

PORTRAYAL OF THE SUBALTERN IN *THE TEMPEST*

By

Sadman Rafid

23263012

A thesis submitted to the Department of English and Humanities in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in English

The Department of English and Humanities
BRAC University
October 2025

© 2025. Sadman Rafid
All rights reserved.

Declaration

It is hereby declared that,

1. The thesis submitted is my/our own original work while completing degree at BRAC University.

2. The thesis does not contain material previously published or written by a third party, except where this is appropriately cited through full and accurate referencing.

3. The thesis does not contain material which has been accepted, or submitted, for any other degree or diploma at a university or other institution.

4. I have acknowledged all main sources of help.

Student's Full Name & Signature:

Sadman Rafid
23263012

Approval

The thesis/project titled “Portrayal of the Subaltern in *The Tempest*” submitted by Sadman Rafid (23263012) of Summer 2025 has been accepted as satisfactory in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in English on November 16, 2025.

Examining Committee:

Supervisor:
(Member)

Sabiha Huq, PhD
Professor, Department of English, and Humanities
BRAC University

Departmental Head:
(Chair)

Professor Firdaus Azim
Chairperson, Department of English, and Humanities
BRAC University

Abstract

The paper discusses the representation of subalterns in *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare, paying special attention to the silencing of the voices of lower classes and women. Caliban is the colonised and silent figure, and Miranda is the only woman in the play who is dominated and manipulated and used by her father, Prospero. By these characters, Shakespeare reveals how the ruling class possesses power and uses it over them. To explore this, the study uses Marxist feminism to bring out the connection between the oppression of classes and gender. The stance of Miranda reveals the fact that women are made property both in the patriarchal and the class hierarchy. The theory of power by Michel Foucault elaborates further on how power can work not only by rulers but also by knowledge and language, as well as everyday practices. This manipulation, though unobtrusive, is shown in the fact that Prospero has power over magic, education, and speech. Another politics that is present in the play is that of the upper classes, where Prospero as the representative of the ruling elite, can continue to dominate through silencing the voices of the subalterns, such as Caliban and Miranda. Instead of being passive victims, their struggles also demonstrate how power marginalises and erases the bottom. After all, *The Tempest* can be seen as much more than a magical story and as a text that dramatizes the silencing of the subaltern. This study argues that Shakespeare's play should be read as a critique of how power, class, and gender intersect to suppress marginalised voices, especially those of colonised subjects and women.

Keywords: Subaltern, Postcolonialism, Marxist, Feminism, Patriarchy.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my parents, whose love, support, and guidance have been the foundation of everything I have achieved. They have always believed in me, encouraged me to chase my dreams, and taught me the value of hard work and perseverance. Through every challenge and triumph, they have stood by my side, offering strength and wisdom. This journey would not have been possible without their sacrifices and constant motivation. Thank you for your endless love and for always inspiring me to do my best. This is for you, and I am forever grateful.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Allah the Almighty first for giving me the perseverance with which I can complete my thesis without being hindered by the obstacles and setbacks I have faced through the approach. I am grateful to my honourable supervisor Sabiha Huq for her support. She gave me a tremendous amount of freedom for how I would manage my dissertation but also provided much needed support and encouragement when I was struggling with obstacles and was in dilemma about whether or I could not even finish working on my paper. I would also like to thank the other faculties of BRACU, my friends and relatives who have all supported me in my time of need and motivated me to keep going forward.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	ii
Approval	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Table of Contents	vii
Chapter 1	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	3
1.2 Background	3
1.3 Rationale	4
1.4 Research Questions.....	4
1.5 Theoretical Framework.....	5
1.6 Literature Review	7
1.6.1 Postcolonial Readings and the Subaltern	11
1.6.2 Feminist Theory and the Silence of Miranda	14
1.6.3 Foucault's Power and Surveillance in Prospero's Rule	15
1.6.4 Class and Upper-Class Politics in the Play	16
1.6.5 Summary of the Literature Review	19
1.6.6 Caliban and the Colonial Other: A Deeper Postcolonial Debate	19
1.6.7 Miranda and the Gendered Subaltern in Literature.....	21
1.6.8 Ariel: Freedom, Service, and the Invisible Worker.....	21
1.6.9 <i>The Tempest</i> as a Mirror of the Real World	22
1.7 Methodology	23
1.8 Scope and limitations.....	26
1.9 Conclusion	27
Chapter 2	28
Analysis and Discussion.....	28
2.1 Caliban as a Character	28
2.2 Caliban's Role in <i>The Tempest</i> and Postcolonial Theory	31
2.2.1 Caliban as a Subaltern	32

2.2.2 Caliban and the Earth	33
2.2.3 Caliban, Rebellion and Ridicule	33
2.2.4 Humanity and Dehumanization of Caliban.....	34
2.2.5 Caliban in the History of Criticism	34
2.2.6 Caliban and Intersectionality.....	35
2.3 Miranda's Role in <i>The Tempest</i>	35
2.3.1 Miranda as Interpreted by Feminists	36
2.3.2 The Subaltern Theory of Miranda and Spivak.....	37
2.3.3 Miranda and her Goodness and Bounds	37
2.3.4 Miranda and Caliban	38
2.3.5 Miranda and Getting Married.....	38
2.3.6 Miranda's Quietness	39
2.3.7 Miranda on Critical Tradition.....	39
2.3.8 The collocation of gender with class.....	39
2.4 Sycorax's Absence in the Play	40
2.4.1 Spivak's Subaltern Woman.....	41
2.4.2 The Power of Sycorax and Prospero	41
2.4.3 Sycorax as a Mother	42
2.4.4 Sycorax and Gendered Authority.....	42
2.4.5 Sycorax's Critical Neglect	43
2.4.6 Reflecting on Sycorax in a different light.	43
2.4.7 Sycorax as the Vanished Subaltern	44
2.5 Ariel's Part in <i>The Tempest</i>	44
2.5.1 Ariel and Colonial Authority	45
2.5.2 Power/Knowledge by Ariel and Foucault.....	45
2.5.3 Ariel's Need for Freedom	46
2.5.4 Ariel and Uncertainty	46
2.5.5 Ariel in Relation to Caliban	47
2.5.6 Ariel's Poetic Voice	47
2.5.7 Ariel's Last Freedom	48
2.5.8 Important Responses to Ariel	48
2.5.9 Ariel as an Ambivalent Subaltern	48
Chapter 3	50

Analysis	50
3.1 Caliban: Class and Colonialism.....	50
3.2 Miranda: Gender and Patriarchy within the Class Privilege.	50
3.3 Sycorax: Sex and the Postcolonial Unwritten.	50
3.4 Ariel, Obedience, Colonialism, and Class.....	51
3.5 Prospero: The Cross-Sectional Master	51
3.6 Being Quiet Together.....	52
3.7 Gaps in Previous Criticism	52
3.8 Intersectionality in <i>The Tempest</i>.....	53
3.9 Why We Should Read <i>The Tempest</i> again.	53
3.10 Caliban in the Modern World	53
3.11 Miranda in Contemporary Feminist Interpretations.....	54
3.12 Getting Sycorax Back	55
3.13 Freedom and Ariel.....	55
3.14 The Contemporary World and Prospero	55
3.15 <i>The Tempest</i> and Countries After Colonialism	56
3.16 Intersectionality and Present Discourse.....	56
3.17 <i>The Tempest</i>: Performance and Adaptation	57
3.18 Lasting Importance.....	57
3.19 Conclusion of Analysis.....	58
Chapter 4	60
Further Discussion	60
4.1 Responding to the Research Enquiries	60
4.2 Original Contributions	60
4.3 Wider Importance.....	61
4.4 Summary of the analysis	62
Chapter 5	64
Conclusion	64
Works Cited.....	68

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Tempest will show that there is a clear claim about power and voice: those in charge decide who gets to speak in a way that matters on the island, and this rule is kept in place by teaching, naming, watching, and carefully planned promises. Some people will say that the play is not just a sweet story about forgiveness. Instead, it shows a small world where different kinds of power work together such as power of empire over natives, power of men over women, and power of rich people over poor people and these powers shape what words can do. It will be shown that Caliban represents an individual of limited power as he lived on the island before until he is labelled a “monster” and a “slave,” thereby reducing his legitimate claim to the land as just noise. This illustrates that spoken words can be accepted but considered invalid. It will be shown that Miranda is used to show how a daughter's voice can be staged and limited at the same time. This is because her words of kindness and love are shared as part of a plan made by her father to join two high families. This shows that gentle speech can still serve higher control. It will be shown that Ariel is used to show how service and watching can guide other people without open force because his songs and reports are valued most when they help Prospero keep order as this proves that quiet tools like music, lessons, and secret eyes can hold great power. It will be shown that Sycorax is used to prove the deepest kind of silence since her story is told only by her enemies and her own voice is never given. This proves that a person can be fully removed from the record by being spoken about but never allowed to speak. It will be argued that Prospero is the one who teaches, names, rewards, and forgives and that these actions are used to guide the words and actions of others so that control looks natural. This shows that language and knowledge can be used as tools of rule. It will be shown that the major scenes of the play such as Caliban's lessons, Miranda's instructions, Ariel's songs and the

arranged romance with Ferdinand which are not random occurrences but rather components of a singular design which organizes voices into an order where certain words follow others. People will say that the island is like a test room for real life where people learn and practice ideas about being "civil," "obedient," or "noble" until they seem right. This is why some speakers are trusted and others are doubted. The ending, which looks calm and kind, will be used to show how elite order can be restored without raising those who are below it. This shows that calm words can hide painful losses and that a return to the old home can be built on the silence of others. It will be shown that, upon careful reading of the play about fundamental inquiries such as who speaks, who listens, who decides meaning and the consistent response is power that selects the significant voices. This answer will be clearer if the text is looked at the lines about empire, gender, and class all together instead of separating them. This is because the same pattern can be seen in each case: names are given, lessons are set, promises are made, and words from below are bent to fit the story told from above. A simple idea of "people with little power" often called the "subaltern" will be enough to guide this reading. These people are the ones who are most often spoken for, corrected, or erased. This shows that the play does not just show one type of silence but many types working together. It will be argued that the play itself warns that those who own the books and the stage can collect and shape voices and that any attempt to "recover" a lost voice must face that risk as this shows that care must be taken when making claims about what the quiet characters "really say." The thesis aims not to refute beauty or label the play as only unjust, but to show its basic controlling voice where words are evaluated according to status, familial intentions and historical claims of rank, a standard maintained even in a peaceful tone. By following this rule through Caliban, Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax, it will be shown that power affects speech in the play in a way that explains why some calls for fairness are ignored while others have a lot of power. The proof will be based on simple steps: reading scenes carefully, paying close attention to who speaks and under what

terms, and comparing characters carefully. These steps will support the main claim without the need for special or hard words. It will be argued that the play's lessons about voice and control still matter outside the stage because schools, courts, homes, and workplaces also decide who gets heard and how meaning is fixed but the use of present life here serves only to show why the question is serious, while the proof stays with the text itself. In short, it will be shown that *The Tempest* shows that speech in the play is not free or equal but is controlled by power that Caliban's bold lines, Miranda's tender lines, Ariel's sweet lines, and Sycorax's missing lines all point to one system and that the peace at the end is built by restoring high order while leaving low voices where they were. The thesis will show that the heart of the play is not just storms and magic but also the quieter magic of controlling words who can speak, who can hear and what their speech can mean. This will be done by making the case in clear language and sticking to the scenes where the rule is most clear.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This thesis will explore how *The Tempest* shows the silencing of the subaltern, especially the woman, Marxist feminism, Spivak's theory, Michel Foucault's ideas on power and the influence of upper-class politics. Using examples from the text and research from scholars, we will try to understand how Shakespeare's play speaks about control and silence and whether the subaltern can truly speak in this story or not.

1.2 Background

The Tempest, written by William Shakespeare, is regarded as a wonderful and enigmatic play about an island, a disaster, and a strong magician named Prospero. Upon closer inspection, we discover that it is also a tale about silence, power, control, and the voices of those who are unable to speak for themselves. It has a significant message of control, power, and silence. In this thesis, the author explores the representation of the subaltern in *The Tempest*, the

underprivileged individuals that are often ignored or unheard. It speaks of a powerful message of control, power, and silence.

1.3 Rationale

This research paper is aimed at describing the importance of researching the subaltern in *The Tempest* and it also seeks to justify why this study is required. Human beings have been discussing Shakespeare's play over several centuries, but in most circumstances, they have been concerned with magic, politics, or make-up. During the past decades, there has been a shift towards colonial and postcolonial interpretations by critics, especially focusing on Caliban as a symbol of colonised people. Feminist critics have also indicated the way Miranda is silenced in a male-run society. However, such conversations are often conducted separately, as though there is no relationship between colonial power and gender power.

The paper is important because it brings these streams of criticism together under the umbrella of subaltern studies. The studies investigate the regulations of silence and voice under the prism of Gayatri Spivak, Michel Foucault, Postcolonial theory, and Marxist feminism by underlining colonial power, gender, and class. The practical reason is also that we learn how characters such as Caliban, Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax are muted in literature, and this is what makes us realise how real people are muted in society. Literature does not exist in isolation of life, and the play is always a reflection of real problems of inequality, dominance and seeking approval. This work, thus, enhances not only Shakespearean criticism but also general arguments on the topic of colonialism, patriarchy and subalternity.

1.4 Research Questions

The paper is informed by four research questions. The initial question concerns the way *The Tempest* brings to the fore the subaltern characters such as Caliban and Miranda. The second question describes the way Prospero employs power, language, and knowledge to

dominate people. The third question explores the concept of how theories like Marxist feminism and the subaltern studies of Gayatri Spivak can enable us to understand Miranda and Caliban. The last question enquires the contribution of the class, gender, and colonial history to the silencing of these characters.

