

Paul Brown

“This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine’: *The Tempest* and the discourse of colonialism”,

in Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell U.P., 1985, pp. 48-71

[NOTE: page numbers are at the bottom of each page.]

It has long been recognized that *The Tempest* bears traces of the contemporary British investment in colonial expansion. Attention has been drawn to Shakespeare's patronal relations with prominent members of the Virginia Company and to the circumstances of the play's initial production at the expansionist Jacobean court in 1611 and 1612.-13. Borrowings from a traditional and classical stock of exotic stereotypes, ranging from the wild man, the savage and the masterless man to the tropology of the pastoral *locus amoenus* and the wilderness, have been noted. Semi-quotations from contemporary propagandist pamphlets and Montaigne's essay on cannibals have been painstakingly logged. 1 However, a sustained historical and theoretical analysis of the play's involvement in the colonialist project has yet to be undertaken. 1. This chapter seeks to demonstrate that *The Tempest* is not simply a reflection of colonialist practices but an intervention in an ambivalent and even contradictory discourse.³ This intervention takes the form of a powerful and pleasurable narrative which seeks at once to harmonise disjunction, to transcend irreconcilable contradictions and to mystify the political conditions which demand colonialist discourse. Yet the narrative ultimately fails to deliver that containment and instead may be seen to foreground precisely those problems which it works to efface or overcome. The result is a radically ambivalent text which exemplifies not some *timeless* contradiction internal to the discourse by which it inexorably undermines or deconstructs its 'official' pronouncements, but a moment of *historical* crisis. This crisis is the struggle to produce a coherent discourse adequate to the complex requirements of British colonialism in its initial phase. Since accounts of the miraculous survival of members of the company of the Sea Adventure, wrecked off Bermuda in 1609, are said to have provided Shakespeare with an immediate source for his production, let an incident in the later life of one of those survivors serve as a ground for this analysis.

[48]

In 1614 John Rolfe, a Virginia planter, wrote a letter seeking the Governor's blessing for his proposed marriage with Pocahontas, abducted daughter of Powhatan, chief-of-chiefs. This remarkable document announces a victory for the colonialist project, confirming Rolfe in the position of coloniser and Pocahontas in the position of a savage other. The letter is an exposure of Rolfe's inner motives to public scrutiny, a production of his civilised 'self' as a text to be read by his superiors, that is, his Governor and his God. What lurks in Rolfe's 'secret bosome' is a desire for a savage female. He has had 'to strive with all my power of body and minde, in the undertaking of so mightie a matter, no way led (so farre forth as mans weaknesse may permit) with the unbridled desire of carnall affection: but for the good of this plantation, for the honour of our cuntry, for the glory of God, for my own salvation, and for the converting to the true knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, an unbelieving creature, namely Pokahuntas'.⁴ As the syntax of the sentence indicates, the whole struggle, fought on the grounds of psychic order, social cohesion, national destiny,

theological mission, redemption of the sinner and the conversion of the pagan, is conducted in relation to the female body. 'Carnall affection' would appear, despite Rolfe's disavowal, to have been a force which might disrupt commitments to conscience, Governor and God.

Pocahontas had posed a problem that was 'so intricate a laborinth, that I was even awearied to unwinde my selfe thereout'. Yet whether good or evil, Pocahontas cannot fail to operate as a sign of Rolfe's election, since if reformable, she is the space to be filled with the saintly seed of civility, if obdurately irreformable, she assures the godliness of him who is called to trial (the whole ethos of the godly community in the wilderness depended upon such proximity and exposure to evil). Rolfe's supposedly problematic letter may therefore be said to *produce* Pocahontas as an other in such a way that she will always affirm Rolfe's sense of godly duty and thus confirm him as a truly civil subject.

Inexorably, the text moves from the possible beleaguerments of carnality -variously constituted as the threat of the tempting wilderness, the charge that Rolfe's own interests in this matter are purely sexual, and the possible detraction of 'depravers and turbulent spirits' within the colony -towards a more positive presentation. Now the carnal affection which might fracture Rolfe's sense of duty becomes re-encoded as a vital part of God's commandments: 'why was I created? If not for transitory pleasures and worldly vanities, but to labour in the Lord's vineyard, there to sow and plant, to nourish and increase the fruites thereof, daily adding with the

[49]

good husbandman in the Gospell, somewhat to the tallent, that in the end the fruites may be reaped, to the comfort of the laborer in this life, and his salvation in the world to come?' Given this imperative, mutual sexual desire, including the female's 'own inticements', can be admitted. Now it would be unmasterly not to desire her, as husbandman. The other incites the godly project: the godly project is embodied in the other. With the word thus made flesh and with Rolfe's self-acquittal in the court of conscience, all that remains to be achieved is the reorientation of those potential detractors into public witnesses of Rolfe's heroism, that 'all the world may truly say: this is the work of God, and it is marvelous in our eies'.

The threats of disruption to Rolfe's servitude to conscience, Governor and God have thus become the site of the affirmation of psychic, social and cosmic order. The encounter with the savage other serves to confirm the civil subject in that self-knowledge which ensures self-mastery. Of his thoughts and desires he can say: 'I know them all, and have not rashly overslipped any'. The letter, then, rehearses the power of the civil subject to maintain self-control and to bring the other into his service, even as it refers to a desire which might undermine that mastery .

After his initial calls for Rolfe to be denounced as a traitor, James I allowed the 'princess', newly christened 'Lady Rebecca', into court as visible evidence of the power of civility to transform the other. Pocahontas was to die in England a nine day's wonder; Rolfe returned to his tobacco plantation, to be killed in the great uprising of the Indians in 1622. The Pocahontas myth was only beginning, however. 5

Even this partial analysis of one aspect of such myth-making serves to demonstrate the characteristic operations of the discourse of colonialism. This complex discourse can be seen to have operated in two main areas: they may be called 'masterlessness' and 'savagism'. Masterlessness analyses wandering or unfixated and un-supervised elements located in the internal margins of civil society (in the above example, Rolfe's subjective desire and potential detractors within the colony). Savagism probes and categorises alien cultures on the external margins of expanding civil power (in the same example, the Amerindian cultures of Virginia). At the same time as they serve to define the other, such discursive practices refer back to those conditions which constitute civility itself. Masterlessness reveals the mastered (submissive, observed, supervised, deferential) and masterful (powerful, observing, supervising, teleological) nature of civil society. Savagism (a-sociality and untrammelled libidinality) reveals the necessity of psychic and institutional order and direction

[50]

'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine' in the civil regime. In practice these two concepts are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. Together they constitute a powerful discourse in which the non-civil is represented to the civil subject to produce for Rolfe a 'labyrinth' out of which, like Theseus escaping from the Minotaur's lair, he is to 'unwind' his 'self'.

