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Abstract

The paper focuses on how ambivalence sets off a scandalous locus exclusively intended for Caliban and Ariel in *The Tempest*. Caliban, a colonized-divided-self, is incapable of reproducing himself accurately to the European settlers. This provocative feature stimulates Caliban and Ariel to be turbulent for liberty resulting from their resistance and rebellion against Prospero and the colonial legacy reinforcing their hybridization that intimidates Prospero too to lose his sole authority over the island, and trials his ‘monolithic power. Ariel is a submissive spirit unlike Caliban; he is deprived of the concrete human figure where Caliban is portrayed as a semi-human creature. Consequently, the ambivalent portrayal of Ariel and Caliban emphasizes the blend of convoluted identities in a hybrid formation, which invites the postcolonial critics to debate on.
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1.1 Introduction

The irresolute exposures of Ariel and mostly Caliban in Shakespeare’s (1564-1616) *The Tempest* (1611) became a postcolonial discourse to the critics. Shakespeare’s illustration of Caliban as semi-human or half-animal and the other non-European characters as with an unsolved identity leaves them in a crisis of identity. This paper reconnoiters the obscurities of portraying the ambivalent figures of the non-European renderings in the play *The Tempest* and, to explore the ambiguities, it employs postcolonial theory especially as advanced by Homi K. Bhabha’s concept of ambivalence and hybridity. It finds out that each non-European character in the play is categorized within a given geopolitical context that recounts to the upsurge of postcolonial theory underscoring hybridity, an upshot of ambivalence that views the non-Europeans as the composite of complex uniqueness in a crossbreed figuration.
1.2 Background of the Study

During colonization, the British Empire dominated the colonized lands along with the inhabitants. In the name of civilizing the whole world, they continued to suppress the native inhabitants both physically and mentally. They forcefully imposed their language and culture on the colonized psyches. Consequently, the colonizers created the divisions between self and other, master and slave, civilized and savage, white and black, good and evil, strong and weak, occident and orient, elite and subaltern in terms of education, ethnicity and the daily life of the colonized societies. Hence, with a shrewd attempt to enlighten the entire humanity, the West generated surrogate and even ‘underground self’ through the procedure of mimicry, ambivalence, and hybridity. Prospero can be counted as one of the most authoritative colonial agents of Shakespeare’s plays. He reflects the character of a colonizer and the ways he deals with the inhabitants of the island reflect the attitudes of the settler. He clutches the island from the native called Caliban and rapidly enslaves him in his own land. He takes the authority from the native inhabitants, establishes a new order on the island and announces himself the ruler. Conversely, Caliban remained an independent native islander of the island before the arrival of Prospero. When the critics explore through the lens of postcolonialism, they can behold Caliban representing the subjugated native ruled by the foreign ruler. As a consequence, he can be identified as the representative of the colonized ‘other’ imperiled to the imposed rule of his subjugator.

Shakespeare’s The Tempest can be considered as a good specimen of postcolonial censure in which Caliban and Ariel represent the racial ‘others’. Here, their language is an important device to study on and to gain a vision of their identity which is double, divided, hybrid and ambivalent. The fluidity or the lack of concrete identity is another important concern to the postcolonial critics.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Ambivalence and hybridity are closely associated with the non-European characters’ fluid identities which leave the characters in a crisis of identity in the play. The problem arises when the characters find themselves with a baffling uniqueness and discover themselves as a muddle of complex identities in a hybrid formation.

1.4 Research Questions

This research is conducted to find out the answers to the following questions:

i. In what ways can ambivalence and hybridity be applied while featuring the non-European characters in The Tempest?
ii. How do Ariel (an airy spirit) and Caliban (a fish-like semi-human creature) lose their human figures under the bardolatry of Shakespeare?
1.5. Objectives of the Study

1.5.1 General Objective

• to try to find out if there is any trace of hybridity and ambivalence in the figuration of the non-European characters in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*

1.5.2 Specific Objectives

• to find out a given geopolitical context that correlates to the upsurge of postcolonial theory accentuating ambivalence, a sequel of hybrid identity
• to find out the non-Europeans as the blend of intricate selves in a hybrid formation
• to explore ambivalence in case of Ariel
• to locate Caliban as a hybrid self
• to discover the way how ambivalence and hybridity can be applied to lure postcolonial insight into *The Tempest*

1.6. Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that ambivalence and hybridity simultaneously played an operative role on the non-European characters in *The Tempest* and the non-European characters especially Ariel and Caliban lose their human figures under the authority of Shakespeare.

