

Placing Prospero's Island: (Post)Colonial Practices of Comparing in the Academic Reception of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*

MARCUS HARTNER (BIELEFELD UNIVERSITY)

Abstract

*One of the most important developments in the recent scholarly investigation of (academic) practices of comparing has been the emergence of a profound criticism of comparative methods. Postcolonial scholars have drawn attention to the political and moral dimensions of comparing which frequently hides behind the seemingly neutral nature of comparative research. In the context of this discussion, this article presents a case study that traces the history of academic approaches to Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and discusses the function of (geographical) comparisons in the underlying conceptual and ideological matrix of different readings of the play by various schools of literary criticism. The article's particular focus is on scholarly interpretations that explicitly and/or implicitly engage with the text's embeddedness in colonial discourse and the corresponding practice of placing Prospero's fictional island in the Caribbean. In this context, I will show that colonial, postcolonial, and so-called 'Old World readings' of the play either locate or refuse to locate the island and its key protagonists literally and/or discursively in the specific geographical and/or historical context of the Americas. By analyzing the historical trajectory of this practice, this entry attempts to illustrate that postcolonial criticism itself looks back on a long history of engaging in ideologically charged practices of comparing. It also discusses potential consequences of these findings for the study of early modern literature.*

Keywords: The Tempest, Shakespeare, Postcolonial Practices of Comparing

1. Practices of Comparing

Writing about comparative practices frequently begins with the acknowledgment that comparisons are ubiquitous. And indeed, philosophers and cognitive scientists have claimed comparisons to be fundamental to "the way we think" (Fauconnier and Turner; cf. Grave 135-139).[1] They argue that our ability to compare constitutes a basic aspect of human cognition, reaching from rudimentary pattern recognition to complex mental operations. But comparing does not only play a key role in the realm of cognition. Since the 18th century, comparative methods have acquired a central status in many academic disciplines and permeated an increasingly wide range of social domains – a situation which has led scholars such as Michel Foucault and Niklas Luhmann (39) to famously characterize modernity as an

age defined by comparative practices.[2] In the light of such assessments and given their social and scientific ubiquity, it is perhaps not surprising that acts and practices of comparing have themselves recently become objects of research in the humanities.[3]

While various aspects of comparative logic, practice, and methodology have been investigated over the past years, perhaps the most important development in the context of this paper lies in the emergence of an increasing scholarly criticism of (academic) acts of comparing as such. In particular, postcolonial critics have attacked the seeming objectivity and neutrality of comparisons.[4] They have highlighted the political and moral dimension of comparing that frequently hides behind the seemingly neutral and disinterested method of comparative study. Comparisons, Radhakrishnan emphasizes, "are never neutral: they are inevitably tendentious,

didactic, competitive, and prescriptive" ("Why Compare?" 454). While the act of comparing, metaphorically speaking, "assume[s] a level playing field", it turns out on closer inspection that "the field is never level" (Spivak 609). In other words, comparisons are always conducted from a particular perspective and driven by particular interests. They are, in Spivak's words, "never a [neutral] question of compare and contrast, but rather a matter of judging and choosing" (609). Put differently, comparisons not only possess an epistemological but also a political dimension. While this may be irrelevant for some (academic) forms of comparison, the situation acquires specific relevance in (historical) contexts of (post)colonialism, in which "the grounds of comparison" have traditionally been teleological and Eurocentric (Cheah 3).

The point is that in a world structured in dominance, comparisons are initiated in the name of those values, standards, and criteria that are dominant. Once the comparison is articulated and validated, the values that underwrote the comparison receive instant axiomatization as universal values. (Radhakrishnan, *Theory* 74)

As a result of the postcolonial criticism of comparative methods, (simplistic) comparative endeavors between presumed distinct, monolithic "geographical and cultural areas" (Cheah 3) and their cultural products have generally been called into question. This has not only plunged the discipline of comparative literary criticism into a debate about its foundational principles,^[5] but it provides the (literary) historian with a rich ground for critical investigation. In this context, I suggest that despite its instrumental role in challenging cultural and regional comparisons, postcolonial criticism itself has a long tradition of engaging in such practices. My paper presents a historical case study of the academic treatment of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* that aims to serve as a contribution both to the diachronic reception history of Shakespeare's work and to the discussion of postcolonial approaches to early modern literature. For this purpose, I am not only interested in the role both pre- and postcolonial

scholarship have assigned to the play in the cultural imagination of the Americas, but I will first and foremost investigate and discuss the function of (geographical) comparisons in establishing the underlying conceptual and ideological matrix of different approaches to the play.

2. Colonial and Postcolonial Readings of *The Tempest*

Perhaps no other work in the canon of English literature can look back on an equally long-standing controversial debate about its "association with New World colonization" (Raman 51) as Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1623).^[6] The debate began more than two hundred years ago when Edward Malone (1808) compared aspects of the text to early 17th century reports of a shipwreck on the coast of the Bermudas in 1609 and became convinced that he had discovered one of the main sources of the famous text. These reports, in Malone's view, "unquestionably gave rise to Shakespeare's *Tempest*, and suggested to him [Shakespeare] the title, as well as some incidents, of that admirable comedy" (*The Plays* 381).^[7] In the following decades, Malone's observations gradually took hold. They turned him into the first voice in a long and increasingly influential tradition of scholars who argued for the central importance of the New World context of Shakespeare's play by basing their assessment methodologically on an implicit comparison between the text's setting/characters and contemporary representations of (the) America(s).