That such an encounter of the civil and non-civil should be couched in terms of the promulgation/resistance of fulfilling/destructive sexual desire, as it is in Rolfe's case, deserves careful attention, as this strategy is common in colonialist discourse. Such tropes as that of the coloniser as husbandman making the land fruitful, or of the wilderness offering a dangerous libidinal attraction to the struggling saint, are ubiquitous. The discourse of sexuality in fact offers the crucial nexus for the various domains of colonialist discourse which I have schematised above. Rolfe's letter reorients potentially truant sexual desire within the confines of a duly ordered and supervised civil relationship. *The Tempest* represents a politicisation of what for Rolfe is experienced as primarily a crisis of his individual subjectivity. For example, the proof of Prospero's power to order and supervise his little colony is manifested in his capacity to control not *his*, but his *subjects'* sexuality, particularly that of his slave and his daughter. Rolfe's personal triumph of reason over passion or soul over body is repeated publicly as Prospero's triumphant ordering of potentially truant or subversive desires in his body politic. Similarly, Prospero's reintegration into the political world of Milan and Naples is represented, in Prospero's narrative, as an elaborate courtship, a series of strategic manoeuvres with political as well as 'loving' intentions and effects. This will be examined further in due course. For the moment I am simply seeking to show connection between a class discourse (masterlessness), a race discourse (savagism) and a courtly and politicised discourse on sexuality. This characteristically produces an encounter with the other involving the coloniser's attempts to dominate, restrict, and exploit the other even as that other offers allurements which might erode the order obtaining within the civil subject or the body politic. This encounter is truly a labyrinthine situation, offering the affirmation or *ravelling up* of the civil subject even as it raises the possibility of its undoing, its erosion, its *unravelling*.⁶ A brief survey of British colonial operations will help us to establish a network of relations or discursive matrix *within and against which* an analysis of *The Tempest* becomes possible.

Geographically, the discourse operated upon the various domains of British world influence, which may be discerned roughly, in the terms of Immanuel Wallerstein, as the 'core', 'semiperiphery' and

[61]

'periphery'.⁷ Colonialism therefore comprises the expansion of royal hegemony in the English-Welsh mainland (the internal colonialism of the core), the extension of British influence in the semiperiphery of Ireland, and the diffuse range of British interests in the extreme, periphery of the New World. Each expansive thrust extended British power beyond existing spheres of influence into new margins. In the core, these areas included the North, Wales and other 'dark corners' such as woods, wastes and suburbs. In the semiperiphery, the Pall around Dublin was extended and other areas subdued and settled. In America, official and unofficial excursions were made into 'virgin territory'. I have given one example of the production of an American other; the production of core and Irish others will exemplify the enormous scope of contemporary colonialist discourse.

In his 'archaeology' of the wild man type, Hayden White discusses the threat to civil society posed by the very proximity of anti-social man: 'he is just out of sight, over the horizon, in the nearby forest, desert, mountains, or hills. He sleeps in crevices, under great trees, in the caves of wild animals'.⁸ Many of these characteristics are shared by the more socially specific production of the 'masterless man', the ungoverned and unsupervised man without the restraining resources of social organisation, an embodiment of directionless and indiscriminate desire. Masterless types were discerned in royal proclamations to exist in the very suburbs of the capital.¹⁰ These and other texts produce a counter-culture within the margins of civility, living in disorder, requiring surveillance, classification, expulsion and punishment. A typical example is Richard Johnson's *Look Upon Me London* (1613) in which warnings against the city's many 'alectives to unthriftiness' are given. To counter such traps for the ingenuous sons of the gentry, Johnson produces a taxonomy of bad houses, hierarchically arranged according to the social standing of their clientele, of which the worst are 'out of the common walks of the magistrates'. These are 'privy houses', privy in that they are hidden and secret and also in that they attract the dirt or excremental elements of the body politic. Such dirt is continually viewed as a dire threat to civil order in this literature. Johnson specifically warns that 'if the shifters in, and within the level of London, were truly mustered, I dare boldly say they would amaze a good army' (p. 20). The masterless are, here, produced as an other, that 'many-headed multitude' common in such writing.¹²

This other is a threat around which the governing classes might mobilise, that is, around which they might recognise their common class position, as governors, over and against the otherwise un-governed and dangerous multitudes. In *The Tempest* Stephano the

[52]

'drunken butler' and the 'jester' Trinculo obviously represent such masterless men, whose alliance with the savage Caliban provides an antitype of order, issuing in a revolt requiring chastisement and ridicule. The assembled aristocrats in the play, and perhaps in the original courtly

audiences, come to recognise in these figures their own common identity - and the necessity for solidarity among the ruling class in face of such a threat. This solidarity must take priority over any internecine struggles; the masterless therefore function to bind the rulers together in hegemony. They were produced as a counter-order, sometimes classified according to rigid hierarchies of villainy in some demonic parody of good order,³ sometimes viewed as a reserve army of potential recruits for rebellion (see Chapter 4 in the present volume), sometimes offered as a mere negative principle, the simple absence of the requirements of civility, attracting the sons of the gentry through its very spaciousness, irresponsibility and dirtiness.

Johnson's text produces a complex pleasure beyond the simple production of an instrumental knowledge of the masterless other. This knowledge is certainly offered for the services of magistracy and no doubt produces the antitype by which good order might be defined. Yet this moral and serviceable discourse displays in its descriptive richness precisely the intense and voyeuristic fascination for the other which it warns the gentry against. The text ostensibly avoids the taint of voyeurism by declaring that since this probing and exposing of dirt is required for the sober gaze of magistracy, a certain specular pleasure may be allowed. Again, at least officially, a potentially disruptive desire provoked by the 'alective' other of masterlessness is channelled into positive civil service. This encoding of pleasure within the production of useful knowledge for the advantage of civil power is specifically described by Francis Bacon in his essay 'Of Truth' as an erotic and courtly activity: the pursuit of knowledge is a 'love-making or wooing'.¹⁴ Bacon implicitly offers an ideal of Renaissance sovereignty which can unite what Foucault terms 'power-knowledge-pleasure'.¹⁵ Here pleasure is not simply disruptive, something produced by the other to deform or disturb the civil subject; it is a vital adjunct to power, a utilisation of the potentially disruptive to further the workings of power. In courtly fictions we can see this movement in operation: the other is incorporated into the service of sovereignty by reorienting *its* desires.