1.5 Theoretical Framework

There are four approaches that are united by the theoretical framework of the study. These are the postcolonial theory, subaltern theory of Spivak, Marxist feminism and theory of power and knowledge of Foucault. All the theories establish another angle and combine them to build a solid body of information for the play analysis.

Postcolonial theory examines the impact of colonization on people, cultures, and literature. In *The Tempest*, Prospero is often seen as a colonizer who claims control over an island that was once ruled by Sycorax and lived on by Caliban. Caliban, in turn, becomes a symbol of the colonized subject as his land taken, his language forced upon him, and his resistance dismissed as monstrous. Postcolonial theory helps explain why Caliban's voice is not respected, why he is labelled a "monster," and how the play reflects colonial attitudes.

Spivak's subaltern theory offers another important reading. The subaltern, Spivak theorizes, is a subject who cannot speak openly within the spaces of power. If they can speak, they are not heard or if heard, misrepresented. We can view here how Miranda and Caliban are subaltern subjects. Caliban is addressed and treated as barbarous, Miranda is addressed and confined in the roles of daughter and wife. Sycorax is the final subaltern who is utterly silenced and remembered only in Prospero's rageful speech. Spivak's question, "Can the subaltern speak?" rings in one's head throughout the play. Marxist feminism is a fusion of the ideas of Marxism which prioritizes class and economic oppression and feminism which prioritizes gender oppression. Marxist feminism argues against the supposition that women and

particularly poor women are doubly oppressed both by class and patriarchy. Although Miranda is a noblewoman, by birth she has no power. Her destiny is determined by her father, and even her love for Ferdinand is determined under Prospero's power.

Marxist feminism assists us in realizing why Miranda's obedience and silence are not only her character but signs of larger social patterns that quieten women. Foucault's concept regarding power and knowledge is also fundamental to this study. Foucault once believed that power is never always exercised by violence but increasingly by control of knowledge, schooling, and surveillance. Words and education are as powerful for Prospero in *The Tempest* as his sorcery. He commands people, leads them by their mouths, and has authority without always using brute strength.

Foucault's theory of power and knowledge provides an effective framework for analysing Prospero's control over Ariel, Miranda, and Caliban in *The Tempest*. Foucault claims that power exceeds just physical control, being intricately connected to the creation and control of knowledge. Prospero uses his vast knowledge, particularly of magic and language to control others in the play. He tells each character what they know that how they know it and when they can use that knowledge. Ariel, a spirit who is bound to serve Prospero and he learns certain tasks and gets information that only helps Prospero. Ariel is promised freedom but only if he obeys which shows how knowledge can be used to control what people want and do. In the same way, Miranda's father's teachings limit her understanding of the world; she only knows what Prospero lets her know which keeps her dependent and obedient. Prospero controls Caliban through language as well since he teaches him the language of his oppressor. Caliban claims his ownership of the island, but Prospero hides his knowledge by describing him a "savage," thereby leaving his understanding of the island's natural world irrelevant. Foucault's theory shows how Prospero's control over language, knowledge, and the flow of information

not only takes away these characters' freedom but also builds up the island's power structures. Prospero strengthens his power and keeps a system where resistance is low, and compliance is high by controlling what each character knows and what they can say.

Together, the four theories provide a good foundation upon which this thesis can examine the play from more than one side. Rather than examining colonialism, gender, or power separately, the theories are blended to demonstrate how these forces converge and support one another.

1.6 Literature Review

The way of how *The Tempest* can be read to find the deeper meanings and more complicated themes is a long-standing debate of scholars. On the surface of it, the play is a mere tale of magic, destruction, and eventual reconciliation. The novel starts off with the magical storm by Prospero which invites a party of elites into the island. It ends with forgiveness, atonement, and restoration of order. Most scholars believe that Shakespeare uses the play to ask some important questions about power, silence, authority, and interpersonal relationships. The play reflects bigger struggles in society regarding the freedom of expression, muzzling and how power systems can control and suppress expression. *The Tempest* can be regarded as the examination of the advantages and disadvantages of self-expression and silence and how to establish, defend and resist the authorities.

Two postcolonial critics, Ania Loomba and Stephen Greenblatt, have said a lot about Caliban and the meaning that he represents as a symbol of the colonised subject. These critics refer to the fact that Caliban has contacts with Prospero and takes part in the play to demonstrate that the relationships between the colonialists can be very complex and conflict filled. People believe that the language of Caliban is an important pointer of colonial oppression since it alternates fighting and surrendering. He swears and claims that he owns the island, yet on other

occasions he must speak a language that he did not choose. The conflict reveals the hypocritical nature of colonisation where the colonised person is mostly compelled to learn the language and lifestyles of his or her oppressors as he or she struggles to maintain his or her identity. The fact that Caliban is a colonised person is an essential element when it comes to the issues of race, empire, and the aftermath of colonialism. Paul Brown goes as far as to claim that *The Tempest* is consciously adhering to the logic of imperialism in that Prospero is the civilising power and Caliban the savage, which justifies the attitude of colonialism. In this perspective the struggle and resistance of Caliban is an indication of a continuous struggle of approval and the ill impacts of colonisation.

Another primary character, which has been addressed by feminist researchers, is Miranda. As an illustration, Lorie Jerrell Leininger claims that Miranda appears innocent, but this does not hold water since it conceals the fact that she is not even aware of who she is. Miranda is perceived as the embodiment of purity and virtue by people, but this picture is limited by patriarchy that views Miranda as a daughter that needs to be taken care of and a wife that needs to be sold in a political marriage. The character of Miranda brings out the role of patriarchal systems that do not allow women to speak up. The language she uses is framed and restricted by the males that surround her and her father, Prospero. Other commentators also have observed instances in which Miranda was against this silence. As she describes Ferdinand how she thinks about him, we are left wondering whether there are times that she truly has power and choice, or she is just doing what her father wants her to do. It might seem that Miranda is the one who feels love and desire, but it is the larger patriarchal structures that shape her life. The conflict between submissiveness and opposition qualifies the interpretation of the character of Miranda as a more intricate approach to the role of women in civilizations with patriarchy.

Two other characters in *The Tempest* that have not received as much attention as they deserved are Ariel and Sycorax, who are equally important when discussing subalternity and silence. Other individuals perceive Ariel, the spirit hired by Prospero as a loyal man who can only be free when he serves Prospero. Ariel is not fully loyal to Prospero, and he cannot be free unless he fulfils what he promised to fulfil. The life of Ariel shows that there are individuals that can never be free unless they succumb to the strength of the dominating persons. Sycorax, however, can never appear on stage, yet her absence is as important as her presence. Sycorax is represented as the exiled and mute colonial woman, and her narrative is only explicated by the speech of Prospero, which makes her look like a powerful and malevolent witch. Peter Hulme argues that the ousting of Sycorax off the stage is concomitant with the non-presence of women, specifically colonised women, in history, and the narratives that constitute their legacies. Her silencing highlights the aspects of colonial and patriarchal power that marginalise and diminish the voices, especially those of the women and the colonised people.

The issues of power, language, and silence in the play have been discussed using various theoretical frameworks that explain why there are intricate relations between Caliban, Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax. The theories of power and knowledge by Michel Foucault offer a significant basis of grasping how Prospero sustains his power over the characters, particularly, on how he manages to control the language and information. Foucault assumed that power does not only deal with physical control but also with control over knowledge and the use of this knowledge in organising the society. In *The Tempest*, Prospero takes advantage of his knowledge in magic and language to control the people in his world. He sets himself to be the most significant individual in command. He determines what Ariel is capable of, the way Miranda is taught, and the way Caliban thinks of himself. Prospero remains in authority and dominates order in the island through domination of knowledge. The study of subaltern studies that was advanced by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, helps to explain why characters like

Caliban and Sycorax fail to express themselves in a way that makes sense to the existing discourse. The question that Spivak poses is, Can the subaltern speak? is directly applicable to the characters of *The Tempest*, whose voices are either muted by the mighty or non-existent in the narrative. Finally, Marxist feminism introduces a new dimension of analysis by connecting the slavery of Caliban to the more prominent issues of class, work, and exploitation. The fact that Caliban was a labourer on the island and his relationship with Prospero demonstrates larger issues to do with class and labour in a capitalist society.

The research on the play is sufficient, but there are still gaps in the study. Most of the commentators do not consider the impact of colonialism and gender on the life of such characters as Caliban and Miranda. Instead, they consider them to be two different things. Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax are usually not considered in postcolonial and feminist studies, with Caliban and Prospero remaining the primary protagonists. Miranda is viewed as one who does little, but the same is not the case with Ariel and Sycorax who are viewed as either loyal servants or non-existent. Nevertheless, these characters have other forms of subalternity that should be examined. These silences of these characters should not be ignored instead, they should be viewed as complicated forms of survival, resistance, or erasure. When humans discuss silence, they often consider it in a one-dimensional manner without really giving much thought to how such instances of silence can mean more when it comes to the power dynamics of the play.

This analysis aims at filling these gaps by incorporating postcolonial and feminist concepts into the subaltern studies. This thesis aims to discuss the complex aspects of subalternity by analysing the voices of disadvantage in *The Tempest*. Caliban, Miranda, Sycorax and Ariel are the examples of several types of subalternity; some of them speak but are not heard, others speak but are limited in their speech, and others do not talk at all. The

paper will contribute to the study of the topics of power, quiet and resistance in *The Tempest* through the collective analysis of the characters as opposed to individual. The approach demonstrates that the structure of the story and the relationships of the characters in the play allow taking an in-depth look at the way in which colonialism, patriarchy, and class oppression interrelate and show how these systems of power operate within the play and in real life. This thesis will seek to explain the many strata of power that influence human relationships in the play by incorporating these characters and thus revealing how silence and speech are manipulated, opposed, and negotiated.

1.6.1 Postcolonial Readings and the Subaltern

Postcolonial theory is one of the most important concepts to understand *The Tempest*. This theory helps us to think about how literature explores about colonialism which indicates the way how powerful European countries took land, freedom, and voices from people in other parts of the world. In *The Tempest*, Prospero acts like a European colonizer and Caliban becomes a symbol of the people who were ruled, controlled, and silenced. Many scholars say that the play tells the story of what happens when one group takes power from another just like in real life colonization.

Caliban is often described in a negative way. In the play people call him a “monster” and treat him like he is inferior to human. This is what happened in real life also that colonizers treated native people as wild or dangerous to control them. But Caliban is not only an animal but also, he has thoughts and feelings, and he tells us:

“This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak’st from me.” (Act I, Scene II)

Caliban here is making an important claim. He is telling him that the island is his and his mother before Prospero arrived at the island. He does not simply talk but he is making a point about politics. He desires to possess his territory and his privileges. However, no one in the

play hears him. Rather, Prospero handles what he is saying as hazardous. This is an indication of how the voices of the pushed down are usually disregarded by those in power.

This can be explained with the assistance of the ideas of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Spivak uses the essay *Can the Subaltern Speak* to discuss the individuals at the bottom of the power structure. She calls them "subalterns." They are not only poor or different but also, they are not free to speak. When they attempt to speak or alter what has been said they do not listen even those in power. This is what befalls Caliban. He has lines in the play. He talks. He argues. But his words are mocked, twisted, or turned against him. His voice is never actually taken seriously.

Even the language he uses is part of the problem also. Prospero taught Caliban to speak. But instead of helping him, this language becomes a tool to control him. Prospero says:

"I pitied thee, / Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour / One thing or other."
(Act I, Scene II)

This makes it sound like Prospero was kind to Caliban. But Caliban replies in anger:

"You taught me language; and my profit on't / Is I know how to curse."

This shows how painful the "gift" of language really was. Caliban did not gain power from learning to speak. He was forced to speak in the colonizer's way. The only thing he learned was how to curse the people who control him. This is remarkably close to the concept what Spivak explains when the subaltern learns the language of the ruler, and they lose a part of their own identity. Their voice no longer feels true. It becomes a copy of the ruler's voice.

Many scholars agree with this view. Peter Hulme, in his book *"Colonial Encounters"* (1986), says that Caliban looks exactly like the way European colonizers described native people as wild, untrustworthy, and full of bad desires. Hulme says that when Caliban fights

back and then Prospero sees it as proof that Caliban is not civil. But Caliban is just resisting unfair treatment. Ania Loomba, in her book “*Colonialism/Postcolonialism*” (1992), also talks about this. She says that Caliban is like the native people in the Caribbean and the Americas. When European countries went there then they used stories like *The Tempest* to show that they were “helping” but they were taking control. Caliban’s story shows how this lie works.

We are also reminded by Loomba that Shakespeare wrote *The Tempest* sometime in 1610. This was only some few years after England established its first colony in North America, Jamestown, in 1607. So, people were watching the play at that time. They had in mind these new colonies. The play Island depicts weird individuals and unfamiliar locations. They also resembled closely the actual colonies which England was starting to establish.

This is discussed by another author Deborah Willis in her essay *Shakespeare Tempest and the Discourse of Colonialism* (1989). She says that the relation between Prospero and Caliban is not built on equality and cooperation. It is based on control. Prospero is such that he treats the island as his property. He applies tricks, pain, and clever language to ensure that no one doubts his authority. Caliban is not an evil character, but he is simply a person who is attempting to be a free one. But the story will not let him win. He is trapped in the world where his voice does not count. Caliban also attempts to rebel by uniting with Stephano and Trinculo who are two foolish and drunken figures who arrive in the island. Caliban believes that they can assist him to dispose Prospero. But this is only an indication of how poor his situation is. He has no good choices. He simply shifts one master to another. Stephano and Trinculo do not have much concern over him. They laugh at him too. This section of the story reveals that colonised individuals tend to attempt to flee yet get caught in another form of subjugation. They do not find real freedom. This is yet another illustration of what Spivak implies by subalterns. They are talking in circles that are never going to listen to them.

