

Odsjek za anglistiku

Filozofski fakultet

Sveučilište u Zagrebu

DIPLOMSKI RAD

**Postcolonial Othering in Three Plays by Shakespeare: *Othello, Antony and Cleopatra,*
*The Tempest***

(Smjer: Engleska književnost i kultura)

Kandidat: Mojca Čađo

Mentor: dr. sc. Janja Ciglar-Žanić

Ak. godina: 2014./2015.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Postcolonial Vocabulary	3
2.1. Postcolonialism.....	3
2.2. Othering	5
2.3. Colonial or Postcolonial Shakespeare?.....	6
3. <i>Othello</i> : The Tragedy of the Alien-Insider.....	9
3.1. Instability and Anxiety	11
3.1.1. Racial politics in <i>Othello</i>	11
3.1.2. <i>Othello</i> in Venice	14
3.1.3. Iago the Author	16
3.2. Race, Gender, and Sexuality in <i>Othello</i>	18
3.3. Internalised Otherness and Received Ideologies	21
4. Constructing Otherness in <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	25
4.1. Cleopatra's Racial Difference	26
4.2. Gender and Power in <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	28
4.2.1. Serpent of Old Nile and The Dark Queen Fantasy	29
4.2.2. Rome as Centre of Ideology.....	31
4.2.3. "Transform us not to women": Gender Crisis.....	33
4.3. Power of Representation.....	35
5. <i>The Tempest</i> in a Colonial Context: Speaking for the Other.....	38
5.1. Shakespeare's <i>Tempest</i> and Prospero's	39
5.1.1. Prospero's Creation	40
5.1.2. Linguistic Colonialism.....	43
5.2. Aspects of Otherness in <i>The Tempest</i>	45
5.2.1. Wild Man Caliban.....	45
5.2.2. The Non-Savage Other: Ariel	50
5.2.3. Miranda and the Female Voice	51
6. Conclusion.....	55
7. Bibliography.....	58
8. Abstract	62

1. Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to explore the concept of postcolonial othering with regard to three plays by William Shakespeare. In this paper, I will attempt to explain some basic assumptions behind the concept of othering and explore its principles and workings in three literary texts: *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Tempest*.

Attempting a reading from a point of view that is described as *postcolonial* is made difficult by several factors, and placing Shakespeare in such a context may prove to be slippery ground, as the term *postcolonial* is itself somewhat imprecise. Furthermore, the age and nature¹ of the plays makes it difficult for the contemporary reader to understand the framework to which they belong. Historicising may be necessary to a certain extent, but it is also imperative not to historicise in a way that produces an anachronistic reading. Therefore, it is very important to establish a vocabulary that is appropriate to the subject matter.

When discussing postcolonial othering in literature, it is first necessary to determine what is and what is not postcolonial. Postcolonial studies are a relatively new field, and although works labelled as postcolonial are brought together by certain assumptions and goals, *postcolonialism* includes a number of different efforts made by contemporary literary criticism, affiliated through their focus on post-imperialist society and culture.

The effort of analysing postcolonial othering in Shakespeare is further complicated by the fact that we are born into a conceptual framework which allows binarity. It seems very *natural* to accept the fact that there is *us* and *them* (an idea demonstrated by many postcolonial critics, including Edward Said). However, it is almost inexcusable to view

¹ Dramatic works of William Shakespeare were at the time of their creation intended to be performed in theatres, and were subsequently written down. This has resulted in numerous issues regarding their authenticity, and it is therefore imperative to approach them with caution.

Shakespeare's work as an appropriation of the history of interactions between Europeans and non-Europeans, while keeping in mind that every reading of Shakespeare in itself is an appropriation. Throughout history, readers have generated multiple *Shakespeares*, and we continue to do so today. While historicising is in a way inevitable, it is very important to maintain a certain distance, i.e. resist projecting our own point of view onto the texts, since that mistake leads us to simplify a very complex web of meanings and skew the texts into something they are not. Keeping these potential difficulties in mind, this paper aims to present an exploration of othering as a cultural construct and the way in which it translates itself from the socio-political sphere into literature. The main focus of this paper is race, gender, and ideology, i.e. their construction and deconstruction in Shakespeare, using the works of eminent postcolonial literary theorists.

2. Postcolonial Vocabulary

Before attempting to analyse Shakespeare's works in terms of postcolonial criticism, it is necessary to acknowledge the underlying problems. There are many potential traps one should try to avoid when dealing with this subject matter, such as the ambiguity of the term *postcolonial*, the incompleteness of contemporary knowledge of Shakespeare, the dangers of using inappropriate, anachronistic vocabulary and in result, the danger of unintentionally inscribing personal opinions into the existing texts. As an attempt to establish an appropriate frame of reference that can be used for analysing the three plays, in this chapter I will try to answer the following questions: What is postcolonial? What is othering? How does Shakespeare fit in this concept?

2.1. Postcolonialism

Firstly, it is necessary to define, insomuch as it is possible, the scope of postcolonialism. The term *postcolonial* started out as a historical concept and not an ideological one and it was first used in the early 1970s referring to the period immediately after decolonization. The term was soon appropriated by literary criticism. M. H. Abrams' *Glossary of Literary Terms* (245-246) defines postcolonial criticism with regard to three central issues it explores. Firstly, it attempts to replace "the *master-narrative* of Western imperialism" (245) with a counter-narrative in which the colonial cultures (the colonial *Other*) get reinscribed into the world history. Secondly, it is concerned with the formation of the postcolonial subject and with the voice of the subaltern. Thirdly, the postcolonial agenda aims to "disestablish Eurocentric literary norms and values and to expand the literary canon to include colonial and postcolonial writers" (Abrams 246). These are, according to Abrams, the three elements that form the basis of any postcolonial criticism. However, Abrams also points out that the field of postcolonial studies is "not a unified movement with a distinctive

methodology" (245). In other words, postcolonial studies may be considered an umbrella term covering a number of different efforts made by contemporary literary criticism related by the aforementioned issues.

In *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* (23-37), Leela Gandhi explains that the background of postcolonial theory is marked by Marxism (to be more precise, Marxist theories on ideology) and poststructuralism/ postmodernism (Derrida's deconstruction). In the simplest terms, the Marxist aspect of postcolonialism is expressed in its interest in economic and political determinants influencing the creation of literature, as well as its focus on ideology and concern with the subaltern. However, it may be argued that new historicism actually created a foundation for the emergence of postcolonial criticism, since new historicists such as Althusser modified some Marxist ideas regarding the background of literature. New historicists perceive literary texts as placed within all institutions and discourses that constitute a culture within which the text exists. Literary texts thus coexist with all other texts and interact with them "as both a product and a producer of cultural energies and codes" (Abrams 191). This is a particularly important insight into the history of postcolonialism, as it explains why Shakespeare is a good choice for this discussion. This issue shall be analysed in more detail in the final portion of this chapter.

One of the key texts of postcolonial criticism is Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), an analysis of *cultural imperialism* as a form of imperialism that establishes its power through enforcing a certain type of discourse that demonises the Oriental and represents it as the inferior Other. Said offers several definitions of orientalism, calling it both a style of thought and a corporate institution for dealing with the Orient, which itself is a man-made idea. Although Said's *Orientalism* has been extensively criticised, the work did contribute, at least partially, to the discussion on the source and scope of imperialist power. By creating an ontological and epistemological distinction between the West and the East, colonists have

created a very powerful discourse that became a mechanism of maintaining power. In fact, Said emphasises the fact of representation, not natural depiction. Perhaps the idea that the Occident needs to represent the Orient may be the result of the idea that the Orient cannot speak for itself. In her famous essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?* (271-313) Gayatri Spivak analyses the subaltern as a heterogeneous² group of people who are not included in the discourse of cultural hegemony. The author states that the subaltern cannot speak, and any attempt on the side of Western academy to give a voice to those who have none inevitably leads to perpetuating the same hegemonic mechanism that keeps them quiet. This is quite a problematic issue, as it seems that the process of silencing and giving voice to the subaltern is a vicious circle. Such a conclusion only proves that the workings of political and cultural imperialism are intertwined and deeply rooted, and it also indicates that postcolonialism is greatly flawed, as it is focused on the Western academy and unintentionally continues othering non-Western ideas and culture.

2.2. Othering

The concept of othering is described by different sources as a process, perception, misconception, representation, mental classification, rhetorical device etc. In fact, it may be a basic human mental category, a mechanism of survival that has existed since the beginning of human history. It is a basic principle of group dynamics, basing the cohesion between members of one group on their difference from another group.

In postcolonial criticism, othering has been a key concept. Since the colonial/imperialist framework is inherently hegemonic, the division between a dominant group and a subordinate group is thoroughly enforced. Othering appears as a key concept in many important works of postcolonial criticism. I have already mentioned that Said's view of

² It is particularly important to emphasise this fact, as the subaltern should not be perceived as a single, unified group.

cultural imperialism is that it represents the colonised as the inferior Other. This is supported by an unspoken presumption that the Orient cannot represent itself (why would it not if it could?) and thus surrenders this task to the Occident. Naturally, by reducing the Orient to a passive role of something that needs to be represented, studied, depicted, taught, the Occident establishes itself in opposition to all the negative traits that are ascribed to the Orient. Said points out that a major element in European culture is the idea of European identity as superior to non-European, and this precisely is the mechanism of othering – displacing undesirable characteristic and behaviours onto the Other. However, there is a deeper purpose behind it, other than simply asserting dominance. The mechanism of othering, when placed in the colonial context, does not serve solely the purpose of keeping the colonised powerless. Rather, the relationship functions as a dialogue in which the two sides participate in constructing one another. To be more precise, in perceiving others – in this case non-Europeans – in a negative way, we build ourselves up in opposition.

Considering the historical period in question, early 17 century, it should be stated that several important processes were in motion at the time. The Turkish threat, i.e. the expansion of the Ottoman Empire, was not yet over at the time when English colonial expansion began, and the emergence of nationalism across Europe would soon follow. One of the crucial roles that othering would have played is the construction of Englishness, as the undesirable characteristics attributed to non-Europeans would lead to a definition of a European English identity that is in antithesis to the Others.

2.3. Colonial or Postcolonial Shakespeare?

The final question this chapter aims to answer is one about the relevance of William Shakespeare to the postcolonial issue. The answer is twofold. Firstly, there is no author in Western literary history more canonical than Shakespeare. Considered by many the greatest author in the English language, Shakespeare is on the one hand recognised and celebrated

internationally, and on the other remains a cultural symbol of Englishness. Secondly, having lived in a time when English colonial power started growing, a time of great political and social turmoil, Shakespeare provides a unique perspective into certain issues that would later become momentous.

The three plays by Shakespeare chosen for analysis in this paper are *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Tempest*. Since they were written in early 17 century, the plays themselves do not belong to the postcolonial era; moreover, Shakespeare died long before Britain's colonial power peaked. However, the focus of this paper is not history, but literature. In other words, it aspires to analyse not what *was*, but what was *represented*, especially in terms of race, ideology and gender. The three plays chosen for analysis represent three different facets of the colonial experience, or to be more precise, three different perceptions of the Other. In a way, each play explores one stereotype of the Other and hopes to ease the anxieties of its audience regarding the unfamiliar threat.

If postcolonial readings aim at discovering the ways in which early modern European society perceived and defined non-Europeans, then reading Shakespeare from such a perspective essentially means analysing the ways in which Shakespeare's plays relate to such social codes of the time when they were written and performed. For example, *Antony and Cleopatra* explores the stereotype of the non-European woman, a repository of metaphorical meanings that within the imperialist colonial discourse represents two aspects of femininity: helpless and passive on the one hand and horrifying, powerful on the other. The relationship between a European man and a non-European woman within the imperialist framework translates into the political struggle for domination, with the black woman's surrender to the white man as the ultimate colonialist fantasy. *Othello* on the other hand tells the story of a relationship between a non-European man and a European woman, a situation that within the said discourse reminds of the nightmare of miscegenation. Furthermore, the play examines the

stereotype of the irrational, angry black man whose temper inevitably leads to catastrophe. Finally, *The Tempest* provides a very interesting exploration of the noble savage stereotype and in a most immediate way delves into the complex relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. However, the fact that the said three plays display certain stereotypes is complicated by the way in which each of them subverts the image it represents.