Such fictions include celebrations which centre upon the figure of the good sovereign. In these, the mere presence of the royal personage and the power of the royal gaze are able to transmute hitherto recalcitrant elements of the body politic, engendering in the place of

[63]

disorderly passion a desire for service that is akin to an erotic courtship. In progresses, processions and masques such powers were continually complimented. In 1575, for example, at Kenilworth, Elizabeth I was confronted by an 'Hombre Salvagio'. In dangerous marginal space, beyond the confines of the great house, at the edge of the wild woods, at a most dangerous hour (nine o'clock in the evening), the Virgin Queen encountered the very emblem of marginality. But at this moment of maximum threat the wild man is metamorphosed into her eloquent and loving subject. He says:

O queen, I must confesse it is not without cause
These civile people so reioyce, that you should give them lawes.
Since I, which live at large, a wilde and savage man,
And have ronned out a wilfull race, since first my life began,
Do here submit my selfe, beseeching yow to serve. ¹⁶

The Hombre's entry into a loving relationship with Elizabeth is also his entry into interpersonal language (he has hitherto only spoken to his echo) and into subjection to a lawful sovereign: his very capacity to represent himself as 'I' is in the gift of the sovereign. She confers on him the status of a linguistic and a legal subject, he now operates in a courtly idiom and in the 'sentence' of the sovereign law. 17 Such taming of the wild man by a courtly virgin is a ubiquitous trope in medieval and Renaissance literature, as Richard Bernheimer has shown. 18 It serves as an emblem of courtly power, of the capacity to reorient masterlessness and savagism into service without recourse to the naked exercise of coercive power. This tropology is of great importance in the delineation of the Miranda-Caliban relationship, as I shall show later.

The discourse of masterlessness was embodied also in proclamations and statutes requiring that the bodies of vagrant classes, for example, should be modified.¹⁹ Those condemned as persistent vagrants could literally be marked (whipped, bored, branded) with public signs announcing their adulteration, the hallmark of vice. Alternatively they could suffer the discipline of the work-house or the Bridewell. Yet no apparatus seemed sufficient to keep their numbers down. The constant vilification and punishment of those designated masterless by the ruling classes was not simply a strategy designed to legitimate civil rule: it also evidences a genuine anxiety. This took several forms: a real fear of the power of the governed classes should they mobilise against their betters; a complex displacement of the fear of aristocratic revolt on to the already vilified; a realisation that the increasing numbers of mobile classes evidenced a fundamental social change and a great threat to traditional modes of

[64]

deference; and, finally, perhaps, a recognition of the restrictive nature of that deference society registered precisely in the continuous fascination for the disorderly other.

The thrust into Ireland from the 1530s sought to consolidate and expand British political control and economic exploitation of a strategic marginal area previously only partially under British authority. 20 D. B. Quinn has shown that the major policies of this expansion included plantation of British settlements in key areas, the establishment of a docile landed elite, the fossilisation of the social order in areas under British control, the conversion of Gaelic customs into their 'civil' counterparts and the introduction of English as the sole official language. 21 These policies were exercised partly through a vast discursive production of Ireland and the Irish. The virtuous and vicious potentialities that were attributed to Pocahontas predominate in such discourse. Ireland was therefore a savage land that might yet be made to flow with milk and honey like a new Canaan. Similarly the Irish were seen as both savage Gaels and lapsed civil subjects. This arose out of historic claims that the land was *both* a feudal fief under British lordship {then, under the Tudors, under direct British sovereignty}, whose truant subjects needed reordering and pacification *and* also a colony, where the savage other needed to be civilised. conquered, dispossessed. 22. The discourse afforded a flexible ensemble to be mobilised in the service of the varying fortune of the British in their semiperiphery .

In this highly complex discourse an 'elementary/ethnology' was formulated in which the various cultures of Ireland might be examined, and evidence gathered to show their inferiority to civility even as their potential for exploitation was assessed {Quinn. p. 2.0}. As with the Negro or

Amerindian, the Irish might be constituted as bestial or only marginally human and, as such, totally irreformable. For example, in 1594 Dawtrey drew upon a whole stock of common-places to give his opinion of the possibility of change in the Irish: 'an ape will be an ape though he were clad in cloth of gold' {quoted in Quinn, pp. 36-7). It should be noted that Stephano's and Trinculo's masterless aping of the aristocrats in IV.i, where they steal rich clothes off a line, bears the weight of this stereotypicality -- and their subsequent punishment, being hunted with dogs, draws full attention to their bestiality .

Even if granted human status, Gaelic modes of social behaviour were viewed as the antithesis of civil codes. In Spenser's account of booleying {the seasonal migration of livestock and owners to summer pasture), this wandering and unsupervised operation enables its practitioners to 'grow thereby the more barbarous and live

[55]

more licentiously than they could in towns, ...for there they think themselves half exempted from law and obedience, and having once tasted freedom do, like a steer that hath long been out of his yoke, grudge and repine ever after to come under rule again. 23 Barbarity is opposed to the life of the town or *polis*, and the booleyers evade the law, conferring upon themselves the status of truants or outlaws - masterless men. Each social relegation marks the Irish off again as beast-like, requiring the management of the British husbandman.

Within this general delineation of masterless barbarity, particular classes of footloose Irish were specifically targeted, especially jesters (again notice how Trinculo is related to such exemplary antitypes), 'carrows' (or gamblers), wolvine 'kernes' (or foot soldiers) and bards. Such figures literally embodied the masterless/savage threat and their suppression became a symbolic statement of British intent for the whole of uncivil Ireland.

More positive versions of Ireland were also produced, particularly in those texts which advocated plantation of the English beyond the Pale. Such versions produce Irish culture, generally, along the lines of a 'negative formula', in which the alien is afforded no positive terms but merely displays the absence of those qualities that connote civility, for example, no law, no government, no marriage, no social hierarchy, no visible mode of production, no permanent settlement.~4 Again *The Tempest* is implicated in such a strategy. Gonzalo's description of his imagined island kingdom in II.i, culled from Montaigne, rehearses the standard formula by which the colonised is denigrated even as it appears to be simply the idle thoughts of a stranded courtier .

At its most optimistic the negative formula represents the other as a natural simplicity against which a jaded civility might be criticised, yet even here the other is produced for the use of civility, to gauge its present crisis. Nevertheless, the other's critical function must not be overlooked, as I hope to demonstrate with *The Tempest*. The more typical orientation of the other around the negative formula, however, is the production of a *tabula rasa*. Eden's translation of Peter Martyr's *Decades* (1555) provides a central statement of such a strategy. The Amerindians are 'Gentiles' who 'may well be likened to a smooth, bare table unpainted, or a white paper unwritten, upon the which you may at the first paint or write what you list, as you cannot upon tables already painted, unless you raze or blot out the first forms'.~5 Here the other is an empty space to be

inscribed at will by the desire of the coloniser. In some accounts of Ireland the land and the bulk of its peasantry were this unpainted table. Yet contradictorily, for instance in the version of Sir John Davies, before it

[56]

could be painted at will certain obdurate forms, tyrannical lords and customs had to be razed. 26

