Postgraduate English
www.dur.ac.uk/postgraduate.english
ISSN 1756-9761

Issue 43 Spring 2022

Editors: Hannah Voss and Vicky Penn

Exile and Colonialism in The Tempest*: Prospero's Powers and Identities Revisited*

Yi-chin Huang

yichin.huang@wmich.edu

Exile and Colonialism in *The Tempest*: Prospero's Powers and Identities Revisited

Yi-chin Huang
Western Michigan University

Postgraduate English, Issue 43, Spring 2022

Among the wide and diverse readings of *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's last complete full play, much attention has been drawn to its colonialist implications and aspects. Prospero, the deposed Milanese Duke, is a European subject who has been exiled to an alien island and then become the ruler of the people and creatures there. The play's representation of Prospero's relations and interactions with the earlier inhabitants of the island, Ariel and Caliban, and most importantly its contemporary context of the onset of Europe's colonial activities, reveal the significance of the underlying colonial discourse.[1] When it comes to Prospero's multifaceted relations with Ariel, Caliban, and the island, however, a reading focussed on his identity as an exile provides more insight into the play's representations of the intersected issues and undertakings of exile and colonialism. Given the significant overlap of Prospero's state of exile with his identity as a colonizer, it is worthwhile to see his encountering and interactions with the island's earlier inhabitants through the prism of exile, with consideration of the ideological significance of exile in Shakespeare's time.[2]

In the context of early-modern England, exile was either a common socio-political happening or a recurring theme seen frequently in historical and literary traditions. J. Seth Lee, as a recent example, notes how 'exile became a way of life for thousands of people: Protestant and Catholic, English and European' in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth

[1] Some important critiques that read *The Tempest* from post-colonialist and political perspectives include Paul Brown, '"This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine": *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism', in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism,* 2nd ed., ed. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 48–71; Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 89–134; Meredith Anne Skura, 'Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 40 (1989), 42–69; and, Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, eds., *The Tempest and Its Travels* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

[2] Some post-colonial readings take Ariel and Caliban as the natives of the island who symbolize the natives of the New World in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while others tend to be more precise, understanding colonization as a process of layering and seeing Ariel and Caliban as 'previous inhabitants'. See Andrew Gurr, 'Industrious Ariel and Idle Caliban', in *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 198–208.

centuries, a phenomenon and concern that can be seen in Elizabethan literary culture.[3] This theme also recurs in several of Shakespeare's works, mostly because of its 'direct performative power'.[4] While there are many different aspects of exile represented in Shakespeare's plays, *Richard II* and *The Tempest* are the two plays in which we see most evidently the political aspects of exile; moreover, it is in *The Tempest* that we most clearly witness both the political and colonial aspects of exile. The two exiled characters in *Richard II*, Thomas Mowbray and Henry Bolingbroke, are both noblemen banished by King Richard as their punishment. Richard's announcement of this penalty exemplifies how banishment was conventionally perceived and represented in the literary tradition in which Shakespeare participates:

> The sly slow hours shall not determinate
>
> The dateless limit of thy dear exile;
>
> The hopeless word of never to return
>
> Breathe I against thee, upon pain of life.[5]

This statement is also a concise illustration of the kind of situations and feelings from which an exiled nobleman is supposed to suffer, a stereotypical commonplace in English literature from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare's times. Such a traditional impression of exile, unsurprisingly, is also conspicuous in the characterization of Prospero in *The Tempest*.

Prospero's physical and mental states of exile play an important part in his power relations with Ariel and Caliban as well as in the political implications underlying *The Tempest* as a whole. When it comes to the power relations surrounding Prospero, abundant scholarly discussions have focused on the various aspects of his identity, including studies of Prospero as a humanist, a single-parenting educator, a powerful magician, a monarch, in addition to a colonialist and a banished exile, as will be discussed below. The exiled aspect, however, seems to have drawn relatively less critical attention, a void which this paper aims to fill via an emphatic investigation into Prospero's power relations with Ariel and Caliban from the perspective of his exiled status, and the dynamics of his exiled identity with various coexisting identities of him as a magician, a master of slaves and servants, and a colonizer.

---

[3] J. Seth Lee, *The Discourse of Exile in Early Modern English Literature* (London: Routledge, 2018), p. 8.
[4] Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile* (Gordonsville, VA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 1.
[5] William Shakespeare, *King Richard II*, ed. by Andrew Gurr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 1.3. 150–53.

