

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



**A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctorate in English**

Option: Literature
Title

**Shakespeare and Defoe in Modern and Post-modern
African/Caribbean Literature**

Presented by:
CHERIFI Ahcene

Supervised by:
Dr. KHELIFA Arezki

Board of Examiners:

GUENDOZI Amar, Professor, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou, Chairman,	
KHELIFA Arezki, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou,	Supervisor,
DOUIFI Mohamed, MCA, University of Algiers 2,	Examiner,
BOUBAAYA/BELFAR Naciera, MCA, University of Setif,	Examiner,
BENMEZAL Farid, MCA, University of Boumerdes,	Examiner,
AZIZ Rabea, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou,	Examiner.

January, 2023

Acknowledgements

I would like, first and foremost, to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor **Doctor KHELIFA Arezki** who has patiently guided me with his invaluable feedback and constructively commented upon every single aspect of this work during the full process of its writing. I am also grateful to **Professor RICHE Bouteldja** and **Professor ZERAR Sabrina** without whom the entire idea and concept behind this research would not have germinated. My thanks have to be extended to the board of examiners namely **Professor GUENDOUI Amar**, **Doctor DOUIFI Mohamed**, **Doctor BOUBAAYA/BELFAR Naciera**, **Doctor BENMEZAL Farid** and **Doctor AZIZ Rabea**, for their intellectual generosity; despite their tight schedules, they have kindly and wholeheartedly accepted to read, discuss and assess this work. To my parents and family members, in the last position, thank you for your unconditional support and above all, for being there when I needed you the most.

To my wife, son, parents and siblings: if I am to be caught in a mighty ‘tempest’ and ultimately get shipwrecked, under whatever circumstances, on a ‘desert’ island —all I would have, indubitably, required is your presence, there, with me.

Abstract:

The present research has sought to study William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) in relation to Ngũgĩ Wa Thion'o's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969) and Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985); it has also targeted to explore the connection which binds Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) to Nadine Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960), Derek Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978) and J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* (1986). This research, in terms of theoretical bearings, has been pillared on a paradigm constituted around Mikhail Bakhtin's historicist intertextual dialogism, Gérard Genette's notions and Raymond Williams' ideological and cultural materialist continuum. While conducting this study, I have reached a wide range of findings. First, each one of the six African/Caribbean adaptations, under scrutiny, has leaned on its source text, Shakespeare's or Defoe's, reproducing and stylizing, therefore, seen as stylization of, several elements from their 'originals'; however, it has to be highlighted, following this thread of arguments, that they have been far from being carbon copies. This would pertain to my second major finding, which is the fact that every single author has made use of his/her source of inspiration to suit his/her own purposes; the final outcome has been six texts which have, at times, parodied or engaged in a polemic, hidden or overt, with the English bard's last play or Defoe's novel; in accordance with my third finding, some adaptations have, at other times, treated the source work metatextually by either commenting on and criticising it, or deleting, reducing, amplifying and revising a variety of its aspects. The fourth finding might be associated with Williams' ideological and cultural spectrum which has uncovered, to me, the crucial importance of the background of every African/Caribbean literary attempt this study has dealt with. This has resulted in six texts which have had to explore and voice a great deal about the concerns, issues, certainties, uncertainties, perceptions and realities of their precise historical moment of production than Shakespeare's or Defoe's era and lifetime. This research has been divided into seven chapters; the first one has been devoted to the alleged source texts which have been contextualised and examined in their exact environment. The six following chapters have been organised into two parts, three chapters each, with every one of them being concerned with studying one African/Caribbean adaptation with its source at a time.

Key Words: The Tempest, Robinson Crusoe, Intertextual Dialogism, Cultural Materialism, Stylisation, Polemic, Ideology

Résumé:

La présente recherche a étudié *The Tempest* (1611) de William Shakespeare dans une relation étroite avec *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) de Ngũgĩ Wa Thion'o, *A Tempest* (1969) d'Aimé Césaire et *Annie John* (1985) de Jamaica Kincaid; elle a également exploré le lien qui pourrait lier *Robinson Crusoé* de Daniel Defoe (1719) à "*Friday's Footprint*" de Nadine Gordimer (1960), *Pantomime* de Derek Walcott (1978) et *Foe* de J. M. Coetzee (1986). Cette recherche, en termes de repères théoriques, s'est appuyée sur un paradigme constitué autour du dialogisme intertextuel historiciste de Mikhaïl Bakhtine, des notions de Gérard Genette et du continuum matérialiste culturel de Raymond Williams. En menant cette étude, j'ai atteint un large éventail de conclusions. Premièrement, chacune des six adaptations Africaines/Caribéennes examinées s'est appuyée sur son texte source, celui de Shakespeare ou de Defoe, reproduisant et stylisant, donc vu comme stylisation de, plusieurs éléments de leurs «originaux» ; il faut cependant souligner, à la suite de ce fil d'arguments, qu'elles [les six adaptations] sont loin d'être des copies conformes. Cela concernerait ma deuxième découverte majeure, qui est le fait que chaque auteur a fait abondamment usage de sa source d'inspiration pour le répondre à ses propres objectifs; le résultat final a été six textes qui ont parfois parodié ou engagé une polémique, cachée ou ouverte, avec la dernière pièce du barde anglais ou le premier roman de Defoe; conformément à ma troisième constatation, certaines adaptations ont, à d'autres moments, traité l'œuvre source de manière métatextuelle soit en la commentant et en la critiquant, soit en supprimant, réduisant, amplifiant et révisant une variété d'aspects du texte originale. La quatrième découverte pourrait être associée au spectre idéologique et culturel de Williams qui a révélé, pour moi, l'importance cruciale de l'ensemble du contexte de chaque tentative littéraire Africaine/Caribéennes dont cette étude a traité. Cela a abouti à six textes qui ont dû explorer et exprimer beaucoup sur les préoccupations, les problèmes, les certitudes, les incertitudes, les perceptions et les réalités de leur moment de production historique précis que de l'époque et la vie de Shakespeare ou Defoe. Cette recherche a été divisée en sept chapitres; le premier a été consacré aux présumés textes sources qui ont été examinés dans leur environnement exact. Les six chapitres suivants ont été organisés en deux parties de trois chapitres chacune, chacun d'entre elles étant concerné à la fois par l'étude d'une adaptation Africaine/Caribéenne avec sa source.

Mots clés : La Tempête, Robinson Crusoé, Dialogue intertextuel, Matérialisme culturel, Stylisation, Polémique, Idéologie

الملخص

سعى البحث الحالي إلى دراسة مسرحية ويليام شكسبير "العاصفة" (1611) (*The Tempest*) في علاقة وثيقة مع رواية "حبة قمح" للكاتب الكيني نقوي واثونفو (1967) (*Ngũgĩ Wa Thion'o's A Grain of Wheat*) و مسرحية "عاصفة" من تأليف إيمي سيزار (1969) (*Aimé Césaire's A Tempest*) بالإضافة إلى رواية جامايكا كينيسيد المسماة "آني جون" (1985) (*Jamica Kincaid's Annie John*) ؛ وقد استهدف أيضًا هذا البحث استكشاف العلاقة التي قد تربط "روبنسون كروزو" للروائي الإنجليزي دانيال ديفو (1719) بالقصة المعروفة بـ "بصمة الجمعة" لنادين جورديمر (1960) (*Nadine Gordimer's "Friday's Footprint"*) ، ومسرحية بانثومايم للكاتب السانت لوسيان ديريك والكوت (1978) (*Derek Walcott's Pantomime*) ورواية "فو" للمؤلف الجنوب إفريقي جي إم كويتزي (1986) (*J. M. Coetzee's Foe*). من حيث المحامل النظرية، ارتكز هذا البحث على نموذج تم تشكيله حول حوار النصوص التاريخي لميخائيل باختين، ومفاهيم الباحث الفرنسي جيرارد جينيت والإستمراية الأيديولوجية والثقافية لريموند ويليامز. أثناء إجراء هذه الدراسة، توصلت إلى مجموعة واسعة من النتائج. أولاً، استندت كل واحدة من التعديلات الإفريقية/الكاريبية الستة، قيد الفحص، إلى نصها الأصلي، المؤلف من طرف شكسبير أو ديفو، لإعادة إنتاج أسلوب، وبالتالي يُنظر إليها على أنها إعادة صياغة "لأصولها" أو نصها الأصلي؛ ومع ذلك، وفقاً لهذا الطرح، يجب تسليط الضوء على أن كل عمل أدبي إفريقي/كاريبي كان بعيداً كل البعد عن كونه نسخة كربونية للعمل الأصلي. تقودنا هذه الحجة إلى الإستهتاج الرئيسي الثاني الذي يتعلق بحقيقة أن كل مؤلف استخدم على نطاق واسع مصدر إلهامه/مصدر إلهامها ليناسب أغراضه/أغراضها؛ كانت النتيجة النهائية ستة نصوص، في بعض الأحيان، سخرت أو شاركت في جدال، مخفي أو علني، مع مسرحية الشاعر الإنجليزي أو رواية ديفو؛ وفقاً لاستنتاجي الثالث، في أوقات أخرى، عالجت بعض التعديلات العمل المصدر نصياً إما بالتعليق عليه وانتقاده، أو حذف، وتقليل، وتضخيم، ومراجعة مجموعة متنوعة من جوانبه. النتيجة الرابعة التي استخلصتها مرتبطة بالطيف الأيديولوجي والثقافي لويليامز والذي كشف، بالنسبة لي، التالي: الأهمية الحاسمة للخلفية الكاملة لكل محاولة أدبية أفريقية/كاريبية تعاملت معها هذه الدراسة. نتج عن ذلك ستة نصوص استكشفت وعبرت عن قدر كبير من الاهتمامات والقضايا والشكوك والمفاهيم والحقائق المتعلقة بلحظة إنتاجها التاريخية الدقيقة مقارنة بعصر شكسبير أو زمان ديفو. تم تقسيم هذا البحث إلى سبعة فصول. تم تخصيص الفصل الأول للنصوص "المصدر" المزعومة التي تم وضعها بكل دقة في سياقها وبيئتها التاريخية. تم تنظيم الفصول الستة التالية في جزأين، ثلاثة فصول لكل منهما، كل واحد منها معني بدراسة التكيف الإفريقي/الكاريبي لـ "العاصفة" و "روبنسون كروزو" في كل مرة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: العاصفة، روبنسون كروزو، الحوار التناسي، المادية الثقافية، الأسلوب، الجدل، الأيديولوجيا

Contents

Acknowledgement.....	i
Dedications.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Résumé.....	iv
المُلخَص.....	v
Contents.....	vi
General Introduction.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	05
Issue and Hypothesis.....	11
Methodology.....	12
Methodological Outline.....	19
Endnotes.....	20

Part One:

Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719): The Historical, Cultural and Ideological Backgrounds

Chapter One:

The Tempest and Robinson Crusoe: History, Lives, Times in Context, Intertextual Dialogic Perspectives and Ideological Concerns

Introduction.....	23
<u>1- William Shakespeare and <i>The Tempest</i>: Life, Context, Influences.....</u>	23
A- William Shakespeare: More than a Playwright.....	23
B- Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i> : Elizabethan and Jacobean Influences.....	24
<u>2- Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i> (1611): Intertextual Origins.....</u>	27
<u>3- <i>The Tempest</i>: Residual, Dominant and Emergent Considerations.....</u>	29
A- The Spectre of Feudalism as the Residual Aspect in <i>The Tempest</i>	29
B- Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i> and the Dominant Ideological Elements.....	30
B- I- Absolutism (Absolutist Monarchy): As a Dominant Aspect.....	30
B - II- Mercantilism: An Economic Dominant Ideology.....	32
C- Capitalism and Colonialism: Emergent Ideologies in <i>The Tempest</i> :.....	33
<u>4- Daniel Defoe and <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>: Life, Context, and Influences.....</u>	36
A- The Life of Daniel Defoe.....	36
B- Daniel Defoe's <i>Robinson Crusoe</i> (1719) in Context.....	37
<u>5- Back to the Origins of the Crusoe Story.....</u>	39
<u>6- The Crusoe Tale: From Williams' Ideological and Cultural Continuum.....</u>	41
A- Defoe's Text: Political and Economic Remnants.....	41
B- The Dominant Economic, Cultural and Political Patterns.....	45
B-I- Capitalism and the Crusoe Narrative.....	45

B-II- Eurocentrism: A Dominant Cultural Feature.....	47
B-III- The Supremacy of High Time Colonialism.....	48
C- The Emergent: Individualism, Industrialisation, and Inventiveness.....	50
Conclusion.....	52
Endnotes.....	52

Part Two:

Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) Appropriated, Revisited and Aggressively Reworked through Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969) and Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985)

Chapter Two:

Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967): A Stylization and Subtle Rewriting of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in Relation to Cultural and Ideological Considerations

Introduction.....	56
<u>1- Ngũgĩ's Life and a Text in Context.....</u>	<u>57</u>
A- Ngũgĩ: A Postcolonial Committed Author.....	57
B- Contextualising Ngũgĩ's <i>A Grain of Wheat</i> (1967).....	58
<u>2- Ngũgĩ's <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>: A Stylization of <i>The Tempest</i>.....</u>	<u>61</u>
A- Stylizing the Characters.....	61
A- I- From Prospero to John Thompson.....	61
A- II- Calibans in Full Rebellion.....	63
A- III- Ariel: A Spirit whose <i>Spirit</i> Hovers in Kenya.....	67
B- Colonial Paternalism and the Civilising Mission.....	68
C- The Rhetoric of Good Intentions Slips towards Colonial Brutality.....	72
<u>3- Ngũgĩ's <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>: A Hidden Polemic Directed at <i>The Tempest</i>.....</u>	<u>75</u>
A- The Setting: From an Unknown Island to Africa.....	76
B- A Hidden Polemic through the Characters.....	78
B- I- Caliban: From Utter Monstrosity to Full Humanity.....	78
B-II- Prospero and Thompson: The Beginning and the End of Colonialism.....	80
C- Caliban's Wrath: Miranda Sexually Abused.....	81
D- Language and Narrative Voice.....	83
<u>4- Ngũgĩ's <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>: Ideologically and Culturally Explored.....</u>	<u>85</u>
A- The Residual in <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>	85
B- The Dominant Capitalist Drive and Patriarchy.....	88

C- Emergent Features: Neocolonialism, Betrayal and the Corruption of the New Elite or the New Bourgeoisie.....	90
Conclusion.....	93
Endnotes.....	93

Chapter Three:

<u>Césaire’s <i>A Tempest</i> (1969): An Aggressive Appropriation Embedded in Its Temporal and Spatial Ideological Environment as a Blatant Occupation of Shakespeare’s Text</u>	
Introduction.....	99
<u>1- Aimé Césaire’s Life and a Play not to be De-contextualised.....</u>	100
A- Aimé Césaire and Cultural Re-appropriation.....	100
B- Aimé Césaire’s <i>A Tempest</i> : A Play Steeped in Its Background.....	101
<u>2- <i>The Tempest</i> and <i>A Tempest</i> through Metatextuality.....</u>	103
A- <i>A Tempest</i> : A Commentary on the Reality/Unreality of Performance.....	104
B- A Radical Shift in Perspective and Setting.....	105
C- Colonialism: A Commentary on Theory and Practice.....	107
D- A Blow at the Colonial Pedagogy and the Civilising Mission.....	109
E- A Commentary on <i>The Tempest</i> : Christianity and Its Values.....	110
F- Prospero: From Protagonist/Humanist to Antagonist/Despotic.....	111
G- Further Stingy Comments on/Rejoinders to Shakespeare’s Prospero.....	114
H- Caliban Salvages His History and Identity.....	116
I- Refuting Rape and Sexual Harassment Accusations.....	118
J- Disillusionment: From a Utopian to a Dystopian Vision of the Island.....	119
<u>3- <i>A Tempest</i>: Excisions, Reductions and Amplifications of the Source.....</u>	120
A- Significant Excisions at the Level of <i>A Tempest</i>	121
B- <i>A Tempest</i> : Necessary Reductions.....	122
C- Strategic Amplifications in Césaire’s Adaptation.....	124
<u>4- Residual, Dominant and Emergent Ideological and Cultural Elements.....</u>	126
A- The Residual in <i>A Tempest</i>	126
B- Dominant Ideological and Cultural Elements.....	127
C- Césaire’s <i>A Tempest</i> : An Emergent Debate and Neocolonialism.....	128
Conclusion.....	131
Endnotes.....	131

Chapter Four:	
<u>Kincaid's <i>Annie John</i> (1985): A Subtle, but Forceful Feminist Takeover of Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i> Ingrained in Its Historical and Cultural Milieu</u>	
Introduction.....	137
<u>1- Jamaica Kincaid and <i>Annie John</i>: Life and Environment.....</u>	137
A- The Life of Jamaica Kincaid.....	137
B- The Background of <i>Annie John</i> (1985).....	139
<u>2- Kincaid's <i>Annie John</i>: A Stylization of <i>The Tempest</i>.....</u>	141
A- Kincaid's Novel and Shakespeare's Characters.....	141
A- I- Miss Nelson: Kincaid's Female Prospero.....	141
A- II- Caliban-like Figures in <i>Annie John</i>	142
B- Stylized Colonial Dynamics.....	146
C- The Civilising Mission and Colonial Education: A Deadlock.....	147
<u>3- Kincaid's Hidden Polemic Against Shakespeare's <i>The Tempest</i>.....</u>	148
A- Prospero's Perspective versus a Child's Point of View.....	149
B- The Island Setting Retrieved in Kincaid's Novel.....	151
C- Who Smells Like Fish? Other Caliban-like Figures?.....	153
D- 'Usurping' Prospero's Magus Powers.....	155
E- Sycorax: A Strategic Resurrection.....	156
F- From Heterosexual to Homoerotic Modes.....	159
G- <i>Annie John</i> : A Condemnation of Colonialism.....	161
<u>4- Kincaid's Novel Linked to the Residual, Dominant, and Emergent.....</u>	165
A- <i>Annie John</i> and the Residual Ideological and Cultural Features.....	165
B- The Dominant: Anti-colonial Spirit and Hippie Cultural Values.....	167
C- The Emergent: An Upsurge of Neocolonialism.....	170
Conclusion.....	171
Endnotes.....	172

Part Three:

Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) Rewritten, Remodelled, Revised and Reinvented through Gordimer's *Friday's Footprint* (1960), Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978) and Coetzee's *Foe* (1986)

Chapter Five:

The Crusoe/Friday Story and Men/Women Dualities under the Apartheid Regime in Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960) Framed with Feminist, Ideological and Cultural Influences

Introduction.....	178
<u>1- Nadine Gordimer's Life and "<i>Friday's Footprint</i>" in Context.....</u>	179

A- Nadine Gordimer: The Life of an Engaged Intellectual.....	179
B- Gordimer’s “Friday’s Footprint” (1960): Context and Influences.....	180
<u>2- “Friday’s Footprint”: A Stylization of Robinson Crusoe.....</u>	183
A- The Characters in Gordimer’s Adaptation and Defoe’s Source.....	183
A- I- Crusoe Retrieved through Arthur and Johnny.....	183
A- II- Rita Cunningham: Gordimer’s Friday.....	186
B- Colonialism, Coloniser/Colonised, Slave/Master and Crusoe/Friday: Dynamics, Binaries and Dualities Stylized in Gordimer’s Text.....	190
C- “Friday’s Footprint”: The Shipwreck, almost a Desert and Loneliness.....	193
D- The Struggle Against Nature with Breathtaking Adventures.....	195
<u>3- “Friday’s Footprint”: A Parody and a Metatext of Robinson Crusoe.....</u>	196
3- I- Gordimer’s Text: A Parody of Robinson Crusoe.....	197
A- Undermining the Coloniser’s Identity and Capacity for Survival.....	197
3- II- Gordimer’s Tale: A Metatextual Rewriting of Defoe’s.....	199
A- Criticising and Diminishing Crusoe.....	199
B- Women: Hearing the Voice of the Silenced and Oppressed.....	200
<u>4- “Friday’s Footprint”: Ideological and Cultural Aspects.....</u>	204
A- “Friday’s Footprint” and the Residual Rural Community.....	204
B- The Dominant: Capitalism and the Apartheid System.....	206
B- The Emergent Notion of Women Empowerment.....	208
Conclusion.....	209
Endnotes.....	210

Chapter Six:

Walcott’s Pantomime (1978): The Crusoe/Friday Encounter and Colonial Story Retold by the “Black Crusoe” as a Struggle for Identity in a Quite Different Cultural and Ideological Matrix

Introduction.....	215
<u>1- Derek Walcott’s Life and Pantomime (1978) in Context.....</u>	216
A- Derek Walcott (1930-2017).....	216
B- Events in History: Pantomime (1978).....	217
<u>2- Walcott’s Pantomime: An Overt Polemic Against Robinson Crusoe.....</u>	218
A- What if the “Subaltern [...] Speak[s]”: Narrative and Perspective.....	218
B- A Blow at the Setting: The Crusoe Tale in the Post-independence Era.....	220
C- A Black Civilised Crusoe and a White Cannibal Friday.....	222
D- What if the Master/Slave Dynamics Are Toppled?.....	224