So vacuous or vicious, docile or destructive, such stereotypical production announced the triumph of civility or declared the other's usefulness for its purposes. But a dark countertruth needed to be acknowledged. The inferior culture of the Gaels had absorbed the Old English invaders, as Davies noted with horror: 'The English, who hoped to make a perfect conquest of the Irish, were by them perfectly and absolutely conquered' (P.290). The possibility of 'going native' was constantly evidenced in this example, which Davies likened to the vicious transformation of Nebuchadnezzar or the Circean swine (p. 297). The supposed *binary* division of civil and other into virtue/vice, positive/negative, etc, was shown to be erodable as the forces of the subordinate term of the opposition seeped back into the privileged term. The blank spaces of Ireland provided not only an opportunity for the expansion of civility; they were also sites for the possible undoing of civil man, offering a 'freedom' (Spenser's term for the avoidance of civility in the quotation above) in which he might lapse into masterlessness and savagism. The same discourse which allows for the transformation of the savage into the civil also raises the possibility of a reverse transformation. As Davies could announce a hope for the homogenisation of the Irish into civility 'so that we may conceive an hope that the next generation will in tongue and heart and every way else become English' (Davies, p. 335), so Spenser could remark of civil man: 'Lord, how quickly doth that country alter men's natures' (p.51).

Given the importance of the colonisation of Ireland for British expansionism, together with its complex discursive formation which I have outlined briefly, it is surprising that such scant attention has been paid to such material in relation to *The Tempest*. I am not suggesting that Irish colonial discourse should be ransacked to find possible sources for some of the play's phraseology. Rather (as Hulme and Barker suggest) we should note a general analogy between text and context; specifically, between Ireland and Prospero's island. They are both marginally situated in semiperipheral areas (Ireland is geographically semiperipheral, its subjects both truant civilians and savages, as Prospero's island is ambiguously placed between American and European discourse). Both places are described as 'uninhabited' (that is, connoting the absence of civility) and yet are peopled with a strange admixture of the savage and masterless other, powerfully controlling and malcontentedly lapsed civil subjects. Both locations are subject to powerful organizing

[57]

narratives which recount the beleaguements, loss and recovery -- the ravelling and unravelling -- of colonising subjects. Such discourse provides the richest and the most fraught discussion of colonialism at the moment of the play's inception.

Much of my analysis above has been theoretically informed by Edward Said's account of orientalist discourse. 27 Orientalism is not simply a discourse which produces a certain knowledge of the East, rather it is a 'western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient' (p.3). Although it cannot be simply correlated with the process of *material* exploitation of the East, the discourse produces a form of knowledge which is of great utility in aiding this process -serving to define the West as its origin, serving to relegate alien cultures, serving even the voyeuristic and libidinal desire of the western man who is denied such expression elsewhere.

Homi K. Bhabha's recent account of the colonialist stereotype effects a critique of Said, suggesting that even in the stereotype there is something which prevents it from being *totally* useful for the coloniser. 28 Bhabha says the stereotype 'connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and demonic repetition' (p. 18). This is to say that at the heart of the stereotype, a discursive strategy designed to locate or 'fix' a colonial other in a position of inferiority to the coloniser, the potentiality of a disruptive threat must be admitted. For example, if a stereotype declares the black to be rapacious, then even as it marks him as inferior to the self-controlled white, it announces his power to violate, and thus requires the imposition of restraint if such power is to be curtailed: so the stereotype cannot rest, it is always impelled to *further* action.

To summarise, I have begun to suggest that colonialist discourse voices a demand both for order and disorder, producing a disruptive other in order to assert the superiority of the coloniser. Yet that production is itself evidence of a struggle to restrict the other's disruptiveness to that role. Colonialist discourse does not simply announce a triumph for civility, it must continually *produce* it, and this work involves struggle and risk. It is this complex relation between the intention to produce colonialist stereotypicality, its beleaguering and even its possible erosion in the face of the other that I now wish to trace through *The Tempest*.

The play begins in an apparent disruption of that social deference and elemental harmony which characterise the representation of courtly authority in Renaissance dramaturgy. Yet this initial 'tem-pest' becomes retroactively a kind of antimasque or disorderly prelude to the assertion of that courtly authority which was supposedly in jeopardy. From Prospero's initial appearance it becomes

[58]

clear that disruption was produced to create a series of pie magic precisely in order to effect their resolution. The dramatic conflict of the opening of the play is to be reordered to declare the mastery of Prospero in being able to initiate and control such dislocation and dispersal. This narrative intention is a correlate of the courtly masque proper, in which, conflict having been eradicated, elaborate and declarative compliment might be made to the supervising sovereign (as in the Hombre Salvaggio episode, above). Prospero's problems concerning the maintenance of his power on the island are therefore also problems of representation, of his capacity to 'forge' the island in his own image. The production of narrative, in this play, is always related to questions of power.

In his powerful narrative, Prospero interpellates the various listeners -calls to them, as it were, and invites them to recognise themselves as subjects of his discourse, as beneficiaries of his

civil largesse. Thus for Miranda he is a strong father who educates and protects her; for Ariel he is a rescuer and taskmaster; for Caliban he is a coloniser whose refused offer of civilisation forces him to strict discipline; for the shipwrecked he is a surrogate providence who corrects errant aristocrats and punishes plebeian revolt. Each of these subject positions confirms Prospero as master.

The second scene of the play is an extended demonstration of Prospero's powerful narration as it interpellates Miranda, Ariel and Caliban. It is recounted as something importantly rescued out of the 'dark backward and abysm of time' (I.ii.50), a remembrance of things past soon revealed as a mnemonic of power. This is to say, Prospero's narrative demands of its subjects that they should accede to *his* version of the past. For Miranda, Prospero's account of her origins is a tale of the neglect of office, leading to a fraternal usurpation and a banishment, followed by a miraculous landfall on the island. Prospero first tells of his loss of civil power and then of its renewal, in magic, upon the marginal space of the island. This reinvestiture in civil power through the medium of the non-civil is an essentially colonialist discourse. However, the narrative is fraught because it reveals internal contradictions which strain its ostensible project and because it produces the possibility of sites of resistance in the other precisely at the moment when it seeks to impose its captivating power.

In the recitation to Miranda, for example, Prospero is forced to remember his own past *forgetfulness*, since it was his devotion to private study that allowed his unsupervised brother, masterlessly, to seize power. He is forced to recall a division between liberal and stately arts which are ideally united in the princely magus of masqu-

[59]

ing fiction. However as the recitation continues, this essentially political disjunction becomes simply the pretext or initial disruption that is replaced by a mysterious account of the recovery of civil power, the reunification of the liberal artist and the politic sovereign. It is represented as a *felix culpa*, a fortunate fall, in which court intrigue becomes reinscribed in the terms of romance, via a shift from the language of courtiership to that of courtship, to a rhetoric of love and charity .

