the Church Homilies and that these are reflected in his writing is shown by Hart. He finds that the Homily on Rebellion is pertinent to _The Tempest_, as well as the ones on evil and the devil's actions. Hart points out further important statements from the Homily on Rebellion:

> Where most Rebellions and Rebels be, there is the express similitude of Hell, and the Rebels themselves are the very figures of fiends and devils, and their Captain the ungracious pattern of Lucifer, and Satan, the prince of darkness; of whose Rebellion as they be followers, so shall they be of his damnation in hell undoubtedly partakers.[51]

And thus Lucifer and leviathan are more closely linked by their common evil natures. Both are considered the "king of sinners," or the "first embodiment of sin" and become synonymous. The willful seeking of trouble that is found in the devil is also to be found in leviathan. Accordingly, God's condemnation of this creature is clear.

In Ezekiel, God commands the prophet to

> take up a lamentacion for Pharaoh king of Egypt, and say unto him, Thou art like ... a dragon [whale, leviathan] in the sea; thou cast out thy fete and stampest in their [the Israelites'] rivers (32:2).[52]

Pharaoh was an evil king who had wronged God's chosen people. The Israelites had come to depend upon the strong Egyptian influences but were exploited in return. For the Egyptian mistreatment of the Israelites, God promised punishment and scattering of the Egyptians.[53] In describing how evil their king was, the metaphor likening him to the dragon in the seas--leviathan--certainly implies the wickedness of this sea-creature as well as of Pharaoh.

The diabolical nature of the creature of the seas is again stated in Ezekiel: "Beholde, I come against thee, Pharaoh, King of Egypt, ye great dragō [leviathan--see Isaiah 27:1] that lieth in the middes of his rivers ..." (29:3).[54] As the embodiment of good, God opposes all evil; He is intolerant of the forces working against Him. Again, likening Pharaoh to the dragon associates the sea-creature with evil. Thus one understands why when

> the Lord cometh out of his place, to visite the iniquitie of the inhabitāts of the earth upon them .... the Lord with his sore & great and mightie sworde shal punish livithan,[55] that piercing serpent, even livithan, that

> croked serpent, & he shal slay the dragon that is in the sea (Isaiah 26:21-27:1).[56]

Only the evil will be punished; so leviathan must be evil. As part of the water-imagery given in the Bible, then, leviathan does indeed reflect associations with evil.[57] He himself appears to have a thoroughly evil nature.

As characterized in The Tempest, Caliban appears to be related to the sea, and could then be likened to the pictures of leviathan as a sea-creature. Descriptions of Caliban are not whole; the partial ones given in the play add up to a quite confused picture. The problem of describing Caliban has been the concern of many critics, but two are notable here. Schücking describes him in the following way:

> The name is derived from a metathesis of Cannibal, but he is really a monster of the sea. His eyes lie deep in his head, he has long claws, is apparently covered with white scales all over his body, has arms like fins, and he exhales a penetrating odour of fish.[58]

Schücking, then, sees Caliban as somewhat like the pictures of the whale as the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century people saw it. The scales, the arm (paw-like in Topsell's illustration), and the characteristic odor discussed in the legends found in the poem "The Whale"--all these were recognized in Elizabethan concepts of whales.

A study by Miss Audrey Yoder seems to be the most thorough investigation into the possible appearance of the character Caliban. She considers all textual names given Caliban and descriptions of him, as well as the actions the character is able to do, in drawing a picture of the "slave and deformed salvage."[59] In attempting to clarify a picture of Caliban, she also considers the props used during

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to find any hints to the slave's stage appearance. Miss Yoder concludes "that Caliban may have been made up more as a wild fish-like man than a dog-like fish is possible ... however ... almost any spectacular garb desired was available in the constume wardrobes of Shakespeare's day."[60] Miss Yoder's study thus suggests it is only through the play itself that one can draw a valid picture of Caliban, since availability of stage props made possible any figure desired by a play's author.

Certainly it seems that the most striking picture of Caliban given in The Tempest is that of a fish, or a water-beast, and one must rely on Shakespeare's presentation of the character, as mentioned above, to obtain the clearest understanding of the slave's appearance. He is shown to have a great similarity to a fish or other sea-creature when he is described by the other characters of the play, and it is such information that supports an interpretation of Caliban as being related to the water-imagery of the play. Indeed, he has the characteristic smell of the sea. Trinculo immediately observes:

> ... What have we here? A man or a fish? dead or alive? A fish: he smells like a fish; a very ancient and fish-like smell; a kind of, not of the newest poor-John. A strange fish! ... Legg'd like a man! and his fins like arms! .. (II, ii, 23-31).

Thus the first parallel between Caliban and leviathan shows that they both are related to the sea: leviathan lives in the sea; Caliban lives near the sea and has characteristics of a sea-creature. But, as Trinculo finally perceives, "this is no fish, but an islander, that hath lately suffered by a thunderbolt" (ll. 32-34). This creature is not exclusively a fish; he is half-fish, half-man.[61] Certainly it is

clear that Caliban can not parallel leviathan in all respects. One notes that so far as one can discern from the play Caliban's size does not match that given in traditional pictures of leviathan or references to leviathan in Shakespeare. Nevertheless any identification that explains most of Caliban's characteristics is the one to be received. It may be hazarded that no explanation of Caliban would explain all characteristics of the figure: physical, mental, and moral. The identifications already in the field, as I have already pointed out, explain fewer of his total characteristics than does the leviathan interpretation. Indeed size is the only traditional characteristic of leviathan in opposition to the view advanced in this paper. One notes that in other plays, Shakespeare employed similar character construction. The witches in Macbeth are compounded of such diverse elements as to delude identification with the Norns or the Fates or with the witches of English or Scottish tradition, and the ghost of Hamlet's father is not clearly from a Roman Catholic purgatory or from a pagan prototype of the same. One gathers that Shakespeare, in presenting characters of extra-human nature, does not desire a complete identification that would permanently remove the mystery.

Indeed Caliban's identification with leviation is to be regarded as a symbolical one. He is not an actual leviathan but a symbol of the Biblical leviathan; and a symbolical interpretation applies primarily to qualities of personality--temperamentally the leviathan and Caliban are identical. As such the leviathan-Caliban is an appropriate counterpart to Prospero who is not a complete representation of Jehovah, but in intelligence and moral aspects epitomizes God, particularly the God of the Old Testament, as discussed in Chapter IV.

Thus, Caliban cannot then be thought to parallel leviathan in appearance in all respects, although Alonso, when first seeing the unusual character, calls him unqualifyingly "a plain fish" (V, i, 266). Certainly, as somewhat fishy, Caliban might appear to be scaly,[62] and indeed Job 41:6 (KJV, 41:15) identifies leviathan as having scales, as also the dragon in Ezekiel 29:4 (leviathan as in Isaiah 27:1?) is described as having scales.

Yet it is more generally as a sea-creature that Caliban is referred to. He is finned like a fish; he smells like a fish; he is often referred to as a fish; but a general interpretation would certainly have to consider that he is neither completely fishlike nor human. He can only be regarded symbolically as a fishlike sea-creature, which symbolism is suggested by the partial reality of the marine character. When Ariel invisibly taunts Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban, Caliban mistakes his voice for that of Trinculo, and accuses him of being cowardly; Trinculo defends himself, "Thou debosh'd fish .... Wilt thou tell a monstrous lie, being but half a fish and half a monster?" (III, ii, 31-32). Thus Caliban is pictured as only partly a fish or a fishlike sea-creature; he is also to represent a servant, a human. I believe that it is through his actions and his personality that Caliban most closely resembles a certain creature of the seas, leviathan.

That Caliban has a hostile personality is learned early in the play as Prospero says to Miranda, "We'll visit Caliban, my slave, who never/ Yields us kind answer" (I, ii, 308-309). As leviathan "troubles the waters" so the tendency is apparent in the unfriendly attitude of the servant-monster Caliban.

Often in the play, Caliban is associated with or called by the

names of devils. Especially since he was born of the witch Sycorax and the devil, his evil nature is known. Prospero acknowledges: "Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself/ Upon thy wicked dam ..." (I, ii, 319-320). Also he calls to his unusual servant, Caliban "... this mis-shapen knave,/ His mother was a witch ... This demi-devil-- For he's a bastard one--had plotted with them [Stephano and Trinculo] to take my life ..." (V, i, 268-274). He thus shows the rebellious nature, the evil character, of his slave by revealing the desire within the sea-creature to kill his master.[63] Prospero rightly calls him "this thing of darkness" (l. 275). Such association with evil makes parallels with leviathan become clearer. Prospero gives an elaborate description of his slave's personality in the following passage:

> A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
> Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains
> Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost;
> And as with age his body uglier grows,
> So his mind cankers (IV, i, 188-192).

Although effort had been made to change Caliban, he failed to respond, to profit from the suggestions given him by Prospero, as Pharaoh--likened to a whale or dragon (leviathan?) in Ezekiel--had failed to change. Despite the warnings God sent to him, this Pharaoh continued to be "a staff of reed to the house of Israel" (Ezekiel 29:6 and II Kings 18:21). Such hostility appears to come naturally to the sea-creature Caliban. These instinctive reactions can be seen when Caliban implores Stephano to bite Trinculo to death (III, ii, 39). Even in this action Caliban seems to be paralleling the action of the sea-creature in Amos 9: "Thogh thei [evil ones] be hid from my sight in the bottome of the sea, thence wil I commande the serpent, and he

shal byte them" (v. 3). Just as the sea-serpent or sea-creature here has a natural tendency to bite, and leviathan is described as having teeth "terrible round about" in Job 41, then Caliban seems to be in keeping with the creatures of the sea, for he, too, draws attention to the sharp and dangerous teeth of the sea-beasts. This too recalls a picture of the whale as the Elizabethans saw it: a notable feature in one illustration in Topsell's book is the long and sharp teeth protruding from the jaw of the animal labeled as a whale. Water beasts and water creatures abound in fearful features and actions it seems, but they were regarded as necessary parts to God's universal life plan, according to contemporary thoughts.[64] As being a part of a large-scale plan these creatures are, then, subordinated to the power controlling all things.

Surely, it is shown throughout the play that Prospero has power over Caliban and can order him to do what he bids. Caliban does not like Prospero; he desires to oppose him, but most obey him through fear. The first appearance of Caliban shows him cursing Prospero, yet fearing him. He wishes evil to befall Prospero, but he knows that the old duke's power is stronger than his from his mother or even her gods. "I must obey. His art is of such power/ It would control my dam's god, Setebos" (I, ii, 372-373). Because Caliban is controlled by Prospero, he becomes somewhat a plaything to him, as leviathan is in Job a plaything to God.[65] This relationship is abhorred by Caliban, but he cannot have it otherwise. Nevertheless, he expresses his sentiments as he curses Prospero and plots against him:

> All the inflictions that the sun sucks up,
> From bags, fens, flats, on Prospero fall and make him

> By inch-meal a disease! His spirits hear me
> And yet I needs must curse. But they'll nor pinch,
> Fright me with urchin-shows; pitch me i' th' mire,
> Nor lead me, like a firebrand, in the dark
> Out of my way, unless he bid 'em; but
> For every trifle are they set upon me,
> Sometime like apes that mow and chatter at me
> And after bite me, then like hedgehogs which
> Lie tumbling in my barefoot way and mount
> Their pricks at my footfall: sometime am I
> All wound with adders who with cloven tongues
> Do hiss me into madness (II, ii, 1-14).

The natural opposition between good and evil could produce no other relationship between Prospero and Caliban, between the Master and leviathan. They repel each other; the evil fights the good. So, Caliban dislikes Prospero; he hates his powerless relationship to him, and begins to plot against his master when he finds Stephano and Trinculo interested in the possibility of overthrowing Prospero for the rule of his domain and for winning Miranda in marriage. Caliban wants them to do something he cannot do:

> I say, by sorcery he got this isle;
> From me he got it. If thy greatness will
> Revenge it on him,--for I know thou dar'st,
> But this thing dare not,--" (III, ii, 60-63).

As Job 41 shows, leviathan is controlled by God, who can have him "make many supplications" or "speak soft words" or as Psalm 104 points out, "wait on Him." This type of obedience Caliban must show to Prospero; he _must_ do the service his master orders of him.

Thus Caliban dares not attempt to rebel actively against his stern master, but he does want someone to be successful in hurting Prospero. As leviathan "troubledst the waters" Caliban sets out to trouble his master, to work toward evil ends. He eggs on Stephano and

Trinculo with devil-like propositions. He promises them rewards for the murder of Prospero: "Do that good mischief which may make this island/ Thine own for ever ... (IV, i, 217-18). But Caliban is giving them double-talk. When Stephano and Trinculo want to loot Prospero's cell first (before killing Prospero), Caliban argues against it. He wants them to do his will--he merely wants to be rid of his master and hoped to tempt Stephano and Trinculo into doing the job for him by promising them rewards for it, in true devil-like form.