It certainly is possible to read Shakespeare's plays through a postcolonial prism, but in doing so it is crucial to keep in mind the following: the fact that we do not read a play in the same way we read a historical record does not mean that they are not equally valid insights into the past. Literature contributes to our vision of history and its relation to the present; it does not in itself constitute reality, but participates in creating it.

3. *Othello*: The Tragedy of the Alien-Insider

The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice, one of Shakespeare's major tragedies, was probably written in 1603 or 1604,³ printed as a quarto in 1622, and subsequently included in the First Folio in 1623. It is believed to be an adaptation of a short story about a jealous Moorish captain, written in 1565 by Giraldo Cinthio. Among many readers the play is most strongly associated with the subject of marital jealousy and racial politics. Considering the small number of non-European characters in Shakespeare's plays, the author's choice of a Moorish protagonist is obviously not unimportant. However, this is not a play about jealousy, nor is it a play about race. While it is fairly common to read Shakespeare's plays in terms of *major* or *universal* themes, such an approach is potentially misleading, as it disregards the fact that they were written for performance in the theatre, and thus meant to be watched, not read. Moreover, the protagonist of the play is not just a stranger inevitably destroyed in a hostile environment, but a character whose position is very particular. Being both a Moor and a Venetian soldier, Othello occupies the space between *us* and *them*.

Being one of Shakespeare's major tragedies, *Othello* stands side by side with *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*, yet it has always stood apart among them. In the introduction to *Othello* in *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare* (1399-1400), Russ McDonald explains that *Othello* never attained the same status as the other three plays because the subject of the play is in fact love and its fragility. Traditionally, love has been a subject more appropriate for comedy than tragedy, and McDonald goes so far as calling *Othello* "a comedy gone wrong" (1398). The author also proposes the possibility that Shakespeare's audience would have recognised another element in the way that Iago and Desdemona interact with Othello. He suggests that they, as opposing characters, are actually engaged in a battle for Othello's soul.

³ Traditionally, *Othello* is believed to have been written in 1603 or 1604, but lately there have been indications that the tragedy was written in 1601 or 1602. Source: Honigmann, E.A.J., ed. *Othello* (1-4).

The battle of the soul, *psychomachia*, is the central part of morality plays, "dramatized allegories of a representative Christian life in the plot form of a quest for salvation" (Abrams 166). Although these plays were popular in the 15 and 16 centuries, the early 17 century audience would have remembered this genre, and probably would have detected such an element in *Othello*.

As the second chapter of this thesis has already established, the mechanism of othering within the context of early modern European colonialism plays an important role in the constitution of Englishness. In *Othello*, this principle is slightly complicated by the fact that the world of the play blends with the world of the audience, and moreover, the dialogue that creates *us* and *them* is trilateral. Firstly, there is the Moor. Although Othello's heritage is never precisely defined and categories of race, ethnicity and religion are fused together, it is quite clear that he is a stranger who earned his place in Venetian society, but never fully became its equal member⁴. Secondly, there is Venice. In comparison with the presumably savage Moor, Venice is automatically perceived as the opposite – a place of culture, order and control. Thirdly, there is early modern England, i.e. the world of the audience, twice removed from the strange and dangerous Moor.

In this chapter, it is my objective to demonstrate that the most interesting aspect of the play is not its underlying racist, misogynist discourse, but its relationship with the real world and the author's purpose with regard to his intended audience. I chose to examine this relationship using three categories: race, gender, and ideology. It should be noted that these three inherent elements are fused together: neither is in itself a unique key that unlocks the complex web of readings that the play offers.

⁴ In the essay 'A most wily bird' *Leo Africanus, Othello and the trafficking in difference*, J. Burton calls Othello an "alien-insider" (45), which perfectly describes his position within Venetian society.

3.1. Instability and Anxiety

3.1.1. Racial politics in Othello

Although race is not the unique subject of *Othello*, racial politics plays a part in its analysis. On some level, *Othello* may be read as a racist fantasy of the horrors of miscegenation. It is made very clear at all times that Othello is an outsider and there are plenty examples of racist language, coming from both the Venetians and Othello himself⁵. The play contains numerous mentions of black and white, contrasting darkness and light, and the characters continue making an antithesis of Othello's foul blackness and Desdemona's pure, white innocence – in a way, it is impossible to imagine the play without this strong visual element. However, it is necessary to consider the true nature of this perceived threat.

Historically, early modern Europeans based their understanding of race on a blend of misunderstood observations and fiction, as they were unable to explain the detectable differences between themselves and peoples from other continents. From the biblical story of Noah's curse upon Canaan, various classical and medieval myths of foreign lands crowded with cannibals, to newer pseudoscientific explanations⁶, the category of race has always had a very alienating, exclusive quality. Apart from the assumptions about foreign lands and peoples coming from literature and myths of the wild man, there were more recent sources of information – merchants, who due to the impossibility of verbal communication with Eastern traders, seem to have affirmed the stereotype of the 'silent native'⁷. Yet choosing race as a marker of difference is problematic, among other reasons, precisely because of its inherent fragility. Transgressions of racial boundaries minimise the possibility of distinguishing between races, therefore erasing any strict divisions into *us* and *them*. This feeds not the fear

⁵ Othello's name is not mentioned before the third scene of Act I, but he is present from the very beginning as the topic of Brabantio, Roderigo and Iago's conversations, where he is talked about in an openly hateful and racist way. When he appears in I.3, the Duke calls him "Valiant Othello" (I.3. 48), as opposed to the previously used epithets.

⁶ Linnaeus and his classification of human beings paved the way for 'scientific racism', creating a taxonomy of humans, with the presumption that racial mixing is unnatural.

⁷ Term used by Ania Loomba in the essay "Shakespeare and Cultural Difference" (172).

of the unknown, but more specifically the fear that the familiar may in fact be unfamiliar and consequently, that the perceptions and laws that govern the creation of our identities are unreliable and empty.

Othello's example illustrates this point perfectly, both because of his background and because of his social position. The subject of Othello's race is quite ambiguous, since the term most often used is *Moor*. There are two sources that testify to his heritage: references made by other characters, which are unmistakably racist and sometimes intentionally inaccurate, and his own stories. In regard to the first source, comments made by other characters, we can observe a certain extent of bending the truth to slander Othello. One such example is Brabantio's conclusion that Othello must have used some unholy magic to seduce Desdemona, since their love is otherwise unthinkable. This instance is not as offensive as many other derogatory remarks found in the play, yet it clearly illustrates the unreliability of Othello's description by other characters. Regarding the second source, Othello's stories about his past, it is interesting to notice the ways in which those stories play a part in the construction of his identity. It was the tales of his remote past that made Desdemona love him, it is the stories that both connect him to the unfamiliar Other and at the same time help him dissociate himself from it. Furthermore, both sources are quite unreliable because they constitute only vague mentions of his past and never particular information. The images of his past and his culture in the play point to several possible backgrounds: he may be African, Spanish or Turkish, or in terms of religion, he may have been a pagan or a Muslim. Race, religion and ethnicity have no clear confines in this case and we have no way of knowing his exact story. A question that needs to be asked before continuing is whether it is adequate to speak of race at all when it comes to Shakespeare. For example, in *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism* (2-3), Ania Loomba asserts that it is anachronistic to speak of *race* in the historical context of Renaissance society. Race in itself is a deeply ambiguous term with no

precise definition, even more so when placed in the context of early modern period. The basis of perceived racial identities at the time consisted of observations and mythology, and those unreliable sources were the only ones that were available to Shakespeare. Although this mixing of various categories of *foreign* races and religions might be an intentional subversion of race, it is more likely that the author deemed it unimportant to observe details, as the vagueness of Othello's heritage only contributes to the sense of unfamiliarity and Otherness. The world of the play does not offer a clear explanation, nor does it need one. Considering the fact that *Othello* is not a historical record, but a theatrical piece intended for performance, the character of Othello is more than likely imagined as an embodiment of the collective fears of the audience; in fact, in his essay *Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor*, Daniel Vitkus describes Othello as a "theatrical embodiment of the dark, threatening powers at the edge of Christendom" (160). The unfathomable savagery attributed to the then largely unexplored African continent, as well as the very real and very frightening Turkish threat would have been recognised by Shakespeare's audience. We may not be able to disregard all the meanings of race that are known to us, but we should be able to set race aside and try to view the play from categories that would have been more important and understandable to Shakespeare's audience. Loomba warns that not all Shakespeare's plays contain "seeds of what we regard as progressive and humane" ("Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism" 111). It is precisely because of Shakespeare's position in the Western literary canon that we ascribe these values to his works, but it is nonetheless inappropriate to do so. Therefore, I must conclude that it is impossible for the reader to take sides and even inexcusable to project one's partiality onto the author. No matter how subversive the play may be, it represents a world in itself, and while it certainly does present us with an exploration of many themes including racism, it is not a defence of the mistreated Others. The world within the play simultaneously builds itself up and tears itself down and we cannot attempt to

condense its complexity to a simple anti-racial message, as this would be both anachronistic and simplistic.

3.1.2. *Othello in Venice*

Similarly to the unresolved issue of Othello's racial heritage, his social position is quite unique. Through his military exploits, Othello became a very valuable member of Venetian society⁸. In time, Venice managed to "wash him white"⁹ to a certain degree, i.e. his position shifted and the former outsider/menace became an insider/protector. Again, this instability of social identities, similar to breach of racial boundaries, points to the frailty of the existing ideology of difference, and ultimately to the situation in which the threatening aspect of humanity cannot be displaced onto someone else. In *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, Loomba states that "while Othello is the defender of the Christian state against the Muslim threat, he also embodies that threat" (96). Othello's position both as the Other and as the hero is crucial, and his strange difference lies not only in his race, but also in the fact that he fully adopted the values of Venetian society and consequently internalised its racism. The fact that it is Othello who perceives himself as an outsider and therefore the otherness is internalised says much about the mechanisms of colonial power. It may be wrong to view Othello's suicide as punishment or a societal mechanism that eliminates the unwanted element, but his fate does point to the fact that the rift between the familiar and the unknown is contained within one person and therefore impossible to sustain. In my opinion, his ultimate madness does not mean that Othello is thrown back to his stereotype, but signifies the impossibility of surviving as "an alien in an alien world" (Roux 26).

⁸ Perhaps Venetians allowed him to join their ranks overlooking his origin, or maybe it was precisely because he had the will to leave it behind. In this case however, it is irrelevant.

⁹ Karen Newman explains this expression, originating with Aesop, as a proverb signifying impossibility and futile efforts – "to wash the Ethiop white" (142) is attempting to do the impossible.

In the simplest terms, Othello progresses as follows: in his past he was a Muslim or Pagan, non-Christian stranger; then he redeemed himself by embracing Christianity and becoming a military leader and trusted insider; finally, he seemingly backslid into Moorish savagery as he was overcome by jealousy and became a murderer. The violent ending has for some readers only reaffirmed the stereotype of the jealous Moor, whose artificial civility could not last as it was unnatural. However, it is unsure what kind of civility is in question.

An interesting point relevant to the discussion is the symbolic significance of the setting, or more precisely, its perception. It is interesting to note how differently Venice is characterised by different scholars. While Vitkus, for example, depicts early modern Venice as a place of multiculturalism and openness, pointing out that the "longevity and supposed civic virtue of Venice's republican government led to a conventional comparison of Venice with virginity" (164), some disagree, stating the exact opposite – that it was a city known for debauchery, gambling, deceit. Contrary to the aforementioned comparison, in *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism* (99) Loomba states that Venice was often personified as a prostitute. The latter perception would have been more familiar to Shakespeare's audience, to whom Italy was a familiar setting of comedies – light-hearted plays with happy endings. It has already been mentioned in this paper that *Othello* employs certain theatrical conventions of comedies, and the setting, along with the theme of jealousy and supposed infidelity are certainly among them.