This is marked by a series of tropes deriving from courtly love conventions, as Kermode notes (p. 18). The deposed duke becomes a helpless exile who cries into the sea, which charitably responds, as does the wind, with pity (148-50). The deposition becomes a 'loving wrong' (151) - again the very form of oxymoron is typical of Petrarchan love sonnetry. These romance tropes effect a transition from a discourse of power to one of powerlessness. This mystifies the origin of what is after all a colonialist regime on the island by producing it as the result of charitable acts (by the sea, the wind and the honest courtier, Gonzalo, alike) made out of pity for powerless exiles. Recent important work on pastoral and amatory sonnet sequences has shown how such a rhetoric of love, charity and romance is always already involved in the mediation of power relations.^{2.9} Prospero's mystifying narrative here has precisely these effects. Further, his scheme for the resumption of his dukedom and his reintegration with the larger political world is also inscribed in such terms, as a courtship of 'bountiful Fortune', his 'dear lady', or of an auspicious star which 'If now I court her not, but omit, my fortunes / Will ever after droop' (see 179-84). And, of course, a

major strategy of this scheme is to engineer another courtship, between Miranda and the son of his old enemy- his daughter having been duly educated for such a role in the enclosed and enchanted space of the island. The entire production of the island here, ostensibly an escape or exile from the world of statism, is thoroughly instrumental, even if predicated upon an initial loss of power.

In the same scene Prospero reminds Ariel of his indebtedness to the master, an act of memory which it is necessary to repeat monthly (261-3). This constant reminding operates as a mode of 'symbolic violence': 30 What is really at issue is the underlining of a power relation. Ariel is, paradoxically, *bound* in service by this constant reminder of Prospero's gift of *freedom* to him, in releasing him from imprisonment in a tree. That bondage is reinforced by both a promise to repeat the act of release when a period of servitude has expired and a promise to repeat the act of incarceration should service not be forthcoming. In order to do this, Prospero utilises the

[60]

'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine' previous regime of Sycorax as an evil other. Her black, female magic ostensibly contrasts with that of Prospero in that it is remembered as viciously coercive, yet beneath the apparent voluntarism of the white, male regime lies the threat of precisely this coercion. This tends to produce an identification between the regimes, which is underscored by biographical similarities such as that both rulers are magicians, both have been exiled because of their practices, both have nurtured children on the isle. The most apparent distinction between black and white regimes³ I would seem to be that the latter is simply more powerful and more flexible. Part of its flexibility is its capacity to produce and utilise an other in order to obtain the consent of Ariel to his continued subjugation.

Caliban, on the other hand, is nakedly enslaved to the master. The narrative of I.ii legitimises this exercise of power by representing Caliban's resistance to colonisation as the obdurate and irresponsible refusal of a simple educative project. This other, the offspring of a witch and a devil, the wild man and savage, the emblem of morphological ambivalence (see Hulme, 'Hurricanes in the Caribees,' p. 67ff), was even without language before the arrival of the exiles. It was Miranda, the civil virgin, who, out of pity-, taught Caliban to 'know thine own meaning' (358). Yet, as with the Hombro Salvaggio above, the 'gift' of language also inscribes a power relation as the other is hailed and recognises himself as a linguistic subject of the master language. Caliban's refusal marks him as obdurate yet he must voice this in a curse in the language of civility, representing himself as a subject of what he so accurately describes as '*your language*' (367, my stress). Whatever Caliban does with this gift announces his capture by it.

Yet within the parameters of this capture Caliban is able to create a resistance. Ostensibly *produced* as an other to provide the pretext for the exercise of naked power, he is also a *producer*, provoking reaction in the master. He does not come when called, which makes Prospero angry (3.1.5-2.2.). Then he greets the colonisers with a curse, provoking the master to curse in reply, reducing the eloquent master of civil language to the raucous registers of the other (3.2.3-32.). Third, he ignores the civil curse and proceeds with his own narrative, in which Prospero himself is designated as usurping other to Caliban's initial monarchy and hospitality (3.3.3-46). Such discursive strategies show that Caliban has indeed mastered enough of the lessons of civility to ensure that its interpellation of him as simply savage, 'a born devil, on whose nature / Nurture can never stick'

(IV.i.188-9), is inadequate. Paradoxically, it is the eloquent power of civility which allows him to know his own meaning, offering him a

[61]

site of resistance even as civility's coercive capacities finally reduce him to silence (373-5).

The island itself is an 'uninhabited' spot, a *tabula rasa* peopled fortuitously by the shipwrecked. Two children, Miranda and Caliban, have been nurtured upon it. Prospero's narrative operates to produce in them the binary division of the other, into the malleable and the irreformable, that I have shown to be a major strategy of colonialist discourse. There is Miranda, miraculous courtly lady, virgin prospect (cf. Virginia itself) and there is Caliban, scrambled 'cannibal', savage incarnate. Presiding over them is the cabalist Prospero, whose function it is to divide and demarcate these potentialities, arrogating to the male all that is debased and rapacious, to the female all that is cultured and needs protection.

Such a division of the 'children' is validated in Prospero's narrative by the memory of Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda (I.ii.347-53), which immediately follows Caliban's own account of his boundless hospitality to the exiles on their arrival (333-46). The issue here is not whether Caliban is actually a rapist or not, since Caliban accepts the charge. I am rather concerned with the political effects of this charge at this moment in the play. The first effect is to circumvent Caliban's version of events by reencoding his boundlessness as rapacity: his inability to discern a concept of private, bounded property concerning his own dominions is reinterpreted as a desire to violate the chaste virgin, who epitomises courtly property. Second, the capacity to divide and order is shown to be the prerogative of the courtly ruler alone. Third, the memory legitimises Prospero's takeover of power.

Such a sexual division of the other into rapist and virgin is common in colonialist discourse. In *The Faerie Queene*, for example, Ireland is presented as both Irene, a courtly virgin, and Grantorto, a rapacious woodkerne from whom the virgin requires protection, thus validating the intervention of the British knight, Artegall, and his killing machine, Talus.³² Similarly, in Purchas's *Virginia's Verger* of 1625 the uprising of 1622 is shown to be an act of incestuous rape by native sops upon a virgin land, and this declares the rightfulness of the betrothal of that land to duly respectful civil husbandmen, engaged in 'presenting her as a chaste virgin to Christ' (see Porter, *The Inconstant Savage*, p.480). Miranda is represented as just such a virgin, to be protected from the rapist native and presented to a civil lover, Ferdinand. The 'fatherly' power of the coloniser, and his capacity to regulate and utilise the sexuality of his subject 'children', is therefore a potent trope as activated in *The Tempest* and again demonstrates the crucial nexus of civil power and sexuality in

[62]

colonial discourse. The other is here presented to legitimate the seizure of power by civility and to define by antithesis (rape) the proper course of civil courtship- a channelling of desire into a series of formal tasks and manoeuvres and, finally, into courtly marriage. Such a virtuous consummation is predicated upon the disruptive potential of carnality, embodied in the rapist other and in the potentially truant desires of the courtly lovers themselves, which Prospero constantly

warns them against (as at IV.i.15-2.3 and 51-4). With little evidence of such truancy, Prospero's repeated warnings reassert his power to regulate sexuality just at the point when such regulatory power is being transferred from father to husband. Yet his continued insistence on the power of desire to disrupt courtly form surely also evidences an unease, an anxiety, about the power of civility to deliver control over a force which it locates both in the other and in the civil subject.