<u>3- <i>Pantomime</i>: A Metatextual Reconstruction of <i>Robinson Crusoe</i></u>	226
A- Colonialism: A Scathing Commentary.....	227
B- Language and Creole: Subverting the Centre.....	230
C- <i>Pantomime</i> : A Metatextual Reinterpretation of the Past.....	232
D- Women the Excluded: A Metatextual Response.....	234
<u>4- <i>Pantomime</i> and the Residual, Dominant and Emergent</u>	235
A- Colonialism and Eurocentrism: Residual Elements.....	236
B- Capitalism and <i>Pantomime</i> : The Dominant.....	238
C- Emergent Neocolonial Concern and Multicultural Vision.....	239
Conclusion.....	241
Endnotes.....	241
<u>Chapter Seven:</u>	
<u>Coetzee's <i>Foe</i> (1986): Telling the 'Untold,' those Silenced Stories of the 'Others,' Friday and Women, with Ideological and Cultural Bearings</u>	
Introduction.....	245
<u>1- J. M. Coetzee and <i>Foe</i> (1986): The Full Background</u>	246
A- J. M. Coetzee: A Life of Cultural Conflicts.....	246
B- <i>Foe</i> : A Work Imbedded in its Context.....	247
<u>2- Stylizing <i>Robinson Crusoe</i> through <i>Foe</i></u>	248
A- <i>Foe</i> in Time and Place: Back to Defoe's Source.....	249
B- Crusoe and Friday: Dynamics Stylized and Resuscitated.....	249
C- The Basic Storyline and Style.....	250
D- Paternalism and the Civilising Mission.....	252
<u>3- Coetzee's <i>Foe</i>: An Overt Polemic Against the Source</u>	253
A- The Castaways: From Crusoe to Barton.....	254
B- Breaking the Tyranny of Crusoe's Voice/Gaze: Hearing the 'Other'.....	255
C- An Overt Polemic to the Island: From Utopia to Dystopia.....	257
D- Crusoe and Cruso: Two Sides of the Same Coin.....	259
E- Crusoe/Cruso: Sexual Desire Revised in <i>Foe</i>	262
F- Colonialism, Colonial Brutality and the Question of Slavery.....	262
G- Who is Coetzee's Friday in Relation to Defoe's?.....	266
H- Cannibalism Countered and Subverted.....	269
I- <i>Foe</i> : A Blow at Daniel Defoe.....	270
<u>4- The Residual, Dominant and Emergent in Coetzee's <i>Foe</i></u>	271
A- <i>Foe</i> and the Residual: Slavery and Eurocentrism.....	271

B- <i>Foe</i> and the Dominant: Apartheid and Capitalism.....	273
C- The Emergent: Neocolonialism, Multiculturalism and Feminist Issues.....	276
Conclusion.....	278
Endnotes.....	279
General Conclusion.....	283
Bibliography.....	290

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

General Introduction:

Well, I am an African, but I will say this, no matter how many skies fall: the major distinguishing mark of African literature of the twentieth century is that it is a literature displaying the mentality of a colonised people. It began in reaction to colonialism; it has thrived in reaction to colonialism[.] One might add an aside here: Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Shakespeare's *The Tempest* could be said to be the beginning of the literature of the colonizing people.¹

I have in no way been arguing that postcolonial writers are somehow doomed in one way or another to evoke Shakespeare [and] Defoe [...] in perpetuity: those particular names, and the intertextual relations that they have generated, are simply a convenient form of shorthand, serving as an easily recognizable labyrinthine of the connections that binds us to a colonial (and colonized) past, with "a glow of after-memory," continues obscurely to illuminate our lives.²

[T]he Empire writes back to the Centre.³

Scholars, in both the English and non-English speaking world alike, have, so far, demonstrated the intricacy of studying the Western literary tradition without making any reference, however slight, to either William Shakespeare or Daniel Defoe. These two authors, one might assume, are pillars of Western, if not world, literature who have brought into existence, with their strikingly different characters, stories and plots, various unprecedented techniques, prototypes, memorable heroes, outstanding passages and even genres. Critics often tend to point at the enduring and eternal impact of these two key figures whose timeless texts, which peculiarly yet not undeservedly, outlived them, spawning thereby a wide range of subsequent rewritings, subversions, appropriations and adaptations. *The Tempest* (1611) and *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) remain, in this respect, the central paradigms which, indubitably, shed light on Shakespeare's and Defoe's worldwide fame and testify on behalf of the widespread literary effect they have had and the permanent mark they have left.

The echo of these two texts, I might argue, has resonated through centuries, despite the constantly shifting values and slippery grounds, under myriad artistic forms; they have been remodelled and transformed, with abundance, into novels, plays, films, television series, paintings and even poems. Shakespeare's play and Defoe's novel have no longer been imprisoned in the context of the British Empire since they have, in many ways, achieved a mythical position which has allowed them to transcend the confines of their initial time and

place. To list only a few instances as regards Shakespeare's play, scholars refer to: Octave Mannoni's *Prospero and Caliban: Psychology of Colonization* (1950), George Lamming's *The Pleasures of Exile* (1960), Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969), Roberto Fernández Retamar's *Caliban* (1971), Margaret Laurence's *The Diviner* (1974), David Wallace's *Do You Love Me, Master?*(1977) and Elizabeth Nunez's *Prospero's Daughter* (2006). These works have reinterpreted the play, from quite different standpoints, and have, mainly, but not exclusively, focused on drastically altering the slave/master connection embodied through Prospero and Caliban. Colonialism, in the bard's play, has been revisited through both subtle and straightforward strategies in an attempt to criticise it, debunk its dynamics and ultimately dissolve its colonial founding pillars: myths and stereotypes. One critic has argued, in this direction, that *The Tempest*, has come to be viewed "as a manifesto of decolonisation and a myth of transatlantic imperialism rooted in the central metaphor provided by the colonial encounter" binding the alleged 'master' to his constructed 'other' and by extension 'slave.'⁴

When it comes, on the other hand, to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, the words of Mr. Betteredge, the narrator of Wilkie Collins' novel *The Moonstone* (1868), are highly expressive as he has assure[d] that, "a book as Robinson Crusoe never was written, and never will be written again."⁵ Exaggerated, as it might appear, though not devoid altogether of truth, such resolute words seem to stress the tremendous importance of Defoe's novel which has, often, been reinterpreted through time at various proportions and dimensions. The detailed narrative of a man, Crusoe, with all his virtues and 'vices,' whose adventurous, spirited and unequalled mind set has gone beyond the context of 18th century England since it has recurrently resurrected through ages. The fact that Defoe's novel (1719) has centred around an 'ordinary' man's struggle, who could be anybody else, with his adventures springing from the mundane world, not belonging to the realm of gods or semi-gods, has, thus, with much accuracy, entitled it to be pinpointed as the onset of the English novelistic tradition.⁶

The seemingly endless charm Defoe's text has might lie in many aspects among which giving birth to a timeless and heroic figure which stands, today, as one of the most, if not the most, renowned literary heroes. Watt's contention, as such, that the novel, bearing its protagonist's name, has in no way to be mingled with other texts, but "with the great myths of Western civilisation [like] Faust[us], Don Juan and Don Quixote"⁷ has, arguably, a well-grounded basis. The solitary and 'indomitable' character, Defoe brought into life, has exceeded the status of a fictitious hero in Western literary tradition. Today, the name of such a figure, Crusoe, has not only managed to be teamed with Defoe's whenever spoken of, but has also lasted beyond the British Empire whose colonial clichés, stereotypes and dynamics played a key role in the writing and shaping of the entire story's appealing narrative.

Crusoe's castaway tale, just like Shakespeare's play, has been adapted, reworked and appropriated to suit audiences from markedly different periods, countries and ages which might situate such a novel among those recurrent, well known and canonical texts⁸ the modern historical and literary times have witnessed. The texts that, excessively or slightly, borrow and inspire items, be they at the level of form or content, from Crusoe's 18th century tribulations, have multiplied through time; the next two centuries have, upon meticulous examination, seen a wide range of texts the origins of which might be *Robinson Crusoe*. Critics and scholars often refer, at this stage, to Robert Michael Ballantyne's *Coral Island* (1858), Jules Verne's *The Mysterious Island* (1874), Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1882), Rider Haggard's *She* (1887), H. G. Wells's *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896), William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954), Eth Clifford's *The Curse of the Moonraker* (1955), Muriel Spark's *Robinson*(1958) and Michel Tournier's *Friday, or the Other Island*(1967)—all have perpetuated, one way or another, Defoe's enduring literary legacy and brought new insights to and, sometimes comments on, its story by discussing, reinterpreting and even rejecting themes and issues it has embodied.

In the African/Caribbean context, Shakespeare and Defoe have had a strong appeal due to which they have spurred the imagination of many modern and postmodern writers. To be exhaustive, herein, would be an arduous undertaking, if not impossible, and to mention only a few names, I can speak about Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, Aimé Césaire, Jamaica Kincaid, Nadine Gordimer, Derek Walcott and J. M. Coetzee. Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* has been identified as the origin of Ngũgĩ’s *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), Césaire’s *A Tempest* (1969), and Kincaid’s *Annie John* (1985). Ngũgĩ has qualified the play as an interesting shortcut to be appropriated because it is full of “images that are later on to be reworked into a racist tradition [...] in popular European literature about the colonised peoples: the savage as a rapist, lazy, a lover of whisky, stupid [and] cannibalistic.”⁹ It seems, from a careful reading of Ngũgĩ’s work, that he has engaged in a dialogue with the bard’s play in which he has not only “answer[ed] back,”¹⁰ but has also refuted the long list of stereotypes imputed to the ‘savages.’ The words of one critic are quite significant when he has fostered that, “Prospero-like characters are present in [...] *A Grain of Wheat*.”¹¹ With Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, on the other hand, critics have signalled the influence it has exercised on Gordimer’s “*Friday’s Footprint*” (1960), Walcott’s *Pantomime* (1978) and Coetzee’s *Foe* (1986). These works might be seen as texts which have engaged in an intertextual and dialogic relationship with their source since each has contained, in its own way, a shipwreck and a secluded life on a remote island, to list only a few features. Through these attempts, Gordimer, Walcott and Coetzee have revisited a multitude of issues raised by Defoe’s text.

This study, in brief, pertains to explore the close link *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe*, as source texts, might have in relation to six of their African/Caribbean literary revisions. The texts subject to scrutiny are, on the one hand, Ngũgĩ’s *A Grain of Wheat*, Césaire’s *A Tempest* and Kincaid’s *Annie John* which have appropriated Shakespeare’s play from the view point of the oppressed; this thesis has also examined, on the other hand, the ways in which Gordimer’s “*Friday’s Footprint*,” Walcott’s *Pantomime* and Coetzee’s *Foe*

have adjusted the Crusoe story to their eras, articulating the prevalent ideas, values, and ideologies of their specific environments. It would, thus, be highly accurate to argue that each author, depending on his historical era, has appropriated *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* “for [his] own purposes, to embody [his era’s] morals and to promote its own values.”¹² Accordingly, Shakespeare’s and Defoe’s texts have become crucial references or even turning points for several African/Caribbean postcolonial novelists and playwrights alike, who wanted to struggle against, and subvert almost four hundred years of defamatory, colonial discourse in favour of the indigenous ‘other.’

Review of the Literature:

The fact that African/Caribbean literary adaptations of *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* have been subject to a huge amount of critical literature, from a variety of approaches, is something I cannot ignore and easily dismiss or let go unnoticed. In connection with *The Tempest*, the first text this thesis would explore is *A Grain of Wheat* which has been critically studied by a host of scholars. Deploying a sociological perspective, Ian Glenn (1981) has focused on the main characters and how Ngũgĩ has used them to “solve the dilemmas of the group to which he belongs: [the Kenyan] intellectual élite.”¹³ Nearly everyone, to say the least, is struggling with harsh past experiences of one kind or another depending on the thorny challenges reigning over their lives; these negative experiences have, as a result, come to the surface with the departure of the British coloniser. Glenn has asserted that characters like Mugo have been used to tackle the intricate issues of the increasing lack of commitment to the political sphere and the need for social responsibility the country’s intellectuals were supposed to deal with throughout the restless transition to an independent Kenya.¹⁴

Léon Mugesera has studied, in his article (1983), Ngũgĩ’s text from a psychoanalytic viewpoint. He has used Freud’s concepts of “Ego,” “Super-ego” and “Id” to show the psychological torment that the heroes have been doomed to endure due to betrayal and guilt; Mugo, Mumbi, Koinandu, Karanja and many others have been haunted with their past deeds

which has produced a constant feeling of guilt. The “moral torture” of such figures “is psychological” since the “Id” of each one of them “has excessive strength which [has] damage[d] the[ir] ego[es].”¹⁵ Societal and auto-inflicted punishments under the form of embarrassing and painful confessions in addition to exile, the author believes, are inevitable for the characters’ desire for redemption.

Thomas Cartelli (1999) and Rebecca Fasselt (2016) are other representative critics who have analysed Ngũgĩ’s novel in relation to the bard’s play relying on the postcolonial approach to scrutinise the way in which the novelist has made use of the Prospero/Caliban paradigm in favour of the ‘Other.’ Cartelli has emphasised the coloniser/colonised dichotomy which is located at the centre of Ngũgĩ’s anti-colonial stance.¹⁶ The author has also given considerable attention to the character of Mr. Thompson who is the representative of the British colonial order in Kenya. Cartelli’s analysis blends the novel with Ngũgĩ’s anti-colonial vision; nevertheless, its ideological considerations have been overlooked. Fasselt has, on the other hand, focused on the narrative voice in Ngũgĩ’s work, the style of which is both ingenuous and creative, something the critic has not failed, in any way, to pinpoint. She has contended that such an intricate narrative is only harnessed as a blueprint to put forth Ngũgĩ’s subtle response to the ‘original.’ She has asserted that *A Grain of Wheat* “is a useful example of postcolonial we-narration [...] of the cultural nationalist phase that eschews an authoritative postcolonial “we”; this technique “underpins the idea of indigenous solidarity and foregrounds a communal voice in opposition to the Western canon.”¹⁷ The connection between Shakespeare’s text and Ngũgĩ’s novel might become quite apparent inasmuch as the latter is a ‘second hand’ writing inspired from the bard’s timeless play with which it has engaged in an active conversation.

Elleke Boehmer (2005) has appealed to a feminist perspective in her reading of *A Grain of Wheat*. Her analysis has been centred on the key roles women have played in Ngũgĩ’s novels which range from biological considerations, in his early texts, to eventually

strong and to a certain extent independent characters that can stand as counterparts to the male hero in later writing. She has gone further by affirming that in *A Grain of Wheat* “the redemptive group of central characters is dominated by a single woman [who is Mumbi] – linking them together”; this allowed her to hold “the position of epicentre primarily [due to her being a] biological female” in a male dominated society.¹⁸ Boehmer has succeeded in unfolding the dynamics of male/female link in the Kenyan patriarchal society through her discussion of the kind of, to a certain extent, stereotyped roles attributed to each one of them.

From a historicist-inflected standpoint, Delia Krause (2008) has examined Ngũgĩ’s novel with regards to its wider historical context. Although it has been set a few days to Kenya’s independence, as Krause has confirmed, most of the events have transgressed the confines of that tumultuous period into a distant past during the ‘Mau Mau’ rebellion. The plot has been interwoven around betrayal and disillusionment the characters, and Kenyans by extension, have experienced at that time; there has been, most importantly, a reference to post-independence during which the corrupt elite has taken the reins of Kenya while the ‘ordinary’ people who have truly struggled for the country, have been discarded, at the time of independence, from leadership.¹⁹ This context has, in a wide range of ways, contributed to the shaping of both characters and prevalent themes in Ngũgĩ’s appropriation of its source.

Just like Ngũgĩ’s *A Grain of Wheat*, Aimé Césaire’s *A Tempest* (1969) has been discussed by a number of critics from myriad approaches. The postcolonial framework is the most recurrent and Rob Nixon is a representative sample in this respect. Nixon’s (1987) discussion of Césaire’s play has been centred on the ways in which he has departed from the bard’s ‘original’ in order to break the western colonial myths which have been, for centuries, conveyed through Prospero.²⁰ The critic has uncovered some profound alterations Césaire has introduced through which Caliban has become the defiant counterpart of Prospero and the spokesman of the colonised. Nixon’s critical vision is pertinent; yet, the heavy reliance on the postcolonial theory confined his scope to the changes brought upon the source without an

inherent analysis of their ideological purports to the adaptation. Not far from Rob Nixon's view point, Melanie Otto's (2007) reading of *A Tempest* has nearly tackled the same issues. Otto has not failed to uncover how subversive Césaire's text is by clarifying that Caliban has been drastically altered from the abominable 'other' to a monument of resistance. Through Caliban's rebellion, the author has seen an indefectible symbol that has spared no effort to voice his utter rejection to bear the yoke of the colonisation.²¹ Otto's analysis, nonetheless, has its limitations since it is quite restricted to the Prospero/Caliban relationship; which is why, a variety of issues, raised by the play, have been overlooked.

The linguistic standpoint has been deployed by Judith Holland Sarnecki in her study (2000) of Césaire's and Shakespeare's plays. Her central focus is closely tied to the way language has been used by the Martinican to remodel Caliban into some sort of a revolutionary hero.²² The first argument Sarnecki has advanced is the African words incorporated into *A Tempest* which serve as an alibi substantiating the existence of Caliban's mother tongue; what was at stake here, to the oppressed, is to proudly brandish his native identity. The second argument was Caliban's ability to speak the language of the coloniser which he, later on, has wielded as a means to launch his rebellion against Prospero. Sarnecki has pointed-out Caliban's mastery of many languages to highlight his intelligence and even superiority over his monolingual 'master.' The author has managed to shed light on the use of language to subvert the source; however, I contend, Césaire has relied on other strategies.

Jonathan Goldberg's seminal study (2004) of *A Tempest* has avoided the postcolonial perspective and has, in return, leaned on the feminist standpoint. The author has focused on women's limpid presence since they have been silenced. Neither Sycorax, with no speaking parts whatsoever, nor Miranda, with her rare and even 'insignificant' appearances, have been capable of playing a key role in Césaire's play. The latter's deployment of Caliban with the shallow presence of the female characters has been interpreted by Goldberg as being purely "masculinist."²³ The fact that women's voices are not heard in *A Tempest* is something its

author might have amended; nonetheless, studying a 20th century text, Césaire's, through a rigorous 21st century third wave feminist perspective would entail many limitations.

Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985) has in its turn attracted serious critical attention. A major contribution has come from Gilbert Yeoh (1993) whose postcolonial perspective supplemented by feminism has been quite effective. His study positions Kincaid's text as an adaptation which has revised some of the problematic colonial issues raised by Shakespeare's last play.²⁴ Yeoh has put emphasis on Sycorax, Caliban's mother, who has been allowed to speak, something Shakespeare would not have even imagined four centuries ago. This technique is, indubitably, innovative as Yeoh has explained; but, it might be worth noting that he has failed at putting this adaptation in its historical context.

Chantal Zabus (2002), with her feminist viewpoint, has uncovered the link between Kincaid's novel and Shakespeare's source. One of her main points is the transformation of the play from a male to a female perspective through the reliance on a girl narrator²⁵ to retell the story. Caliban, Mirinda and Sycorax have also been radically metamorphosed in *Annie John* to rework the colonialist stereotypes and allow women as a "subaltern" to be heard. Despite the pertinence of Zabus' analysis, it might be worth noting that Kincaid's text is imbued with hidden elements and aspects related to Shakespeare's play that she did not account for.

Most of Defoe's African/Caribbean literary adaptations have, on a similar fashion, been under meticulous scrutiny with the exception of Nadine Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960). The most consequential contribution which has studied Gordimer's tale has come from Paul Rich (1985) who has seen Gordimer's story from the postcolonial vision. The author has revealed some of the ways in which the novelist has readjusted Defoe's narrative by focusing on Rita Cunningham to elucidate how emblematic she is of the "white colonial identity."²⁶ Rich has also uncovered the presence of Crusoe-like figures alongside a shipwreck which are some features of *Robinson Crusoe* which has been remodelled to suit Gordimer's designs. Like Rich, Ann Marie Fallon's article (2011) has adopted the

postcolonial frame work; she has perceived “*Friday’s Footprint*” as a postcolonial response which has revised its source. She has even gone farther when she has claimed that Gordimer’s text has “dissent[ed] from the oppressive narratives that create the South African nation-state.”²⁷ One of the weaknesses of Fallon’s analysis has some origins in the fact that she has not juxtaposed the source and its adaption in a dialogic connection.

The case of Derek Walcott’s *Pantomime* (1978) is unique in the sense that it has fuelled a considerable amount of critical debate. Several critical commentaries like that of, Renu Juneja (1992),²⁸ Bridget Jones (1996),²⁹ Shalini Puri (2004),³⁰ Sam Vásquez (2012),³¹ and Ann Marie Fallon (2018),³² have grounded their interpretations of Walcott’s text on the postcolonial approach. They have tackled the Crusoe/Friday duality which has been metamorphosed. The Saint Lucian-originated playwright has inversed the racial roles, the critics have emphasised, making of Crusoe/the slave and of Friday/the master. They have as such uncovered some of the strategies the playwright has used to revise and debunk the colonial dynamics related to hierarchy.

Besides, Paul A. Griffith’s (2010) cultural and structuralist analysis of Walcott’s play has exposed other aspects the author has deployed to rework *Robinson Crusoe*. The revisionary language as a strategy of resistance³³ has been one of the issues Griffith has attempted to shed light on. Naming people, things together with the subversive use of the “master’s” words, the writer has explained, have been some of the potent techniques in *Pantomime* which have rendered less oppressive or even inoffensive the cultural authority of the source. The main weakness of Griffith’s reading might be situated in terms of text/context link since he has not historicised his analysis.