1.7 Literature Review

In this part, it is tried to review the critics’ opinions related to the topic and also the idea of ambivalence and hybridity based on the postcolonial discursive parameter. It is endeavored to consider several works by the distinguished critics to find out a specific point of departure and research gaps for completing the work. The following reviews of the literature focused on the scholarly works on the analysis of the characters especially Caliban and Ariel. Critics contemplate Caliban and Ariel as the representatives of the Third World colonized subjects. Therefore, the character of Caliban gained critics’ interest due to his ‘ambivalent’ and ‘hybrid’ physical and mental figuration as portrayed in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. Numerous critics took labors to sketch the portrayal of Caliban and Ariel within postcolonial frameworks. Primarily, the figure of Caliban can be regarded as the symbol of the primitive human race, a degenerated semi-human character revealing his greed, disorder and lust. Caliban and Ariel are the imaginary forms of the non-Europeans as imagined by the Europeans to justify colonialism. Conversely, in Third World countries, these characters gained a positive notion, a view that highlights the rebellious spirit of Caliban against Prospero’s suppression.
I began reviewing the inspection conducted by Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, which indicates that, due to the ambiguous description of Caliban, there have been incalculable interpretations of the character in the play, a range that pictures Caliban from a half-animal figure to a Third World inhabitant (172-198). The different portrayals of Caliban have been made possible not only because of Shakespeare’s imprecise description of his character but because the figure of Caliban, as a performative type, involves “cultural stories, traditions, and political contestations that comprise our sense of history” (Diamond 1). As a character Caliban simultaneously draws cultural and political contestations, Caliban is decomposed into a political and cultural vehicle by which the colonial authors keep reinterpreting Caliban to attend their particular objectives.

Then I reviewed the Baker and Hulme’s “Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish” which illustrates a conceivable anti-colonial discourse in the play by pointing out that Prospero’s extreme anger towards Caliban’s rebellion and resistance displays Prospero’s anxiety regarding the foundation of his legitimacy in ruling the island (Drakakis 195).

However, another shift in figuring Caliban took place with the prevailing influence of Darwin’s theory of evolution. Daniel Wilson associates Caliban’s deformity with Darwin’s notion of the missing link. In this new scientific attitude, Caliban is labelled as half-fish and half-human. Wilson mentions that Caliban’s fish-like appearance is related to Darwin’s view that humans evolved from some species of aquatic animal (Vaughan and Vaughan 184).

I too reviewed Joseph Roach’s introduction to The Cities of the Dead and Elin Diamond’s Performance and Cultural Politics that are quite suitable in conceptualizing the various manifestations of Caliban, exhibit the results of cultural surrogation involving cultural and political contestations. The various representations of Caliban can be read as a series of cultural surrogation, a process in which culture “reproduces and re-creates itself” (Roach 2). The probable reason why Caliban, as a cultural surrogation, always reconstructs himself is due to the very nature of performance. As a cultural surrogation, performances “carry within them the memory of otherwise forgotten substitutions” (Roach 5).

Shakespeare’s Caliban, for instance, embodies the character of the ‘Other’ as imagined by Shakespeare. The different representations of Caliban in criticism and political discourse over different periods reflect the Europeans’ attitudes toward the non-Europeans or the Other that are profoundly coloured by the political and cultural situations of the time.
This procedure of rewriting and reinterpreting, which Joseph Roach terms “cultural surrogation” conveys that any sort of representation may function as a surrogate for other kinds of representations, that means any kind of writing on Caliban are the probable surrogates for other kinds of writings with different cultural and political agendas.

Both textual and non-textual presentation always reproduces and reconstructs itself because it embodies cultural and political contestations in which certain political and cultural viewpoints get extra privileged than others. However, subordinated viewpoints are not eliminated. They stimulate the restructuring of another presentation that challenges the previous viewpoints. In this manner, a presentation generates as a surrogate for another presentation.