The Tempest Island is a miniature of an empire. It is governed by a white European man who talks smart, employs magic and religion to remain in power. He determines who toils, who talks, and who is liberated. Caliban is not merely a single man, but he represents the entire population in the world that has been treated in such a manner. His narrative demonstrates how it hurts to be muted. His voice is a real one, but it is never permitted to alter anything. Other readers believe that *The Tempest* is a magical story of forgiveness. However, in a postcolonial perspective it is far darker. It demonstrates the fact that power conceals itself behind pleasant expressions. It demonstrates how those who are most injured are the ones who do not have right to speak. Their voices are not handled with respect even when they wish to speak.

In the end, a postcolonial reading helps us see the truth behind the play specially when we use Spivak's theory. Caliban speaks clearly. He tells us that the island was his. He tells us that learning language only helped him curse. But no matter what he says. The people in charge ignore him. This is the real meaning of being subaltern, being there, being real, but not being heard. And this idea still matters today. Around the world, many people are still struggling to have their voices heard. Caliban's story reminds us to listen to those voices that have been silenced.

1.6.2 Feminist Theory and the Silence of Miranda

Caliban represents the voice of the colonized while Miranda embodies another form of silence as the silence of women in a male-dominated world. Feminist critics have often questioned why Miranda speaks so little in *The Tempest* and why her choices are continually controlled by her father. Despite being a noblewoman, Miranda is not free she lives entirely under Prospero's control and is isolated from the world around her. She has no contact with other women and the first man she meets besides her father is Ferdinand, who later becomes her husband. Her famous line, "O wonder! What numbers here of goodly creatures! / How

beauteous mankind is! O fair new world / That thus of people hast't! The play (Act V, Scene I) helps to emphasise her innocence and her inexperience. She is amazed and admires the outside world, in which she has never had the opportunity to explore.

Using Marxist feminism, we can understand the situation of Miranda more closely. Scholars like Sylvia Walby and Chandra Talpade Mohanty argue that women's oppression is connected to class systems. In this view, Miranda is not just a woman, but she is a tool used by men which is firstly by her father and then by her future husband. She is "given" to Ferdinand to form political alliances. Her thoughts and feelings are not important to the larger plan.

In Spivak's theory, Miranda also highlights the idea of a subaltern. She is allowed to speak but only in ways that serve her father's goals. Her voice is not her own. Scholars like Coppelia Kahn in her article "Miranda and the Problem of the Feminine Voice in *The Tempest*" explain that Miranda is a symbol of purity, but she is not allowed to be a person with agency. She is there to complete the image of a perfect daughter but not to make choices or challenge power.

1.6.3 Foucault's Power and Surveillance in Prospero's Rule

One of the most interesting ways to understand Prospero's control in *The Tempest* is through the work of Michel Foucault and specially his ideas about knowledge, surveillance, and discipline. Foucault said that the strongest kind of power is not physical violence but the power that works through observation, education, and language. He used the term "panopticon" to explain how people change their behaviour when they feel they are being watched all the time. Prospero uses his spirit servant Ariel to spy on everyone. Ariel becomes the secret invisible eye who reports on what people do and speak. Consequently, Prospero is in constant possession of what is going on even in his absence. This gives the illusion of mental control

the way people act not because they are afraid of being punished but because they believe they are being monitored.

Foucault also shared the view that control is also through language and naming. Prospero refers to Caliban as a beast or savage which means that he is establishing an identity of Caliban that he cannot easily get out of. People begin to believe the labels they are given. Miranda is also given names like “virtue” and “obedient daughter,” which shows how she behaves. These words are not just descriptions they are instructions. Scholars like Meredith Anne Skura (1989) discusses how Prospero’s magic is not just a fantasy. It represents the European obsession with knowledge and classification which was used during colonial times to divide people into categories and justify control.

1.6.4 Class and Upper-Class Politics in the Play

Another central theme explored in literary discussions of *The Tempest* is the idea of class and how upper-class politics are maintained even on an island far away from traditional society. Though the island has no official government or laws but the way power is managed arises a deep hierarchical class system concept. Former Duke of Milan, Prospero, does not give up his sense of royalty. He continues to act like a ruler and expects obedience as well as gives orders and treatments to others according to their social rank. This suggests that class power does not disappear even when social structures are removed it finds new ways to survive and show itself. Prospero’s actions on the island show how upper-class individuals maintain their authority through relationships based on class, status, and control. For example, Caliban is treated as a slave because he is a native of the island and is seen as uncivilized. Prospero constantly reminds him of his lower place in society even though it is Caliban who originally knew and lived on the island. Prospero says:

“Thou most lying slave, whom stripes may move, not kindness.” (Act I, Scene II)

This line shows how Prospero sees Caliban as someone who can only be controlled through punishment which is a belief that reflects old ideas about lower-class and colonized people being unworthy of gentle treatment or respect. Caliban's low class, race, and lack of power tend to keep him under Prospero's control.

Ariel is also a servant but not because he is lazy or disobedient but because he is non-human. Prospero uses promises of freedom to keep Ariel working but this freedom is always delayed. From a class perspective, Ariel is like a worker who must depend on the employer's word having no real bargaining power. Ariel's hopes are stopped to Prospero's goodwill but not to any rights or equal status. This shows how the upper class often keeps control by offering rewards that are always just out of reach. Though Miranda is Prospero's daughter and of noble birth, but she is also used in political ways. She is kept in the dark about her past and taught only what her father wants. As she is eventually promised in marriage to Ferdinand, it is not for love alone but to create social and political connections. Prospero says to Ferdinand:

"Then, as my gift and thine own acquisition / Worthily purchased, take my daughter." (Act IV, Scene I)

This quote shows that Miranda is being given as a reward-like property or land. Her emotions are not the main concern her marriage is used to build alliances and restore Prospero's status. Even though Miranda is noble by birth but her position as a woman places her below men in the power structure. This highlights how class politics are not just about wealth or title, but they are also shaped by gender. The nobles who land on the island including Alonso, Antonio, and Sebastian are also treated differently than Caliban or Ariel. Even though they committed wrongs in the past like Antonio stealing Prospero's dukedom, they are not punished in the same way. Prospero forgives them for not to show kindness but to restore his own political position. His forgiveness is a strategy. It assists him to rejoin Milan with his energy

and fame. It is an indication of how the superior class defends itself even in instances of betrayal.

This is a clear image of how the ruling class manages to survive and restructure even after being ousted in office according to Marxist point of view. Prospero does not resort to the methods of violence and war to reclaim his status. Instead, he appeals to education, language, promises and emotional appeal. These are the non-coercive instruments of power. According to Marxist theorists, the ruling class does not take control of things only by owning them, but by influencing ideas and relations as well. In *The Tempest*, Prospero is the creator of the island by his words and actions. He instructs Miranda, orders Ariel, torments Caliban and even works magic and speeches to the Ferdinand and Alonso.

Such critics as Stephen Greenblatt (1988) and Paul Brown (1985) in their journals *Shakespeare Quarterly* and *Renaissance Drama* have discussed how the reign of Prospero on the island reflects Renaissance concepts of class, nobility, and political dominance. Greenblatt dwells upon the issue of cultural authority and knowledge that Prospero employs to reconstruct his social power. Brown examines the way the island turns into a place where the ideals of order and class of Europeans are not imposed by the law but rather the will of a strong person. By making Miranda his bride to Ferdinand and pardoning the other nobles, Prospero is making sure that the future will still abide to the same rules of classes as the one that took Prospero out of Milan. Caliban is forsaken; he is dumb once more. Ariel is released but it is not yet clear where he will go. Those who put an end to the play in the positions of control are the same nobles who initiated it. The implication of this is that in *The Tempest* world, there can hardly be class mobility. The individuals who are born to lower ranks because of race, nature or gender will never leave them. The only individuals that are restored or rewarded are the ones that were already in the upper class. This demonstrates that the systems of classes sustain themselves by

controlling relationships and illusion of justice. Even other scholars such as Barbara Fuchs (2001) have indicated that even the island which is expected to be a place of magic and change turns out to be a place that retains the same old power structures. The hope of freedom and equality turns out to be another step that the upper classes are to play their power.

Concisely, the politics of class and upper-class in *The Tempest* are not coincidental. They are entrenched in the plot, the characters, and the end of the play. This reading reminds that real-world class systems often work the same way. Power does not always need to fight but sometimes it only needs to speak well, forgive publicly, and marry wisely. The deeper message of *The Tempest*, from a Marxist viewpoint is that the upper class does not give up power, but it simply changes how it looks. Even on a magical island, class rules are followed, and the voices of the lower class are kept low or silenced together.

1.6.5 Summary of the Literature Review

All the scholars and theories reviewed in this chapter point to one important idea based on *The Tempest* is a play about power, silence, and control. We can understand how Shakespeare shows a world through the lenses of postcolonial theory, Marxist feminism, Foucault's power analysis, and studies of class politics where the voices of the subaltern like Caliban and Miranda are either ignored, reshaped or used for someone else's gain. The literature agrees that *The Tempest* is more than a magical story. It is a mirror of society where those in power decide who gets to speak and who must remain silent. The characters who are most silenced by race, gender or class are also the ones whose stories matter the most when still read the play today.

1.6.6 Caliban and the Colonial Other: A Deeper Postcolonial Debate

Caliban is one of the most controversial characters in the postcolonial literature. Theories have still been developed by scholars on the way in which his character in *The Tempest* reflects

the life of colonized individuals. His existence as a half-human and half-monster demonstrates the way colonizers dehumanized the native population and regarded them as savage, barbaric, and threatening.

Caliban is also a heroic figure in an essay by Roberto Fernandez Retamar titled *Caliban: Notes Towards a Discussion of Culture in Our America* (1974) where he is portrayed as a hero against colonialism. Retamar also claims that Caliban is not an antagonist, but he is a victim of robbery and culture. He speaks a language that Prospero taught him but instead of being thankful he is angry. Retamar suggests that Caliban's curse and rebellion show the anger of colonized people who were ignored of their land, language, and dignity. This concept is supported by many modern critics who believe that intentionally or not, Shakespeare was revealing the truth of European colonization. In Caliban's words readers hear a voice that represents Africa, the Americas, and the global South regions that were colonized and controlled by European powers for hundreds of years. This makes Caliban a universal subaltern not just in the play but across the history. Some critics have pointed out that Shakespeare has complicated the character of Caliban by showing him as crude, violent, and foolish. For example, he tries to serve two comic characters Stephano and Trinculo who promise him freedom. This has arisen a debate among scholars that if Caliban is only a victim or is also shown as unable to lead himself. Some argue that this weakens the idea of him being a full representative of the colonized. Besides this debate most scholars agree that Caliban is a powerful example of how native people were turned into "others" through language and storytelling just as Spivak and Foucault describe in their theories. The island is his, but he is never allowed to rule it, and his voice is never taken seriously by those in charge.

1.6.7 Miranda and the Gendered Subaltern in Literature

Miranda is often admired for her innocence and kindness. Critics have shown how her silence and obedience reflect a long history of how women have been treated in literature and life. In “The Woman’s Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare,” Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz discusses how women like Miranda are written to complete male characters’ stories except their own. Miranda is part of her father’s plan, and her marriage is used as a diplomatic strategy. She is a noblewoman but has no agency and a common trait for women in classical literature. What makes Miranda’s case unique is that her silencing is gentle. Prospero loves her and speaks kindly to her. This soft approach is part of what Foucault calls internalized power. Miranda learns to obey not out of fear but because she believes it is her role as a woman. This kind of control is deeply rooted in real-world societies where many women grow up believing that their job is to listen, support, and never to lead. Feminist scholars such as Ania Loomba and Coppelia Kahn have shown that Miranda’s character teaches us about how women’s roles in literature that reflect their place in society. Most societies have conditioned women to keep silent, be pretty, and useful to the man in the same way Miranda was. Her new brave world is not the one she discovers her voice in but the one she is offered one father to another husband without being given a chance to make her own choices. This aids us to appreciate the fact that there is an intersection between gender and class. Miranda is a good lady, but she is controlled by her gender. She is the one who is privileged and powerless. These ensure that she is another literary gendered subaltern.

1.6.8 Ariel: Freedom, Service, and the Invisible Worker

Some scholars have also looked at Ariel while much attention has been given to Caliban and Miranda. Ariel is focused as an important character in the conversation about power and freedom. Ariel is not human, but he has emotions, desires, and thoughts. He longs for freedom and serves Prospero in the hope that he will be released one day. His role reflects another kind

of subaltern figure who works willingly because of hoping for a better future. In modern society, this is like the invisible worker who follows the rules, obeys quietly, and waits patiently for rewards that may never come. Foucault's idea of discipline through hope and observation adjusts perfectly with Ariel's condition. Ariel is not punished but he is kept loyal by promises and praise.

Scholars such as Paul Brown (1985) in his article "This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine" suggest that Ariel and Caliban represent two sides of colonized labour. Caliban is the angry and rebellious slave and Ariel is the quiet, obedient servant. But both are under Prospero's control. Neither is free. Ariel also teaches us that freedom can be delayed and faded forever specially when someone else decides when you are ready. After numerous services Prospero continues telling Ariel, not yet. It is a moral on how systems of power will offer justice but leave the people waiting. The politeness and patience of Ariel do not get him immediate results but as the real-life workers can always see that their reward is never coming.

