Prospero and Caliban: Destruction of the Native

Brooke Bastie

William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* received new critical interpretation in the 1970s when scholars began to view the text not only as Shakespeare's final play but as a dramatic representation of colonial authority.[1] These readings implicate Prospero as the oppressive colonizer and utilize Caliban as the representative of the colonized collective. By understanding the dynamic of the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, the reader can recognize the imperial environment of this era. To that end, this master and servant relationship fits several well-established patterns: the colonizer invades the foreign land and gains the trust of native people; the mutual relationship changes when the colonizer usurps the authority of the native inhabitants; the native people attempt rebellion without avail; and, finally, the colonizer opportunistically leaves, but the native culture remains scarred from the impact of the colonial tyranny.[2] Shakespeare delineates these steps through Prospero and Caliban and crafts a narrative epitomizing a typical colonial interaction during the seventeenth century and those to follow. Close readings of critical passages reveal how Shakespeare humanizes the colonial process and exposes some of its flaws.

Shakespeare's writing draws upon the current ideas of his time. His contemporaries address the idea of colonialism in language unlike that used to discuss the issue today. Montaigne's frequently cited essay "On Cannibalism" addresses differences between savage and

high society, admitting he does "not believe . . . that there is anything barbarous or savage about" the natives "except that [society calls] barbarous anything that is contrary to [its] own habits."[3] His definition of what is "wild" involves a metaphor linking fruit to nature. "Wild fruit" is actually ordinary, for nature is its place of origin and, therefore, the fruit removed from nature should be called "wild." Extending the metaphor to human beings Montaigne claims an instinct is an inherent feature. Are civilized human beings less wild because they are less natural? Montaigne already seems to hold contrary views on colonial thought about cannibals. In *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's manifestation of the savage, Caliban, hovers dangerously close to the word "cannibal." With the switch of a few letters, the name "Caliban" acts as an anagram of the "cannibal" he embodies. Shakespeare allows the audience to hear the thoughts of Caliban and the way he reasons through his problematic relationship with Prospero. The audience begins to associate Caliban, over the course of the play, less as cannibalistic and savage nature, but more as a decision-making person. Shakespeare's interpretation of the cannibal through Caliban aligns with his contemporary Montaigne; Caliban is not so wild after all.

Montaigne continues his thoughts on the nature of the cannibal by looking closer at native culture. He does not see an innate savagery. If native culture is natural, then it is modern culture that corrupts it into something "unnatural. Montaigne believes an indigenous society consists of simpler and more innocent type of person., due to its isolation from the world at large. Ahead of his time, Montaigne saw the value in a childlike and innocent spirit, much like the later view of English Romantics in the nineteenth century. These scholars retreated to nature, in a much more privileged manner, but nonetheless, saw the value in stepping away from modernity and pursuing a childlike philosophy of simple living.

Finally, Montaigne draws on the incivility and savagery still present in society at large. While some non-European societies of the time believed in practices such as human sacrifice, the English believed in execution. Both took a human life, but each maintained a different rationale. The English understood their justification, but demeaned the cannibal for lacking a justification be fitting English standards.[4] Montaigne pondered which was worse: the English mutilating, burning, and torturing the living "under the cloak of piety" or "roast[ing] a man and eat[ing] him after he is dead." The answer from Montaigne's rhetorical context infers the latter.[5] And Shakespeare seems to depict a similarly savage European crew. Prospero and Miranda verbally and physically assault Caliban throughout the play. While Caliban might entertain deviant thoughts, his actions seldom display such physical or violent defiance in word and deed. Shakespeare purposely paints the civilized as less controlled than the savage.

The crux of Montaigne's struggle with the cannibal surfaces clearly in Gonzalo's monologue. Shakespeare comes close to directly quoting Montaigne's essay "On Cannibals" in Act 2, when Gonzalo states how he would colonize the island. Shakespeare's placement of Gonzalo's monologue within an idealistic fantasy marks his deviation from Montaigne's ideas. Gonzalo sets up his ideal "plantation" within the context of a dream.[6] In this dream, Gonzalo asks "And were the king on't, what would I do" (2.1.146). The word "king" implies the highest status, and, therefore, the subordination of all those beneath. Although Gonzalo begins as a colonizer, he intends to provide a different kingly rule, which he parses in the ensuing lines. Within Gonzalo's kingdom, he will have no "letters . . . be known" (2.1.151). These letters represent signs of status. A title before a name implies nobility and inherently forces society into a hierarchical structure where some must remain low so that other can remain high. By removing

social hierarchy from his vision, Gonzalo eliminates the first issue of colonialism, the power dynamic in place between the oppressed and the oppressor. He reiterates his desire for the destruction of the hierarchy through the use of economic terms. The words “riches” and “poverty” (2.1.151) imply rank order, the exact opposite of Gonzalo’s vision. For that reason, he will not allow these status symbols in his new kingdom.