Caliban’s participation in political and cultural circumstances reminds me of Edward Said who argues why literary critics are always ready to receive the influences, conventions, and rhetorical styles from their predecessors, which may limit the author's creativity in manufacturing his/her works. Diamond clarifies as “the possibility of materializing something that exceeds our knowledge, that alters the shape of sites and imagines other as yet unsuspected modes of being” (2). Thus, Caliban is viewed as the figure of endless surrogation, one that permits the postcolonial resistance to interfere.

A reformation of Caliban’s figure appears in the work of Aimé Césaire (1913-2008). Césaire’s Caliban represents the “yet unsuspected modes of being” (Roach 2) that emerged as a form of challenge to the preceding Caliban. The characters that appear in Césaire’s A Tempest (1969) are the same as those in Shakespeare’s The Tempest with two modifications, namely, that Ariel is a mulatto slave and Caliban is a black slave. The plot also slightly changes in the term of determination when Prospero decides to stay on the island instead of returning to Milan. As a rewriting, A Tempest reformulates and answers back to what The Tempest states in dealing with race and global politics. In other words, as a surrogate, A Tempest fills the gaps so that those forgotten non-European ‘Others’ may arise and speak.

I reviewed Edward Said’s (1935-2003) Orientalism (1978) which unfolds ‘Eurocentric universalism’ that expresses the superiority of Europeans especially the white western people including their cultures are termed as the ‘Occident’ and the inferiority of the “non-Europeans” along with their specific cultures are labelled as the ‘Other’ or the ‘Orient’. This type of representation represents the non-Europeans to the Occident as exotic, mystical and seductive.

To sum up, the ambivalent and hybrid portrayal of Ariel and Caliban are not explicitly discussed in the above-mentioned articles and criticisms. It is assumed that
ambivalence and hybridity combinedly played an operative role on the non-European characters in *The Tempest*.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

Bill Ashcroft defines postcolonial theory as “that dynamic of opposition, the discourse of resistance to colonialism which begins from the first moment of colonization. I most definitely do not mean after colonialism because that would be to suppose an end to the imperial process” (163).

Ashcroft’s definition of postcolonial theory anticipates the above reductive meaning and is generally accepted since it signifies that colonialism is still working and the postcolonial theory is written in resistance to colonialism.

Edward Said (1935-2003)’s *Orientalism* (1978) aided in heightening the political aspect of colonialism because Orientalism provides a way to expose how a colonized other is created and manipulated to justify colonialism.

Homi K. Bhabha’s (1949-present) *The Location of Culture* (1994) demonstrates a fundamental theoretical base of postcolonialism. His study of dominations, subjugations, oppressions, colonial traumatic feelings, and impact of other powerful factors which produce another culture, creed, doctrine, habit and civilization; is deeply influenced by Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Edward Said, Jacques Lacan and Jean-Paul Sartre. The fundamental concepts of Bhabha can be summarized in four words: liminal, hybrid, mimicry, and ambivalent.

They define the ways in which the colonized others resist and rebel against the power of the colonizer, a power which is not as secure as it seems to be. It emphasizes the present situation, in a world marked by a contradictory mixture of violently proclaimed cultural difference and the complexly interconnected networks of globalization. Instead of seeing colonialism as something locked in the past, Bhabha illustrates how its histories and cultures constantly interrupt the present, challenging that we transform our understanding of cross-cultural relations. The authority of dominant nations and ideas is never as complete as it seems because it is always marked by anxiety, something that empowers the dominated to fight back (Huddart 1).

One of the most extensively discussed and most disputed terms in postcolonial theory; hybridity usually refers to the formation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone fashioned by the establishment of colonization. The term hybridity is used in ‘horticulture’ to refer to the cross-breeding of two species by attaching or cross-
fertilizing to fashion a third ‘hybrid’ one. Hybridization occurs in linguistic, cultural, political and racial forms.

The term *hybridity* is mostly associated with the concept conceptualized by Homi K. Bhabha whose investigation of colonizer-colonized relationships highlights their interdependence and the reciprocated construction of their subjectivities, which is closely related to *mimicry* and *ambivalence*.