Placing a Moor turned Christian (or a slave turned soldier) in a space with wavering codes provides a very slippery ground. But who taught Othello to be a good Christian in the first place? Was it someone like "honest Iago"? Maybe his violent tendencies that were brought out by Iago are not rooted in his Moorish heritage, but in his unsuccessful transformation into a Venetian. The trope of turning is present throughout the play: Othello

turns Christian and then "turns Turk"¹⁰ again, Desdemona turns into a whore in Othello's eyes, Iago turns from a trusted character into a villain etc. It is the turning that is so problematic, since it is never done completely. Othello is integrated into Venetian society, yet remains a stranger; he is deemed reliable enough to be a trusted military leader, but not enough so to be a trusted husband to Desdemona. While planning to murder Desdemona for her alleged unfaithfulness, he talks about her sin not as an insult to himself, but an insult to God and to her own immortal soul. "Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men" (V.2. 6) proclaims Othello as he prepares to kill her, taking on the role of God who disciplines his children: "This sorrow's heavenly; / It strikes where it doth love." (V.2. 21-22).

Perhaps he did it in an attempt to rationalise his violent response, or perhaps because he indeed wanted to "wash white" her sins and turn her back to virtue and salvation. This latter notion is particularly interesting, as it also raises the issue of domestic control, which shall be discussed in more detail in the section named "Race, Gender, and Sexuality in *Othello*".

3.1.3. *Iago the Author*

A crucial aspect of Othello's character and the reason for his downfall is his incredible susceptibility to Iago's manipulation. The character of Iago is very interesting because he is the one who dictates not only Othello's "turning Turk", but also the audience/reader's perception of the story. Iago's mission, so to speak, is to arouse jealousy in Othello and ruin both his and Cassio's lives. There has been much debate on Iago's reasons for such profound hatred and seemingly purposeless vindictiveness, which seems to stem from nothing in particular, i.e. he appears to be doing evil for the sake of evil. Coleridge famously called it

¹⁰ "Are we turned Turks, and to ourselves do that/ Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites?" (II.3. 159-160) – Othello's words as he tries to break apart the fight between Cassio and Roderigo (and Montano who initially wanted to stop them).

"motiveless malignity" (qtd. in Honnigman "Othello" 34) and A. C. Bradley¹¹ adds to the traditional perception by describing Iago as cold and collected, someone who is *above* emotions and passions.

On the one hand, the only possible motive that is known to us is precisely his jealousy. He is jealous of the alleged affair that his wife had with Othello, jealous of Cassio for getting the promotion that he had desired for himself. It may be argued that he wants to make Othello jealous because that is the sentiment that he knows best. Again, he displaces his own weakness onto Othello, who due to his specific social position poses an easy target. However, why do we, the audience trust Iago? When we learn that Cassio was chosen over Iago for the position of lieutenant, it is Iago himself who proclaims Cassio as unfit. The same happens when we learn that Othello presumably had an affair with Emilia – nobody but Iago ever mentions it. These are the two reasons given for Iago's hatred of Othello and presented as motives for his revenge, and we accept them immediately.

The audience may not be completely blind to Iago's depravity, but the other characters in the play are. They repeatedly refer to him as "good Iago" or "honest Iago", while Othello is usually identified simply as "the Moor". However, Iago himself knows the true nature of public perceptions: "Reputation is an idle and most false / imposition, oft got without merit and lost without deserving" (II.3. 257-8). In all honesty, we cannot know whether Iago truly was motivated by jealousy (and perhaps tried to conceal it through his ruthlessly cool composure) or whether his motives were entirely different. But what we do know is that Iago is the one in charge of both Othello and the audience, which makes both relationships colonial. And just as the colonial subject is subordinate to its coloniser, so are we to Iago. Often likened to Shakespeare himself because of his authorial role in the play, Iago creates

¹¹ The character of Iago is analysed at length in Bradley's lecture on Othello, published in his major work, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (181-194)

and undoes the play as an author would. He uses Othello's unstable position and internalised otherness to manipulate him, and in a similar way, uses our helplessness and lack of insight to subdue us. In other words, the readers trust Iago because there is no other option but to see the world of the play through his eyes, and by accepting his reasoning we also accept his language and perpetuate the power he has over his subjects.

3.2. Race, Gender, and Sexuality in *Othello*

It has been mentioned that one of the traps of reading and analysing Shakespeare's works is the tendency of trying to gloss over the fundamental perception of race of its time, which in today's terms definitely is – racist. It is a similar case with misogyny. A fear of female duplicity is present throughout the play, and it is quite deeply rooted in the characters' minds. The ease with which Othello is swayed by Iago and led to believe his wife's infidelity is astounding. Considering the fact that Othello and Desdemona's relationship was so loving and their marriage still new, it is unusual that he does not trust her and is so easily turned against her. Is this a consequence of an inherently misogynous culture of Venice or an instinctive reaction of a jealous Moor? It is interesting that the "ocular proof" he requires comes in the form of a handkerchief, and one that has a magical background. The handkerchief was given to Othello's mother by an Egyptian sorceress as a love charm to keep his father in love with her. This might be another reason for Othello's sudden distrust of Desdemona, a magical one. The importance of the handkerchief has been interpreted in several ways, and one particularly interesting reading by Karen Newman, presented in the essay *"And wash the Ethiop white": Femininity and the Monstrous in 'Othello'*, suggests that the handkerchief figures a "lack around which the play's dramatic action is structured" (156), and the lack in question is the missing link between femininity and the monstrous. In an analogous vein, Loomba suggests that the handkerchief might represent lost innocence, as in some cultures (including some African traditions) a bloody napkin is the proof of virginity

("Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism" 100-102). In this case, a clean napkin also reflects a lack, which causes Othello great distress. The handkerchief, in fact, signifies nothing – it is an empty signifier that Iago offers Othello, and it is very appropriate, as it proves something that is not there. Still, it succeeds in causing the effect desired by Iago: Othello "mistakes the sign for the thing itself, and in the process collapses his own identity into the signs that manufacture him as Moor: jealous, intemperate, murderous, barbaric." (Roux 26)

One issue that has been mentioned in the previous section is domestic control. When Othello decides to murder his wife, he is doing so either because of his blind jealous rage, or in order to redeem her virtue by saving her immortal soul. The second notion is slightly questionable, but in both cases the scenario is the same: a husband punishing his wife for transgressing (sexually or religiously) in order to regain control. The matter is hugely important as it brings us back to the coloniser-colonised relationship. It is quite common for postcolonial and feminist literary criticism to draw a parallel between patriarchy and imperialism and to liken the role of the colonised in relation to the coloniser to the role of women in relation to men. There are several aspects that show how gender roles are performed, from the relationships between husbands and wives, to perceptions of race/religion in terms of gender and sexuality. This sort of exchange is present in Othello and Desdemona's relationship from the very beginning. For example, when he explains the reason for their marriage to Brabantio he says that the stories of his past made her love him, and he loved her for the pity she had shown. Brabantio suggests that Othello had bewitched his daughter, which he denies, saying that she did "with a greedy ear / Devour up my discourse" (I.3 149-150), which almost evokes an image of casting a spell, speaking words that enchant and seduce. Although Desdemona does have a personal perspective, she is denied agency first by her father, and then by her husband.

The treatment of women in the play is a very broad subject, and for the purposes of this paper, needs to be reduced to the main points. Many critics have pointed out there are only three female characters in the play, and all of them have something in common: Bianca is a prostitute, Desdemona is accused of being one, and Emilia as being her *bawd*. All three are accused of sexual misdemeanour, and more importantly, as Lisa Jardine explains in "*Why should he call her whore?": Defamation and Desdemona's Case (24-26)*", all three – regardless of rank – are equally vulnerable to a sexual charge. Jardine suggests that Desdemona, as the only noblewoman among the three, is the least worldly and has no grasp of the severity of the accusation once it arises. This can offer an explanation of the fact that she does not defend herself at all, and the situation only escalates due to her ignoring the issue. Furthermore, out of the three female characters, two are killed by their husbands, and the remaining one is abused by the man she loves. While the mistrust of women and their representations as dishonourable and deceitful is present in basically all male characters, this might be a tongue-in-cheek diversion on the part of the author, as in the end, the women are the most benign and consistent characters in the play.

Considering the sexual politics of the time when the play was written, it is not unusual to find traces of a misogynous mainstream ideology. However, gender is present and politicised not only in relationships between women and men, but also in depictions of race. Race itself is gendered, as in early modern England Muslim and African peoples were imagined and represented as lustful, hypersexual, homosexual, even bestial. The fears, sexual anxieties, and to some extent forbidden fantasies of early modern Europeans translated into a prejudiced depiction of unbridled Oriental sexuality. In a way it was a product of strict sexual politics of a time whose strained political climate increased the focus on morality and devoutness, but the collective imagination was also fuelled by accounts of wondrous encounters with anthropophagi and other mythical beings. We witness both aspects of

othering in the first act of *Othello*; first in Roderigo, Brabantio and Iago's racist remarks in I.1., and the second in Othello's speech in I.3. Iago uses derogatory speech when he notifies Brabantio about Othello's marriage to Desdemona, but he does not do it out of habit as Roderigo does, but he takes it one step further in order to unsettle him.

"Your heart is burst; you have lost half your soul;
Even now, now, very now, an old black ram
Is tupping your white ewe. Arise, arise!
Awake the snorting citizens with the bell,
Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you." (I.1. 86-90)

The highly suggestive language not only focuses on the black/white contrast signifying a corruption of the girl's purity, but also draws a parallel with bestiality, which was often ascribed to Moors. The linguistic imagery continues to draw from the same source, as Iago warns Brabantio not to dismiss his warnings:

"Because we come to do
you service, and you think we are ruffians, you'll have
your daughter covered with a Barbary horse; you'll have
your nephews neigh to you; you'll have coursers for
cousins, and jennets for Germans." (I.1. 108-112)

There are many similar examples found in the play, and they all point to the hypothesis of othering as displacing and projecting a society's fears and anxieties onto others. The reason for such uncertainty of a society's structures perhaps lies in its ideologies. In the following section, I will try to review the world of the play and its characters with regard to the ideologies of Shakespeare's time.

3.3. Internalised Otherness and Received Ideologies

Although ideology itself has so far been mentioned few times, the entire discussion of the play is in fact an analysis of its ideologies. When discussing this particular matter, the

question is not what mentality was inherent to the characters in their setting (that has so far been resolved), but rather in what ways the characters align with those ideologies.

With this purpose in mind, it is necessary to focus on the character of Iago. The most powerful tool Iago possesses is credibility, which gives him authority over other characters' narratives. This possibility is explained in Alan Sinfield's essay *Cultural Materialism, Othello, and the Politics of Plausibility* (30-32), where the characters in *Othello* are examined in relation to the category of plausibility. The author explains that Iago's plausibility stems from the fact that he repeats the existing ideological patterns of Venetian culture. This account is based on the Althusserian notion of ideology, which is the idea that a society must produce their ideologies in order to survive. In fact, Sinfield claims that the most powerful scriptor is Venice, and the state actually has the final word after Othello's death.

In *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism* (91-92), Loomba explains that ideologies work because they aren't entirely external, and this is particularly true in the case of Othello. Although he was accepted into Venetian society on account of his military skills, and "washed white", his difference is both visible, on account of his dark skin, and threatening on account of his connection to the Turks, who constituted a serious threat to the state. Yet what really locks Othello in his ambiguous position is his self-estrangement. By internalising Venetian ideologies of gender and race, he obediently stepped into the role of Other. It may seem contradictory to make such a claim, because he did earn the esteem of Venetians in his military role; however, as a true colonial subject, he speaks in the voice of his master (the state), and as such, he is hybridised, dependant on the master narrative of Venice.

Karen Newman points out that in the past, some critics tried to redeem the character of Othello by attempting to *alleviate* his blackness. For example, she mentions M.R.Ridley, the editor of the Arden Othello, to whom Othello was "black, but" (144) – which is unsettling.