Just like the aforementioned works, J. M. Coetzee’s *Foe* (1986) has received its fair share of meticulous examination with several studies conducted through the postcolonial underpinning. Paula Burnett (1996),³⁴ Elleke Boehmer (2005),³⁵ Elizabeth Kraft (2007),³⁶ and Eli Park Sorensen (2010),³⁷ have stressed that Coetzee’s novel is a postcolonial text which has

responded to Defoe's. The attention has, therefore, been radically shifted from Crusoe, the British Empire's pioneer of colonial expansion, towards Coetzee's mute Friday, the eternal emblem of the oppressed 'Other.' The drastic transformation of Crusoe's *Foe*, written without "e" all along the novel, has not gone uncommented. The 18th century mythical self-reliant, adventurous, 'indomitable' and dynamic entrepreneur, the critics have noticed, has been refashioned by Coetzee into a somewhat dull, stubborn, narrow-minded and 'strange' character whose presence on the island sharply contrasts with Crusoe's in the source.

Coetzee's novel has besides been subject to studies fostering an intertextual dialogic approach. Critics as David Cowart (1993),³⁸ David Fishelov (2008),³⁹ Anthony Uhmlann (2011),⁴⁰ and Tisha Turk (2011),⁴¹ have explored the tight link which binds *Foe* to *Robinson Crusoe*. They believe that Coetzee's work has encompassed most of the classical criteria—shipwreck, castaway life, and an encounter with the other—which make it a Robinsonade. The critics have also uncovered some of the ways in which Coetzee has departed from the 'original' in an attempt to remodel the Crusoe story while voicing late 20th century gender and racial issues. Other equally interesting readings of *Foe* have been grounded on a feminist foundation. Fiona Probyn-Rapsey (2002),⁴² and Teresa Pinto Coelho (2019),⁴³ have focused on the narrative perspective which has been shifted from Crusoe's male oriented mode of story-telling towards a female oriented one through Susan Barton as a narrator and a main character. Barton's worldview has, the two critics believe, served as a strategy to make women's voice heard in the male dominated realm⁴⁴ of 'castaway' stories. It is a manner of addressing the issue of female exclusion in Defoe's narrative through which Coetzee has tackled white women's position in a patriarchal South Africa.

Issue and Hypothesis:

It is quite apparent from the above review that myriad studies have been conducted in relation to the African/Caribbean literary adaptations of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*; nonetheless, no previous work has, to my best knowledge,

combined the theoretical framework, I would subsequently rely upon, together with these two masterpieces in a single book-length study with Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat*, Césaire's *A Tempest*, Kincaid's *Annie John*, Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*," Walcott's *Pantomime* and Coetzee's *Foe*. One might notice from the review that most scholars have had their attention revolving on the remodelled aspects between Shakespeare's play and Defoe's novel in relation to only some of their literary adaptations. To disregard what the critics have highlighted, at this point, would not be possible; however, the revealed disparities have not been, in critical notions, connected to the cultural and ideological purport of Shakespeare's and Defoe's texts. Additionally, the previous works and research papers, be they glued to formal or/and thematic dimensions, have not really shown the potential thread in the texts under study. A key claim I foster, which is at the heart of my inquiry, is that unless these aspects are considered using Raymond Williams' concepts, related to cultural and ideological dimensions, the strategies the subsequent texts have deployed to critically address the source texts, play and novel, would not be unveiled. Williams' ideological and cultural continuum is used with the 'dominant' at the centre within each novel, play and story, subject to study, entailing this driving force; however, each one of them is doomed to voice, with varied proportions, 'residual' and 'emergent' elements. In order to fathom the issue of adapting Shakespeare's play and the Crusoe tale form divergent backgrounds, spatially and temporally, Mikhail Bakhtin's notions of 'stylization,' 'hidden' and 'overt polemics,' in addition to 'parody' combined with Gérard Genette's categories of 'metatextuality,' 'excision,' 'reduction,' and 'amplification' would all be deployed, whenever needed.

Methodology:

As a writer I know very well that a text is all the words that are in it, and not only those words, but the other words that precede it, haunt it, and are echoed in it.⁴⁵

The above epigraph seems to put under light the idea that every utterance, literary text and by extension artistic work, is far from being 'original,' since it evokes previous words/texts/works; in many cases, it often gets involved in a dialogue which, somehow,

responds to and develops the source. These key features have echo in Mikhail Bakhtin's ground breaking studies which have been pillared mainly, but not exclusively, on a 'dialogic' worldview; later on, 'intertextuality,' which is Julia Kristeva's major contribution, has come to life. This approach, towards textual relationships, has gone beyond any kind of centeredness on language since Bakhtin has, in many ways, referred to the usage of words and the link they inevitably have to environmental and socio-cultural elements.⁴⁶ Resorting to words, therefore, under whatever form, must be seen as a dialogic activity in which every single word, in Bakhtin's sense, would necessarily bring forth connections to be drawn with previous usages of language. The claims of one critic that "[l]anguage is dialogic [and] it is always involved in the relations between specific speakers in specific social situations"⁴⁷ are of high relevance in this context. Literary texts, Bakhtin has perceived, are constantly involved in relationships with tight bonds linking them to the preceding works/texts which is why they are expected, in an inevitable turn, to be influenced by and often yield to a variety of factors like subjectivity, the historical/economic/cultural milieu and the full ideological bearings sustaining them. This has been confirmed by Bakhtin when he claims that "authors found themselves addressing audiences who shared some values and did not share others [...] because their culture imposed norms upon [them], [their] work, and audience."⁴⁸ The myriad elements, which frequently intervene whenever two texts or more are intertextually and dialogically connected, although they are at times extra-textual, are often expected to guide and fashion the literary works coming to life to a high degree. Bakhtin's and Kristeva's notions stand for the pillars upon which rewritings of previous texts rest because they are not, at any rate, ideologically and culturally free; the new works are not, thereby, carbon copies or faithful regurgitations of the mother text. The thorny issues of altering or not the source has a slight, or even no value, whatsoever, in Bakhtin's worldview; being objective therefore is neither an ultimate finality nor an easily reached endeavour;⁴⁹ this is due to the wide range of extra-textual parameters involved in this whole process.

This dialogic view of textual relationships usually considers an adaptation as a new work in itself which actively revises, refashions, reconfigures, reconsiders and even rebuts, at times, the reference point or text. One scholar has, in this regards, fostered that adapting a previous work has to “be understood as a critical reading [...] rather than as a ‘truthful’”⁵⁰ reproduction. It follows, likewise, that without looking at literary adaptations through the intertextual dialogic lenses, we would run the risk of getting caught in a shallow analysis devoid of a thorough vision of the work’s essence. Now, any time a human being appeals to language, on a regular basis, whether someone is aware of it or not, Bakhtin’s dialogic worldview has confirmed that there is reliance on discourse which he has grouped under two major headings. The first one, where there is a single tone with no possibility to spot a different purport other than that of the author’s or the individual character’s speech pattern, is not of any relevance whatsoever to this research. The Russian theorist has argued that in this single voiced category, be it constituted of words to serve the character’s or the writer’s ends, there is “in fact only one voice.”⁵¹ The double voiced, with which this thesis is concerned, usually positions the present writer’s utterances in connection, apparent it might be or not, with the words of a previous author; this falls within the dialogic boundaries of the worldview that has been defended by Bakhtin in terms of his entire perception of language. This discourse, the theorist states, “serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions”;⁵² the thinker also asserts that these purposes, he has pointed at, are that of “the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author.”⁵³ This category of discourse, at the level of any adaptation, might entail various modes, connections and intentions vis-a-vis the source. I have selected, at this stage, many concepts and critical notions which are crucial all along this research, in order to study a multitude of dialogic patterns and modes, at various scales, with a marked divergence of purport and intentions which are in favour of or activated against the source text.

The fact that the notions, under question, would be recurrently used makes their clarification more than a necessity for my designs. I would like to start with stylization in which Bakhtin highlights the utterances of a first author that are deployed by a second or a subsequent with the aim of working for his intentions with no attack or criticism directed at the original's purport. His viewpoint, in relation to stylization, is more than relevant as he has stressed that it "is an artistic representation of another's linguistic style"; it "creates a free image" about the first author's manner of writing or speaking and "highlights [it] by carrying into it [the subsequent artist's] interests."⁵⁴ It has to be clarified that any stylized text has to entail the source writer's and the stylizer's, that is to say the subsequent author's voice, worldview and intention without any signs of imminent clash which means there should be harmony between them; he has maintained that a stylization, wherever pinpointed, "does not collide with the other's thought, but rather follows after it in the same direction."⁵⁵

Part of the double voiced discourse, there are, besides, the hidden and overt polemics. Both categories, not peculiarly, have the kind of dialogic critical pattern which is being addressed at the source text's not only formal and thematic structures, but also its whole ideological foundations. Bakhtin has argued that the hidden polemic, when it comes to significance, harbours in its intentions an indirect or inexplicit criticism, attack or clash against the first writer's discourse with no apparent willingness, at any moment, to render its status easily detectable.⁵⁶ As an active participant in meaning construction, the reader has, on a similar vein, the obligation to strive to bring under light the subsequent author's antagonism which has been distilled all over the text as a set of subtle strategies which purport to diffuse and circumvent the intricacies of a specific environment or subject matter with a restricted number of cues evincing this criticism. The overt polemics, to continue with, entails in contrast the second author's visible aim of striking an explicit attack directed at the central aspects of the source literary work/text. The one who overtly gets engaged in this category of polemics is not trying, at any stage, to dissimulate the antagonism which is included through

his/her words/utterances/work. The reader, in this situation, would find little complexity, if any, to fathom this type of clear, direct and outright criticism of the original work's realm.

The Russian theorist has clarified that the double voiced discourse includes another category where the second author appeals to a prior work with the intention of mocking its foundations and whole referents. These are the boundaries he has set in connection with the dialogic pattern he has dubbed parody. In it, there must be two voices, at least, or more; one of them is that of the person who parodies and the other belongs to the one being parodied or ridiculed. In the same fashion as in polemics, the conflicting voices involved, in a parody, show no intention at harmonious cohabitation; there is clear animosity and adversity between them which is denoted through the clash at the level of their aims and intentions. Bakhtin has made it conspicuous that, in a parody, the author who is in the process of mocking another's words "clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims."⁵⁷ Hence, the second author would make fun of the 'original' by using its words/text/or other elements without attempting to be faithful to it bringing into existence, thereby, a new text which is not a carbon copy of its source; the key item in this category is that it is intended to produce a humorous reaction from the reader.

Furthermore, I deem of great importance, if not crucial, to my research the choice of Gérard Genette's four concepts: 'metatextuality,' 'excision,' 'reduction' and 'amplification.' They are, at this point, relevant if a thorough analysis and dissection of any literary adaptation is the desired target. The first category, dubbed metatextuality, has been deployed to speak about "the relationship" between works, a subsequent towards an earlier one, its source, which is "most often labeled "commentary"."⁵⁸ Genette has argued that the word 'metatext' might be used to pinpoint an adaptation or the present text that strikes a blow and out-rightly comments on, rebuts and criticises, either in an implicit or an explicit way its alleged source; the French theorist, following this vein, has established metatextuality as "the *critical* relationship par excellence."⁵⁹

An excision consists of omitting from the adaptation elements which have been included in the 'original.' Genette has maintained that it "consists then of suppression pure and simple [it might be] a single massive [...] *amputation*";⁶⁰ there is, as such, a removal of aspects or even parts. Reduction, in its turn, stands for the shortening of an event or an idea in contrast to the source text. Any reduction would mean a conscious process of making ideas or other elements briefer than they have been in the latter; in Genette's terms, "[o]ne cannot reduce without diminishing [a work] or, more precisely, without subtracting from it some part or parts."⁶¹ Amplification, to end with, "is one of the "paths of creation,""⁶² which involves a "processes of extension [...] and expansion"⁶³; thus, the outcome lingers on aspects the source has not elaborated on. My choice of these three concepts is relevant in relation to Bakhtin's stylization, parody, hidden and overt polemics, on the one hand, and Genette's metatextuality on the other; this is because no adaptation might, intentionally, criticise, mock or comment upon its 'source' without doing the job of cutting, shortening or increasing its content.

The intertextual dialogic process, I have so far fostered, to study the new literary outcomes, adaptations, in relation to their source texts would not be carried to its finality without a paralleled reliance on Raymond Williams' cultural and ideological spectrum through what he has designated as 'residual,' 'dominant' and 'emergent.' This continuum, with its three categories, is existent in any society, with reference to whatever period of its evolution; these strata either interact in a harmonious fashion or clash under the impact of their conflicting purports to control the social matrix in which they have evolved. To begin with, the residual has been identified as being "effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process."⁶⁴ Williams has deployed this notion to delineate the limits of those aspects, practices, values and beliefs the origin of which might be traced back to an earlier historical period; these elements often resurge, in another epoch, under the form of a remnant in a society. This layer is not empowered to be hegemonic and its reappearance has

to be seen as a remainder of a distant era. Williams has drawn the confines of the residual by stating that they stand as the leftovers of the past which must be seen as “results of earlier social formations”⁶⁵ that ultimately come into the surface.

The dominant is located at the centre, the heart, of Williams’ ideological and cultural spectrum since it marks a clear-cut distinction between those controlling or hegemonic aspects at the level of a society and other less important elements. With the ascendance of capitalism to power, one scholar has identified the hegemonic or “dominant ideology [as being related to the] bourgeois ideology.”⁶⁶ This is what is known, today, as mainstream culture or the establishment which relies upon various organisations and bodies including media, in all forms, the household and the public sphere in order to impose a certain vision; this is the reason for which Althusser has also designated it as the, “Ideological State Apparatus.”⁶⁷ What Williams has dubbed the “dominant” culture or ideology might either be contradicted or supported by the ‘residual’ and/or ‘emergent.’ In his worldview, the latter means those aspects, entities, certainties and values that come to life in a societal matrix within a precise historical moment. He has argued, in *Marxism and Literature*, that this third layer designates all the “new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships [that] are continually being created”;⁶⁸ it points, likewise, at the newborn elements, be they cultural or ideological, which integrate a society for the purpose of challenging the dominant or in order to support its dynamics and work in its favour.

Due to relevance to this research, I have to clarify that Williams’ cultural and ideological spectrum often interlaces and intertwines, at one point or another, with Bakhtin’s and Genette’s conceptualisation of textual relationships. The cultural and ideological aspects in a societal environment are of high value since they condition and even impose upon novelist, playwrights and authors, in general, certain modes of writing and expression. When a writer senses political, religious, cultural or ideological controversy, the hidden polemic might spare him the inevitable head to head clash; if, on the other hand, the author targets to

cause ideas altercation, the overt one would suit this purpose; when the artist's perception is in harmony with the hegemonic ideology and culture, Bakhtin's stylization might be deployed to materialise the stylist's ends. This research's approach springs, to cut things short, from two paradigms pillared on Bakhtin's historicist intertextual dialogism and Genette's notions, on the one hand, with an intentional reliance on Williams' three cultural materialist notions, on the other;⁶⁹ this is a combination of two continuums with their tightly related visions to fulfil my designs. There is, therefore, an appeal to Bakhtin's and Genette's concepts, in terms of formal and thematic dimensions, through which subsequent textual relationships are highlighted as new outcomes which actively address the 'original' work by stylizing, rewriting, appropriating, criticising, commenting and mocking its elements; in addition, Williams' three critical cultural and ideological strata are more than needed.

Methodological Outline:

To conduct this study in relation to the various literary adaptations of *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* in modern and postmodern African/Caribbean literature, I have selected six major texts as subject matter of investigation. They are in the following order: Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat*, Césaire's *A Tempest*, Kincaid's *Annie John*, Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*," Walcott's *Pantomime* and Coetzee's *Foe*. The choice of these works is far from being fortuitous; it springs from two central incentives. The first one is rooted in my belief in the importance of that temporal distance between the six texts; the second, on the other hand, is linked to the disparity in terms of spatial backgrounds in which the adaptations have been produced. These two factors, time and space, are expected to be pivotal when it comes to the examination of the changes which have been brought into Shakespeare's play and the Crusoe tale through divergent epochs, cultures and countries which contributed to the emergence of creative rewritings with unusual and quite divergent tempests and Crusoes.

This thesis is divided into seven chapters for a thorough analysis of every single literary revision. The first one is meant to situate *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* in their

historical contexts, because I firmly believe that each story owes, somehow, many aspects to its precise environment. The background of the source texts are crucial because they entail hegemonic ideologies and cultures thanks to which they have been written, published and read by their authors' contemporaries. The six chapters, that would follow, have been organised into two parts, three chapters each; the first part has dealt with Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969) and Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985) in relation to Shakespeare's last play; the second one is constructed around three other chapters which have explored Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960), Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978) and Coetzee's *Foe* (1986) in a tight link to Defoe's masterpiece. I have to clarify, herein, that the six adaptations have been contextualised independently in their respective chapters.

Endnotes:

¹. Charles E. Nnolim, *Issues in African Literature*, (Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2010), p. 95.

². Chris Bongie, *Islands and Exiles: The Creole Identities of Post/colonial Literature*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 430, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=juC7vaxM80C&pg=PA430&dq=shakespeare+defoe&hl=fr&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=shakespeare%20defoe&f=false. Accessed 31/10/2015.

³. Salman Rushdie, Cited in Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back Theory and Practice in Post Colonial Literature*, (London: Routledge, 2002), p. i.

⁴. Nadia Lie, Theo d'. Haen, *Constellation Caliban: Figurations of a Character*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), p. 272, in

https://books.google.dz/books?id=JMPPhRK1Ms94C&pg=PA272&dq=has+logically+been+reread+and+rewritten+as+a+manifesto+of+decolonisation+and+a+myth+of+transatlantic&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiHxvmcp4X7AhWj_7sIHQK4DqkQ6AF6BAgBEAI#v=onepage&q=has%20logically%20been%20reread%20and%20rewritten%20as%20a%20manifesto%20of%20decolonisation%20and%20a%20myth%20of%20transatlantic&f=false. Accessed on 16/10/2015.

⁵. Wilkie Collins, (1868), *The Moonstone*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 12.

⁶. Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), p. 71.

⁷. Ibid., p. 84.

⁸. Margaret Drabble, ed., *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, (New York: Oxford, 2000), p. 268.

⁹. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 33.

¹⁰. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back Theory and Practice in Post Colonial Literature*, (London: Routledge, 2002), p. i.

¹¹. Johnson, Paraphrased by Benaouda Lebdaï, "Traces of Shakespeare's Tragedies in Africa," in Estelle Rivier and Eric C. Brown, eds., *Shakespeare in Performance*, (Newcastle: Cambridge Schooling Publishers, 2013), p. 185,

in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=DTYyBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA185&lpg=PA185&dq=shakespeare+influence+ngugi&source=bl&ots=W18mdW0sGX&sig=2KOH7Y10cPLPoicGBRFjO23VSDQ&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0CBsQ6AEwAGoVChMI7PaMmCHjyAlViloUCh0jzwEw#v=onepage&q=shakespeare%20influence%20ngugi&f=false>. Accessed on 21/ 10/ 2015.

¹². Katherine Frank, *Crusoe Daniel Defoe, Robert Knox and the Creation of a Myth*, (New York: Pegasus Books, 2012), p. 18.

¹³. Ian Glenn, "Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and the Dilemmas of the Intellectual Elite in Africa: A Sociological Perspective," in *English in Africa*, Vol 08: N° 02, 1981, p. 53, Rhodes University, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40399035>, Accessed on 13/10/2016.

