"Use your authority!":

Pedagogy in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*

Wesley Boyko

Ellen Oliensis

Comparative Literature Department

University of California, Berkeley

2018

Introduction

Comprised of a total of nine scenes, William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* forms a pronounced symmetrical structure. At the center, scene 5 (3.1), which presents Ferdinand and Miranda's betrothal, divides the other scenes into two groups, with each corresponding in characters and plot to the scenes on the other side of the betrothal. Scenes 4 (2.2) and 6 (3.2), for instance, focus on Caliban's drunken endeavor to take over the island with Trinculo and Stephano; scenes 3 (2.1) and 7 (3.3) depict Antonio and Sebastian's conspiracy to kill Alonso and usurp the throne, both of which times are frustrated on account of Ariel's intervention; scenes 2 (1.2) and 8 (4.1) develop Prospero's facilitation and guidance of Miranda and Ferdinand's relationship; and scenes 1 (1.1) and 9 (5.1), including the last 70 or so lines from scene 8, deal with the rise and resolution of the play's primary conflict.

As might be expected in such a tightly constructed play, the subplots themselves become doubled, which then builds up a mirror effect between each pair of scenes with regard to the themes and issues within their respective subplots. The tempest at the beginning of the play may serve as a model for this mirror effect that Shakespeare creates; for it wrecks Alonso's ship in the first scene ("We split, we split, we split!" [1.1.62]), symbolically splitting the characters along with the ship, and then, in the last moments of the play, Shakespeare repairs the destroyed ship ("our ship,/ Which but three glasses since we gave out split,/ Is tight and yare and bravely rigged as when/ We first put out to sea" [5.1.222-225]), just as the tension and division between the characters are finally resolved. As seen in this model for each scene pair, the confusion and chaos that quickly pervades the world of *The Tempest* soon finds organization and order by the end of the play. While the first and last scenes, specifically, exhibit a more physical representation of order and disorder through the ship, the characters' individual interactions are also seen to follow this formula of tension between chaos and order.

More than simply chaos and order, though, Shakespeare's play relativizes these themes to a larger context: the chaos of rebellion and the order of authority. Returning to the splitting ship in the first scene, Shakespeare carries the disorder of the storm over to the characters' own exchanges. As the storm hits hardest and the mariners struggle to keep the ship from foundering, Alonso and his retinue appear on stage and begin to beleaguer the Boatswain. The Boatswain, distressing over the dangerous situation, answers their questions harshly, to which Gonzalo, in an attempt to reprimand the Boatswain's impudence, replies, "Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard" (1.1.19). The Boatswain then comes back with a speech that profoundly captures a major issue of the play: "None that I more love than myself. You are a councillor; if you can command these elements to silence and work the peace of the present, we will not hand a rope more. Use your authority!" (1.1.20-23). The trying circumstances of the tempest breaks down the social organization between the characters, and once a hint of chaos and rebellion begins to show in the Boatswain's answers, Gonzalo is obligated to react by asserting his authority and appealing to a standard of hierarchy. As with any play, dialogue is crucial to characterization, so looking at the language Gonzalo employs in his address to the Boatswain, one notices a distinct use of imperative forms. Gonzalo does not ask for respect from the Boatswain; instead, he demands the Boatswain to remember his place on the social ladder, imposing a lesson of power and authority upon him. And on the other side of the conversation, the Boatswain's own imperative ("Use your authority!") follows through with the constant tension between chaos and order, rebellion and authority.

More than simply alluding to the traditional hierarchy, Shakespeare also presents Gonzalo himself as a teacher of authority and order, which helps categorize the two themes of rebellion and authority underneath a single topic of pedagogy. Accordingly, a resemblance to teacher-student relationships may be seen developing throughout this exchange with the

Boatswain, since Gonzalo, the learned councilor of the king, wishes to teach the boorish sailor a lesson on the traditional hierarchy within their society.

The amazing part about the Boatswain's interaction with Gonzalo is how it encompasses so many themes of the play. Given the circumstances of the tempest, the Boatswain reasonably renounces the traditional hierarchical system within his society; he questions its legitimacy, and as he does so, he moves on to declare that only once Gonzalo has the magic to back up his claims and "command these elements to silence and work the peace of the present," then all of his (Gonzalo's) teachings of order and authority would achieve validity. This entire altercation between Gonzalo and the Boatswain thus serves as a miniature for the entire play.

Just as the themes authority and order become associated with the motif of pedagogy, Shakespeare repeatedly associates rebellion and chaos with the motif of usurpation. When Prospero introduces the audience to the reasoning behind his machinations, he explains that the King of Naples teamed with Antonio to "presently extirpate me and mine/ Out of the dukedom and confer fair Milan,/ With all the honours, on my brother" (1.2.125-127). The issue of usurpation that concerns the main plot can be seen to align itself with the Boatswain's own rebellious nature in the first scene, since both Antonio and the Boatswain, whether by nature or circumstances, begin to question authority. And the issue of usurpation does not stop here, as in each scene that showcases the main antagonists (Caliban, Stephano, Trinculo, Antonio, and Sebastian), Shakespeare restages the plot to usurp power to reflect the main conflict involving Prospero's own struggle with Antonio. As will be seen, in response to each of these schemes for power, there is always a teacher who attempts to reestablish the traditional order through his knowledge of books, and sometimes magic.

For the purpose of this essay, then, I wish to concentrate on these two themes of usurpation and pedagogy, both of which are continuously reinvented in each of the scenes, and

how the two interact with each other and thus advance a larger issue within *The Tempest*: namely, the problem of social order and hierarchal power dynamics. Putting on display within the safety of a fictitious island several situations that allow the characters to rebel against their authoritative teachers and the legitimacy of traditional hegemonies, Shakespeare's *The Tempest* works through the central issue of whether or not some people are naturally more fit to occupy a higher level on the social ladder than others.

Teacher and Student Relationships

Continuing with the notion of how authority and traditional social dynamics are incorporated throughout the play, one first ought to contemplate the basic relationships operating within pedagogy. The word "pedagogy" itself sprouts from a Greet root; combining the noun *παῖς* (child) and the verb *ἄγω* (to lead) to signify a relationship of youth and elder, of follower and leader, and of subject and ruler. The root of pedagogy consequently suggests a hierarchal order, where the teacher's power of knowledge shapes and guides the subjugated pupil. *The Tempest* likewise conforms to this relationship of authority, mapping it on to each scene. A sort of literary refrain, which Shakespeare may easily have intended to betray his depiction of the burgeoning pedagogical relationships within the play, comes at the end of many scenes: injunctions to "lead away" (2.1.324), "Follow, I pray you" (3.3.110), and "Follow and do me service" (4.1.266) often signal the *Exeunt* of the scene. The last of these commands, spoken by Prospero to Ariel in scene 4, most clearly identifies the affinity between following and subjugation, since the urge to follow concurrently highlights the service that Prospero demands of Ariel. With each refrain, therefore, Shakespeare qualifies the pedagogical content of the play (that is, the characters follow and lead, dividing into their distinct roles of teacher and student to act out the dynamics of authority fundamental to pedagogy).