Next, Gonzalo lists different types of industry and emphasizes the destruction of those industries. In his kingdom, “all men [will be] idle” and the women will be “innocent and pure” (2.1.155-6). Gonzalo, similar to Montaigne, values thinking. Much like the bourgeoisie of the day, Gonzalo sees the benefits of a comfortable lifestyle where no man will work. In his new colony, he will again level the social classes and allow all men and women the pleasures of a carefree lifestyle. This idea contrasts with the colonial mindset, where only the colonizer lives a life of idleness, and the colonized must serve. He summarizes the first part of his monologue with two words: “no sovereignty” (2.1.157). Gonzalo states the desire for a classless colony again. But his repetitious and tedious explanation in favor of the breakdown of the social hierarchy works directly against the colonial mindset. His friends, Sebastian and Antonio, point out to the contradiction between his claim to rule and his free ideal society by reminding him “he would be king on’t” (2.1.157) should he build his kingdom without class. However, Gonzalo prioritizes equality and welfare for his subjects over the power accumulated through a totalitarian rule.

By deconstructing colonialism’s power structure, Gonzalo leads his listeners to a more friendly place and provides good reason for this type of social dynamic. He cites the benefits of work again “without sweat or endeavour” (2.1.161). Then Gonzalo muses about the peace this

society would have with no “Treason, felony, / Sword, pike, knife, [or] gun” (2.1.161-62). The insinuation of peace points directly to the normal interactions between the colonizer and the native. Often the colonizer uses weapons as a means of power to subvert indigenous people. Europe’s industrial advancements allowed them to create sharper and more lethal weapons. All of Gonzalo’s idealized thought, fall flat within the context of the play, undercutting the proposed revisions to the colonial scheme. Shakespeare puts this reference in a time of idle discussion, placing the ideas put forth by Montaigne in his essay about the ideal colonial empire as mere fairy tales compared to the harshness of colonial rule. Not only does he write his perspective on colonialism in an idealized manner, but Gonzalo also draws a connection between his imagined society and that of the “Golden Age” (2.1.168). By comparing his ideal society to the Greco-Roman notion of a perfect age, Shakespeare shows how Gonzalo’s argument turns fantastical. This connection involving Gonzalo’s vision, Montaigne’s “On Cannibalism,” and the Golden Age exposes the one factor for which Gonzalo and Montaigne do not fully take into account: human corruption. Shakespeare delineates the current state of the island, the subordination of Caliban, and the unrelenting rule of Prospero, as the reality of colonial authority. Shakespeare exposes his agreement with Montaigne’s theory through Gonzalo’s monologue but demonstrates Montaigne’s ideas only work within the context of a dream. The reality of colonial authority is grim.

And with the bleak nature of colonial authority under indirect scrutiny in this text, Shakespeare’s decision to write about a Spanish exploration becomes as relevant. David Scott aptly points out ,“in order to understand the project of colonial power at any given historical moment one has to understand the character of the political rationality that constituted it.”[7]

Abiding by this principle, exploring the colonial thought of seventeenth-century England exposes the environment perpetuating colonialism. From the fifteenth to the seventeenth century, the Age of Exploration characterized much of Europe. Spain, Portugal, France, and England, major stakeholders of European power, began to see the political and economic advantages to materials found in previously undiscovered lands. This two-hundred-year foot race equally represents the fight between native and European culture. His choice of Spanish characters points to Shakespeare's awareness of the colonial argument, the sentiments of his nation towards the savage, and the possible regressive nature of England's thinking. Finding potential faults in the English mindset towards colonialism, Shakespeare shifts the focus to another nation to avoid censorship. His choice of Spaniards demonstrates his fear of the tale about colonialism reflecting poorly upon the monarchy. Thus, he places it in a Spanish context. Either Shakespeare knew the ramifications of colonialism and did not want his critique of the ideology in *The Tempest* to reflect poorly on the crown, or he wanted the English audience to formulate opinions on the topic without directly critiquing their society. These two core reasons enable the reader to see the colonial thread of England and analyze the thread as such. As the post-colonial theory begins to pull at this thread, the unraveling exposes the effects of Shakespeare's writing in colonial England. Shakespeare captures a moment in history and preserves the sentiments of the savage and the colonizer through his play. As such, the action of the play and analysis of the characters demonstrate a fossilized colonial ideology prepared to be examined, categorized, filed, and reexamined in the context of post-colonial theory.