This tradition proved to be so successful that by the end of the 19th century, it had become "unquestionable" for the prominent Shakespeare scholar Sidney Lee that Prospero's island could be compared to and identified "with the newly discovered Bermudas" (*A Life* 253). Following Malone, Lee names a number of sources such as Silvester Jourdain's *A Discovery of the Barmudas* (1610) in support of this claim, and furthermore asserts an unequivocal relationship between the character Caliban and "the aboriginal savage[s] of the New World" (253).^[9] Although he declares

the character to be “no precise presentation of any identifiable native American”, he believes Caliban to be

an imaginary composite portrait, an attempt to reduce the aboriginal types of whom the dramatist and his contemporaries knew anything to one common denominator. ... [I]t is obvious that Shakespeare was eclectic in garnering his evidence But finally, from his imaginative study of the ‘idea’ of aboriginal life, there emerges a moving sentient figure which, in spite of some misrepresentations, presents with convincing realism the psychological import of the American Indian temperament. (Lee, *Elizabethan and Other Essays* 295-296)[10]

For Lee, Caliban is a true representation of the Native American because he corresponds to Lee’s own notion of a character in a primitive stage of evolutionary development, “a creature stumbling over the first stepping-stones which lead from savagery to civilization” (296). Lee’s racist assessment is typical for much of the writing in his time (A. Vaughan 140). Yet, apart from its racism, the passage is also typical for ‘New World’ readings of the *Tempest* up to the present day in that the character Caliban takes center stage in interpretations of the text which are located primarily in a (post)colonial (conceptual) frame. Accordingly, the introduction to Morton Luce’s Arden edition of the play not only claims that “nine-tenths of the subjects touched upon by Shakespeare in *The Tempest* are suggested by the new enterprise of colonisation” but also that Caliban clearly constitutes “a dispossessed Indian” (qtd. in Vaughan and Vaughan, Introduction 100). Similarly, a few years later the scholar Walter Alexander Raleigh declared the play to be a “fantasy of the New World”, and the name Caliban to be “almost certainly a distortion of Cannibal”; he described the portrait of this character in general as “a composition wrought from fragments of travellers’ tales” that “shows a wonderfully accurate and sympathetic understanding of uncivilized man” (112-113).

On an ideological level, the examples above illustrate that early arguments comparing aspects of Shakespeare’s play with the New

World tend to read contemporary cultural notions of Native American inferiority into Caliban. In addition, these scholars often instinctively identify with Prospero in their interpretations, who accordingly comes to represent culture and civilization. Lee, for example, voices the opinion that “[e]very explorer shared Prospero’s pity for the aborigines’ inability to make themselves intelligible in their crabbed agglutinative dialects and offered them instruction in civilised speech” (*Elizabethan and Other Essays* 296-297). [11] His statement is indicative of a cultural frame of mind convinced of Western (linguistic) superiority that serves as the implicit, underlying (Eurocentric) ground of all contemporary comparisons featuring the native population of the New World (Cheah 3). On a methodological level, the interpretations of scholars such as Lee, Luce, and Raleigh primarily rely on the identification of potential early modern sources whose relevance is then proclaimed by means of associative reasoning. One of the problems with this method that is fundamentally based on a comparison of these sources with the text of *The Tempest*, however, lies in the diverse and rather inconclusive results of such comparisons. This becomes apparent when we return to some of the historical analyses of the text. Certain snippets of the play such as the name ‘Setebos’, the god worshiped by Caliban (*The Tempest* 1.2.374, 5.1.361), could in fact be more or less convincingly traced. The name appears to be literally taken from a Patagonian deity that appears in the translation of Antonio Pigafetta’s report on Magellan’s circumnavigation of the globe (Lee, *A Life* 253).[12] A case can also be made for the influence of Montaigne’s “Of the Caniballes” (100-107) on a speech by the character Gonzalo in Act II. Scholars have argued that Gonzalo’s fantasy about what he would do if he were King on Prospero’s island can be compared to Montaigne’s (idealized) description of Brazilian natives and their culture (*The Tempest* 2.1.148-165).[13]

Other links, however, are less unequivocal. For example: “The references to the gentle climate of the island” featured in travel reports such as Jourdain are, for Sidney Lee, one of the reasons why Prospero’s island can be compared with the climate of “the newly discovered Bermudas”

(*A Life* 253). This may certainly be a possible comparison, but it is hardly a necessary one, particularly if one bears in mind that the island's literal location in the play is the Mediterranean (between Tunis and Naples) – a region also commonly associated with a “gentle climate”. A similar case concerns “the spirits and devils” that allegedly “infested” the Bermudas according to those early accounts; for Lee, they seem to clearly provide a link to the characters Ariel and Caliban (253). Yet, medieval and early modern travel accounts from all hemispheres abound in references to magical or monstrous creatures. Again, it remains doubtful whether, for example, Silvester Jourdain's short reference to the Bermudas as “a most prodigious and enchanted place” (8) indeed constitutes conclusive evidence for the particular relevance of this text as a source for *The Tempest*. Better cases may be built for other documents, such as William Strachey's “A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates”.^[14] But even the latter has remained heavily disputed up to the present day (e.g. Stritmatter and Kositsky's *On the Date, Sources and Design of Shakespeare's The Tempest*).^[15]

Historically, the lack of unequivocal evidence for a colonial setting, i.e. the inability to identify a critical amount of conclusive similarities between Shakespeare's play and contemporary sources about the New World, thus triggered a number of critical responses in the first half of the 20th century. Though New World readings remained largely dominant, some scholars began to poke holes in the accounts of Lee and others based on the inconclusiveness of the comparisons illustrated above. Elmer Edgar Stoll, for example, protested that “[t]here is not a word in *The Tempest* about America or Virginia, colonies or colonizing, Indians or tomahawks, maize, mocking-birds, or tobacco. Nothing but the Bermudas, once barely mentioned as a faraway place, like Tokio or Mandalay” (213). Similarly, Frank Kermode stressed in his introduction to the Arden edition of 1954 that there was “nothing [...] fundamental” to the play's “structure of ideas which could not have existed had America remained undiscovered, and the Bermuda voyage never taken place” (xxv). In other words, given the lack of conclusive evidence, an

alternative tradition for reading the play emerged in which critics skeptical of the New World connection refocused on the general context of the ‘Old World’. Though both traditions have existed side by side ever since, colonial readings of *The Tempest* have not only continued to dominate literary criticism, but, more importantly, they went through a fundamental transformation in the second half of the 20th century.