The power relations between father and daughter may be taken for granted, and in most cases, it is incumbent upon the parent to teach the child. Prospero even acknowledges this title to Miranda, claiming to be "thy schoolmaster" (1.2.172). In a similar fashion, when Shakespeare first introduces Prospero and Miranda, he structures their dialogue like a historical narrative that Prospero teaches to Miranda. Prospero declares, in response to Miranda's admission that she knows little of her past,

> 'Tis time
> I should inform thee further. Lend thy hand
> And pluck my magic garment from me. So,
> Lie there my art. Wipe thou thine eyes, have comfort;
> …Sit down,
> For thou must now know further. (1.2.22-33)

The speech above functions as a transition into the narrative of Prospero and Miranda's past, and in preparation for this narrative, Prospero sprinkles his speech with a confident repetition of imperative forms. For example, he begins the first four sentences with commands, while simultaneously expressing his wish to inform Miranda about their past. By coloring this preface to Prospero's narrative with a domineering tone, Shakespeare discloses one of the first hints at the connection between teaching and authority in his play. Most notably, in the last line of the speech, Shakespeare ends with a command to "Sit down" before repeating the initial proposal that Miranda should "know further." Rather than proceed directly into his narrative, Prospero must first arrange Miranda and himself in their proper positions, and one can imagine the scene playing out with Prospero standing above Miranda, haranguing her, while she sits passively. It is as though, in this play, the act of teaching requires Prospero to be in a position of power before becoming a teacher. Both the barrage of imperatives that Prospero delivers to his daughter in conjunction with his newly introduced position as Miranda's teacher thus act together in this scene to portray Prospero as a figure of authority.

Indeed, throughout the same dialogue, when Prospero informs both Miranda and the audience of his past and his reasoning for conjuring the tempest, Shakespeare punctuates Prospero's speeches with various interruptions, such as "Dost thou attend me?"(1.2.78) and "Dost thou hear?"(1.2.106). His constant worrying over Miranda's attention, as may be argued, helps hold the audience's own attention and avoids a long, droll passage recounting Prospero's backstory; however, it might also be said that the more Prospero doubts his daughter's focus, the more the scene resembles a schoolhouse lesson. The passage would then extend its purpose into a much more pointed illustration of the power dynamics operating within *The Tempest*. Despite Miranda's straightforward answers, which at times even rise to a superfluous pitch to convey her interest ("Your tale, sir, would cure deafness" [1.2.106]), Prospero continuously questions his daughter on behalf of her lack of attention. More abstractly, as a teacher Prospero's power is founded precisely upon his pupil's attention, and if Miranda were to ignore him, then all the previous imperatives that Prospero relied on to frame his story would be subverted. Shakespeare, then, establishes Prospero's authority of command precisely through the mutual participation of Prospero as a teacher who offers his lessons and Miranda as a student who listens and obeys those lessons. In this way, the interruptions throughout the dialogue help sustain the practice of authority that Prospero first employed in the preface leading up to his narrative.

Another perspective that one can assume to better understand how Prospero assimilates himself into a position of power is through the very content of the lesson he imparts to Miranda. At this point in the play, Miranda, as well as the audience, is unfamiliar with Prospero's past, and so all authority rests with him to recreate and teach the truth of his past. The uninformed position that Miranda and the audience occupy thus benefits Prospero's pedagogical role and advantages him, since he is the only one who knows the past. Prospero can, in any way he sees fit, set the terms of his claim on the dukedom of Milan. Moreover, looking back to the moment when

Prospero first tells Miranda, “Thy father was the Duke of Milan and/ A prince of power” (1.2.54-55), we notice that Miranda’s innocence cannot help but question, “Sir, are not you my father?” (1.2.55). At the surface, Shakespeare plays with a literal interpretation of Prospero’s words, for Miranda confuses his meaning for the suggestion that her real father was someone other than Prospero, that is, the Duke of Milan; yet her words also leave open an interpretation to her status as a student and her unfamiliarity with social hierarchies. Miranda, only knowing Prospero in his capacity as a paternal figure, remains ignorant to the hierarchical system of royalty and nobility in which her father once lived. For Miranda, there has only existed a familial relationship between her and her father, but with this revelation, Prospero teaches Miranda about another aspect of his authority in addition to his paternal role: he is also “A prince of power.” In this sense, Prospero as a teacher, holding full control over the transmission of information, can identify himself as figure of power in both his familial and social roles, thus obtaining the authority derived from traditional hierarchies (again, both familial and social).

In the next scene, if one examines the subplot involving Alonso and his retinue, he or she will begin to discover a comparable resemblance to pedagogy unfold throughout the shipwrecked characters’ interactions. The role of teacher that Prospero fulfilled in the previous scene becomes doubled in the faithful counselor, Gonzalo, who attempts to console Alonso’s bereavement, but is challenged by two unruly students (Antonio and Sebastian). Gonzalo immediately takes on the authority of teacher when the scene opens; he starts his speech by informing Alonso of a more reasonable perspective they should hold while contemplating their situation:

> Beseech you, sir, be merry. You have cause
> (So have we all) of joy, for our escape
> Is much beyond our loss. Our hint of woe
> Is common: every day some sailor’s wife,
> The masters of some merchant, and the merchant,
> Have just our theme of woe. But for the miracle,
> I mean our preservation, few in millions
> Can speak like us. Then wisely, good sir, weigh

Our sorrow with our comfort. (2.1.1-9)

Complete with examples from common experience, such as the woe of the sailor's wife, the masters of the merchant, and the merchant himself, Gonzalo appeals to the universality of woe in an attempt to mitigate Alonso's fear of loss. Gonzalo even expresses the rigid rationalism of his character by transforming their circumstances into a simple account of numbers: he mentions that they are lucky enough to be few in a million and that their escape outweighs ("Is much beyond") their loss. In other words, the miracle that so many of them were saved compensates for the loss of one, Ferdinand. Shakespeare therefore characterizes Gonzalo as a rational figure, whose reasoning is comprised of a more reasonable outlook on their situation. Each of these traits, arguably, satisfies the usual criteria that one would expect from a schoolmaster, and what is particularly interesting in this scene is how Gonzalo's presence as a teacher grants him a newfound authority. Compared to the first scene on the ship, where Gonzalo is quick to serve his king ("The King and prince at prayers, let's assist them, for our cause is as theirs" [1.1.52-53]), Gonzalo becomes much more authoritative in this passage. He takes the opportunity presented by their shipwrecked state to urge his king, rather than simply emulate him, as he did in the first scene. Gonzalo's heightened position of power is further evidenced once Alonso snaps at him and states, "You cram these words into mine ears, against the stomach of my sense" (2.1.107-108). With this reaction from Alonso, Shakespeare reveals how the present situation has allowed Gonzalo to be a teacher for Alonso, despite the king's resistance, and claim a noticeable amount of authority through his teachings. This is not to make the claim that Gonzalo wholly attempts to challenge the traditional hierarchy, especially since he still aligns himself with Alonso and even relies on this allegiance with the king for power, but it becomes apparent how Shakespeare utilizes this speech as a mode of characterization to more firmly assert Gonzalo's authority as a teacher.