Other instances which reflect Caliban's savage and evil nature include his insistence that Stephano and Trinculo use brutal methods to kill Prospero. He urges that they knock a nail into his head;[66] he also suggests that regardless of the method they use, they should be certain to make him suffer. Caliban does indeed wish he could be free of his master, if not by open rebellion, then by disposal of Prospero.

Nevertheless, it is Prospero who prevails in the end, as God prevails over the frightening creature leviathan. Caliban, having experienced the wrath of his master, sees that his erring ways profit him nothing. That Prospero has won over him, Caliban at last realizes, so he submits himself again, saying that he will be "wise hereafter/ And seek for grace" (V, i, 294-295). As the ferocious leviathan is subdued and ultimately controlled by his Master, so Caliban is again in the service of his master.

NOTES

[1] Nicholas Rowe, "Account of the Life, etc., of Mr. William Shakespeare" (fr. Introduction to his edition of Shakespeare's plays, 1709), Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, ed. D. Nichol Smith (New York, 1962), p. 14.

[2] Levin L. Schücking, Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays, tr. Peter smith (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1959), p. 240. Murry also remarks that although Caliban is a general representative of the natives, he is "Shakespeare's own imagination of the savage, he is the primitive man" (p. 399).

[3] Frederick Schlegel, Lectures on the History of Literature, tr. Henry G. Bohn (London, 1896).

[4] William Hazlitt, Characters of Shakespeare's Plays (London, 1955), p. 91.

[5] Edward Dowden, Shakespeare: His Mind and Art (New York, 1918), p. 373.

[6] Matthews, pp. 203-204. Clemen also gives a similar comment on this matter. He remarks that Caliban is Shakespeare's "main agent in connection of the world of plants and animals; he has an earthy atmosphere" (p. 187).

[7] Schücking, p. 254.

[8] Knight, Shakespearean Tempest, p. 260.

[9] Ibid., p. 258.

[10] Knight, The Crown of Life (2nd ed., London, 1948), pp. 211-212.

[11] Colin Still, Shakespeare's Mystery Play (London, 1921), pp. 170-171.

[12] The following allegorical interpretations involve a scale of beings and Caliban is the lowest in each. Mrs. Kemble sees Caliban as the lowest form of human in the Great Chain of Being; not unlike this idea is one presented by Daniel Wilson, Caliban, The Missing Link (London, 1873), who regards Caliban as the "missing link" an acceptance that the figure is literally half-animal, half-man. Dowden's interpretation gave Caliban the status of the "groundlings," the low populace who viewed Shakespeare's plays and who needed to be elevated in status in order that they might appreciate the fine art presented to them. Schücking reports that Thümmel saw Caliban as raw matter unrefined, and that Kreyssig saw the character as representative of the vulgar masses--the lowest, most wayward of all the populace.

Other interpretations include those by the following critics who are concerned with the moral improvement of Caliban. Spencer says, "The animal level is presented half-symbolically through Caliban"; he is clearly sub-human in nature, then, as this critic sees him (p. 196). Caliban is thought to be such a lowly, animal-type being that he is incapable of purgation, according to Spencer. Stauffer says further along this same vein: "Caliban is Prospero's 'Thing of darkness.' He is subhuman and therefore incapable of reformation" (pp. 304-305). Leo Kirschbaum, Character and Characterization in Shakespeare (Detroit, 1962), pp. 34-35, writes that "Caliban is punished physically to be made to mind. He is, however, so base as to be below improvement of thought beyond the level he reached."

Audrey Yoder, Animal Analogy in Shakespear's Character Portrayal (New York, 1947), acknowledges in her study that "Caliban has been called a barbarian, the lower nature of man, the 'missing link,' [as noted above by Wilson] a monster similar to a Brazilian monster born of a human woman and a daemon, a colony, and so on. It is easy to find significance for Caliban as a symbol" (p. 91). Colin Still, Shakespeare's Mystery Play (London, 1921), maintains that in "Caliban we have a personification on mythological lines of the Tempter who is Desire .... The Tempter's typical form which he assumes in myth and legend is that of a monstrous Serpent or Dragon, as in the myths of Cadmus, of Perseus, and of St. George. This creature is native to water, whence he emerges to assail his victim" (p. 170).

[13] Carl Schmitt, Der Leviathan in der Staatslehre des Thomas Hobbes: Sinn und Fehlschlag eines politischen Symbols (Hamburg, 1938), p. 11.

[14] Lulu Rumsey Wiley, Bible Animals: Mammals of the Bible (New York, 1957), p. 313. The English Bible texts she lists as having checked include only the King James Version.

[15] The verse reads in the Geneva Version as follows: "Let them that curse the day, (beig *ready to renue their mourning) curse it." *The note reads: "which cursse the day of their birth, let them lay that cursse upon this night." Miss Wiley interprets this passage in the following way: "In his distress of mind and agony of suffering, Job cursed the day of his birth and wished it had perished out of the calendar of the other days and months. He called upon those magicians, who were accustomed to curse the day, to curse his night, and called for hired mourners to bewail the night, that there should be no mirth. Magicians claimed to make, by means of charms or curses, day and night a time of darkness and evil omen." One sees that much has been read into the verse by Wiley. Such matter would not clearly have been considered or understood by the Elizabethan reader of the Geneva Version passage and its explanatory note.

Miss Wiley then continues to discuss the meaning of the term "mourning," that word which is given as "leviathan" in all other verses in which it appears. "Commentators generally have agreed that the term mourning, or a leviathan (an animal) Job 3:8, was used figuratively and probably meant some fabulous creature, like the dragon, which was

popularly supposed to cause eclipses and darkness by enfolding and swallowing up the sun and moon. The belief grew or was promoted by conjurers and enchanters that they alone were able to invoke the monster to cause eclipses and bring upon the day and night a host of evil--'who were skillful enough to raise up even the crocodile [modern interpretation of Job 41 leviathan] from his water home,'" (p. 314), with secondary citation from Tristram.

16 Ibid., p. 313.

17 Ibid., pp. 196-197.

18 Henry Tristram, The Natural History of the Bible, 1868; cited in Wiley, p. 196.

19 Note that the Epistle to the Geneva Bible reads as follows: "and thogh Satan lay all his power and craft together to hurt and hinder the Lordes building: yet be you assured that God wil fight from heaven against this great dragon, the ancient serpent, which is called the devil and Satan," and Revelation 20:2, Geneva Version, which reads: "and he [the Lord] toke the dragon, that olde serpent, which is the devil and Satan and he bounde him a thousand yeres."

20 Note that the KJV chapter division of Job 39, 40, and 41 differs from the Geneva Bible division of these chapters. Job 40:1-5 in the KJV are numbered 39:31-35 in the Geneva Bible. Job 40:6-24 in the KJV are 40:1-19 in the Geneva Bible. Job 41:1-14, KJV are 40:20-33, Geneva Bible. Job 41:15-34, KJV are 41:1-20, Geneva Bible. The numbering I use throughout is that of the Geneva Version.

21 Wiley, p. 197.

22 Schmitt, p. 12.

23 Ibid., pp. 12-14, 41-42.

24 Most of the modern commentators identify leviathan as the crocodile in Job 40-41, and all passages referring to Egypt or Pharaoh also are interpreted as having leviathan as a crocodile. I could not find any sixteenth- or seventeenth-century expressions in accord with the definition of the creature as a crocodile. Such interpretation does not, in any way, seem to have strong foundations in these early views, but seems to have been adopted in more recent study of the term.

25 Edmund Spenser associates the terms "whirlpool" and whale; and as they are in apposition, it would appear that they were indeed thought of as synonymous. In The Faerie Queene, he speaks of "sea-shouldring whales, Great whirlepooles, which all fishes make to flee." That "whirlepoole" was an accepted name for whales during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is discussed at length by P. Ansell Robin, Animal Lore in English Literature (2nd ed., London, 1936): "Whirlepoole was used then as the name of a spouting whale. Holland uses the term in

his translation of Pliny (IV, 4 and 8): He speaks of the 'whales and whirlepoole called Balaenae,' and a 'mighty fish called Physeter, i.e., a whirelpoole.' Matteux in translating Rabelais (IV, 33) wrote: "'About sunset, coming near the wild Island, Pantagruel spied afar off a huge monstrous Physeter--a sort of whale, which some call a whirlpool'" (pp. 119-120). Another note made by Robin gives the following information: "Physeter is a Greek word literally meaning 'blower.'"

[26] The Bibles I checked include the KJV, the Geneva Version (the 1560, 1576, and 1580 editions), and the Great Bible.

[27] Noble, Glossary, s.v. Leviathan.

[28] Edward Topsell, Historie of Serpents (1608), ed. M. St. Clare Byrne, The Elizabethan Zoo: A Book of Beasts Both Fabulous and Authenic (London, 1926), p. 39.

[29] Ibid.

[30] The connection of animals with religious truths was common during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and indeed handed down from earlier centuries. The Old English poem "The Whale" was based on some unknown version of the Physiologus, which is a collection of a group of some fifty Christian allegories, the majority of which gave a description of some member of the animal kingdom as an emblem of some ethical or religious truth, as discussed more fully by Robin, pp. 7-8. Stopford Brooke, English Literature (New York, 1908), p. 203, adds to this information, asserting that in such works as the early poem, the whale is the image of the devil. Rudolf Wittkower, "Marvels of the East," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, V (1943), 159-197, discusses the religious importance of animals, not only in Christian doctrine, but also in Eastern religions. His study presents much information about the Middle Ages' attitudes toward monsters and monstrous animals: "It is not surprising that the idea of looking at the monsters as 'moral prodigies' was evolved in the Later Middle Ages when the allegorical aspect and interpretations of the world, as conceived by M. Capella and other late antique authors, was extended into a comprehensive system. This is the time which saw moralizations of the Bible and of Ovid's Metamorphoses, of the gods of antiquity, of history and science. This is also the time in which preachers used for their sermons the stories of the Gesta Romanorum, that late medieval collection of moralized fables and tales which had an unrivalled success down to the sixteenth century. In such a collection the marvels could not of course be omitted. The one hundred-seventy-fifth tale 'de mirabilibus mundi' contains a full account of them. The people with the long lower lip appear here as symbols of justice, those with the long ears listen to the word of God, the cynocaphali are the preachers who ought to be coarsely clad just like the dog-headed people, and the headless monsters are the symbol of humility, and so on" (pp. 177-178).

[31] Robin, p. 124. The moral exhibits the religious edification to be derived from the legend.

[32] Ibid., p. 125.

[33] Robin adds that "Both these legends of the whale appear in a treatise attributed to St. Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch (fl. 327) and that of the whale's sweet breath luring fish to destruction occurs in a Medieval bestiary" (p. 125).

[34] Brooke, pp. 205-206.

[35] The breath of the whale is described as being "winsome," so sweet that it lures its prey into the trap of its mouth. In contrast, leviathan's mouth breathes fire, which frightens his victims, or makes them immoble in some way that he can overpower them.

[36] H. N. MacCracken, F. E. Pierce, and W. H. Durham, An Introduction to Shakespeare (New York, 1910), discuss this as the dragon's mouth, p. 26.

[37] Edmund Spenser, Poetical Works, ed. J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt (London, 1963), p. 521.

[38] The OED gives other instances of the term "leviathan" being used with this meaning. In Eden's Decades I: "To the Reader," he remarks that God provided that "the greate Serpente of the Sea, Leviathan, would have such dominion in the Ocean." The relationship between leviathan and the evil qualities of Satan is clarified in the following passage: "This fende was the first pat felle for his pride .... P lyvyatan is cold," Destr. Troy. Lydgate's Chronicles: Troy II, 17 also mentions leviathan as something wicked. In this work, the creature is called "the vile Serpent, Leviathan." Still another early concept of leviathan shows a relationship between him and the devil, the most evil of all figures. Bokenham Seyntys added this comment: "Man was first by the enveye deceyved of hys enmy, clepyd serpent, behemot or levyathan."

[39] Shakespeare's England, ed. C. T. Onions (Oxford, 1950), p. 491.

[40] Schmitt, p. 40.

[41] Noble, Glossary, s.v. Leviathan.

[42] This passage is KJV Job 41:1, as mentioned above; the following verse numbers will be given according to the Geneva Version, after the quotation, in parentheses.

[43] A variant rendering of this verse recognized in the Cross-Reference Bible gives: "Thou hast made to play with."

[44] A marginal note from the Geneva Version gives this explanation: Because he feareth lest thou [God] shuldeth take him."

[45] God can easily exert strength and justice at will against such forces. David acknowledges God's power in Psalm 74:13 and 14, which

are discussed below. Further, that man alone is helpless, indeed terrified by these creatures, is mentioned in Job 41:11: "When he [Leviathan] raiseth up himself, the mighty are afraid: by reason of breaking, they purify themselves." The fear such creature causes to arise in the people who view him is also emphasized in verses discussed below. It is revealed that they must change their hearts, become "purified" when they seek God's help in securing themselves from the evil being, leviathan. Certainly we must agree that "None is so fierce that dare stir him up"; so that the Lord is aware that as these people are mortally weak, not one "is able to stand before me," Job 40:29. But He further establishes that "whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine," and leviathan as merely one of His many creatures, is certainly under His loving care and strict control, v. 30.