It is true that the term Moor is inaccurate and that we can only guess what Othello was supposed to look like or whether that really mattered, but trying to make him more like us goes against the play's intentions and his difference can never really be cancelled out – a difference that would have been perceived very differently by the play's original viewers than by the contemporary reader. Moreover, we are tempted to ignore the fact that in Shakespeare's theatre, Othello was played by a white man – and so was Desdemona. In the essay '*Othello was a White Man*': *Properties of Race on Shakespeare's Stage* (204-206), Dympna Callaghan explains that Othello would have been played by an older white man in blackface, and Desdemona by a younger white man in whiteface, possibly causing a comical effect. The author also explains how the social exclusion of women and blacks coincided with their presence in dramatic representations. While *exhibition* of 'exotic' people was a normal practice, in which people of other races were displayed as objects, *mimesis* (i.e. imitation of Otherness) gave the actor more power to actively participate in representation. According to Callaghan, the first time Othello was played by a black man was in 1930 – although casting non-whites was never expressly forbidden.

It may be possible to draw a parallel between the attempt to make Othello less black in order to disperse his negative image and our own attempt to make *Othello* an anti-racist text. Even though the image of Moor as Other is in a way subverted, racism and perceptions of race are not the *subject* of the play. Maybe the love story between Desdemona and Othello was doomed due to the inflexibility of racial politics, the psychology of bodily humours, magic, or the incompatibility of military and private life. It is a play drawing on theatrical

conventions of comedy, and essentially presenting a love story – one that is greatly complicated by the issue of racial and gender politics, but not centred in it.

4. Constructing Otherness in *Antony and Cleopatra*

Shakespeare's tragedy *Antony and Cleopatra*, first printed in the First Folio of 1623 and first performed either late in the year 1606 or sometime in 1607¹², follows the lives of Roman general and triumvir Mark Antony, and the Egyptian queen Cleopatra from the time of Sextus Pompey's revolt against the Second Triumvirate to the time of Cleopatra's death. It is believed that the plot is based on Plutarch's account of Mark Antony's life in *Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans*, with certain changes to the story. It is crucial for the interpretation of the play to remember that Shakespeare's version adds an emphasis on the protagonist,¹³ who is a powerful ruler, an Oriental female, and a woman in love.

In the introduction to *Antony and Cleopatra* in *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare* (1651-1658), A. R. Braunmuller explains the probable emotional investment of Shakespeare's audience in the story, i.e. the medieval myth that survivors of the Trojan War founded Rome, and their descendants Britain. This "foundation myth" makes it clear that the play's 17 century audience would have approached the plot with a pre-conceived idea of their connection to the Romans. Such an attitude could surely influence a person's perception of the plot, and their attitude towards the values that the play presents. Anxieties about foreigners, women, and military conquest are reflected in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and the social climate of the time is echoed in the images dispersed in the play. What follows is a discussion of certain aspects of postcolonial othering that can be detected in the play, or more precisely the way in which categories of race, gender, and ideology create the world of the play and link the reader to the world of early modern England. With this in mind, I will begin with a short analysis of the racial issue in the play.

¹² Source: Wilson, John Dover, ed. *Antony and Cleopatra*.

¹³ Even though the title of the play is *Antony and Cleopatra*, I do not hesitate to consider Cleopatra as the sole protagonist for reasons that will be discussed in subsection 4.2.1.

4.1. Cleopatra's Racial Difference

The play opens with the Roman Philo's comment on Antony's infatuation with Cleopatra, which is, in his opinion, a weakness. Although the play is full of racist and sexist remarks, the very first speech we hear contains some of the fiercest insults. In merely thirteen lines, Philo calls Cleopatra tawny, a lustful gypsy (more precisely, he refers to her 'gypsy lust'), a strumpet. It has already been established in the previous chapter that race is not a valid category when speaking of early modern European politics of difference, or more precisely, that the idea of race was not made of the same (mostly biological) markers as today. However, racial politics does constitute a noteworthy element in this play, above all because of the political and geographical context in which the plot is placed. Just as the mysterious Moor's background is impossible to decipher, Cleopatra's race is never mentioned. The historical Cleopatra was of Greek origin, but Shakespeare's Cleopatra was simply dark, different, non-Roman, non-white. We can gather some information from the words that others use to describe her, but that kind of characterisation is unreliable, as it is mostly biased and contemptuous (for example, Philo's speech). However, her own description coincides with outside observations on her skin, which is in her words "with Phoebus' amorous pinches black" (I.5. 28). The Queen of Egypt, unlike the Moor of Venice, does not accept the dominant Roman/European racial discourse that perceives white as good and black as wicked, but sees no fault in her own blackness and even revels in it. There is no doubt that Cleopatra, like Othello, is not intended to be viewed strictly as a personification of a certain race/ethnicity/religion. She instead embodies a more general dark Other, an ancient and enigmatic Egypt that, as Loomba explains in *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, evoked in Shakespeare's audience a connection with "ancient religion, philosophy, and learning" (114), but was also a part of the Ottoman Empire since 1516 – which spoke to the fear of the militant Turkish Other.

Referring back to the "foundation myth" that helps bridge the gap between Cleopatra's time and Shakespeare's time, it is possible to presume the reaction to Cleopatra and Antony's affair on the part of Shakespeare's audience. Fear of miscegenation has already been mentioned in the chapter on *Othello*, where the ultimate racist nightmare plays out: the sexual union of a white woman and a black man. However, *Antony and Cleopatra* demonstrates a different case, one including a white man and a black woman. One of the possible readings of this play is to read the love affair as a tragic story of a hero whose life is ruined by a wicked woman, and she presumably does so in several different ways. The first scene in the play that takes place in Rome (I.4.) shows Caesar talking to Lepidus about Antony:

"This is the news: he fishes, drinks, and wastes
The lamps of night in revel; is not more manlike
Than Cleopatra, nor the queen of Ptolemy
More womanly than he" (I.4. 4-7)

It is clear that Romans see his new Egyptian way of life as a lapse. To them, time spent in leisure is wasted, and Antony seems to be more interested in entertainment than in politics. Through the harmful Oriental influence, Roman Antony was contaminated and was no longer "The triple pillar of the world" (I.1. 12), but the epitome of weakness¹⁴. Maybe this fear stems from the accounts of Christian soldiers and sailors in the Mediterranean who converted to Islam. As Daniel Vitkus explains it ("Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor" 152-155) some of them "turned Turk" in order to gain certain privileges, become renegade pirates or join the Ottoman army. To the people of early modern England, a society that is still quite homogenous in the religious and racial sense, and who does not know much about Islam other than its evil and deviant connotations, this idea must have been quite terrifying.

¹⁴ The idea of harmful effects coming from contact with the Other does not apply exclusively to the Orient, but is also present in the fear of female influence, as will be elaborated in the section devoted to gender anxiety.

As I have previously established, the early modern audience partially derived their sense of the Other through reports of wondrous encounters. Myths of wild men, cannibals and Amazons were perhaps not the single source of information for Shakespeare's audience, but their influence still lingered. Myths of the New World and its fantastic horrors blended with the stories of the Orient and its dangers, and although the mercantile and colonial expansion meant that England was gaining new sources of power, the Turkish threat was a reminder of its vulnerability. However, it may be argued that the prominent category of Otherness in this play is not race, but gender.

4.2. Gender and Power in *Antony and Cleopatra*

It seems to be quite common for postcolonial criticism to point out the analogy between race and gender. In literature, imperial conquest has often been likened to sexual conquest, and the colonised land to a woman. Similarly, the mechanisms behind patriarchy can be compared to imperialism, as they are based on the supremacy of one social group over another, and keeps the repressed powerless through exclusion from the discourse of power¹⁵. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, gender seems to be a more important marker of difference than race, not only in the case of Cleopatra as a woman in power, but in many other elements found in the play. The play contains many images of sexual love, male bonding, homoeroticism, fear of emasculation, gender reversal, etc. Still, in order to examine anxieties related to gender in a wider sense, I will start by exploring the image of a dangerous woman in power.

¹⁵ Although there is an analogy between race and gender, neither women nor non-Europeans are a homogenous social group, and they should not be carelessly categorised together as one.

4.2.1. *Serpent of Old Nile and The Dark Queen Fantasy*

When considering the usual titles of Shakespeare's plays, it is quite conspicuous that this is a play that focuses on a monarch, but holds in its title another name. Although the central theme is love between two characters, the love story does not really develop, and neither does one of the characters in question. In the essay *Egyptian Queens and Male Reviewers: Sexist Attitudes in 'Antony and Cleopatra' Criticism*, Linda Fitz argues that the play should be called *Cleopatra*, and interprets Shakespeare's alterations of Plutarch's text as showing a greater interest in Cleopatra as a person. After all, she is the one with an inner struggle, she grows as a character, and dominates the final act after Antony's death in Act IV. Yet she is "cut off at the outset from serious consideration as a tragic hero" (184), simply because she is a woman. This exclusion corresponds with the principle of colonial repression, as both women and non-Europeans are considered to be so harmful to the dominant narrative, they are denied access completely. This is just one of the ways in which women are fixed as the Other, not just by the author, but apparently also by the contemporary reader who perpetuates the principle by making assumptions about the play.

A typical type of story that appeared at the beginning of England's mercantile and colonial expansion is the dark queen fantasy: a seductive, powerful black woman meets a white man and surrenders herself to him. Again, the trope of turning is crucial, as she is either turned Christian or metaphorically turns the man into a woman¹⁶. In Loomba's words, "The foreign woman is alluring, dangerous, and powerful, which makes her ultimate capitulation all the more meaningful." ("Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism" 124). The scenario of her destruction subconsciously alleviates the fear of the European "turning Turk" under the influence of a dark seductress by either destroying or converting the dangerous woman.

¹⁶ This instance will be further explained in "4.2.3. *Transform us not to women: Gender Crisis*"

Interestingly, Edward Said points out that the Orient serves as a theatrical stage that nourishes the European imagination – which includes Shakespeare. Orientals are not represented as they are, but as objects studied by the Occident. This particularly applies in the case of the depictions of Oriental women in European literature, where they are "usually the creatures of a male power-fantasy. They express unlimited sensuality, they are more or less stupid, and above all they are willing." (Said 207) Even women in power, figures such as Cleopatra, eventually must be broken. However powerful they may figure among their own people, ultimately they are only suitable for representation if they are either appropriated into the imperialist narrative or vanquished¹⁷. If we presume that Oriental women in Occidental culture are normally perceived and represented as territory that waits to be conquered, we will notice that Cleopatra is neither naive nor willing to be subjugated. In her essay on the play, Marilyn French states that *Antony and Cleopatra* is "unique in the canon because it alone presents in a positive way the outlaw feminine principle embodied in a powerful female." (264) But what is the source of her power?

Firstly and obviously, it is her political power. This point applies above all to the historical Cleopatra, but it is necessary to have a basic understanding of her influence before continuing with Shakespeare's version. Even though the historical era to which she belonged by far precedes the idea of nations, it is possible to conclude that the subjects were unified in their admiration of the ruler, as they were considered divine and not human. Interestingly, Cleopatra was the only Ptolemy to learn Egyptian, as rulers considered themselves to be so godlike that they did not have much in common with their people. In particular, she identified with the goddess Isis, which made her particularly dear to her people, but also fixed her position with Rome, as Isis was often identified with Venus. Loomba mentions in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* an association of nation and family, originating in the feudal era.

¹⁷ This misogynistic attitude is rooted in a deeper anxiety about contamination, and ultimately the instability of gender.

The identification of King and Father enabled family and nation to develop simultaneously, both fixing people into similar positions in relation to authority. Thus the familial vocabulary of nations developed, with women as national mothers, men as fathers, and all citizens as sisters and brothers. *Antony and Cleopatra* subverts this idea, as the Father of the nation is in fact a Mother. Shakespeare's Cleopatra is also a mother – not only to her child, but also to Egypt.