- ¹⁴. Ibid., p. 58.
- ¹⁵. Léon Mugesera, "Guilt and Redemption in Ngugi Wa Thiong'o's "A Grain of Wheat," in, *Présence Africaine*, Vol 01: N° 125, 1983, p. 230, *Présence Africaine Editions*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24350692>, Accessed on 15/10/2016.
- ¹⁶. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (Routledge: London, 1999), p. 09.
- ¹⁷. Rebecca Fasselt, "(Post)Colonial We-Narratives and the "Writing Back" Paradigm: Joseph Conrad's *The Nigger of the "Narcissus"* and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Vol 37: N° 01, 2016, p. 157.
- ¹⁸. Elleke Boehmer, "'The Master's Dance to the Master's Voice': Revolutionary Nationalism and Women's Representation in Ngugi Wa Thiong'o," in *Stories of Women*, Vol. 26, N° 01, 2005, p. 46, Manchester University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt155j4ws.6>, Accessed on 16/10/2016.
- ¹⁹. Delia Krause, "A Grain of Wheat: Ngugi's Tribute to the Armed Rebellion," in *Wasafiri*, Vol 04: N° 09, 1988, p. 06, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02690058808574172>, Accessed on 17/10/2016.
- ²⁰. Rob Nixon, "Caribbean and African Appropriations of "The Tempest"," in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, p. 571, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>, Accessed on 17/10/2016.
- ²¹. Melanie Otto, "'Beyond the Horizon': The Location of the Caribbean," in John McLeod, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, (London: Routledge, 2007), Pp. 101-102.
- ²². Judith Holland Sarnecki, "Mastering the Masters: Aimé Césaire's Creolization of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*," in, *The American Review*, Vol: 74, N° 02, 2000, p. 276, American Association of Teachers of French, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/398722>, Accessed on 18/10/2016.
- ²³. Jonathan Goldberg, *Tempest in the Caribbean*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), p. 91.
- ²⁴. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 103, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 25/10/2016.
- ²⁵. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 128.
- ²⁶. Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 27/10/2016.
- ²⁷. Ann Marie Fallon, Cited in Robert Mayer, "Global Crusoe: comparative literature, postcolonial theory and transnational aesthetics by Ann Marie Fallon (Review)," in, *Project Muse*, Vol: 47, N° 02, 2015, P.p. 90-91, The Scribnerian and the Kit-Cats, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/scb/summary/v048/48.1.mayer.html>, Accessed on 03/11/2016.
- ²⁸. Renu Juneja, "Derek Walcott," in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Commonwealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press, 1992), P.p. 261-263.
- ²⁹. Bridget Jones, "'With Crusoe the slave and Friday the Boss': Derek Walcott's Pantomime," in Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*, (London: MacMillan, 1996), P.p. 225-236.
- ³⁰. Shalini Puri, *The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post/Nationalism, and Cultural Hybridity*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), P.p. 107-137.
- ³¹. Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York, Palgrave MacMillan: 2012), P.p. 117-150.
- ³². Ann Marie Fallon, "Anti-Crusoes, Alternative Crusoes: Revisions of the Island Story in the Twentieth Century," in John Richetti, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to "Robinson Crusoe"*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), P.p.207-220.
- ³³. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Macmillan Palgrave: 2010), p. 56.
- ³⁴. Paula Burnett, "The Ulyssean Crusoe and the Quest for Redemption in J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* and Derek Walcott's *Omeros*," in Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*, (London: MacMillan, 1996), P.p. 239-253.
- ³⁵. Elleke Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), P.p. 159-166.
- ³⁶. Elizabeth Kraft, "The Revaluation of Literary Character: The Case of *Crusoe*," in *South Atlantic Review*, Vol 72: N° 04, 2007, P. p. 37-58, South Atlantic Modern Language Association, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27784739>, Accessed on 05/11/2016.
- ³⁷. Eli Park Sorensen, *Postcolonial Studies and the Literary Theory, Interpretation and the Novel*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), P.p. 96-120.
- ³⁸. David Cowart, *Literary Symbiosis: The Reconfigured Text in Twentieth-Century Writing*, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993), P.p. 149-172.
- ³⁹. David Fishelov, "Dialogues with/and Great Books: With Some Serious Reflections on "Robinson Crusoe,"" in *New Literary Source*, Vol 39: N° 02, 2008, P.p. 335-353.

- ⁴⁰. Anthony Uhlmann, "Realism and Intertextuality in Coetzee's *Foe*," in Chris Danta, et al., eds., *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction*, (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), P. p. 81-94.
- ⁴¹. Tisha Turk, "Intertextuality and the Collaborative Construction of Narrative: J. M. Coetzee's "*Foe*,"" in *Narrative*, Vol 19: N° 03, 2011, P.p. 295-310.
- ⁴². Fiona Probyn-Rapsey, "J M Coetzee: Writing with/out authority," in *Jouvert: a Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, Vol 07: N° 01, 2002, P.p. 1-12.
- ⁴³. Teresa Pinto Coelho, "Robinsonaden in the Feminine? Coetzee's *Foe* and Muriel Spark's *Robinson*," in Sue Kossew and Melinda Harvey, eds., *Reading Coetzee's Women*, (Gewerbestrasse: The Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), P.p. 129-146.
- ⁴⁴. Ibid., p. 143.
- ⁴⁵. Antonia Susan Byatt, *On Histories and Stories*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 2000), p. 46.
- ⁴⁶. Graham Allen, *Roland Barthes*, (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 80.
- ⁴⁷. Ibid.
- ⁴⁸. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. XVIII.
- ⁴⁹. Ibid. p. XIX.
- ⁵⁰. Sara Martin, "Classic Shakespeare for all: Forbidden Planet and Prospero's Books, Two Screen Adaptations of the Tempest," in Deborah Cartmell et al., eds., *Classics in Film and Fiction*, (London: Pluto Press, 2000), p. 50.
- ⁵¹. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 189.
- ⁵². _____, "Discourse in the Novel," in Michael Holquist ed., *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans., Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 324.
- ⁵³. Ibid.
- ⁵⁴. Ibid., Pp. 362-363.
- ⁵⁵. _____, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 193.
- ⁵⁶. Ibid., p. 196.
- ⁵⁷. Ibid., p. 193.
- ⁵⁸. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 04.
- ⁵⁹. Ibid.
- ⁶⁰. Ibid., p. 227.
- ⁶¹. Ibid.
- ⁶². Ibid., p. 276.
- ⁶³. Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 110
- ⁶⁴. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ⁶⁵. _____, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 42.
- ⁶⁶. Louis Althusser, Cited in François Matheron and Oliver Corpet, eds., trans., G. M. Goshgarian, *Philosophy of Encounter: Later Writings, 1978-87*, (Baskerville: Andrea Stimpson, 2006), p. 133.
- ⁶⁷. Luke Ferretter, *Routledge Critical Thinkers: Louis Althusser*, (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 83.
- ⁶⁸. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ⁶⁹. I have relied on a similar theoretical background in my magister memoire, in Cherifi Ahcene, *Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe in Cinematographic Adaptations: A Postcolonial and Intertextual Study*. UMMTO, 2013-2014.

Part One:
Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) and
Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719): The
Historical, Cultural and Ideological
Backgrounds

Chapter One:

The Tempest and Robinson Crusoe: History, Lives, Times in Context, Intertextual Dialogic Perspectives and Ideological Concerns

Introduction

I would like to add that there is no text without context.¹

These are Jacob L. Mey's words which put tremendous emphasis on the prominence of any text's cultural, social, historical, economic, and political backgrounds when it comes to its production, reception and interpretation. Edward Said has even claimed that texts are "a part of the social world, human world, human life, and of course the historical moments in which they are located and interpreted."² The background is, therefore, of capital value since it has that much needed power to guide, enlighten, contribute to, reinforce and even condition our views of any text under whatever shape; the readers would not be able to capture a work's essence without digging into the wider background information leading to its production. I claim that *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe*, this work's reference texts, face the pressing need of being placed in their contexts; otherwise, one might run the risk of not gaining an in-depth understanding of neither these texts nor their subsequent African/Caribbean literary adaptations. One of my central beliefs, and key aspects about adaptations, is that a rewriting of any text can never ever be a verbatim reproduction; this practise often leads, thereby, to new works/texts which "can reveal as much about the concerns of their own time as they can about those of the original text."³ Both texts must not be analysed in isolation and each one has to be embedded in its context with the historical background acquiring a massive value becoming, as such, an integral part of this thesis. This chapter has been designed to contextualise *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* to fathom the dynamics which were already in action by the time they have been published, which, on the other hand, would probably give us an insight into why they have recurrently been adapted in African/Caribbean contexts.

1- William Shakespeare and *The Tempest*: Life, Context, Influences:

A- William Shakespeare: More than a Playwright:

William Shakespeare, the renowned English poet and playwright, was born in Stratford-upon-Avon in 1564 the year which coincides with the death of John Calvin and the birth of Galileo Galilei.⁴ The bard's life spanned through the Elizabethan and the Jacobean eras which are often referred to as early modern or Renaissance England. There was nothing

unusual about his early life, and much like his contemporaries, he attended a grammar school; the qualitative leap in his acting and writing career, however, occurred in (1590) when his first dramatic work came to life, *Henry VI*. Whether he travelled around Europe or not, that remains a mystery; nonetheless, the Italian setting of some of his plays (Verona, Venice ...) seem to slightly suggest that he has had some overseas errands.⁵ The fact that he played an active role in the Lord Chamberlain's Men, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, and an even more central position in the King's Men, with James I's absolutist reign, is not open to question, the aspect that saw his notoriety skyrocketing to the point of transcending the confines of England. It was in (1599) that the 'Globe Theatre' was set into motion and ever since, Shakespeare's heritage has neither ceased to grow nor did it dwindle at any rates; it would be quite difficult today, if not impossible, to meet someone in the English speaking countries who has never heard, at least, slightly of William Shakespeare.⁶ His career is forever stamped with timeless plays among which *Hamlet* (1600) *Measure for Measure* (1604), *Macbeth* (1606), and of particular interest to this thesis, *The Tempest* (1611). He died in (1616) leaving behind a legacy, for English and World literature alike, which perhaps would not, in the future, be matched at the artistic, social, linguistic and even political dimensions.

B- Shakespeare's *The Tempest*: Elizabethan and Jacobean Influences:

Queen Elizabeth I, under whose reign Shakespeare (1564) has experienced life for four decades and a half, took the Kingdom's reins in (1558), when the would-be-bard was only aged six, and her power position was safeguarded until (1603). This has come to be known among historians as the Elizabethan Age which has not only been England's Golden Age in literature, but also in politics as well. The Renaissance ideals reached England from the continent, although not in full prominence, after the battle of Bosworth (1485) more than a century after the movement's beginning in Italy.⁷ Earlier, literature and other artistic forms flourished during 16th century England particularly with the reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547), but on a greater scale during the Elizabethan Age and the human being, as an entity, took another dimension with the marked shift from a medieval God-centred to a renaissance man-

centred world. The Reformation was important to the English Renaissance since, in various ways, it freed the island from the grip of the Roman Catholic Church and established Henry VIII, through the Act of Supremacy (1534), as the head of the Anglican Church.⁸ Queen Elizabeth, in turn, encouraged drama, poetry and other artistic modes which saw authors like Shakespeare, Spenser and Marlowe reaching, in this matrix, other dimensions of creativity.

One of the main concerns of Queen Elizabeth was, of course, England's foreign policy endangered by the growing domination of its European archenemy, Spain, over both sea routes and trade centres in the new world and some parts of Asia. To fortify the island against potential foreign, especially Spanish, invasion and strengthen its commercial presence overseas, the Queen encouraged the construction of strong defensive royal and commercial fleets. The sea voyages and raids, upon Spanish ships, of sea-hawks and seadogs like John Hawkins, Richard Hakluyt, Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Drake, whom the Queen hailed with recognition, brought more wealth to the nation and contributed to the exploration of various new trade posts and plantations.⁹ It was the beginning of the Mercantile System under which exporting goods was highly preferred to importing them with overseas trade occupying a vital role in the English economic system. The middle class, to which the merchants belonged, began its skyrocketing ascendance to power because of its acquired wealth while the taxes paid to the crown generated from mercantile activities made England richer.

The creation and chartering of the Muscovy Company (1555), the East India Company (1600) and many other ones reinforced England's commercial might worldwide, with Russia, parts of North, South America and central Asia, targeted for lucrative trade activities to be established which in return made the Kingdom a serious competitor to Spain. The latter's supremacy over sea routes and trade posts was constantly put into evidence under the impact of the growing power of the English Royal and commercial navies. Things culminated in (1588) when, in a decisive battle, the Royal Navy defeated the mighty Spanish Armada in the English Channel. England, in the aftermath of this battle, established itself as a world power

to be reckoned with. Shakespeare and his contemporaries were conscious of this aspect together with the importance of sea voyages, trade, plantations and eventually colonies; therefore, they entailed, whether conscious or not, many of these aspects in their writing.

The death of Queen Elizabeth in (1603) marked the end of the Elizabethan Age, an era the English would forever associate with prosperity, while the crowning of James I signalled the beginning of, in general, the Stuart dynasty's reign, with all its controversies, and the Jacobean Age, in particular, that would last until (1624). The cultural guidelines set under Elizabeth I in relation to promoting the Renaissance ideals were, to a certain extent, followed and encouraged under the reign of James I. He also encouraged, like his predecessor, overseas trade through the Virginia Company (1606), the establishment of plantations and colonies, mostly in the new world, to generate more income through taxes the merchants and mercantile companies were compelled to pay. Under his reign, James Town, for example, was founded in Virginia in (1607) receiving not only his approbation but also his unfailing underpinning for its establishment as a permanent settlement. This context of the emergent tendency of empire building teamed with the English spirit of adventure, exploration and sea voyages—all contributed, each in its own way, to *The Tempest* as a final outcome the way it today is. James I's internal policies, on the other hand, were, the least to say, unpopular due to his belief in the Divine Right of Kings or the Absolutist Doctrine which gave the King total right to introduce new laws, taxes and a complete control over his subjects. James I went into many troubles with the parliament which voiced its disapproval over his growing unpopular policies; he took this as "sedition in his subjects"¹⁰ to refute his authority leading to the institution's dissolution between 1611 and 1621. Looking at *The Tempest* in the light of the Jacobean Age, Prospero, the intellectual magician with supernatural powers, whose absolute authority over 'his' island and subjects was perhaps a very tempting portrait of a King to James I with his "absolutist predilections and occult interests";¹¹ likewise, his character and reign over the island might be paralleled, in a way, with James I and his reign over England.

2- Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611): Intertextual Origins:

Shakespeare was neither a pure inventor nor a mere craftsman—but an especially able and talented improviser. His greatest and most persistent professional skill was in reimagining the texts of other writers.¹²

This epigraph is taken from Stephen J. Lynch's seminal study (1998) in which he has investigated the sources from which some of Shakespeare's plays were inspired; he has, through the above words, put much emphasis on the intertextual origin of Shakespeare's works. Even a masterpiece like *The Tempest*, with its 'ingenuously' interwoven plot, intricate characters and 'elaborate' setting, seems unable to escape Lynch's assertion. Now, retracing the English bard's last play exclusively back to one single text is not possible; hence, I might argue, not without risks, that it is highly likely possible that the bard interwove elements from his imagination, which he did not lack, with a variety of other far-fetched source.

The first text from which Shakespeare might have partly had the idea of writing *The Tempest* is the pamphlets written by the survivors of the shipwreck of an English ship called the Sea Venture in (1609).¹³ Its journey began in England sailing through the Atlantic Ocean to the new world, and once in the Caribbean, a mighty hurricane, which almost blew it into smithereens, damaged its outer shell and cast it away; the crew managed to wrench a living on the island until their ship was fixed, resuming, thus, their route to north America. Many narratives were produced recounting these incidents among which William Strachey's account (1610) to which Shakespeare perhaps had access since it already was in circulation a year before the publication of *The Tempest*. "There are many cross-references," David Stone confirms "between Strachey's account and [Shakespeare's] text";¹⁴ therefore, Stone focuses on the direct link which might be drawn between Strachey's and Shakespeare's storm.

Another equally important source which Shakespeare might have relied on is Michel de Montaigne's essay "*Of the Caniballes*" of which the Florio translated version (1603)¹⁵ was widely available and would have been accessible to the Stratford-upon-Avon originated writer. The presence of Caliban is vital since Prospero enacts the European 'superiority' the moment he crowns himself 'master' over the island and this indigenous inhabitant, who with

his ‘unusual’ shape and ‘awkward’ manners, was arguably inspired by Montaigne’s text; “[t]he invention of Caliban,” Andrew Gurr explains, “can be found in Montaigne’s essay on cannibals.”¹⁶ Gurr has identified a wide range of similarities between the ‘original’ text and Shakespeare’s at the level of characters and even in terms of the way they speak.

Some scholars¹⁷ like J. M. Nosworthy (1948),¹⁸ Jan Kott (1976),¹⁹ Andrew Gurr (2014)²⁰ and Lisa S. Starks-Estes (2014)²¹ point at Virgil’s *Aeneid* and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* that were very popular and quite accessible during the Jacobean England as potential sources from which Shakespeare might have borrowed a few aspects. Nosworthy and Kott have shown the link between some characters, the setting (Mediterranean), the shipwreck, and many other elements, which were incorporated in both Virgil’s and Shakespeare’s texts. The fact that a hurricane is used in the opening scene in both *Aeneid* and *The Tempest* did not pass unnoticed since it has been brought under a careful scrutiny and Nosworthy even manages to find a “Virgilian counterpart”²² when it comes to the island upon which Prospero has been castaway. The figures of Caliban and Prospero, on the other hand, have been examined in relation to Ovid’s work; the former, with his ‘unnatural’ deformities, is seen as “an Ovidian character” while the latter’s magic is related to the powers of gods.²³ Starks-Estes claims, moreover, that “myths from *Metamorphoses* [have been] incorporate[d]”²⁴ at the level of *The Tempest*. The striking similarities spotted, are compelling enough, which appear to underpin the claim that Shakespeare might have had access to Virgil’s and Ovid’s texts which perhaps fuelled his imagination while writing his masterpiece.

Besides the above mentioned texts, scholars have identified possible additional sources in the likes of Margaret Tyler’s English translation of *Mirror of Knighthood* (1580), John Marston’s *The Malcontent* (1604) and Jacob Ayrers’s *Fair Sidea* (1605) which were accessible to Shakespeare.²⁵ These literary works bear so many alarming similarities, at thematic and formal levels, with *The Tempest* which might point at them as the ‘original’ texts. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan (2014) have identified in them several

elements of plot and characters upon which the English bard might have leaned while writing his play. Today, it is hard or even next to impossible to say for sure whether Shakespeare has resorted to any of these works or not; unless further documents reveal the exact origin of *The Tempest*, scholars are bound to keep researching and sometimes speculating about it.

3- The Tempest: Residual, Dominant and Emergent Considerations: **A- The Spectre of Feudalism as the Residual Aspect in *The Tempest*:**

Feudalism as an economic, political and social system, with all its ‘intricacies,’ was predominant, nearly all over Europe, during the, so called, Middle Ages. Historians and commentators alike, have not, in any way, whatsoever, set hard and fixed boundaries to these ages in terms of time, yet at varying degrees, they, have agreed that this period of dark times, in European history, advanced as an immediate aftermath of the fall of the Roman Empire around (410A.D) spanning until the end of the 15th or even up to the beginning of the 16th century around (1500 A.D).²⁶ This purports that, with Shakespeare’s birth, in the second half of the 16th century (1564), and by the time he published *The Tempest* (1611), in the first half of the 17th century, Feudalism was not, by any standards, an actively dominant ideological and cultural entity, in early modern or Renaissance England. Feudalism was on its road to extinction, by then; despite its fleeting presence as a remnant in the countryside,²⁷ it, gradually, got relegated, one might argue in Williams’ ideological continuum, to the status of a residual ideological and cultural element. It is, in accordance with this historical development, that I argue that Feudalism makes, although subtly and sparsely, its appearance in *The Tempest* as a residue. The framework of “feudal history,” to borrow Jan Kott’s words might be detected in Shakespeare’s play, as a form of a remnant, in “Prospero’s narrative.”²⁸ The feudal dynamics, if I might put it as such, of “struggle for power, of violence and conspiracy,”²⁹ are, from time to time, in action in *The Tempest*. Sidney Finkelstein’s argument, in this direction, is of high relevance as he explains that, through his play, Shakespeare, to put it no less stronger, was against “feudal mentality” of cyclical violence, bloodshed and murder which the bard saw “as no longer capable of a constructive role, [but]

only [a] destructive [one].”³⁰ Such a feudal cycle of backstabbing comes to life and might be observed though Prospero’s ‘illegitimate’ takeover of Caliban’s island; we get, as the story unfolds, to know Prospero whose dukedom, in Milan, was taken, in turn, by his brother Antonio who relied on the help of the King of Naples, Alonso. The cycle continues with Sebastian who, hereafter, conspires, in a thrilling twist, with Antonio to murder Alonso to control Naples. Jan Kott’s words, in this respect, are significant as he clarifies this process,

Caliban is the offspring of Sycorax’s union with the devil. On her death he assumed rule of the island. He was its rightful lord, at least in the feudal sense. Caliban lost his realm, just as Prospero had lost his dukedom. Caliban was overthrown by Prospero, just as Prospero had been overthrown by Antonio. Even before the morality proper is performed and Prospero’s enemies undergo the trial of madness, two acts of feudal history have already been acted on the desert island.³¹

The same kind of residual feudal order and schemes operated and might be spotted in the play’s marriages; it has to be brought into light that, in many cases, feudal monarchs arranged relationships to seal political and economic alliances. There is one instance of this category of feudal marriages which is the union of Claribel, Alonso’s daughter, with the king of Tunis; against her will, she complied with the patriarchal order,³² of the era and accepted the profitable ‘transaction’ to her father and his kingdom. In this ‘transaction,’ however, Lara Vetter confirms that “Claribel loses her name, her identity, in the marriage; that she is defined entirely in terms of her relationship to her father, the king”;³³ she believes that “[i]n Shakespeare’s period, this alliance would have strengthened ties to the Turks, invaluable for Venice, a major trading port, in consolidating power against Spain.”³⁴ Claribel would benefit from this marriage by raising her social status in the feudal order to that of the Queen of Tunis because if she is to remain in Naples, under different circumstances, she would ultimately lose the throne to her brother Sebastian, the male legitimate heir of Alonso.

B- Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and the Dominant Ideological Elements: B- I- Absolutism (Absolutist Monarchy): As a Dominant Aspect:

The state of monarchy is the supremest thing on earth; for kings are not only God’s lieutenants on earth, but even by God himself they are called gods.³⁵

These are James I’s words, to the English people, before the demanding gentry-and merchant-made parliament. The first Stuart King has, in terms of doctrine, pillared his reign

on, what has been dubbed, the Divine Right of Kings, as his above words might denote. Under this absolutist doctrine, James I proclaimed total authority to enforce new laws, impose taxes, at whim, and punish his subjects, in case of insubordination, without even a fair trial. For James I, he is God's representative on earth, as the above epigraph shows, and it is God who made him King; given the fact that God cannot be wrong, therefore, James believed, or at least he wanted his subjects to believe, that he, himself, cannot be wrong. Hence, he claimed supreme authority over both state and subjects. This was the background against which *The Tempest* was produced and circulated, a context in which Absolutism was established as the dominant ideological feature. Jacobean people were indoctrinated, on a similar vein, with a set of ideas about the first Stuart monarch, which depict him as the intellectual and absolutist God-guided-magician; "James I's appropriation of the role of magus or royal sorcerer as a figure for the providential absolutism of his rule,"³⁶ is reproduced via Prospero's portrayal.