A capacity to divide and demarcate groups of subjects along class lines is also demonstrated. The shipwrecked courtiers are dispersed on the island into two groups, aristocrats and plebeians. The usurping 'men of sin' in the courtly group are first maddened, then recuperated; the drunken servants, unmastered, are simply punished and held up to ridicule. This division of masterless behaviour serves a complex hegemonic function: the unselfmastered aristocrats are reabsorbed, after correction, into the governing class, their new solidarity underscored by their collective laughter at the chastened revolting plebeians. The class joke acts as a recuperative and defusive strategy which celebrates the renewal of courtly hegemony and displaces its breakdown on to the ludicrous revolt of the masterless.

Such binarism is also apparent in productions such as Ben Jonson's *Irish Masque at Court* (first put on in December, 1613).³³ Here indecorous stage-Irish plebeians are banished from the royal presence, to be replaced with the courtly exemplars of newly-converted Anglo-Irish civility. In this James I's coercive power is celebrated as music. Now Ireland has stooped to 'the music of his peace, / She need not with the spheres change harmony'. This harmonics of power causes the Irish aristocrats to slough off their former dress and customs to emerge as English court butterflies; the ant-like rabble are precluded from such a metamorphosis.

This last example demonstrates another strategy by which sovereign power might at once be praised and effaced as *power* in colonialist discourse. In this masque, power is represented as an *aesthetic* ordering. This correlates with Prospero's investment in the power of narrative to maintain social control and with *The Tempest's* production of the origins of colonialism through the

[63]

rhetoric of romance, its representation of colonial power as a gift of freedom or of education, its demonstration of colonialist organisation as a 'family romance' involving the management and reordering of disruptive desire. The play's observation of the classical unities (of space, time and action), its use of harmonious music to lead, enchant, relax, restore, its constant reference to the leisured space of pastoral³⁴ and the dream, all underline this aesthetic and disinterested, harmonious and non-exploitative representation of power. In a sermon of Richard Crashaw (1610), the latent mechanisms of power which actually promote the metamorphosis of jaded civil subjects is acknowledged: the transplanted, if 'subject to some pinching miseries and to a strict form of government and severe discipline, do often become new men, even as it were cast in a new mould' (quoted in Porter, pp. 369-70). *The Tempest* is, therefore, fully implicated in the process of 'euphemisation', the effacement of power -- yet, as I have begun to demonstrate, the play also reveals precisely 'the strict form of government' which actually underpins the miraculous narrative of 'sea change'. The play oscillates uneasily between mystification and revelation and this is crucially demonstrated in the presentation of the plebeian revolt.

The process of euphemisation depends upon the rebellious misalliance of Caliban and Stephano and Trinculo being recognized as a kind of antimasque, yet there are features of this representation which disrupt such a recognition. Ostensibly the 'low' scenes of the play ape courtly actions and demonstrate the latter's superiority. The initial encounter of the masterless and the savage, for example, is analogous to the encounter between the civil and the savage narrated by Prospero, and to the encounter of the New World virgin and the gallant courtier enacted before the audience. Caliban's hospitality to Prospero is repeated as an act of voluntary subjection to the actually powerless exile, Stephano. This act is a bathetic version of the idealised meeting of civil and savage epitomised in the Hombre Salvagio episode -Caliban misrecognises true sovereignty and gives his fealty rather to a drunken servant. Unlike the immediate recognition of a common courtly bond which Miranda and Ferdinand experience, the savage and the masterless reveal a spontaneous *non-civil* affinity. More locally, as the courtly exiles brought Caliban the gift of language, so the masterless donate 'that which will give language to you, cat' -a bottle (II.ii.84-5); the former imposes linguistic capture and restraint, the latter offers release.

Yet the issue is more complex, for what this misalliance mediates, in 'low' terms, is precisely a colonising situation. Only here can the

[64]

colonising process be viewed as nakedly avaricious, profiteering, perhaps even pointless (the expense of effort to no end rather than a proper teleological civil investment) Stephano, for example, con- templates taming and exhibiting Caliban for gain (II.ii.78-80). Also, the masterless do not lead but are led around by the savage, who must constantly remind them of their rebellious plans (see IV.i.231-2). This low version of colonialism serves to displace possibly damaging charges which might be levied against properly- constituted civil authority on to the already excremental products of civility, the masterless. This allows those charges to be announced and defused, transforming a possible anxiety into pleasure at the ludicrous antics of the low who will, after all, be punished in due course.

This analysis still produces the other as being in the (complex) service of civility, even if the last paragraph suggests that a possible anxiety is being displaced. Yet there is a manifest contradiction in the representation of the misalliance which I have not considered so far: in denigrating the masterless, such scenes foreground more positive qualities in the savage. The banter of the drunkards serves to counterpoint moments of great eloquence in the obdurate slave. Amid all the comic business, Caliban describes the effects of the island music:

the isle is full of noises,
Sounds and sweet airs, that give delight, and hurt not.
Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
Will hum about mine ears; and sometimes voices,
That, if I then had wak'd after long sleep,
Will make me sleep again: and then, in dreaming,
The clouds methought would open, and show riches
Ready to drop upon me: that, when I wak'd,
I cried to dream again (III.ii. 13 3-41)

Here the island is seen to operate not for the coloniser but for the colonised. Prospero utilises music to charm, punish and restore his various subjects, employing it like James I in a harmonics of power. For Caliban, music provokes a dream wish for the riches which in reality are denied him by colonising power. There seems to be a quality in the island beyond the requirements of the coloniser's powerful harmonics, a quality existing for itself, which the other may use to resist, if only in dream, the repressive reality which hails him as villain -both a feudalised bonded workhorse and evil incarnate.

This production of a site beyond colonial appropriation can only be represented through colonialist discourse, however, since

[65]

Caliban's eloquence is after all 'your language', the language of the coloniser. Obviously the play itself, heavily invested in colonialist discourse, can only represent this moment of excess through that very discourse: and so the discourse itself may be said to produce this site of resistance. Yet what precisely is at stake here?