[46] The Oxford Book of Christian Verse, ed. Lord David Cecil (Oxford, 1940), p. 60.

[47] Schmitt offers this note of explanation: "Die Verquickung des Leviathan mit apokalyptischen Figuren scheint erst spät einzutreten, and zwar auf dem Weg über die Gleichsetzung mit dem 'Teufel' in allgemeinen. Bei Wilhelm Neuß, die Apokalypse des hl. Johannes in der altspanischen und altchristlichen Bibel-Illustration, 1931, ist der Leviathan nicht besonderes gennant, obwohl einige der Bilder des 'Drachen' und des 'Tieres aus dem Meere' späterer Deutung als Bilder des Leviathan erscheinen könnten ..." (p. 12).

[48] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[49] This is not to be confused with the pre-Christian Lucifer that Miss Matthews ties Caliban to, pp. 181-182. This Lucifer and Satan of Christianity are thought of as synonymous.

[50] Noble, p. 100.

[51] Alfred Hart, Shakespeare and the Homilies (Melbourne, 1934), pp. 55-56.

[52] Miss Wiley notes that here the dragon represents an antagonist toward God, as was Pharaoh, p. 197.

[53] The Lord announces to Pharaoh that his kingdom will be destroyed "and it shall be no more the confidence of the house of Israel which bringeth their iniquity to rembrance ..." (Ezekiel 29:16).

[54] Miss Wiley regards the "Pharaoh" dragon here as the crocodile, p. 197; but as I mentioned above, no such interpretation could be found in any of the Elizabethan Bibles I consulted.

[55] Miss Wiley's explanation of the term "leviathan" is that it "is applicable to every great tenant of the waters: sea-serpents, crocodiles, any large sea monster." She says that the leviathan here, "'the piercing (rigid) serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent,'

seems to symbolize the enemy nation--Assyria. The creature may have been some land serpent, like the python or great rock snake, swift, rigid-nosed, with long, gliding body. The expression may refer to its habit of skulking noiselessly away to glide out of danger. Or its winding, curving motion may suggest a water-serpent, following the crooked course of the Euphrates river." But she maintains that in any case, "The dragon (the crocodile) is everywhere given as the reverenced emblem of Egypt; and the 'dragon ... in the sea,' symbolized the Egyptians" (pp. 314-315).

[56] Miss Wiley notes here that "the prophet [Isaiah] announced God's judgment upon certain nations, symbolized by the term 'leviathan,'" and as mentioned above; this would not have been a clearly understood interpretation that the Elizabethans would give. She also suggests that "sea" here should be understood as "river," but again, no such interpretation is implied in the Geneva Version or its notes.

[57] Also connected with this evil of the waters must be the whale. Job questions God when he finds that he is being plagued by many troubles: "Am I a sea or a whalefishe, that thou keepest me in warde?" (7:12). The Genevan gloss explains this passage to mean that Job asked "am not I a poore wretche? What nede thou then to lay so much pline on me?" Surely if Job believes that God must restrict and keep in check "whalefishe" then these must be rather dangerous or evil-natured creatures.

[58] Schücking, p. 253.

[59] Miss Yoder presents one of the most thorough studies on the appearance of the strange character Caliban. She dismisses as generally known the picture of Caliban as supernatural (referring to the fact that he is the offspring of a witch and a devil), but she does continue to point out the possible stage appearance, the physical picture of the unusual figure.

Miss Yoder begins: "Is it more likely that he [Caliban] was beast-like, bird-like, fish-like, or a combination of these? ... he was, when born, 'a freckled whelp.' Does this imply that he was like a dog, a bear, a lion, or some other animal?" (p. 91).

She further emphasizes that the phrasing Prospero uses, "a freckled whelp," is significant in interpreting Caliban, but she also considers other pictures that are given in the speeches of Trinculo and Stephano, who have many conversations with and about the "slave-monster." They regard Caliban as a shallow, weak, howling, drunken, but good-natured servant-monster, and they refer to him mainly as that or as a moon-calf. "Trinculo once calls him a 'puppy-headed monster,'" Miss Yoder points out, "which together with the 'whelp' of the earlier description makes us wonder whether Trinculo's description refers to his inconsiderable mental ability, his physiognomical characteristics, or to both. Likewise, it is difficult to know what to make of the dialogue that remarks about Caliban's set eyes,--and his tail.

"Is this to be considered merely as rather indelicate playing upon the word by Trinculo, or can it possibly mean that Caliban

possessed a tail? It is difficult, if not impossible, to say. Perhaps some support is offered to the possibility of a tail as Trinculo says, continuing that fish idea, although it must be borne in mind that Trinculo is by now quite intoxicated, and reproving Caliban, by calling him a 'deboshed fish.' Trinculo also demands: '. . . Wilt thou tell a monstrous lie, being but half a fish and half a monster?' When Stephano tells Trinculo to stop plaguing the poor, ignorant monster or he will turn his mercy out of doors and 'make a stock-fish of thee' the accent could be considered as being on the word 'thee'" (p. 92).

Continuing the elaborate description of the appearance of the character, Caliban, Miss Yoder mentions that the figure was definitely somewhat disproportioned, as he is often called "beast." Also "Caliban evidently has fingers; for Trinculo tells him, 'Monster, come, put some lime upon your fingers, and away with the rest.' Stephano then repeats the order, 'Monster, lay-to your fingers: help to bear this away where my hogshead of wine is, or I'll turn you out of my kingdom.' Probably the strongest argument for Caliban's fish-like nature is the comment of Antonio upon him . . . . 'Very like one of them/ Is a plain fish, and, no doubt, marketable.' Seemingly, few statements could be plainer than that one. If we go by the hints Shakespeare seems to drop about Caliban's stage appearance, Caliban had fins but fingers also, impressed a number of people with looking and smelling like a fish, even to the extent of one's calling him 'a plain fish' and another's mentioning his tail, though probably in jest" (p. 93).

[60] Ibid., p. 98.

[61] Other brief descriptions of Caliban point him out to be a creature of unusual features. Throughout the play he is called monsters of various types by Stephano and Trinculo. The second act closes with Trinculo calling him a "howling monster! a drunken monster!" (II, ii, 183-184) and Stephano calling him "O brave monster!" (l. 192).

Alonso's reactions to Caliban's appearance were that "This is a strange thing as e'er I look'd on" (V, i, 289). Antonio says: "[he] Is a plain fish" (l. 266). Derogatory names given to Caliban by Prospero might also be called to mind here. He calls his servant "the beast Caliban" (IV, i) and later in that scene, "A devil, a born devil, on whose nature/ Nurture can never stick . . ." (ll. 188-189). When Caliban once failed to respond to Prospero's calls, the Duke yelled to him: "Thou earth thou! Speak!" (I, ii, 314) and "Come, thou tortoise!" (l. 316). The choice of the word "tortoise" here is suggestive of three things: Caliban is slow; he is a lowly form of life--less than human; and he is related to the sea; i.e., a sea creature.

Miranda also gives hints about the appearance of the complex figure. She comments to Prospero that Caliban "'Tis a villain, Sir; I do not love to look on" (I, ii, 309-310).

[62] Schücking mentions these scales on Caliban, too. He gives a description of the figure as having white scales covering his body, p. 253.

[63] The "devil" descriptions are also given by Stephano in II, ii when he first sees Caliban and Trinculo under the cloak. He immediately begins questioning the unusual figure before him "Have we devils here?" Later in the same scene, Trinculo, having already seen Caliban and then hearing the voice of Stephano who he thought had drowned in the sea when the storm raged, becomes convinced that he is in the presence of unnatural bodies and cries out to himself "and these are devils." The unusual appearance of Caliban seems to be the basis of judgment as a devil by these two characters. Stephano, being convinced that awful powers were present when he heard the "four-legged monster" call him by name, declares: "This is a devil, and no monster. I will leave him; I have no long spoon" (II, ii, 102-103).

[64] The concepts behind the Great Chain of Being held that life ranged from the minutest form to the highest form, the Creator. The perfect condition meant that each form of life must exist or the chain would be broken--there was necessity for evil and for good creatures both. Those evil were the lowest form--the farthest from the top of the chain, perfection.

[65] Note that in both Job 40:24 and in Psalm 104:26 the word "play" is used in connection with God's relation to the sea-monster leviathan.

[66] Schücking, too, uses this point as proof of Caliban's sub-human nature, p. 254; and as mentioned above, this is one of the many clear Biblical parallels found in the play.

CHAPTER IV

PROSPERO AS THE LORD IN BIBLICAL WATER-IMAGERY

As illustrated in Chapters II and III, Biblical water-imagery presents all evil forces as being ultimately under the control of the Almighty, and such power is found in Prospero in The Tempest. In this play all action--of the characters, of the tempest, and the sea waters--is under Prospero's control.

Although many critics have recognized Prospero as a major character of The Tempest and a mighty figure in that play, none has established a definite parallel between the Duke and God as both are regulators of men and nature. The complex figure of Prospero has been subject to widely contrasting views,[1] but a majority of the critics discuss some connection between Shakespeare and Prospero, interpreting the play as a personal allegory.

Prospero is identified with Shakespeare for various reasons: Dowden believes that as "an harmonious and fully developed will" Prospero closely reflects the character temper of Shakespeare in all the last plays.[2] Lowell's allegorical interpretation, which presents a picture of Shakespeare's attempts to elevate the audience to appreciate the theater as art, argues that "in Prospero shall we not recognize the Artist himself [Shakespeare]" as that figure is engaged in attempts to improve mankind.[3] Thus the play becomes a presentation of Shakespeare's

personal feelings, with Prospero (the Artist--Shakespeare) attempting to endow Caliban (the audience?) with a certain culture that "never sticks."

Still another critic, Murry, agrees that Prospero is akin to his creator; and this view must be considered more nearly correct. "Prospero stands clean apart from all Shakespeare's characters .... He is 'in some sense' Shakespeare; as a character Shakespeare created, he must reflect something of Shakespeare."[4]

Continuing in the same vein of interpretation, Knight most thoroughly labors the identity of Shakespeare and Prospero. He says that Prospero controls the plot, "composing it before our eyes; but, since the plot is ... so inclusive an interpretation of Shakespeare's life-work, Prospero is controlling, not merely a Shakespearean play, but the Shakespearean world. He is thus automatically in the position of Shakespeare himself, and it is accordingly inevitable that he should often speak with Shakespeare's voice."[5] Knight adds later even more statements emphasizing the parallels between Shakespeare and the Duke. He says that Prospero "controls the comprehensive Shakespearean world, thus automatically reflecting the author, Shakespeare."[6] He further adds evidence from the play supporting his view: "Prospero, corresponding to the poet's controlling judgment, returns to Milan, uniting his daughter, his human faith, to his enemy's son; and Shakespeare's life-work, in Henry VIII, draws to its conclusion."[7]

Even with the parallels presented, Knight nevertheless qualifies his identification of Shakespeare with Prospero: "And yet, Prospero, one person in a play of many, cannot fully be equated with the author whose self-reflection is necessarily at the time of composition, the

whole play."[8] Indeed, Knight regards Prospero as a complex character; he is a "composite of many Shakespearean heroes, not in 'character,' since there is no one quite like him elsewhere, but rather in his fortunes and the part he plays."[9] In Knight's words, "Prospero is a kind of God, and yet Prospero is as surely man" and "He is a man-God."[10]

It is this man-God conception that is connected with the water-imagery of the play, but Knight did not develop or even suggest this point.[11] That Prospero indeed seems to reflect much of God's association with the water-imagery in the Bible has been suggested above. As discussed briefly in Chapter II, all action of Biblical seas is directed by God, primarily for judgment purposes. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter III, God ultimately controls the evil creatures of the seas as well. Prospero's corresponding functions in The Tempest have been discussed as being his using the sea-storms to bring the "three men of sin" to state of "heart's sorrows" and his obvious power over his slave Caliban. Before any absolute parallel can be drawn between God and Prospero, however, one must clearly understand the roles of each as relevant to water-imagery of the Bible and of The Tempest (as derivative of Biblical water-imagery) respectively.

The Bible clearly expresses the idea that all nature is subject to God's power, though the seas rage furiously and leviathan the huge sea-monster creates great disturbances. These demonic natures can be overcome and controlled by the Lord Almighty. A close study of the sea-imagery will reveal that indeed, God does employ these frightening elements to achieve His purposes--He intends certain results from their presence. That God is in control of the wild, raging waves and the creatures in the sea is mentioned many times in the Bible.