Early critics view Prospero as an "all-knowing, benevolent patriarch and artistic creator whose motives are beyond reproach," but in the light of decolonization movements in "Africa,

the Caribbean, and Latin America" the narrative of the oppressed Caliban overshadows the study of the benevolent Prospero.[8] Although early critics point to positive interpretation of Prospero's actions, from Prospero's simple explanation of his unjust deposition as the Duke of Milan to first interactions on the island in the second scene of the play, his word choice hides an abusive power dynamic influencing his relationship with the island's inhabitants. Prospero's rhetoric depicts Caliban's background as barbaric. Not only does Prospero directly call Caliban an "abhorred slave" (1.2.504), he also dehumanizes his appearance by relating his half-human half-devil origins. Prospero justifies this description because Caliban springs from the relationship between Sycorax, a witch, and Hades, the ruler of the underworld. By villainizing the slave's origins, Prospero begins to invalidate his claim to the island even though Caliban knows "the island's" his "by Sycorax [his] mother, / Which thou tak'st from [him] (1.2.334). Initiating the typical master-slave dynamic, Caliban points to the master's dependency on Caliban as his sole subject, claiming him as the only "subject that [Prospero has]" (1.2.344), even though Caliban "was [his] own King" first (1.2.345). His claim to the island and his view of Prospero as the usurper aligns with the typical experience of a colonized person. The colonized collective knows its right to the land but remains powerless against the western colonizing forces. Prospero's derogatory and oppressive terminology reinforces the master-slave dynamic of their relationship even though Caliban knows his claim to the island is viable. Therefore, the backgrounds of Prospero and Caliban demonstrate the beginning of a typical relationship between the colonizer and the colonized.

The origin of this relationship begins as a reciprocal process, both are equal beneficiaries of one another's knowledge. Prospero and Miranda must, at first, rely on Caliban to teach them

the ways of the island. Caliban exclaims that he "loved [them] / And showed [them] all the qualities o'th' isle: / The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile" (1.2.337-39). By divulging the secrets of the island to the two foreigners, their relationship develops through mutual benefit and an exchange of services. Caliban offers "hospitality to Prospero" in hopes that the same hospitality will be returned.[9] Conflating hospitality with "civility," Paul Brown argues Caliban's almost royal monarchy over the island implies a level of civilization suggesting etiquette and the development of a political system. In addition, Brown carefully chooses the word "hospitality" as it embodies the friendly attitude towards guests. This image subverts the shipwreck and the estrangement between Prospero and Miranda and converts them into a Private Island Getaway, where instead of purchasing a timeshare, they seize the timeshare company. The mere suggestion of Prospero and his daughter Miranda as guests insinuates the original resident, Caliban, as the owner of this tropical hideaway. And Caliban asserts his claim through his mother. However, colonizers often debunk such claims as invalid because of the typical criminal nature of the uncivilized native, such as Sycorax's "banished exile," or the assertion of a patriarchy, seeing Sycorax's "gender" as weakening the claim of Caliban.[10] This incongruence and invalidity inevitably lead to the slow shift in power when Prospero and Miranda arrive. The idea of the two strikingly different populations living together in harmony appears idealistic because on this isolated island, Prospero cannot remove himself from his royal origins. Consequently, Prospero, himself an exile, hungers for power as his role as ruler travels with him. So just as his physical body moves from Milan to the island, so, too, does his rule transfer from one kingdom to another. Prospero never intends to build a symbiotic relationship. Therefore,

Prospero quickly flips the power dynamic to maintain some sense of sovereignty in this new domain.[11]

The mutualistic dynamic switches into an authoritative dynamic when Prospero attempts to justify Caliban's enslavement. Prospero cunningly times his seizure of power to strengthen his unjust claim to the island and unjust treatment of Caliban. Caliban attempts to engage in a physical relationship with Prospero's daughter Miranda, something admitted by Caliban and reported to the audience by Prospero. When Prospero prosecutes Caliban, he accuses him of seeking "to violate / The honour of [his] child" (1.2.348-49). Caliban shows no remorse and claims he only desired to populate "the isle with Calibans" (1.2.352). Prospero uses this attempted rape as leverage to give justice to the enslavement of Caliban. The ironic accusation of Caliban's rape of Miranda parallels the idea of colonialism as the rape of the native land. Therefore, Prospero himself acts symbolically as a rapist to the island as he manipulates Caliban to exploit the land and its resources. The connections between physical rape and metaphorical rape give purpose to Prospero's relation of this anecdote, not only as exhibit A in the conviction of Caliban but also as exhibit A in the conviction of himself as a colonizer. Patrick MacDonnell tries to extrapolate the meaning of rape to demonstrate the manipulative nature of Prospero, as he "imprudently lodged the two together," inciting the whole incident.[12] While Prospero's intelligence does not exclude this level of manipulation (he controls every action of the play) it proves incongruent with one of his biggest concerns: his daughter's virginity. Prospero desires to maintain his sovereignty. However, even more so, he desires to control the purity of his daughter. The accusation demonstrates his ability to commandeer an advantageous moment to enact rule, rather than a master plan to expose the native as the savage. Prospero's manipulation

of the rape incident into an opportunistic deposition of the mutualistic relationship, creates the rift between the colonizer and colonized. Eric Cheyfitz draws a connection between Caliban as Prospero's property and Miranda as Prospero's property and therefore, colors the rape and eventual nuptials of Miranda as examples illustrating "the sexual appropriation of women for political purposes."[13] Diplomatically, the marriage of Miranda and Ferdinand advances Prospero's sovereignty and political prowess whereas an intimate relationship between Miranda and Caliban would ultimately besmirch Prospero's name. Hence, the casting of his advances as rape not only subordinates Caliban's mutual claims to the land but in turn also lends support to conduct the future of Prospero and his daughter.