The answer I believe is scandalously simple. Caliban's dream is not the *antithesis* but the *apotheosis* of colonialist discourse. If this discourse seeks to efface its own power, then here at last is an eloquent spokesman who is powerless; here such eloquence represents not a desire to control and rule but a fervent wish for release, a desire to escape reality and return to dream. Caliban's production of the island as a pastoral space, separated from the world of power, takes *literally* what the discourse in the hands of a Prospero can only mean *metaphorically*. This is to say, the colonialist project's investment in the processes of euphemisation of what are really powerful relations here has produced a utopian moment where powerlessness represents *a desire for powerlessness*. This is the danger that any metaphorical system faces, that vehicle may be taken for tenor and used against the ostensible meanings intended. The play registers, if only momentarily, a radical ambivalence at the heart of colonialist discourse, revealing that it is a site of *struggle over meaning*.

Prospero's narrative can be seen, then, to operate as a reality principle, ordering and correcting the inhabitants of the island, subordinating their discourse to his own. A more potent metaphor, however, might be the concept of dreamwork³⁵ -that labour under- taken to represent seamlessly and "palatably what in reality is a contest between a censorship and a latent drive. The masterful operations of censorship are apparent everywhere in *The Tempest*. In the terminology of the analysis of dreamwork developed by Freud, these political operations may be discerned as displacement (for example, the displacement of the fear of noble insurrection on to the easily defeated misalliance), condensation (the condensation of the whole colonial project into the terms of a patriarchal demarcation of sexuality), symbolisation (the emblems of the vanishing banquet, the marriage masque, the discovery of the lovers at chess) and secondary revision (the ravelling up of the narrative dispersal of the storm scene, the imposition of Prospero's memory over that of his subjects, etc.). As I have attempted to show above with specific examples, such operations encode struggle and contradiction even as they, or *because* they, strive to insist on the legitimacy of colonialist narrative.

Further, as this narrative progresses, its master appears more and more to divest himself of the very power he has so relentlessly sought.

[66]

As Fiedler brilliantly notes, in the courtship game in which Miranda is a pawn, even as Prospero's game succeeds he himself is played out, left without a move as power over his daughter slips away (Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare*, p. 206). So the magus abjures his magic, his major source of coercive power (V.i.33-57). This is ostensibly replaced by civil power as Prospero resorts to his 'hat and rapier', twin markers of the governor (the unduffed hat signifying a high status in a deference society, as the rapier signifies the aristocratic right to carry such weaponry). Yet this resumption of power entails the relinquishing of revenge upon the usurpers, an end to the exploitation and punishment of the masterless and the savage, even an exile from the island. Further, he goes home not to resume public duty but to retire and think of death (see V.i.310-II). The completion of the colonialist project signals the banishment of its supreme exponent even as his triumph is declared.

Is this final distancing of the master from his narrative an unravelling of his project? Or is this displacement merely the final example of that courtly euphemisation of power outlined above? One last example must serve to demonstrate that the 'ending' of the play is in fact a struggle between the apotheosis and the aporia of colonialist discourse. The marriage masque of IV.i demonstrates Prospero's capacity to order native spirits to perform a courtly narrative of his own design. In addition, this production is consented to by the audience of the two courtly lovers, whose pleasure itself shows that they are bound by the narrative. As such, the masque is a model of ideological interpellation, securing chastity, a state which the master continually *demand*s of the lovers, through active consent rather than coercive power. Further, Prospero's instructions to his audience before the masque begins implicitly rehearse his ideal subject- audience: 'No tongue! All eyes! be silent' (IV.i.59). Yet the masque is disrupted, as Prospero is drawn back from this moment of the declaration of his triumph into the realm of struggle, for Caliban's plot must be dealt with. Although the plot is allowed for in his timetable (see IV.i.141-2) and is demonstrably ineffectual, this irruption of the antimask into the masque proper has a totally disproportionate effect to its actual capacity to seize power. The masque is dispelled and Prospero utters a monologue upon the illusory nature of all representation, even of the world itself (IV.i.153-8). Hitherto he has insisted that his narrative be taken as real and powerful- now it is collapsed, along with everything else, into the 'stuff' of dreams. The forging of colonialist narrative is, momentarily, revealed as a forgery. Yet, Prospero goes on to meet the threat and triumph over it, thus completing his narrative. What is

[67]

profoundly ambivalent here is the relation between narrative declaration and dramatic struggle. Prospero requires a struggle with the forces of the other in order to show his power: struggle is therefore the precondition for the announcement of his victory. Yet here the moment of declaration is disrupted as a further contest arises: Prospero must repeat the process of struggle. It is *he* who largely produces the ineffectual challenge as a dire threat. This is to say, the colonialist narrative requires and produces the other -- an other which continually destabilises and disperses

the narrative's moment of conviction. The threat must be present to validate colonialist discourse; yet if present it cannot but impel the narrative to further action. The process is interminable. Yet the play has to end.

Given this central ambivalence in the narrative, and given Prospero's problematic relationship to the restitution of civil power, it falls upon the honest old courtier, Gonzalo, actually to announce the closure of the narrative. He confirms that all is restored, including 'all of us ourselves /When no man was his own' (see V.i.2.O6-13). True civil subjectivity is declared: the encounter with the forces of otherness on the island produces a signal victory. Yet the architect of that victory is to retire and die, his narrative a mere entertainment to while away the last night on the isle, his actor reduced in the epilogue to beg for the release of applause. When apportioning the plebeians to the masters, he assigns Caliban to himself, saying 'this thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine' (V .i.2. 75-6). Even as this powerfully designates the monster as his property, an object for his own utility, a darkness from which he may rescue self-knowledge, there is surely an ironic identification *with* the other here as both become interstitial. Only a displacement of the narrating function from the master to a simpler, declarative civilian courtier can hope to terminate the endless struggle to relate self and other so as to serve the colonialist project. At the 'close' of the play, Prospero is in danger of becoming the other to the narrative declaration of his own project, which is precisely the ambivalent position Caliban occupies.

The Tempest, then, declares no all-embracing triumph for colonialism. Rather it serves as a limit text in which the characteristic operations of colonialist discourse may be discerned -as an instrument of exploitation, a register of beleaguerment and a site of radical ambivalence. These operations produce strategies and stereotypes which seek to impose and efface colonialist power; in this text they are also driven into contradiction and disruption. The play's 'ending' in renunciation and restoration is only the final ambivalence, being at once the apotheosis, mystification and potential erosion of the

[69]

colonialist discourse. If this powerful discourse, thus mediated, is finally reduced to the stuff of dreams, then it is still dreamwork, the site of a struggle for meaning. My project has been to attempt a repunctuation of the play so that it may reveal its involvement in colonial practices, speak something of the ideological contradictions of its *political* unconscious.³⁶

Notes

1 Such scholarship is summarised in Frank Kermode's Introduction to his edition of William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* (London: Methuen, 6th ed., corrected, 1964), passim. All quotations of the play are taken from this edition.