1.6.9 *The Tempest* as a Mirror of the Real World

When all these characters are united, Caliban, Miranda, Ariel, and Prospero, we start to realize that *The Tempest* is not merely a play concerning a magical island but It is a reflection of the systems of the real world, both in the epoch of Shakespeare and in our era. It shows how power works in colonial empires, in patriarchal families, in class-based societies and in institutions that control people silently. Postcolonial studies, feminist theory, and Foucauldian philosophy of scholars across different fields agree that the play exposes the hidden structures of control. Here it is the native who is called a monster and the daughter who is used for making alliance as well as the spirit who waits forever for freedom. Shakespeare presents a world where the powerful rule quietly and the powerless remain unheard. This continues today in real

societies also. Marginalized groups who are based on race, gender, class, or identity are often let to speak but not listened to. Their roles are assigned. Their voices are shut. This is exactly Spivak warned against what and what *The Tempest* shows in dramatic form.

On the contrary, we have looked at how *The Tempest* has been interpreted by scholars using modern theories of power, gender, and class. From Spivak's subaltern theory, we learn that people like Caliban and Miranda can be made silent even when they speak. From Marxist feminism, we come to understand how women like Miranda are controlled through love and class systems. Through Foucault, we find out that the knowledge, language, and observation used by Prospero form an invisible regime of control. *The Tempest* is a multidimensional play that we can read in literature as well. It is not just about magic, but it is about the real magic of power which is often hidden behind kindness, promises and silence. Prospero represents the upper class and the colonizer. Caliban and Miranda represent different forms of subalternity. One from them based on race and colonization and the other on gender and obedience. Ariel shows us the invisible worker with loyal instinct, hardworking, but never fully free. By reviewing these different scholarly perspectives, we can now move forward in the thesis to explore the detailed analysis of these themes using selected scenes and dialogue from the play and connecting them to real-world systems that continue to affect who gets to speak and who is forced to stay silent.

1.7 Methodology

Every research project must have a clear method because a method shows not only how the work is done but also why it is done in a particular way. Without a clear method, a study can lose its direction. This thesis examines the portrayal of the subaltern in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, depends on qualitative and analytical approaches. Qualitative research means working with words, ideas, and meanings rather than numbers or statistics. Analytical research

means examining the play carefully and connecting it with critical theories as well as drawing out hidden meanings. These approaches allow to read the play closely and explain how Shakespeare uses silence, voice, and power to represent figures who can be described as “subaltern.”

The research uses two types of sources: primary and secondary. The primary source is Shakespeare’s play *The Tempest* which has been read in a scholarly edition so that its text and annotations provide accurate materials for analysis. The secondary sources are the writings of critics such as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Ania Loomba’s *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*, Coppelia Kahn’s “Miranda and the Problem of the Feminine Voice in *The Tempest*”, Peter Hulme’s *Colonial Encounters*, Sylvia Walby’s *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Chandra Talpade Mohanty’s “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses”, Paul Brown’s “This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine”, Karl Marx’s *The Communist Manifesto*, Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* as well as theorists and scholars who have studied Shakespeare, colonialism, feminism, and the concept of the subaltern.

Among the most important secondary sources, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?” questions if marginalized voices can ever be truly heard. Vital insights from Ania Loomba’s *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* expose the impact of empire on literature. Peter Hulme’s *Colonial Encounters* shows a historical context for approaching Prospero’s role as a colonizer. To explain how power and knowledge can be applied to explain how power and knowledge work in insidious and invisible forms using Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish*. The importance of Marxist feminist writings is also crucial since it demonstrates the way in which the combination of the classes and gender silences women such

as Miranda. These were the works that give the background to the study. However, they also have gaps, like the fact that they do not talk enough about Miranda as a subaltern character, and they hardly discuss the absence of Sycorax. This thesis aims to fill up those gaps.

This research is based on three research methods to answer the research questions. They are close reading, thematic analysis, and character analysis. Close reading is the process of studying the words and the lines of Shakespeare very closely. It asks questions concerning the logic behind the choice of certain words, their connotations in terms of power relations, and the depiction of silence and voice. The curse that Prospero is cursed by Caliban, an example, is, in addition to being an insult, resistance to colonization. Miranda is not only romantic when she says loving words to Ferdinand but also demonstrates the lack of freedom that she has. Thematic analysis searches for lofty ideas that permeate the play. The major themes of silence and voice, power and control, class and gender, and colonialism and rebellion are studied in this thesis. These were the themes that are raised frequently in the play, and the consideration of these themes assists us in examining the play in relation to actual life. Character analysis is an aspect that concerns one character at a time. The case of Caliban as the colonized person whose language is ignored is analysed. Miranda is analysed as the stifled lady whose fate is determined by her own father. Prospero is seen as the master character with power, knowledge, and magic in his hands. Ariel has been a more contradictory subaltern who is only able to find freedom by being compliant. Sycorax plays a crucial role even though she is not present since her silence demonstrates how the colonized women are omitted in history.

The information to be used in this study will be obtained in three sources: the text of *The Tempest*, scholarly articles and books, and theoretical works of the major thinkers. The play is the primary evidence whereas the secondary materials of online sources and academic

libraries offer interpretations and theoretical comments. The sources were selected because they directly answer questions of colonialism, gender, class, and silence.

This is an effective way of doing this since to discover the latent meanings in literature one must read it closely and carefully. The thing is to repeat the story, but it must be done critically by connecting the play with the larger issues in society. The thesis builds up the superficial plot of shipwreck, magic, and reconciliation, by bringing close reading and robust theoretical frameworks together, thus expounding why *The Tempest* reflects colonialism, patriarchy, and class difference.

All these theories bring their unique approach to the problem, with postcolonial theory explaining how Caliban is represented, the subaltern theory by Spivak explaining why Miranda and Sycorax do not speak, the concepts of Foucault discussing how Prospero can govern people through knowledge, and the Marxist feminist theory relating the state of Miranda to the broader problem of women oppression. This study presents a novel and significant interpretation of Shakespeare's play through combining various approaches and focusing on frequently neglected characters.

1.8 Scope and limitations

Every research project has a particular area of study which defines the limits of its scope. This thesis simply examines Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. There are many Shakespeare plays that deal with power, magic, or gender but this study only looks at one text so that it can be fully and carefully analysed. The play centres on four characters: Caliban, Miranda, Prospero, and Ariel, with some focus on the missing character Sycorax. These characters are selected as all of them is.

effectively represent the themes of silence, power, and subalternity. The study is confined to specific theories such as postcolonial theory, Spivak's subaltern studies, Marxist feminism, and Foucault's theory of power/knowledge. Psychoanalysis and structuralism are two other theories that could be used to analyse the play, but they are not the focus of this work. The study employs *The Tempest* as the principal text and utilizes secondary sources from critics and theorists accessed via online sources. One limitation is that the study fails to offer a full historical narrative of colonialism or feminism during Shakespeare's era. Instead, it uses modern ideas to explain the play in ways that make sense today. Another limitation is that the analysis is interpretive rather than empirical as it does not utilize quantitative data or surveys but depends on critical reading and logic. Finally, the thesis does not mean to represent all potential subaltern perspectives but rather presents a singular viewpoint influenced by the selected theories.

1.9 Conclusion

Concisely, this approach examines *The Tempest* by qualitative and analytical approaches. It relies on a close reading of the text, examination of the themes and characters and assistance on four principal theories. The research questions can hardly be considered new in the context of Shakespeare studies; nevertheless, they are unique in terms of their combination of different approaches and the emphasis on some of the neglected characters, including Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax. This thesis shows how Shakespeare's play illustrates the suppression of voices and the complex relationships of power by addressing problems in prior scholarship and combining postcolonial, feminist, and subaltern perspectives.

Chapter 2

Analysis and Discussion

The goal of this chapter is to look at Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in depth through a combination of postcolonial theory, Marxist feminism, Michel Foucault's ideas about power, knowledge, and Gayatri Spivak's subaltern theory. The chapters Literature Review and the Methodology have already preconditioned this talk. The Literature Review demonstrates what other critics have written about the play and identified areas where further study is necessary such as the fact that Caliban receives less attention than Miranda, Ariel, or Sycorax. Methodology discusses how this thesis applies descriptive and analytical techniques, such as close reading, thematic analysis, and character analysis in answering the research questions. All those tools will be applied in this chapter.

This chapter is the most significant chapter of the thesis since it passes through the theory up to the actual analysis of the text. It addresses *The Tempest* at length, citing lines, examining scenes, and relating them to such broad themes of silence, power, and resistance. It is not only about Caliban and Prospero even though they have received much criticism. Rather, it further examines Miranda, Ariel and Sycorax who are usually omitted in critical analyses or only briefly covered. In this chapter, the author demonstrates that it is not only a single character that displays subalternity in the play. Instead, it has demonstrated through multiple characters, whose voices are either suppressed, deleted or coerced into submission.

2.1 Caliban as a Character

In the play, the most evident example of colonial oppression is Caliban, which is why the discussion begins with him. He has been dubbed by many critics as the Other which translates to mean that he is the native of the island whose land has been usurped and whose language has been replaced by that of the colonizer. In this regard, the postcolonial theory is

especially relevant because it explains the portrayal of Caliban as a savage and the mockery or ridicule of his opposition. In this chapter, the author explores Caliban as a subject of subaltern studies by demonstrating how Caliban is not only colonised but also excluded to play a significant role in the life of the human community. His voice is heard by people, but they do not pay attention to it. This is an indicator of the subaltern state.

The chapter then moves on to Miranda, who at first seems innocent and powerless but her role shows how patriarchal systems keep women quiet. Miranda is a lady of high bloodline, but she cannot choose what she wants to do. Her father has power over her life, what she says and even who she marries. Marxist feminism makes Miranda's situation clear that she may be from a wealthy family, but her gender means that she cannot speak up. Spivak's ideas apply here too because Miranda's speech is always shaped by what her father says. She can talk but only within certain limits.

Sycorax is the third character who is not on stage at all, but she is especially important to the study of subalternity. Sycorax does not speak for herself as her story is only told through Prospero's frustrated descriptions. This shows Spivak's idea that the subaltern woman cannot express her voice, as her existence has been forgotten by the voice of the colonizer throughout history. A lot of people do not pay attention to Sycorax but this chapter says that her silence is a strong reminder of how colonized women are erased twice as once by gender and then by colonial discourse.

Ariel, the fourth character, provides us with another picture of subalternity. Ariel obeys Prospero when he claims that he is being loyal and he is employed with the hope that he would be free eventually. Ariel finds his freedom serving others whereas Caliban does not shy away to fight against it. An example of how power is exercised is through violence and consent and reward is the case of Ariel. The concepts of Foucault on discipline and surveillance are useful

in this case since they demonstrate how Prospero dominates knowledge and magic in influencing Ariel. The freedom to speak by Ariel seems to be restricted and temporary, which is another way of living as a subaltern.

Lastly, the chapter looks at Prospero himself, not as a victim but as someone who has power and knowledge. Prospero is the colonizer, the patriarch, and the intellectual authority who uses language, books, and magic to control others. He shows what Foucault refers to as the complex, invisible signs of power that function through knowledge and control rather than open violence. Previous critics have primarily characterized Prospero as a colonizer. But this chapter broadens the topic by describing him as a figure of surveillance and discipline whose authority is intricately linked to the structure of knowledge.

These character-based analyses are later used to show the connection of various systems of oppression, patriarchy, and class within the play. Previous remarks frequently considered these systems in isolation. But this chapter claims that they connect and help one another. For example, Miranda's silence cannot be simply seen as a gender issue, nor can Caliban's resistance be just seen as a colonial issue. Instead, they show how class, gender, and colonial history work together to silence voices in complicated ways.

The last parts of the chapter link this analysis to current discussions. Many people have revised *The Tempest*, like Aimé Césaire's *Une Tempête*, which imagines Caliban as a revolutionary voice for the oppressed. This chapter shows the constant importance of Shakespeare's play through the eyes of contemporary theory. The removal of subaltern voices in literature reflects the ongoing silencing in real-world contexts, displayed through colonial histories, patriarchal systems, and differences in class.

This chapter involves critical analysis of subalternity in *The Tempest* by close reading and application of critical theories. It extends beyond previous research to examine Miranda,

Ariel, and Sycorax as well as Caliban and Prospero. It depicts the intricate interaction of silence, speech, and power, offering a more detailed understanding of the interaction of the play with subaltern voices. By so doing, it addresses the research questions and addresses the gaps that were identified during the Literature Review. The subsequent paragraphs are arranged in terms of character and theme, and each discussion links up to the larger context of subaltern studies.

2.2 Caliban's Role in *The Tempest* and Postcolonial Theory

Caliban is one of the most talked about characters in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Caliban is described as different, monstrous, and uncivilized from the very first moment he steps on stage. Prospero calls him "a freckled whelp, hag-born" and later Trinculo wonders if he is "a man or a fish." This language of being an animal and being different makes Caliban different from the Europeans who come to the island. People do not treat him like a full human being they treat him like something strange, dangerous, and less than human. Because of this, Caliban is now one of the most important characters in postcolonial readings of the play. To analyse Caliban simply as a colonized creature is to stop at a connecting point. He is not only colonized but he is also subaltern. Gayatri Spivak's idea of the subaltern refers to people who cannot speak or even if they do which cannot really be heard. Caliban talks a lot in the play. He curses Prospero, sings and plans to rebel but no one listens to him, makes fun of him or changes what he says. His voice does not change things for him. Caliban exemplifies the portrayal of subaltern in Shakespeare's play.

The first and most obvious way to understand Caliban is through postcolonial theory. Ania Loomba claims that Caliban expresses the fears and misconceptions of European colonialism. The colonizer views the native as equally attractive and dangerous, essential for labour yet regarded with hatred as uncivilized. This contradiction is shown by how Prospero treats Caliban. Prospero says that at first, he was nice to Caliban and even taught him how to

Speak. But when Caliban tries to fight back, Prospero makes him his slave and calls him ungrateful. This is like what Europeans often said to justify colonization: that they brought "civilization" and "language" to natives, who should be grateful, but when natives fought back, they were punished as savages.