The enslavement of Caliban leads to extremely harsh conditions, where Prospero uses his magic to torment Caliban. Aside from physically assaulting him, Prospero and Miranda both hurl verbal assaults at him. Prospero calls Caliban a "poisonous slave" and "the devil himself" (1.2.320) while Miranda's verbal attacks cohere with those comments of her father's involving Caliban's his "vile race" (1.2.359) and servanthood. But Caliban does not accept such mistreatment. He understands his inability to defeat Prospero because of his magic, but he never accepts subordination. Instead, he continues to speak out against his oppressor knowing the consequences of his rebellious words while maintaining his freedom in the final place of his domain, his mind. However, his inexorable resistance illuminates the reason many decolonized people groups identify with Caliban. Colonized areas in "Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America" used the experience of Caliban as a "rallying cry" of resistance against their oppressors when they saw "national liberation was imminent," and "revise and mobilize the play" to fit their specific political turmoil.[14] When Caliban resists, those same colonized people of Africa, the

Caribbean, and Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s use his words to claim their land back from their oppressors. The highlight of their outcry comes when Caliban recounts the betrayal of Prospero's initial promises and Caliban reminds him that he is "all the subjects that [Prospero has], which first was [Caliban's] own king, and here [Prospero] sty[s] [him]" (1.2.340-41). In this instance, Caliban's singular experience becomes a colonized collective, demonstrating the plight of the entire community of colonized people groups and reminding the colonizer that their power remains vested in the existence of the subordinate group. The transferal of Caliban to a multitude of tribes demonstrates his universality as a complex representative of imperialism. However, Scott and Parker would argue that colonized people each develop individual independent histories an individual struggle for independence, and an individual reaction to the effects of the colonizer. In such understanding, the narrative of the captive is not totally subdued by that of the colonizer; some aspects of culture cling to the edges of the colonial imprint.[15] But in this manner of thinking, individuality does not preclude the colonized to use the same logic as the colonizer in order to fight systemic oppression. Instead of defining themselves as colonial "others," they define themselves as the colonial "together," knowing their differences but utilizing a colonial grouping to fight the imperial institution that enslaved them. The identification of colonized people with the colonized Caliban justifies his emblematic mode during the 1960s and 1970s as a not holistic but sufficient representation of experiences of native people during times of colonization.

When a colonizer enters a new nation, the native inhabitants' cultural traditions move in one of two directions. The colonizer "either push[es] the [natives] towards utter difference—thus silence—or towards utter likeness—and thus the collapse of their unique identity."[16] This

unfortunate dichotomy, with one extreme as calamitous as the other, arises when the colonizer attempts to civilize what he perceives as savage. Either the resistance or the acceptance of this supposed civilization dictates the path of the native population, and eventually, the native population's culture. When Prospero teaches Caliban his language, he deceives himself that he works for the betterment of Caliban. Yet Caliban resists this helpful skill and claims the only benefit of learning the new language is knowing "how to curse" (1.2.365). He then demands that "the red plague rid [Prospero] / For learning [Caliban] [his] language" (1.2.365-66). Language and cultural identity are often closely intertwined. Language aids in the formation of a national identity and often acculturation occurs when another group strips away parts of that identity. Therefore, because of Caliban's resistance, Prospero embodies "a colonizer whose refused offer of civilization forces [Caliban] to strict discipline."[17] This preliminary attempt to civilize Caliban may intend to craft a better life for him, a life following European model.

However, the intention and result of this action appear to conflict as Caliban relents against the strong colonial hand. This supposed gift becomes an additional point of leverage over Caliban as Prospero calls for his obedience as his servant because he helped him learn his native tongue even though it "took pains to make thee speak" (1.2.354). As Prospero provides this supposed favor for Caliban to gain leverage, the reader sees Prospero's colonial justification unfold. He justifies his entrapment of Caliban by citing intangible lessons of civility. This particular justification and lack of others suggests something about the purpose of Prospero's character. Many colonizers' focus foremost upon the "extraction of wealth" from the colonized people.[18] The other motivation for colonization is typically rooted in religious conversion, the idea of saving souls whilst turning profits. Prospero's oppression of Caliban seems to stem not

from the desire to make money or exact religious conversion, but rather from some kind of twisted mentorship which in turn serves to ease Prospero's stay on the island. Prospero's blindness to his oppressive nature stems from his desire to cloak himself as a humanitarian, teaching the savage manners, a seemingly better language, and civility.