Similarly, in an example that Gonzalo later provides to discuss their circumstances on the, supposedly, deserted island, he wonders what it would be like had he the chance to govern a plantation ("Had I plantation of this isle, my lord— [2.1.144]), and he proceeds to reimagine the world in a manner that situates himself as the new king. In talking about what Gonzalo would do if he owned a plantation, Shakespeare openly identifies Gonzalo with Prospero, who has, in fact, had the same opportunity to govern the island of *The Tempest*. And as discussed above, when Prospero held full authority to describe his right to the dukedom of Milan on account of Miranda's own lack of knowledge, Gonzalo can also mobilize information to his advantage and gain dominance over his students. Whereas Prospero described the proper social order being one with him as the true Duke of Milan, Gonzalo employs the pedagogical relationship that takes shape over the course of the third scene to teach the other characters about what a perfect world on the island would look like, specifically with himself as its governor.

In response to Gonzalo's imaginary plantation, Sebastian even calls out, "'Save his majesty!" (2.1.170). Not only does this comment add another layer to the authority and power that Gonzalo acquired through his position as a teacher, but Sebastian's jest also offers a look at another feature of the teacher-student relationship: the unruly student. While Prospero and Miranda displayed a more cohesive and harmonious relationship, notwithstanding Prospero's constant questioning of Miranda's attention, Gonzalo, Antonio, and Sebastian exhibit a more contentious relationship, one fraught with rebelliousness and discipline. As Gonzalo begins to take on his role as a teacher, Antonio and Sebastian also begin to take on the role of Gonzalo's insubordinate students.

At one point in the conversation, Gonzalo makes a passing reference to Dido as a comparison to Alonso's daughter, and when he does so, he includes an odd epithet that describes Dido as "Widow Dido" (2.1.79); this remark then leads into a long digression between the lords

in an attempt to determine both the location of Carthage and Dido's status as a widow. The long attention paid to this seemingly frivolous detail is enough to puzzle many readers, yet at the same time, the moment seems to gain extra significance on account of its inclusion in the play despite its trivial nature.

First off, it might be important to note that "Carthage and Tunis were not physically the same city, but 'after the destruction of Carthage Tunis took its place as the political and commercial centre of the region'" (Vaughan 190), and furthermore "Dido was the widow of Sychaeus" (Vaughan 189). The accuracy of Gonzalo's knowledge subsequently transforms what would be a petty argument into a lesson, as he tries to convince Sebastian and Antonio of the truth of his statements. Indeed, Keith Linley, in his book The Tempest *in Context*, notes that "Virgil's epic," a text that speaks at length about Dido and her actions, "would have been well known by the audience, particularly the men, who would have read, translated and analyzed parts of it at school and university" (214). While contemplating this scene, then, it is important to keep in mind that Shakespeare's audience would have been much more involved in the debate over Dido's status as a widow. Also, as Linley states, the audience's knowledge of the reference would have most likely been gleaned from one's education in school and university. Shakespeare appears to be keenly aware of this fact while writing the debate, for in many ways, the dialogue seems to play on its own resemblance to a classroom lesson, which many audience members might have experienced firsthand. Gonzalo, in this case, more completely takes up the role of a teacher, attempting to impart a lesson in the Classics, while also attempting to subdue a few disobedient students. Even Adrian, another lord present in Alonso's party, says, "Widow Dido, said you? You make me study of that. She was of Carthage, not Tunis." Although the word "study" here is applied in the sense of cognition and pondering, Adrian, unaware, seems to

further elicit the image of a lesson taking place. The study of which Adrian speaks, no doubt, is Gonzalo's proposition that Dido is a widow and Carthage is Tunis.

Again, following the debate over Dido's widow status, Shakespeare develops another pedagogical relationship between Caliban and Stephano. Although Stephano is far from Prospero and Gonzalo in nobility and virtue, he gains a position of authority over Caliban by teaching him the art of drinking. Deciding to ease Caliban's fits with wine, Stephano orders,

> Come on your ways; open your mouth. Here is that which will give language to you, cat. Open your mouth! This will shake your shaking, I can tell you, and that soundly. [*Pours into Caliban's mouth.*] You cannot tell who's your friend. Open your chaps again. (2.2.81-85)

Like with the lesson Prospero gave to Miranda earlier in the play, Shakespeare uses his language to indicate the diverging levels of power that the teacher and student hold. Stephano introduces his speech with a string of imperatives, just as Prospero and Gonzalo had, but where the commands of the other teachers were integrated into their language to bolster their authoritative station, here Stephano takes this device to a comic, almost excessive, degree by physically forcing the liquor down Caliban's throat. And the power dynamics only continue to manifest once Caliban discovers the taste of wine and decides to serve Stephano: "These be fine things, an if they be not sprites;/ That's a brave god and bears celestial liquor./ I will kneel to him" (2.2.114-116). In a way, the more Stephano teaches Caliban about wine and emphasizes his own position as a teacher, the more compelled Caliban becomes to conform to the student role, the subjugated role. One might additionally look at the symbolism of the wine throughout the scene involving Caliban and Stephano, and its ability as a teaching instrument to expedite these pedagogical roles.

When Stephano first catches sight of Caliban, who has Trinculo hiding under his garment, he exclaims,

> This is some monster of the isle, with four legs, who hath got, as I take it, an ague. Where the devil should he learn our language? I will give him some relief, if it be but for that. If I can recover him and keep him tame, and get to Naples with him, he's a present for any emperor that ever trod on neat's leather. (2.2.64-69)

The "relief" that Stephano proposes to give to Caliban is the wine, and it is interesting how Shakespeare chooses wine, an object often associated with forgetting, to "tame Caliban and make him acceptable to "any emperor." The wine thus transforms symbolically into an instrument of Stephano's pedagogical control, for it is implemented to efface ("tame") Caliban's natural temperament and replace it with the social customs of Stephano's society. This is to say that the wine Stephano uses to subjugate Caliban acts as a vehicle for Neapolitan culture. Stephano, in fact, claims outright that he wants to tame the foreigner Caliban, a "monster of the isle," a creature who would be unfamiliar with normal courtly customs, and convert him into a Neapolitan citizen. As Leslie A. Fielder explains, the entire scene dissolves into "a drunken revolution…, and joining the clowns who would be kings, Caliban turns drunken, too, which is to say, becomes a clown himself" (201). Fielder makes a trenchant observation on behalf of the social assimilation inflicted upon Caliban, yet he fails to note how the wine can function similarly to the control of information and the knowledge of books, which are utilized by both Prospero and Gonzalo. The definition that Fielder provides for the books in *The Tempest*, then, may serve equally for Stephano's wine: "symbols of a literate technology with which the ruling classes of Europe controlled the subliterates of two worlds" (202). So much more is being taught to Caliban by Stephano than simply the art of drinking, since Stephano employs his knowledge of drinking and wine to not only affirm his own authority as a teacher (as best exhibited when Caliban decides to serve Stephano) but to also tame and teach Caliban the ways of Neapolitan society.