The advent of Postcolonialism with its scholarly re-assessments of Western colonial rule significantly altered earlier New World readings of the play, for example, by fundamentally reversing the evaluations of Caliban and Prospero. In 1960, George Lamming declared that he could not help reading the play against the background of England's colonial history. *The Tempest*, he argued, was “prophetic of a political future which is our present. Moreover, the circumstances of my life, both as a colonial and exiled descendant of Caliban in the 20th century, is an example of that prophecy” (13). Fernández Retamar makes a similar statement and also identifies with Caliban in his assertion that for the people of the Caribbean

[o]ur symbol then is ... Caliban. This is something that we, the *mestizo* inhabitants of these same isles where Caliban lived, see with particular clarity: Prospero invaded the islands, killed our ancestors, enslaved Caliban, and taught him his language to make himself understood. What else can Caliban do but use that same language – today he has no other – to curse him, to wish that the ‘red plague’ would fall on him? I know no other metaphor more expressive of our cultural situation, of our reality. ... [W]hat is our history, what is our culture, if not the history and culture of Caliban? (24)^[16]

The quotes from Lamming and Retamar stand for a general reversal in the interpretation of Caliban that is embedded in a new critical reading of the relationship between past and present, between history and allegory. Retamar's suggestion that we view Caliban as a kind of symbolic ancestor for the peoples of the Caribbean is based on an understanding of the island's colonial past as fundamentally

intertwined with the colonizer's imperial, cultural, and literary history: "Symbolic appropriation of *The Tempest* to represent an ongoing condition thus merges with a historical reading of the play as the original colonial allegory to which the postcolonial present can be traced" (Raman 2011: 58).

But even though Retamar and Lamming reverse the evaluation of the relationship between Prospero and Caliban in their reading of the play, several underlying comparative coordinates remain unchanged. They evidently also locate Shakespeare's fictional island in the Caribbean and identify Caliban as a symbolic representative of the "mestizo inhabitants" of this region, whose colonial cultural history they argue to resemble Caliban's subjugation by Prospero. Correspondingly, the latter continues to be compared to the European colonizer. However, as the academic perspective changes from a colonial to a postcolonial ideological frame, the conceptual grounds of comparison also change. While Lee had identified "Prospero's pity" for the cultural 'deficiencies' of the native as one of the links between the play and his notion of the Western explorer (*Elizabethan and Other Essays* 296), Prospero's behavior is now compared to that of the colonial invader, murderer, and slaver (Retamar 24). While Retamar and Lamming thus continue to take the historical connection of the text to early modern English colonialism for granted, the main thrust of their criticism turns towards a re-conceptualization of the relationship between colonizer and colonized both in the present and the past. From this postcolonial perspective, colonialism is construed not only as a political and historical event, but also in terms of a critical reading of its ideological, conceptual, and symbolical practices. Pursuing a related strategy, Octave Mannoni's seminal *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonialism* employs the play's characters as typological models for what he sees as the characteristic psychological personality types of European colonizers and colonized natives. Drawing on psychoanalysis, Mannoni diagnoses two opposing and complimentary psychological conditions for the two groups: While Caliban embodies a dependency complex that Mannoni believes to be characteristic of the colonized,

Prospero, i.e. the colonizer, suffers from a 'Prospero Complex', a lack of an "awareness of the world of Others, a world in which Others have to be respected"; this condition is combined with a nervous impatience, and an infantile "urge to dominate ... , which social adaptation has failed to discipline" (108).

Mannoni's ideas were highly influential, but they were also severely criticized – particularly the notion of the dependency complex.[17] Still, in the context of this paper, his work provides another instance of the general strategy of conceptualizing *The Tempest* as a colonial text by comparing Caliban to the colonized and Prospero to the colonizer. In other words, the play's connection to and relevance for (post)colonial discourse is once more coupled with the implicit presupposition of its historical embeddedness in the symbolic, geographical, and biographical contexts of colonialism. When for Zabus "the colonial encounter between Prospero and Caliban" comes to provide "the central metaphor" for "transatlantic imperialism" (116; cf. Fishburn), the underlying logic of this interpretation is also both different and similar to earlier readings by Lee and Malone. Instead of tracing potential historical sources and comparing their content to Shakespeare's depiction of the island and its characters, now the text's colonial status is revealed by the way its character relationships resonate with a postcolonial critique of the colonial encounter. In other words, *The Tempest* continues to be read as a colonial play, although it is a new set of associative links between text and perceived (post)colonial context that is considered to be relevant. No longer primarily interested in hunting for the sources that inspired the playwright, scholars now see the play's "dominant discursive con-texts" in "the ensemble of fictional and lived practices" of "English Colonialism" (Barker and Hulme 198). From this point of view, Caliban is no longer seen as a faithful representation of the barbarous Native American (Lee, *A Life*). Instead, he is considered to be "one of the most powerful symbols in the European construction of the New World as its Other" (Fishburn 158).

3. Alternative Readings

Over the past decades, postcolonial approaches have exerted a major influence on the scholarly reading of *The Tempest*; many postcolonial critics see it as “a self-evident truth” that the play “is not only a colonialist text, but has functioned historically to support and validate a colonialist ideology” (Lindley 39).[18] Yet, as with any other successful academic paradigm, such readings have not gone uncontested. Critical voices favoring an Old World reading have continued to point out weak spots. The main thrust of their argument again tries to draw attention to the dissonances emerging from a comparison between early modern scenarios of colonialism and the plot/setting of the play.