In his essay, ‘Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences’, Bhabha argues that all cultural announcements, speeches, statements, dialogues, and systems are created in a space that he terms the ‘Third Space of enunciation’. Cultural identity always develops in ‘this contradictory and ambivalent space’, which for Bhabha is a hierarchical inherent ‘originality’ or ‘purity’ of cultures which are ‘untenable’ (37).

According to Bhabha, the conscious recognition of this ambivalent space of cultural identity may aid the colonized to overcome the exoticism of cultural ambiguity to recognize an empowering *hybridity* within which cultural difference may function:

It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory - where I have led you - may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s *hybridity* (Bhabha 38).

In the essay, “Dissemination: time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation” included in *The Location of Culture*, conveying the idea about ‘potent symbolic and affective sources of cultural identity,’ Bhabha conceptualizes:

It is the mark of the *ambivalence* of the nation as a narrative strategy - and an apparatus of power - that it produces a continual slippage into analogous, even metonymic, categories, like the people, minorities, or ‘cultural difference’ that continually overlap in the act of writing the nation. What is displayed in this displacement and repetition of terms is the nation as the measure of the liminality of cultural modernity (Bhabha 140). The term *ambivalence* basically refers to a mental, social, cultural or behavioural state of people. Bhabha clarifies that the hybridization of any culture creates the ambivalent condition. It creates such a condition in which individuals feel their culture and behaviours belonging to ‘no one’s land’. Thus, *hybridity* and *ambivalence* differ in term of their meanings and their implications. One is the outcome of the other one. Hence, *ambivalence* is a fundamental aspect of *hybridity*.
1.9 Rationale of the Study

This study renders an entirely new vision of exploring the ambivalent and hybrid portrayals of the non-European characters which undergo the complex identical issues under the authority of Shakespeare. It raises the question in the minds of the readers regarding the non-Europeans’ portrayals in the play and therefore, it incites awareness amongst the readers.

1.10 Methodology

Being a literary one, to complete this study and obtain the findings, A qualitative content analysis method is applied. The primary source for collecting data is the text of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) and the secondary data sources are the relevant books, journals, articles, criticisms, thesis papers, MPhil and PhD dissertations, newspaper articles, and book reviews on Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, which are related to the topic. The methodological steps that are followed are: i) I read the text of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (1611) alongside the criticisms of the renowned Shakespearean critics; ii) Then, I tried to analyze relevant research works, books, articles, reviews, film to discover the ambivalent portrayal of non-Europeans in the play *The Tempest*; iii) While dealing with different books and articles I scanned the keywords, and then I read and selected the relevant matches for my work; iv) After selection, I interpreted and analyzed the data and used them in my work; v) The research questions are explored and clarified using the qualitative method; vi) Moreover, I followed the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, Seventh Edition, for the writing style and citations.

1.11 Timeline

The duration of this study was six months, which involved content analysis and writing the final paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Duration</th>
<th>Work Progressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd week of January</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week of February</td>
<td>Selection and Finalization of the Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd week to 3rd week of February</td>
<td>Reading Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week of March</td>
<td>Writing the Theoretical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd week to 3rd week of March</td>
<td>Reviewing Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th week of March</td>
<td>Writing an Introductory Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week to 3rd week of April</td>
<td>Preparation and Development of Discussion Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th week of April</td>
<td>Composition of the Discussion Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week of May</td>
<td>Composition of the Concluding Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd week of May</td>
<td>Edition and Revision of the Entire Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.12 Scope and Limitations

The study is an academic research. Therefore, it is limited within some boundaries. As the title clarified and specified the subject of the study, it neither included the other texts of Shakespeare nor examined other approaches than a qualitative content analysis method. It was limited to the exploration of *ambivalence* and *hybridity* in *The Tempest*. This research can benefit the existing knowledge and at the same time, it can add new insight to the reading of literature. Accordingly, it can contribute new postcolonial insight into the interpretation of *The Tempest*.