The most famous Caliban quote, "You taught me language, and my profit on't / Is, I know how to curse" is central to most postcolonial readings. In this case, language is a curse and a blessing. Caliban is now able to speak the language of the colonizer, but he employs it to retaliate, swear and not allow Prospero to dominate him. His curse, however, is not taken seriously either as Prospero fights it off or he ignores it. This scene demonstrates the way that colonialism empowers certain individuals and depowers other people. Caliban receives the voice yet loses his power. He can speak, and it does not matter what he says in the play.

2.2.1 Caliban as a Subaltern

The theory proposed by Spivak helps in furthering this analysis. The central question of Spivak is whether the subaltern can speak fits Caliban perfectly. She says the answer is no. The subaltern can produce sounds as well as utter words, but the power elites do not recognize them as actual words. The speech styles of Caliban are influenced by the opinions of Prospero and other characters. It makes them believe that he is a savage when he swears. It seems to people that it is funny or ridiculous when he fights back, particularly when he joins Trinculo and Stephano in their drunken uprising. The system is configured in such a way that he cannot utter anything to alter his status. This is the place where the subaltern condition is being oppressed. The power that Prospero has is oppressive to Caliban and he is also trapped in a system that ensures that what he says do not count. His resistance is heard by people, but they do not recognize that. He has the speech, but he is unable to alter the sequence of the play. This

is the tragedy of the subaltern that is the failure to transform the words into actions or recognition.

2.2.2 Caliban and the Earth

Another key aspect of the subaltern identity of Caliban is his attachment to the land. Prospero claims that he owns the island due to his knowledge and magic but Caliban claims that it belongs to him, by Sycorax, my mother. This is a powerful statement as it is a challenge to the power of Prospero. Caliban claims that he is entitled to inherit something. Nobody listens to his assertion, though. Prospero is acting as a foreigner in his own house. The postcolonial critics such as Peter Hulme assert that this struggle is an embodiment of the European colonization of the Americas whereby the Native Americans lost their land to conquerors who had assumed legal or divine powers. The attempt by Caliban to reclaim the island is regarded as rebellion rather than justice. This once again indicates the position of low in the chain of command even when he presents a valid claim that the system in control claims it is not a valid claim.

2.2.3 Caliban, Rebellion and Ridicule

Caliban does not simply sit there. He attempts to oppose the power of Prospero by collaborating with Trinculo and Stephano to remove him. However, Shakespeare makes this uprising appear humorous and even ridiculous. Caliban gets on his knees in front of Stephano and refers to him as a god since he brings him alcohol. The uprising has become intoxicated idiocy. There has been a debate on whether this is a mockery of colonial resistance by Shakespeare, or it illustrates how unfortunate it is that one cannot rebel in oppressive systems. This scene is very crucial in the eyes of a subaltern. Caliban attempts to fight but he does it collaborating with other outsiders who are also foolish. His rebellion is not taken seriously by

Prospero and the audience. This demonstrates that the resistance of the subaltern is usually regarded as irrational or useless. So, guarding the status quo against any danger.

2.2.4 Humanity and Dehumanization of Caliban

Among the central questions concerning Caliban, there is whether he is a person or not. Prospero and others refer to him as a monster, a beast, or a thing of darkness several times. But Caliban also talks in a beautiful and poetic manner. Another of the most beautiful passages in the play is that in which he speaks of the sound of the island: Be not afeard, the isle is full of noises, / Sounds and sweet airs, which bring delight and hurt not. This disparity demonstrates the fact that the colonizers had the tendency to treat natives as non-people and as those who are indifferent to their culture or humanity. According to Stephen Greenblatt and other critics this moment reveals the sensitivity and imagination of Caliban that is contrary to the notion that Caliban is merely a savage. But in the play, his beauty is overshadowed by the main plot of monstrosity. This once more reveals the subaltern situation: he behaves like a human, but power cannot fully discern it.

2.2.5 Caliban in the History of Criticism

People have read Caliban in many different ways over the years. Some have seen him as a symbol of colonial resistance, others as a comic fool and still others as a tragic figure. Each of these readings shows what people were worried about at the time. People in the 1800s often used Caliban as proof that Europeans were better than everyone else and as a reason for colonialism. He became a symbol of resistance in the 20th century, especially after postcolonial studies became popular. In his play *Une Tempête*, Aimé Césaire reimagines Caliban as a revolutionary who stands up to Prospero and demands freedom. This changing picture of Caliban shows that he is not just a character but also a place where people argue about colonialism, power, and identity. In this thesis, Caliban is shown not only as a colonized being

but also as a subaltern whose voice is unable to change his status. Previous critics focused on resistance, but this study focuses on how far that resistance can go. Caliban talks but no one hears him.

2.2.6 Caliban and Intersectionality

This thesis will discuss Caliban not merely as a racial and colonial figure but also as a character in terms of the connection between class and gender and his status. Caliban does not just get colonized; he is also treated as a worker who is required to collect wood and be of service to Prospero. His subalternity as a servant brings out the aspect of class. At the same time, Prospero talks about the way Miranda had tried to assault him, which gives his narrative a gender dimension. This act has been interpreted in many ways by people as evidence of his savagery, as a colonial stereotype of the hypersexual native, or as a final opportunity to demonstrate power. Whichever way you take it, it does not help him gain recognition at all. His race and class together with gender make him twice inferior.

To sum up, Caliban is not only a representation of colonial resistance. He is a prototype of the subaltern situation: He talks but no one hears him, he opposes but is reproached, he demands land but is refused and he is humane but is dehumanized. The postcolonial theory makes us view him as the colonized subject but the subaltern theory by Spivak lets us view how bad his situation is. The voice of Caliban exists, but it is not appropriate to change the power regimes that make him silent. This qualifies him as one of the most powerful illustrations of the subaltern in the work of Shakespeare.

2.3 Miranda's Role in *The Tempest*

In critical reviews of *The Tempest*, Miranda is often viewed as a lesser character that is weakened by the power of Prospero, the conflict of Caliban and the loyalty of Ariel. Miranda is, however, a significant element in the play in terms of power and silence. She is the daughter

of Prospero, and she was brought up alone on the island. Her father dictates on her future. She is born noble, and as she is a woman, she can only do so much. She is supposed to be submissive to her father, and she will later marry Ferdinand. By doing so, Miranda can be interpreted as the silence of women even in the high classes of society that are perpetrated by men. Shakespeare provides Miranda with lines which indicate that she is kind, curious and even independent, yet her father controls her which makes these issues less significant. The tone of the words Miranda utters is determined by the instructions given by Prospero already at the outset. Her father promptly alters her thought when she pleads with the shipwrecked men claiming, O, I have suffered with these I have seen suffer. She, he says, does not know the entire reality yet. People empathize with her, but they leave her emotions behind the tale of Prospero. This forms the trend of her personality that goes through the play: she talks though her voice is always affected by the male authority.

2.3.1 Miranda as Interpreted by Feminists

This is the long-standing criticism of Miranda by feminist critics: the fact that she was silenced. Lorie Jerrell Leininger argues that Miranda is being used as a prize, rather than as a full-fledged human being. Her union with Ferdinand is political than a love affair. Ann Thompson has also observed that the instances in which Miranda has agency such as when she declares that she loves Ferdinand, are highly orchestrated by her father. Prospero establishes the setting, initiates the events, and determines the result. People tend to glorify Miranda as innocent and pure, but these qualities are the product of the patriarchal pressure. It is not her voice or her decisions that make her valuable but her chastity and obedience. Her identity is entirely pegged on her being a daughter and a wife. Miranda demonstrates how women are silenced, not by their silence but by the narrow focus of their conversation in the patriarchal systems.

2.3.2 The Subaltern Theory of Miranda and Spivak

The concept of subaltern by Gayatri Spivak is applied to the case of Miranda. Spivak argues that subaltern woman can never utter any form of authentic speech because their voice is continuously processed through the existing systems. Miranda is a talkative person in the play, and her words by themselves never have a meaning. They are only identified when they are in line with the plans of Prospero. As an example, Miranda is becoming independent when she falls in love with Ferdinand. She dares him and tells him; I am your wife should you marry me. But this was the situation created by Prospero. He spies on the way they go about it, accepts their relationship, and even advises Ferdinand not to unravel the virgin knot of Miranda. It might be that Miranda is only in love but there is no problem with it as it aids her father in his political and personal ambitions. It is not in this way that Miranda belongs to her voice. She can speak but the system ensures that whatever she says promotes patriarchal authority. She is a subaltern character since her personalities are lost to playing the role of an obedient daughter and an attractive bride. Men still listen to her even when she speaks in a courageous tone.

2.3.3 Miranda and her Goodness and Bounds

One of the things that can be pointed out about Miranda is her compassion. Horror strikes her at the storm her father has brought about, and she experiences pain of the sailors as though it was hers. This scene demonstrates that she is a nurturing and powerful person. But Prospero speedily informs her that no one has been injured and diverts to his own tale. Her pity is true, yet it does not make a difference. It enters the tale of betrayal and banishment of Prospero. This trend indicates that the words and emotions of Miranda are not ignored but they do not alter anything. She talks and feels but the system ensures that nothing changes what she says. The other indicator of being a subaltern is speaking in vain.

2.3.4 Miranda and Caliban

Miranda is even more complicated by the fact that she has a relationship with Caliban. Prospero recalls that Caliban had attempted to raped Miranda and he uses this recollection to justify why Caliban must be a slave. Miranda is the representation of chastity that Prospero must defend. But the voice of Miranda is absent in this tale. She does not speak about what occurred. He is not the only one to do this, instead, Prospero addresses her and uses her body to demonstrate that he is powerful over Caliban. This is significant as it reveals the way the voice of women is commonly neglected, even in the situations when it is the most significant to them. Miranda is the protagonist in this story who is unable to narrate it. It is indicated by her silence that patriarchal systems do not only silence women but also exploit their experiences to their advantage. Here, Prospero takes the silence of Miranda to reveal that he is in control of her, as well as Caliban.

2.3.5 Miranda and Getting Married

The final episode of Miranda in the play is when she marries Ferdinand. Initially, Prospero feigns opposition to the marriage and threatens Ferdinand against taking Miranda too soon. However, this opposition is merely a trial; in fact, Prospero is the one running the match. The very fact of Miranda saying she is in love with him, when she says that she is his wife provided he will marry her, sounds bold, yet it is a part of a scheme that her father had laid out. She can act only with the boundaries set by the male authority. The Marxist feminist theory can be applied to explain this dynamic. Although Miranda is not exchanged by money, the marriage remains a bargain to the benefit of Prospero. She turns out to be an icon of peace, solidarity, and collaborator. Her individual wants are in line with the political demands of her father, making her voice effective but non-independent. It is not an isolated occurrence in patriarchal societies: women are allowed to speak, but only in a way that will be helpful to men.

2.3.6 Miranda's Quietness

Miranda does not say a lot, and this is the most interesting thing about her. She does not doubt the power of her father. She does not struggle against being a wife. She does not describe the attack of Caliban. These interruptions are as significant as what she is saying. They demonstrate the confinements of her subjectivity by the structures around. Spivak is reminding us that the subaltern woman cannot talk since other people constantly distort, put in a frame, or remove what she is saying. Miranda emphasizes this through her silence. She is a force in the play though her voice is not always clear. There she is, though silent; she may be observed but not heard completely.

2.3.7 Miranda on Critical Tradition

Having not liked Miranda, hundreds of years, people believed that she was the most innocent, pure, and obedient one. She was a good daughter and good wife, people stated. Only in the late 1900s feminist critics began to challenge this notion. Lorie Jerrell Leininger denied the idealised version of Miranda and demonstrated that she is silenced and objectified in a patriarchal order. The boundaries of her independence of appearance were pointed out by Ann Thompson and others. This thesis is based on these feminist readings and contributes towards them by placing Miranda within the subaltern studies. Though previous critics acknowledged her oppression, very few have directly associated her with the subaltern woman of Spivak. This paper shows that not only is Miranda silenced, but she is also selectively excluded in subjectivity. Not only is she a silent individual, but she is also a subaltern figure whose voice can never be entirely her own.

2.3.8 The collocation of gender with class

One should bear in mind that the silence of Miranda is influenced not only by the gender but also by the class. She is a noblewoman and daughter of Duke of Milan. Her position in her

class provides her with some degree of respect and protection. Men do not treat her as a slave as Caliban, or they do not forget her as Sycorax. However, she is still deprived of a voice despite her privilege, being a woman. Such a combination demonstrates the complexity of the relationships between class and gender. Miranda is not a helpless figure as Caliban, yet she does not possess the power to control her life to the full extent. Her subalternity is different but just as natural.

To sum up, Miranda is one who speaks on behalf of the woman who remained silent in *The Tempest*. She speaks but she is influenced by the influence of her father. She pities him, but her emotions are towards his story. She is in love, and the marriage is an arranged one. She does not comment on things that directly affect her such as the attempted assault of Caliban. Feminist criticism has demonstrated how she has been silenced but this thesis builds on that argument by employing the theory of the subaltern as developed by Spivak. Miranda can speak, but she never has her own voice. Her subjectivity is entangled in the patriarchal and the colonial structures in which she is encircled. Through the analysis of Miranda alongside Caliban, Ariel, and Sycorax, we can conclude that subalternity in *The Tempest* is not limited to the colonised male figure. It involves also those women who are muted within the patriarchal structures despite their belonging to privileged classes. The stance of Miranda demonstrates that gendered subalternity operates contrary to colonial subalternity, but both communicate the same fact that some voices, however powerful, are never audible.