2 Some of the major incursions into this field are to be found in the notes below. At a late stage in the production of this paper I learnt of Peter Hulme's and Francis Barker's collaboration on an analysis of *The Tempest* in the forthcoming *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London: Methuen, 1985). I was very pleased to see a draft of this important intervention which,

unfortunately, I have not space to comment fully upon here. However, I hope I have begun to answer their call for a historical 'con-textual' analysis of the play.

3 By 'discourse' I refer to a domain or field of linguistic strategies operating within particular areas of social practice to effect knowledge and pleasure, being produced by and reproducing or reworking power relations between classes, genders and cultures.

4 The text is reproduced in Warren M. Billings, ed., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: a Documentary History of Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), pp. 2.16-19.

5 See Grace Steele Woodward, *Pocahontas* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), especially pp. 153-89.

6 Actually 'ravelling' is a radically ambivalent term, meaning both to entangle and disentangle. It has peculiar descriptive relevance for my analysis of *The Tempest*.

7 See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: vol. I* (New York: Academic Press, 1974), ch. 2., *passim*.

8 Hayden White, 'The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea', in Edward Dudley and Maximillian Novak, eds., *The Wild Man Within: an image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Pittsburgh University Press, 1972.), pp. 2.0-1.

9 On the masterless classes see particularly Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (1972.; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), Ch.3, *passim*.

10 See Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, ed., *Tudor Royal Proclamations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), vol. II, no. 62.2. and vol.111, nos. 762. and 809, for examples.

11 Richard Johnson, 'Look Upon Me London. ..' in J. Payne Collier, ed., *Illustrations of Early English Popular Literature* (1863; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966), part 7, P.19. Jonathan Dollimore, above P.76, quotes a remarkably similar phrase in George Whetstone's *Mirror for Magistrates*, which is undoubtedly the most important immediate source for Johnson's plagiarism and serves to underline the chronic ubiquity of such a trope.

12. See Christopher Hill, 'The Many-Headed Monster in late Tudor and Early Stuart Political Thinking', in Charles H. Carter, ed., *From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation* (New York: Random House, 1965), PP.2.96-32.4.

13 See for example the collection of A. V. Judges, ed., *The Elizabethan Underworld* (1930; rpt. London: Routledge, 1965).

[69]

14 In Francis Bacon, *Essays* (I62.5), ed. Michael Hawkins (London: Dent, 1973), P.4.

15 See the theorisation of power-knowledge-pleasure in Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: vol. I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981), *passim*.

16 In John Nichols, ed., *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth (182.3; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1966)*, vol. I, pp. 436-8.

17 On the assimilation of the language of the other for the service of colonialism see Stephen J. Greenblatt, 'Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century,' in Fredi Chiapelli, ed., *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970), 561-80. This article and that of Peter Hulme, 'Hurricanes in the Caribbees: the Constitution of the Discourse of English Colonialism', in Francis Barker et al., eds., *Literature and Power in the Seventeenth Century: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature, July 1980* (Colchester: University of Essex, 1981), pp. 55-83, offer important commentary on Caliban and civil language.

18 Richard Bernheimer, *Wild Men in the Middle Ages: a Study in Art, Sentiment and Demonology* (1952.; rpt. New York: Octagon Press, 1970), pp. 136-55.

19 For a listing of the acts relating to vagrancy see Ken Powell and Chris Cook, *English Historical Facts: 1485-1603* (London: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 56-8.

20 For a short account of this bloody history see Grenfell Morton, *Elizabethan Ireland* (London: Longmans, 1971), *passim*.

21 See David Beers Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), especially ch. 10; and Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: the Celtic Fringe in British Colonial Development 1536-1966* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), especially part 2.

22. Hence the discourses regarding the Irish and the Amerindians were mutually reinforcing. See on this issue Nicholas P. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 30 (1973), 575-98. Throughout this section I am indebted to the work of Bernard W. Sheehan, *Savagism and Civility: Indians and Englishmen in Colonial Virginia* (Cambridge University Press, 1980), *passim*.

23 Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), ed. W. L. Renwick (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p. 50.

24 See Sheehan, ch. I, *passim* and Margaret T. Hogden, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964), *passim*.

25 Quoted in H. C. Porter, *The Inconstant Savage: Englishmen and the North American Indian* (Duckworth, 1979), p. 28.

26 Sir John Davies, 'A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Subdued. ..Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign', in Henry Morley, ed., *Ireland Under Elizabeth and James I* (London: George Routledge, 1890), p. 341.

27 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Routledge, 1978), p. 2.

28 Homi K. Bhabha, 'The Other Question', *Screen* 2.4 (1983), no.6, pp. 18-36.

29 On the relation of courtship and courtiership see Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones, 'The Politics of Astrophil and Stella', *Studies in English Literature*, 2.4 (1984), 53-68. On the mediation and effacement of power relations in courtly discourse see Louis A. Montrose, , 'Eliza, Queene of Shepheardes', and the Pastoral of Power', *English Literary Renaissance*, IO (1980), 153-82.. For a short account of courtly theatre see Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975), *passim*.

[70]

30 On this concept see Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 190-7.

31 As noted in Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (St Albans: Paladin, 1974), p.64.

32. Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. T.P. Roche and C.P. O'Donnell (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978), book V, cantos xi-xii, *passim*.

33 Ben Jonson, *The Complete Masques*, ed. Stephen Orgel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p.2.06-12.

34 For the use of pastoral in colonialist discourse see Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World: American Culture: the Formative Years* (New York: Viking Press, 1964), pp. 185-93.

35 On dreamwork see Sigmund Freud, *Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis: The Pelican Freud Library Vol. I*, trans. James Strachey, ed. James Strachey and Angela Richards (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), especially chs. 9-11. Stephen Greenblatt notes in his *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 173, that it was Freud who first drew the analogy between the political operations of colonialism and the modes of psychic repression. My use of Freudian terms does not mean that I endorse its ahistorical, Eurocentric and sexist models of psychical development. However, a materialist criticism deprived of such concepts as displacement and condensation would be seriously impoverished in its analysis of the complex operations of colonialist discourse and its addressing of subjects of its power. This paper attempts to utilise psychoanalytic concepts for a strictly historical analysis of a particular text, foregrounding the representation of the embattled subjectivity of the (white, governing, patriarchal) coloniser.

36 The term is that of Fredric Jameson in his *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (London; Methuen, 1983), *passim*. This represents the most profound attempt to assimilate psychoanalytic concepts into a materialist account of narrative production.

I would like to record my deepest thanks to the editors and to Peter Stallybrass, Ann Jones, Andrew Crozier, Alan Fair, Eric Woods and especially Barry Taylor for their enormous help in the preparation of this paper. My main debt, as ever, is to Lesly Brown.