Within each pedagogical relationship in the play, from Prospero and Miranda to Stephano and Caliban, the characters intuitively split into their separate roles of teachers and students, and

a great part of this split may be recognized in the distinct power dynamics that emerge throughout their individual scenes. Each scene thus progresses into a situation where the teacher gives some form of a lesson to the student. Furthermore, Shakespeare seems to generate an explicit theme to help foster the connection between these pedagogical relationships and the power dynamics therein. As we saw with Prospero, who taught Miranda about his right to the dukedom; Gonzalo, who tried to teach the Boatswain of Alonso's rights as a king; and Stephano, who attempted to teach Caliban about wine, each lesson by each of the teachers works toward establishing an ordered representation of the world (specifically, the hierarchal systems that permeate society). Concurrently, the teachers in *The Tempest* also acquire their authority by communicating these concepts of the world to their students, concepts in which the teacher stands above the student. With so much of the play being centered on the topic of usurpation and the loss of power, it is easy to understand why Shakespeare concerns so many of his characters with this notion of how people teach one another about certain rights of authority and ruling.

Books and Magic

As discussed with Stephano's wine, the teachers within the play oftentimes rely on certain artifacts to reinforce their claim to authority. For Prospero and Gonzalo, as opposed to Stephano, these objects come in the form of books and magic, which allow the teachers to activate their lessons on social hierarchy in a more concrete form and ensure their power. Indeed, many critics have written much on the fact that "surely it is Prospero's books that enable him to control and humiliate those around him, and Caliban in particular," yet what is most striking about this aspect of the play is how books operate as a medium between the pedagogical authority of the teachers and the magic that permits Prospero so much control over Caliban and the others (O'Dair 35).

Reading and academic inquiry, first of all, fit snuggly alongside the magical powers that pervade the play, as Shakespeare often connects the two separate motifs of magic and books. All the mentions of Prospero's studies and readings, for example, seem to enter the play to justify Prospero's character as a magical figure, especially since his vast knowledge of books has directly contributed to his abilities. During Prospero's recounting of his past downfall, he specifically acknowledges books as the cause of his negligence concerning Antonio's surreptitious schemes; he explains,

> …those [books] being all my study,
> The government I cast upon my brother
> And to my state grew stranger, being transported
> And rapt in secret studies. (1.2. 74 -77)

There appears to be a semantic game that Shakespeare is playing in this passage, which may further the audience's understanding of the symbolism of books and their existence in *The Tempest*. In line 76, Shakespeare decides to use the word "transported" to indicate Prospero's enthrallment with his studies, a meaning which is also suggested through the other participle ("rapt"), so the definition that Shakespeare seems to be aiming at is the sense that Prospero's interest has become absorbed in his studies. But Shakespeare also appears to be tempting his audience to interpret the word "transported" with a more magical definition; in other words, Prospero actually traveled into a separate world while reading and being involved in his studies. The real world around him is similarly described as remote and distant, once Prospero dives deeper into the world of reading—"to my state [I] grew stranger." With a language that conflates ideas of interest and spatial relations, Shakespeare defines Prospero's secret studies as if they were a literal entry into a new and different world. In fact, these associations surrounding Prospero's books share the same symbolic sense of illusion that marks Prospero's own magical powers later in the play.

A little further in Prospero's story, Shakespeare inserts another description that plays on the metaphorical space that one inhabits through the act of reading. Prospero states, "Me, poor man, my library/ Was dukedom large enough" (1.2.109-110). The library, besides being a physical space, also functions as a metonymic representation for the act of reading, which as Prospero implies, can generate new worlds that equal the limits of his dukedom. The books and the narratives that they unravel contain a potential to challenge the real world, just as Prospero's library can challenge his dukedom in size. While this statement appears as a passing comment to supplement the general idea of Prospero's fondness for literature, it evolves into an additional representation of books and their magical capacity. In accordance with the extended display of magic that follows this discussion, Prospero's enchanted description of acts as a direct link from his magical abilities to the studies in which he participated while he was the Duke of Milan.

Then, when Caliban convinces Stephano to take control of the island from Prospero, Caliban creates a more express connection between magic and books. Caliban warns Stephano of Prospero's powers:

> … thou mayst brain him,
> Having first seized his books, or with a log
> Batter his skull, or paunch him with a stake
> Or cut his wezand with thy knife. Remember
> First to possess his books, for without them
> He's but a sot, as I am, nor hath not
> One spirit to command. They all do hate him
> As rootedly as I. Burn but his books. (3.2.88-95)

The books of Prospero are immediately identified as the source of Prospero's power, for only once the books are separated from Prospero does he become vulnerable to physical attacks and weapons (such as the knife, stake, or log); otherwise, as Caliban suggests, Prospero's magic saves him from any harm. Caliban even evokes a hierarchal system to describe the authority that Prospero holds over him. Caliban states that without the books, Prospero would be "but a sot, as I am." The statement acknowledges that Caliban does not consider himself of the same class as

Prospero, for Prospero occupies a position higher than a sot. It ought to also be remarked that Caliban's language places him in a passive role, with respect to Prospero. In the passage, the only time Caliban enters as a subject of a sentence (that is, in the form of a first person pronoun) is in a dependent clause that compares him to the activities of others. For instance, the spirits, Caliban states, hate Prospero, just as he does, but Caliban reduces his own actions to merely an imitation of the hatred held by the spirits. In this manner, the lack of books keep Caliban a sot and from attaining the same status as Prospero, and Caliban's admission of the fact articulates the subjugation and absence of agency that he experiences throughout the play.

Additionally, what is so significant about the imagery of books and their ability, through their connection with magic, to assert various characters' power is the fact that books themselves have a critical function in the classroom. The teachers who disseminate their authority oftentimes do so through their knowledge of literature, which Shakespeare seems keenly aware of as he makes the jump, throughout the play, from this theoretical notion of knowledge granting power to teachers to a much more concrete representation of that power. Prospero's books grant him the same magic that allows him, as a teacher, to establish a hierarchal system of pedagogy on the island.

Although Gonzalo does not share in the same magical activities that Prospero does throughout the play, Shakespeare is still able to connect Gonzalo and his position as a teacher to magic. As already pointed out in the first scene, the Boatswain expected Gonzalo to back up his teachings with a more tangible expression of his authority (i.e. magic); likewise, Sebastian and Antonio, while joking with each other in the third scene, attempt to make a similar connection between Gonzalo's words and magic. Embedded in the conversation where Gonzalo tries to teach the other characters about the location of Carthage, the two unruly students, Sebastian and Antonio, jest:

> ANTONIO. His word is more than the miraculous harp.
> SEBASTIAN. He hath raised the wall, and houses too.
> ANTONIO. What impossible matter will he make easy next?
> SEBASTIAN. I think he will carry this island home in his pocket and give it his son for an apple.
> ANTONIO. And sowing the kernels of it in the sea, bring forth more islands! (2.1.87-94)

Ostensibly, Antonio invokes the image of "the miraculous harp" to show how Gonzalo incorrectly names the location of Carthage; however, almost oblivious of what he says, Antonio speaks to the general motifs of magic and books that Shakespeare continually synthesizes throughout the play. It is in fact Gonzalo's knowledge of classic books, and of subjects like Carthage and Dido, that permits his words to acquire this magical imagery. The notion of bringing forth islands or even of carrying an island in his pocket are distinct magical acts that Antonio and Sebastian assign to Gonzalo. The very "word" of Gonzalo that Antonio takes issue with, therefore, gains authority through these magical capabilities ascribed to it, and though not the same magic that Prospero conjures, Gonzalo "hath [also] raised" magically a hierarchal framework that establishes the authority of his words. Gonzalo therefore becomes particularly doubled with Prospero in more than just his pedagogical relationships to other characters; Gonzalo mirrors Prospero's knowledge of books as well as Prospero's association with magic. While teaching, it is presumably Gonzalo's own knowledge of books that affords him this subtle connection with magic, which then, as with Prospero, acts to represent his authority.