As Jane Kingsley-Smith points out in her study of Prospero as the banished Duke of Milan, the significance of his exile lies partly in the identity crisis resulting from this experience. Prospero's two identities as such a powerful magus and colonizer do not offset his anxiety in exile derived from his sense of displacement and self-loss, but rather strengthen a feeling of solitude and a longing to return.[6] Being reinforced by such other themes as education, magic, and colonialism, Prospero's identity as an exile plays a crucial part in his characterization — 'an identity that encompasses these other roles'.[7] More importantly, it is Prospero's own decision to eventually abandon his magical powers, along with his life in exile and colonial rule over the island, that enables him to 'embrace humanity' and return to his homeland, Milan.[8] According to Leah Scragg, moreover, the motif of exile or banishment offers both the playwright and the audience an opportunity to explore 'the relationship between the individual, the social group, and the order of nature', and ultimately to '[examine] the limitations and capabilities of the human mind'.[9]

One important facet relevant to Prospero's banishment is his magical capability to not only consolidate his rule over the island but also attempt to regain his position in Milan, as well as how his final decision to relinquish both his vengeance and magic represents a renunciation of powerful control over the island and a restoration of the human community. Having examined these aspects, John S. Hunt points out how Prospero's use of magic, his development of mindset, and his power relations with other characters all eventually reveal that it is 'in the mind's relation to those things — body, community, world — that it defines itself in opposition to', that the sacredness of humanity lies, rather than the 'isolated, extraordinary ego'.[10] In other words, it is only through the termination of Prospero's exile that he can 'find the spiritual prosperity he desires'.[11] Similarly, Jonathan Bate points out that Prospero's pursuit of magical knowledge is in effect a pursuit of power, which leads to his 'bad humanism' — the opposite of the humanist ideal of linking knowledge and learning to

[6] Jane Kingsley-Smith, '*The Tempest*'s Forgotten Exile', in *Shakespeare Survey 54: Shakespeare and Religions*, edited by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 223–33 (p. 223).
[7] Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile*, p. 173.
[8] Ibid., p. 172.
[9] Leah Scragg, *Shakespeare's Mouldy Tales: Recurrent Plot Motifs in Shakespearian Drama* (London: Longman, 1992), p. 155.
[10] John S. Hunt, 'Prospero's Empty Grasp', *Shakespeare Studies*, 22 (1994), 277–313 (p. 309).
[11] Ibid.

creating a good ruler.[12] Prospero's magic embodies not only his powers and limitations but also his rule over the island and other characters.

Such an embodiment is also evident in the play's representation of Prospero's ambiguous relations with nature — particularly the island's environment. A most noteworthy illustration of this aspect is the figurative 'magic contest' between Prospero and Sycorax the witch, which also shows how Prospero's colonization of the island exemplifies such issues as the colonial politics, monarchy and ruling, and narrative or discursive power, all revealed in the reciprocal dynamics between Prospero and the island.[13] As it is through Prospero's interactions and interrelations with the island — especially with Ariel and Caliban — that the significance of his identity of exile may be best revealed, critical views on such relations provide another part of the basis for the present essay.[14] In addition to Caliban, Prospero's relation with Ariel as well as the interrelations among these three characters also forms an intriguing basis for a comparative perspective on Prospero's multifaceted identity as an exile.[15]

As a recurring theme or motif of literature in general, exile — as Edward Said poignantly points out — is always potent and even enriching, strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience.[16] Said also describes an 'intellectual exile' like 'a shipwrecked person who learns to live in a certain sense with the land' and 'who is always a traveler, a provisional guest, not a freeloader, conqueror, or raider'.[17] This depiction is indeed strikingly appropriate for Prospero, with regard not only to his mentality of transient lodging on the island but also to his self-identity and characterization as more an exile than a coloniser. Another noteworthy aspect of exile revealed by this description is the alien environment that an exile is forced to face. Using *The Tempest* to examine Caribbean colonial