As for Shakespeare's Cleopatra, it seems that the focus is not entirely on her royal power. She is portrayed as a 'regular' person far more than as a ruler, and although she definitely does take an interest in securing Egypt's fate, her interaction with other characters shows her as hasty, childish, and sometimes even obnoxious¹⁸. Still, inconsistent with the fact that she plays the role of the harlot and Antony that of the hero, during their affair he was first married to Fulvia, and then to Octavia. The hero cheats on two wives and one mistress in the duration of the play, yet the harlot remains faithful. Maybe it is possible to view constancy, as M. French's essay suggests, as a form of Cleopatra's power. The constancy in question is above all a personal quality, a romantic quality of Cleopatra as a person in love, but it is also applicable to Egypt as her dominion. Throughout the play, Egypt remains a location of sensuous pleasures, playfulness, beauty, and fertility – in other words, it is presented as 'feminine'. On the other hand, Rome is very much *masculine* – focused on power, war, contest. Even though Egypt never really changes (it, like its ruler, is constant), there is no doubt that the plot is dominated by Roman values.

4.2.2. Rome as Centre of Ideology

In order to explain the world of the play in terms of real-life ideologies of its time, I will use a comparison of *Antony and Cleopatra* to a play that was discussed in the previous

¹⁸ In Act III, scene 3 she has a delightfully amusing conversation with a messenger who brings news about Octavia. Knowing her history of violently punishing bearers of bad news, the messenger is easily led to present Octavia in a very unflattering light, so as to appease the jealous Cleopatra.

chapter of this paper. Truly, *Othello* bears many similarities to *Antony and Cleopatra*. They are both stories of an Oriental Other trapped in an Occidental narrative. Although the Other is not presented entirely as something negative or harmful, it is clear who has the final word. Keeping in mind the performative character of Shakespeare's works, it is plausible to presume that the unusual characters presented on stage were intended to amaze, entice, and amuse the spectators. Still, the world of the play must be returned on the right track in the end, because 'we', the audience, need to be assured that 'they' – however human, kind, just, and heroic they turn out to be, are contained in their own world, without contaminating our reality for too long. This is reminiscent of Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of the carnivalesque, a literary mechanism in which the dominant mode is subverted "by introducing a mingling of voices from diverse social levels that are free to mock and subvert authority" (Abrams 63). However, in the end the authority is reinstated, and that is what happens in Shakespeare as well. In *Othello*, the final words are spoken by Lodovico, a Venetian nobleman, and the state will decide what to tell the public of Othello's death. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, a speech by Octavius Caesar concludes the final act, and thus Roman values are re-established. "The voice of Rome opens and closes the drama." (French 265) It may not seem so at first glance, since Cleopatra does manage to meet her end in Egypt, but in her personal victory over her captors (i.e. escaping the disgrace of captivity¹⁹) she is still defeated. The play's ending guarantees Roman dominion over Egypt in the future, despite Cleopatra's attempts to keep it in the hands of her own dynasty. In order to avoid being brought to Rome and being made into a mockery, she decides to take her life and remain in Egypt forever, but when she takes control over her fate, she does it "after the high Roman fashion" (IV.15. 91). Therefore, it is a question whether she manages to speak in her own voice, or whether she is ultimately ensnared in the Roman value system.

¹⁹ In reality, she already had been made into a spectacle, in a wonderful moment of overlapping of the world of the play and the world of Shakespeare's stage – but this issue will be discussed further in section "4.3. Power of Representation".

4.2.3. "Transform us not to women": Gender Crisis

It has been mentioned several times in this chapter that one of the key elements of the play is gender and the fears it generates. Space itself is gendered in the play, and particular values are attributed to different locations. Therefore, everything that happens is somehow marked by the archetypal view of its location. Since Egypt is associated with pleasure, fertility, irrationality, even duplicity, it is a place where Antony and Cleopatra can freely carry on their illicit romance. Unlike Antony's soldiers (with the exception of Enobarbus), Cleopatra's attendants seem to defend their relationship because she loves him and that gives it legitimacy.

From a Roman perspective, the unsettling aspect of Egyptian femininity is not its commitment to sensuous pleasures, but the absence of strict divisions. Egypt is a place where gender reversal is quite commonplace, and this is visible in numerous instances. One of the most striking images is the following scene, in which Cleopatra retells to Charmian and her other attendants how she 'caught' and subdued Antony, using a fishing metaphor in which she is the one drawing him up on a string. She also talks about their playful, drunken, cross-dressing bedroom games, which is a perfect example of gender reversal and its threatening aspect to the dominant hierarchy²⁰:

"I laughed him out of patience; and that night
I laughed him into patience; and next morn
Ere the ninth hour I drunk him to his bed;
Then put my tires and mantles on him, whilst
I wore his sword Philippan." (II.5. 19-23)

Interestingly, the gender reversing moment resonates in a later scene, when Cleopatra had already betrayed Antony and he cursed at Mardian: "O, thy vile lady! / She has robbed me of my sword." (IV.14. 22-23) The language is quite transparent (as is the play's focus on

²⁰ Loomba considers gender reversal to be an aspect of Egypt's relation to Rome, and suggests that Cleopatra's effeminising effect on Antony was seen as a threat to Rome's dominion over Egypt.

sexual puns), and so is Antony's sense of emasculation. The play seems to prove him right. At the very beginning of the play he is presented as a shadow of his former self, and at the end he is unsuccessful in his attempt at suicide. The Egyptian Cleopatra ends her life in the Roman fashion, but the Roman Antony fails to do.

Linda Fitz suggests that there are two ways in which we can read the play: as a story of a hero betrayed by a strumpet, or as a story of transcendental love²¹ ("Egyptian Queens and Male Reviewers: Sexist Attitudes in 'Antony and Cleopatra' Criticism" 182-183). The former version has already been discussed at some length in the previous sections of this paper, but the latter has not. Even though *Antony and Cleopatra* essentially is a love story, the only developments in the relationship between the lovers come in the form of a dialogue between betrayal and forgiveness. Images of passionate romance are scattered throughout the play as our focus shifts between Rome and Egypt. Antony betrays Cleopatra by marrying Octavia, Cleopatra betrays him by leaving the Battle of Actium²² and later on by joining Caesar's side in order to preserve her rule over Egypt, he decides to kill her for it but ultimately gives up, she sends out fake news of her death... Each betrayal is soon forgotten, as forgiveness seems to be the only charity they allow one another. Still, their love story is constantly being interrupted by scenes of battle. This sort of dynamics echoes their relationship in a way, and yet it dominates a significant part of the play. In *Othello*, we keep expecting a war, yet we are always brought back to the love story. But in *Antony and Cleopatra*, we expect a great love story, but keep getting back to the battle.

²¹ It is interesting to notice that the first interpretation resembles the Roman view of their affair, and the second one coincides with the Egyptian view.

²² Antony fully blamed her for his disgrace, as he followed after her when she left the battle. But why did he not stay?

4.3. Power of Representation

The initial premise of this paper was to provide an analysis of othering as a cultural construct and the way its literary representation reflects the social norms and politics of Shakespeare's time. A key aspect of this attempt is to keep in mind the fact that these plays were intended for the viewing of a 17 century European audience, people with presumably similar views about Otherness, but coming from different walks of life.

The fact that the story on stage had to be interesting enough to entertain both the noblest and the lowest classes certainly makes a statement about the nature of the spectacle. An interesting topic that crops up in *Antony and Cleopatra* is the politics of performance. The idea of being made into a spectacle reappears as the greatest insult one can experience. For example, when Antony is furious with Cleopatra for betraying him in the midst of battle, he wishes her to be paraded around Rome in front of the commoners as Caesar's prisoner.

"Let him take thee,
And hoist thee up to the shouting plebeians;
Follow his chariot, like the greatest spot
Of all thy sex! Most monsterlike be shown
For poor'st diminutives, for dolts" (IV.12. 33-37)

The issue of performance becomes most prominent in the final act, when Cleopatra ponders her fate after Antony's death.

"Nay, 'tis most certain, Iras. Saucy lictors
Will catch at us like strumpets, and scald rhymers
Ballad us out o' tune. The quick comedians
Extemporally will stage us, and present
Our Alexandrian revels; Antony
Shall be brought drunken forth, and I shall see
Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness
I' th' posture of a whore." (V.2. 215-222)

On the one hand, this fear is not unfounded. Loomba explains that "Roman emperors had displayed their captives in the official triumphs, and during Shakespeare's time, European

monarchs imitated this practice by recreating extravagant processions which showcased captured slaves, animals, and goods, and also displayed personifications of the territories they traded with or colonized." ("Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism" 131) Obviously, Cleopatra would have made an impressive trophy, as was the personification of Egypt's beauty and mystery. Additionally, in the eyes of the populace, such a display would have been a powerful confirmation of the Roman domination over Egypt.

On the other hand, as Cleopatra despairs over the fact that she will be played by "Some squeaking Cleopatra boy" (V.2. 221), she traverses the divide between her own time and Shakespeare's, leading up to our own. It must have been such a curious sight, a white man playing Cleopatra on the English Renaissance stage, desperate over the fact that she will be played by a white man in Rome. She does not want to be impersonated; she wants to script her performance, and she tries to resist being represented by Rome – by taking her own life. In fact, performance is power, in the sense that the representation of others is a privilege granted to those in power. Sadly, it is questionable whether she succeeded, since her death was both a triumph and a defeat, as its conditions were dictated by Roman codes.

In my analysis of the othering mechanisms in *Antony and Cleopatra*, I have relied mostly on the perceptions of the play's female protagonist. Even though the play is filled with interesting details and traces of accounts of the Orient (possibly mixed with myths of the New World), the main focus was on Cleopatra's femininity as a crucial aspect of difference. In the observed mind frame, a foreign land is likened to a woman and most aspects of difference work in the same way for both. Cleopatra herself is a truly fascinating character, both because of her particularity in comparison to most Shakespeare's female characters, and because of the many roles she plays: she is a mother to Egypt, a lover and fiend to Antony, and a prop to Octavius. She is stuck between her personal feelings and political duty, while her threatening

strength (initially) subverts the rhetoric of Roman values. However, in the end it is proven that such a creature of inconstancy and contradiction cannot survive for long. Egypt is a *feminine* location, it celebrates love and life, and after Antony's death there is none of it left. The *masculine* Roman principle survives in the end, and even though its legacy does not seem to bring any good to the world, Octavius as the voice of Rome closes the play, not failing to make one final pun at the expense of Cleopatra's salaciousness²³.

²³ "Most probable/ That so she died; for her physician tells me/ She hath pursued conclusions infinite/ Of easy ways to die." (V.2. 352-355) – the pun is based on the Elizabethan slang use of 'die' with the meaning 'orgasm'.

5. *The Tempest* in a Colonial Context: Speaking for the Other

Although every one of Shakespeare's plays unravels before the audience a world of its own, and each of them problematizes in its own particular way some aspect of human existence, many critics seem to single out Shakespeare's final play, *The Tempest*, as the most enigmatic. It is an unusual text in a number of ways, starting with the genre, and continuing the story (and its source), the author's intentions, the play's position in the canon, etc.

The Tempest was first performed in 1611, and printed in 1623 as the first text in the First Folio²⁴. At the time, it was categorised as a comedy, but since the 1890s it has been classified as a romance, along with *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and sometimes *The Two Noble Kinsmen*²⁵. The play contains aspects of both comedy and tragedy, additions such as song and dance, and elements of the courtly masque. It is also the only play by Shakespeare that follows the three unities: time (3 hours – which is emphasised by Prospero asking Ariel what the time is), place (the island), action (Prospero's punishment of the usurpers and Caliban). It is also the only play for which no single source was found, although it is believed to have been inspired by travel writing²⁶. The play has been analysed in many different ways, and many readings suggest a personal interpretation, identifying the author with Prospero and the play's ending as his farewell to theatre. However, the readings I will consider in this paper are those that place *The Tempest* in a colonial context, particularly with regard to the relationship between the play's characters and some of the myths of Otherness that the play unravels.

²⁴ The decision to put *The Tempest* first in the book seems unusual, since it was written last.

²⁵ In *Shakespeare and Romance*, Stanley Wells lists the following motifs that are common in romances: a deliberate sense of unreality, presence of the supernatural, marriage of a virtuous young hero and heroine, intermingling of courtly and pastoral scenes, a family separated only to be reunited at the end – all of which can be found in the play.