While Stephano continues in his own didactic purpose of teaching Caliban the art of drinking, as well as social order, Shakespeare lets slip a combination of phrases that further hint at the motifs of books and magic in the play. Stephano states, "Come, swear to that. Kiss the book. I will furnish it anon with new contents. Swear!" (2.2.139-140). Of course, the intended idea is of drinking from Stephano's wine bag, and the joke is that the image of kissing a book is a common "sign of fealty, akin to kissing the Bible when swearing an oath"(Vaughan 214); however, Stephano's words also raise in the audience's mind the idea that it is knowledge and

reading themselves (as suggested through the common phrase) by which a teacher establishes his or her own power. Despite not being openly associated with magic, Stephano does appear to Caliban as more than human. Indeed, Caliban quickly tries to ingratiate himself to his teacher, Stephano, by addressing him as a divine figure: "I prithee, be my god" (2.2.146). There remains a divine characteristic or some other supernatural aspect attached to Stephano, which grants Stephano his power as a teacher. For Caliban, this conclusion is drawn specifically from Stephano's knowledge and teachings about wine, or as Stephano calls it, his "book." Thus even in the less defined figures of authority in the play, one continues to see this principle of teachers assuming a quality of magic, or some other supernatural feature, to help assert their authority, just as one might do with his or her superior knowledge of books. And together with this, these magical and divine qualities can be exploited to impress a particular concept of social hierarchies upon students.

The affinity between books and magic comes easily in *The Tempest*, since like Prospero's spirits and magical illusions, the teachers of the play can turn information to support their arguments and compel their students to obey their authority. Though Prospero appears to be the only character in direct possession of books, other teachers, such as Gonzalo, have enough knowledge of texts that they can continue to manipulate information in their favor. As has already been looked at, the indirect manner in which Shakespeare includes books within his dialogues, such as when Gonzalo alludes to Dido from the *Aeneid* in his debate with Sebastian and Antonio, can also act as a representation of books in the play.

Alongside his reference to the ancient Roman author, Gonzalo makes a separate reference to Michel de Montaigne's essay, "Of Cannibals" to more firmly achieve his authoritative position. In this moment, Gonzalo reimagines himself as a new leader on the island, yet when one examines the quotation a bit closer it becomes clear that Gonzalo is not only taking the

opportunity of being on a remote island to consider himself in a position of power, but he is also relying on his knowledge of books to support his claim. Montaigne, in his essay, writes about the indigenous cultures of Brazil: “I should tell Plato that it is a nation wherein there is no manner of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no science of numbers, no name of magistrate or political superiority; no use of service, riches or poverty, no contracts, no successions, no dividends, no properties, no employments, but those of leisure” (37), and almost identically, Gonzalo proclaims,

> I’th’commonwealth I would by contraries
> Execute all things, for no kind of traffic
> Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
> Letters should not be known; riches, poverty
> And use of service, none…. (2.1.148-152)

It ought to be stated that Montaigne’s own style of writing often involves quoting texts from antiquity, either for support or to debate them, and it is no different for this essay, which explains the reason he begins with “I should tell Plato.” When Montaigne considers the topic of indigenous peoples and their culture, he turns to older texts to better persuade the audience, as any argumentative essay should. Correspondingly, Gonzalo turns to Montaigne to support his own claim to rule the plantation. The sustained quotation from Montaigne adds to Gonzalo’s argument to help convince the other characters of his own potential as a ruling figure. It is also noteworthy that Montaigne begins his passage with two existential uses of the copulative verb (“it is…” and “there is…”), which nearly removes the author from the passage and delivers an almost impersonal tone to his statements and descriptions. Gonzalo, on the other hand, inserts himself as the subject of the verbs and seems much more involved with how he would rule over the island (“I would…”). By placing himself as the subject, Gonzalo adapts Montaigne’s words for his own argument, and just as with Montaigne’s depiction of a culture that has removed all the hindrances of society (from riches to magistrates), Gonzalo also tries to soften the other

characters up to the idea of his authority by imagining how he might likewise create a society on the island without "sweat or endeavour; treason, felony,/ Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine" (2.1.161-162). So, whereas Montaigne's purpose is to prove the existence of alternate ways of living, Gonzalo manipulates the quote in such a manner that he becomes the subject of the quote and thereby "the king on't" (2.1.146).

Gonzalo even ends his lesson with another passing reference to antiquity: "I would with such perfection govern, sir,/ T'excel the Golden Age" (2.1.168-169). The "Golden Age" he refers to is, of course, a time in Greek and Roman mythology where human beings lived in harmony and had little to worry about, and may be found in the works of several Roman authors, not the least being Ovid, who appears again in the play during Prospero's abjuration of magic. Surely, since Gonzalo cannot command spirits, he cannot achieve the same effect of magic that Prospero produces through his books. Yet, it may still be argued that because he crafts his arguments with the use of books, particularly with regard to Virgil and Montaigne, Gonzalo affirms the legitimacy of his authority, just as Prospero's magic and books have done for himself.

Having now looked at how Shakespeare generates an affinity between books and magic, there still remains to be seen how both of these motifs join together with respect to the larger theme of pedagogy and develop the play's representation of authority in teacher-student relationships. Particularly in the eighth scene of the play, in which the masque takes place, the full effect of books, magic, and pedagogy is realized. First, as Linley states, "The masque proper, as a courtly entertainment, combines dialogue between allegorical or classical figures, song and dance and the wearing of masks. While appearing trivial, lavish, extravagant and ephemeral, often designed to celebrate special occasions (particularly nuptials), they carry coded meanings usually of a political-ethical nature" (201). Inherent to the notion of a masque is its didactic

message that the author hides beneath its surface to teach his or her audience; Linley also describes a "dialogue between allegorical or classical figures." Both of these aspects can be interpreted through the themes examined so far: the intended interest in teaching the audience as well the use of books and literary texts, which provide the content (particularly, the classical figures) of the masque. Shakespeare, in his own representation of a masque, faithfully replicates these two aspects, but in Prospero's magical hands, Shakespeare also supplies a third aspect: magic.