[I]f the play is about colonialism, Prospero is a very odd colonist indeed. He did not choose to voyage to his island, has no interest in founding an outpost of Milan, and no desire to turn the riches of the island which Caliban has made known to him into tradable commodities In many respects he seems closer to Duke Senior, reluctant inhabitant of the Forest or Arden in *As You Like It*, than to Sir Thomas Gates, and generically his island functions rather more like the ‘green worlds’ or earlier Shakespearean comedy, from *Two Gentlemen of Verona* onwards, than it does as a colonized territory. (Lindley 39)

Robert Miola also agrees that “the island setting of *The Tempest* constitutes the *locus amoenus*, or ‘pleasant place’ of the pastoral genre”.[19] Far from being a colonial space, it “provides the conventional retreat from civilization and the courtly world” (144). Moreover, the play seems to lack any interest in England’s colonial projects in the West:

Even the action on Prospero’s Mediterranean isle, controlled as it is by Prospero’s magic, steadfastly resists the colonial analogy it nevertheless suggests: the ‘shipwrecked’ men on whom Prospero practices are Italians, overwhelmingly royalty or nobility; they had been traveling east; they had been trying to go home;

... and all do go home in the end. (Knapp 221)[20]

In addition, it is not only the Italian characters for whom the colonial analogy is problematic. Even Caliban, who, as we have seen above, has become a symbol for the colonized, does not represent an indigenous native. The attempt to cast the relationship between Prospero and Caliban as prototypical for the colonial relationship between colonizer and native is complicated by the characters Ariel and Sycorax (Skura 50). As the son of the dead witch Sycorax who had taken possession of the island after having been exiled from Algiers many years ago, “[t]he enslavement by Prospero repeats his mother’s earlier imprisonment of Ariel, who might be considered the island’s ‘real’ indigenous inhabitant” (Lindley 39). From this point of view, Caliban rather constitutes “a first-generation colonialist himself” (39), who would not only like to regain control of the island but also to use Prospero’s daughter to people “This isle with Calibans” (*The Tempest* 1.2.351).[21]

The reference to Caliban’s transgressive sexual energy manifests in the scene in which he is accused of having attempted to rape Miranda, however, it can also be read as supporting Miola’s comparison of the play with the genre of the pastoral. For Miola, Caliban can clearly be compared to a pastoral satyr, “a paradoxical combination of animality, humanity, and divinity” (146). Satyrs, he explains, “represent brutish sexual desire but possess the human gifts of speech and song as well as a divine ancestry and vitality”. Caliban, in his view, possesses all of these characteristics (146). The character cannot only be seen as a pastoral satyr, however. He may also be placed in other interpretive contexts. There are, for example, the period’s fascination with monsters and monstrous births (Burnett; del Lucchese and Toppe 488); the much older notion of the ‘wild man’, a mythical figure that can be found in medieval artwork and literature (Lindley 43);[22] or the idea that Caliban “is a more general representation of anarchy, or social uprising” (Marshall 379).

Such interpretations call into question the assumption that colonialism constitutes the play’s dominant discursive context and support

readings that foreground the play's connection to Jacobean concerns closer to home. Tristan Marshall, for example, believes that the way Shakespeare's text centers on the island and its ruler Prospero points to an underlying preoccupation with "Britain as a distinct and insular community" (400).[23] Similarly, David Kastan holds the opinion that the play is much more concerned with European politics than with European colonial activities. He points, *inter alia*, to the similarity between Prospero and Rudolf II, the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire who was first stripped of administrative control (1606) and later deposed by the Habsburg archdukes (1611) for entirely "dedicating himself to scientific and occult study" (192). It hardly needs to be mentioned at this point that Kastan's argument, again, is based on a comparison between one of the key characters and (a figure from) the play's contemporary historical context. And again, the function of the comparison changes fundamentally. This time, it is employed in order to serve the general argument that "the critical emphasis upon the new world" has obscured "the play's more prominent discourses of dynastic politics" (189).[24] Instead of a postcolonial desire to read the play in the context of early colonialism, i.e. to locate it "in *our* historical moment" (196), Kastan wants to return to *the play's* historical moment:

If ... one's interpretive desire is to reinsert the play into its own historical moment, ... it seems to me that we should look more closely at the old world than the new, at the wedding of Elizabeth and Frederick rather than of Pocahontas and John Rolfe, at James's own writings rather than the writings from Jamestown. This seems to me so both because old world history marks the play (context as discourse) more insistently than does the new world ... and because the European history allows a reader to make sense of more in the text (context as frame) that would otherwise seem arbitrary or inexplicable. (196)

Kastan's clean-cut separation between locating *The Tempest* in *our* historical moment and in *the play's* historical moment is conceptually and methodologically problematic (Raman 53).

Nevertheless, he belongs to a number of critical voices who make the valid point that dogmatic postmodern readings run into several textual problems. Various passages of the text make it impossible "to sustain a univocal reading of the play as a colonialist text" unless important details have been 'tweaked' (Lindley 43).[25] It is important to take such critical comments seriously. Yet, my purpose behind outlining the arguments of scholars skeptical of the colonialist paradigm is not to denounce or refute postcolonial readings of the play. Even though Caliban may not represent an indigenous native of the isle, I believe that his name still seems to be an anagram of 'cannibal'; and although he may not be a morally blameless character, it still "makes us flinch" from our position of "historical retrospect" when Prospero, the European foreigner to the isle, "calls Caliban 'savage' and 'slave'" (Alexander 153).