2.1 *The Tempest* as a Blend of Countless Colonial Elements

Prospero, the protagonist of the play, is a European who takes control of a remote island with the help of his strong power of magic. He enslaves the native and indigenous inhabitants Ariel and Caliban to labour for him and preserves his authority by a mixture of threats, terrorizations, enchantments, and, spells. By capturing the sole authority of the island which is not his own and by employing his European authority over the uncivilized, barbaric, mysterious, unreasonable, strange, and backward non-European creatures, Prospero appears as a colonial agent who upholds the colonial legacy of enslaving the natives and spreading the colonial control over the island. Here Prospero’s power of magic allegorically signifies the political power of the Europeans over the non-Europeans.

Though Prospero seems to be the heroic figure of colonial literature, Caliban can be perceived as the hero of postcolonial literature. Caliban who is the sole native inherent of the island, claims himself as the legal owner of the place and shows his rebellious attitudes to Prospero. He candidly states:

This island’s mine by Sycorax, my mother,  
Which thou tak’st from me. When thou cam’st first,  
Thou strok’st me and made much of me;  
... And then I loved thee  
And showed thee all the qualities o’ th’ isle:  
... For I am all the subjects that you have,  
Which first was mine own king; and here you sty me  
In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me  
The rest o’ th’ island (1.2.332-345).

Caliban is compelled to serve Prospero and his daughter Miranda against his will. Prospero outspreads to Caliban his European vague and ambiguous friendliness, teaches him the very European language, and, in response, he is revealed all the natural resources of the island by Caliban. However, Caliban refuses to obey Prospero's rules and instruction and tries to molest Prospero’s daughter Miranda. Consequently,
their relationship turns into the relationship of master and slave, self and other, occident and orient, civilized and savage, good and evil, elite and subaltern, white and black, and, strong and weak.

The concept of the ‘Other’ is propagated by Edward Said (1935-2003) in his Orientalism (1978). He points out that by the oriental scholarship the ‘Orient’ or the ‘non-Europeans’ along with their specific and traditional cultures are represented as the unreachable, uncivilized, unreasonable, mysterious, barbaric, and backward terming them as the ‘Other’ whereas the ‘Occident’ or the ‘Europeans’ especially the white western people including their cultures are unquestionably considered as more reachable, civilized, reasonable and advanced terming themselves as the “We”.

Said defines the entire procedure of ‘othering’ and remarks on how the colonized ‘others’ are not permitted to grow and prosper within their own societies with a complete and cohesive sense of identity. They are frequently portrayed as cruel, sensual, idle, corrupted, driven by ‘instinctive emotions’ and lust, and so on. Caliban is portrayed with all the characteristics of ‘Other’ as defined by Said.

Shakespeare represents Caliban as an “ignoble savage.” Trinculo interprets Caliban as a specific kind of fish-like monster when he first encounters Caliban. Then Trinculo plans for carrying the monster back to England where the strange creature can be exhibited in a freak show. He says:

What have we here, a man or a fish? Dead or alive? A fish: he smells like a fish, a very ancient and fish-like smell, a kind of not of the newest-poor-john. A strange fish! Were I in England now... there would this monster make a man; any strange beast there makes a man. When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian. Legged like a man and his fins like arms! (2.2.24-33).

This speech by Trinculo can be criticized under postcolonial perspective. The major colonized and dominated characters in The Tempest are Caliban, a semi-human fish-like creature and Ariel, an airy spirit having no concrete figure. Prospero captures the island and controls all its native inhabitants utilizing his knowledge of magic. It is supposed that the name ‘Caliban’ is chosen from Roman word ‘Cauliban’ which symbolizes ‘black’ as Prospero calls Caliban “this thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine” (5.1.275-76).

However, the colonized-colonizer relationship is established by the speech of Prospero that, “We cannot miss him; He does make our fire, / Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices / That profit us” (1.2.313-15). Thus, the relationship between Prospero and Caliban illustrates the colonial practices of master and slave and European and native.
Ariel, an airy spirit, is another native inhabitant of the island, who is forced to submit himself to Prospero and to obey his order. Though Prospero liberated Ariel from his imprisonment, Ariel never owns his liberty throughout the play. It is Ariel who generates a fierce storm ‘Tempest’ at the very beginning of the play by the authority of Prospero. In this play only, Prospero can visualize Ariel and Ariel performs all the necessary tasks to satisfy his master. When Ariel wishes for his liberty, Prospero denies at that moment. Moreover, Prospero promises Ariel’s liberty to make him obey the rest of his commands.