The idea of the master giving seemingly good natured gifts to his slaves continues as Trinculo and Stephano introduce Caliban to alcohol. Caliban, under the influence, reveres them as gods and desires both to achieve his freedom and to transfer masters. These actions demonstrate the dependency complex of enslaved populations and their inevitable reliance on colonial authority. This small form of rebellion demonstrates Caliban's disapproval of Prospero's rule but his inability to accept self-governance. Caliban tells Stephano and Trinculo they are "brave gods," and he will "kneel to [them]" (2.2.115-6). Octave Mannoni suggests colonized people suffer from a "dependency complex" because these people groups need the colonial rule to offset mental distress. The dependency complex manifests through an inability to accept independence and manifests symbolically through the possibility of dependency on alcohol, which Stephano and Trinculo introduce to Caliban. Alcohol as a means to corrupt indigenous people groups appears in many narratives of enslavement such as James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans.* The correlation between the corrupt Native American Magua and the corrupt Caliban demonstrates a similar trend in transatlantic literature. Although Mannoni attempts to give reasons for Caliban's relentless efforts to find a master, Caribbean writers criticize this narrow outlook as one reflection of ethnocentric tendencies. Caribbean writers argue with Mannoni's statement because it reduces the intellectual ability of native populations. While Mannoni's assessment of the presence of the dependency complex remains negotiable,

and is represented by the "[contestation] by a host of Caribbean writers and intellectuals," the Stockholm syndrome might better explain the psychology of a dependency complex. Colonization is a traumatic event for the colonized group; their entire livelihood changes. The colonial population becomes captives of the imperialist regime, and the psychology of captivity applies to the colonized group. Their dependency consequently stems from aggressive ruling that steals their sense of cultural sovereignty.[19]

Trinculo and Stephano also demonstrate the colonizer interested in the economics of the native population. Their plan of capturing Caliban and putting him on display exemplifies the type of oppression the colonizers used to dehumanize indigenous populations and exploit them for personal gain. Upon seeing Caliban, Trinculo and Stephano plot to take him back with them if only they can "recover him, and keep him tame" (2.2.76); he will be a "present for any emperor that ever trod" (2.2.70). The connection between possession or occupation of land and the possession of a person appears not only in the relationship between Caliban and Prospero but also between Trinculo and Stephano. During this rebellion stage, Caliban believes his new masters will treat him differently. However, the text illustrating the mindset of the colonizer goes beyond basic interactions between Prospero and Caliban and applies to a grander ingrained ideology. And these attempts to civilize and introduce Caliban to new ideas of the European way of life represents the selfish motives of the colonizer.

As Caliban realizes the oppressive nature of his conditions, he entertains the idea of an actual rebellion against his original captor Prospero. Although he makes verbal insurrections from Prospero's harsh hand, he does not physically rebel against Prospero. When he meets Trinculo and Stephano, Caliban sees new and potentially benevolent rulers, and he desires to

switch allegiances from Prospero to the new boys in town. Somehow the switch of ownership signals freedom to Caliban, and he conjures up a plot to kill Prospero with his new drunken gods. These sentiments take action only when Caliban drinks too much, claiming his freedom in a drunken stupor. Because of his inebriation, Caliban sings of "freedom" because he has a "new master" and therefore feels he is a "new man" (2.2.180-82). This song once again highlights the contradictions of colonized people, where they seek freedom through a new master and not through their own rule. Paul Brown articulates the relationship between Trinculo, Stephano, and Caliban as an "antimasque" because of the repetition not only of "the encounter between civil and savage" but also "the hospitality of Caliban . . . as a voluntary act of subjection."[20] By creating repetitive actions, Shakespeare exposes the underlying tendency of westerns to enslave what they perceive as the savage. By demonstrating similar actions arising in Trinculo and Stephano, Prospero can no longer signify this anomaly in his action. The norm now becomes the colonial pattern.

However, this excitement is short-lived for when Caliban sees Prospero again in the final scene of the play, he fears the punishment awaiting him for plotting the death of his master. Because Caliban's plan against his master comes from a drunken state, it can represent his dream of freedom rather than the action itself, the dream being the hope of an oppressed population. Caliban's rationale for not pursuing this freedom stems from Prospero's superior position in weaponry, as Caliban demonstrates repeatedly his belief in his culture and way over those of Prospero. Where native populations use spears, bows, and arrows, foreigners use guns and properly sharpened swords. This idea manifests itself here in Prospero's magic, an element that outweighs any weapon Caliban could craft. An indefinable magical force embodies the unknown

power of the colonizer to the colonized who view these foreigners as aliens invading their land in clothing they have never seen, carrying weapons they cannot imagine, and speaking a language completely different from their own. These foreign forces make the collective colonized feel alienated in their homeland. Inevitably, the control of the colonizer roots establishes the oppressed and the fear, especially when it comes in the form of repercussions for rebellion.