Neither does the purpose of my investigation lie in proclaiming one set of comparisons to be more accurate or productive than another. What I have tried to highlight, by tracing the academic reception of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, is the fundamental role comparisons play in all of the approaches outlined above. Colonial, postcolonial, and Old World readings of the play locate or refuse to locate the island and its key protagonists literally and/or discursively in the specific geographical and/or historical context of the Americas. In all cases, comparisons between text and context are not employed in a "neutral" way but deliberately serve a particular interpretation of Shakespeare's work. In this function, they turn out to be crucial for establishing the underlying conceptual and ideological matrix for the respective reading of the play – a finding interesting in several respects. On the one hand, it pays testimony to the ubiquity of comparative practices in different schools of literary study in general. In this context, it raises the crucial question whether approaches in cultural and literary studies can avoid engaging in comparative readings of text and context in literal, symbolical, and metaphorical ways at all. If comparison, as Friedman emphasizes, is "an inevitable mode of human cognition", then "to refuse comparison" is either an impossible or a misguided academic practice, tantamount "to stick[ing] your head in

the sand" (760). On the other hand, the history of the academic treatment of Shakespeare's play reminds us of the problematic nature of specific forms of comparison (cf. Radhakrishnan, *Why Compare*). In this context, it also demonstrates that postcolonial critics have substantially participated in comparative practices that discursively construct Europe and the Americas as a conceptual binary consisting of distinct, monolithic geographical and cultural areas. In the attempt to squeeze *The Tempest* into a single interpretive frame, the postcolonial readings outlined above subscribe to a conceptual separation between Old World and New World contexts that repeats the structural dichotomy between 'the West and the rest' inherent to earlier colonial readings, albeit in a politically reversed form.

4. Beyond Binary Comparisons

In response to the situation outlined above, I would like to propose that we refrain from such simplistic conceptual and comparative binaries in the postcolonial study of early modern literature. In order to resist politics of othering, comparative practices require an increased methodological and epistemological reflexivity that engages "with the contradictions inherent in comparison, [and] ... that creatively open[s] up dialogue and new frameworks for reading and acting in the world" (Friedman 760). Particularly with regard to the study of the early modern period, any strict conceptual separation between Old World and New World, between the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, and the British Isles, is misleading and counterproductive. Instead of playing different contextual frames off against each other, it is necessary to pay attention to the ways in which they intersect and combine into something that is greater than the sum of its parts. Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, in this respect, is a wonderful example for the creative blending of elements from seemingly distinct contexts. The playwright weaves the fabric of his text out of multiple sources and demonstrates his ability to interconnect and merge cultural models of various kinds in a productive way.

Once more, Caliban serves as a good example as his portrayal deliberately features elements associating him with a wide range of contextual fields including the Caribbean, Africa, and classical (European) mythology. The name "Caliban", as I have mentioned before, associates the character with the Caribbean. Caliban is an anagram of 'cannibal', a term derived from the ethnic name *Carib* or *Caribes* that belonged to a people of the West Indies who were accused of eating human flesh by European explorers and colonizers. The term replaced the older term "anthropophagi" in the early modern period and became firmly associated with the native inhabitants of the Caribbean as practitioners of cannibalism (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 37-38). The character is, furthermore, associated with the New World by being shown to worship Setebos, a Patagonian deity (*The Tempest* 1.2.374). At the same time, Caliban is the son of the Algerian witch Sycorax, which genealogically makes him of North African descent – a fact that for Barbara Fuchs links the character with the Maghreb, a region firmly associated with the threat of Muslim piracy and the notion of captivity and slavery at the time. The origin of Sycorax and the forced marriage of Claribel to the King of Tunis, which are both part of the back story, place the play in the context of the general concern about the power of the Ottoman Empire. For Fuchs, "any island imagined in the Mediterranean at the time of the play, then, would be understood to exist in a hotly contested space, permanently threatened by the Ottoman Empire" (57-58).

In addition to Caliban's North African genealogy, Sycorax reminds the reader/spectator of the two witches Circe and Medea from classical antiquity (cf. Warner); Caliban can be linked to the aforementioned mythical traditions of the satyr, the 'wild man', and the monstrous races in general. This composite nature is reflected in what Warner has called the "contradictory zoology" of the character: his description by other characters in the play does not add up to a coherent image, but is made up of "shuffling, overlapping pictures [that] have made Caliban notoriously difficult to cast and dress" (98-99). On the one hand, Caliban and Sycorax are thus emblematic of the multiple locations of the island. On the other hand, they illustrate

that ideas and images could migrate in multiple directions in the early modern period. European explorers, travelers, and colonists not only took traditional symbols and images of liminal figures (e.g. satyrs, monsters, and amazons) westward to impose them on the New World (cf. Wittkower), but the process also moved in reverse. When Shakespeare takes the name of the Patagonian deity Setebos to further exoticize the North African witch and her offspring, this small detail, in my opinion, points to a much larger phenomenon: the general interconnection of a wide range of discursive contexts concerning the encounter with other cultures and civilizations. By embedding allusions to Cannibals, the “still-vexed Bermudas” (*The Tempest* 1.2.229), and Patagonian deities, into a plot that is concerned with questions of dynastic exile, rule, and succession, the play symbolically reminds us that “the colonial activity of seventeenth century Europe” cannot be seen independently of “the politics of the Great European powers” (Kastan 194).[26] For Jerry Brotton, this means that

[t]o interrogate the specificities of *The Tempest’s* complex negotiation of its Mediterranean contexts does not simply call for a rejection of its New World readings in favour of its Old World resonances. ... Instead I would argue that the play is precisely situated at the *geopolitical bifurcation* between the Old World and the New, at the point at which the English realized both the compromised and subordinated position within which they found themselves in the Mediterranean, and the possibility of pursuing a significantly different commercial and maritime initiative in the Americas. (“Contesting Colonialism” 37)

The composite nature of Caliban that includes the blending of New World references and a North African origin, for example, serves as a reminder that England’s early colonial endeavors are contemporaneous to England’s experiences of North African piracy and Ottoman power in the Mediterranean; such seemingly different contexts can be interlinked politically and symbolically in complex ways. [27] “[T]he different geographies animated by

the play” which are emphasized by different schools of critics, Loomba suggests, “remind us ... of the limitations of compartmentalizing the waters, of thinking about the Atlantic without the Mediterranean, and the Mediterranean without the Indian Ocean” (28). As we have only begun to explore the manifold connections between these spaces, it is an important task for Early Modern Studies to further pursue lines of investigation that focus on their intersection.