[12] Jonathan Bate, 'The Humanist *Tempest*', in *Shakespeare: La Tempête Etudes Critiques*, ed. by Claude Peltraut (Besancon: Université de France-Comte, 1994), pp. 5–20 (pp. 10–11).
[13] Richard Levin, 'My Magic Can Lick Your Magic', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 22 (2009), 201–28. See Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) and Constance Jordan, *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and Subject in the Romances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), for studies on similar aspects of colonial politics and power struggle of *The Tempest.*
[14] Leslie A. Fiedler, for example, treats such relations by regarding Caliban (and, in some sense, Ariel) as a 'New World Savage', with a consideration of the themes of colonialism and race — Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare: Studies in the Archetypal Underworld of the Plays* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2006).
[15] Harry Berger Jr., as a quintessential example, provides an insightful analysis of the magical world and the 'island relationship' between Prospero and Ariel as well as that between Prospero and Caliban. See Harry Berger Jr., 'Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's Tempest', *Shakespeare Studies,* 5 (1969), 253–83.
[16] Edward Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 137.
[17] Edward Said, 'Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals', *Grand Street*, 12 (1993), 112–24 (p. 121).

experience, George Lamming points out that there is 'no geography more appropriate to the study of exile' than the topos of the island.[18]

The audience learns the story of Prospero's banishment and exile upon the island for twelve years before the beginning of the play from his dialogue with Miranda, his daughter, in the second scene. Prospero reveals his previous identity and authority:

> Twelve year since, Miranda, twelve year since,
>
> Thy father was the Duke of Milan and
>
> A prince of power.[19]

He then reveals how his brother usurped his dukedom while he dived into his 'secret studies' in his library and excluded himself from the worldly affairs (1.2.84–95, 110–17). Prospero's own narration plays a significant part in the exilic representation in the play, with various aspects that can all be understood through the lens of his power relations with others. At the most obvious level, the authoritative power of the dukedom lies at the center of the power struggles — be it on or under the table — between the brothers. Just as Constance Jordan observes, Shakespeare's romance play can be regarded as political drama, and how Prospero tackles and finally overcomes his typically political challenges can be understood as *The Tempest's* central subject.[20]

Having lost the political power struggle because of his own unduly negligence of governance, Prospero became an outcast from Milan, also due to the collusion of his brother Antonio and the King of Naples, Alonso. While Prospero himself admits that he had neglected his worldly duty (1.2.110), he also expresses apparent hostility against Antonio and Alonso when he describes the process of his deposition and banishment at their hands (1.2.145–56, 168–79). Noteworthily, Prospero also stresses how he and Miranda were loved by the Milanese people, which was also a main reason why Antonio and Alonso chose not to kill them:

> [...] they durst not [destroy us],
>
> *So dear the love my people bore me,* nor set

[18] George Lamming, *The Pleasures of Exile* (London: Allison and Busby, 1984), p. 96.
[19] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994). 1.2. 66–68.All further quotations from *The Tempest* are taken from this edition.
[20] Jordan, pp. 147–53 and p. 211.

> A mark so bloody on the business, but
>
> *With colors fairer painted their foul ends*. (1.2. 168–71, emphasis my own)

With this explanation of how they came to the island in exile twelve years before, Prospero successfully depicts himself as a victim of the power struggle, with exile as the fate of those defeated. In this image of victimized exile, Prospero conveys his innocence primarily through an emphasis on the fact that he enjoyed so much of his people's love that his political rivals dared not put him to death right away. Such an emphasis on the subjects' love for their ruler — even though the ruler already neglected his duty of governance by secluding himself in his library for a long while — reminds the audience, in early-modern England or in the twenty-first century, of Queen Elizabeth's famous 'cult of love', a strategy to consolidate her monarchic power.[21]

In addition to the struggles over authoritative power in Milan that have caused Prospero's exile, another aspect of power, less apparent than the political struggles, can be seen in Prospero's pursuit of his studies — the 'liberal arts' that keep him away from the administrative affairs of his dukedom. Because this study is in fact magical learning, many have read Prospero's pursuit of this learning as a pursuit of power — the magical power that enables him to subjugate Ariel, Caliban, other spirits on the island, and even Ferdinand, Alonso's son, under his rule and command. In Jonathan Bate's analysis of humanism and *The Tempest*, while the humanist ideal of a good ruler, according to Erasmus, should be well-educated in liberal arts, a good king is differentiated from a tyrant by their use of power and attitude towards it. Prospero, therefore, who uses magical power to rule the island and avenge his banishment, is on the brink of a tyrant, who 'uses his power for himself'.[22] Bates concludes, 'Instead of making his learning the basis of sound government, [Prospero] pursues it secretly, for his own benefit. This self-centredness brings him closer to the tyrant than the virtuous prince'.[23] With a similar concern about Prospero's exclusive pursuit of secret studies, Harry Berger Jr. suggests that Prospero's obsession with studies of sorcery indicate that exile already lies in his essential nature, for it is a kind of liberation for him and the inevitable result of his seclusion in Milan:

[21] Jordan, p. 124. Although Jordon's discussion of Queen Elizabeth's Golden Speech here aims to examine the issue of merchant and trade in *The Winter's Tale*, some points of this discussion are also applicable to *The Tempest.*
[22] Bate, p. 9.
[23] Ibid., p. 10.