In the last scene of the play, Caliban and Prospero demonstrate the final step of the typical master-slave dynamic. As Caliban, Trinculo, and Stefano's plan to kill Prospero unfurls, Prospero addresses the traitors. In so far as Trinculo and Stefano rebellion, Prospero takes no responsibility for their actions of usurpation. But Prospero recognizes his culpability for Caliban and his actions, grudgingly admitting,

> These three have robbed me, and this demi-devil
> (For he's a bastard one) had plotted with them
> To take my life. Two of these fellows you
> Must know and own; this thing of darkness I
> Acknowledge mine. (5.1.272-76)

Once again, Prospero reinforces Caliban's illegitimate birth to undercut Caliban's claim to the island in the eyes of Prospero. Even as Prospero readies for departure, he continually demonizes and subordinates Caliban by reinforcing his just claim to the island. Already utilizing the rape of Miranda as justification for enslavement, Prospero harkens back to another rationale to justify his seizure of colonial power. Caliban's bastardized past had no relevance to Caliban's ownership of the island, as he was the only inhabitant and inherited the island from his mother. Therefore, Prospero's relentless recollection of this negligible fact acts more to assuage any colonial guilt than to work as a mechanism to assert imperial authority. His secondary response to Caliban's rebellion proves double-edged. Prospero takes responsibility for the uprising of Caliban because

he has molded the native into a creature who rebels. Inherently, Caliban's rebellion demonstrates the failure of absolute authority over the colonized. But Prospero's responsibility diminishes the triumphant act of defiance for the native. By claiming responsibility for all of the native's actions, Prospero hollows out Caliban's self-determining act. Besides undercutting Caliban's rebellion as a manifestation of his misguided rule, he also recognizes Caliban as a "thing of darkness" (5.1.275). In the context of a highly religious England, lightness and darkness take on greater significance than good and evil. These two attributes speak to a more profound spiritual well-being. By relating Caliban to darkness and dehumanizing him with the word "thing," Prospero subjects Caliban to a class below human, back to the base animalistic state of existence. So by Prospero undermining Caliban's claim to the island, subverting his final act of power, and pushing him to a subhuman state, Shakespeare exposes the colonial mindset and sets up the last interaction between Caliban and Prospero.

In their final dialogue, Prospero exerts his final authority over Caliban, and this scene admits to the scars of a colonized existence. Prospero pardons the rebellious behavior of Caliban by sentencing him to the penance of cleaning Prospero's cell; should Caliban "trim [his cell] handsomely," then he will gain "[Prospero's] pardon" (5.1.294). Caliban's acknowledgment of his mistake reverts his allegiance to Prospero, and he asks for forgiveness. Highlighting the strength of the imperialistic relationship, Prospero exacts the manipulative bond he holds over Caliban. He assigns Caliban a final superfluous chore even though he will not stay on the island to see its completion, as he will soon head back with the rest of the royal party to Milan. The relationship between Prospero and Caliban ends as Prospero leaves the island, but the remnants of his colonial dictatorship remain in the form of a scarred and changed Caliban. After his short

taste of pseudo-freedom, Caliban responds to Prospero's commands with the penance of an obedient servant.

> Ay, that I will; and I'll be wise hereafter
> And seek for grace. What a thrice-double ass
> Was I to take this drunkard for a god,
> And worship this dull fool! (5.1.295-98)

Caliban's initial reaction to Prospero's reprimand and punishment verifies his complete subservience to Prospero's rule. Caliban attempts to appease his colonial overlord by explaining his new pursuit of wisdom and grace, both religious proverbs demonstrating Caliban's realignment with European ideology as opposed to his native instincts. His secondary reaction reflects the shame associated with rebellion for the native. Caliban essentially calls himself a fool of great magnitude for even entertaining the thought of switching allegiances to Trinculo and Stefano. His self-deprecation shows the psychological imprint the colonial authority makes on its subjects. Caliban then reveals another dimension of colonial rule by equating his master-slave relationship with the act of worship. Caliban's treatment of his masters as being higher than himself epitomizes the destructive nature of colonialism. At one point, Caliban and Prospero were equals. Now, Caliban is not only a subject but subhuman, as Prospero pointed out in his early speech. Therefore, as Prospero makes a show of giving the island back to Caliban, even though he stole it from him when he first arrived, he leaves Caliban believing himself a representative of a benevolent ruler. The departure of Prospero for Milan negatively affects Caliban. Like any colonists leaving the new territory and returning to their homeland, their stay is never about permanence, but rather about power, only leaving when Prospero secures his elite status back in his home country of Milan. As Prospero instills his values and changes Caliban,

so, too, do colonists change the indigenous people when they arrive, and those changes do not disappear when they leave.

For these reasons, Emma Smith argues *The Tempest* is a "theatrical microcosm of the imperial paradigm."[21] The entire story in the light of post-colonial criticism, especially the relationship of Prospero and Caliban, represents on a basic level the nature of colonial powers and relationship between them and the native population. Although this play can be seen from a multiplicity of perspectives, with the help of recent scholars, the examination of colonialism takes the play out of the "context . . . of the plays' historical and political signification" and into the present.[22] Thus, *The Tempest* can be viewed from a many diverse angles, but Prospero can no longer only represent a manifestation of the dying Shakespeare, but also must to some extent represent the oppressive colonial overlord.