However, the academic reception history of *The Tempest* not only serves as a powerful reminder of the limitations of compartmentalizing the early modern world but, on a different level, it also illustrates the tempting nature of this practice. As my paper has attempted to show, conceptually dividing the early modern world into clearly demarcated geographical and cultural blocks allows both (post)colonial scholars and their critics to sustain coherent readings of the play and its protagonists. Thus, despite its instrumental role in challenging cultural and regional comparisons, postcolonial criticism itself looks back at a long history of engaging in simplistic and ideologically charged practices of comparing. What we may learn from this history is that in order to overcome the monolithic readings that tend to emerge from such practices, that in order to “move past centrisms and instrumentalisms of all kinds” (Friedman 760), postcolonial approaches in early modern literary studies perhaps need to resist the temptation of squeezing texts into a single interpretive frame. The various schools of criticism of *The Tempest* outlined above rather indicate that Shakespeare deliberately refrains from placing Prospero’s island in a clearly specified geopolitical space. Instead, I believe that the play’s setting and characters are fundamentally composite and inherently contradictory in nature. In this respect, a critical reading of the polyphonous comparisons invited by *The Tempest* effectively undercuts the ideologically charged interpretations of the play outlined above. Such a reading, in my opinion, also moves into the direction of Natalie Melas’ general vision of “a practice of comparison” in literary studies “that doesn’t begin from the foundation of empirical unities and in which comparison is not put to work in the service of a

distinct project" ("Merely Comparative" 657).

Endnotes

[1] This article has been written within the framework of the Collaborative Research Center SFB 1288 "Practices of Comparing. Changing and Ordering the World", Bielefeld University, Germany, funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

[2] See, also, Epple and Erhart 14.

[3] See, for example, the edited volumes by Felski and Friedman, and by Epple and Erhart, as well as the work of the Collaborative Research Center SFB 1288 "Practices of Comparing. Changing and Ordering the World" (Bielefeld University).

[4] See, for example, Melas 2007, Stoler 2001, Harootunian 2005, and Radhakrishnan 2009.

[5] See, for example, Rey Chow "The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European Perspective." *English Literary History* 71.2 (2004), Natalie Melas, *All the Difference*, and Susan Stanford Friedman "Why Not Compare?" *PMLA* 126.3 (2011).

[6] Raman's account of this debate (51-67) provides one of the starting points for my own discussion in this paper. For an introduction to the topic, see also Lindley (30-45), and Vaughan and Vaughan, Introduction (39-47 and 98-108). For a general introduction to the critical contexts of *The Tempest*, see, furthermore, the contributions in Hulme and Sherman 2000, as well as Vaughan and Vaughan 2014, which includes the helpful survey by Charry, "Recent Perspectives on *The Tempest*" (61-92).

[7] Malone presents his observations initially in *An Account of the Incidents, from Which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest Were Derived* (1808). The quote is from the expanded version of the argument that appeared in Malone, *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* (1821).

[8] The notion that the Bermudas are the play's location was further popularized in Kipling, *How Shakespeare Came to Write the 'Tempest'* in the same year.

[9] Other potential sources that have been suggested as sources for *The Tempest* include a promotional pamphlet by the Council of the Virginia Company, *A True Declaration of the State of the Colonie in Virginia* (1610) and the letter from the same year by William Strachey "A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates." Although the first publication of the letter was in 1625, scholars have assumed that it was available to Shakespeare in manuscript form (Lindley 31). Another text frequently cited as a potential source is Michel de Montaigne's "Of the Canibales" (100-107) in *The Essayes, or Morall, Politike and Millitarie* (1603). Scholars have argued that Shakespeare might have borrowed from Montaigne's (idealized) description of Brazilian natives for his portrayal of Caliban and, in particular, for a speech by Gonzalo in act II (see ensuing discussion as well as Vaughan and Vaughan (Introduction 44-45 and 61)). For

more detailed overviews of the play's entire spectrum of potential sources and the history of its scholarly debate, see Gurr 2014, Alden Vaughan 1988, Lindley 2002 (25-33), and Vaughan and Vaughan (Introduction 36-62).

[10] Sidney Lee "The American Indian in Elizabethan England" was originally published in *Scribner's Magazine* in September 1907. I have used the reprint of the article in Sidney Lee, *Elizabethan and Other Essays* edited by Frederick Boas 1968 ([1929]: 263-301).

[11] Until the 1960s/1970s, a different tradition of reading the characters in the play dominated Latin American scholarship. José Rodó, *Ariel* (1900) associated Caliban with the "colossus of the North", i.e. the US, while simultaneously "urging the Latin American nations to seek inspiration in the more ethereal Ariel" (Fishburn 158); cf. Vaughan and Vaughan (Introduction 98-99 and 102-103)).

[12] The first English translation of Pigafetta's short account appeared in Richard Eden's anthology *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India* (1555). It describes, *inter alia*, an encounter in South America with a people "the capitayne named *Patagoni*" as well as one of their deities, the "greate devyl they caule *Setebos*" (220).

[13] See, for example, Vaughan and Vaughan (Introduction 44-45 and 61) and Marshall 1998 (382).

[14] Sir Thomas Gates was the Governor of the English Colony of Virginia in 1610. On his way to the colony his ship, the *Sea Venture*, was heavily damaged during a hurricane and left Gates and his crew marooned on the island of Bermuda where they spent ten months before managing to build two small boats that would take them to Jamestown. William Strachey, who was a passenger on board the *Sea Venture*, wrote a letter containing a narrative of those events. This report was not published until 1625, although a manuscript version that Shakespeare may have had access to had previously been circulated in England. As one of the play's allegedly main sources, the letter is partially reprinted in the recent Arden edition of *The Tempest* by Vaughan and Vaughan (287-302).

[15] Cf. Barry Clarke 2011, who believes it to be improbable that Shakespeare had access to Strachey's report before the first performance of *The Tempest*. See also Elmer Stoll's argument, that "there are some few isolated similarities in subject-matter [between *The Tempest* and Strachey's report], such as a storm, a shipwreck, St. Elmo's fire, a Master, a Boatswain, a harbour, an island, the north wind; but who could tell a sea story without them, even Herodotus or Heliodorus?" (Stoll 213).