²⁶ It is suggested in the Introduction to the Arden edition of *The Tempest* (41-43) that the travel writing in question is William Strachey's *True Reportory*, which describes a shipwreck on the Bermudas in July 1609. Although the account was published in 1625, it is believed that it was available as a manuscript soon after the survivors of the shipwreck returned to England in 1610.

5.1. Shakespeare's *Tempest* and Prospero's

Even the most superficial reading of *The Tempest* reveals the fact that it is a story of domination. The amount of signals and images that point to a narrative of colonisation are overwhelming, yet it would be irresponsible to state that *The Tempest* is simply an allegory of colonialism. There are many elements that provide a basis for such an interpretation. Most conspicuously, the relationship between Prospero and his subjects, Caliban and Ariel, the island's only inhabitants before the arrival of Prospero and Miranda. As a powerful magician and (supposedly) a father-like protector of the island's inhabitants, Prospero is the central figure of the play. He seems to be creating and advancing the plot from the beginning to the end, from the tempest that causes the shipwreck in Act I, to the happy ending in Act V – and everything in between.

In *'Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish': The Discursive Con-texts of "The Tempest"* (202-205), Francis Baker and Peter Hulme explain that the element that points to English colonialism as the main context of the play is its focus on the figure of usurpations. Usurpations are present in all segments of the play and seem to include nearly all the characters. In the first scene of Act I, the boatswain orders the passengers to their cabins during the storm, which is perceived as an offense by the nobles. Next, there is Antonio's revolt against Prospero, Caliban's alleged attempt at rape of Miranda, Antonio and Sebastian's attempted fratricide and regicide, and finally, Caliban's rebellion against Prospero, helped by Stephano and Trinculo. Although all of the alleged usurpations feed into a common anxiety about domination and resistance, they are not present in the play in the same way. "For Prospero, the real beginning of the story is his usurpation twelve years previously by Antonio, the opening scene of a drama which Prospero intends to play out during *The Tempest* as a comedy of restoration." (Baker and Hulme 203) It follows that the story of *The Tempest* and Prospero's story are not one and the same. It should be noted that the usurpation that started

Prospero's story on the island is retold by Prospero himself – maybe the true reason of his removal from the position of duke is glossed over by his story of having been too immersed in his studies to pay attention to his duties. However, in that particular moment we are practically identified with Miranda, who knows nothing of the entire history and can add nothing to the tale. This indicates another interesting possibility: Prospero's usurpation of the play itself. Baker and Hulme argue that the said history of usurpations belongs to the world of the play, but the way that Prospero controls and utilizes the audience's perception extends beyond the plot and is systematically kept silent throughout the play.

5.1.1. Prospero's Creation

Continuing in a similar vein, the relationship of dominance between Prospero and the other characters is to a large extent based in his ability to speak for them. Language is a crucial aspect of cultural imperialism, and its importance for this play is just as great. It is one of the prominent markers of difference in the world of the play, and it is also crucial in our perception of the play. Going back to a previous observation about *Othello*, it seems that the reader's relationship with Prospero is similar to the one we may have with Iago. In many cases, we are exposed only to his version of the story and even if we detect the fact that his narrative is not equal to the narrative of the play, it is constructed in such a way that denies us the insight into an objective truth. To the characters in the play, his perspective is everything – for the most part. "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." (Brown 59) This fact is reflected in every exchange he has with the others, and the only moment in the play in which his presence is not felt occurs after he momentarily forgets about Caliban's rebellion in IV.1. and stops the wedding masque in order to take care of the issue.

Prospero's rapport with the other characters is a vast subject, one too complex to be addressed in this paper in its entirety. To Miranda, he is a father and a teacher, to Ariel he is a saviour, to Caliban he is disciplinarian (through Caliban's own fault), and to the shipwrecked he is a "surrogate providence" (Brown 59). Each of these relationships positions him in the role of master, and more importantly, each of them is imposed from his own point of view. In fact, his position of power is constantly played out, i.e. he continually reasserts his own version of the story, placing himself in the position of power. It is seen right away that Prospero is Ariel's master. However, when Ariel reminds him of his promise to give him freedom, Prospero reminds him: "Dost thou forget / From what torment I did free thee?" (I.2. 250-251), and continues to retell their shared history, one where he is Ariel's liberator and lays rightful claim to his servitude. In Miranda's case, the assertion of authority is more subtle, and he performs it by referring to himself as her teacher. This happens, for example, while he is explaining their background to Miranda.

"Here in this island we arrived; and here
Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit
Than other princes can, that have more time
For vainer hours, and tutors not so careful" (I.2. 171-174)

He incorporates this comment into the story of their arrival on the island, reminding Miranda that she is indebted to him for his teaching. In some way, Miranda is in fact his project, and their time on the island, which is often compared to a laboratory, serves the purpose of creating her in such a way that fits in with his narrative, and the wider picture of Milan and Naples' politics. He orchestrates the arrival of his countrymen on the island, stages obstacles to her and Ferdinand's love knowing that they will marry, makes sure that she is completely unable to resist his will. However, his relationship with Miranda will be explained in further detail in the subsection "Miranda and the Female Voice".

Prospero's relationship with Caliban is slightly different, in part because he is the only subject that resists Prospero's narrative. He keeps bringing up the fact that the island belonged to him and his mother Sycorax before him, until Prospero usurped it. He also introduces a past in which Caliban loved Prospero and showed him "all the qualities o' th' isle" (I.2. 337), and their relationship was mutually beneficial. However, Prospero quickly interrupts him, claiming that he treated him humanely until he tried to rape Miranda. This moment is crucial to numerous postcolonial critics, as it seems to legitimise Prospero's usurpation and inhumane treatment of Caliban. In fact, Caliban does not deny the accusation, he revels in the fact that he would have 'peopled the island with Calibans' if he had the chance. This instance is very strange for many reasons. Firstly, the act of violence against Miranda seems unmotivated, and may not have been intentionally malicious, but misguided²⁷. Secondly, Prospero did not retaliate by killing or exiling him completely, but kept him as a slave. Next, he conveniently brings it up when Caliban talks about their past, and the fact that the island was his until he stole it from him. Prospero (or Miranda, depending on the edition) then produces a speech about his savagery and incapability of being civilised. "Colonist legitimation has always had then to go on to tell its own story, inevitably one of native violence: Prospero's play performs this task within *The Tempest*." (Baker and Hulme 205). Indeed, when Caliban protests again, Prospero brings the conversation to an end by cursing him with stomach cramps, so Caliban goes away. This detail shows not only Prospero's hatred of Caliban, but also his unease at times when he mentions the past, pointing to a deeper anxiety about the legitimacy of his own rule. It also allows us to glimpse into the depth of Prospero's creation: he has to continue performing his role by re-asserting himself as the right and benevolent ruler of the island.

²⁷ For example, Paul Brown suggests that Prospero's power lies in his power to control his subjects' sexuality. Therefore, in Caliban he does not punish the attack on his daughter, but the escape from his authority.

5.1.2. Linguistic Colonialism

Stephen Greenblatt's celebrated essay *Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century* (16-32) deals with the issue of linguistic colonialism. The author presents a view of English colonisation of the New World as a mission of propagating English language. Originating perhaps in Cicero's assertion that man's advantage over animals is precisely speech, and his account of the civilising effect of speech in *De Oratore*, the idea of language as the instrument of rule includes the assumptions that the New World natives have no language and therefore no culture. Therefore, this linguistic mission of cultural imperialism is allowed to present itself as beneficial, as it gives the gift of speech to those that are without it. The subsection entitled "Prospero's Creation" has provided numerous instances of Prospero's linguistic colonialism, and while Caliban certainly represents the Other to Prospero, the prominent marker of difference in their relationship is language. Prospero's story (as opposed to the play's story) relies greatly on the myth of the Wild Man. Stories about strange, savage, hairy people inhabiting strange foreign lands, possibly originating in the Greek myth of the satyr, were quite popular during the middle ages and the Renaissance. One of the main characteristics of the Wild Man is the absence of language, and following from the idea of the civilising power of language, teaching a savage to speak (English) is a selfless and noble endeavour, the White Man's Burden. Caliban's speech is often brought up, and one such instance is the famous scene in which Miranda (or in some editions, Prospero) recalls teaching him speech.

"MIRANDA: Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other: when thou didst not, savage,
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like

A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
With words that made them known. But thy vile race,
Though thou didst learn, had that in't which good
natures
Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
Deservedly confined into this rock,
Who hadst deserved more than a prison.

CALIBAN:

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!" (I.2. 351-365)

It has already been mentioned that Miranda (or Prospero) gives this speech after Caliban begins telling the story of his and Prospero's relationship, and claims Prospero stole the island from him. Thus Prospero's reaction is to divert attention from the unpleasant history of usurpation and shift focus on Caliban's incorrigible savagery, which is innate. This iconic scene lies in the foundation of Greenblatt's reading, as Caliban's retort (about having only learned to curse) is deeply ambivalent. On the one hand, it proves Prospero right, as Caliban is so deeply corrupted that he can only take in the lowest form of verbal communication. On the other hand, it proves Prospero wrong, as Caliban not only learned to speak, but also learned to use his master's language against him. In Greenblatt's view, this is a sign of Caliban's bitter moral victory. However, it has already been established that Prospero's account is very subjective, and there is nothing suggesting that Caliban's is not. It is very tempting to "choose sides" in this story, and perhaps by choosing to believe in the veracity of Caliban's story, the reader becomes subject to another stereotype, the one of the noble savage. The play itself does not give definitive answers, it is deliberately contradictory and wondrous, so the various narratives within it should be explored carefully, not forced.

5.2. Aspects of Otherness in *The Tempest*

The main reasons for choosing *The Tempest* for discussion in this paper are the play's focus on the noble savage stereotype and its exploration of the relationship between coloniser and colonised. Both aspects are evident in the exchange between Prospero and Caliban, but the play offers much more than just their story. The basis for Prospero's takeover of the island is usually explained by the contrast between the learned magician and the monstrous Caliban. Yet Caliban is not Prospero's only subject on the island; before the arrival of the Naples party there are two more subjects dependent on him: Ariel and Miranda. How is Prospero's control over them legitimised in the play, considering the fact that neither of them is as uncivilised, monstrous, or disobedient as Caliban? The protagonist is a figure of power whose library provides him with a deep and mysterious knowledge of the world. This knowledge translates into magic, which hypothetically allows him to control other inhabitants of the island, yet every time he magically interferes with the other characters, he does it through Ariel, his servant. This chapter will present a discussion of Prospero's three subjects, and the way in which each of them represents the Other to Prospero.

5.2.1. Wild Man Caliban

It has already been mentioned that the story of *The Tempest* is presumably based on an account of a shipwreck in the Bermudas. However, the geographical location of the island in *The Tempest* is vague. It has been speculated about extensively in the past, as the hints are sparse and contradictory. We know that Prospero sent Ariel on an errand to the Bermudas: "Safely in harbour/ Is the king's ship; in the deep nook, where once / Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew / From the still-vexed Bermudas" (I.2. 226-229). We also know that the shipwrecked party was sailing from Tunis to Naples. In his essay '*This Tunis, sir, was Carthage*': *Contesting Colonialism in The Tempest*, Jerry Brotton suggests that the play is "much more of a politically and geographically bifurcated play in the negotiation between its

Mediterranean and Atlantic contexts than critics have recently been prepared to concede" (24), which is supported in his opinion by Sebastian, Gonzalo and Adrian's disputation over Tunis and Carthage. The author examines the play's potential for revealing traces of England's foreign encounters in its early colonial phase, and what this analysis reveals is "a deep ambivalence regarding the nature of early English maritime encounters with territories over which it could exercise little or no political control" (36). North Africa and the eastern Mediterranean were not as distant and exotic as the Americas, yet they were out of reach due to the Ottoman occupation. In the author's opinion, the play reflects the fact that England was not quick enough to invade, rather than the rise of English colonialism. It certainly is curious that a play placed (at least partially) in a Mediterranean context makes no mention of the Turks, but one particular problematic location that is mentioned is Algiers (Argier) – the former home of Sycorax. According to Prospero, Sycorax was exiled from her homeland "For mischiefs manifold, and sorceries terrible / To enter human hearing" (I.2. 264-265), and the only reason for which her life was spared was her pregnancy with Caliban. Thus Caliban's character receives another layer, a vaguely African identity.