2.4 Sycorax's Absence in the Play

Sycorax is one of the most interesting characters in *The Tempest* because she is both there and not there at the same time. She never talks or shows up on stage, and the audience only knows her through Prospero's words. But she is a strong presence in the background of the play. She used to be the queen of the island, is Caliban's mother and locked Ariel up before Prospero got there. The story of the island would be different without her. Even though she is

important, she is still silent, remembered only as a cursed memory. This lack is not by chance. Shakespeare could have made Sycorax speak but he did not. Instead, he lets Prospero tell the audience who she is. People say she is a witch, an old woman, and a cruel person who abused her power. Only Prospero says these things, and he is the most powerful character in the play. This means that the colonizer's words are the only things that make up Sycorax as a character. Her silence symbolises the erasure of colonised women from history, remembered solely through the antagonistic narratives of their conquerors.

2.4.1 Spivak's Subaltern Woman

Gayatri Spivak's essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" gives us a strong way to think about Sycorax. Spivak contends that the subaltern woman is rendered voiceless not due to an absence of voice, but because her voice is eliminated, ignored, or replaced by prevailing authority. When she appears in history she is only portrayed through the other people. This is what exactly happens to Sycorax in *The Tempest*. Shakespeare does not allow her to speak and instead, Prospero discusses her, which alters her perception by the audience. Spivak also explains that people remember the subaltern woman and usually believe that she is a monster or a threat. The same thing happens with Sycorax. Prospero refers to her as a blue-eyed hag, hence making her appear different, implying her to be evil. People despise her not only due to her magic, but also since she was a strong woman. A powerful woman is a two-fold menace in a patriarchal and colonial society since she defies gender and colonial structures. The descriptions of Prospero make her look like a dangerous woman and colonial power.

2.4.2 The Power of Sycorax and Prospero

Another important thing that happens in the play when Sycorax is erased is that it makes Prospero's power stronger. Prospero makes his own rule over the island seem more real by making Sycorax seem evil. He says he is the fair ruler who has taken over from a tyrant. This

is a common colonial tactic which makes the native ruler look cruel and illegal to make conquest seem okay. Sycorax is what makes Prospero's control over Caliban and Ariel make sense. Prospero frequently reminds Ariel of how cruel Sycorax was by telling him that he would still be stuck in the pine tree where Sycorax had put him if Prospero had not been kind to him. Prospero uses Sycorax's memory to make people more loyal in this way. Ariel is thankful to Prospero because he thinks Sycorax was worse. But Ariel never hears Sycorax's side of the story just like the audience never does. The colonizer's power is kept strong by the silence of the subaltern woman.

2.4.3 Sycorax as a Mother

Sycorax is also important because she is Caliban's mother. Caliban is connected to the island and its past before colonisation through her. He is not just a native; he is the son of the island's last king. He says to Prospero, "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother," which shows that he has a stronger claim to the land, but Sycorax is still gone here. Caliban can call on her as proof of his legitimacy, but she still does not speak. She cannot protect herself, explain her rule, or tell her story. The only thing that makes Caliban and Prospero remember her is their words and furious descriptions. This renders her a two-fold subaltern, a woman who has been obliterated by patriarchy and a colonised ruler who has been obliterated by colonialist discourse.

2.4.4 Sycorax and Gendered Authority

The treatment of Sycorax also demonstrates that people were even concerned about powerful females during the Shakespearean era. Women who practiced folk medicine or healing became popularly known as witches and would get hunted. Sycorax, who is described as a witch, fits this cultural stereotype. Her magic is taken to be unnatural and dangerous whereas that of Prospero is taken to be real since they are associated with books, learning and

male dominance. This disparity reveals that the power of men and women in the play is different. The magic of a woman is perilous and not permissible whereas the magic of a man is civilised and powerful. Thus, the erasure of Sycorax is not only colonial but also patriarchal. She symbolizes the intimidation of woman authority both at home and in colonies.

2.4.5 Sycorax's Critical Neglect

Sycorax has received the least amount of critical attention compared to Caliban, Miranda or even Ariel. *The Tempest* has been interpreted traditionally in many ways, with little reference to her as a central figure, only as a secondary one. Her importance has just started to be accepted with the emergence of feminist and postcolonial criticism. Her omission has been given importance by Peter Hulme and other critics who have said that it reflects the omission of colonised women in history. Even these critics do not give her much attention. Such disregard is a form of critical silencing itself. Sycorax is the character that critics tend to ignore in their analysis as Shakespeare did. The thesis intends to fill that gap by arguing that Sycorax is essential in the analysis of subalternity in *The Tempest*. She does not just talk quietly; it is an important part of the power relationships of the play.

2.4.6 Reflecting on Sycorax in a different light.

There are modern versions of *The Tempest* that try to restore the voice of Sycorax. An example is the play *Une Tempête* by Aime Césaire in which Caliban has a revolutionary voice, yet Sycorax is absent. Her story has been fantasized by other writers and scholars who portrayed her as a tough individual who opposed the colonisation by Prospero. These rethinking highlight the desire to reclaim the voices of those that Shakespeare silenced. Spivak, however, puts us back to our senses reminding us that recovery is not easy. We continue to speak on behalf of Sycorax, although we are attempting to give her a voice. She is unable to

express her personal view because her voice was never recorded. This contradiction describes the general problem of restoring the subaltern voice in the historical and literary discourses.

2.4.7 Sycorax as the Vanished Subaltern

In conclusion, Sycorax will be the most appropriate example of subalternity in *The Tempest*. She does not speak, she does not appear on the stage, and all we can recall of her is the furious lines of Prospero. She represents a representation of the colonised woman who has been obliterated twice, firstly by her gender and secondly by colonialism. Her absence validates the power of Prospero and affects the devotion of Ariel as he controls Caliban. The fact that people who did not like Sycorax tend to disregard her speaks volumes as she remains silent throughout the play as one of the strongest symbols. She demonstrates that subalternity is not only the usage of voices and disregard but also prohibition of expression in totality. This thesis points out the silence within *The Tempest*, demonstrating the mechanisms through which it can be erased.

2.5 Ariel's Part in *The Tempest*

Ariel is one of the most fascinating characters in *The Tempest* since he is a servant and has free spirits. He is a supernatural entity whose powers are more powerful than all the other individuals in the island, yet he must obey the instructions of Prospero. Ariel is a loyal servant to Prospero in the play as he carries out his magic errands, reports on events, and alters the fate of the stories. Even though Ariel has power, he is not free. At the end of the play, Prospero gives him his freedom. The relations between Ariel and Prospero make us ponder over the power, loyalty, and freedom. Caliban does not hesitate to fight back, and curses Prospero, yet Ariel does what he says. But he does not always do what he is told. He sometimes reminds Prospero of his promise to set him free which shows that his loyalty is based on the hope of getting something in return. Ariel's situation exemplifies an alternative expression of

subalternity which one that gets survival and ultimate freedom not via struggle but through obedience to authority.

2.5.1 Ariel and Colonial Authority

From a postcolonial perspective, Ariel may be regarded as an additional example of the colonised individual. If Caliban stands for resistance, Ariel stands for acceptance. He respects Prospero's power, learns from him, and uses his own powers to help him. He will be free in the end but only after years of work. This shows one of the ways that colonial powers ruled and they got some natives to be loyal by giving them privileges in exchange for following orders. Ariel becomes a collaborator, getting small rewards for his work while helping Prospero stay in charge.

Ania Loomba and others have observed that Ariel is a person who is colonised, who approaches the coloniser closer by being loyal. Nevertheless, his freedom is restricted. Prospero continues to narrate to Ariel how cruel Sycorax was and this makes Ariel feel grateful to him. The freedom of Ariel is not determined by his obedience, but by the desire of Prospero to grant him his freedom. By doing so, Ariel remains in the background with his voice and desires being heard only when they can be incorporated in the power structure of Prospero.

2.5.2 Power/Knowledge by Ariel and Foucault

Another theory that can be used to analyse the subalternity of Ariel is the theory of power/knowledge by Michel Foucault. According to Foucault, power is not necessarily practiced by violence, but also by intricate structures of discipline, surveillance, and knowledge. This is demonstrated by Ariel since he is obedient due to persuasion and promises and not pressure. Prospero gives Ariel a lesson by reminding him of the past and altering his thinking of the future. The fact that Ariel obeyed demonstrates the vile side of authority and makes people believe that they are complying willingly. Ariel also assists Prospero to keep a

check on things. He flies around the island, observes what occurs and informs Prospero. Prospero is aware of all the events that occur on the eyes and voice of Ariel. Therefore, the service of Ariel is informational and physical. He is an agent and a spy which is consistent with Foucault's conception that power is comprised of the ability to control knowledge and visibility.

2.5.3 Ariel's Need for Freedom

Among the most intriguing aspects of the character of Ariel, one can distinguish the fact that he requests freedom quite frequently. He reminds Prospero of his promise by telling him towards the beginning of the play, "I have done thee worthy service." In his turn, Prospero threatens him with the memory of the imprisonment of Sycorax. This dialogue demonstrates the strained relationship between them: Ariel needs freedom, yet Prospero maintains power by playing with fear and gratitude. The fact that Ariel wants to be free and does so in such a manner makes him relatable yet the way he gets his freedom demonstrates the boundaries of his lowest status. He does not fight back in a violent manner like Caliban. He is obedient and he does what he is told hoping that he will be rewarded. His freedom is therefore conditional and based on the goodwill of the master. This demonstrates the big picture of subalternity: even when a person wants to be emancipated, the relations of power may compel him/her to obey until the authority is willing to liberate him/her.

2.5.4 Ariel and Uncertainty

The concept of conflict in the relations of colonizers developed by Homi Bhabha is also helpful here. Ariel is contradictory as he desires to be free, and he is a slave to it. His fidelity is genuine though it is also a clever thing to do. He admires Prospero and at the same time wishes to be rid of him. This tension demonstrates how difficult it is to cope with power on the part of colonised people they may either resist or comply with or do both. The character of

Ariel shows that subalternity is not always manifested through the open revolt. At times it appears like silent compliance which is melded by the promise of being liberated in the future.

2.5.5 Ariel in Relation to Caliban

Ariel and Caliban are contrasted with each other, yet they create a more wholesome image of subalternity. Caliban is not silent in his struggle, cursing and attempting to rebel, but is mocked and unsuccessful in his attempts. Ariel does so at the word of Prospero, and serves him, and waits till he can be set at liberty, but he, Prospero, has power over him. Both do not attain independence on their own. Caliban remains to be a slave, and it is only on the will of Prospero that Ariel is released. This comparison demonstrates that rebellion and obedience may be the indicators of subalternity. The subaltern is either silenced (Caliban) or incorporated by the dominant (Ariel). The two paths demonstrate the difficulty of gaining recognition and freedom within the systems that are unfair.

2.5.6 Ariel's Poetic Voice

Caliban frequently employs curses in his language, whereas Ariel talks in songs, poetry, and music. His songs cause people to fall in love, become lost, or diminish their fears. His voice is beautiful and powerful, but it is always employed to assist Prospero. A very chilling scene in the play is also when Ariel sings to Ferdinand, "Full fathom five thy father lies." However, it is Prospero who provides him with this poetical power. Ariel, through his art, demonstrates the sadness of the situation that he is a subaltern: even the most beautiful voice he has is at the mercy of another.

2.5.7 Ariel's Last Freedom

At last Prospero releases Ariel at the end of the play and declares to him, "Go free, and fare thou well! Ariel is obviously pleased but Prospero will not release him until he has completed everything that he planned to accomplish. The freedom of Ariel is not the right but the gift. This conclusion helps him to be subordinate. He is not set free due to his own power, but rather because of the mercy of the master. The release of Ariel is usually celebrated by the viewers, and it demonstrates the extent to which the structures of colonialism are embedded in the play. The concept of freedom is not regarded as a natural one, but rather as a gift of power.

2.5.8 Important Responses to Ariel

Previously, critics have interpreted Ariel as a creativity, art, or the air spirit. Romantic critics applauded in his beauty and grace and tended to compare him with the roughness of Caliban. Even more recent postcolonial and feminist critics have re-read him as a subaltern figure, demonstrating the ways his obedience demonstrates colonial tactics of domination. Ariel however has not received the same attention as a subaltern character as Caliban has. His people consider his loyalty as a good one and not a bad one. This thesis challenges that view demonstrating that the obedience of Ariel is the exercise of power and control.

2.5.9 Ariel as an Ambivalent Subaltern

To sum up, Ariel is a multi-layered expression of subalternity. He is strong and bound, submissive and desiring to be free, poetic, and unable to define himself. The case of his relations with Prospero demonstrates that power may act not only by violence. It may also operate by way of promises, persuasion and spying. His loyalty to Prospero helps him to be finally freed. His liberty, however, is founded on authority. Looking at Ariel and Caliban, Miranda, and Sycorax, we may observe that subalternity in *The Tempest* may be rebellious, silent, erased, or obedient. The part that Ariel plays demonstrate how beautiful voice can be

trapped in power structures. His character makes us remember that being subaltern does not only concern the people who oppose and lose; but also, the people who obey the regulations and wait only to realize that their freedom is offered to them on the conditions established by other people.

Chapter 3

Analysis

3.1 Caliban: Class and Colonialism

The case of Caliban demonstrates the relationship between colonialism and class. He is not only a colonised individual, but he is also a slave labourer. Prospero does not only reside on his land, but he also causes him to perform menial duties such as carrying wood. This two-sided exploitation resembles the colonialism of the past where the natives were not only coerced into labour, but their land was stolen. The opposition of Caliban is towards colonialism and oppression of classes. He does not only curse Prospero because he took his island but also because he made him a slave. However, his uprising is mocked and turned into a joke of how the colonial systems turned both political and economic opposition to be considered illegal. The colonialism and the class are interconnected in the context of Caliban; they support each other.