[16] See, in this context, the entry on Caliban in the *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*: "Caliban, in post-colonial literary criticism, is considered one of the most powerful symbols in the European construction of the New World as its Other. Traditionally, Caliban has been seen as the negative foil to Prospero's culture, Miranda's virtue, Ariel's spirituality in a variety of dyadic interpretations; more recent critical attention has focused on *The Tempest* as 'the startling encounter between a lettered and an unlettered culture'" (Fishburn 158).

[17] Frantz Fanon, for example, famously devotes the

fourth chapter of his *Black Skin, White Masks* (83-108) to a thorough criticism of Mannoni.

[18] See, for example, Fiedler 1973, who enthusiastically claims that “the whole history of imperialist America has been prophetically revealed to us in brief parable: from the initial act of expropriation through the Indian wars to the setting up of reservations and from the beginnings of black slavery to the first revolts and evasions” (238).

[19] Lindley also points to Barber 1959 and Frye 1965 for readings that connect the play to the genre of the ‘pastoral comedy’ (39, FN 1).

[20] See Kastan 1999 (188-189) for a similar assessment.

[21] Cf. Skura: “She [Sycorax] is a reminder that Caliban is only half-native, that his claim to the island is less like the claim of the Native American than the claim of the second-generation Spaniard in the New World.” (50)

[22] On the figure of the Wild Man, see chapters seven and eight in Dorothy Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature* (144-196).

[23] Critics have also connected Prospero’s island with Africa and Ireland, which, according to Callaghan “might be understood as the sublimated context for colonial relations in *The Tempest*” (137). In this context, see also Fuchs 1997 (45-62); Brotton 1998 (23-42), and Vaughan and Vaughan (Introduction 47-54).

[24] On the political thought in Shakespeare’s play, see also Jeffrey Rufo “New Directions: ‘He needs will be Absolute Milan’: The Political Thought of *The Tempest*.” *The Tempest: A Critical Reader* edited by Alden and Virginia Vaughan (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

[25] The most important detail for Lindley is Caliban’s attempted rape of Miranda, which poses a problem to unconditionally ‘positive’ readings of Caliban as the victim of colonization. For a discussion, see Lindley (42-43)

[26] Kastan argues that England’s colonial activities are deeply imbedded in its political involvement in Europe: “If our attention to early modern colonialism is to be more than reflexive it must see its practices or what they were, as various and admittedly overdetermined activities within the conflicts of seventeenth century absolutism rather than as examples of a unified and transhistorical imperial desire and administration” (194).

[27] On England’s early modern encounter with Islam and the Muslim corsairs of North Africa, see MacLean and Matar 2011, Brotton 2016, and Colley 2003 (23-134).

Works Cited

Alexander, Michael. *Reading Shakespeare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. 3rd ed. London:

Routledge, 2013. Print.

Barber, Cesar L. *Shakespeare’s Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1959. Print.

Barker, Francis, and Peter Hulme. “Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish: The Discursive Con-Texts of *The Tempest*.” *Alternative Shakespeares*. Ed. John Drakakis. London: Methuen, 1985. 191-205. Print.

Brotton, Jerry. *This Orient Isle: Elizabethan England and the Islamic World*. London: Penguin, 2016. Print.

---. “‘This Tunis, Sir, Was Carthage’: Contesting Colonialism in *The Tempest*.” *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. Ed. Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin. London: Routledge, 1998. 23-42. Print.

Burnett, Mark T. “‘Strange and Woonderfull Syghts’: *The Tempest* and the Discourses of Monstrosity.” *Shakespeare Survey* 50 (1997): 187-199. Print.

Callaghan, Dymna. *Shakespeare Without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Charry, Brinda. “Recent Perspectives on *The Tempest*.” *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*. Ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia M. Vaughan. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 61-92. Print.

Cheah, Pheng. “Grounds of Comparison.” *Diacritics* 29.4 (1999): 523-545. Print.

Chow, Rey. “The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European Perspective.” *English Literary History* 71.2 (2004): 289-311. Print.

Clarke, Barry R. “The Virginia Company and *The Tempest*.” *Journal of Drama Studies* 5 (2011): 13-27. Print.

Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600-1850*. London: Pimlico, 2003. Print.

Council of Virginia. *A True Declaration of the estate of the Colonie in Virginia, With a confutation of such scandalous reports as have tended to the disgrace of so worthy an enterprise*. London: Printed for William Barret, 1610. Print.

Eden, Richard. *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India*. London: Guilhelmi Powell, 1555. Print.

Epple, Angelika, and Walter Erhart, eds. *Die Welt beobachten: Praktiken des Vergleichens*. Frankfurt: Campus, 2015. Print.

---. “Die Welt beobachten – Praktiken des Vergleichens.” *Die Welt beobachten: Praktiken des Vergleichens*. Ed. Angelika Epple and Walter Erhart. Frankfurt: Campus, 2015. 7-31. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press, 2002 [1952]. Print.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002. Print.

Felski, Rita, and Susan Stanford Friedman, eds. *Comparison: Theories, Approaches, Uses*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2013. Print.

- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. "Caliban: Notes Towards a Discussion of Culture in Our America." *Massachusetts Review* 15.1/2 (1974 [1971]): 7-72. Print.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. *The Stranger in Shakespeare*. London: Helm, 1973. Print.
- Fishburn, Evelyn. "Caliban: America as the Other." *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*. Ed. Verity Smith. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997. 158-159. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1970. Print.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Why Not Compare?" *PMLA* 126.3 (2011): 753-762. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance*. New York: Columbia UP, 1965. Print.
- Fuchs, Barbara. "Conquering Islands: Contextualizing *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (1997): 45-62. Print.
- Grave, Johannes. "Vergleichen als Praxis. Vorüberlegungen zu einer praxistheoretisch orientierten Untersuchung von Vergleichen." *Die Welt beobachten: Praktiken des Vergleichens*. Ed. Angelika Epple and Walter Erhart. Frankfurt: Campus, 2015. 135-159. Print.
- Gurr, Andrew. "New Directions: Sources and Creativity in *The Tempest*." *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*. Ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia M. Vaughan. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 93-114. Print.
- Harootunian, Harry. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem." *boundary 2* 32.2 (2005): 23-52. Print.
- Hulme, Peter, and William H. Sherman, eds. *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. Print.
- Jourdain, Silvester. *A Discovery of the Bermudas, Otherwise called the Ile of Divels*. London: Printed by Iohn Windet, 1610. Print.
- Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare After Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Kermode, Frank. Introduction. *The Tempest* [The Arden Shakespeare]. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1954. xi-lxxxviii. Print.
- Kipling, Rudyard. *How Shakespeare Came to Write the 'Tempest'*. New York: Columbia U, 1916 [1898]. Print.
- Knapp, Jeffrey. *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to The Tempest*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992. Print.
- Lamming, George. *The Pleasures of Exile*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1996 [1960]. Print.
- Lee, Sidney. *Elizabethan and Other Essays*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1968 [1929]. Print.
- . *A Life of William Shakespeare*. New York: Macmillan, 1901 [1898]. Print.
- Lindley, David. Introduction. *The Tempest* [New Cambridge Shakespeare]. By William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 1-83. Print.
- Loomba, Ania. "Mediterranean Borderlands and the Global Early Modern." *Representing Imperial Rivalry in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Ed. Barbara Fuchs and Emily Weissbourd. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2015. 13-32. Print.
- Lucchese, Filippo del, and Jana Toppe. "Races, Monstrous." *The Ashgate Encyclopedia of Literary and Cinematic Monsters*. Ed. Jeffrey A. Weinstock. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014. 484-491. Print.
- Luhmann, Niklas. "Kultur als historischer Begriff." *Gesellschaftsstruktur und Semantik – Studien zur Wissenssoziologie der modernen Gesellschaft*. Vol. 4. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1999. 31-54. Print.
- MacLean, Gerald, and Nabil Matar. *Britain and the Islamic World, 1558-1713*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Malone, Edmond. *An Account of the Incidents, from Which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived*. London: C. & R. Baldwin, 1808. Print.
- , ed. *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. Vol. 15. London: Rivington & Sons, 1821. 21 vols. Print.
- Mannoni, Octave. *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonisation*. London: Methuen, 1956 [1948]. Print.
- Marshall, Tristan. "The Tempest and the British Imperium in 1611." *The Historical Journal* 41.2 (1998): 375-400. Print.
- Melas, Natalie. *All the Difference in the World: Postcoloniality and the Ends of Comparison*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2007. Print.
- . "Merely Comparative." *PMLA* 128.3 (2013): 652-659. Print.
- Miola, Robert S. *Shakespeare's Reading*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *The Essayes, or Morall, Politike and Millitarie Discourses*. Trans. John Florio. London: Val. Sims, 1630. Print.
- Radhakrishnan, Rajagopalan. *Theory in an Uneven World*. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. Print.
- . "Why Compare?" *New Literary History* 40.3 (2009): 453-471. Print.
- Raleigh, Walter A. "The English Voyages of the Sixteenth Century." *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea or Over-Land*. Ed. Richard Hakluyt. Vol. 12. Glasgow: MacLehose & Sons, 1905. 1-120. Print.
- Raman, Shankar. *Renaissance Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2011. Print.
- Rodó, José E. *Ariel*. Montevideo: Dornaleche y Reyes, 1900. Print.

- Rufo, Jeffrey A. "New Directions: 'He needs will be Absolute Milan': The Political Thought of *The Tempest*." *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*. Ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia M. Vaughan. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 137-164. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest* [The Arden Shakespeare]. Ed. Virginia M. Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. London: Thomson Learning, 2006 [1623]. Print.
- Skura, Meredith A. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.1 (1989): 42-69. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Rethinking Comparativism." *New Literary History* 40.3 (2009): 609-626. Print.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies." *Journal of American History* 88.3 (2001): 829-865. Print.
- Stritmatter, Roger A., and Lynne Kositsky. *On the Date, Sources and Design of Shakespeare's The Tempest*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2013. Print.
- Stoll, Elmer E. *Poets and Playwrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, Milton*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1930. Print.
- Strachey, William. "A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates Knight." *Hakluytus Posthumus, or, Purchas His Pilgrimes: Contayning a History of the World, in Sea Voyages & Lande-Travells by Englishmen and Others. [...] Some Left Written by Mr. Hakluyt at his Death, More Since Added, His Also Perused, & Perfected*. Ed. Samuel Purchas. Vol. 4. London: W. Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1625 [1610]. 4 vols. 1734-1758. Print.
- Vaughan, Alden T. "Shakespeare's Indian: The Americanization of Caliban." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.2 (1988): 137-153. Print.
- Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia M. Vaughan, eds. *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. Print.
- Vaughan, Virginia M., and Alden T. Vaughan. Introduction. *The Tempest* [The Arden Shakespeare]. By William Shakespeare. London: Thomson Learning, 2006. 3-138. Print.
- Warner, Marina. "'The Foul Witch' and Her 'Freckled Whelp': Circean Mutations in the New World." *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*. Ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. 97-113. Print.
- Wittkower, Rudolf. *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1977. Print.
- Yamamoto, Dorothy. *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Zabus, Chantal. "Prospero's Progeny Curses Back: Postcolonial, Postmodern, and Postpatriarchal Rewritings of *The Tempest*." *Liminal Postmodernisms: The Postmodern, The (Post-) Colonial, and the (Post-)Feminist*. Ed. Theo D'haen and Hans Bertens. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994. 115-138. Print.