In the introduction to the Arden edition of *The Tempest*, it is suggested that the African connection would have evoked a familiar topic in Shakespeare's audience, as some of them (possibly Shakespeare himself) may have read Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, which included a story of a voyage to North Africa in 1586²⁸. Considering the fact that Algiers would have been known to them primarily as a location of the racial/religious Other, Caliban's legacy would have further fixed him in the position of the Other, and maybe added an undertone of sexual depravity and danger, i.e. conjure Oriental stereotypes connected with Moors, Turks and other inhabitants of North Africa.

²⁸ This account, written by John Evesham, mentions Algiers as a town populated with Turks, Moors, Jews, and many Christian captives, including Englishmen.

In any case, neither political narrative is played out singularly in *The Tempest*. Although the myths of the New World and its savage inhabitants are not displayed in a straightforward way, they did find a fertile ground in the Renaissance audience and morphed together with the pre-existing myths of Otherness that existed in medieval literature (and have even existed since the antiquity). In *Learning to Curse*, Greenblatt argues that "both intellectual and popular culture in the Renaissance had kept alive the medieval figure of the Wild Man, one of whose common characteristics is the absence of speech." (Greenblatt 21) This fact relates both to the idea of civilising savages as a linguistic mission of cultural imperialism, and to the problem of the voice of the Other. The impossibility of speech for the Other was mentioned near the beginning of this paper, as the paradox of the subaltern speaking for themselves is demonstrated in the play's treatment of Caliban. He is perhaps the most striking and disturbing character in the play. His physical presence is depicted unsympathetically, beginning with the character list in which he is described as "a savage and deformed slave"(736). He is often referred to as a monster, and compared to animals, even fish. Still, apart from the Wild Man narrative, there is another trope present in the play's depiction of Caliban. The figure of a noble savage is almost an idealised version of the Wild Man, the depiction of a man uncorrupted by civilisation, existing in its natural (even prelapsarian) state. Such an idea is reflected not only in Caliban, but also in Gonzalo's vision of utopia, which was likely inspired by Montaigne's essay *Of Cannibals*. I have already stated that the play offers no definitive resolutions to the issue, so it would be wise not to fall into the trap of trying to discern Caliban's 'true nature', and be satisfied with determining what is represented.

Judging from the perceptions of Caliban by the other characters, it is not hard to imagine their repulsion at the sight of him. It is also quite easy to imagine the reaction of theatregoers to the ape/dog/reptile-like creature. But where does his true threat lie? According

to Greenblatt, the danger of the Wild Man can be observed through his disruption of social order, which is represented in three categories: sex, sustenance, and salvation. Those categories are regulated in society by the institutions of family, political institutions, and Church, which all play a big role in the construction of individual identities. Such reasoning relies on the new historicist view of power structures maintaining themselves through subversion, and we can presume that the 17 century viewers could intuitively recognise the dangers of the Wild Man. While Prospero sets the viewer/reader up to surrender to his perspective, he also lays out contrasting views of civility, language, sexuality, ideology. The disparities co-exist in the play, and the characters remain suspended between them. For example, it is quite transparent, even amusing, that Caliban is so immersed in Prospero's master narrative that even as he tries to stray away from it, he gets absorbed back into it. The very nature of his mutiny illustrates this perfectly. In the introduction to the Pelican edition of the play, Peter Holland identifies this issue: "When given the chance to escape from Prospero's control, he can, however, imagine nothing more radical than replacing one master with another, Stephano." (732)

In his famed essay *'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': 'The Tempest' and the Discourse of Colonialism* (50-58), Paul Brown discerns three discourses within the dominant colonial narrative, one being a class discourse (*masterlessness*), one a racial discourse (*savagism*), and a sexual discourse. Each of these involves a different set of characters and follows a different plot line. The class discourse includes Trinculo and Stephano, who belong to the class of masterless men, "unsupervised elements located in the internal margins of civil society" (50), and as such they need to be put under supervision, rectified and punished. Caliban, as the savage, is a representative of "alien cultures on the external margins of expanding civil power" (50), which need to be civilised and conquered. The subjugation of sexuality, or rather its codification into political and courtly practices, is

another need of the civil society, and is seen in Prospero's elaborate orchestration of Miranda and Ferdinand's courtship, as well as in his punishment of Caliban's sexual transgression.

Ultimately, there is a deep connection between Prospero and Caliban. Even Prospero acknowledges it, or at least it seems so, at the end of the play.

"These three have robbed me, and this demidevil
(For he's a bastard one) had plotted with them
To take my life. Two of these fellows you
Must know and own; this thing of darkness I
Acknowledge mine." (V.1. 272-276)

After all schemes have ended, and the conspirators are caught, Prospero *returns* Stephano and Trinculo to the King of Naples and his lords. After all, the *masterless* must ultimately be assigned a master, and as their lack of supervision is the failure of civil society, they need be corrected and reintegrated into it. The savage, however, is a different story. From a postcolonial point of view, the mechanism of othering that colonial narratives employ is the production of a *tabula rasa* – erasing alternative modes of civility, with the goal of containing the Other. Does Prospero's statement confirm this formula? Yes and no. Yes, because he evidently takes responsibility for Caliban's *savagism*. The colonial mission of civilising the uncivilised is based on the assumption that Others are a blank page waiting to be filled with the dominant narrative, and as I have already established, Caliban is completely immersed in it. The answer to the abovementioned question is also no, because although he cannot extract himself from Prospero's ideology, he nonetheless retains something of his own. He does not forget his version of the past, which is demonstrated in his objection to Prospero's claim of the island: "This island's mine by Sycorax my mother / Which thou tak'st from me." (I.2. 331-332) Even though he is silenced and often voiced over by his master, and even though his

rebellion does not find an independent expression, he still holds on to a piece of his former identity, which allows him to use the language of his oppressors to curse at them.

5.2.2. *The Non-Savage Other: Ariel*

In my analysis of *The Tempest*, I have so far put greater emphasis on the character of Caliban than any other. Admittedly, the character is quite striking, and easily lends itself to a colonial reinscription. However, there is another highly unusual dweller on the island, one even older than Caliban. Ariel, described in the character list as "an airy spirit" (736), is a fantastic creature that moves through the play with a very special dynamism. He changes shapes, appears and disappears, transforms into mythical creatures, turns invisible, plays magical music, all while serving his master Prospero.

Ariel first appears in Act I, scene 2, when he reports to Prospero the way in which he handled the storm and its shipwrecked survivors. Prospero praises him, satisfied with the work of his obedient servant, and we can immediately notice the difference in his treatment of Ariel in comparison to the way in which he treats his other servant, Caliban. Once Ariel is done reporting to his master, he immediately reminds him of the promise to set him free. Suddenly, irked by this inquiry, Prospero reminds Ariel: "Dost thou forget / From what torment I did free thee?" (I.2. 250-251), and recounts their common history. Unwilling to reveal his reasons for keeping Ariel in service just a little longer, Prospero performs his identity by narrating the moment when he saved Ariel by releasing him from the cloven pine in which he was trapped. This is a crucial moment in the play, as it reveals two stories that greatly influence our perception of the dominant discourse in the play. The first story is that of Prospero and Ariel's relationship, in which Prospero is first presented as benevolent, but instantly revealed as a tyrant. The second story is that of the witch Sycorax, Caliban's mother who was exiled from Algiers and left on the island alone, pregnant with Caliban. Sycorax trapped Ariel in a cloven pine when he refused to serve her, and there he remained after her

death, until Prospero came to the island and freed him. Ironically, a very clear parallel is drawn between Prospero and Sycorax. In fact, Sycorax is, according to Holland, "a distorted mirroring of Prospero, proficient like him in the magic arts and exiled like him with a child." (731) Be that as it may, it is interesting that Prospero keeps Ariel in service with a promise of freedom, but also with the assertion that his servitude really is freedom when compared to the years spent in confinement. Is it after all possible that Prospero's magic is basically an instrument of violence? After all, his power over Ariel seems to be based on coercion, not enchantment. Posing such questions certainly is problematic, since the play offers no definitive answers; moreover, it is structured in such a way that renders them futile. Since the entire plot resembles an elaborate dance orchestrated by Prospero, and the concluding epilogue only contributes to such an idea, perhaps it is inappropriate and even impossible to delve into Prospero's reasoning and motives.

Reading various postcolonial reinscriptions of *The Tempest*, it is possible to notice a certain propensity to completely disregard Ariel, as Caliban fits the description of an oppressed colonial subject much better. Although Caliban is quite bizarre and therefore more compelling, Ariel's role should not be disregarded altogether (even if it is viewed mostly in comparison to Caliban). Unlike Caliban, he is a good servant. He knows that his compliance with Prospero's narrative will ultimately ensure his freedom, so he patiently waits, showing no signs of resistance. Indeed, he – unlike Caliban – is a foreign Other that is worthy of civilising.

5.2.3. *Miranda and the Female Voice*

As the only female character in the play (not counting those who are only mentioned), Miranda is hopelessly entangled in the invariably patriarchal discourse of the play. It is not unusual, if we consider the fact that she has never known anything outside Prospero's narrative. Paula S. Berggren, in her analysis of the power of female sexuality in Shakespeare,

notices that Miranda's femininity is reduced to the point of exhaustion, and many critics share the same view of Miranda as a person "more to be wondered at than understood" (Berggren 29). Throughout the play, the only value placed in her is related to her virginity, and her virtue is the only discernable characteristic. Additionally, in the same way that she is only allowed to exist physically as a reflection of her virtues, Miranda herself can only judge others in terms of their appearance. She demonstrates this when she falls in love with Ferdinand at first sight, claiming that "There's nothing ill can dwell in such a temple." (I.2. 458) Perhaps it is Prospero's magic that makes her so uncritical, or maybe it is simply her dependence on his discourse. There is an unusual moment, for example, when he prepares to tell Miranda of their history and we realise that she never even thought about it. "More to know / Did never meddle with my thoughts." (I.1. 21-22) Magic or education, it does not matter. What does matter is the fact that Prospero creates her in practically the same way that he creates Caliban. "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." (Brown 62)

Even though she is placed on the opposite side of the moral spectrum, Miranda is silenced in the same way as Caliban. Lorie Jerrell Leininger's essay *The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's 'Tempest'* (287-289) recounts the very organic moment when Miranda asks her father not to judge Ferdinand too harshly, and his surprised answer is "What, I say, / My foot my tutor?" (II.1. 469-470) Prospero silences her immediately, but also rudely reminds her of her position as the female, less valuable extension of himself. "Miranda is given to understand that she is the foot in the family organization of which Prospero is the head. Hers is not to reason why, hers but to follow directions: indeed, what kind of a body would one have (Prospero, or the play, asks) if one's foot could think for itself, could go wherever it pleased, independent of the head?" (Leininger 287)

Ultimately, Leininger suggests that Miranda's actual role is that of bait. I have already mentioned the alleged attempted rape of Miranda as the justification for Prospero's usurpation of Caliban's land. Miranda has provided a sexual element in the story of Caliban's enslavement, and Prospero's idea of hierarchy necessarily includes such a story as the real proof of his power. Again, Prospero produces her in opposition to Caliban, which is why her virginity is emphasised, as it lends a basis to the dichotomy of virtuous victim vs. lustful attacker.