The allegorical figures that Prospero calls forth in his presentation of the masque (Ceres and Juno) are, what he labels, "Spirits, which by mine art/ I have from their confines called to enact/ My present fancies" (4.11.120-122). Instantly, Prospero connects the exhibition with his own magical powers. The masque, as it stands, is conjured by magic, relies on literary figures, and is intended to teach Ferdinand and Miranda. In fact, just before Prospero initiates the masque, he says to Ferdinand,

> Look thou be true. Do not give dalliance
> Too much rein. The strongest oaths are straw
> To th'fire i'th'blood. Be more abstemious
> Or else good night your vow! (4.1.51-54)

Prospero impresses this lesson on Ferdinand, thus revealing his purpose of maintaining the honor of Miranda, and for this reason, he takes it upon himself, as a magician and a teacher, to convince Ferdinand of the merits of abstinence. Again, the effectiveness of the lesson in the masque is acquired precisely through the combination of books and magic. First, the magic displayed in the masque influences Ferdinand positively in a way that makes the message of the allegorical figures more agreeable. While commenting on the spirits, Ferdinand says, "This is a majestic vision, and/ Harmonious charmingly" (4.1.118-119); he finds the vision both charming and harmonious, as though it has bewitched him, which, no doubt, is Prospero's intention. Second, the classical figures themselves are implemented to urge the young couple toward

abstinence. Juno, a goddess associated with marriage, and Ceres, the goddess associated with fertility, are both mythological figures whose corresponding associations become directly relevant to Ferdinand and Miranda's prenuptial relationship. So, when Ceres mentions that Venus, the goddess of passion, has left with Cupid to a far off land (4.1.93-94), one observes that the masque concentrates, through its allegorical figures, on the very issue of abstinence that Prospero was so concerned about in his previous conversation with Ferdinand. The absence of Cupid and Venus also calls attention to Prospero's awareness of the dangers of youthful passion, such as when Iris says, "Here thought they [Venus and Cupid] to have done/ Some wanton charm upon this man and maid [Ferdinand and Miranda]" (4.1.94-95). Through the characters in the masque, who carry the coded message, Prospero is able to express his lesson of suppressing any threat of passion in Ferdinand and Miranda's betrothal, and in return, Prospero promises, in the words of Juno and Ceres, prosperity of children ("Honour, riches, marriage-blessing,/ Long continuance and increasing" [4.1.106-17]) and of wealth ("Earth's increase, foison plenty,/ Barns and garners never empty" [4.1.110-111]).

With the masque, it becomes clear how the knowledge of books (indicated through Prospero's selection of two classical figures) may combine with magic to more effectively deliver the lessons of the teacher. Furthermore, Shakespeare continues to demonstrate Prospero's authority as a teacher during the masque. Considering Ferdinand's admiration and respect for Prospero, such as when he states, "So rare a wondered father and a wise/ Makes this place paradise" (4.1.123-124), one might take the whole dynamic between the characters during the masque as conforming to the teacher-student hierarchy. The masque scene, therefore, best exemplifies how the motifs of magic and books within *The Tempest* come together as instruments of pedagogy.

Lastly, when Prospero decides to abjure his magic and "drown [his] book" (5.1.57), he pulls his speech from another author, just as Gonzalo did with Michel de Montaigne's essay. Describing the magical marvels that he has performed while on the island, Prospero goes through various descriptions previously spoken by Medea in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. One description in particular, that with "graves at my command/ [I] Have waked their sleepers, ope'd and let'em forth/ By my so potent art" (5.1.48-50), has an odd resonance with the continuity of the rest of the play. Given that Prospero did not have his magic abilities before he came to the island, which seems implied throughout the play and explains why he was unable to stop Antonio's previous usurpation of the dukedom, it is odd that Prospero admits that he has opened graves. Where would these graves have been located, since early in the play Shakespeare informs the audience that when Prospero first arrived, "Then was this island/ (Save for the son that she [Sycorax] did litter here,/ A freckled whelp, hag-born) not honoured with/ A human shape" (1.2.281-284)?

The error in continuity may be credited to some fault in Shakespeare himself; however, another reading could be advanced, namely, that the emphasis of these words, spoken at Prospero's abjuration of magic, rests on the faithfulness to the original passage from Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid that Shakespeare wants to maintain ("I call up dead men from their graves" [Ovid 7.275]). In this sense, then, Prospero draws his magical inspiration directly from the books he reads, specifically the ancient authors. It is not that Prospero has repeated the deeds of Medea and actually raised men from the dead but, rather, that he draws his authority as a mage from Medea and the ancient authors. Plus, what makes magic such a powerful symbol for the authority teachers derive from books is how magic within the play functions analogously to how books function in the classroom. In other words, the magic of *The Tempest* oftentimes creates illusions, from the masque to the many shapes that Ariel is able to take on, and these illusions can then teach lessons to other characters and set up Prospero's own authority as a teacher. If one

then considers the inclusion of books, particularly classic texts, in pedagogical relationships, the teachers likewise become capable of manipulating the information contained in books (such as the manner in which Gonzalo quotes Montaigne) to create the illusion of social order and power hierarchies. The teachers' authority thus comes directly from their own knowledge of books. And yet, for all the power dynamics that are affirmed within pedagogical relationships, Shakespeare continues to show how the illusion of hierarchy can be challenged, especially when the students ignore the lessons of the teachers. Shakespeare, for this aspect of pedagogy, provides the pertinent theme of usurpation.

Questioning Authority

Many schemes to usurp power, as mentioned, are planned among the various antagonists within the play. Whether by circumstances or on account of a naturally dissentious temperament, these characters share a proclivity to question the authority that the teachers of the play attempt to foist upon them. Among these antagonists the most notorious may be Caliban, who plans to make an attempt on Prospero's life despite the teachings that he has received from the mage. While contemplating the information that Ariel provides him about Caliban's desire to take over the island with Stephano, Prospero famously exclaims,

> A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
> Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains
> Humanely taken—all, all lost, quite lost!
> And, as with age his body uglier grows,
> So his mind cankers. (4.1.188-192)

Here the problem of nature versus nurture comes to the forefront of the play's pedagogical representations. David L. Hirst offers a brief, but relevant, commentary to these words: "Prospero is the representative of the world of nurture, of civilization, of art. His ethic is that of cultivating and improving the raw nature of which Caliban is the prime exemplar" (16-17). Prospero, as Caliban's teacher, claims that it is truly Caliban's very nature that has kept him from

benefitting from Prospero's lessons ("my pains"), and if one takes Prospero's words as a sort of philosophy for the play, then it appears that one's nature, acquired at birth, can resist all opportunities for learning, no matter how "Humanely taken." Indeed, this philosophy would have been especially relevant to Shakespeare's audience, many of whom held "the orthodox core belief that all men are born sinners, that evil is in us, and that some refuse the chance to redeem and reform themselves, resist learning, reject conformity to classroom behavior, and fail to view schooling of any type as relevant to them" (Linley 140). In the comparative phrase in lines 191 and 192, one might notice Prospero adopt a similar, orthodox view of Caliban, since he likens Caliban's rebellious mind to his ugly body, making his natural recalcitrance of mind as definite and tangible as a physical object. The persistence of a rebellious mind would then be as difficult to change as one's appearance. Still, it is yet to be seen how this unruly nature in Caliban impacts the authority that Prospero gathers from the pedagogical relationships he constantly sets up throughout the play.