3.2 Miranda: Gender and Patriarchy within the Class Privilege.

Miranda demonstrates how gendered subalternity operates in the circumstances of the privilege of classes. She is born into noble family since she is the daughter of the Duke of Milan. Her social class in theory should provide her with power and safety. However, being a woman, she must keep silent. Her father is the one to marry her off and her voice is put in context by his power, and she is an object of exchange. This is the contradiction, which reveals the relationship between class and gender. Miranda is fortunate as a noblewoman but inferior as a woman. Her quietness is not like that of Caliban; it does not have the same boundaries. But the two demonstrate how voice may be smothered in a thousand diverse ways. As the case of Miranda demonstrates, privilege does not nullify the structures of gendered silencing.

3.3 Sycorax: Sex and the Postcolonial Unwritten.

Sycorax is the furthest point of intersection between colonialism and gender. She is wiped out twice as she is a woman and a native ruler. Prospero sets her ill by referring to her as a witch, a blue-eyed hag whose magic was not real. She lacks voice and only her conqueror tells her story. In this scenario, gender and colonialism are collaborative. Sycorax is exterminated not only based on her culture but also her gender. Had she been a man in charge her absence would have been important yet given the fact that she was a woman her erasure is absolute. She is even unable to discuss her memories; she has no identity except a caricature. It is the most perfect manifestation of the convergence of gender and erasure of colonialism to create absolute silence.

3.4 Ariel, Obedience, Colonialism, and Class

Another layer is added by Ariel: the relationship between obedience and class and colonialism. Ariel is a willing servant of Prospero unlike Caliban who desires freedom. His service demonstrates the way colonialist powers attempted to unite people by providing them with little rewards to be loyal. The fact that he is a servant however continues to influence the obedience of Ariel. His class keeps him in service, despite his supernatural abilities that would make it appear that he could be independent. This shows the convergence of the class and colonialism. Caliban is forcibly taken as a slave whereas Ariel is not. Instead, he is made to serve. His beauty songs and powers are not his own, they are borrowed to assist Prospero. His conditional freedom demonstrates how the process of colonialism and exploitation of classes are united to make even the most talented individuals not free.

3.5 Prospero: The Cross-Sectional Master

Prospero himself demonstrates the convergence of colonial, patriarchal, and intellectual forces to the top. The way colonization works is demonstrated by his power over Caliban. His

domination of Miranda depicts the male domination. The way that class and discipline operate is evidenced by his domination of Ariel. These powers are what have intellectual foundations in his knowledge and books. It is not a single type of power that makes Prospero powerful, but it is a combination of power. He is a coloniser, a father figure, and an expert in knowledge simultaneously. He can control all the other characters because he has so much power. His dominance shows how real systems of authority work: not through one axis of power, but through the overlap of many.

3.6 Being Quiet Together

Caliban, Miranda, Sycorax, and Ariel all have one thing in common: they are all silent. Caliban is a talker and people laugh at him. Miranda can speak, but only under some circumstances. Sycorax cannot talk at all. Ariel is a great singer, although he is told to sing. Their types of silence are different because of colonialism, gender, and class, but they all show the same thing: that subaltern voices are never fully heard. This common condition illustrates the fallacy of examining these figures in isolation. We can only see the whole picture of subalternity in *The Tempest* if we put them all together. The play shows how colonialism, patriarchy, and class work together to create many silences that overlap and echo.

3.7 Gaps in Previous Criticism

These figures were frequently considered individually by critics of the past. The focal points of postcolonial interpretations were Caliban; feminist interpretations were centred on Miranda and new historicist interpretations centred on Prospero. Sycorax and Ariel were overlooked. What was lacking was a study that was a compilation of all these elements. This thesis seals this gap by demonstrating the point of intersection between colonialism, gender, and class in the production of different forms of subalternity. This discussion broadens the dichotomies of colonizer/colonized and male/female with the focus on intersectionality. It

demonstrates that subalternity is multidimensional, with the multiple power structures. *The Tempest* gives several subaltern voices, which are concealed in an unusual way.

3.8 Intersectionality in *The Tempest*

To sum up, the subaltern characters in *The Tempest* are impossible to understand in one category or another. The exploitation of his social class is also one of the reasons why Caliban resists colonialism. The silence of Miranda is shaped by the privilege of gender and classes. Sycorax is simultaneously colonial and patriarchal. The fact that Ariel is obedient is an indication of class and colonialism. The combination of all these powers leads to the power that Prospero has. It is through these intersections that we get to learn more about the play. *The Tempest* shows that silencing is multiple; it is a result of the overlapping oppressive systems. Colonialism, patriarchy, and class do not operate separately, but on the contrary, they are reinforced by one another. This chapter demonstrates that the subalternity in the play is complex, multi-layered, and highly significant to the contemporary discussions of power.

3.9 Why We Should Read *The Tempest* again.

Although *The Tempest* was written at the beginning of the 17th century, the theme of power, silence and outsideness remains highly significant. The question posed in the play is, who has the right to speak? Who is heard? Whose history is remembered? are not confined to the period of Shakespeare. They continue to experience in the modern societies that are shaped by colonial past, patriarchal systems, and inequality. Having gone through the play once more through the prism of postcolonial, feminist, and subaltern, we may observe that Shakespeare was not just writing about magic and reconciliation. He also wrote about the systems of power that continue to impact the life of people to this day.

3.10 Caliban in the Modern World

One contemporary discussion has often reinterpreted Caliban as an anti-colonial symbol. The writers and intellectuals of the twentieth century adopted Caliban as a representation of the oppressed who rose up to resist the imperial rule especially in the territories that were colonized. The best known one is the play *Une Tempête* by Aime Césaire written in 1969. In this adaptation Caliban is no longer a rebellious figure who is mocked but a revolutionary one. He completely disregards the power of Prospero, his freedom and enlists into the struggle of rights of colonised individuals. The recent version by Césaire demonstrates the power of character of Shakespeare. The resistance shown by Caliban in the original play is ridiculed and defeated yet the readers of later centuries have made Caliban a hero. This demonstrates the fact that texts are not fixed but they are constantly reread under the changing historical circumstances. The position of Caliban as the subaltern in the Shakespeare's play is like the present-day slave, colonialism, and discrimination of races. Although his voice is not heard by people in the play, it is an inspiration in the future.

3.11 Miranda in Contemporary Feminist Interpretations

The modern times also have made people look at Miranda differently. Hundreds of years people glorified her as an example of innocence and obedience, as a perfect daughter and wife. However, this interpretation has been challenged by modern feminist critics and writers. Their silence is not a good thing to them; they are just evidence that men are in control. Other adaptations go as far as to make Miranda have a bolder voice and this allows her to challenge her father or demonstrate that she is not like her dad.

In other contemporary stage performances, the directors, emphasize the goodness of Miranda and her independence at times, displaying moments when Miranda attempts to escape the rule of her father. These new readings reveal that contemporary readers are no longer pleased with the sight of women as silent icons. Instead, they seek to find out how to restore the sense of self in Miranda and observe the way in which patriarchy has confined her.

3.12 Getting Sycorax Back

Sycorax is the protagonist of some of the most radical contemporary rereading's. No one cared much about her during hundreds of years. They believed that she was a mere background character who had no role to play in the story. However, according to the present-day feminist and postcolonial critics, her absence is not in vain. They have reconsidered Sycorax a powerful woman whose narrative was misplaced in the Prospero narrative of colonisation. Even some contemporary writers have attempted to voice Sycorax. There have been plays, poems and even critical essays which have rewritten her story and shown her perspective as a colonised woman silenced by patriarchy and empire. Such rereading's can be compared with other attempts at history and literature to recover the voices of women and the colonised people who were omitted in the official histories. Sycorax has now become a symbol of not only silence, but also the struggle going on to restore lost histories.

3.13 Freedom and Ariel

Another question that people have considered is the role of Ariel in the contemporary times. Shakespeare describes Ariel as obedient and loyal, but the contemporary readers often view Ariel as a representation of ambivalence that colonised individuals are going through by service and by negotiation through power. His freedom is perceived by some people as a triumph, but according to the modern critics, it is based on the mercy of Prospero. Other adaptations and performances give more focus on the ultimate release of Ariel, which reveals how bitter his freedom is. The question remains is Ariel free or is the fact that he is free simply the cessation of his service? The contemporary readers are more predisposed to view Ariel as a character whose conditional freedom is a symbol of the boundaries of colonial gifts. There is more that his character can say on the matters of power, consent, and obedience.

3.14 The Contemporary World and Prospero

Modernity has also witnessed people producing current ideas on how to think about Prospero. He was even considered by people as a wise ruler and even to stand in place of Shakespeare. These days, he is read more frequently as a figure of colonial domination and male dominance. Modern critics point out his conquest of the island, his rule on Miranda, and his abuse of Ariel and Caliban. Other directors have attempted to humanise Prospero by depicting him as a tragic hero who clings to power due to the fear of being betrayed and losing. These re-readings help us to remember that Prospero is not a simple bad man; he is a complex character that represents structures of power. In the modern world, where surveillance, discipline, and knowledge are of greater concern than ever, Prospero can be viewed as an early depiction of how people are manipulated as Foucault later discussed it.

3.15 *The Tempest* and Countries After Colonialism

The Tempest is significant to the postcolonial countries. The play can be viewed as an allegory of conquest and resistance in countries that underwent colonisation. Caliban is a representation of the colonised individual, Prospero is the coloniser, Miranda is the one who has been traded in taking the place of another gender, Ariel is the one who labours with the colonist, and Sycorax is the native culture that has been wiped out. This mapping has assisted individuals in Africa, the Caribbean, South Asia, and Latin America to view their history in Shakespeare.

It is not only about the past that these re-readings are taking place. They also discuss the existing issues such as globalisation, migration, and cultural dominance. As it happened to Prospero, who dominated the island, powerful nations impose their economic and cultural structures upon others. The struggle of Caliban to have a voice is resonant in the struggles of the marginalised groups that want to be heard in the globalised world.

3.16 Intersectionality and Present Discourse

The Tempest is relevant in modern times due to the current debates on intersectionality. As this thesis has shown, the concept of subalternity in the play does not exist in any group or character. It involves interplay of colonialism, patriarchy, and class. The play can be viewed by modern readers as a preview of how various forms of oppression interact with each other in contemporary struggles because they are aware of the impact of race, gender, and class on one another. The silencing of Miranda shows that women are capable of being subaltern even in the face of privilege. The resistance of Caliban proves the depreciation of colonized labour. The lack of Sycorax depicts the obliteration of colonised women. Ariel is obedient, which demonstrates the power of agreement. The power of Prospero demonstrates that several systems may be united to maintain control. These reflections are closely related to ongoing discussions on systemic inequality.

3.17 *The Tempest*: Performance and Adaptation

Modern adaptations of *The Tempest* give particular attention to its subaltern nature. To emphasize the politics of the play, the directors occasionally pay attention to the dignity of Caliban, the silence of Miranda, or the lack of Sycorax. Productions have been used in the postcolonial settings to portray the play as a critique of imperialism. As an example, the Caribbean performances are usually cantered around the fact that Caliban has a claim over the island whereas feminist performances emphasize that Miranda is powerless. Changes in the way the story is narrated in adaptations such as *Une Tempête* by Césaire create the colonial aspect of the story as the primary focus. Césaire demonstrates how the play by Shakespeare can be rewritten to be directly addressing contemporary struggles by transforming Caliban into a revolutionary and Ariel into a moderate voice. These adaptations demonstrate that *The Tempest* is not a book of the dead; it is a living document that continues to generate controversy and novel concepts.

3.18 Lasting Importance

To sum up, *The Tempest* remains a significant play to humans in the modern world as it demonstrates that power, silence and subalternity continue to influence society. Caliban, Miranda, Sycorax, Ariel, and Prospero are not merely the characters of the 1600s story; they are also representatives of the constant struggles against slavery, the right to speak, and be heard. The re-readings and re-adoptions of the past two centuries have shown that Caliban can be redefined as a revolutionary, Miranda as a silenced woman, Sycorax as an erased presence, Ariel as an ambivalent collaborator and Prospero as the master of surveillance and control. These readings are new and reveal why the play remains significant. Connecting the text of Shakespeare with the postcolonial, feminist, and intersectional theories, it is possible to say that *The Tempest* is a play that is not only about magic and reconciliation, but about power, silence, and the subaltern condition. It is important because of the timelessness of these problems of Shakespeare to modern society.

3.19 Conclusion of Analysis

This chapter has examined how subalternity is manifested by the characters in *The Tempest* by Shakespeare. The relationships of Caliban, Miranda, Sycorax, Ariel, and Prospero with power, silence, and authority are different. Put them together they demonstrate the ways of voice control, erasures, or conditioning in the systems of oppression.

Caliban, the colonised person, is an example of how colonialism enslaves the voice of the indigenous people. His curses and protests are perceived as signs of resistance by people, but they are either overlooked as savage behaviour or taken as a funny rebellion. He speaks; however, it does not matter what he is saying, and that is what Spivak refers to as subaltern. His connection with the land demonstrates the fact that colonialism deprives native people of their rights and transforms him into a slave and labourer. Miranda, the silenced woman demonstrates how women are restricted even when they are in power through the patriarchy. Her compassion, her affection towards Ferdinand and the fact that she does not say anything

about the attack by Caliban reveal that the power of her father influences her perception of the world entirely. She can speak, however, if Prospero allows her. Her marital life comes out as a bargain that benefits her father rather than one of her own decisions. She is an allegory of the gendered subaltern, who is not a silent subject, but a framed and managed subject. The greatest extreme of subalternity is not there with Sycorax: complete erasure. She does not appear on stage, does not utter a word, but only lives through the furious words of Prospero about her. She is muted twice, by colonialism and by patriarchy. Her absence testifies to the power of Prospero and eliminates the precolonial past of the island. She symbolizes the fact of Spivak that the subaltern woman is voiceless. It is complicated by Ariel, a servant who is obedient. He is a form of subalternity which is based on obedience and collaboration. He sings, he works hard and desires to be free, but the mercy of Prospero is the only thing that can bring him the freedom. His obedience depicts how the colonisers relied on collaborators to maintain control. The perspective of Ariel that Foucault presents reveals that he is a sort of surveillance as well and serves as the eyes and ears of Prospero on the island. His voice is lyric, yet not his, he never ceases to obey orders.