> His being set adrift on the ocean, committed to a course which washed away the old burdensome world of civilization and translated him magically to a new world, unpeopled and unreal — this removal and isolation fulfill the process by externalizing this self-sufficient insularity.[24]

In the same light, Jane Kingsley-Smith points out how Prospero's self-image as an exile and cultural outcast 'appears to facilitate the achievement of Prospero's scholarly ambitions'.[25]

Prospero's pursuit of magic learning, therefore, is a pursuit of power, and his exile is a corollary of this power pursuit. This perspective then brings forth a story of political power struggles different from the version told by Prospero himself about his victimized role of exile. In his scrutiny of Prospero's 'island identity', David Sundelson suggests Prospero's self-awareness of his own inadequacies for his dukedom (and his daughter): 'The departure from Milan is an escape from shame and weakness as much as an expulsion', Sundelson asserts.[26] Kingsley-Smith also indicates that '[t]he fact that he takes these books with him into exile suggests a degree of continuity, even of wish-fulfillment'.[27] Similarly, John S. Hunt notes how Prospero's banishment may be taken as a sort of solution to his rule in Milan:

> In retrospect, Prospero's self-sufficiency has been ruinously flawed by a narcissistic indifference to other lives, and not at all sufficient to the world of action; in an environment of competition, predation, and coercion, renunciation of power is a recipe for ruin.[28]

Prospero's exile, in other words, begins long before he is physically driven out of Milan; it begins when he starts pursuing magical power in his library and rejects his responsibility.

In addition to political, monarchic, and magical power, Prospero's story about his earlier life and banishment reveals a third dimension of power operation: the power of narrative or discourse. In Prospero's own narrative, his exile is the result of Antonio's treachery and collusion with Alonso. Curt Breight argues that this 'official narrative' that Prospero made to Miranda can be seen as an epitome of Prospero's power to manipulate nearly all characters by means of the 'discourse of treason'.[29] While Prospero's narrative

[24] Berger Jr., p. 258.
[25] Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile*, pp. 162–163.
[26] David Sundelson, 'So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's *Tempest*', in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, ed. by Murray Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 33–53 (pp. 35–36).
[27] Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile*, p. 63.
[28] Hunt, p. 300.
[29] Curt Breight, '"Treason Doth Never Prosper": *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Treason', Shakespeare Quarterly, 41 (1990), 1–28 (p. 1).

represents his and Miranda's exile to the island as the innocent result of treason, Breight points to:

> The unrealistic element of Prospero's and Miranda's survival: real-life treason against heads of state — William of Orange, Henry III, and Henry IV (in 1584, 1589, and 1610 respectively) — featured successful assassination, in contrast to the conspirators' comparatively mild treatment of Prospero and his heir.[30]

Another questionable element of Prospero's narrative is his unsatisfactory answer to Miranda's question of why the conspirators did not kill them — 'So dear the love my people bore me' (1.2.169). Breight suggests that 'the disappearance of the ducal family [...] could not have been popularly interpreted as anything other than the murder of duke and heir'.[31] Breight's analysis of the probability and power of Prospero's manipulation of others through words, together with Prospero's above-mentioned pursuit of magical power as the cause or even prerequisite of his banishment, sheds light on the dimension of discursive power possessed by Prospero the exile. Moreover, since this discursive power as such is especially about treason, it is particularly in terms of political struggles, again, that Prospero possesses and exerts it.

Prospero's narrative of his exile, therefore, reveals three different aspects of his power. These aspects can be seen throughout the entire play, making his address to Miranda in Act 1 Scene 2 an early epitome of the exile's power representations. Prospero's power dynamics in his exile on the island are most significantly represented in his relations with Ariel and Caliban. Both Ariel and Caliban can be seen as the natives or earlier inhabitants of the island, and therefore Prospero's dynamics with them can be said to represent colonialism, or at least to possess colonialist implications. As Andrew Gurr points out:

> [To understand] the relations of Prospero with his two servants, it might help to take some note of the question of colonial priority. Colonization is all about power, which is part of its fascination. But that power is usually linked, in ways not always easily identifiable, with the laws of property, or rather of prior possession. It is the last comer who is always the colonizer, if he or she is not to be merely immigrant. Previous inhabitants are likely to have been colonizers in their turn. Colonization is almost always a layering process.[32]

[30] Breight, p. 9.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Gurr, pp. 196–97.