Miranda sheds more light on this problem of nature versus nurture early on in the play when she first explains how she had tried to teach Caliban language, but, as she adds, "thy vile race/ (Though thou didst learn) had that in't which good natures/ Could not abide to be with" (1.2.359-361). Again, from the mouth of another character, the audience learns that Caliban's only problem with conforming to the traditional social order is his own nature. While it may be contended that Shakespeare wrote this exchange between Miranda and Caliban as a chance to posit a colonialist remark against foreign cultures, another reading may be, rather, that Caliban reveals how one's nature can be contrary to traditional hierarchies, which, consequently, also exposes how some of the power dynamics taught by teachers are as artificial as the magic and illusion recurring in the play. Miranda states that Caliban "didst learn" her language; however, Caliban's terrible nature kept him from maturing into what Miranda considers to be essential to

“good natures.” Most likely, being taught by Prospero herself, Miranda’s conception of a good nature would have imitated the same traditional social order that Prospero was expelled from, so what makes Caliban a part of a most vile race is specifically that he disobeys the power dynamics on which teacher-student relationships are founded. In response to Miranda’s words, Caliban even answers, “You taught me language, and my profit on’t/ Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you/ For learning me your language” (1.2.364-366). Caliban, interestingly, is one of the few characters in the play who is able to switch between prose and verse in the play, which allows him emulate the verse in Miranda’s language and the prose in Stephano’s. Caliban, therefore, demonstrates through the very formation of his dialogues how much he was receptive to language (and verse) and capable of learning. The rebellious nature in Caliban that other characters accept as a given thus results more from his rejection of the pedagogical relationship itself. Caliban’s nature keeps him from using language in accordance to Prospero and Miranda’s standards of what is proper, as seen once he is drawn to the prose of Stephano, despite his familiarity with verse. One might even maintain that Caliban fully understood the social order that Prospero and Miranda would have taught him, but his obstinate nature permitted Caliban to see past the illusion of social hierarchy. At the time of the play, then, it is only by magic that Prospero can influence the actions of Caliban. Otherwise, Caliban’s nature permits him to spin his masters’ teachings in his own favor (“my profit on’t/ Is I know how to curse”). Hence, nature, just as Prospero specified above, sustains the insurrection of Caliban and provides an opportunity for him to escape from under the subjugated position of a student.

Antonio, another character of dissention and obsessed with usurping power, appears to suffer from the same rebellious nature. As Miranda points out during Prospero’s account of how he lost his dukedom, “I should sin/ To think but nobly of my grandmother;/ Good wombs have borne bad sons” (1.2.118-120). Miranda first precludes the possibility that her grandmother had

been unfaithful and committed adultery, when she refuses to think other than "nobly" of her grandmother, which then leads to the explanation of nature versus nurture in the second clause. Miranda admits that even good wombs (Shakespeare's metonym for mothers and maternal nurture) can produce bad sons. The juxtaposition of both form and semantic meaning that occurs in line 120 between good wombs and bad sons helps place in sharp contrast the issue of how nature influences good and bad people. The nurturing provided by a good mother can yield little to no effect on a bad son, according to Miranda, for some children, such as Antonio, are naturally inclined toward evil actions. And like Caliban, it is precisely Antonio's nature that enables him to break from the traditional pedagogical relationships and hierarchies taught by the teachers of the play.

Moreover, while planning their usurpation of Alonso, the two unruly students of Gonzalo divulge also how people begin to question the hierarchy taught to them. Gonzalo, as discussed above, attempts to set up a pedagogical relationship with himself as Sebastian and Antonio's teacher; however, the two antagonists undermine his authority with a volley of jokes. Later, after the rest of the king's party have fallen asleep on account of Ariel's song, Antonio takes the time to try and convince Sebastian to emulate his own actions and kill Alonso. It is not that Gonzalo, whose duty it is to teach others about the legitimacy of social order, fails in his role as a teacher, but instead, the like evil natures in Antonio and Sebastian allow Antonio to be a more effective teacher. Yet, what Antonio teaches is not the traditional hierarchy that Gonzalo and Prospero (and even Stephano to some extent) align themselves with: Antonio encourages the dissolution of hierarchy. In an exchange that uses the motion of water metaphorically to describe the refractory ambitions of Sebastian, Antonio and Sebastian hit on the topic of teaching, which has become so common throughout the play:

> SEBASTIAN. Well, I am standing water.
> ANTONIO. I'll teach you how to flow.

> SEBASTIAN. Do so. To ebb
> Hereditary sloth instructs me. (2.1.221-223)

Again, Shakespeare ensconces another pedagogical relationship within *The Tempest*. Contrary to the other teacher-student relationships that establish a particular hierarchy of authority, however, this pedagogy serves to reject traditional values. The subject to be taught is that of usurpation, and as with the conversation delivered between the Boatswain and Gonzalo in the first scene, the theme of questioning authority and the theme of pedagogy become perfectly fused and condensed in this one dialogue. Herein, Antonio teaches Sebastian how to "flow" beyond his position below Alonso, just as Antonio had done with regard to Prospero. It is also significant that Sebastian confesses that nature ("Hereditary sloth") first instructed him to "ebb," or to put it another way, to be content with his subjugated position beneath Alonso, to which Antonio replies with his first lesson to Sebastian:

> If you but knew how you the purpose cherish
> Whiles thus you mock it, how in stripping it
> You more invest it. Ebbing men, indeed,
> Most often do so near the bottom run
> By their own fear or sloth. (2.1.224-228)

Sebastian's first statement of having "Hereditary sloth" closely resembles traditional conceptions of authority; he is less fit to rule Naples than his brother, Alonso, because of his laziness, a specific quality of his nature. But Antonio is able to manipulate this phrase and reveal how "Ebbing men," or men with a similar flaw in their nature, in fact, utilize their own fear and sloth to challenge authority. That is, Antonio shows how some people (like "standing water") may on the surface be content with the traditional hierarchy but truly be flowing water "near the bottom" (in their deepest nature). The lesson, then, is that the true character of a man, just as with water, lies beneath the surface, in one's very nature. Some men can be naturally drawn to certain actions, like usurpation, despite the surface appearance of contentment with their social position, which teachers like Gonzalo have taught to them. Sebastian, in a similar fashion, has assumed

that he is stagnant and deserves no better than his place beneath Alonso, but Antonio soon fulfills the role of a teacher to draw out Sebastian's more evil nature through instruction. The evil nature in Antonio, as may be seen, persuades him to deploy the pedagogical relationship he observed just moments before in Gonzalo and use it to challenge both the authority and the, seemingly natural, nobility of the protagonists. This scene, in a way, echoes Caliban's own actions in the previous scene, when he manipulates the teachings of Miranda and language to challenge the social order impressed upon him by Prospero.

These themes of pedagogy and rebellion become closely interrelated in *The Tempest*, for on the other side of each pedagogical relationship is a scheme to usurp power and to challenge the authority of the teacher. The situations examined above reemerge constantly throughout the play, and what is more, the dynamics of insurrection and authority are not always so clear and unequivocal. In the scene discussed above, Antonio himself took on the position of a teacher, while forming his plan to supplant the king, whereas Caliban, despite being a rebellious student under Prospero's instruction, falls into another subdued role under Stephano; even Stephano, on top of it all, simultaneously rejects the traditional social order by trying to become a king on the island and aligns with that social order by wishing to return to society so that he may offer Caliban as a present to a king. It is the complexity of these characters that make Shakespeare's play so compelling as an illustration for pedagogy and rebellion, but nonetheless, one can discover a clear entwining of these two major themes all throughout the play. Both usurpation and pedagogy concern each character and each subplot, and looking closer, one finds that both themes are intimately tied to power dynamics and traditional forms of hierarchy. For this reason, it is imperative for one to examine not only how Shakespeare incorporates these themes into his play but also what effect Shakespeare's play excites in its audience while dealing with problems of power, rebellion, and pedagogy.