Thus, throughout the play, Caliban and Ariel are treated as the ‘Other’ by Prospero and this treatment helped the postcolonial critics to find out the countless colonial elements in the play.

2.2 Locating the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse in The Tempest

In this section, I tried to describe the reason for shaping the half-demon and half-human creatures like Caliban, his adverse human characteristics, and physical significance and an airy spirit Ariel who is also denied to give a human figure and a proper human voice. To expose these unidentified questions, I tried to locate the colonial ambivalence analyzing the character of Caliban and Ariel.

Caliban is a very significant ‘ambivalent’ creation of a mastermind to interpret various aspects of postcolonialism. Shakespeare fashioned the character Caliban to illustrate significant expositions of numerous subjects, such as orientalism, colonialism, racism, slavery, etc. Caliban is mostly regarded as an almost typical representation of the Third World colonized subject.

Primarily, Caliban can be analyzed as a figure of aboriginal primitive humanity, a disintegrated collapsed character that reveals greed, chaos, unreasoning, and lust. Caliban signifies the imaginary subject of the Third World as imagined by Europe to justify colonialism. By fashioning the figure of Caliban, Shakespeare perhaps tries to show the colonial ambivalence and its effects on the non-European characters, which creates a duality that offers a split in the individual identity of the colonized other and permits for the groups who are the blend of their own culture and the colonizer's cultural identity. Ambivalence occurs in figuring Caliban’s beastly features in human nature in The Tempest.

For the first time, Prospero calls Caliban a tortoise: “Come, thou tortoise” (1.2.317). Prospero also addresses him as a “misshapen knave” (1.2.268). For Caliban’s fiend-like appearance and his fish-like features, Trinculo, a consistently drunken jester, firstly misinterprets Caliban as a fish-like monster who is “legged like a man; and his fins like arms” (1.2.32). Trinculo finally identifies Caliban as an islander who must be deformed by the thunderbolt.
Similarly, Stephano, another drunken butler, also misinterprets Caliban as an animal: “This is some monster of the isle, with four legs, who hath got, as I take it, an ague” (1.2.64-65). Caliban’s origin also obscures the attempt to recognize his nature and appearance. Prospero remarks that his mother, Sycorax, was a ‘damn’d witch’, could control the moon; make flows and ebbs, while his father was the devil himself. This ancestry helps to portray the image of Caliban as half-human and half-devil.

To sum up, the study of these textual descriptions can locate an ambivalent image of Caliban, and Vaughan and Vaughan appropriately claim that “the confusion of epithets that abounds in The Tempest encourages artists, actors, and readers to see Caliban however they wish” (15).

These ambivalent descriptions of Caliban’s malformations invite to interpret Caliban’s character numerously. Numerous productions document Caliban’s various strange depictions. A study from 1667 illustrates that Caliban is characterized as a monster, while a production in 1874 portrays Caliban as half man and half beast; another production in 1895 illustrates that Caliban is staged as “half monkey, half coco-nut” (Vaughan and Vaughan 172-185). These ambivalent descriptions leave no particular identity for Caliban and make him an ambivalent creature who is the mixture of his ‘original’ values and the dominant values.

Shakespeare’s Caliban is wild, barbaric, uncivilized, deformed, unreasonable, irregular, ambivalent, hybrid, and, neither man nor brute. In a lecture on Shakespeare’s “Creature of the Air and the Creature of the Earth”, Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) comments that Caliban’s Portrayal is delightfully conceived, he is a sort of creature of the earth, as Ariel is a sort of creature of the air. He participates in qualities of the brute but he is distinct from brutes in two ways; he has the mere power of understanding without moral reason, and he does not possess the instincts which are possessed by the absolute animals. He is a man in the sense of the imagination. Caliban provides the images from the earth and Ariel from the air (121). Coleridge’s statement unfolds the colonial ambivalence in portraying the ambivalent figure of Caliban and Ariel.