This idea of the layering of colonial power provides an insightful basis for understanding how Ariel and Caliban, the 'earlier comers' and inhabitants of the island, become colonized and subjugated under Prospero's rule.

One of Ariel's most noteworthy aspects is his constant longing for freedom, as explicitly revealed in Act 1 Scene 2, where Ariel demands his liberty:

> ARIEL. Is there more toil? Since thou dost give me pains,
>
> Let me remember thee what thou hast promised,
>
> Which is not yet performed me.
>
> PROSPERO. How now? Moody?
>
> What is 't thou canst demand?
>
> ARIEL. My liberty. (1.2. 287–91)

As the master-servant relationship between Prospero and Ariel continues to be the topic of their dialogue, Ariel's wish for freedom remains an important aspect of their relationship, even though it is oppressed relentlessly by Prospero in later lines. As Prospero stresses, Ariel the elf-like being was saved and freed by Prospero from his confinement by Sycorax, who had imprisoned him due to his inability and/or unwillingness to carry out her commands (1.2. 322–37). This account of how Prospero releases Ariel from Sycorax's imprisonment demonstrates, first of all, the dynamics of owing and repaying in the master-servant relationship between the two, especially when Prospero makes it expressly clear, with explicit threats, that he deserves Ariel's unconditional, even slave-like, servitude:

> PROSPERO. Thou, my slave
>
> As though report'st thyself, was then her servant
>
> [. . .] Thou best know'st
>
> What torment I did find thee in.
>
> [. . .] It was mine art,
>
> When I arrived and heard thee, that made gape
>
> The pine and let thee out.
>
> ARIEL. I thank thee, master.

> PROSPERO. If thou more murmur'st, I will rend an oak
>
> And peg thee in his knotty entrails till
>
> Thou hast howled away twelve winters.
>
> ARIEL. Pardon, master.
>
> I will be correspondent to command
>
> And do my spriting gently. (1.2. 323–24; 340–41; and 345–54)

In other words, there seems to be an agreement or even contract between them — however reluctant now Ariel appears to be about it — that Ariel will repay this debt to Prospero by offering him his service for a designated span of time, which Prospero seems to have promised to reduce by a year. When Ariel reminds him of his promised favour, however, Prospero becomes angry and not only reminds Ariel how great a debt of gratitude he owes, but also threatens to imprison him much like Sycorax did.

Prospero's threat and Ariel's submissive response reflect how successfully the former subjugates the latter with his power. With magical power he is capable of not only releasing Ariel from the pine-imprisonment, but also of inflicting the same or even worse confinement on him; with narrative and rhetoric power, moreover, he is capable of suppressing Ariel's desire for liberty, as illustrated vividly in how readily Ariel responds to Prospero's scolding and threat with acknowledgement and concession. Ariel's servile obedience toward Prospero is due to, as Gurr observes, 'Prospero's magical power, and a combination of gratitude for the release from Sycorax's punishment and fear of its renewal'.[33] In addition to gratitude and fear, Ariel's willingness to serve Prospero is also derived from their commonality, especially in terms of magic. As Berger Jr. notes, 'each has a histrionic and a rhetorical bent which he delights to indulge, and each savors his performances to the full'; Ariel's 'obvious delight in magical performance is doubled by his pleasure in describing it'.[34]

Prospero's act of releasing Ariel from the pine can also be seen as a symbolic overthrow of Sycorax's legacy. In his inquiry into the 'magic contest' in earlier literature, Richard Levin points out 'the possibility that there could have been a real opposition here, and even some kind of magic contest, if Sycorax were still alive'.[35] In one aspect, this

[33] Gurr, p. 197.
[34] Berger Jr., p. 256.
[35] Levin, p. 212.

figurative magic contest between Prospero and Sycorax represents another case of colonialism in *The Tempest*. As mentioned above, colonization can be understood as a layering operation in which the 'later comer' becomes the colonizer by subjugating the previous one(s) under their greater power. The colonial power struggle between Prospero and Sycorax, both with the dual identities of exile-colonialist, is figuratively dramatized through Prospero's release and then subjugation of Ariel, as well as through his intricate role toward Caliban, son of Sycorax.