Notes

1. A significant change in ideology concerning *The Tempest* commenced around the 1970s with the introduction of post-colonial theory and its application to Shakespearean texts. Michael Neill, "Post-Colonial Shakespeare? Writing Away from the Centre," in *Post-Colonial Shakespeare*, ed. Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin, (New York: Routledge, 1998), points to "Ania Loomba, Martin Orkin, Jyotsna Singh, and Gauri Viswanathan" as key critics who "illuminate [the history of colonial Shakespeare's] neo-colonial afterlife" (164). Not only do these critics begin the analysis of *The Tempest* in the light of colonialism but critics such as Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare and Modern Culture* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2008); Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, "Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: The Discursive Context of the Tempest," in *Alternative Shakespeare* (New York: Methuen, 1985); Eric Cheyfitz, *The Poetics of Imperialism and Colonialization from the Tempest to Tarzan,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997); Paul Brown, "This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge mine: The Tempest and the Discourse of Colonialism," in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Material,* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Meredith Skura, "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest,*" in *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 40.1 (Spring, 1998); among others expound the field. For example, Paul Brown (1985) connects the idea of the colonial text and context to "Edward Said's account of oriental discourse" (58). The abrupt nature of this discourse hinges on the 1970s wave of criticism beginning with these critics, among others.

2. Skura supports this structure of the colonial forces in "Discourse and the Individual" by stating "Europeans arrive in the New World and assume they can appropriate what properly belongs to the New World Other, who is then 'erased'" (48).

3. Michel de Montaigne, "On Cannibals," *Essays* (New York: Penguin Books, 1958), 108.

4. During Shakespeare's lifetime, Colonialism began to take its full shape as a money-making enterprise for England. Looking sixty years past Shakespeare's death, the *Articles of Peace* of 1677 finally put into words the prejudice and inequality of colonial authority without recognizing implications. The *Articles of Peace* documented the agreement between India and England in regard to their authority within their country. The jargon of this doctrine primarily aims to return powers back to the Indian state. However, the crafty rhetoric limits the supposed freedoms of the colonized nation of India. The opening phrase of "Article I," *Articles of Peace between the Most Serene and Mighty Prince Charles II. By the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c., and Several Indian Kings and Queens* (London: John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, and Henry Hills, 1677), perfectly sums up the status of the natives "that the respective *Indian* Kings and Queens do from henceforth acknowledge to have their immediate Dependency on, and own all Subjection to the Great King of *England.*" Following this statement, the Indian nation and any freedoms granted henceforth will be marred by the pseudo-freedom given to this nation, because they directly depend upon and owe all subjection to the crown. The *Articles of Peace* exemplifies the codification of "political rationalities of colonial power," David Scott, *Colonial Governmentality*, 193.

By iterating the organizing structure of colonial rule, the English begin to rationalize the imperial thought, giving way to a hierarchical society and begetting the complete domination of those oppressed. At this moment, colonialism becomes not only about money but also a power dynamic between the two opposing groups. In a way, the ability of a country like England to invade, exploit, and civilize demonstrates the ultimate power of imposing an ideology on another

nation. This represents not only political rule, but economic, social, and cultural rule as well. So, by crafting a doctrine like the *Articles of Peace*, the English formulate a rationality entrenched in the delusion that their authority somehow leads to the holistic betterment of an indigenous population.

5. Michel de Montaigne, "On Cannibals," *Essays*. 108-13.

6. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Bloomsbury, London, 1999): 2.1.144. Subsequent citations from this edition will be cited parenthetically in the text. Also see for comparison the Montaigne passage from *Essays:* "This is a nation, I should say to Plato, in which there is no kind of commerce, no knowledge of letters, no science of numbers, no title of magistrate or of political superior, no habit of service, riches or poverty, no contracts, no inheritance, no divisions of property, only leisurely occupations, no respect for anu kinship but the common ties, no clothes, no agriculture, no treason, deceit, greed, envy, slander, and forgiveness have never been heard. How far from such perfection would he find the republic that he imagined: 'men fresh from the hands of the gods'" (110). While the connection is not perfect, the similar language leads to the interpretation that Shakespeare could be making an allusion to Montaigne's work.

7. David Scott, *Colonial Governmentality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 204.

8. Trevor Griffiths, "'This Island's Mine': Caliban and Colonialism" in *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's* The Tempest*,* ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (New York: G.K. Hall, 1998), 130, explains pre-nineteenth century criticism of *The Tempest* in reference Caliban's role dealt with him as a "preternatural being" by critics such as "Dryden, Rowe, Warton, Johnson, and Mrs. Montagu" (130). Griffith furthers the early critical approach by citing how the Darwinian evolution subsumed these early critics' ideas and promulgated the Darwinian "link" between apes and humans through their characterization of Caliban (133). Daniel Wilson, *Caliban: The Missing Link* (London: MacMillan and Company, 1873) expounds the Darwinian interpretation of Caliban, accompanying many stage adaptations of the play and elevates Caliban from a rummaging ape to semi-human. Application of imperial ideals to the play shine through the stage adaptations, especially ones by Beerbohm Tree (1904) and Frank Benson (1900), both of whom played Caliban as an example of the Darwinian link, even studying apes to better understand how to interpret him. Other productions in the early 1900s maintained a similar level of interpretation of Caliban as a brute or savage. Octave Mannoni, a French psychologist, published *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonialism,* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1950) and interprets the relationship between Prospero and Caliban as the colonial French occupation of Madagascar. However, the popularization of a colonial study of *The Tempest* was not implemented until Johnathan Miller's 1970s production of the play, offering an in-depth analysis of colonialism.