Edward Said’s model may help to illuminate Caliban’s ambivalent portrayal which is profoundly modified with the ideology of colonialism. Said defines ‘Orientalism’ as “a will to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate even to incorporate the Other” (5). The Orientalists do not only define the Orient, but they also create and maintain the Orient. Thus, the Orientalists create and maintain the ambivalent characters by othering the non-Europeans like Caliban and Ariel.

However, as this ambivalent representation of Shakespeare’s Caliban is influenced by the European prejudice, the figure often offers the critics of the Third World to refashion what Shakespeare represented, to recreate Caliban in a way that conveys new
perspectives and new political possibilities. The words of Caliban reveal that he is the native inhabitant of the island, who becomes an ambivalent creature by the European invader, Prospero. Caliban is unable to recognize his true identity and rights, though he several times exposed his rebellious attitudes against Prospero’s sole authority and domination.

He is by nature an ambivalent slave who makes a plot with Stephano and Trinculo to slay Prospero. He is a slave of his desire that illustrates his ambivalent nature, the duality or split in his nature. Caliban proclaims, “You taught me language, and my profit on’t / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / For learning me your language” (1.2.364-366).

Caliban’s abnormalities exemplify the kernels of a colonial attitude. Shakespeare makes Caliban speak and rebel, though his rebellion against colonial authority is shown as useless, futile, and ambivalent.

To sum up, it is obvious that Caliban is not merely a comic character, rather he possesses an ambivalent binary role in the play which ensures a split in his individual and cultural identity and creates a ‘Third Space’ allowing Caliban for being a mixture of his original pure identity and the identity of the dominant culture. Thus, Caliban develops an indecent and striking, veneful and obligated, drunk and moderate, cursing and worshipful, blaspheming and merrymaking, shrewd and gullible, ambivalent, merciless, and passionate beastly human character.

2.3 Discovering Ambivalence in Case of Ariel

In this section, I took an effort to define the reason for creating such a non-concrete existence of Ariel which ensures him for being another ambivalent creature. Ariel is a child of colonial imagination. He is a link between the human and imaginative worlds. Edward Said’s concept of the ‘Other’ may aid to illustrate Ariel’s ambivalent, imaginative, a non-concrete, and airy portrayal which is profoundly modified with the ideology of colonialism. Hence there is a unique blend in him. He is a spirit, but he moves in the human sphere. He combines sprit-like qualities with human attributes, and there lies the colonial ambivalence which assures the ambivalence in the portrayal of Ariel.

Ariel, as the very name implies, is a spirit of the air. Coleridge in his lecture on ‘Ariel’ says “In the air he lives, from the air, he derives his being; in the air, he acts; and all his colours and properties seem to have been obtained from the rainbow and the skies.” (118). Being also an elemental spirit, he is equally at home in all elements: he penetrates the earth, mixes with fire and dives into the sea. He changes himself into all shapes, from a figure of fire to a water-nymph, from a harpy to Ceres. He is presented as the colonized other who works for the colonial agent and who retains harmony
among the subordinate spirits. These subordinate spirits suggest the other colonized characters.

Ariel has a great yearning for freedom. He is unwilling to serve Prospero. Prospero has to remind him in which way he had once released him from the curse of Sycorax. To stimulate Ariel, Prospero has to repeat his promise of freedom several times in the play. At the same time, Ariel’s longing for freedom juxtaposes the pleasure that he takes in performing his duties by getting Prospero’s appreciation. He feels flattered when Prospero calls him his brave spirit. This conduct of Ariel is an additional confirmation of the paradoxical and ambivalent nature of Ariel.

Though Ariel is a spirit of the air, he has some human attributes. Giving the human touches in the portrayal of Ariel, Shakespeare created additional ambiguities in defining him as a character. Ariel is a spirit and therefore, incapable of feeling human emotions. Though his non-human nature excites the audience’s admiration and his music gives pleasure, his character becomes ambivalent which lacks the depth and complexity of human nature.

2.4 Locating Caliban as a ‘Hybrid’ Entity in The Tempest

In this section, I attempted to define the reason for being Caliban as a hybrid entity. Hybridity is the political change in the whole system by creating something new. Prospero’s identity, nationality, ethnicity, and other colonial elements mainly shifted Caliban to the hypocritical hybrid culture, which emerged from a ‘third space’.