As to the question 'why Shakespeare killed off Sycorax before the arrival of Prospero, and so lost the opportunity to dramatize a contest between them in which his magic would defeat her magic',[36] Levin argues that a better explanation may be a concern of dramatic effect: as *The Tempest's* plot is focused on how Prospero succeeds in resolving 'all the problems created by his deposition and exile, which in turn requires that he be placed in complete control of the island and of the play from the outset', a magic contest between Prospero and Sycorax presented on stage 'would have distracted attention from' this particular plot.[37] A further consideration of the colonial power struggle between Prospero and Sycorax, however, may cast some doubtful light on Levin's suggestion. If it is indeed crucial to represent Prospero 'in complete control' of the island, possessing dominant power (as a colonialist would), a vivid scene of Prospero's immediate defeat of Sycorax, the former ruler, would have achieved even greater dramatic effect. This assertion of dominance and the changing power dynamics on the island would likely be strengthened by this contest brought to life on the stage.

One may argue that the reason for Sycorax's absence upon Prospero's arrival, and the absence of a magic dual or contest between the two lies in Prospero's identity as an exile, rather than because of colonialism. If in a colonial power struggle, like in any other kind of political struggle, victory means taking control of the territory, subjects, and resources, it also theoretically brings with it responsibility — the ruler's responsibility toward subjects, which is exactly what Prospero earlier shied away from. If this power struggle were to be played out on stage, our instinctive expectation would be Prospero's defeat of Sycorax, overthrowing the previous colonial sovereign and establishing his own permanent rule over the island, just as Antonio had done in Milan, and Sycorax had done previously on this island.

[36] Levin, p. 213.
[37] Ibid.

Kingsley-Smith suggests that 'Sycorax's exile seems deliberately written into the play to reflect upon Prospero's banishment'.[38] The absence of this contest between Prospero and Sycorax, then, may be an attempt to prevent such a reflection from confusing the audience. Prospero himself seems even more anxious about that differentiation, as Kingsley-Smith asserts: 'Prospero feels it necessary to relate, time and again, the island's improvement under his dominion because his exiled status makes such an improvement doubtful'.[39] Sycorax, therefore, functions as an absent, off-stage character, reflecting Prospero's identity as an exile, and is presented as a rival to be overthrown by Prospero. Present only through Prospero's dialogue and his account of this colonisation of the island, Sycorax acts as a foil for Prospero's power: Prospero dispels her sorcery and releases Ariel from the pine, then takes advantage of Ariel's service, to the extent of resolving his banishment and regaining his dukedom, which Sycorax did not achieve — 'thou wast a spirit too delicate| To act her earthy and abhorred commands' (1.2. 324–25). Prospero is able to teach Caliban, Sycorax's son, another task which she failed to accomplish, and further proves his greater power by enslaving Caliban and having him do, ironically, 'earthy and abhorred' (1.2. 326) labor works. Prospero's ultimate show of power is when, eventually, he releases both Ariel and Caliban from his service.

In line with Kingsley-Smith's above-quoted note on how Prospero is eager to relate the 'improvement' of the island to his rule, and his enslavement of Ariel and Caliban as emblems of Sycorax's legacy, this mindset is also how he differentiates his own status as an exile from that of Sycorax herself. Caliban's subjugation under Prospero is neither willing nor legitimate: as he himself claims, 'This island's mine by Sycorax, my mother,| Which thou takest from me' (1.2. 395–96); 'I am subject to a tyrant, a| sorcerer, that by his cunning hath cheated me of the island' (3.2. 46–48). The colonial power relations between Prospero and Caliban have long been self-evident. As Peter Hulme indicates, 'Prospero's power, his magic, has usurped Caliban of his rights. But the text inflects this usurpation in a particular direction: Prospero has taken control of Caliban, made him his slave', but cannot be without Caliban's labour service.[40] As for Prospero's aversion to the 'earthy and abhorred' labour works — which are nevertheless essential for life — that cannot be imposed on Ariel, Berger Jr. suggests that 'Caliban and Ferdinand do not simply do his chores for him; he makes it clear

[38] Kingsley-Smith, '*The Tempest*'s Forgotten Exile', p. 228.
[39] Ibid., p. 229.
[40] Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 127.

that they are doing it as punishment and as an ordeal of degradation'.[41] Prospero's enslavement of Caliban not only demonstrates how he overpowers Sycorax, but also reveals his inherent exilic nature as he secludes himself from the worldly matters.