He is fashioned as James I since he is shown as the absolutist, intellectual magician who possesses the unearthly powers, to command the wind, the seas, orchestrate a storm, a shipwreck and, most importantly, has an absolute authority over 'his' island and 'subjects'; this portrait of a monarch might be tempting to James I with his "absolutist predilections and occult interests."³⁷ Prospero's character and reign over the island, in a way or another, might be linked with James I and his reign over England; it is not peculiar when thinkers like Diane Purkiss and Paul A. Olson, accordingly, declare *The Tempest* as "violently pro-James,"³⁸ and "utterly absolutist and governed by the assumptions of divine right."³⁹ We can see, in many scenes, the wise, magician, with strange powers, but above all the firm absolutist who weaves schemes, reprimands, and even strikes, whenever needed, with an iron fist against disobeying subjects like Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo. Prospero's absolutist wrath is, the textual evidence suggests, not delimited with racial boundaries as, at ripe times, family/European subjects —his brother Antonio, Sebastian, Ferdinand and Alonso, King of Naples— all underwent the trial of hunger and madness⁴⁰ under the impact of Prospero's powers.

B - II- Mercantilism: An Economic Dominant Ideology:

With the end of feudal economic dynamics in early modern England, a new economic system, which is mercantilism, came to prominence. Human labour, as the only means of production, shifted, gradually but surely, from feudal subsistence-oriented towards surplus, commercial, money-making and profit generating aims. Trade and commercial exchanges, internal and external, with much value given to exports, were crucial to the English crown and English people alike, for their ripple impact on economic, cultural and political dynamics. The late 16th, 17th and early 18th centuries have witnessed the skyrocketing rise of mercantilism as “the most important school of economic thought,”⁴¹ which became, in Williams’ ideological spectrum, another dominant ideology. Mercantilism, as an economic doctrine, worked hand in hand with absolutism, the dominant political doctrine, in the sense that trade and commerce contributed to enriching the monarchy through the taxes such activities generated.

Julie Robin Solomon argues that “the interdependencies [...] between merchant and monarch emerge in *The Tempest*,”⁴² and Shakespeare was “most willing to assimilate, embrace, and appropriate mercantile strategies in the name of royal authority.”⁴³ He tells us for example in a relevant, to this discussion, scene about the first encounter of Trinculo and Stephano with Caliban, in which without even quickly realising what this ‘strange’ creature might be, they expressed the prevalent mercantilist tendency of using such a ‘monster,’ through commercial based schemes, to create opportunities for future prospects, a better social and economic status. Trinculo contemplated the idea of giving shows with this “strange fish” and says, “[w]ere I in England now,--as once I was, and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver.”⁴⁴ Stephano has, on the other hand, had a slightly different mercantile approach as he stresses, “if I can recover him [Caliban] and keep him tame and get to Naples with him, he’s a present for any emperor that ever trod on neat’s-leather”;⁴⁵ he also thought, on a later trade-related scheme, that he “will not take too much for him”⁴⁶ in case an opportunity presents itself to sell him. Through this encounter one might see Trinculo and Stephano as “the debased servants-turned-mercantilists.”⁴⁷

C- Capitalism and Colonialism: Emergent Ideologies in *The Tempest*:

Prospero (and with him, Shakespeare) and *The Tempest* itself [are] complicit with colonialism and the rise of capitalism.⁴⁸

Capitalism and colonialism, as coherent economic, social and political systems and discourses, with reference to Williams' spectrum, were only emergent ideological and cultural practices in Renaissance England; the bard's *The Tempest* as Helen Scott claims, came to life with "the birth of capitalism and colonial expansion."⁴⁹ This period has witnessed the rise of the earliest forms of capitalism, the seeds/dynamics of which were already germinating in the dominant mercantile class. Capital has been concentrated in the hands of the merchants who, gradually but surely, stood as the conspicuous emblem of the rising capitalist institutions which advocated, thereafter, a state friendly to capital accumulation and market orientation.⁵⁰ This ripe matrix, with its constantly evolving and even boundary-blurring economic patterns, of money-making, commerce, imports, exports, investments and early capitalist modes, has been propitious for the emergence of an English colonial/expansionist mindset. The textual evidence in Shakespeare's play, to begin with, pointing at capitalism as an emergent ideology, is compelling with the first signs of individualist and capitalist dynamics to be pinpointed in Antonio, Prospero's brother. He might be an illustration of that spirit of individualism, with its unbridled self-centredness akin to egoism, full of grudge, ambition and, above all, ready to do whatever it takes to rise above one's social and economic status. It is not, thus, out of norm, at any rate whatsoever, if Peter Hulme asserts that Antonio is "fully at home within that ideology of individualism so essential to a developing capitalism."⁵¹ Prospero's brother might stand as one of those early 'merciless' capitalists who managed through his unscrupulous schemes to destitute the true duke of Milan and win, thereby, the dukedom for himself.

I have to clarify that it was all in relation to the primogeniture laws, of which the bard himself was, undoubtedly, very well aware, that Prospero and Alonso have been the rulers of Milan and Naples respectively. Antonio was not satisfied, as an emergent entrepreneurial, 'grudge-imbued' capitalist entity, with what he had in life, a similar dilemma Crusoe would taste a century later; thus, he betrayed Prospero to make his social, economic and political

status better. There is one scene, once ‘stranded’ on the island, in which Antonio, with all the ‘cunning,’ longsighted and ‘unscrupulous’ capitalist’s vision, enacted debased psychological tactics on Sebastian, the King’s younger brother, to coax and cajole him into terminating Alonso’s life to gain control of Naples; this kind of emerging entrepreneurial mentality might be one of the reason for which *The Tempest* “cannot be removed from its formative conditions in emergent capitalism,”⁵² that contributed to Shakespeare’s final outcome.

Other examples of the emergent capitalist dynamics, in Williams’ continuum, can entail Prospero and Caliban whose connection is, somehow, based on exploitation.⁵³ The former, with his emergent capitalist aspirations, is often depicted as the one to plan, define, stratify, issue orders and induce an entire economic activity, while the latter stands for the enslaved, ill-treated, surplus-value generating, and driving force which executes and obeys in this process. Despite not having many mouths to feed, Prospero got Caliban immersed in the implemented (interconnected) cogwheels of economic dynamism on the island and drowned him in more wood/water fetching circles which might be read as a capitalist tendency to overwork labourers and produce even when the reason to do so, that is to say ‘need and necessity,’ is absent. Prospero’s rejoinder to Miranda, as she voiced her revulsion at even the thought of looking upon Caliban, is the ‘wisdom’ of a capitalist’s visionary approach claiming that no matter what their feeling towards him are, they “cannot miss him: [since] he does make [their] fire/ Fetch in [their] wood; and serves in offices/ That profit [them].”⁵⁴ The word ‘profit,’ with the entire mouth watering horizon it invokes within today’s capitalists, needs to be emphasised in the sense that it not only resonates with but also connotes a fierce emergent capitalist’s thinking. The argument of some critics when they refer to the play as a text which “works for capitalism,”⁵⁵ and maintain that the “Prospero/Caliban antagonism [is] that between capitalist and proletariat”⁵⁶ is not devoid of truth.

When it comes to colonialism, *The Tempest* has, for a long time, been seen as one of its key texts, especially in African/Caribbean formerly colonised countries, where it has been

tied to colonial literature. A wide range of critics have been oriented towards reading the bard's last play as a colonialism-promotion attempt and the words of Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor are relevant when they maintained that the play "has long served as the embodiment of colonial presumption."⁵⁷ While it would be difficult, if not impossible, to fully rebut the argument of these critics, since the textual evidence is, indeed, very striking, I claim that colonialism in *The Tempest* is an emergent ideology, by the time of its publication and early circulation. The forces that would lead to direct military intervention, that is to say colonialism, were already germinating in Shakespeare's Elizabethan and early Stuart England and the argument of Daniel Vitkus seems appropriate when he affirms that "[t]he Tudor period was an age of plunder, not an "Age of Empire".⁵⁸ Hence, it is not fully immersed, as the interest in overseas territories is emergent, in the colonial enterprise. Piracy and plunder were not unusual to the English people by then, since the first seeds and earliest agents of colonialism might be located in that era's sea-dogs and sea-hawks,⁵⁹ who contributed to the English thorough involvement in sea routes and geographical explorations which, in turn, would later fuel England's, four centuries long, colonial quest.

In *The Tempest*, which cannot be studied, in a nutshell, outside of this context, the moment Prospero is introduced, the readers might spot in him the germinating spirit of colonialism and the precursor, if not the father, to the yet-to-come European coloniser. With all his books, knowledge, reason, emergent early modern English tendency toward colonial superiority and white 'magic,' he might stand for some kind of a perfect clock-master who times every single event from ruling over 'his' island and 'subjects,' orchestrating the tempest, to uniting Miranda and Ferdinand. His relationship with Caliban, whose portrayal might be read as being sympathetic,⁶⁰ to a certain extent, with his occasional rebellious spirit, might be considered as one of the earliest epitomes of European/'other' encounter in literature. Caliban's sympathetic depiction is better expressed in Meredith Anne Skura's words as she states that "Caliban is no cannibal—he barely touches meat, confining himself

more delicately to roots, berries, [...] his symbiotic harmony with the island's natural food resources is one of his most attractive traits."⁶¹ Although many postcolonial critics read Caliban as the prototype of the objectified and colonised subject, he never fails to speak the 'truth,' as he perceived it when he claims, on multiple occasions, his freedom saying,

This island is mine, by Sycorax my mother,
Which thou tak'st from me. When thou cam'st first,
[...] All the charms
Of Sycorax, toads, beetles, bats light on you!
For I am all the subjects that you have,
Which first was mine own king; and here you sty me
In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me
The rest o' th' island.⁶²

If Shakespeare's play was written during high time colonialism, such a passage I believe would have never ever been included; it follows from the above analysis that Daniel Vitkus' claim that "[t]he binary opposition of colonizer and colonized [...] cannot be maintained in a properly historicized description of England's early modern culture,"⁶³ might be of value. Colonialism, as a coherent system, in short, was an emergent ideology by the time *The Tempest* was written, published and circulated.

4- Daniel Defoe and *Robinson Crusoe*: Life, Context, and Influences:

A- The Life of Daniel Defoe:

Daniel Foe, the English multi-jobbed, polyvalent and multi-skilled citizen, but very well remembered for being a novelist, was born in 1660 in London to James and Alice Foe. It was in the aim of becoming a dissenting minister that the young Foe attended the Academy of Reverend Charles Morton at Newington Green in north London which he abruptly left to pursue the world of business converting himself into a merchant in 1683.⁶⁴ His business plans, with the hectic and workaholic mindset they might entail, widened his future horizons with errands and trips both at home and abroad the experiences which would be invaluable when the chance presented itself to write his first novel. The initial success he met in business did not last and the life of the third son of the Foes became a daily struggle for survival, just like Crusoe, with so many spiky economic and social issues to handle. The tumultuous era in which Foe lived was a time when England became the stage for several upheavals. The year

(1685), in English history, witnessed what is designated as the Monmouth rebellion against James II that quickly turned into a nightmare to the insurgents, and Foe managed somehow to save his skin unlike hundreds of rebels. The late 17th century, saw him, against all the odds, basking in another financial success during which he travelled extensively before he went bankrupt anew in (1692) and in his mid-thirties (1695), he changed his name into an aristocrat “Frenchified”⁶⁵ formula, ‘Defoe.’ He got into trouble with the government if not for his debt problems it was for his polemical writings, and the publication of *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* in (1702) is an instance which brought him animosity leading to a short period of imprisonment.⁶⁶ Defoe died in (1731) and from today’s viewpoint, the fact that he acquired a prolific author’s reputation, although late in his life, is not peculiar; with his large repertoire ranging from poetry and essays to novels, among which the timeless *Robinson Crusoe*, there is proof enough and testimony of his brimful style and narrative dexterity.

B- Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) in Context:

The English people have already began the construction of their worldwide empire during the 16th and 17th centuries with commercial ties being, at first position, established with many foreign territories while others have been annexed in North America, the Caribbean, parts of Africa and a few trade posts in India. The merchants have had a strong position all along this period and with their global expeditions, they have sparked not only the country’s interest in, but also a European large scale tendency to value, foreign areas. The prevalent mercantile system which favoured external trade and the exploitation of overseas territories has spawned a willingness at maximising profit through massive commercial activities especially exportation; the creation of the Muscovy Company (1555), the East India Company (1600), the Hudson Bay Company (1670) and the Royal African Company (1672) has been a strategic manoeuvre to fulfil these mercantilist designs. The worldwide trade posts which have been established contributed to a huge influx of both raw materials, the country has witnessed, and man power, through slaves, who were employed in the sugar and cotton plantations scattered throughout the Caribbean and North America.

The long process of direct colonisation during the 18th century has appealed, at the onset, to the above commercial companies which have safeguarded and grounded their trade posts while converting them into military outposts. Defoe's major contribution to British and world literature, entitled *Robinson Crusoe*, has come to life in (1719) and the country's monarch around this date is George I (1714-1727). The beginning of this century has known a British ascendance in terms of military and political power over its European enemies such as Spain, Netherlands and France from whom vast areas have been annexed in this race for resources and supremacy. In addition, the 18th century, with its industrial and economic bourgeoning, led to the domination of the country's capitalists especially with the rise of the factory owners and the wide mechanisation which triggered excessive production. This has resulted in the growth of Britain's requirements for man power and external markets as the local ones were flooded with commodities; these factors, teamed with the incessant demand for raw materials due to the country's growing manufacturing capacity, led to the creation of a strong drive for conquest. "Crusoe is explicitly enabled," Edward Said has confirmed, "by an ideology of overseas expansion," which is "directly connected [...] to the narratives of [...] exploration voyages that laid the foundations of the great colonial empires."⁶⁷

The era in which the first English novel has germinated is also memorable for overseas travelogues which the English sea dogs/hawks, following their worldwide errands, produced entailing accounts which were imaginatively enriching.⁶⁸ This literary genre has become popular with an increase of readership in accordance with the ongoing direct military expansion of Britain and other colonial forces at the global scale.⁶⁹ *Robinson Crusoe* is imbedded, like any literary work, in its era's whole context which has had a considerable impact on its text. The Whigs, who have had a strong position over the Tories, managed to bring forth a powerful government and "questioned the King's claims to unrestrained authority" demanding, thereby, additional influence for the parliament in terms of decision making.⁷⁰ There was furthermore the rise of the merchants and capitalists together with the

prevalence of the puritan and protestant work values which brought about a new individualist mentality that favoured and even sacralised self reliance, time, perseverance, individual efforts, thrift, and material gain which might be considered as core traits of Defoe's hero.

The Eurocentric feelings widespread during the 18th century, which championed the European values, way of life, cultural and religious standards, contributed to the British people's belief in their 'inherent' 'superiority' over the dark skinned races. Such a perception has associated 'progress,' 'reason,' and 'civilisation' with the white Europeans who have been expected, accordingly, to colonise other parts in order to spread these advantages through the pretext that has been dubbed, by then, the civilising mission. The British, like most of their European counterparts, have adhered to this worldview. The industrialists and merchants, who have endorsed the individualist/capitalist values of perseverance, rising above the group, hard work, wealth construction and accumulation, have found a ripe matrix to thrive. Defoe's first novel, in Williams' ideological and cultural continuum, has been published with the dominance of the individualist, capitalist, Eurocentric and colonialist standpoints. The hero has, throughout his adventures, been driven by such values and motives due to which he has worked hard to integrate the capitalist upper classes, demonstrated high 'resilience,' 'intelligence,' a workaholic spirit, and even 'superiority' during his struggle against both wilderness and cannibals. It is not peculiar, in this sense, that Jean Jacques Rousseau has declared that Defoe's novel might serve as a good educational book for Emile⁷¹ asserting that it is the first literary work a male child must "read," for the sake of "entertainment and instruction."⁷² The text is perceived, therefore, by the French philosopher as a manual for education through which children are expected to be transformed into the future reliable and even 'indomitable' citizens, but also colonisers.

5- Back to the Origins of the Crusoe Story:

To speak about total originality in literature or other artistic forms, for that matter, would be a major fallacy and as striking as this fact might be, no author or artist, to my best knowledge, has ever been the product of a sterile matrix free of human contact and other

kinds of influences.⁷³ Any poet, playwright or novelist in the process of writing, Daniel Defoe not exempt, is expected to be subject, whether conscious of it or not, to a wide range of factors among which prior texts and works. Julia Kristeva has claimed, in this sense, that “each word (text) is an intersection of word[s] (texts)”⁷⁴; she has even gone further and asserted that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of”⁷⁴ other texts and works. This textual relationship seems inevitable and in the same fashion that the origins of *The Tempest* have been identified in works written in an earlier stage of history that the roots of *Robinson Crusoe* might be traced back to previous texts. The sources that might have ignited Defoe’s zeal to produce his 18th century novel might be numerous, yet my intention, at this point, is not to be exhaustive; I would, hence, explore some sources which have probably inspired the Crusoe tale.

There is a key text, Abu Bakr Ibn Tufayl’s, to begin with, entitled *Hayy Ibn Yaqzan* to which Defoe’s novel bears a striking resemblance at formal and thematic dimensions.⁷⁵ The events of this account revolve around the solitary life of an infant who has been brought-up by an animal, a doe, on an island with no human contact; this hostile matrix, in which the hero has evolved, compelled him to struggle for survival on a regular basis. He has had, it might be worth to stress, no technological advances or other kinds of tools to face wilderness and its beasts; to circumvent these limitations, the only valid recourse, for him, has been a strict reliance on his ingenuity and acumen. These plot elements are more than enough to bring into memory Crusoe’s sufferings; which is why, a scholar has claimed that, “Crusoe was inspired by [...] *Hayy ibn Yaqzan*.”⁷⁶ Defoe might have had access, at one point of his literary career, to one of the translations of Hayy’s story which has given him the idea to write his novel.

The second possible source of *Robinson Crusoe* might be Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (1611);⁷⁷ there are myriad affinities which might be pinpointed through a targeted reading of these texts. The reader might spot the same pattern of leading a secluded life on an uncharted island where Prospero and Crusoe have had the potential to re-enact the white man’s wildest

colonial fantasies. They have also had, at different proportions, a solitary life that requires fortitude to face the wilderness; the moment they settled, both of them have attempted to recreate the mother land's standards on a distant territory. The two texts entail, at one stage or another, a reference to the indigenous populations through Caliban and Friday; the identity of these native figures has been suppressed and they have been subjugated and enslaved. The bard's play, to clarify the situation, has already been famous, throughout the country, during the 18th century; this means that Defoe, like most of his contemporaries, has had a close knowledge of its entire text by the time he has taken the decision to produce his novel.

One might point-out, in the last position, Alexander Selkirk's story⁷⁸ which has been published around the first decade of the 18th century in a magazine called "*The Englishman*."⁷⁹ Selkirk's misfortunes occurred in (1704) the date around which he has rebelled against his ship's captain the reason for which he has been stranded, as a punishment, on an isolated island somewhere towards the South American coasts. The solitary adventurer, away from the comforts of 'civilisation' and deprived of all assistance, has had to fight for subsistence for a few years; he has experienced the daily hardships of finding food, water, shelter and tasted life in different weather conditions while enduring utter loneliness. There is not even a shadow of uncertainty a critic, hence, argues "about the fact that *Robinson Crusoe* was inspired by the adventures of Alexander Selkirk."⁸⁰ Such an account of an individual man braving the wilderness has been so fascinating to the English readership by then; his story has spread throughout the kingdom and Defoe has been familiar with it prior to writing his first novel; thus, it might be confirmed that Selkirk has been a "model for Robinson Crusoe."⁸¹

6- The Crusoe Tale: From Williams' Ideological and Cultural Continuum: **A- Defoe's Text: Political and Economic Remnants:**

The deployment of Williams' ideological and cultural continuum to read *Robinson Crusoe* might uncover the resurgence of two residual elements, in Defoe's lifetime and literary text, which fall under the political and economic categories. To start with the political dimension, I might point at absolutism and the absolutist monarchy that have become a

residue despite being quite dominant a century ago during Shakespeare's final years and in his work *The Tempest*. The language Defoe's hero has deployed, when speaking of the island as his "little kingdom,"⁸² is a strong indicator of this residual presence; he has even had the choice to either be "king or emperor" throughout the area without any "rivals [or] competitor [and nobody] to dispute sovereignty or command with"⁸³ him. These words might reveal the absolutist undertone the novel has voiced with Crusoe claiming supreme power over both land and subjects. He has, thus, stated "I had the lives of all my subjects at my absolute command; I could hang, draw, give liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all my subjects."⁸⁴ This has been the vision of the early Stuart Kings under whose reign Defoe has not lived; the reference, here, has to be made to James I and Charles I who have advocated the right to rule arbitrarily appealing only to their whims and serving only their personal interests. It has, however, to be clarified that he has experienced, for 28 years, the reign of two other Stuart monarchs, Charles II and James II, which has left its mark on Defoe's first novel.