Psalm 65 tells about the power of God that "appeaseth the noise of the seas and the noise of the waves thereof" (v. 7).[12] Surely, God can gain control of the waters, and the psalmist also acknowledges that the power of God is so great that He can do anything. "The waves of the sea are marvelous through the noise of manie waters, yet the Lord on high is more mightie" (93:4). This Lord "rebuketh the sea, and dryeth it ..." (Nahum 1:4). The dashing waves would then have to cease, and truly "the sea is calme by his power" (Job 26:12). As revealed in these passages, God can reduce at will the action, the noise, the condition of the waters. Isaiah records the declaration of the Almighty in His overpowering the fierce seas: "I am the Lord thy God that divided the Sea when his waves roared" (51:15). The passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea on dry land was made possible by God because He made "a way in the Sea," and then they could cross the Jordan River because He made a "path in the mightie waters" (Isaiah 43:16). The using the seas to serve His purpose is clear here; for it was God's chosen people, the Israelites, who were saved by the parting of the waters, and the enemies of His people who were crushed and drowned by the furious action of the closing waters, employed as judgment against those evil ones. Certainly He "who hathe shut up the Sea with dores," and commanded that "here shal staye the proude waves" of the sea (until the time be right for punishing the wicked who oppress His followers) exhibits His strength over them (Job 38:8, 11).

Time and again attention is called to God's magnificent and loving acts, as people are invited to "come and beholde the workes of God .... He hathe turned the Sea into drye land: thei [Israelites] passe through the river on fote .... we [all men] wēt into the fyre & into

water, but ỷ broghtest us out into a wealthie place" (Psalm 66:5-6, 12). There are still other accounts of the troubles experienced by Christians being taken into God's hands, and being eased when His strength overpowers the "watery" evil forces. The idea that God is with Christians everywhere with His power over feared opposition is recorded by Isaiah. The Lord reassures the prophet: "When thou passest through the waters, I wil be with thee, & through the floods, that thei do not overflowe thee ..." (43:2).[13] The facing of the instability and perils, the judgment the waters often mete out to persons asea, the ever-present dangers make the person who is near the sea, or on the sea, to realize his insignificance, his smallness compared with the expanse and might of natural forces. It is this realization that in turn makes him seek help and reassurance in something outside himself--and ultimately in the only power greater than that of man and nature--God. The waters are thus serving God in being what they are: either through punishing those evil ones who dare to defy the warnings the waters issue, or in turning the thoughts of the wayward Christian back to repentance and God's grace.

That the seas are not easily controlled, that power over seas is indeed awesome is implied in accounts of Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee (Matthew 14:14-32; Mark 6:48-51; and John 6:18-21). Similarly, when the tempest threatened Jesus and His disciples when they were asea, He merely "rose up and rebuked the winde, and said unto the sea, Peace, and be stil. So the winde ceased, and it was a great calme" (Mark 4:39-40).[14] The disciples' reactions to this seemingly simple movement of Jesus indicate the amazement and wonder that they felt toward His actions. "They feared excedingly and said one to another,

who is this, that bothe the winde and the sea obey him?" (v. 41).[15] It is evident, then, that the power of the Almighty alone could be expected to perform such an act--and it is that that the men with Jesus must realize; that all men must realize.

Not only is it established that the seas and all waters obey the Lord, but His power over the creatures of these seas is also acknowledged in many passages. The psalmist sings out for such creatures to "praise ye the Lord frō the earth, ye dragons[16] and all depths" (148:7). These animals are under the care and control of God, and they, as well as all life, must serve the purposes of the Lord; they must be submissive to Him.

They are weaker than the Almighty, even though they may seem frightening to certain individual mortals, even as the waters are awe-inspiring to men, but controllable by the Lord. Psalm 74 records "thou [God] brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters" (v. 13). Thus, the evil that was done by Pharaoh--the metaphorical leviathan--did not go unpunished by God. The host of his armies were caught up in the waters: the waters were instruments of God's judgment. The powers of Pharaoh himself were taken away when "He brakest the head of Liviathan[17] in pieces" (v. 14). Certainly the strength of God is sufficient and His judgment is fair. He "who wounded the dragon [Pharaoh]" is also he who "dryed the sea, even the waters of the great depe" for His people (Isaiah 51:9, 10). This action illustrates again the fairness with which He acted. His people were then able to cross the sea quickly and unimpeded, thus escaping from the evil hands of the Egyptians, who were "broken" in the waters which closed on them.

So it is apparent that the evil associated with Biblical water-imagery

is dominated by God, and it can be observed that in like manner, Shakespeare presents all associations with the water-imagery of The Tempest as being under the control of the powerful figure of Prospero. Many parallels can be drawn between God's association with Biblical water-imagery and Prospero's role in this play.

From the beginning of the play, it is clear that Prospero is in control of the elements. When the tempest rages in the first action of the play, Miranda begins to question her father about it:

> If by your art, my dearest father, you have
> Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.
> The sky it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
> But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
> Dashes the fire out (I, ii, 1-5).

Surely this is nature in an uproar, seemingly uncontrollable. However, Miranda acknowledges Prospero's power to calm, as well as raise, a tempest. She asks that he "allay them," or to create a calm again. Prospero himself makes clearer the detail of his power, as he reassures his daughter concerning the tossing of the ships that could be seen out in the seas:

> Wipe thou thine eyes; have comfort,
> The direful spectacle of the wrack, which touch'd
> The very virtue of compassion in thee,
> I have with such provision in mine art
> So safely ordered that there is no soul--
> No, not so much perdition as an hair
> Betid to any creature in the vessel ...
> (I, ii, 25-31).

The powers he holds are of such nature that he can foretell exactly what will be lost, what will be preserved during the storm. He confidently reports to Miranda that she need not worry, for the men

aboard the ship in the tossing waves would be safe from the raging waters--their lives would not be lost. Propsero is "more mightie" than the waves of the sea. And this information is conveyed through one of the clearest Biblical parallels of the play. As mentioned above, the passage is a close rewording of certain verses in Acts 27.

That it was truly Prospero who raised and controlled the tempest is mentioned later in the play, as well as in this opening scene. Miranda again questions her father about the tempest; this time she asks Prospero for his "reason/ For raising this Sea-storm?" (I, ii, 176-177). Furthermore, Prospero, in explaining to Ariel his reasons for the commands that he had given the airy spirit, acknowledges that he himself "rais'd the tempest" (V, i, 6). Though Ariel is an agent of Prospero,[18] it is the Duke who holds control of situations as they are raised during the play.

Indeed it is clear that Prospero commands and controls Ariel. He summons the airy spirit in such manner as follows: "Ariel! My industrious servant, Ariel" (I, ii, 187 and II, i, 33). Ariel responsively hails the Duke as "potent master" (II, i, 34), later as "master" (l. 48; earlier at I, ii, 293), and also as "great master" (I, ii, 188). Also the significance of Ariel's name (lion of God) might certainly be considered as support for a divine identification of Prospero, and partial explanation for Ariel's humility. Further, to this "servant" figure Ariel, Prospero can boast that it most assuredly was

> ... mine art
> When I arriv'd and heard thee, that made gape
> The pine, and let thee out ....
> If thou murmur'st, I will rend an oak

> And peg thee in his knotty entrails til
> Thou hast howl'd away twelve winters
> (I, ii, 291-293; 294-296).

Throughout the play, Ariel is an obedient servant to Prospero, performing "to every article" what is commanded of him, being praised for his good work. Surely Prospero must possess spiritual powers to be able to control this creature of the air, as well as the spirits that are called forth to perform in the wedding masque. Indeed the Duke himself acknowledges his power over such spiritual creatures to Ferdinand, who remarked about the airy spirits taking part in that masque. Prospero explains that they are

> Spirits, which by mine art
> I have from their confines call'd to enact
> By present fancies (IV, i, 120-122).

In scene after scene, emphasis is placed on the fact that Prospero, not Ariel, is responsible for the action of the play. Ariel is at all times presented as the servant or "messenger boy" for the Duke. He is bound to do the bidding of the more powerful, though not truly spiritual, master of the island. Prospero, too, exercises this control over Ariel freely and easily, as he does indeed make the sprite work hard and continuously for him. For instance, Prospero orders Ariel to:

> Go, bring the rabble,
> O'er whom _I give thee pow'r_, here to this place;
> Incite them to quick motion; for I must
> Bestow upon the eyes of this young couple
> Some vanity of mine art (IV, i, 35-39).[19]

The sprite is asked by Prospero to do many such tasks of bringing someone or something to his master.[20] But Ariel also has some power,

for he can bring other spirits to Prospero, such as these characters of the masque and the goblins which chase Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo into the mire; but as shown here, Ariel can control and command them simply because Prospero extends to him the power to do so. Indeed, this fact is repeated in the scene which introduced the goblins, wherein Prospero calls them "my goblins" (IV, i, 259)[21] although it is Ariel who guides them on the routing of the villains.

Prospero, too, has power over Antonio, Sebastion, and Alonso. Ariel reports to the Duke that these men are

> ... confin'd together
> In the same fashion as you gave in charge,
> Just as you left them ... (V, i, 7-9).[22]

Prospero overpowers them, causing them to be distracted or dazed so that they are not in full control of their faculties. Ariel continues, revealing that certainly these men "cannot budge till your release" (l. 11).[23]

In like manner Prospero has in his control the other characters of the play. Caliban is overpowered by Prospero much as leviathan is by God. Like the leviathan in Psalm 104:25-27, Caliban "waits upon" his master. The position Caliban holds is that of servant and slave, and his responsibility is to do the bidding of his master, the Duke. He must do the menial, but necessary, tasks for Prospero and his daughter. The unusual character is repeatedly called by names such as "servant" or "slave" rarely by his given name.[24]

Caliban's low station and his servile nature are further shown by his relationship to Stephano and Trinculo, adopted when the three of them meet accidentally during the storm. The two men, servants

themselves, in turn call Caliban "servant" and "servant-monster" in all conversations with him or about him. The character of Caliban, then, is much like that of the Biblical leviathan. In being subjected to the every whim of his master, Caliban is as Job 40:24 says of leviathan, "a servant for ever."

The rebellious nature of the servant-monster is ever trying the power of his master, however; and their conflicts prove that Prospero truly is the stronger. When Caliban defies the Duke, Prospero threatens him:

> For this, be sure, to-night thou shalt have cramps,
> Side stiches that shall pen thy breath up; urchins
> Shall, for that vast of night that they may work,
> All exercise on thee; thou shalt be pinch'd
> As thick as honeycomb, each pinch more stinging
> Than bees that made 'em (I, ii, 325-330).

Later in the same scene, Prospero warns Caliban that he should do all work required of him, do it quickly, and do it with obvious willingness. He must do his jobs without complaint and without error, because Prospero sets limits within which Caliban is to work.

> 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 (I, ii, 368-371).

Caliban, here attempting to disobey the power of his master, roars like the waves that symbolize moral evil in the Bible, which are mentioned as being under the authority of God. (Note particularly Psalms 65 and 93, Job 1 and 2, Isaiah 51.) Caliban answers his master in sincere-sounding tones of subjection; he seems to recognize that he cannot successfully defy the commands of his "potent master." He assures

Prospero that he will not need to use the "old cramps" as punishment, for he sees that there is no alternative other than that he

> ... must obey. His [Prospero's] art is of such power
> It would control my dam's god, Setebos,
> And make a vassal of him (ll. 372-374).

Again the character of Caliban seems to show Biblical influence in this reaction to Prospero's commands. Just as God could force leviathan to "speake faire," Prospero has achieved such response from his slave Caliban. Caliban most surely learned through the punishments Prospero dealt him that the Duke was not to be given an opportunity to detect him engaged in any wrong action. Because Prospero would certainly punish severely any open revolt, Caliban knew that he must work silently and underhandedly to be successful in any action opposing his master. He expresses this attitude when he rejects soundly Trinculo's urging him to take part in the theft of the Duke's goods. Openly the servant-monster fears his master and emphasizes that, before all else, they must attempt to dispose of Prospero while they could catch him off-guard, if they did not want to experience his wrath.

> Let 't alone
> And do the murther first. If he awake,
> From toe to crown he'll fill our skins with pinches,
> Make us strange stuff ... (IV, i, 231-234).

Thus Caliban warns Stephano and Trinculo of Prospero's might. When Alonso's drunken servants do not heed the pleas of Caliban but continue their looting of Prospero's cell, he further cries out:

> I will have none on 't We shall lose our time.
> [to commit the murder of Prospero]

> And all be turn'd into barnacles, or to apes
> With foreheads villanous low (ll. 248-250).

Caliban recognizes the usual punishment to be dealt him if Prospero finds out any plot against him, and he knows that this instance would be dealt with even more severely than previous ones. He desperately attempts to convey his fear of Prospero to his comrades Stephano and Trinculo, who neither yet saw Prospero nor knowingly were subject to any of the Duke's power-revealing treatment.

What Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo do not know is that Prospero allowed them to rob him, that he used the "trumpery" from his house "for stale to catch these theives" (IV, i, 88-89). Just as Prospero directed the storm and the safe landing of the ship, he directs the action that these men are to perform. Surely here Prospero seems to be playing with Caliban (as well as with Stephano and Trinculo), as God could play with leviathan[25] (Job 40:24 and Psalm 104:27). The Duke purposely tempts the men to steal his belongings, so they would be deterred from their more serious intent of committing his murder. Yet the misdeed of theft is not to go unpunished either. Like God, who announced "I am come against thee .... leviathan" (Ezekiel 29:3), Prospero says, in conversation with Ariel, "Sprit,/ We must prepare to meet with Caliban" (IV, i, 168). Thus Prospero waits until the right moment until the three thieves are laden with the stolen articles before he looses his punishment. As God in Isaiah 27:1 promised punishment for the evil leviathan, Prospero chastises the impenitent Caliban. He orders his spirit, Ariel, to:

> Go, charge my goblins that they grind their [Caliban's,
> Stephano's and Trinculo's] joints

> With dry convulsions, shorten up their sinews
> With aged cramps, and more pinch-spotted make them
> Than pard or cat o' mountain (IV, i, 259-262).

He continues with instructions for Ariel to carry out; the men are not to be merely attacked and let go, but rather they are to be "hunted soundly" (l. 263) since Prospero commands that the goblins be ordered to follow the thieves everywhere they go.

Many passages point to the power Prospero has over the events which take place in The Tempest. Regarding the relationship between Ferdinand and Miranda, he arranges to make the situation more likely to have a happy conclusion.

> . . . But this swift business [the acquaintance of
> Miranda and Ferdinand]
> I must uneasy make, lest too light winning
> Make the prize light.-- (I, ii, 450-452).

So from that time, he takes charge of the couple's friendship, expanding his taking part in what happens between them by having the masque given for the benefit of his daughter and her new-found friend, bringing Alonso to find his son, etc.

Not only does Prospero's power extend over all nature and all human and spiritual beings, but he seems to have power which envelopes the deceased of the world. Indeed he boasts about his superior control of such things: "Graves at my command/ Have wak'd their sleepers, op'd and let 'em forth" (V, i, 49-50).[26] Certainly this parallels God's power expressed in the Biblical account of the advent wherein the graves give forth their dead.

The entire play repeats often the supreme position Prospero holds in regard to the action which takes place. Indeed it seems that the

Duke controls everything that happens in the play. Gonzalo's statement in the final act, "Look down, you gods .../ For it is you that have chalk'd out the way/ Which brought us hither" (V, i, 205-207) appears to be an explanation of Prospero's action regarding this play. This, too, is Godlike as Proverb 16:9 relates that "the heart of man purposeth his way, but the Lord doth direct his steppes,"[27] as the Duke does in the play.

In addition to Prospero's handling of men revealing his Godlike power, his purpose in controlling the elements, particularly the tempest, reflects such parallels. In both the Bible and The Tempest, one notices that the tempests are employed for like reasons: men are to be made more aware of themselves, their true weaknesses or sins, through the effects of the sea-storms. That God used storms for this purpose is found in at least five places in the Bible. The businessmen in Psalm 107 were tossed about in a sea-storm until they cried "unto the Lord in their trouble" (v. 28) after "their soul melteth" (v. 26). They first realized that they, as mortal men, could not hope to save themselves, and that their lives, both spiritually and mentally, were in God's hands alone; then they became aware that they had been wrong in previous thought and actions. The crews aboard Jonah's ship (Jonah 1 and 2) and aboard Paul's ship (Acts 27) reacted in much the same manner. They sought the Lord's help after they were shown that God alone was responsible for their distress asea, that He was Almighty and could deliver them. All the crews involved in such treatment on the sea were witnesses of God's power; they learned to fear Him and to realize that they must ask for His help. Even the disciples of Christ were exposed to the tempestuous, judging waters for much the same reasons. Twice

when they were on the Sea of Galilee (Matthew 14, Mark 6, John 6), they were tossed with waves that appeared to be sent as reminders to them of God's remarkable strength--over both them and the seas. The evil of the men was reflected in the evil seas; the disciples were to remember that they were humanly weak and had basically sinful natures.

So it seems, too, in The Tempest. Prospero has "incens'd the seas and shores" against the men from Milan (III, iii, 74). They become confused, desperate, and forlorn as the tempest rages. Gradually, they become aware of reasons for their "punishment." Alonso clearly acknowledges his guilty association with the ousting of Prospero, and mourns, for he believes that it is for this foul deed his son "i' th' ooze is bedded" (III, iii, 100). And is it not true that this character is seen as going through a type of baptism in the play, as mentioned above, Chapter II.

Caliban, too, is affected by the action the tempests brought about. He seems to recognize that his master is perhaps not so cruel and overbearing as he pictured him. The intense dislike and evil feelings toward Prospero that Caliban expressed in early communications mentioning the Duke's name are strangely, and noticeably, absent from the last speeches of the servant-monster. He recognizes at last "How fine my master is" although he still fears the chastisement that his master can deliver him. When he realizes that Prospero will treat him kindly, he more fully comprehends the true nature of his master. He promises that he, in gratitude for the light punishment Prospero gave him in payment for his crimes (he has only to make tidy the living quarters of the Duke), will be "wise hereafter/ And seek for grace." He further acknowledges that indeed "What a thrice-double ass/ Was I, to take this

drunkard [Stephano] for a god/ And worship this dull fool! [Trinculo]" He seems to be aware that such action was ridiculous and foolish on his part; that grace or pardon is certainly worth having, even if he has to face his master with the truth of his wayward actions. Like leviathan, who is naturally rebellious but powerless against God's control, so is Caliban. His first thoughts are always centered on rebellion, but he is at last aware that he can gain nothing in action against his master; he realizes he is powerless against his master's control.

Indeed his association with Stephano and Trinculo has been brought about through his desire to escape the fury of the storm, but he seems to have suffered more from his dealings with the two men, because he was prompted by their support to attempt the murder of his master. He seems at last to become aware that he has been misled, when Prospero orders the three thieves brought in to face the assembly of island people. All three of the servants, after having been chased into the mire by Prospero's goblins, eagerly resume their positions again.

Just as it seems that the Biblical uses of the tempest aim for an awareness of repentance for the sin, so the stormy seas and winds of Shakespeare's plays produce such a realization of wrongs and an awakening of the desires to change evil ways. For such purpose the "powers delaying (not forgetting) have/ Incens'd the seas and shores, yea, all the Creatures/ Against your peace," Ariel tells the three men that were guilty of supplanting Prospero. The evil which they did went unpunished for twelve years, but when the situation arises that would serve to enlighten the men of their errors, the "powers" use the opportunity to its fullest extent, through the tempest's fierceness. Even the "dalaying, not forgetting" action that the tempest reflects the "powers"

as enacting parallels Biblical functions of punishment. Psalm 9:12 clearly announces "for when Hee maketh inquisition for blood, He remembereth it and forgetteth not the complaint of the poor." The explanation of this passage as given in the Geneva Version further clarifies an association of Tempest thoughts and Biblical ones: "Tho God revengeth not suddenly the wrong done to His; yet He suffereth not the wicked to go unpunished." (Carter, too,[28] recognizes the Biblical parallels reflected here in Shakespeare's play, and pointed to such as support for his general opinion that Shakespeare used the Bible as source material for all his plays.) The evil ones in the Bible and also in The Tempest were made to suffer the judgments of the waters so they could see their wrongs.

It should be noted that God did not carry out completely His intended punishment against any penitent evildoers: "And God saw their workes that they turned from their evil wayes, and God repented of the evil that Hee had sayde that Hee would doe unto them and He did it not" (Jonah 3:10);[29] further He did not allow lives to be lost in the shipwreck Paul and his crew were in, nor did He allow Jonah to lose his life in the waters or in the fish.

As surely as God restored calm to the boisterous seas which tossed about the frail ships of Jonah's crew and Jesus' disciples; or as He rescued unharmed those who had had to leave their ships when the tempests had achieved their purpose, so Prospero relieves those plagued by the tempests he raised. As God sought only repentance from those that wronged him, so Prospero desires no more from those who wronged him. Ariel is told to give the "three men of sin" warning that they can be saved from the dangers of the storm by "nothing but heart's

sorrow/ And a clean life ensuing" (III, iii, 81-82).[30] They must realize what they did wrong, truly regret that they did such, and try to amend their lives so they would not commit any further evil deeds--all this makes up the requirements Prospero asks of them, to qualify for the Duke's forgiveness and his stopping the punishment they experience.[31]

As God can control everything and have all things work according to His will, Prospero similarly orders everything to be done according to his plans in his bid for revenge against his enemies.

> Now does my project gather to a head,
> My charms crack not, my spirits obey, and time
> Goes upright with his carriage (V, i, 1-3).

Thus Prospero realizes that he has control of the situations which involve all the people on the island, and he clearly knows that

> at this hour
> Lie at my mercy all mine enemies.
> Shortly shall my labours end (IV, i, 263-267).

Indeed Ariel has reported to Prospero that all has been carried out exactly as the Duke has asked it to be. It is evident that Prospero's control is strong over the men from Milan, and Ariel acknowledges to his master that "if you now beheld them, your affections/ Would become tender" (V, i, 17-19). So Prospero does lose his desire to punish the men or make them suffer further than they have in the wake of the sea-storm. Instead of meting out their deserved punishment, Prospero decides to forgive the men. He solemnly announces to Ariel:

> Tho with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick,
> Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury

> Do I take part. The rarer action is
> In virtue than in vengeance. They being penitent,
> The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
> Not a frown further (V, i, 25-30).

Thus do the action and the words of the Duke parallel the Biblical passages which reflect the attitude of God toward those who repent of their sins and promise to lead better, more purposeful lives. As God forgives all who sin against Him, Prospero finds forgiveness within himself for the men who had treated him so wrongly.

Prospero, further like God, shows that he is truly in control of the seas, which helps to make the sinners aware of their wrongdoings, when he restores calm to the waters after the tempest fulfills that purpose for which it is raised. Prospero promises "calm seas, auspicious gales" for the homeward journey of the ship (V, i, 440). Thus he, like God, "appeaseth the noise of the seas and the noise of the waves thereof" (Psalm 65:7).

That Prospero does reflect that position of an Almighty power in _The Tempest_, that he controls all action and all nature much as God is pictured as doing in the Bible is evident from the many parallels between the action described in _The Tempest_ and that presented in the Bible. One should not, however, lose sight of all the information that points to Prospero's power as unnatural.

Early in the first act, Prospero asks Miranda to

> Lend thy hand
> And pluck my magic garment from me. So,
> Lie there, my art (I, ii, 23-25).

The import of such a statement would lead one to believe that Prospero is powerless without his robe, which gives him his "art." Caliban, on

the other hand, believes that Propsero's power lies in his books. He tells Stephano and Trinculo that they must be certain

> First to possess his books; for without them
> He's but a sot as I am, nor hath not
> One spirit to command (III, ii, 70-72).

From this statement, one would be led to understand that all Prospero's power of summoning help from the various spirits and goblins he commands lies in his books, and not at all in his robe. Certainly Prospero himself gives strength to such understanding when he announces

> ... I'll to my book;
> For yet ere suppertime must I perform
> Much business appertaining (III, i, 94096).

Regardless of which one is the sole source of his power, his robe or his books, or if both are necessary for him to play the role of master of the island, that Prospero attains unnaturally the power he demonstrates is accepted from all statements made concerning his ability to control all things. Especially when he denies himself any further work with his "potent art," does he seem quite human--devoid of any supernatural powers. He declares that he will seek no more aid from his "elves," staff, or book (V, i, 33-57). Further, he announces his intent with these words: "... this rough magic/ I here abjure ..." (ll. 50-51). He decides to return to the state of all other men on the island, that of being mortal man, as he reveals at the end of the play. After he has broken all the charms he had placed over the men from Milan, he will deny himself any further use of his "art." He concludes that "what strength I have 's mine own,/ Which is most faint ..." (Epilogue, 2-3).

Shakespeare definitely made his leading character in this play to possess many Godlike traits and actions, but as certainly as Caliban is not leviathan, Prospero is not God. Clearly, Prospero's power is temporary in the sense that he may keep it or dispose of it. His "art" seems to have been learned or developed from his books or robe or both--to be used as power similar to that God exhibits in the Bible regarding bringing sinners to repentance through the judgment of waters and storms. That some sixteenth- and seventeenth-century people thought the Lord's power was something that He could keep or dispose of is treated by William Empson in Milton's God.[32] The consideration that God calls Christ His Son and Heir and that all Christians are Heirs with Christ possibly suggests such an idea: as an heir is to be a replacement, then the Lord may be understood as assigning power to His Son and thus abdicating His throne. Likewise Prospero abdicts in favor of Ferdinand and Miranda, his heirs. Nevertheless, one certainly does not expect to find an exact set of correspondences between Prospero and the God of the Bible. Indeed, such would be blasphemous and not desirable for presentation, but parallels between the Duke and God are numerous and clear and should be regarded as important.

Even though Prospero's power lies not in natural ability, his reflection of Godlike qualities when he is possessed of power cannot be ignored. Especially significant is his character relation to the water-imagery of the play. It is from this relationship he must be seen as God--symbolically so--for he has been carefully drawn to parallel God's role in relation to Biblical water-imagery as this chapter has shown. Thus one should consider the character of Prospero associated with the water-imagery of the play, as Godlike, when formulating a theme of this play.