The turning point of Caliban becoming Prospero's slave, mutually hostile, is another focus of critical attention. Caliban himself admits that Prospero once played a role close to a loving teacher and even surrogate father to him: 'Thou strokedst me and madest much of me, wouldst give me| Water with berries in't, and teach me' (1.2. 397–98). As Jonathan Bate observes, Caliban's 'filth' behavior not only causes the abrupt change in his initially amiable relationship with Prospero but also reveals Prospero's failings as a humanist educator.[42] Bate suggests that:

> Caliban only acts basely after Prospero has printed that baseness on him; what makes Caliban 'filth' may be the lessons in which Prospero has taught him that he is 'filth' [...] Language and learning ought to be paths to right rule, but as Prospero's learning in Milan has led to Antonio's coup, so his teaching on the island leads to Caliban's rebellion.[43]

Caliban's act of 'filth', his attempt to rape Miranda, immediately causes the sharp change in Prospero's attitude towards him. Hiewon Shin notes this turning point as another potential cause of Prospero's anxiety:

> [Such a] rape would threaten [Prospero's] two most valuable possessions — Miranda and the island [...]. Caliban's speech indicates that his attempted rape signifies his desire to regain the ownership of the island by impregnating Miranda and populating the island with his offspring. Clearly, Caliban's sexual potency threatens Prospero's political stability.[44]

Kingsley-Smith also reads the rivalry between Prospero and Caliban and the loss of the latter through the lens of a political and colonial power struggle, yet with more concern about the issue of exile:

> When Caliban rejects him, Prospero experiences the same pattern of betrayal and stigmatization begun in Milan. Rather than allow this rejection to identify him once again as an outcast, unfit for human society, Prospero designates Caliban as monstrous, unnatural and inhuman, and finally banishes him.[45]

[41] Berger Jr., p. 257.
[42] Bate, p.11.
[43] Ibid., pp. 12–13.
[44] Hiewon Shin, 'Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda', *Studies of English Literature*, 48 (2008), 373–93 (p. 376).
[45] Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile*, p. 164.

This scenario of one exile banishing another reveals, again, the power relations that Prospero engages with on the island. On the one hand, as discussed above, overpowering, banishing, and subjugating Sycorax's legacy represents Prospero's complete control of the island, which enables him to make the most use of its power — the supernatural beings — with Ariel's assistance and work, and win the chance of regaining the dukedom of Milan. On the other hand, in some sense Prospero is duplicating Sycorax's mode of behavior as an exile, as well as inheriting her landscape of exile: of the two legacies of the exiled witch, Ariel and Caliban, he keeps one while casting out the other, performing subjugation and achieving domination through his magical power.

From this perspective, Prospero's dominance on the island seems to be strengthening his role of exile more than that of colonialist. Even though he seems disturbed by Sycorax's association of magic, exile, and colonialism and therefore is anxious to differentiate himself from the witch, stigmatizing her as 'foul' — 'who with age and envy| Was grown into a hoop' (1.2. 309–10) — banishing her son, and repeatedly asserting the island's improvement under his rule, still he only seems to strengthen his self-identity as an exile with his failure to civilize the island. During the twelve years of his residence on the island, it remains a landscape of exile: 'Significantly, it is only Caliban who truly appreciates the beauty of the island. Prospero regards it merely as a place of exile in which he practices his "rough magic" and longs for a return to Milan'.[46]

In reference to the relationship between Prospero and Caliban, Bate notes that:

> [Prospero's] humanist project has not worked; his attempt to nurture the natural man has failed [...]. In recognizing his failure, he begins to realize that all along he has been pursuing power, not wisdom [...] now he sees that to be truly human is a matter not of exercising wisdom for the purposes of rule'.[47]

Another noteworthy aspect here is the reasons for such a turning point of Prospero's recognition of his failure, and of his decision to embrace humanity by showing mercy to his Italian political rivals, the cause of his exile. Although it is Caliban's earlier attempt to rape Miranda and later his attempted treason — as seen from Prospero's perspective — to overthrow his rule that make Prospero see his failure, it is Ariel who reminds him of the significance of humanity. In the last scene of the play before the epilogue, Ariel tells

[46] Ian Ferguson, 'Contradictory Natures: The Function of Prospero, His Agent and His Slave in *The Tempest*', *Unisa English Studies*, 28 (1990), 1–9 (p. 6).
[47] Bate, p. 17.