At the end of it all, it is Prospero that possesses all the power and knowledge. He is the coloniser as he rules the island, the patriarch as he oversees his daughter, the servant as he punishes Ariel, the colonized labourer as he enslaves Caliban. It is not only the magic that gives him the power, but also the knowledge, language, and surveillance, which is consistent with the concept of power/knowledge proposed by Foucault. It is only his forgiveness and mercy that come at the end that enhance the hierarchy since only those who are powerful can forgive. Prospero is the metaphor of the structures of oppression that suppress the voices of the subordinates in one way or another.

Chapter 4

Further Discussion

4.1 Responding to the Research Enquiries

The research questions that guided this thesis examined how *The Tempest* emphasises subaltern characters such as Caliban and Miranda, the mechanisms through which Prospero maintains control over others via power, language, and knowledge, the interpretative frameworks provided by Marxist feminism and Spivak's subaltern theory in understanding these figures, and the influence of class, gender, and colonial history in their marginalisation.

This chapter has demonstrated that Caliban and Miranda are indeed central subaltern figures. Caliban's colonised voice is ignored, and Miranda's gendered voice is controlled. They both talk, but no one listens to them in a meaningful way. Prospero's power comes from more than just magic; it also comes from language, education, and spying. According to Foucault's theory, he keeps his power by controlling what people say and know. Theoretical frameworks explain the suppression of the characters. Spivak's theory explains why Caliban and Miranda cannot genuinely "speak," Marxist feminism shows the intersection of Miranda's gender with class, and postcolonial theory highlights the obliteration of Caliban's land claim. The play is about class, gender, and colonial history all at once. Caliban is the labour of colonised people, Miranda is the privilege of being quiet, Sycorax is the memory of being erased, and Ariel is the servant who does what he is told. These axes of oppression intersect, forming a convoluted network of silences. The research questions have been answered by showing that *The Tempest* portrays several subalterns, who have been marginalised in numerous ways by intersecting power regimes.

4.2 Original Contributions

The analysis has a number of new contributions towards Shakespearean criticism and subaltern studies. First, it moves the emphasis off Caliban and Prospero, who were previously the primary objects of past studies and brings Miranda, Sycorax, and Ariel into the picture. By doing it, it demonstrates that subalternity in the play is not merely a concept but a web of silences. Second, it employs intersectionality to demonstrate the combination of colonialism, patriarchy, and class rather than in isolation. Third, it emphasises the importance of the question posed by Spivak, which is Can the subaltern speak? In the criticism of Miranda and Sycorax, who have often been neglected or under-theorised.

The past critics often discussed colonial or feminist features separately. This thesis seeks to fill the gap by bringing them together under the umbrella of subaltern studies. It demonstrates how the silencing of Miranda is not only gendered but also associated with the colonial power and how the lack of Sycorax is the most significant means of erasure, as well as illustrates how the lack of Ariel is the most obvious example of how power operates both through consent and coercion. When these ideas are combined, this analysis provides a more complete picture of *The Tempest* as a play about the systems of power that silence people.

4.3 Wider Importance

The analysis has implications that extend beyond Shakespeare's play. *The Tempest* is an expression of the real world of power relations that continue to silence subaltern voices. Caliban is a representation of the colonised individuals who had his land, and it has been stolen. Miranda symbolises women whose personalities were limited by patriarchy. Sycorax is a representative of all those whose histories were recounted by their conquerors. Ariel is a symbol of those who played by the rules or used the system and received partial justice but never complete freedom. Prospero represents the colonial, patriarchal and disciplinary structures that justified slavery.

These characters are also relevant to modern contexts where inequality, racism, and gendered oppression remain familiar challenges. The outcry of Caliban is echoed in the postcolonial movements, the silence of Miranda in the feminist discourse, the absence of Sycorax in the efforts to recover erased histories, the obedience of Ariel in the debate of complicity and the power of Prospero in the debate of surveillance and knowledge as a means of control. The play remains relevant since it demonstrates structures that continue to influence the world even today, not only during the reign of Shakespeare.

4.4 Summary of the analysis

To sum up, it has been shown in the Analysis and Discussion chapter that *The Tempest* is a play that is closely tied to the issues of power, silence, and subalternity. The characters represent distinct positions in the structures of oppression, and the way they interact shows how colonialism, patriarchy, and class intersect in silencing the voices. The thesis provides a comprehensive study that fills the gaps in the literature by utilising the postcolonial theory, Marxist feminism, the ideas of power/knowledge proposed by Foucault, and the subaltern studies by Spivak.

The main conclusion is that the subaltern in *The Tempest* is a multiplicity of characters, who are rendered silent in diverse ways. The resistance of Caliban, the speech of Miranda under control, the lack of the name of Sycorax and his lack of control, the lack of speech of Ariel and the dominance of Prospero all demonstrate the different forms of silence. The play by Shakespeare gives an important analysis of the subaltern condition, which is relevant to the modern debate on voice, recognition, and power.

In such a manner, we learn more about Shakespeare and the forms of authority which continue to inform our world. Literature can be used to recognise and address silence, underlining the question of whether the subaltern can speak or not, is not only related to

theatrical characters but also to all those authentic voices that seek recognition in the course of history and in society.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The key objective of this thesis was to examine how *The Tempest* employs its major characters to express the concepts of subalternity, stillness and power. Many interpretations of the play give a lot of focus on the themes of magic, forgiveness, and unity. We have discovered more fundamental causes. The plot of the play examines the collaboration of power, authority, and marginalisation. It is concerned with the right to speak and non-speaking. The study was aimed at describing how characters such as Caliban, Miranda, Ariel, and Sycorax are depicted as socially, politically, or culturally marginalised subaltern characters. The thesis has analysed the ways of expression of the characters. The manner in which their voices are either displaced or altered by dominant people, such as Prospero, and the ways their positions in the narrative demonstrate how colonialism, patriarchy and class are all interconnected. The analysis of these characters in the study highlighted how the subalternity in *The Tempest* is complex. It is difficult since colonialism, patriarchy, and class converge in numerous ways. Caliban is the colonised, Miranda is the silenced woman, Ariel is the faithful servant, and Sycorax is the character who is absent but shows the existing power structures. This paper revealed that *The Tempest* can be viewed as a multifaceted critique of how power can silence and marginalise some voices and enhance the power of other voices, in relation to a wide range of theoretical approaches, including postcolonial theory, Marxist feminism, Foucault's concepts of power/knowledge, and Spivak's theory of the subaltern. It is an unusual and useful approach to the play since it unites various critical opinions, concentrating on the characters and issues that are commonly overlooked.

The Tempest has long been divided in the literature, and postcolonial critics have seen Caliban as an embodiment of colonial oppression. Feminist critics consider Miranda to be a weakened woman, whereas others discuss the political aspects of the play in terms of magic and power. Nevertheless, there is much research on the play. These various methods are frequently applied individually, and few studies have attempted to integrate them all in a single large-scale outlook. This thesis sought to fill this gap by conducting a comprehensive study to examine the character of Caliban and Miranda, as well as how the other characters (Sycorax, Ariel, and Prospero) contributed to the power and silence dynamics. Much of the work that has been conducted on this topic has centred around Caliban and Prospero. Miranda has been relegated to a minor figure on many occasions, and the other characters like Sycorax and Ariel have been under-expressed in terms of their political or under-class position. This paper attempted to correct these imbalances by putting emphasis on the sidelined characters and demonstrating their significance to the intricate examination of power, silence, and resistance in the play. The thesis demonstrates that studying these people in a group, as opposed to studying them individually, is more insightful. Their voices and silences are all part of the larger narrative of subalternity, and they create a complex and subtle image of power when combined. The resistance of Caliban, the submission of Miranda, the lack of Sycorax and the approval of Ariel are all indications of marginalisation, all of which reflect the multifaceted nature of relationships of power in the play. The thesis has revealed that *The Tempest* is a complex, cross-sectional perspective on power which cannot be viewed through one perspective or framework. It involves a scrutiny of the interrelations between colonialism, gender, and class in determining the lives and voices of these people.

The research aimed to examine how *The Tempest* brings to light the subaltern figures, how Prospero employs power to oppress others and how different theoretical frameworks could help

us to understand these dynamics better. The first research topic was the portrayal of subaltern characters like Caliban and Miranda, and it revealed that the characters have distinct signs of subalternity. As an example, Caliban is a talking person, yet no one pays much attention to him since they do not believe that he has a voice. Miranda can speak, but according to the restrictions by her father and the culture she inhabits, which is patriarchal. Sycorax is unable to talk at all, and Ariel can sing only in case Prospero allows him to do so. The second area of research question was the way Prospero applies power, language, and knowledge to manipulate other individuals. The analysis found out that Prospero is not only powerful due to magic, but also his power to manage the stream of information and knowledge. He employs words, spying and forgiveness to maintain order and make people straight. This is the picture of colonial power and a patriarchal authority that controls his relations with Miranda and Ariel. The third question was how we might use such theories as Marxist feminism, postcolonial theory, and power/knowledge theory of Foucault to make sense of these characters. The paper has shown that Spivak referenced subaltern theory eloquently elucidates the reasons why Caliban and Miranda cannot speak freely and independently, despite being vocal. The Marxist feminism proved that Miranda was silent not only because of her gender but also because of her social status and because she was a political instrument used by her father and further by Ferdinand. The postcolonial theory explained the dispossession of Caliban and his fight against the colonial conquest, and the framework of Foucault explained the prolongation of the enslavement of his subjects by the power of knowledge and language possessed by Prospero. The former research study investigated how the three factors, class, gender, and colonial history, interacted to lead to silence among people. The research has demonstrated that these elements cannot be looked at separately as they are closely interrelated. The colonization of Caliban is also connected with his exploitation as a lower-class person. The silence of Miranda is influenced by her gender and high social status. The elimination of Sycorax is patriarchal

and colonial. The collaboration of Ariel relates to the subservience of the classes and the colonialism complicity. These intersections have revealed that *The Tempest* provides a tricky image of power which is not easily seen by observing these intersections. It is requesting a greater insight into how various systems of oppression intersect to suppress some voices. The thesis has given a better understanding of the play, demonstrated the complex networks of power, silence, and resistance, as well as pinpointing the enduring relevance of the themes in modern discourse in terms of colonialism, gender, and class.

Works Cited

- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
<https://archive.org/details/locationofcultur0000bhah>
- Brown, Paul. “‘This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine’: *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism.” *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 2nd ed., Cornell University Press, 1994, pp. 48–71.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3874104>
- Césaire, Aimé. *A Tempest: Based on Shakespeare’s The Tempest—Adaptation for a Black Theatre*. Translated by Philip Crispin, Oberon Books, 2013.
<https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/a-tempest-9781840022310/>
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–99.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039>
- Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*. Autonomedia, 2004.
<https://libcom.org/article/caliban-and-witch-silvia-federici>
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
<https://archive.org/details/disciplinepunish00fouc>
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. Routledge, 1990.
<https://www.routledge.com/Learning-to-Curse/Greenblatt/p/book/9780415900499>
- Hulme, Peter. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797*. Routledge, 1992.
<https://www.routledge.com/Colonial-Encounters-Europe-and-the-Native-Caribbean-1492-1797/Hulme/p/book/9780415289884>
- Leininger, Lorie Jerrell. “The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*.” *The Tempest: Critical Essays*, edited by Patrick M. Murphy, Routledge, 2001, pp. 285–300.
<https://www.routledge.com/The-Tempest-Critical-Essays/Murphy/p/book/9780815338905>

- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2015.
<https://www.routledge.com/ColonialismPostcolonialism/Loomba/p/book/9781138809860>
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. Edited by Gareth Stedman Jones, Penguin Classics, 2002.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- Orgel, Stephen. *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance*. University of California Press, 1975.
<https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520028933/the-illusion-of-power>
- Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.
<https://archive.org/details/orientalism00said>
- Rubin, Gayle. “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex.” *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna Reiter, Monthly Review Press, 1975, pp. 157–210.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174166>
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, 1994.
<https://archive.org/details/cultureimperiali00said>
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Stephen Orgel, Oxford University Press, 2008.
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-tempest-9780199535903>
- Singh, Jyotsna. *Colonial Narratives, Cultural Dialogues: “Discoveries” of India in the Language of Colonialism*. Routledge, 1996.
<https://www.routledge.com/Colonial-Narratives-Cultural-Dialogues-Discoveries-of-India-in-the-Language/Singh/p/book/9780415860182>
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, Columbia University Press, 1994, pp. 66–111.
<https://www.sfu.ca/cmns/courses/2010/801/1-Readings/Spivak-CanTheSubalternSpeak.pdf>
- The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.
<https://archive.org/details/historyofsexuali0000fouc>
- Thompson, Ann. *Shakespeare’s Women*. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/shakespeares-women/>

Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/shakespeares-caliban/>

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. *Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500–1800*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/performing-blackness-on-english-stages-15001800/>

Young, Robert J. C. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2001.

<https://archive.org/details/postcolonialisman00youn>