NOTES

[1] To illustrate this point consider Orgel: "Prospero's power is the power of imagination, and it is something no other character possesses" (p. 111), and Schücking, who holds a completely different view of Prospero: "He is destitute of the infinite wealth of human traits, the interplay of qualities which gives such a magic life to the poet's other great figures .... Prospero ... has a certain dryness; he does not impress the critical observer with quite the greatness he might be supposed to possess" (p. 243).

Further contrasting views are shown in the following criticisms. Consider Orgel again, "His magic is something like Bacon's idea of science; not spells and witchcraft, but a complete understanding of nature" (p. 120), and the opposing views as noted by Stauffer: "Prospero's 'nobler reason' is no scientific rationality .... His power is fate; Destiny and Providence are his other names" (p. 304).

In other studies one finds Knight (Christian Renaissance) and Spencer agreeing that Prospero is a "kind of god"; but Kirschbaum asserts that Prospero is void of spiritual greatness, the Duke "only cooperated with the gods in helping to bring the men from Milan to penitence" (p. 40). Still another critic, Dowden, bridges the gaps between these two positions. He simply states that "spiritual powers are in alliance with Prospero," thereby skirting comment which would describe the actual nature of Prospero as being godlike or more fully mere man (p. 364).

[2] Dowden, p. 371.

[3] James Russell Lowell, Literary Essays, III (Boston, 1894), p. 61. Clark, too, hints that Prospero may be regarded as Shakespeare. However, he does not fully embrace this idea.

[4] Murry, p. 392.

[5] Knight, Crown, p. 208. Much the same thought is accepted by MacCracken, Pierce, and Durham, who offer "... here [in The Tempest] perhaps, as much as anywhere, the temptation to read the philosophy of the poet into the story of the dramatist comes strongly upon the reader.

"There are two speeches of Prospero, in particular, where the reader is inclined to believe he is listening to Shakespeare's own voice [as Knight, too, points out]. In one, Prospero puts a sudden end to his pageant of the spirits and compares life itself to the transitory play. In the other, Prospero bids farewell to his magic art ..." (p. 206).

[6] Knight, Crown, p. 220.

[7] Ibid., p. 223.

[8] Ibid., p. 226.

[9] Ibid., p. 204.

[10] Knight, Christian Renaissance, pp. 117, 337. Kirschbaum, as mentioned above, does not agree with this interpretation of Prospero. He says: "Prospero is not god." In fact, Kirschbaum sees too much evil in the character of the Duke to accept him as a holy being. "Prospero is not nice. He has to struggle to be compassionate ... the figure of Prospero ... [has] unruly nature .... emphasized rather than minimized" (pp. 37-38).

Holding views along this same line of thought is J. Dover Wilson, The Meaning of The Tempest (Newcastle, 1936). He claims that Prospero is a tyrant, taking pleasure in meting out punishments, until Ariel charges him to be merciful in the last act of the play.

[11] Colin Still has acknowledged Prospero as God, but he also includes an interpretation of the Duke as fulfilling a part in the pagon rites of Initiation:

"In so far as the Play corresponds to the pagan rites, Prospero may be regarded as the counterpart of the hierophant, or initiating priest. But in the wide scheme I have latterly been treating he figures the protolypal Supreme Being, whom, indeed, the pagan hierophant was deemed to represent" (p. 202).

[12] A marginal note offers this explanation of the verse: "He sheweth ye there is no parte nor creature in ye worlde, w is not governed by Gods power & Providence."

[13] A marginal note explains the reference as "by water and fyre, he meaneth all kinde of troubles and perils."

[14] The use of the wind to stir up tempestuous seas might be noted here, as well as God's frequent use of whirlwinds and thunder to appear to men. "Then answered the Lord unto Job out of the whirlewinde" (Job 38:1). God often came to Job as wind or thunder, displaying the might with which he controlled all nature. Nahum also deals with this power: "The Lord hathe his way in the whirle-winde, and in the storme and the cloudes are the dust of his fete" (1:3, 4). The power of God in tempests is used to punish those who need such: "For he [God] destroyeth me with a tempest," Job cries (Job 9:17). The association of thunder sounds with punishment is shown as follows: "The substance of the ungodlie shal be dryed up like a river, and they shal make a sound like a great thonder in the raine" (Ecclesiasticus 40:13).

[15] Other passages revealing God's power over the seas include the following: "He bindeth the floods, that they do not overflowe" (Job 28:11). "The Lord ... breaketh the sea, whē the waves thereof roare" (Jeremiah 31:35). "He gave his decree to the sea that the waters shulde not passe his commandement" (Proverb 8:29). "The Sea saw it [God's power] and fled" (Psalm 114:3). "I wil make the floods ylandes, and I wil drye up the pooles" (Isaiah 43:15). Job relates that "at the breth of God ... the breadth of the waters is made narrowe .... Whether it be for punishmēt, or for his lande, or of mercie, he causeth it [waterstorm] to come" (Job 37:10, 13). A marginal note gives this explanation of the verses: "Raine, colde, heat, tempests and suche like are sent of God, ether to punish mā, or to profite ye earth, or to

declare his favour toward man." Isaiah 19 reminds the wicked that he cannot hide from God in the sea, because the power of God extends to the depths. Psalm 46:3-3 also records the works of God in exerting His authority over the wild actions of the seas. A book from the Apocrypha, the Wisdome of Salomon, also notices the power of God over the seas: "But thy providence, O father, governeth it [a ship asea]: for thou hast made a way, even in the sea, and a sure path among the waves" (14:3).

[16] A marginal note offers this explanation of the term "dragon" as meaning "great and mōstruous fishes, as whales and suche like."

[17] A marginal note here defines "liviathan" as that "which is a great mōstre of the sea, or whale, meaning Pharaoh."

[18] Ariel, like most of the characters in this play, has been subject of many studies, few agreeing on the exact nature and make up of the spirit figure. Clemen sees him merely as "a kind of storm-spirit. Words and images which characterize him revive the world of the sea, winds, and waves" (p. 184). Knight, in Crown, calls the figure the "personification of poetry" (p. 208); and Dowden and Stauffer view the character as indeed spiritual, not human at all, nor bound by any human ties. To Schücking, too, Ariel is not human since he can change being and shape at will, and he can penetrate water, earth, go anywhere; but according to Schücking, he is the "embodiment of supreme human qualities" (pp. 251-252).

The "airy spirit" is likened to other figures Shakespeare has created: Schlegel and Cumberland Clark, Shakespeare and the Supernatural (London, 1931), call him a sylph, an image of air, much like Puck, Oberon, or other of Shakespeare's fairies. Knight, in Shakespearean Tempest, says that the figure represents Destiny, much as Jupiter in Cymbeline does.

Several critics have attempted to establish a clear association between Ariel and angels. Richmond Noble and William Burgess see a connection between the Ariel mentioned in Isaiah 29 and Shakespeare's Ariel. Burgess says: "To the poet's art, the passage of thought from 'Ariel, the city--' an exhibition of divine justice, to Ariel, a spirit of the air, with a similar mission was simple and easy" (p. 55). Certainly the sixth verse of Isaiah 29 would suggest similar incidents attributed to both figures, but further relationship is rather doubtful. The verse is as follows: "Thou shalt be visited of ye Lord of hostes with thundre, and shaking, and a great noyse, a whirlewinde, and a tempest, and a flame of devouring fyre."

Thomas Carter, too, sees Biblical reflections in the figure of Ariel. He observes: "Ariel was a spirit of flame and amid the vessel 'all afire,' and Shakespeare seems to have recalled the incident of the burning fiery furnace of Nebuchadnezzar, where the words occur--

'The fire had no power over their bodies, for not an haire of their head was burnt, neither were their coats changed, nor any smell of fire came upon them'" (p. 472). Such reflections are seen in addition to those mentioned above, e.g., parallels between Ariel's answer about the safety of all aboard and those of the incident given in Acts.

Robert Speaight, Nature in Shakespearean Tragedy (London, 1955), mentions that "... Ariel may be said ... to represent the Divine powers which are lent to his master. In one respect he is above Prospero, since he performs the things which Prospero cannot. In another respect, he is below him, since he obeys, for the time being, his behests ....

"If Ariel is subject to Prospero, that is only because Prospero, through his mastery of magic, has borrowed the Divine perogatives. It is as a priest and not as a man that Ariel obeys him ..." (pp. 156-157).

Frances Neilson, Shakespeare and The Tempest (Rindge, New Hampshire, 1956), agrees that Prospero cannot perform the acts he desires to have take place; but she cannot agree that there is anything in this play that "smacks of Christiam doctrine."

It is Roland Frye who most completely disagrees with any attempt to read Biblical parallels into an interpretation of Ariel. He concedes that "What Ariel is, we do not know exactly, and though he may be one of the 'ministers of fate,' as he declares, he is not human and certainly may not be seen as a Christian, though he serves the essentially Christian plans of the human Prospero" (p. 231).

[19] Italics used here are mine.

[20] Ariel was instrumentive in "pointing" the tempest (I, ii, 193-194). He was asked to report on the whereabouts of Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo and of Antonio, Alonso, Sebastian, and Gonzalo at many times during the play. He was asked to release the men from their charms, to bring Caliban and comrades from the mire, to bring the ship's crew to the gathering of people, as well as to be in charge of bringing the goblins and spirits when and where Prospero wanted them to do something.

[21] Italics used here are mine.

[22] Italics used here are mine.

[23] Italics used here are mine.

[24] Note the following references to Caliban: I, ii, 308, 313, 319, 345, 351, 374. Others are given in all conversations with Stephano and Trinculo, who call him "monster" or "devil" in addition to "slave" or "servant."

[25] In these two passages in which the word "play" appears as connected with the action of leviathan and God, several possible meanings of "play" seem probable. Surely when one "plays" with a bird (as compared with the handling of leviathan by God) he can tease it--by having it on a leash, by having it in a cage, or by in some way giving it half-free movement, yet keeping every action of the fowl in check.

[26] The consideration of death as "sleep" is certainly reflection of the Biblical ideas of death. Indeed the wording of this passage recalls a specific Bible verse. Both Noble (p. 251) and Carter (p. 477)

recognize here a parallel to Matthew 27:52: "and the graves did open themselves, and many bodyes of the Saintes which slept, arose."

[27] Carter, too (p. 478), mentions this parallel as evidence of Shakespeare's knowledge and use of the Bible.

[28] Beginning on page 475, Carter discusses quite fully the parallel shown between The Tempest and this passage.

[29] Carter, too (p. 477), notes this parallel.

[30] It should be noted that "Ariel is speaking in well-established theological terms here. 'Sorrow of heart' or 'sorrow of soul' covered what the theologians taught should be man's response to his own evil doing,--plus a new life following" (Frye, pp. 242-243).

That Elizabethans were well advised that they were to have a "good amendment of life" following penitence is discussed further by Noble: " ... in the New Testament, 'amendment of life' is peculiar to the Geneva of Luke 15:7 ('which neede none amendement of life' as also Matthew 3:8 and Acts 26:20). But the phrase is also found in the Exhortation in the Communion Service 'confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life.' It abounds in the Homily on Repentance. In addition, the rendering of Matthew 3:2, prefixed to Morning and Evening Prayer, cannot be overlooked--'Amende your lives, for the kyngdome of God is at hande.' The phrase 'amend your lives' also occurs in the Communion Office and 'amend our lives' in the Litany as well as phrases in the Genevan of Luke 13:3" (p. 61).

[31] Still has also recognized the purpose of the Duke as I mention it here. He states: "... his [Prospero's] sole purpose is thereby [with sorrow and misfortune] to bring sinners to repentance" (p. 204). Still does not, however, relate Prospero's intentions to the water-imagery of the play nor does he associate them with Biblical ideas of water-imagery.

[32] William Empson, Milton's God (Norfolk, Connecticut, 1961).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

As most critics realize, a simple interpretation of The Tempest is clearly out of the question. Thus quite widely varying themes have been offered for this play, many of them allegorical. At present two comprehensive interpretations have received consistent attention: interpretations of the play as a personal allegory of Shakespeare's philosophy, and others, closely related, which regard the play as part of Shakespeare's "last phase" of writing, tied together with the themes of reconciliation and restoration found in these plays.

I propose that a major theme of the play is one of Christian repentance and forgiveness, as seen relevant to the water-imagery revealed in the play. Certainly one cannot deny that all persons, their actions, their thoughts, their feelings, are affected by the storms, the seas, and the noise of these forces: the water-imagery of the play. Indeed many critics have approached such an interpretation--those concerned with reconciliation discussed later in this chapter, for instance--but none has based his views on the direct Biblical reflections the play offers.