Conclusion

All over the play, Shakespeare peppers his language with words and phrases about teaching and instruction, and even at a macro level the individual scenes begin to recreate the experience of a classroom. In accordance with this observation, I have tried to explore a reading of *The Tempest* that concentrates on two major themes, pedagogy and rebellion, and how these two themes become restaged and reworked in the various scenes of the play. Yet the question remains: how does *The Tempest* arrange themes of pedagogy and rebellion to either entertain or instruct its audience?

One angle that the audience might attempt is a post-colonialist perspective that sets the evil natures of the usurpers, particularly the foreign usurper Caliban, against Western traditions and depicts these antagonists as targets to be dominated by Western values. Many critics have, indeed, found this reading of the play most relevant with regard to its many themes, especially the persistent theme of Prospero's books: "The relationship between illusion and oppression has often foregrounded the book in post-colonialist readings of the play, so that the object, like Prospero's art, becomes enmeshed in taxonomic or cultural materialist theories of authority and surveillance" (Scott 158).

In this case, it would be appropriate to also think about how the play takes place entirely within the green world, which Northrop Frye defines in *The Anatomy of Criticism*: "the action of the comedy begins in a world represented as a normal world, moves into the green world, goes into a metamorphosis there in which the comic resolution is achieved, and returns to the normal world" (182). The green world specifically opens up the potential for magic to help galvanize the resolution in the real world, which in *The Tempest*, is left just outside the action of the play, in the periphery. Prospero's account of his past in scene 2 arranges the conflict central to the plot, and his final decision to abjure magic and forgive his brother Antonio then implies a resolution

to this conflict and a return to the traditional hierarchy supported by the protagonists and teachers. In a post-colonialist reading, the green world that completely surrounds the action of the play serves to reestablish Western values and resolve the problem of foreign cultures, especially since "despite Prospero's retirement, his vow to break his staff and drown his book, relations of power and privilege in *The Tempest* remain structurally unchanged" (O'Dair 36). Also, keeping in mind that the play takes place on a foreign island and forces the Westerners to interact and tame the native Caliban, the post-colonialist reading appears to have many merits. Even Trinculo compares the marvelous appearance of Caliban to the interest that a dead Indian can attract in England: "any strange beast there [England] makes a man. When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian" (2.2.30-32). Trinculo hopes to use Caliban like an Indian and be made a man (that is, make a large profit). The attitude that many characters have to the indigenous Caliban, as exemplified in Trinculo's remark, agrees entirely with the post-colonialist reading, but one might also carry this reading a bit further and consider the cultural context in which the play was written.

The recent expansion to the West that Shakespeare and his contemporaries were experiencing, as well as the introduction to people who were very far removed from Shakespeare's own culture, helps explain the relevance of the play's themes of pedagogy and rebellion. Paul Brown likewise suggests that Shakespeare's play is intimately involved in "the struggle to produce a coherent discourse adequate to the complex requirements of British colonialism in its initial phase" (132). One might specifically recall Miranda's famous exclamation: "How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world/ That has such people in't" (5.1.183-184). Although the remark is directed at the people from Naples and Miranda's hope of returning to the "new world" of Italy, it may be argued that for Shakespeare's own audience these words would have resonated with the popular interest in the New World of the Americas.

The play, then, recognizes the introduction of new value systems and the broad scope of "beauteous mankind" that British colonialism transported home, and in this manner, Shakespeare takes advantage of his own historical situation and reflects it within his own characters. Like the struggle with the conflicting themes of pedagogy and rebellion in the play, the Renaissance conception of what is the natural order of things seems to also be shook by the introduction of the New World. Without commenting too much on the moral predicament of colonialism, one can still see how Shakespeare engages his play with the destabilization of Western values that New World cultures seemed to suggest by their very existence.

The Tempest subsequently transforms into a showcase for this new conception of human nature that Shakespeare's contemporaries would have experienced when introduced to the New World. Montaigne, then, seems particularly applicable to this perspective, as he expresses a poignant analysis of alternate cultures that Shakespeare situates in his play. In an essay by John Gillies, he articulates how these

> radical thought experiments of More and Montaigne are predicated on an 'American principle': the perception that ideal prehistoric forms of political organization posited in ancient poetry, philosophy and Natural Law thinking (and completely at odds with the contemporary or historical European political order) actually existed in the New World, and were therefore pertinent to political thought in a way that they had never been before. (191-192)

In this light, we see that Montaigne does not describe the indigenous people of Brazil objectively; instead, he idealizes their culture and tries to prove how people can live without the social order that permeates Western society. Similarly, and what *The Tempest* seems to be invoking by referencing Montaigne, Shakespeare plays with this idea that the traditional social hierarchy can be challenged, for it is not in any way a representation of a natural state. To put it another way, the themes of rebellion that run all throughout the play reproduce the implications offered in Montaigne's essay: namely, if the traditional hierarchy of the West were a natural state

of humanity, then the people of Brazil, and the antagonists of the play, would also be forced to conform to these values.

More than that, Shakespeare shows how this arbitrary hierarchy enters into Western culture and sustains itself: pedagogy. People are taught to respect and obey the traditional social order by teachers who almost magically create these social structures and impress them upon their students. Yet, both nature, as with Caliban and Antonio, and circumstances, as with the Boatswain, allow certain students to see past this magical illusion of hierarchy. One can label these characters as merely unruly students, but the antagonists' presence in the play cannot be ignored, for their very presence shows how the authority of men who occupy higher positions on the social ladder is founded on flimsy ground, on nothing but magical illusion. The fictional setting of the play, in many ways, generates a safe space for Shakespeare to question the legitimacy of the social order taught by teachers and handle the problems that the discovery of the New World brought up in his own culture. One cannot say whether or not Shakespeare intended to assert the merits of one way of thinking about Western values over another; there is far too much room for interpretation in the play to make that clear. But, one thing does seem clear about the play's use of pedagogy and rebellion: *The Tempest* puts on stage many issues revolving around traditional social orders, presenting them to the audience and leaving it up to each audience member to work through these problems.

Works Cited

Brown, Paul. "'This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism." *Modern Critical Interpretations: William Shakespeare's The Tempest*. Edited by Harold Bloom. Chelsea House Publishers, 1988, pp. 131-151.

Fielder, Leslie A. "The New World Savage as Stranger." *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: The Tempest*, Edited by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2008, pp. 196-203.

Frye, Northrop. *The Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton University Press, 1957.

Gillies, John. "The Figure of the New World in *The Tempest*." *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*, Edited by Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000, pp. 180-201.

Hirst, David L. *The Tempest: Text and Performance*. MacMillan, 1984.

Linley, Keith. *The Tempest in Context: Sin, Repentance and Forgiveness*. Anthem Press, 2015.

Montaigne, Michel. "Of Cannibals." Translated by Charles Cotton. *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: The Tempest*, Edited by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2008, pp. 33-45.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Arthur Golding, Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Scott, Charlotte. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, Arden, 1999.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason and Alden T. Vaughan, editors. *The Tempest*. By William Shakespeare, Arden, 1999.