The fact that Crusoe has, on many occasions, declared his supreme authority might, in this sense, be interpreted as a residual aspect since the question of absolutism has already been resolved, in England, with the establishment of the constitutional monarchy during the second half of the 17th century. Once the solitary sojourn of Defoe's protagonist has drawn to its end, the inhabitants of the island, with the coming of Friday, his father and a Spanish sailor, have altered the area's entire social atmosphere; this growth in the community has brought into the surface "Crusoe's rhetoric of absolutism"⁸⁵ which has articulated its existence more than it has done at any other stage of the hero's island life. What was missing, to enact Crusoe's residual despotic or absolutist tendency, before the arrival of these newcomers, is the much needed 'subjects' who would be subdued to his unquestionable authoritarian will. There is a passage of great relevance in which the hero has confirmed,

My island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in subjects; and it was a merry reflection, which I frequently made, how like a king I looked. First of all, the whole country was my own property, so that I had an unbounded right of dominion. Secondly, my people were perfectly subjected – I was absolutely lord and lawgiver -

they all owed their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been occasion for it, for me.⁸⁶

The dissection of the above passage is crucial; starting from the way Crusoe has associated wealth with the list of his 'subjects' being engrossed, to the fact that he has crowned himself King over every single inch of the island, to establishing his absolute power/authority over 'his' people who have been characterised as being submissive to the point of being ready to sacrifice their lives for their 'monarch/Crusoe', if needs be.

The earliest English colonial endeavours, at the economic dimension, have been constructed around the connection between commerce, external preferably through exporting goods, away from the 'Laissez Faire policy,' handing thereby the economic affairs to the state. This mercantile⁸⁷ tendency was all about overseas trade, after all, with products to be sold worldwide; this activity must, at all costs, be maximised in relation to both imports, to be reduced, and local commercial activities. This economic worldview, by then, refers to "doctrines of the period from about 1500"⁸⁸ until the beginning of the 1700s during which every European country, England not exempt, has resorted, as expected and stipulated, to commercialising all sorts of riches, natural and manmade alike, with such activities most importantly regulated through economic nationalism which has considerably increased the might of the Tudors and Stuart dynasties. The colonies, in this economic worldview are good for nothing, but to complete the economy of the hegemonic colonial force; they are invaluable markets, a means for cheap labour force and the much coveted metals of all kinds that contribute to the country's wealth.

A closer look at the publication date of Defoe's novel combined with a glance at, its background, a pivotal sequence in British civilisation, would allow us to grasp that the reliance on commerce has been convicted "as a 'false' system of economic thinking."⁸⁹ It has gone bankrupt sine making money through trade has regressed losing ground, during the late 17th century, to the increasingly powerful capitalist vision, with its 'Laissez Faire' pillared approach, which advocated wealth construction through the control and ownership of the

means of production. By the second decade of the 18th century, the time when Defoe's literary work was published, capitalism rose to the status of the dominant ideology, while the commercial worldview, although, practically in its death-bed, has continued to be an effective remnant of the past. This fits Williams' perception of the residual ideology and/or culture as being "effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process [...] as an effective element of the present."⁹⁰ The ancient commercial drive, despite its being brought into existence in the past, might still be visible as an active entity in Defoe's text.

Crusoe's birth and upbringing, similar to Defoe's, took place in fact in an environment which championed capital gain, investment and profit-generating manoeuvres; both author and character were not, likewise, unaware of the dominant capitalist dynamics, in action, which were taking control of the economic activity. The paternal figures, in the novel, whose tireless efforts at quelling Crusoe's capitalist desires to go abroad, have been without much success; accordingly, the commercial-based economic structures, that brought the family to its secure situation, and which used to be admired and regarded as "the most suited to human happiness,"⁹¹ have been relegated by Crusoe to a secondary position. It was against all odds, his father's will, that Crusoe undertook the enterprise of rising above his fortunes. The commercial worldview has sprung again to life as a remnant when Crusoe's overseas adventures began through his first voyage to Africa as "both a sailor and merchant."⁹² With this voyage, which he, at the beginning, undertook with 40 pounds, he "brought home five pounds nine ounces of gold-dust," Crusoe states "which yielded [him] in London, at [his] return, almost 300 pounds";⁹³ this prospect of wealth-making from trade has generated, although only initially, some delight towards commercial activities. The thought of accumulating wealth and maximising fortunes was so charming that Crusoe has been enticed to make a second voyage to Africa, which proved to be, unlike the first, a failure. The ship on which he made the voyage, much to his misfortunes, has been attacked by corsairs along the Canary Islands and he has been made captive in North Africa.

Crusoe's escape from his captivity came two years later in the aftermath of which he boarded a Portuguese ship, which saved him, heading towards the Brazil. During Crusoe's meeting with the Portuguese captain, a transaction has been carried out in which Defoe's hero, the merchant whenever the occasion presents itself, sold a boat and an African slave to the captain. Once in the new world, the hero resolved to "turn planter"⁹⁴ after buying huge parcels of land that were meant to promote and pillar his commercial cash crop activities. His efforts were unsuccessful at the onset since, after two years, he has only been planting for subsistence. Gradually, but surely, his plantation grew, sometimes even at an alarming rate, that the "buying of negroes,"⁹⁵ to use Crusoe's words, which represents a source for cheap labour force, was not only a pressing need, but also an urgent obligation. The hero's commercial spirit woke up and he took, with a few fellow planters, the decision to undertake his third voyage to Africa, Guinea, for trade purposes, buying slaves. These events, all in all, ranging from his first trade voyage to Africa to "his mercantile slaving expeditions"⁹⁶ take full significance the moment one understands that the country's past commercial economic dimension and orientation was still present, as an effective remnant, in Defoe's text.

B- The Dominant Economic, Cultural and Political patterns: B-I- Capitalism and the Crusoe Narrative:

Written during the 18th century, a period when capitalism, which emerged earlier during the previous century, stood as one of the dominant ideologies, all over Europe, in general, and Britain, in particular, *Robinson Crusoe* is dominated by capitalism and bourgeois attitudes. The capitalist drive is 'irresistible' to the hero that he amasses huge sums of money, even on a remote island, despite its uselessness in the absence of "social relations representing social power over others."⁹⁷ Since he is not the first child, much like Daniel Defoe himself, Crusoe is well aware of the Primogeniture Laws, which allocate the family's wealth and possessions to the first born. Defoe's hero, without much hope for a future wealth prospect, follows his society's dominant capitalist urge and leaves England, to distant overseas territories, where he expects to carve a new economic reality for himself. The words

of a prominent scholar, which I borrow hereafter, are of great significance as he explains that, “Crusoe’s ‘original sin’ is really the dynamic tendency of capitalism itself [...] Leaving home, improving on the lot one was born to, is a vital feature of the individualist pattern of life.”⁹⁸

Capitalism is omnipresent, throughout Defoe’s masterpiece where the hero, the readers might quickly understand, is anything, but lazy; he can be, depending on the circumstances, a sailor, a merchant, a slaveholder, a tailor, an earthenware pot maker, a priest, a carpenter, a bullet/gun powder manufacturer, a hunter, a baker, a cook, an umbrella maker, an architect, a construction worker —all these functions he has successfully performed whenever the situation was fit. Crusoe the self made man, one comes to know, is full of common sense, creativity, entrepreneurship and resilience which allowed him, no matter how the circumstances were, to circumvent his daily difficulties while even managing, at times, to come out with significant capital gain. Some of his major concerns, as any capitalist in today’s world, were: time, although he has had much of it on the island, labour, production and profit. I cannot remember a single instance where Crusoe was satisfied with what he has amassed in terms of capital; as a result, and despite the uselessness of money and gold on the island, he kept intact all his gains. His dividends from previous sea voyages, the gold coins he retrieved from the wreck, and even a few pieces he recovered from the pockets of a drowned boy, he did not afford to let uncollected, amounted to huge sums he preserved. Like any capitalist, he has, for the most part, a certain duty or even an obligation to keep and try to maximise daily profit. Stephen Hymer has managed to put it in clearer words, as he affirms,

Robinson has succeeded in accumulating much faster than if he had remained content, for he adds a new fortune from his island economy to the growth of his plantation. True, he must suffer a long period of isolation, but in many ways his solitary sojourn represents the alienation suffered by all under capitalism- those who work and receive little, as well as those like Robinson who accumulate and always must go on.⁹⁹

Crusoe’s relentless drive to make profit, at all costs, made him exploit not only the natural resources all over, but also the human resources which came under his disposition. Here I can refer, nearly, to all the people Defoe’s hero has met whom he uses, in a way or another, to either stabilise his economic status or for other ‘individualist’ ends. The best examples, to list

a few, would be the English and Portuguese captains, the former's widow later on, his African slave, and his man Friday—all were caught, under various proportions in Crusoe's spiny capitalist cogwheels since he resorted to them as tools to fulfil his designs. Capitalism was one of the hegemonic entities at the time of the writing, publication and distribution of Defoe's text, the aspect which played a vital role in shaping it the way readers know it today.

B-II- Eurocentrism: A Dominant Cultural Feature:

Eurocentrism, the inherent belief that European values, assumptions and cultural modes are supposed, not only, to be superior, but also to be taken as universal standards, is a European power-based worldview. It advocated and tried to impose, the idea that Europeans, unlike other races, were much 'superior,' 'civilised' and 'enlightened'; this was a well constructed discourse meant to consolidate the European colonial image to justify, what has been termed the 'civilising mission.' The existence of such a discourse of power, combined with many other strategies, aimed at giving the coloniser the authority to exploit, acculturate and subdue, if necessary, other peoples mainly non-European and *Robinson Crusoe* is not exempt from this discourse. A careful reader, hence, would only come to the conclusion that Eurocentrism is present as one of the dominant cultural features in Defoe's first novel.

The fashion, in which Crusoe has dealt with Xury, a boy whose company has been crucial while captive in North Africa, and his slave Friday denotes an arrogant, condescending and Eurocentric pattern. The boy became Crusoe's servant after their escape; the passage, hereinafter, shows Crusoe's patronising 'nature' as he spoke to Xury telling him "if you will be faithful to me, I'll make you a great man; but if you will not stroke your face to be true to me—that is, swear by Mahomet and his father's beard—I must throw you into the sea."¹⁰⁰ In Crusoe's, just as in Defoe's readership's, Eurocentric vision, Xury must comply with the 'superior' norms; something he, submissively, did when he "swore to be faithful" to Crusoe "and go all over the world with [him]."¹⁰¹ He is dealt with as an irrational child for whom the master would take all the decisions. The boy was sold, a few days later, to a Portuguese

captain, though he was utterly resilient, docile and acquiescent; he stands, in Crusoe's eyes, as the 'other' whose race is good for nothing, but to be exploited and sold for slavery.

The same pattern of Eurocentric behaviours might be observed when it comes to Crusoe's relationship with his slave Friday who was sentenced for life-long servility. Crusoe imposed everything on him, just like he did with Xury, since he is the superior master whose orders the native must receive. Friday is, as any coloniser would expect, "docile towards work, happy to be a slave, and too easily disgusted by cannibalism."¹⁰² He is objectified through a systematic discourse that portrayed him as the, 'skin-coloured,' 'savage,' 'irrational,' and 'cannibal' whose "affections were tied to"¹⁰³ Crusoe the 'civilised,' 'rational,' and 'Christian,' "like those of a child to a father."¹⁰⁴ Like most of Defoe's readers, by then, Crusoe took the civilising mission seriously since he 'tamed' his man Friday, 'taught' him English, 'introduced' him to the British eating habits, way of life and, above all, made him a Christian. The 'superior' Crusoe confirmed, "I was greatly delighted with [Friday], and made it my business to teach him everything that was proper to make him useful."¹⁰⁵ It is, of course, up to Crusoe to decide what is 'right' and what is not; on the other hand, he would never ever ill-treat, enslave or condescend other Europeans —the Spanish, the Portuguese captain and the plantation owners are only a few examples— whom he saw as counterparts, and with whom it happened he has had excellent relationships based on racial equality and mutual respect. Defoe's novel, in brief, has voiced the era's Eurocentric perception.

B-III- The Supremacy of High Time Colonialism:

Brett McInelly's assertion that *Robinson Crusoe* is a text which "cries out for study in its colonial context," since "British colonialism informs nearly every feature of Defoe's first novel,"¹⁰⁶ is not, at all, deprived of truth. The 18th century witnessed an ever changing world with an intense activity of the major traditional European colonial forces such as France, Portugal and Spain, which strove, through military campaigns, for overseas land seizure. Britain was no exception, since it established its colonial settlements in the New World, India and Africa; this colonial tradition has had a considerable effect upon the British authors who,

in their stories, have portrayed such an enterprise and advocated success away from their mother country. *Robinson Crusoe*, one of the earliest colonial texts, contains many elements bringing it under that category of writings which support the dominant colonial¹⁰⁷ ideology.

A perusal of Defoe's text has uncovered to me the presence of the colonial ideology which might be observed throughout the entire plot. Annexing lands is considered, by many thinkers, vital to any coloniser and Crusoe might not be singled-out; the moment he got stranded on an 'uninhabited' island, he got involved in the process of colonising its lands. He appropriated its territories, plains, valleys and forests by establishing his ownership naming himself King over it. There is a particular scene in which Crusoe was preoccupied with the exploration of the area; it was with much amazement, zeal and pleasure, the same feelings every coloniser experiences at the sight of an exotic setting, that he surveys a green valley and he observes, "to think that this was all my own; that I was king and lord of all this country indefensibly, and had a right of possession; and if I could convey it, I might have it in inheritance as completely as any lord of a manor in England."¹⁰⁸ Crusoe's colonial attitude, as depicted in this passage, is the least to say alarming, to a 21st century reader.

Crusoe had no time to lose, though he would remain for twenty-eight years, since after the shipwreck, he explored nearly all the island. This being done, without much delay, he initiated the process of settling, altering and exploiting the island's abundant resources. He constructed a summer dwelling, but a winter one as well, as any coloniser would have done, to make his life easier. The hero also managed, after a painstaking effort, to have a few farms, which allowed him, together with the enclosures he constructed for his cattle, mainly goats, to diversify his diet. It is not, therefore, surprising today to know that many postcolonial authors have labelled the protagonist "the symbol of British conquest";¹⁰⁹ Crusoe succeeded in settling, exploring, altering, taming and colonising a large island. Colonialism, as one of the dominant cultural elements, in a nutshell, has shaped Defoe's text.

C- The Emergent: Individualism, Industrialisation, and Inventiveness:

Individualism, one of the most recurrent terms in the modern societies, might be defined as a “self-centered feeling or conduct as a principle,” leading to the individual’s freedom in terms of “action or [/and] thought.”¹¹⁰ This definition seems, on a wide range of levels, to fit Defoe’s novel, in general, and its hero, Robinson Crusoe, in particular. Crusoe’s individualist tendency, which is, at times, close to an unbounded desire to be free of any social ties, whatsoever, is quite apparent. The first-person narration, the viewpoint from which the story has been told, centres every aspect, to the slightest detail, on the protagonist; a fact which might suggest nothing, but the prominence of individualism. This same tendency towards individualism, although emergent, in England, by the 18th century, was increasingly in vogue. If the life of Crusoe, the way Defoe delineates him, the individual and ‘ordinary’ man, is valued, it is only because of the English “society [which by then] value[d] every individual highly enough to consider him the proper subject of its serious literature.”¹¹¹ Crusoe, very much the product of his era, sees family and the middle-class state of life as constraints that would hinder him from exploiting all his potential.

There is only one viable option in case Crusoe wanted to live for himself and pursue his dreams; it is to leave his family and society for overseas adventures. The decision, when the right time came, was relatively easy to take; despite everybody’s opposition, Crusoe “would be satisfied with nothing but going to sea.”¹¹² He favoured individualism over group life in the aftermath of which he, the sole survivor of a shipwreck, got marooned on a remote and an ‘uninhabited’ island, the thing Crusoe, the by-product of the emergent individualist tendency not only desired, but also coveted. There was, it seems, nothing easy to Crusoe than having a Kingdom where he would be free to relish, with much pleasure, his new individualist life. Crusoe came, quicker than any reader would have imagined, to terms with his solitary life, despite his initial horror at the thought of it, since he reconciled himself with his present state; “[a]s for my solitary life, it was nothing,” he assures, “I did not so much as pray to be

delivered from it or think of it; it was all of no consideration.”¹¹³ It was on that same Island, which he initially dubbed, “The Island of Despair,”¹¹⁴ that Crusoe struggled against all odds, for more than two decades, without any human contact. The astounding reputation Defoe’s novel has enjoyed, “demands at least partly to be considered,” Andrew O’Malley (2012) highlights “in terms of how effectively it connected with such emergent [...] ideological formations of the eighteenth century, as individualism.”¹¹⁵ Defoe’s protagonist managed not only to survive, but also to ‘tame’ the wilderness, settle its lands and achieve self sufficiency; the aspects that, for the most part, would have been next to impossible without Crusoe’s strong drive for industry and inventiveness. Such a drive is not, under whatever circumstances peculiar, since the emergent spirit of the Industrial Revolution was already, by the publication and circulation of Defoe’s novel, hovering all over England.

Crusoe possessed very limited resources and nearly no technological assets with the exception of his firearms and gunpowder; this situation would have been more than enough to plunge anybody in a state of total dejection and surrender, but not Crusoe. With much inventiveness, although wanting for tools, he managed to device an axe, a wheelbarrow, a plough, a chair, a table, baskets, a sieve, even a mill —all he achieved and made possible through “labour and invention.”¹¹⁶ He relied, while making such tools, on the, yet to come, with the Industrial Revolution, technique of Labour Division. He championed innovation and, like many inventors of the era, he made use of his ‘ingenuous’ spirit; for instance, to manufacture a machine with which to sharpen his axes, knives and other tools, Crusoe explains, “I had a grindstone [...] I contrived a wheel with a string, to turn it with my foot, that I might have both my hands at liberty [...] I had never seen any such thing in England [...] This machine cost me a full week’s work to bring it to perfection.”¹¹⁷ Whenever the situation requires it, he would appeal to his creativity to device a machine or a tool; the scourging sun with its burning hot rays, from time to time, spurred Crusoe to craft an umbrella; this object which he “cleverly fashioned for himself became so well known that later in the 18th century

when umbrellas came into wide use, they were called Robinsons in England.”¹¹⁸ Crusoe’s individualism, spirit of invention and industrialisation, in short, stand for the emergent ideological and cultural formations in vogue, by then, to which Defoe’s text gave voice.

Conclusion:

Throughout this chapter, I have contextualised *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe*. This has allowed me to reveal the various dynamics, in action, contributing to the fashioning of these literary works. I have submitted them, as source texts, to a rigorous intertextual and dialogic inquiry which has shown that both Shakespeare and Defoe have appealed to previous sources for inspiration while writing the two would-become masterpieces. Finally, I have resorted to Williams’ categories of ‘residual,’ ‘dominant,’ and ‘emergent’ through which I have dissected the ideological and cultural matrix that has shaped Shakespeare’s last play and Defoe’s first novel.

Endnotes:

¹. Jacob L. Mey, “Speech Acts in Context,” in Anita Fetzer and Etsuko Oishi, eds., *Context and Contexts: Parts Meet Whole?*, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011), p. 171.

². Edward W. Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 4.

³. Heidi Kaye and Imelda Whelehan, “Introduction: Classics Across the Film/Literature Divide,” in Deborah Cartmell et al., eds., *Classics in Film and Fiction*, (London: Pluto Press, 2000), p. 04.

⁴. Arthur F. Kinney, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 01.

⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 04.

⁶. Ian Nichols, *The Pocket Essential William Shakespeare*, (Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2002), p. 07.

⁷. Tom Streissguth, *The Greenhaven Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, (Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2008), p. 114.

⁸. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

⁹. John M. Murrin et al., Vol, 01, *Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of the American People*, (Boston: Thomson Wadsworth, 2008), P.p. 54-56.

¹⁰. James I, Cited in Christopher Baker, ed., *Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution, 1600-1720: A Biographical Dictionary*, (London: Greenwood Press, 2002), p. 193-194.

¹¹. Robert Crozman, *The World is a Stage: Shakespeare and the Dramatic View of Life*, (Washington: Academica Press, 2005), p. 184.

¹². Stephen J. Lunch, *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Sources and Plays*, (London: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998) p. 118.

¹³. Frederick Turner, *Beyond Geography: The Western Spirit against Wilderness*, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983) p. 158.

¹⁴. David Stone, *The Tempest*, (Cheltenham: Nelson Thrones Ltd, 2003), p. 02, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=2q-Gv7FSyp8C&pg=PA1&dq=There+are+many+cross-references+between+Strachey%E2%80%99s+account+and&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi085qqo4X7AhWli0HHe_JDCsQ6AF6BAGGEAl#v=onepage&q=There%20are%20many%20cross-references%20between%20Strachey%E2%80%99s%20account%20and&f=false, Accessed on 02/12/2016.

¹⁵. Andrew Gurr, “New Directions: Sources and Creativity in *The Tempest*,” in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 95.

¹⁶. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

¹⁷. Among the scholars who argue that Virgil’s *Aeneid* has influenced Shakespeare’s the *Tempest*, I can name: J. M. Nosworthy (1948), Jan Kott (1976), Andrew Gurr (2014).

While for those who maintain that Ovid's *Metamorphoses* has been the origin of *The Tempest* I can refer: Lisa S. Starks-Estes (2014), Andrew Gurr (2014).

¹⁸. Nosworthy J. M., "The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*," in *The Review of English Studies*, Vol 24: N° 96, 1948, P. p. 281-294, Oxford University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/510670>, Accessed on 03/12/2016.