Because of the complex nature of The Tempest's characters, their actions and thoughts, many critics have offered equally complex interpretations of the play. Spencer has observed that any student of this play must indeed consider more than any one explanation of it,

for "*The Tempest* is a play with so many layers of meaning that no single interpretation can do it justice."[1] Accordingly he presents his view of the play as being in terms of "three levels in Nature's hierarchy--animal, human, and intellectual," which may be considered as a "central framework from which further and broader interpretations may radiate."[2] Others, too, allow many interpretations to be compounded for a complete understanding of the whole play.[3] Certainly this freedom generally accepted in the handling of themes expressed in *The Tempest* accounts for the large number of allegorical and symbolical interpretations given in this play.[4]

Some of these views have found little support (Kemble's, Wagner's, and Wolff's, for example), but the themes of personal allegory have persisted as the most widely accepted of them all. Yet within these discussions there are variant paths of interpretation. Indeed the personal allegory views have been turned many ways, but most commonly those who offer such an interpretation see Shakespeare in the figure of Prospero, giving the stage and the world a farewell speech, presenting throughout his last complete play some last words of his life's philosophy. On the basis of this alleged leave-taking, Miss Neilson declares:

> The critics who regard it as a biographical drama have reason on their side .... [but] the biographical idea is not in the play itself .... Still, there is a personal philosophy in it, which is broadly based upon the thought and work of his [Shakespeare's] life. It is the distillation of problems that harassed him from the days of his youth.[5]

Indeed she asserts that the play's significance lies in its being one of Shakespeare's last plays, summing up his complete work and his life's

principles. Miss Neilson continues:

> What is the theme of The Tempest? Foul play! ... The foul play of usurption, of regicide, of sedition [as he sees in the themes of Shakespeare's histories] .... The Tempest is the summing up of the thoughts that had burdened Shakespeare's soul since he was a young man. Those critics are right who emphasize that the plays indicate that the author held to the old ideas of an established order of economic freedom as the means to hours of leisure that could be given to the education of the mind and inspiration to the soul. It is inconceivable that any earnest student reading the histories of the English dynasties can ignore the fact that Shakespeare always held closely in mind the memory of happier days .... [and clearly in summing up this belief] The Tempest is a declaration for the restoration of the law and custom of the land.[6]

Similarly, Traversi finds the play is a fulfillment of Shakespeare's ideas treated in earlier plays: associations with concern for proper organization of family and state.

> The two institutions, the family and the state, are based, in the widest sense of the word, upon reason and are in turn the foundations of a civilized, moral way of living; and it is only when passion in the individual overcomes reason and aims at their destruction that evil enters society. Seen from this standpoint, The Tempest is a full-fledged symbolic treatment of themes more directly, personally indicated in earlier plays.[7]

Others see the play more specifically personal: they regard Prospero as Shakespeare himself, speaking forth ideas he wanted his audiences to remember. Dowden; Clark;[8] MacCracken, Pierce, and Durham;[9] Stauffer;[10] Bush;[11] and Hankins all dwell on such topics. Dowden concludes: "In The Tempest we find the ideal expression of the temper of mind which succeeded his [Shakespeare's] mood of indignation--the pathetic yet august serenity of Shakespeare's final period."[12] Hankins adds further comment along this same line--

> *The Tempest* seems to have been the final word in the expression of his [Shakespeare's] view of life. His weariness of strife and hypocrisy, his longing for peace and simplicity, reflect the perennial desire of all mankind found in an even greater message "Peace on earth, good will toward men."[13]

As discussed more fully below, such positive assertion of Shakespeare's views is certainly questionable. While one may assume from his consistent treatment of a subject that Shakespeare tended to believe a certain thing, unless the author himself left definite statement to evidence that he did indeed believe such, one must be careful to treat the matter with regard for its validity as being what it is: merely speculation strongly supported by hints from his work, but not fact.

Even Knight, who offers a theme not based singly on the personal allegory the play suggests to the critics above, succumbs to the temptation to read into the play certain parallels between the author and his major character. He comments that "*The Tempest*, patterned of storm and music, is thus an interpretation of Shakespeare's world .... [and it] can be considered as Shakespeare's artistic autobiography."[14]

There are many objections to one's considering the play principally as personal allegory and to interpreting a personal application of thoughts or actions in the characters of the play. One must not conclude such without a clear foundation, and since Shakespeare himself left no diary, no journals, no indications of what he personally believed, what he personally intended to do in any of his plays or in any of his writing, one can only assume, not conclude, certain ideas as being endorsed by him. Certainly I agree with Stoll, who argues against autobiographical interpretations: "and if he [Shakespeare]

made no gesture of farewell in his will he is not likely to have made one where it was least to be expected or comprehended--in a play." In this way Stoll further points out that Shakespeare is indeed "not like Goethe [for example] in making his work occasion for personal confessions."[15]

The second group of interpretations overlaps the first yet less definitely offers themes based on Shakespeare's personal philosophy. These studies find that The Tempest is, in some way, a culmination of preparatory work the other plays offer: tragedies, histories, comedies--all have been discussed as being related in thought to this play.[16] The most widely accepted of these views, however, relate this play to the latter themes of "reconciliation" or "restoration"; and it is this concern with finding of the lost, the saving of the threatened, that comes close to the theme my study reveals. And it should be noted that many critics have dwelt on this topic.

MacCracken, Pierce, and Durham offer the following interpretation: "The central theme of The Tempest is, like that of the other romances, restoration of those exiled and reconciliation of those at enmity ...."[17] Rowse, too, associates the play with Shakespeare's last works and the themes which he finds running through them: "A major theme behind this play is ... contrast"; but, he adds, "... on the personal side, more haunting is the theme that runs through all these last plays of finding what has been lost. Allied with this is that of innocence and youth threatened, endangered, then marvelously saved."[18] Clark states: "The theme of the play is one of reconciliation, with pardon and atonement for the sins or mistakes of one generation in the young love of the children and in their promise."[19] Murry, too, advocates such an

interpretation of the play. "It may be that his [Shakespeare's] central 'idea' was the obliteration of the evil done and suffered by one generation through the love of the next, and that his problem was to represent that 'idea' with the same perfection as he had in the past represented the tragedy of the evil done and suffered."[20] Knight agrees with Clark and Murry that the problems are solved "at long last [with] a union of sea and earth in gentleness .... All is here [in the union of Ferdinand and Miranda] finally restored and forgiven."[21]

Certainly there exists this "reconciliation" as a major factor in the play, but as evidenced in the preceding chapters, it is not simply "reconciliation" or "restoration," but a redemption, a divine type of forgiving, that ultimately takes place. It is not merely in the union of Ferdinand and Miranda that we see the complete breakdown of hostility between Alonso and Prospero, but most clearly in their direct facing of each other: with Alonso pleading for forgiveness and Prospero granting it.

Still closer to recognizing the interpretation I offer, Knight relates the play to the expression of water-imagery in others of Shakespeare's plays. Through this viewpoint he explains: "From the beginning to the end of Shakespeare's work all 'projects' are associated with sea-adventures; adverse fortune with tempests, but happiness with calm seas and the 'gentle breath' of loving winds."[22] Knight thus presents two main themes for this play: "tempest-music opposition and nature-divine opposition": the first of each is related to loss and dispersion and the latter of each symbolic of revival and restoration.[23] He clarifies what he includes in the tempest-nature parts of the contrasts by listing its parts: "tempests, thunder, raging seas,

fierce beasts."[24]

It is true that the sea-tempest imagery makes up the main theme of the play, but Knight has missed the basis of this imagery and the significance of the action guided by it. The "calm seas" Prospero vows to provide for the returning party are also part of the theme: the conflict is not merely of tempest-music opposition, but of the basic opposition of evil and good.

The theme of The Tempest indeed emerges from the water-imagery of the play drawn from Biblical water-imagery. This sea-tempest imagery pervades every act and scene of the play; it relates to all characters, particularly the major figures in the action, Caliban, Alonso, and Prospero.[25] I propose that this theme is the Christian idea of repentance and forgiveness (or lack of penitence and punishment).[26] From the beginning of the play to its conclusion, the seas and storms seem to be directed by Prospero for the purposes of punishing the men who wronged him (as God intends punishment for impenitent sinners, for instance the Egyptians who persecuted the Israelites); but when through the "sea-change" they suffer, the men, most clearly Alonso, recognize the guilt they bear and then feel it necessary to promise "a clean life ensuing," Prospero extends his forgiveness and grace to them (as God forgives all who repent of their sins: particularly the merchants in Psalms, Jonah, and others associated with sailing episodes troubled by the furious, judging action of the seas) and promises for the return trip of the whole party "calm seas" which testify to his sincerity. Throughout the play the sea-monster Caliban is a rebellious force (as leviathan the sea-beast is rebellious against God), but in all episodes his efforts to prevail over Prospero are thwarted (as God completely

overrrules leviathan). Indeed the characterization of Prospero and Caliban as symbolical of good and moral evil respectively, as levying the water-imagery of the Bible, points to the theme of penitence and forgiveness which arises from the play as a symbolical whole.

NOTES

[1] Spencer, p. 195.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Stauffer, like Spencer, regards the theme of the play as falling into three areas of thought: kings, love, and farce, p. 302. Also, Reuben Brower, "The Mirror of Analogy--The Tempest," Field of Light (New York, 1951), traces seven main "continuities" or analogies through the play. They include the following: "strange-wondrous," "sleep-and-dream," "sea-tempest," and "music-and noise" imagery; "earth-air," "slavery-and-freedom," and "sovereignty-conspiracy" opposition, p. 97.

[4] A few critics are opposed to reading Shakespeare as allegory or symbol. Schücking, for instance, denies possibility of any symbolic interpretation of the play as he concludes: "A symbolic interpretation of The Tempest is therefore altogether out of the question, both as regards the whole or single parts of the play" (p. 264). Still another critic, Murry, who admits being "adverse to reading Shakespeare as allegory," exemplifies the strong tendency to do such because of the many problems attempts at a simple interpretation of the play involve. He regards the play as "more nearly symbolical than any of his [Shakespeare's] plays" (p. 391). The theme he offers (discussed below) then is one considered "nearly symbolical" but not strictly so.

Many more, however, view the play as partly or wholly symbolical. Consider, for example, the following: Lowell observes: "Here the leading characters are not merely typical, but symbolical,--i.e., they do not illustrate a class of persons, they belong to universal Nature" (p. 59). Mrs. F. A. Kemble offers the following allegorical interpretation: "The image it [the play] presents to my mind [is] of the glorious supremacy of the religious human soul over all things by which it is surrounded," cited as an appendix in Frederick Boas, ed., The Arden Shakespeare: The Tempest (Boston, n.d.), p. 108. Other interpretations include Wolff's, which is a discussion of the play as offering solutions to problems connected with Elizabethan social structure--he says that the play presents a new sociological order: Caliban is the lowest order, with the other characters in the play representing orders progressively higher--and the highest level is the best, the most desirable. Don Cameron Allen, Image and Meaning (Baltimore, 1960), views the play as an expression of the dream of life which is ideally without any evil or struggle. He says the "metaphor of life can be manifest in the uniting of Ferdinand and Miranda in marriage, but still the dream, the hope for an ideal state of happiness is spoiled by the reality of Caliban and the type of unimprovable being he represents" (p. 61).

Mrs. Emma B. Wagner, The Tempest: An Allegorical Interpretation, ed. Hugh Robert Orr (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1933), keeping in the vein of allegory, suggests that The Tempest "is an allegory based upon the psychology of the human mind in its reaction to certain historical

events pertaining to the subject. Its symbols, then, as evidenced by the cast of characters, are concrete representations of abstract ideas, including the intellectual faculties or qualities of mind, and the emotions which man's environment and experiences of life cause to emanate from it .... Thus, The Tempest becomes a drama of Christianity concerned primarily with that intellectual, moral and religious movement which culminated in the sixteenth century in that cataclysm or storm of human thought known as the Reformation. Hence the title, The Tempest" (pp. 1-2).

Others, too, see a sense of struggle or contrast as key symbolical ideas in The Tempest. Bertrand Evans, Shakespeare's Comedies (Oxford, 1960), regards such as the main ideas of the play. He points out that no actual struggle or conflict appears in the action of the play--Ariel's desire for freedom and Caliban's desire for revenge, as well as the plot of Antonio and Sebastian against Alonso,are not fulfilled. Evans remarks that above all, "whatever The Tempest is, it is not an account of Prospero's struggle with and final triumph over baser elements in himself .... Plainly, in The Tempest, Shakespeare did not seek to represent struggle itself, but to proffer its fruits. Prospero's struggle is all past when this action commences--his struggle first to survive and then to acquire the power which is an accomplished fact when first we meet him and which renders further struggle unnecessary and impossible" (pp. 334-336). The main concern of the "struggle" considered by Evans is that of assuring that the unfit are kept from ruling--that Antonio or Caliban or Stephano would rule is "utterly horrible," and the satisfaction of the drama comes in the realizing that the innocent (Ferdinand and Miranda) are protected in the world, in knowing that "evil is utterly helpless in the grasp of good" (p. 337).