There are three more women mentioned in the play apart from Miranda. It has already been established that Sycorax is somewhat of a dark twin to Prospero. Every mention of her name invariably happens in a very negative context, yet it is quite obvious that such descriptions come from Prospero, who came to the island years after her death. The presumption that his source of information was Ariel does not clarify much, as he spent the duration of her life on the island trapped in a pine tree. In any case, there is no knowledge of the island beyond that which Prospero gives us, and the way that he erases the real Sycorax from the play serves to reinforce the narrative of him as the benevolent father and protector. Sycorax as a northern African woman with magical powers cannot exist in the same narrative. In *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, it is explained why Sycorax represents an Old World threat to the New World colonial dynamic of *The Tempest*: "Unlike the fair Moorish women who can be converted and assimilated into European families, this 'hag' from Algiers must be eliminated and detached from her child, who can then be adopted as the white man's burden, acknowledged by Prospero as a 'thing of darkness' who is both alien and 'mine'." (Loomba 167)

Another female character in *The Tempest* that is only mentioned and never appears is Alonso's daughter Claribel, who is only mentioned since the shipwrecked party was sailing back to Naples after attending her wedding to the King of Tunis. She is neither described nor

actively present in the plot, but the fact that she was married off to Tunis, instead of some European country does reinforce the previously mentioned Old World influence, particularly as their marriage could signify King Alonso's aspiration to strengthen bonds with the Moorish land and therefore reduce the threat.

Finally, there is Prospero and Antonio's unnamed mother. Like Claribel, she is also only mentioned in the play, yet she is significant in the nature vs. nurture debate that is usually present in various readings of *The Tempest*. While examining the characters crucial for the play's postcolonial readings and placing an emphasis on Caliban, I have failed to mention one important fact – that the villain of the play is unequivocally Antonio. When Prospero tells Miranda of her uncle's usurpation and its cruelty, she shudders to think that the man in question is their own flesh and blood. "I should sin / To think but nobly of my grandmother. / Good wombs have borne bad sons." (I.2. 118-120) Antonio is in fact the one who is incorrigible and morally warped – at least that is what Prospero's story suggests.

The overall treatment of femininity in *The Tempest* reveals a predictably misogynistic ideology in both Prospero's and the play's texts. None of the women mentioned in the play are allowed agency, which is especially visible in the case of Miranda, who in my opinion is subaltern in the truest sense of the word. She is not simply disenfranchised, but completely cut off from the dominant discourse of the story, never allowed to glimpse into the world beyond her father's magic. However, the world of *The Tempest* is completely self-contained. Whether it is Shakespeare or Prospero who serve us their narrative, all characters and all issues are used simply to advance the plot, and the plot is pre-determined, yet non-linear. Ultimately, as much as we try to find a stable ground on which to base our reading, the play simply refuses to cooperate.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis, as stated in the Introduction, was to explore the mechanism of postcolonial othering with reference to three plays by William Shakespeare: *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Tempest*. Furthermore, the intent was to produce a reading of the three plays from the point of view of postcolonial literary studies, while revealing the advantages and disadvantages of such a perspective. Considering the fact that every reading is necessarily a reinscription, just as every reading is inevitably tied to the act of historicising, the attempt to keep a certain distance from the texts, or to maintain objectivity, has proven to be quite a difficult task. Since the paper focuses on the construction and deconstruction of such cultural categories as race, gender, and ideology, I have chosen to approach the plays from an angle that more or less coincides with the new historicist perspective, accepting the relativity of particular texts, and their existence among other co-texts. Even though great emphasis is placed on ideology, there is never only one grand narrative in the centre, but many different, contrastive discourses.

In its analysis of *Othello*, this paper has focused on the ideologies of race, exposing certain collective anxieties of the time that arose from contacts with foreigners. The character of Othello, sometimes perceived as the jealous husband archetype, holds a unique position in Venetian society as someone who is both an insider (a highly regarded military leader) and an outsider (a Moor). The central theme of the play is love; more precisely, the play uncovers some social anxieties caused by the marriage of a white woman and a black man. The language of the play underlines the contrast between the black Othello and the white Desdemona, which would have probably contributed to the perception of the characters on Shakespeare's stage. While an analysis of the play revealed the presence of certain racist and misogynist ideologies, my conclusion is that reading *Othello* exclusively in terms of such

ideologies is futile. Instead, an approach that could generate a more fruitful reading would take into account various texts about the Renaissance politics of difference, the influence of legends and literature, the political and social life of Shakespeare's England, etc.

The second play I discussed was *Antony and Cleopatra*, another tragedy that speaks of perceptions of the Other in early modern England. The play explores the stereotype of the non-European woman, and both reinforces and subverts the dark queen fantasy, i.e. the story about a powerful exotic woman brought to her knees by a white conqueror. After studying the play and several texts that analyse its gender-related problematic, I concluded that the fear of non-European femininity is based in a deeper anxiety of a patriarchal, xenophobic society. The anxiety about non-white, non-submissive femininity is related to the fear of the reversal of gender roles. Many postcolonial scholars have pointed to the issue of gendered localities, or more precisely, the belief that the Orient possesses certain feminine characteristics and is bound to *infect* the European with its femininity through contact.

The third play I included in my paper, *The Tempest*, fits in with the postcolonial discourse wonderfully, as it probes into the relationship between the master and the slave, and with a certain degree of ambivalence, explores the noble savage stereotype. In this play we can find traces of all the aforementioned ideologies of difference, and it approaches them in a peculiar way, as the characters in *The Tempest* are actually isolated outside civilisation, living on an island that the play describes as uninhabited. Such conditions provide a remarkable background against which fears of the Other are contemplated. The fears of brutality and inhumanity of foreigners, rooted in accounts of foreign contacts and based on a mixture of fact and fiction, is demonstrated in the character whose presence is most ardently discussed by postcolonial scholars, Wild Man Caliban. It was interesting to observe that however hateful the relationship between the slave Caliban and the master Prospero may be, there exists a certain mutual dependence, as both their identities are constructed in opposition to the other.

In *The Tempest*, the main marker of difference is speech, and Caliban's alleged inability to learn language differentiates him not only from Prospero and other European castaways, but also from Others such as Cleopatra and Othello, those who are worthy of civilising and integrating into European society.

The possibility of subaltern agency remains an unresolved issue. It is a problem rooted in the history of colonialism and its far-reaching influence. It could be argued that cultural imperialism is still alive today, and although the definition of colonialism has changed, the power structures have essentially remained unchanged. Furthermore, insisting on Shakespeare as a bastion of European cultural heritage, and at the same time as exceptional, defender of human rights, siding with the downtrodden, suggests reinscription gone too far. Considering not only the inability to fully imagine Shakespeare's theatre, but also the futility of guessing the extent to which the texts have been altered in time does not imply that one should not try to analyse them. Admittedly, it is almost impossible not to project our contemporary notions of Otherness onto the texts we read, as reinscriptions of literary texts are, in my opinion, the component that imbues the text with meaning, and every reading constitutes an inscription. Ultimately, the most interesting aspect of various inscriptions of Shakespeare is the fact that they allow us to observe the echoes of our own time, and the ways in which socio-cultural perspective continues to evolve.

7. Bibliography

1. Orgel, Stephen, and Braunmuller, A.R., eds. *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare*. New York: Penguin, 2002. 730-761, 1392-1444, 1651-1700. Print.
2. Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston (etc.): Thomson Wadsworth, 2005. Print.
3. Barin, Filiz. "Othello: Turks as 'the Other' in the Early Modern Period." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, Vol.43 (2010): 37-58. JSTOR. Web 18 June 2014.
4. Bradley, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Bungay, Suffolk: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1971. 142-198. Print.
5. Brown, Paul. "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': *The Tempest* and the discourse of colonialism." *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*. Dollimore, Jonathan, and Sinfield, Alan, eds. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1985. 48-71. Print.
6. Chakravorty Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1988. 271-313. Print.
7. Ciglar-Žanić, Janja. *Neka veća stalnost. Shakespeare u tekstu i kontekstu*. Zagreb: Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2001. Print.
8. Dervin, Fred. "Cultural identity, Representation and Othering." *The Routledge Handbook of Intercultural Communication*. London; NY: Routledge, 2011. Print.
9. Drakakis, John, ed. *Alternative Shakespeares*. London; New York: Routledge, 2002. 26-47, 195-209. Print.
10. Engler, Balz. "Othello's Great Heart." *English Studies* Vol. 68 (1987): 129-136. EBSCOhost. Web 30 July 2013.

11. Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1998. Print.
12. Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse. Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York; London: Routledge, 2007. 22-51. Print.
13. Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. Print.
14. Greene, Gayle, Thomas Neely, Carol, Swift Lenz, Carolyn Ruth, eds. *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Urbana; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983. 17-34, 211-239, 285-294. Print.
15. Hawkes, Terrence, ed. *Alternative Shakespeares Volume 2*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996. 38-62, 164-191, 192-215. Print.
16. Howard, Jean E., O'Connor, Marion F., eds. *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*. New York; London: Methuen, 1987. Print.
17. Jardine, Lisa. *Reading Shakespeare Historically*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996. 19-34. Print.
18. Joughin, John, ed. *Shakespeare and National Culture*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1997. Print.
19. Kumamoto, Chikako D. "Some Wonder in This Handkerchief: Magic, Early Modern Good Medicine, and Othello's Strange Difference." *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium* (2008): 29-44. EBSCOhost. Web 30 July 2013.
20. Lazarus, Neil, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
21. Loomba, Ania. *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Print.
22. Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London; New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

23. Loomba, Ania, and Orkin, Martin, eds. *Post-colonial Shakespeares*. London; New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.
24. Nicholson, Catherine. "Othello and the Geography of Persuasion." *English Literary Renaissance Vol. 4* (2010): 56-67. *EBSCOhost*. Web 9 August 2013.
25. Roux, Daniel. "Hybridity, Othello and the Postcolonial Critics." *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* (2009): 23-29. *EBSCOhost*. Web 9 August 2013.
26. Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994. Print.
27. Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Wilson, John Dover, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. vii-xxxvii. Print.
28. Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Mason Vaughan, Virginia, and Vaughan, Alden T., eds. 3rd ed. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2001. 1-142. Print.
29. Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Othello: The Moor of Venice*. Honigmann, E.A.J., ed. 3rd ed. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2001. 1-111. Print.
30. Sinfield, Alan. "Cultural Materialism, Othello, and the Politics of Plausibility." *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: University of California Press (1992): 30-52. Web 13 June 2014.
31. Šporer, David, ed. *Poetika renesansne kulture: novi historizam*. Zagreb: Disput, 2007. Print.
32. Vitkus, Daniel J. "Turning Turk in *Othello*: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor." *Shakespeare Quarterly Vol. 48*. (1997): 145-176. *JSTOR*. Web 18 June 2014.
33. Wells, Stanley. "Shakespeare and Romance." *Shakespeare's Later Comedies*. Palmer, D.J. ed. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1971. Print.
34. Wisker, Gina. *Ključni pojmovi postkolonijalne književnosti*. Zagreb: AGM, 2010. Print.

35. Young, Sandra. "Imagining Alterity and Belonging on the English Stage in an Age of Expansion: A Reading of *Othello*". *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* Vol. 23 (2011): 21-29. *EBSCOhost*. Web 9 August 2013.

8. Abstract

This thesis aims to present a reading of three plays by William Shakespeare from the perspective of postcolonial literary studies. The plays selected for analysis in this context, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Tempest*, and *Othello*, can be read with regard to certain stereotypes about the Other. Each play is analysed from the perspective of postcolonial criticism mainly through an exploration of markers of difference it contains, such as speech, race, religion, and gender. The first play discussed in the paper, *Othello*, is viewed in terms of early modern European anxieties about race and religion, focusing on the stereotype of a dark foreign man and its perceptions among Shakespeare's contemporary audience. The second play considered in this paper, *Antony and Cleopatra*, explores the stereotype of a dark non-European woman and the threatening, gender-reversing aspect of Oriental femininity. The third play discussed is *The Tempest*, which is analysed in terms of the Wild Man/noble savage stereotype, as well as its exploration of a very particular relationship between a master-coloniser and his subjects. Conclusions about social, political, and cultural ideologies of early modern Europe are reached by examining particular sets of stereotypes of Otherness that are reflected in the three plays, with the help of reinscriptions by eminent postcolonial literary scholars.

Keywords: gender, ideology, Otherness, postcolonialism, race.