Prospero of his torment not only of Prospero's enemies, Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio, but also his friend, Gonzalo. This depiction is followed by his assertion that if he were human, his 'affections | Would become tender' (5.1. 23–24), which Prospero, as a human, also reflects (5.1. 28–31). According to Bate, this awareness of humanity leads to Prospero's renunciation of his magic and studies, which have empowered him and yet led him away from humanity and caused his banishment.[48] As John S. Hunt indicates, '[in] renouncing magic as soon as he can safely do so, Prospero seems to be renouncing his place behind the Wizard's screen, and trying to relocate himself in his native human community'.[49] This, as is revealed at the end of the play, is indeed what Prospero longs for.

It is both Ariel and Caliban, therefore, who provide Prospero with the opportunity of self-recognition, which also means his eventual regaining of his place in Milan. Therefore, this aspect may be seen as the last and most significant aspect of Prospero's relations with them. Having power over his two servile subjects due to his magical power, Prospero nonetheless is not able to rid himself of his identity as an exile until he decides to renounce that power. Moreover, as Prospero's final liberation of both Ariel and Caliban can be viewed as a symbol for his power struggle with Sycorax, the figurative rivalry this time may be the most significant. While Levin sees this liberation as 'another kind of victory over her magic', one could argue that Prospero's act of releasing them is no more an act of overpowering Sycorax, at least not in terms of magic.[50] Prospero's act of setting them free is accompanied by his relinquishment of his magical power, as he drowns his book. Prospero's act of liberation is a demonstration of his true differentiation from Sycorax, as he throws off the shadow of colonisation and exile by freeing himself and his slaves from this seemingly endless cycle.

[48] Bate, p. 17.
[49] Hunt, p. 307.
[50] Levin, p. 213.

Works Cited

Bate, Jonathan, 'The Humanist *Tempest*', in *Shakespeare: La Tempête Etudes Critiques,* ed. by Claude Peltraut (Besancon: Universite de France-Comte, 1994), pp. 5–20

Berger Jr., Harry, 'Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's *Tempest*', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 253–83

Bongie, Chris, *Islands and Exiles: The Creole Identities of Post/Colonial Literature* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998)

Breight, Curt, '"Treason Doth Never Prosper": *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Treason', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 41 (1990), 1–28

Brown, Paul,'"This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine": *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism', in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 2nd ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 48–71

Ferguson, Ian, 'Contradictory Natures: The Function of Prospero, His Agent and His Slave in *The Tempest*', *Unisa English Studies*, 28 (1990), 1–9

Fiedler, Leslie A., *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 2006)

Fitz, L. T., 'The Vocabulary of the Environment in *The Tempest*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 26 (1975), 42–47

Gurr, Andrew, 'Industrious Ariel and Idle Caliban', in *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 193–208

Hadfield, Andrew, *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Hulme, Peter, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Hulme, Peter and William H. Sherman, eds., *The Tempest and Its Travels* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Hunt, John S., 'Prospero's Empty Grasp', *Shakespeare Studies,* 22 (1994), 277–313

Jordan, Constance, *Shakespeare's Monarchies: Ruler and Subject in the Romances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997)

Kingsley-Smith, Jane, '*The Tempest*'s Forgotten Exile', in *Shakespeare and Religions*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 223–33

—— *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile* (Gordonsville, VA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Lamming, George, *The Pleasures of Exile* (London: Allison and Busby, 1984)

Levin, Richard, 'My Magic Can Lick Your Magic', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 22 (2009), 201–28

Maquerlot, Jean-Pierre, and Michèle Willems, eds., *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Said, Edward, 'Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals', *Grand Street*, 12 (1993), 112–24

—— *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000)

Scragg, Leah, *Shakespeare's Mouldy Tales: Recurrent Plot Motifs in Shakespearean Drama* (London: Longman, 1992)

Seed, Patricia, '"This Island's Mine": Caliban and Native Sovereignty', in *The Tempest and Its Travels*, ed. by Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 202–11

Shakespeare, William, *King Richard II*, ed. by Andrew Gurr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

—— *The Tempest,* ed. by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1994)

Shin, Hiewon, 'Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda', *Studies of English Literature*, 48 (2008), 373–93

Sundelson, David, 'So Rare a Wonder'd Father: Prospero's *Tempest*', in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, ed. by Murray Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 33–53

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

Walch, Günter, '"What's Past is Prologue": Metatheatrical Memory and Transculturation in *The Tempest*', in *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michèle Willems (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 223–38