The conflict concept is turned a different way by Dowden. He, too, notes that there is much opposition between ideas throughout the play--in those views held by Ariel, Caliban, Stephano, Antonio, and others. Dowden observes, though, that "complete liberty is not the best, one needs bonds of affection, duty [Miranda and Ferdinand exemplify happiness]" (pp. 374-375). Thus, he offers as a major theme "the thought that the true freedom of man consists in service" (p. 373).

[5] Frances Neilson, p. 99.

[6] Ibid., pp. 26, 106. Also illustrative of this type of interpretation are the views of Garnett, who literally associates the action of the play with the celebration of the betrothal of Frederick and the daughter of James I and draws parallels between Prospero and James: the play is seen as related to the economic and moral order of England. "A wise, humane, peace-loving prince, who attains his ends not by force, but by means of policy; devoted to far-sighted enterprises, which none but himself can realize, much less fathom; independent of counsellors, in a secure position, fearing no enemies, and watching over all around him with his superior wisdom: holding back until the hour for decision had come and then successfully intervening; serving legitimate science, but the sworn enemy of the black art: this is what James was in James's eyes, and this is Prospero," cited in Schücking, p. 260.

[7] Derek Traversi, Shakespeare: The Last Phase--The Tempest (London, 1954), p. 200.

[8] Clark, note especially page 105.

[9] MacCracken, Pierce, Durham, note especially pages 205-206.

[10] Stauffer, note especially page 302.

[11] Note Geoffrey Bush's interpretation: "... we think sometimes of Prospero as the type of the artist [Shakespeare]; and we may imagine, if we wish, that there is an affinity between Prospero's art and Shakespeare's, suggesting the success with which Shakespeare imposed his own great vision upon the world. But what we remember about Prospero is only partly his success; it is partly the loneliness and melancholy that accompany this enterprise of the reason to connect things and their significance. It is Prospero who more than any other of Shakespeare's characters stands at one remove from the world, witnessing and guiding it, and at the end it is Prospero who will abjure his magic, break his staff, and deeper than did ever plummet sound will drown his book. In the mind of the artist is the consciousness that what he had chosen to do will never be completed" (p. 133).

[12] Dowden, pp. 337, 338.

[13] Hankins, pp. 278-279.

[14] Knight, Crown, pp. 204, 224.

[15] Stoll, p. 22.

[16] Consider for example, Orgel: according to his interpretation, the play shows direct relationship between Shakespeare's tragedies and The Tempest. Contrary to most other critics, however, he places this play as preparation for the writing of the tragedies, not regarding it as one of Shakespeare's last plays, pp. 110-132.

[17] MacCracken, Pierce, and Durham, pp. 205-206.

[18] Rowse, pp. 433, 435.

[19] Clark, p. 106.

[20] Murry, p. 393.

[21] Knight, Shakespearean Tempest, p. 264.

[22] Ibid., p. 266.

[23] Ibid., p. 263.

[24] Knight, Christian Renaissance, p. 117. He further remarks regarding this conflict: "The Tempest thus contains many ... main

elements of imagery; a sea-tempest and a wrecked ship; another land storm later; supernatural appearances in thunder and lightning. This blending with music; suggestion of fierce beasts, bulls 'bellowing' and lions; a whole series of incidents revolving around Caliban half fish-monster, half-man; and the pine and oak prisons to Ariel, associated with wolves and bears. Ariel himself disguised as a 'nymph of the sea', thus forming a contrast with the sea-beast, Caliban: it is the contrast of depths still and translucent with the muddied turbulence of tragic and tempestuous sea," Shakespearean Tempest, p. 262.

[25] MacCracken, Pierce, and Durham acknowledge the action's being controlled, but assert that it is Ariel's "whose spirit pervades every scene .... All of them [characters] are led, by the wisdom of Prospero acting through Ariel, away from their own wrong impulses, and into reconcilement and peace" (pp. 205, 206). As expressed in the preceding chapter, it should be kept in mind that it is Prospero's power, as well as his wisdom, which controls, pervades every scene; the emphasis is not on the airy spirit who serves the Duke.

[26] Although two critics come close to acknowledging this as a theme (Stauffer says "important words are 'liberty' and 'grace,'" [p. 306]; and Matthews asserts "The Tempest remains to affirm that to the end of his working life Shakespeare retained the faith implicit in his greatest play, that in the ruling of 'the clearest gods,' justice and mercy meet,"[p. 162]), neither fully realizes the significance that Biblical reflections of the water-imagery have on the development of the play.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Don Cameron. _Image and Meaning._ Baltimore: The John's Hopkins Press, 1960.

The Bible and Holy Scriptures. Geneva Version, 1560. Microfilm.

Boas, Frederick, S., ed. _The Arden Shakespeare: The Tempest._ Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., n.d.

Bowen, Gwynneth. _Shakespeare's Farewell._ Inglethorpe: Gwynneth Bowen, n.d.

Brooke, Stopford. _English Literature._ New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Brower, Reuben Arthur. "The Mirror of Analogy--_The Tempest._" _The Fields of Light._ New York: Oxford University Press, 1951, pp. 95-112.

Burgess, William. _The Bible in Shakespeare._ Chicago: The Winona Publishing Co., 1903.

Bush, Douglas. _Themes and Variations in English Poetry of the Renaissance: Time and Man._ Claremont, California: The Claremont Graduate School, 1957?

_____, Geoffrey. _Shakespeare and the Natural Condition._ Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Byrne, Muriel St. Clare. _Elizabethan Life in Town and Country._ 6th ed. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1950.

Carter, Thomas. _Shakespeare: and Holy Scripture: With the Version He Used._ London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.

Chambers, Sir Edmund K. _The Elizabethan Stage._ Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

Clark, Cumberland. _Shakespeare and the Supernatural._ London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1931.

Clemen, Wolfgang H. _The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery._ London: Methuen & Co., 1951.

Coleman, Hamilton. Shakespeare and the Bible. New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1955.

The Cross-Reference Bible. American Standard Version. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1959.

deGroot, John Henry. The Shakespeare's and "The Old Faith". New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.

Dowden, Edward. Shakespeare: His Mind and Art. New York: Harper and Bros., 1918.

Downer, Alan S., ed. William Shakespeare: The Tempest. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1958.

Empson, William. Milton's God. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1961.

Evans, Bertrand. Shakespeare's Comedies. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

Frye, Roland Mushat. Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed. Shakespeare: The Tempest. 11th variorum ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1892.

Goadby, Edwin. The England of Shakespeare. London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., n.d.

Gray, H. D. "The Sources of The Tempest." Modern Language Notes, XXXV (June, 1920), 321-330.

Halliday, F. E. Shakespeare in His Age. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1956.

Hankins, John Erskine. Shakespeare's Derived Imagery. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1953.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Audience. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Hart, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Homilies. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1934.

Hart, John A. Shakespeare--Lectures on Five Plays: The Tempest. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1958.

Hazlitt, William. Characters of Shakespeare's Plays. London: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Heuer, Hermann. "Traumwelt und Wirklichkeit in der Sprache des Tempest." Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XC (1954), 210-228.

Hoeniger, F. D. "Prospero's Storm and Miracle." Shakespeare Quarterly, VII (1956), 33-38.

James I, King. Daemonology. Ed. George B. Harrison. London: Bodley Head, Ltd., 1924.

Kermode, Frank, ed. The Arden Shakespeare: The Tempest. 6th ed. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1958.

Kirschbaum, Leo. Character and Characterization in Shakespeare. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962.

_____. "The Tempest: Apologetics or Spectacle?" Two Lectures on Shakespeare. London: The Clover Press, 1961, pp. 19-41.

Kittredge, George Lyman, ed. Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Chicago: Spencer Press, 1958.

_____. Shakespeare: The Tempest. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1939.

Knight, George Wilson. The Christian Renaissance. New York: W. N. Norton and Co., Inc., 1962.

_____. The Crown of Life. 2nd ed. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1948.

_____. The Shakespearean Tempest. 3rd ed. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1953.

Landauer, Gustav. Shakespeare. Ed. Martin Buber. Hamburg: Rütten & Loening Verlag, 1962.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. The Great Chain of Being. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Lowell, James Russell. Literary Essays, III. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1894.

MacCracken, H. N., F. E. Pierce, and W. H. Durham. An Introduction to Shakespeare. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1910.

Marx, Leo. "Shakespeare's American Fable." Massachusetts Review, II (1960), 40-71.

Matthews, Honor. Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays. London: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Murry, John Middleton. Shakespeare. London: Jonathan Cape, 1948.

Neilson, Frances. Shakespeare and The Tempest. Rindge, New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1956.

The New Testament Octapla--The Geneva Version. Ed. Luther A. Weigle. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, n.d.

Noble, Richmond. *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Nosworthy, J. M. "The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*." *Review of English Studies*, XXIV (1948), 281-294.

Onions, C. T., ed. *Shakespeare's England*, I. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1950.

Orgel, Stephen K. "New Ways of Adversity: Tragic Experience in *The Tempest*." *In Defense of Reading*. Ed. Reuben Brower and Richard Poirier. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1962, pp. 102-140.

Owst, Gerald Robert. *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. 2nd ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

The Oxford Book of Christian Verse. Ed. Lord David Cecil. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940.

The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse. Ed. E. K. Chambers. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932.

Plimpton, George A. *The Education of Shakespeare, Illustrated from the Schoolbooks in Use in His Time*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Renner, Ida. "Leitmotive Shakespeares Im *Tempest*." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCV (1959), 284-291.

Robin, P. Ansell. *Animal Lore in English Literature*. 2nd ed. London: John Murray, 1936.

Rollins, Hyder E. and Herschel Baker, ed. *The Renaissance in England*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1954.

Rowe, Nicholas. "Account of the Life, etc., of Mr. William Shakespeare." *Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare*. Ed. D. Nichol Smith. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962.

Rowse, A. L. *William Shakespeare*. London: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

Ruegg, August. "Caliban Und Miranda." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, LXXIX (1953), 128-131.

Schelling, Felix E. *Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1643*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1908.

Schlegel, Frederick. *Lectures on the History of Literature*. Tr. Henry G. Bohn. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.

Schmitt, Carl. Der Leviathan in der Staatslehre des Thomas Hobbes: Sinn und Fehlschlag eines politischen Symbols. Hamburg: Hanseatische verlagsanstalt, 1938.

Schücking, Levin L. Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays. Tr. Peter Smith. Gloucester, Massachusetts: George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., 1959.

Smith, Sharon L. "The commedia dell' arte and Problems Related to Source in The Tempest." The Emporia State Research Studies: Shakespeare and The Renaissance, XIII (September, 1964), 11-23.

Speaight, Robert. Nature in Shakespearean Tragedy. London: Hollis and Carter, 1955.

Spencer, Theodore. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942.

Spenser, Edmund. Poetical Works. Ed. J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Spurgeon, Caroline F. E. Shakespeare's Imagery, and What It Tells Us. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936.

Stauffer, Donald A. Shakespeare's World of Images. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1949.

Still, Colin. Shakespeare's Mystery Play. London: Cecil Palmer, 1921.

Stoll, Elmer Edger. Shakespeare Studies. New York: G. E. Stechert and Co., 1942.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.

Topsell, Edward. "Historie of Four-Footed Beastes" and "Historie of Serpents." The Elizabethan Zoo: A Book of Beasts Both Fabulous and Authenic. Ed. Muriel St. Clare Byrne. London: Frederick Etchells and Hugh MacDowell, 1926.

Traversi, Derek. "The Tempest." Shakespeare: The Last Phase. London: Hollis and Carter, 1945, pp. 193-272.

Wagner, Emma Brockway. The Tempest: An Allegorical Interpretation. Ed. Hugh Robert Orr. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1933.

Wells, Henry. Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Westfall, Alfred Van Rensselaer. American Shakespearean Criticism: 1607-1865. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1939.

Wiley, Lulu Rumsey. *Bible Animals: Mammals of the Bible.* New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1957.

Wilson, Daniel. *Caliban, the Missing Link.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1873.

_____, Harold S. "Action and Symbol in *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, IV (October, 1953), 375-384.

_____, J. Dover. *The Meaning of The Tempest.* Newcastle on the Tyne: The Literary and Philosophical Society, 1936.

Wittkower, Rudolf. "Marvels of the East: A Study in the History of Monsters." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, V (1943), pp. 165-190.

Wordsworth, Charles Bishop. *Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible.* London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1864.

Wynne, Arnold. *The Growth of English Drama.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1927.

Yoder, Audrey. *Animal Analogy in Shakespeare's Character Portrayal.* New York: King's Crown Press, 1947.

VITA

Linda Flasch Redman

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: WATER IMAGERY IN *THE TEMPEST*

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Guthrie, Oklahoma, June 25, 1941, the daughter of Otto Arthur and Margaret Elma Flasch.

Education: Attended grade school and high school in Coyle, Oklahoma; graduated in 1959; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the Oklahoma State University, with a major in English, in August, 1962; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree in August, 1965.

Professional experience: Served as a graduate assistant in the Oklahoma State University English Department for two years, 1962-1963; 1963-1964, and one year as an instructor, 1964-1965.