Caliban and other inhabitants of the island have to compromise to adopt the colonizer’s ethics, social structure, supremacy, religion, or even clothing. The effort is also taken by Prospero to teach the language of England to Caliban to spread colonialism. Thus, Caliban undergoes a process of hybridization as “hybridity occurs in post-colonial societies both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control, or when settler-invaders dispossess indigenous peoples and force them to ‘assimilate’ to new social patterns” (Ashcroft 183).

Morton Luce’s remark on Caliban appears in “Caliban the Bestial Man” where he explains that “Caliban can be viewed in three separate ways: 1) as a hag-born monstrosity, 2) as a slave, and 3) as a savage, or dispossessed Indian” (793). Therefore, it is clear that Caliban is not a singular identity but the blend of the three. The monster, the slave, and the aboriginal Indian that ensure him for being a hybrid creature which is formed under the influence of Prospero’s identity, nationality, ethnicity, and other colonial elements and ensures the ‘cross-fertilization’ between their (Caliban and Prospero’s) ‘constitutive elements’ (Ashcroft 184).
The rebellious and opposing attitudes of Caliban towards the colonial authority, such as the attempt to rape Prospero’s daughter Miranda, to curse Prospero in the language which was taught by him, to make a plot against Prospero with Stephano and Trinculo, and to try to seize the authority, power and right of the island from Prospero ensure Caliban’s hybridization. Caliban says, “You taught me language, and my profit on’t / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / For learning me your language” (1.2.364-366).

Caliban could be succeeded if Ariel does not overhear the conversation where Caliban reveals his plan, as he says, “Having first seized his books, or with a log / Batter his skull, or paunch him with a stake, / Or cut his wezand with thy knife” (3.2.88-90). Stephano and Trinculo ruin the plan by falling into the trap that Ariel sets up, despite Caliban’s objection.

Thus, Caliban is made a hybrid creature by the colonial invader, Prospero, who is made to recognize his rights by providing European language and education resulting from his several futile rebellions against Prospero’s sole authority and domination. It affrights the colonial agent Prospero.

2.5 The Way Ambivalence and Hybridity are exploited in The Tempest

In this section, I endeavored to make an effort to discover the way how ambivalence and hybridity are exploited in The Tempest. The consequence of ambivalence is to produce a profound tension between the authority and the colonized other. And this tension is quite obvious in the relationship between Prospero and Caliban.

Therefore, in The Tempest, ambivalence creates a controversial position and outlook both for Caliban and Prospero because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent. Caliban for being a colonized other never can replicate himself exactly to the colonizers and this ambivalence makes Caliban ‘turbulent for liberty’ (Bhabha 87) resulting Caliban’s resistance and rebellion against Prospero and, the colonial authority and power. This situation of Caliban ensures his hybridization. This hybridization threatens Prospero to lose his sole authority and power and it creates an ambivalent situation that challenges the ‘monolithic power’ of Prospero.

Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan in their Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History describe that Caliban is a countless victim of European imperialism and colonization. Like colonized people, Caliban remains disinherit, exploited, and subjugated. Like them, he learned the conqueror's (Prospero) language and perhaps conqueror’s values as well. Like them, he endured enslavement and contempt by European invader and eventually he rebelled. Like them, he is torn between his indigenous culture and the culture which is superimposed on it by his conqueror (145).
Thus, \textit{hybridity} and \textit{ambivalence} are exploited in \textit{The Tempest}. \textit{Ambivalence} tries to ‘decentre’ colonial authority Prospero from his position of power resulting in Caliban’s resistance and rebellion against him which makes Caliban a hybrid entity. That is why hybridity can be seen as a feature of \textit{ambivalence}. Caliban’s ambivalent situation leads to his hybridization that tries to challenge Prospero’s monolithic dominance.

3. Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that this paper attempts to locate the ambiguities of portraying the ambivalent and hybrid portrayal of non-European characters in the play. It is transparent that Caliban loses his territory; while on the other hand, he gets European education, which confirms him the entrance to power. He undertakes to utilize this ability to dissolve his master, Prospero. It is labored to scrutinize the unexplained identical issues of Caliban and Ariel which confirm them as a jumble of intricate individualities in a hybrid and ambivalent configuration.
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