¹⁹. Jan Knott, "The Aeneid and the Tempest," in *A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Vol 03: N° 04, 1976, P.p. 424-451, Trustees of Boston University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20163431>, Accessed on 03/12/2016.

²⁰. Andrew Gurr, "New Directions: Sources and Creativity in *The Tempest*," in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 94-95.

²¹. Lisa S. Starks-Estes, *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Play: Transforming Ovid*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), p. 162.

²². Nosworthy J. M., "The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*," in *The Review of English Studies*, Vol 24: N° 96, 1948, P. p. 290, Oxford University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/510670>, Accessed on 03/12/2016.

²³. Jonathan Bate, Cited in Andrew Gurr, "New Directions: Sources and Creativity in *The Tempest*," in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 87-88.

²⁴. Lisa S. Starks-Estes, *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Play: Transforming Ovid*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), p. 162.

²⁵. These works have been suggested as potential sources by: Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. xii-xiv.

²⁶. Johannes Fried, *The Middle Ages*, trans., Peter Lewis, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), Pp. VII-VIII.

²⁷. Howard. J. Sherman, "Feudalism to Capitalism in England," in Howard. J. Sherman et al., eds., *Economics: An Introduction to Traditional and Progressive Views*, (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 50.

²⁸. Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, trans., Boleslaw Taboskorski (Warsaw: Doubleday and Company, 1964), p. 116.

²⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

³⁰. Sidney Finkelstein, Cited in Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), 123.

³¹. Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, trans., Boleslaw Taboskorski (Warsaw: Doubleday and Company, 1964), p. 118.

³². Harold Bloom, *Bloom's Shakespeare through Ages: The Tempest*, (New York: Bloom's Library Criticism, 1994), p. 7.

³³. Lara Vetter, *By Avon River H. D.*, (Gainesville: The University Press of Florida, 2014), p. 24.

³⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³⁵. James I, Cited in Andrew James Hartley, *The Shakespearean Dramaturg: A Theoretical and Practical Guide*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 197.

³⁶. Diane Purkiss, *The Witch in History Early Modern and Twentieth-century Representations*, (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 184.

³⁷. Robert Crossman, *The World is a Stage: Shakespeare and the Dramatic View of Life*, (Washington: Academica Press, 2005), p. 184.

³⁸. Diane Purkiss, *The Witch in History Early Modern and Twentieth-century Representations*, (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 184.

³⁹. Paul A. Olson, *Beyond a Common Joy: An Introduction to Shakespearean Comedy*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), p. 220.

⁴⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), Pp. 71-77.

In Act Three, Scene Three, for instance, we read about the trial Antonio, Sebastian and Alonso underwent. Prospero was some sort of a puppeteer perfectly staging what to occur, cunningly guiding his enemies and tightly controlling them towards their ultimate punishment like powerless puppets. They were, in fact, quite hungry; Prospero took advantage of this and used his powers through Ariel who made them see a banquet full of food. The moment Prospero's enemies approach, the whole apparition disappears. They were, with the end of this scene, frightened to the verge of madness.

⁴¹. Howard. J. Sherman, "Feudalism to Capitalism in England," in Howard. J. Sherman et al., eds., *Economics: An Introduction to Traditional and Progressive Views*, (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 58.

⁴². Julie Robin Solomon, "Going Places: Absolutism and Movement in Shakespeare's "The Tempest", in *Renaissance Drama, Essays on Epistemological Transformations and Theater History*, Vol 22: N° 1, 1991, p. 6, The University of Chicago Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41917271>, Accessed on 02/01/2020.

⁴³. *Ibid.*, p. 13. Accessed on 02/01/2020.

⁴⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 52.

⁴⁵. *Ibid.*, 53.

⁴⁶. *Ibid.*, 54.

- ⁴⁷. Julie Robin Solomon, "Going Places: Absolutism and Movement in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*," in Renaissance Drama, Essays on Epistemological Transformations and Theater History, Vol 22: N° 1, 1991, p. 22, The University of Chicago Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41917271>, Accessed on 02/01/2020.
- ⁴⁸. Frank W. Brevik, *The Tempest and New World-Utopian Politics*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 75.
- ⁴⁹. Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (London: Routledge, 2020), p. 104. Note: This book has influenced my whole perception about the emergence of capitalism.
- ⁵⁰. Howard J. Sherman, "Feudalism to Capitalism in England," in Howard J. Sherman et al., eds., *Economics: An Introduction to Traditional and Progressive Views*, (London: Routledge, 2008), Pp. 50-55.
- ⁵¹. Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean 1492-1797*, (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 155.
- ⁵². Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), p. 22.
- ⁵³. This whole argument of seen the Prospero/Caliban duality as a capitalist relationship is rooted in and influenced by Helen C. Scott's *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*
- ⁵⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 22.
- ⁵⁵. Paul Cefalu, *Revisionist Shakespeare: Transitional Ideologies in Texts and Contexts*, (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 48.
- ⁵⁶. Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), p. 21.
- ⁵⁷. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor, *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), p. 101, in https://books.google.dz/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=neXcAAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA99&dq=shakespeare%27s+influence+on+african+authors&ots=6hDH7ft78&sig=QTB4iOKR5FMCcixNybRXvoj370&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&=false, Accessed on 13/01/2020.
- ⁵⁸. Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean 1570-1630*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 03.
- ⁵⁹. David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 100.
- ⁶⁰. This view which considers Caliban's portrayal as being sympathetic, rebellious and has many good traits has been fostered by: Meredith Anne Skura. Meredith Anne Skura, "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*," in Shakespeare Quarterly, Vol 40: N° 01, 1989, Pp. 42-69, Folger Shakespeare Library, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2870753>, Accessed on 15/01/2020.
- ⁶¹. Ibid., p. 51.
- ⁶². William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ⁶³. Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean 1570-1630*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 03.
- ⁶⁴. Cynthia Wall, "Defoe and London," in John Richetti, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 163.
- ⁶⁵. John Richetti, *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography*, (London: Blackwell publishing, 2005), p. 18.
- ⁶⁶. Ibid., p. 20.
- ⁶⁷. Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p. 70.
- ⁶⁸. Richard H. Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 39.
- ⁶⁹. Ibid., p. 229.
- ⁷⁰. Basil Williams, *The Whig Supremacy 1714-1760*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 39.
- ⁷¹. Emile refers to Jean Jacques Rousseau's work entitled *Emile or on Education*.
- ⁷². Jean Jacques Rousseau, (1762), *Emile or on Education*, trans., Allan Bloom, (Toronto: Basic Books, 1979), Pp. 184-185.
- ⁷³. The influence of Kristeva's *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, and Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination* is apparent with reference to originality and the context's impact upon authors.
- ⁷⁴. Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue and Novel," in Leon S. Roudiez, ed., *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans., Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), p. 66.
- ⁷⁵. I have referred to this possible source of Defoe's novel in my magister memoire, *Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe in Cinematographic Adaptations: A Postcolonial and Intertextual Study*. 2013-2014, p. 23.
- ⁷⁶. Samar Attar, *The Vital Roots of European Enlightenment Ibn Tufayl's Influence on Modern Western Thought*, (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007), p. XI.
- ⁷⁷. Carole Moses, "Daniel Defoe," in Carl Rollyson, ed., *Critical Survey of Long Fiction*, (New Jersey: Salem Press, 2010), p. 1169.

- ⁷⁸. I have referred to this possible source of Defoe's novel in my magister memoire, *Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe in Cinematographic Adaptations: A Postcolonial and Intertextual Study*. 2013-2014, p. 22.
- ⁷⁹. Richard Wilson, *The Man Who Was Robinson Crusoe: A Personal View of Alexander Selkirk*, (Glasgow: Neil Wilson Publishing Ltd, 2011), p. 14.
- ⁸⁰. Ibid., p. 08.
- ⁸¹. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes Travel Writing and Transculturation*, (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 190.
- ⁸². Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 130.
- ⁸³. Ibid., p. 121.
- ⁸⁴. Ibid., p. 141.
- ⁸⁵. Tom Paulin, Cited in H. G. Widdowson, *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), p. 134.
- ⁸⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 226.
- ⁸⁷. Iddir, Meriem and Hallalel Melissa. *Survival Narratives in Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, Jules Verne's The Mysterious Island and Yann Martel's Life of Pie: An Intertextual Dialogic and Cultural Materialist Study*. Tizi Ouzou: UMMTO, 2019, p. 36. Note: The two students have pointed out mercantilism as a remnant.
- ⁸⁸. William S. Kern, "Robinson Crusoe and the Economists," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 63.
- ⁸⁹. Lars Magnusson, ed., *The Political Economy of Mercantilism*, (New York: Routledge, 2015), p. i.
- ⁹⁰. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ⁹¹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 04.
- ⁹². Ibid., p. 16.
- ⁹³. Ibid.
- ⁹⁴. Ibid., p. 32.
- ⁹⁵. Ibid., p. 36.
- ⁹⁶. Michael V. White, "Reading and Rewriting: The Production of an Economic Robinson Crusoe," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 19.
- ⁹⁷. Stephen Hymer, "Robinson Crusoe and the Secret of Primitive Accumulation," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 49.
- ⁹⁸. Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), p. 62.
- ⁹⁹. Stephen Hymer, "Robinson Crusoe and the Secret of Primitive Accumulation," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 49.
- ¹⁰⁰. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 21.
- ¹⁰¹. Ibid.
- ¹⁰². Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 12.
- ¹⁰³. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 196.
- ¹⁰⁴. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁵. Ibid., p. 197.
- ¹⁰⁶. Brett, C. McInelly, "Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and Robinson Crusoe," in *Studies in the Novel*, Vol 35: N°1, 2003, p. 01.
- ¹⁰⁷. Iddir, Meriem and Hallalel Melissa. *Survival Narratives in Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, Jules Verne's The Mysterious Island and Yann Martel's Life of Pie: An Intertextual Dialogic and Cultural Materialist Study*. Tizi Ouzou: UMMTO, 2019, p. 38. Note: The two students have pointed colonialism as a prevalent aspect.
- ¹⁰⁸. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 95.
- ¹⁰⁹. Eve Tavor Bannet, *Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading 1720-1810*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 26.
- ¹¹⁰. Oxford English Dictionary, Cited in Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 242.
- ¹¹¹. Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), p. 57.
- ¹¹². Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 03.
- ¹¹³. Ibid., p. 91.
- ¹¹⁴. Ibid., p. 65.
- ¹¹⁵. Andrew O'Malley, *Children's Literature, Popular Culture, and Robinson Crusoe*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 79.
- ¹¹⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 112.
- ¹¹⁷. Ibid., p. 77.
- ¹¹⁸. Cathy Silver, "Umbrellas: Drenched in History," in <https://www.nytimes.com/1981/05/06/garden/umbrellas-drenched-in-history.html>, Accessed on 23/02/2020.

Part Two:
Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611)
Appropriated, Revisited and Aggressively
Reworked through Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of*
***Wheat* (1967), Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969)**
and Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985)

Chapter Two:
**Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967): A
Stylization and Subtle Rewriting of
Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in Relation to
Cultural and Ideological Considerations**

Introduction

The Tempest is a responsible party to its successive readings and rewritings insofar as it has made seminal contributions to the development of the colonialist ideology through which it is read.¹

In this process, [...] Ngugi, [...] regenerate[s] out of [his] own firsthand experience of colonization a conception of Shakespeare as a formative producer and purveyor of a paternalistic ideology that is basic to the material aims of Western imperialism.²

The imaginative transfer of Prospero and Caliban from Shakespeare's fictionally cross-referenced island to Africa also took place in [...] *A Grain of Wheat*.³

Superficially, at least, there seems to be no obvious connection between *The Tempest* (1611) and *A Grain of Wheat* (1967); the two works have been produced at markedly different historical moments with a divergence in terms of the social, economic and political dynamics which contributed to their shaping as final and finished products. Yet, the appeal, even the charm, of Shakespeare's work, for African/Caribbean authors, Ngũgĩ included, is not, under whatever circumstances, to be underestimated. *The Tempest* has come to existence embodying Shakespeare's time emergent ideologies of capitalism and colonialism; these ideologies which were in their onset, by then, have gained massive maturity, as coherent and dynamic systems, in the course of the three and half centuries that would follow. This is perhaps one of the reasons for which Ngũgĩ, whose country and people suffered from colonisation, might have been interested in adapting Shakespeare's play.

The present chapter is oriented towards shedding light on *A Grain of Wheat* in connection with *The Tempest*; it is divided into four major sections which would explore the multitude of issues the two works share and diverge upon. First and foremost, there is an urgent need to have a quick, but well targeted, glance at Ngũgĩ's life and the context which has shaped his work. This would be more than necessary if we want to grasp its full essence. The second section is meant to read the novel as an adaptation which has stylized its source, while the third one, thereafter, would be an attempt to read *A Grain of Wheat* as a text that has engaged in a hidden polemic with *The Tempest*. To end with, the fourth section would lean on Williams' terminology to gain a better view of the novel's ideological, cultural and historical moment by dissecting the various dynamics, in action, leading to its production.

1- Ngũgĩ's Life and a Text in Context:

A- Ngũgĩ: A Postcolonial Committed Author:

Struggle. Struggle makes history. Struggle makes us. In struggle is our history, our language and our being.⁴

Thus writes Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986); these words might, in so many ways, be a synopsis to his vision of life as an actively engaged writer whose existence has always been a continuous struggle. Known as Ngũgĩ, his colonial and Christian name is James Ngũgĩ, a name which would later on be problematic in his fight for his identity; he is a Kenyan writer, essayist, novelist and theorist who was born in (1938). It is in Limuru, his birth place, that he received some early colonial education in a missionary school⁵ where he came into contact with the coloniser; afterwards, he joined Manguu Gikuyu Independent School where a somewhat African centred mode of education was adopted.⁶ He entered the University of Leeds in (1964) after five years spent in Uganda at Makerere University College. His European and African education together with the Mau Mau rebellion (1952-1960), he has witnessed, would prove to be invaluable to shaping his interests in issues like culture, language and identity in relation to colonialism.

Ngũgĩ's concern with and fight for cultural decolonisation pushed him in (1968) to advocate the abolition of the department of English while a teacher at the University of Nairobi.⁷ He was convinced that education, in his country, is supposed to promote African identity rather than being a neocolonial harpoon which would strengthen the culture of the ex-coloniser. Through his scathing criticism of neocolonialism, it might be seen that he was much troubled by Kenya's post-independence, where multinational companies and the new elite enjoyed all the privileges while the 'commoners' were reduced to nothingness. These same politicised and controversial writings earned him a hard-lived one year detention (1977) without even being subject to a trial in Kamiti Maximum Prison.⁸ He initially published in English, yet around this time, he adopted, as part of the cultural decolonisation he fostered, his mother tongue, Gikuyu, as the first language for his writings. After the English language, his name was next to do justice to whatever colonial legacy that remained of his existence

since in (1979), he rejected his Christian and colonial name, James, in the wake of which he adopted Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o⁹ his African-originated name. He remains today one of the most prolific African living writers whose extensive publications include: *Weep Not, Child* (1964), *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) and *Decolonising the Mind* (1986).

B- Contextualising Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967):

The British presence in today's Kenya and some of its adjacent territories might be traced back to (1895) in what was dubbed, at that time, East Africa Protectorate.¹⁰ The British government eventually established the area as a colony, which was attached to the Crown, changing its name to the Kenya Colony in (1920),¹¹ eighteen years before even Ngũgĩ was born. The colonial enterprise considered this territory, like many parts around the globe, as the land of the 'whites' where they can develop their potential. This vision implied the colonial process of annexing the best portions of land throughout Kenya resorting to all possible means, even violence if necessary, to take them; they were then offered to British colonists who were expected, as counterparts, to contribute to the well-being of their fellow citizens back home. The most fertile lands which were subject to this colonial takeover during the early 20th century were, to the misfortunes of Ngũgĩ's people, those referred to as "White Highlands"¹² which used to belong to the Gikuyu or Kikuyu.

The settlers, who were often ignorant of farming techniques, faced another dilemma which was their pressing need to a steady labour force, and since Ngũgĩ's people became landless, the outcome was not unpredictable. They became a vital source that supplied the colonists with cheap workforce; this was the first major injustice done to them since they lost their lands and were absorbed in the exploitative dynamics of the colonial economic system. What made things worse was the "spiritual" relationship the Gikuyu people had with their land since it was for so long seen as God's gift to their forefathers.¹³ The rest of the Kenyans, in other parts of the colony, were overwhelmed with taxes which not only restricted their economic horizons but also productive capacity of both cash and subsistence crops. The

growing resentment among those who were over-taxed for their lands, houses and livestock was met with alternatives which were, either way, disastrous; the natives were compelled to work for the settlers for minimum wages to make a living, starve to death, which was not an option to most Kenyans, or fight back the coloniser. These thorny questions were some of the uneasy dilemmas with which Ngũgĩ grappled in his novels among which *A Grain of Wheat*.

The social and political conditions of most Kenyans, the Gikuyu in particular, were, the least one might say, deplorable. Many of them, after losing their lands, suffered from unemployment and lack of opportunities; while, on the other hand, those who were caught in the colonial production system —working for the whites— were, like many of their counterparts in other colonies, overworked, underpaid and commonly punished. The white settlers and the British colonial administration resorted to systematic harassment and harsh measures which consisted at times of whipping the native workers to keep them docile and obedient; it even amounted at other times to abuse and torture.¹⁴ The Kenyans were excluded from the political scene, much like most the indigenous populations in Africa under colonial grip, since they were given little space to voice their hitherto repressed concerns and grievances. The Kikuyu Central Association tried to react against the colonial takeover of the natives' lands and took in charge the mission of getting them back to their righteous owners,¹⁵ yet these demands, to a great extent legitimate, were dismissed and met with a deaf ear by the colonial authorities. It was in no way surprising that all these factors, teamed with the spread of anti-colonial spirit during the 1950s, all over the globe, contributed to radicalising many Kenyans who launched their uprising in (1952) through the Mau Mau or Kenya Land and Freedom Army. The British authorities declared the State of Emergency in the aftermath of which nationalist leaders were arrested and heavy military means were deployed combined with violent campaigns which were all meant to crush the rebels.

Ngũgĩ, who was a teenager by the time, and his family, were affected in a wide range of ways by these upheavals. Many of his close relatives, and Ngũgĩ himself was not exempt,

experienced this traumatic period as the main characters whose direct involvement in this insurgency shaped the central concerns, themes, characters and events around which his early novels revolved.¹⁶ The fact that one of his brothers was a Mau Mau caused much mayhem to his mother who, because of this, was detained and tortured in (1955).¹⁷ Hundreds of thousands meanwhile were put in detention camps where they suffered ill-treatment and were confronted with bitter living conditions. Ngũgĩ was the eye witness of murders, massacres, incendiary and sabotage acts committed by colonial troops against his people who joined the Mau Mau and he also saw, on the other hand, some of his countrymen getting enrolled, for one reason or another, in the mighty British forces. It is not, hence, peculiar if a wide range of themes ranging from suffering to treason would be voiced with, much abundance, in his novels among which *A Grain of Wheat*. Ngũgĩ's words showing the relationship between his writings and this context might be relevant, at this stage, when he argues,

As I write I remember [...] ; my mother's struggle with the soil so that we might eat, have decent clothes and get some schooling; my elder brother, Wallace Mwangi, running to the cover and security of the forest under a hail of bullets from Colonial policemen; [...] my cousin, Gichini wa Ngũgĩ, just escaping the hangman's rope because he had been caught with live bullets; uncles and other villagers murdered because they had taken the oath; the beautiful courage of ordinary men and women in Kenya who stood up to the might of British imperialism and indiscriminate terrorism. I remember too some relatives and fellow villagers who carried the gun for the white man [...] I remember the fears, the betrayals [...] the moments of despair and love and kinship in struggle and I try to find the meaning of it all through my pen.¹⁸

The plot of *A Grain of Wheat* has been associated with the independence era; however, the narrator intermittently flashes back to the time when British settlers were in a position of power all over Kenya. The context of the Mau Mau rebellion, in which most of the characters got stuck, is crucial since it brought the fight for liberty and emergency state, the time when most of the depicted events took place. These incidents were the origin of some of the central themes Ngũgĩ has regurgitated, which might come as no surprise since his family members were affected by Colonialism —their lands were taken by white settlers— which pushed many of them to get actively involved in the rebellion.¹⁹ He has managed, hence, to voice, as one of the novel's concerns, the undesired outcome of the colonial encounter over the natives through the various traumatic experiences of which the colonial epoch is ripe.

2- Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat*: A Stylization of *The Tempest*:

This section has been designed to examine the extent to which *A Grain of Wheat* might be considered as a text that has stylized *The Tempest*. To his end, I would like, before going any further, to quickly remind the reader of the meaning of Bakhtin's stylization. It is all about the subsequent "author's thought, [which] once having penetrated someone else's discourse ['original' text] and made its home in it, does not collide with the other's thought."²⁰ Thus, it entails coexistence between the source and its adaptation. My claim, likewise, would be targeted to show the cohabitation of Shakespeare's and Ngũgĩ's voices in terms of the characters, the perception of paternalism and the civilising mission, and then examine the colonisers' rhetoric of good intentions which slides toward violence in both texts. These elements have been reproduced, to a certain extent, in Ngũgĩ's novel.