Jyotsna Singh, "Post-Colonial Reading of *The Tempest,*" in *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, ed. Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Singh addresses early colonial critics citing their final interpretation of the text. Other critics, such as Frank Neilson, "The Tempest as Autobiography," in *Shakespeare and The Tempest*, (Rindge, NH: R. R. Smith,1956): 108-16, supports this theory by addressing the figure of Prospero as a manifestation of Shakespeare; see also Jyotsna Singh, *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, 215.

9. Paul Brown, *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism,* 64.

10. Patricia Seed, "'This island's mine': Caliban and Native Sovereignty," in *The Tempest and its Travels*, ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 209-10.

11. Barker and Hulme, *Alternative Shakespeare*, 195. Barker and Hulme's argument hinges on the idea of "con-text" and the process of "occlusion" (195), meaning original Shakespearean criticism shut out the contextualization of the work within a historical, political or cultural context that would allow for a colonial interpretation (195).

12. Patrick MacDonnell, *An Essay on the Play of The Tempest* (London: J. Fellowes, 1840); Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, "Introduction" in *The Tempest,* Arden Shakespeare (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1999), 89.

13. Eric Cheyfitz, *The Poetics of Imperialism,* 162.

14. Jyotsna Singh, *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*, 215; the revision of the play took shape mainly through Caliban's claim to the land through heritage, just as their claim to the land stems from their heritage. *A Grain of Wheat* by Kenyan Ngugiwa Thiong'o and *Une Tempête* by Aimé Césaire are examples of texts written the 1960s and 1970s inspired by *The Tempest* to spark anti-colonial movement within their home countries.

15. Scott, *Colonialism*, 523, and Parker, *Reading 'Barbary' in Early Modern England, 1550-1658*, 88.

16. Stephen Greenblatt, "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century," in *Learning to Curse* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 31; Ania Loomba in *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 165, articulates that this idea of "sameness and difference" are useful not only for the colonial mentality but the deconstruction of this mentality in post-colonial literature.

17. Brown, *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism,* 219.

18. Ibid., 64.

19. Ibid., 59; Octavio Mannoni, *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization,* trans. P. Powesland (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1950); and Ania Loomba, *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*; all use Mannoni's description of the "dependency complex" to set up a contrast in mentality where many other colonized populations of "Caribbean writers" view this idea as derogatory toward the enslaved populations and not a full elaboration of the complex "psychic conflict" the rule "imposes . . . upon colonized people" (163).

Skura, "Discourse and the Individual," draws connections between Caliban and the American Indian through "his closeness to nature, his naiveté, his devil worship, his susceptibility to European liquor, and above all 'treachery'" (48-49). While Skura's association with the Indian delineates the factors ignored by many critics such as "no decorative feathers, no arrows, no pipe, no tobacco, no body paint, and . . . no love for trinket and trash" (49), Alden T. Vaughan, "Shakespeare's Indian: The Americanization of Caliban" in *Shakespeare: The Critical Complex,* ed. Stephen Orgel and Sean Keilen, (New York: Garland, 1999), more forcefully asserts that "if Shakespeare had such metaphors in mind, Caliban must symbolize the Indians who lost their land and often their liberty to European intruders" (131). This approach focuses too much on the assumption of Shakespeare's intent as the author and conjecture to take this account as factual, but it poses interesting connections to other texts that dealt with the seventeenth century colonial exploits; Loomba, *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism,* 163.

In *Shakespeare and Modern Culture* Marjorie Garber notes another French critic with an emphasis in psychiatry, Frantz Fanon, utilizing his experience as a "black intellectual in a France

permeated with racism" to color his interpretation of the "colonizer and colonized" (24). Fanon, Garber explains, disputes the dependency complex's origins, arguing for its roots in "race" rather than "childhood psyches of the individuals" (25). While Fanon's own personal experience seems to validate his major dispute with the dependency complex, Garber points to "the Hegel presented in Alexandre Kojeve's famous Paris lectures" (27) as his influence. Hegel's theory relies upon the idea of the dialectic, which Fanon transfers to talk about the relationship between the master and the slave. This new dialectic, that of the master and the slave, shows the dependency complex not just as the slave seeking a new master, but as the master's inability to function without the slave. Demonstrating the dependency as reciprocal fights the weakness citing in Mannoni's interpretation of the text.

20. Scott, *Colonial Governmentality*, 207.

21. Emma Smith, "The Tempest," *Approaching Shakespeare* lecture, (Oxford University, November 2011), https://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/tempest-1

22. Barker and Hulme, *Alternative Shakespeare*, 195.