A- Stylizing the Characters:

A- I- From Prospero to John Thompson:

Everybody knows all about Prospero taking over the island.²¹

The main character and hero of *The Tempest* is Prospero, the legitimate duke of Milan, who has been overthrown by Antonio. After being pushed to a forced exile, Prospero has been stranded on an island where he has epitomised the English, or even the white man's, presence in overseas territories. The righteous duke of Milan has managed, without much effort, to establish his reign over the remote area and its citizens, although they were not many, whom he made his subjects. It would not seem unusual, thereby, if successive generations of critics have seen in "Prospero [...] the symbol of colonialism."²² I have to clarify that the words of the above epigraph are Ngũgĩ's; it might be conspicuous that he, like many of his African/Caribbean contemporaries, has had a special interest in Shakespeare's play and Prospero in particular.

On a similar vein, it has to be stated that one of the main figures of *A Grain of Wheat* is the English agent John Thompson. The latter, a stylized version of Prospero, is a colonial administrator in Kenya, who is thoroughly, sometimes even unscrupulously, committed to the

ideals of British colonialism. Judith Anne Pocock has declared that “Ngũgĩ’s Prospero, John Thompson, is no doddering old fool,”²³ since he has spared no efforts in serving his colonial ideals. He came to Kenya with a firm belief in “a great moral idea,”²⁴ which leans on the so called British civilising mission which excited him, at the onset, with its idea of being part of the empire and contributing to the spread of its ideals all over the globe especially in Africa. After more than three centuries, Prospero, one of the earliest representatives of colonial order, has been resurrected and stylized to suit the Kenyan context through John Thompson.

Shakespeare’s Prospero has recurrently articulated his moral and cultural superiority over Caliban, his only subject, who is stamped with irrationality, credulity and stark inferiority. He calls him “poisonous,”²⁵ “wicked,”²⁶ “most lying [...] filth,”²⁷ and all sorts of degrading names pointing at him as the primitive, irrational and bestial other. The passage below evinces the kind of cultural superiority Prospero has claimed addressing him as such,

Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
[...] but thy vile race,
Though thou didst learn, had that in’t which good natures
Could not abide to be with.²⁸

These utterances shed light on Prospero’s assumptions of cultural superiority since he fosters the position of the knowledgeable to ‘teach’ and ‘civilise’ the ‘abhorred,’ ‘brutish,’ ‘savage,’ and ‘vile’ other. Caliban and his whole race, as such, are vilified, condescended and reduced, by the auto-proclaimed ‘master,’ Prospero, to the status of the colonised and inferior.

John Thompson, Ngũgĩ’s stylized Prospero, follows closely in the footsteps of Shakespeare’s hero. He has had an earnest desire to record, in a diary, his experiences in Kenya; it is not, thereby, fortuitous, in any way, that he gave his manuscript the following title: “Prospero in Africa.”²⁹ The more readers delve into his notes, the more they see his colonialist psychology immersed in and engrossed with his unfailing sense of superiority. The language he employs whenever he refers to the Kenyans or to their land sounds similar, if not somehow repetitive, to that Prospero once used. In a typical passage, in his notes, Thompson

says, “[t]hese primordial trees have always awed primitive minds. The darkness and mystery of the forest, have led him (the primitive man) to magic and ritual.”³⁰ He has associated the words ‘primordial,’ ‘primitive,’ ‘darkness,’ ‘magic’ and ‘ritual’ with Kenya and the Kenyans to consider them as being primarily different, inferior and primitive; Thomas Cartelli’s words are altogether straightforward and expressive as he asserts that,

Thompson’s attitudes are symptomatic of beliefs and positions that have characterized Western encounters with the “Other” throughout the course of colonial history. Thompson’s initial conception of Africans as both different and unequal expressly echoes Prospero’s insistence on Caliban’s incapacity to master civil behavior in *The Tempest*.³¹

A- II- Calibans in Full Rebellion:

Our symbol then is not Ariel [...] but rather Caliban [...] what is our history, what is our culture, if not the history and culture of Caliban?³²

Ngũgĩ and many of his contemporaries, in the colonies, might have perhaps seen in Caliban something akin to themselves and a reference to the indigenous populations. They have put much emphasis on the value of *The Tempest* as a text entailing through Prospero and Caliban the coloniser and colonised patterns of relationship; the native’s words which are, at times, poised with resistance and rebellion especially when he says “[t]his island’s mine,”³³ have been regarded as a palpable rejection of colonialism. This coloniser/colonised link, has been marked with intricate dynamics as Prospero uses all the necessary means to subdue Caliban who, in turn, shows the spirit of resistance in an attempt to reverse the situation. His intermittent defiance of Prospero’s authority and the fact that he even plotted to dethrone him, make Caliban a key literary figure that has struggled, at least within the limits of its might, against the oppressor. Ngũgĩ has confirmed that the bard’s play “is interesting in that it has all the images that are later to be reworked [...] about the colonised peoples”;³⁴ he has recognised the potential of reworking Caliban, and his interest in him is not, thus, peculiar or unjustifiable. In *A Grain of Wheat*, there are many natives whose features of struggle and resistance might be traced back to or associated with Caliban. “Although Caliban is never mentioned in *A Grain of Wheat*,” Judith Anne Pocock contends, “his presence hovers in one way or another behind all of the peasant Calibans that populate the village of Thabai.”³⁵

Exploring all the Calibans of Ngũgĩ's novel, in an exhaustive attempt, is not my central concern for it might be a subject in itself for an independent thesis; however, I would only focus on three stylized Caliban-like characters: Gikonyo, Koina and Kihika. They have taken the freedom fighter's oath in the wake of which they have agreed to fight and die, if necessary, for the Mau Mau. The moment they have integrated this organization, they have sworn allegiance to shield forest fighters, protect the organisation and do whatever it takes to free Kenya; this includes acts of hostility, disobedience and extreme violence directed at the European settlers, on the one hand, and the British coloniser's army, administration and even civilians on the other hand.³⁶ The author has relied on these stylized versions because "Caliban [...] incorporates qualities Ngũgĩ wishes to explore in his peasant character[s]."³⁷

Gikonyo, Ngũgĩ's first Caliban, was among the earliest, with Kihika, to take the Mau Mau oath. He was arrested and, subsequently, imprisoned for "six years through seven detention camps."³⁸ That period was very harsh on him since he struggled with psychological issues like solitude, recurrent harassment from the officers while at the same time being ruthlessly overworked, in the sweltering heat, at breaking "stones in a quarry."³⁹ Such a scene, in which Gikonyo is not even allowed to catch his breath, in the quarry, echoes *The Tempest* with Caliban overworked to death, in the same fashion, carrying this time not rocks, but "burden[s] of wood."⁴⁰ After years in detention, Gikonyo's psyche has been damaged; thereby, he confessed the fact that he took the Oath. What is interesting, here, is not Gikonyo's confession, as he uncovers himself as a Mau Mau, but it is the fact that "he had refused to name anybody involved in oath administration";⁴¹ he had not sold, therefore, the leaders of the organisation nor anybody else to the British.

The second Caliban-like figure is lieutenant Koina who has been enrolled, as a young man, during the Second World War in the British army, serving as a cook. This engrossed him with pride and, once back in Kenya, he developed a critical attitude toward the white businessmen in front of whom he "would cite his services to the whiteman during the war and

claimed that this entitled him to better treatment,⁴² including a better wage and appropriate working conditions. Koina has even defiantly addressed a white shoe-factory boss whom he told with the presence of other coloured workers, “I want more money. I want a decent house and enough food, just like you. I want a car like yours.”⁴³ He has not been given this job, but he has, later, been employed to serve Dr. Lynd, a white woman and a plant pathologist who has had a beautiful dog she treats better than the Kenyans. He has had access, there, to the colonialist’s life which created in him a strong grudge and a bitter resentment against all the settlers. While Koina’s people suffered unemployment, hunger, lack of shelter and above all, an indignant treatment, the Europeans, on the other hand, were enjoying all kinds of privileges—more than enough food, big houses, stable jobs and a superior social position— all conferred upon them by their status as colonisers. He has experienced the injustice Caliban has tasted when Prospero reduced him to living in a rough rock while he exploited the rest of the island for himself. Caliban’s words are significant when he vehemently bursts, “I am all the subjects that you [Prospero] have/ [...] and here you sty me/ [i]n this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me/ [t]he rest o’ th’ island.”⁴⁴ Koina has swallowed the bitterness of being reduced to nothingness, in the same fashion as Caliban, since he saw the discrepancies and incessant injustice his people were subjected to. Consequently, he thought that,

The amount of steak [Dr. Lynd’s] dog ate could have fed a whole family. The amount of money spent on the dog was more than the total wages of ten Kenyans. The dog had its own room in the house, with a bed and sheets and blankets! And what about the woman? [Dr. Lynd] She had no husband, no children, no extended family. Yet her big house could easily have sheltered many families. How could all this be? Why should he live in a shack while this woman and her dog lived in such opulence and luxury?⁴⁵

Koina has come to believe, in the same fashion as Caliban, that his ancestors’ land has been annexed, from its righteous owners, by the white man who gifted it to the colonists. This contributed to his revolt and embrace of violence against the British as the only viable option to even the situation and shake the status quo. His joy at taking the oath and joining the freedom army might not be described. Koina has in this way been a stylized figure endowed with Caliban’s revolutionary spirit which has served as an “inspiration that has provided a

vision of resistance to oppressions for freedom fighters.”⁴⁶ This kind of spirit has not only been Gikonyo’s and Koina’s privilege as it might be spotted in Kihika and many others.

The third stylization, therefore, related to Caliban’s character in Ngũgĩ’s novel is Kihika, one of the Mau Mau leaders, who was already dead by the time the events unfold; however, the narrator keeps flashing back to the time when he was still a vigorous young man imbued with revolutionary ideas. The readers are told that he not only resented but also abhorred, just like Caliban and Koina, the colonisers for all the atrocities they perpetrated. Kihika’s interest in politics goes back to his childhood, and from that epoch onwards, he stood against the British and it was obvious for him that resisting colonial violence with counter-violence might be the only means of struggle to crush colonialism. His anti-colonial vision was centred on reacting with violence, if needs be, to systematic colonial harassment. In one of his famous speeches in Thabai, he maintained, “[t]his is not 1920. What we now want is action, a blow which will tell”;⁴⁷ Kihika believed that the time when his fellow men were passive and indecisive is now, in the 1950s, long dead and drowned in history.

Kihika has also shown, like Caliban when he conspired to dethrone and potentially kill Prospero, a high degree of military engagement to perpetrate acts of hostility and defiance by attacking and capturing the Mahee “big police garrison in the Rift Valley.”⁴⁸ One night, he stormed, with his men, into the place and killed many officers, stole their arms and ammunitions, freed all the prisoners, and finally left it on fire to vanish into the forest. With his spirit of resistance and constant criticism of the coloniser, he is a key stylized Caliban-like figure who claimed Kenya as a non-white land to be recovered by sacrifice. He is, moreover, responsible for assassinating the District Officer of Thabai, Thomas Robson, whose cruelty was beyond imagination; these acts, combined with the kind of spirit he possessed, earned him the reputation of “the terror of the whiteman.”⁴⁹ One might understand through Kihika’s portrayal that “Caliban’s defiance [...] of Prospero’s oppression and his embrace of violence to win liberation have particular resonance for Ngũgĩ.”⁵⁰

A- III- Ariel: A Spirit whose *Spirit* Hovers in Kenya:

The 1950s and 1960s have been marked by an unprecedented surge of revolutionary spirit which has gained full momentum to the extent of sweeping all over the colonies. Most intellectuals, in the colonies, during this period have considered that “Ariel is a colonial collaborator, a political and cultural sellout”,⁵¹ and Ngũgĩ might not be, at any rate, an exception. Ariel is a spirit whose extraordinary powers to be anywhere, at anytime and to instantly assume whatever shape, have been of a great utility to Prospero. The latter relied on him to perform intricate tasks ranging from staging the illusion of the shipwreck, bringing him objects in distant lands, luring his enemies, distracting them to tormenting Caliban. Throughout the play, Ariel shows submission to his master, and when Prospero tells him there is more “business for thee,”⁵² he does not evince any signs of resistance and answers “[m]y lord, it shall be done.”⁵³ Prospero also used him, with his powers to be invisible, one scholar claims, as the incarnation of an ideal undercover agent and the quintessential spy whose eyes watch over his ‘subjects’.⁵⁴

The stylization of a figure with Ariel’s orientations, in the light of what has, so far, been said in *A Grain of Wheat* might not be regarded as an unusual occurrence. The character to be associated with Ariel is Karanja who is both a worker in one of the coloniser’s stations and a collaborator with the British; he has been nominated chief on Thabai to watch over the natives and report any unusual activities to the authorities. Thompson, the agent of the empire, appealed to Karanja, the same way Prospero relied on Ariel, to perform various tasks: from transporting his letters and buying food for dogs to spying on activists and getting valuable information. Like Ariel, the collaborator has demonstrated his total submission to the whites with an unfailing willingness to serve Thompson and the colonial administration. With the story moving forward, the narrator reveals that Karanja has “sold the Movement and Oath secrets”⁵⁵ to the British; he is quite fascinated by the white man whose power has “built the bomb and transformed a country from wild bush and forests into modern cities,”⁵⁶ as he

thought. He admired the British and acknowledged their ‘superiority’ over his people to the point of joining the coloniser’s army, taking, thereby, arms against his own people. He spared no effort, much like Ariel, in collaborating with them; thus, “Karanja has brought humiliation upon himself by assuming that the white man is automatically superior.”⁵⁷ If Ariel is very obedient, it is because he fears Prospero’s magic since he has threatened to open-up an oak tree and imprison him in its “knotty entrails till/ Thou hast howl’d away twelve winters.”⁵⁸ Similarly, Karanja dreaded the white man’s magic, which in Ngũgĩ’s text refers to ‘science,’ ‘arms’ and ‘bombs.’ His words to Mumbi, herein, might give us a glimpse at his vision, “[t]he whiteman is strong. Don’t you ever forget that. I know, because I have tasted his power. [...] And bombs are going to be dropped into the forest as the British did in Japan and Malaya.”⁵⁹

Karanja has become dependent on the white man, to the extent of being unable to conceive his existence without them. He and Ariel, as colonised, have both begun “to internalize and accept their inferior status as truth [consequently they] both admire and fear the colonizers.”⁶⁰ Karanja’s admiration and fear of the colonists distorted and veiled his vision; which is why, he served them faithfully; for him, the day they would leave Kenya might never come. His meeting with Gikonyo, once back from detention, is expressive as the collaborator tells him, “[I]isten carefully [...] People here obey the law, hear? No meetings at night, no stories about Gandhi and Unity and all that. The whiteman is here to stay’.”⁶¹ All that Karanja dreaded was about to happen and his demons were about to be exorcised on Independence Day. Thompson and many settlers took the decision to leave for England and “Karanja, the Ariel figure, is left bitterly abandoned, and nearly run over by the shattered Thompson, as he recklessly drives off to escape the independent Kenya.”⁶²

B- Colonial Paternalism and the Civilising Mission:

Paternalism has always been pillared on the belief in the coloniser’s inherent ‘superiority’ and the native’s ‘inferiority’ in which, the coloniser, vested in his authority, is supposed to take decisions, from the least to the most significant, since he is “the one who

knows best how to govern his ‘subjects,’ who are seen as in need of development, through a governance that includes protection, [...] care, [...] disciplining, punishing and sometimes practices of coercion.”⁶³ This has resulted in the creation of power-based relationships between the coloniser/colonised in which the former is supposed to endorse his ‘civilising mission’ while the latter is expected to be the inferior upon whom the lights of civilisation would be bestowed. The ground evidence suggests that various critical attempts have highlighted the presence of this mode of connections in the bard’s play and tried to uncover the miscellaneous dynamics it entails. *The Tempest* has, thus, been regarded, by many postcolonial thinkers, Ngũgĩ included, as “a celebrated early example of white paternalism exercising its prerogatives on and against its colonial subjects,”⁶⁴ with Prospero as the paternalist white coloniser and Caliban as the colonised subject to this mindset.

Ngũgĩ has stylized the colonial paternalist view which has been, consciously or unconsciously, embodied in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. The moment Caliban claims ownership of the island which he, in his sense, has inherited from Sycorax, Prospero has attempted to justify his policies with stark colonial paternalism and says,

Thou most lying slave,
Whom stripes may move, not kindness! I have us’d thee,
Filth as thou art, with human care, and lodg’d thee
In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate
The honour of my child.⁶⁵

Prospero’s well targeted words, “human care,” and “lodg’d thee/ In mine own cell/”⁶⁶ depict the kind of paternalism which considers the ‘other’ as a child to be taken care of, protected and even disciplined, if needs be. Ngũgĩ has highlighted this aspect through his white settlers particularly his own Prospero, Thompson, who endorses the belief that “[t]he *Negro is a child*,”⁶⁷ with whom the coloniser has the responsibility, or even the obligation, to do whatever it takes to ‘enlighten’ him; after all, he cannot do it himself in the coloniser’s vision.

To materialise this paternalist vision, “the French policy of Assimilation” is Thompson’s favourite approach “over British Indirect Rule,”⁶⁸ which would create the kind of copies the coloniser aspires to; he believes, on the other hand, that, in case adopted, such a

policy is doomed to failure if restricted to the intellectual elite and consequently “[t]he peasant in Asia and Africa must be included.”⁶⁹ His vision is all about “inclusive paternalism,”⁷⁰ to be directed at all the supposedly ‘inferior’ Kenyans. Shakespeare’s Prospero has himself attempted, without much success, to culturally assimilate Caliban through various strategies including teaching him language and European manners; Ngũgĩ has recognised this, which is why he “employs Prospero [Thompson] as a figure who would “naturally” appeal to an idealistic Englishman seeking a high-minded rationale for his own and his nation’s imperial designs in the repository of his cultural heritage.”⁷¹ Thompson is the embodiment of colonial paternalism since he contends that Africans will always need whites for help; he says that “Africa [...] cannot do without Europe.”⁷² This paternalist vision and the civilising mission have served, for centuries, as the coloniser’s alibi to vindicate colonialism.

The time when *The Tempest* has been published was an era when colonialism was still an emergent ideology, albeit it has constituted a mighty drive to the English people. The white colonisers, the British not exempt, have expressed a ‘moral duty,’ even an obligation, to spread their ‘ideals’ in accordance with the civilising mission. These attempts at ‘educating,’ the colonised, ‘altering’ his language, perceptions and manners might be pinpointed in the bard’s play. Shakespeare has, on numerous occasions, delineated “the educational efforts of Prospero and Miranda” which might “be equated with the notion of a civilising mission,”⁷³ in their alleged attempt to ‘extirpate’ Caliban from his ‘bestial,’ ‘irrational’ and ‘primitive’ ‘nature’ by assimilating him towards their ‘human,’ ‘rational,’ and ‘civilised’ ‘existence.’ Prospero has claimed that his efforts with Caliban have been “[h]umanely taken/”⁷⁴ motivated by “human care/”⁷⁵; an argument which might be located at the heart of what has been labelled the civilising mission. Prospero’s quest and efforts to transform the ‘other’ is better expressed in his own condescending words to Caliban,

[...] I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other: when thou didst not, savage,
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like

A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
With words that made them known.⁷⁶

It is this same argument, of the civilising mission, which has been stylized by the novelist and advocated by Thompson. Initially, he has never had a personal interest in Britain's colonial overseas ventures; however, one day he came across Kipling's poems and his view has been altered and, thereafter, he felt immediately involved in this mission. Thompson has experienced, somehow, an awakening which got him hooked in Britain's colonial designs. This mission has been seen as a "will to raise savage peoples from superstition and blood-sacrifice, taboos and witchcraft and the attendant fears and slaveries, to a more enlightened existence."⁷⁷ What convinced him to come to Kenya was his meeting, in England, with two African students who demonstrated an almost perfect mastery of history and literature. This made the would-be colonial agent see the 'power' of the civilising mission.

Thompson understood that although they were Africans, the two students have evinced a great admiration for the British efforts to spread their 'enlightened' ideals. He thought that these "two Africans [...] in dress, in speech and in intellectual power were no different from the British"; he asked "[w]here was the irrationality, inconsistency and superstition so characteristic of the African and Oriental races?"⁷⁸ The answer to this question was more than obvious to Thompson since he thought that all those negative traits have "been replaced by the three principles basic to the Western mind: i.e. the principle of Reason, of Order and of Measure."⁷⁹ The triumph of Britain's mission, which has been initiated by Prospero more than two centuries earlier, was not to be doubted for Thompson. He would not only guide the Kenyans to becoming English in terms of language, life perception and intellect, but also contribute, like Prospero, to 'educating' and 'civilising' the Africans who, in his perception, have been, for centuries, immersed in "irrationality, inconsistency and superstition."⁸⁰

The civilising mission, despite Prospero's and Miranda's attempts, has been a total failure in *The Tempest* with Caliban neither transformed nor 'civilised' the way they wanted

him to become. Prospero's argument that he taught the native, on a daily basis, new aspects among which language, has been effectively countered by Caliban's answer,

You taught me language, and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse: the red plague rid you,
For learning me your language!⁸¹

Caliban, consequently, retorts in the English he has been taught which is wielded to ward off the blow and struggle against his oppressor by articulating his desire for freedom. Prospero keeps reminding the readers of his constant and painstaking effort to civilise his 'subject,' and much to his dismay, the native's rebellion and curses represent his only reward. Prospero's words are relevant when he speaks of the failure of his mission towards Caliban,

A devil, a born devil, on whose nature
Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains,
Humanely taken, all, all lost, quite lost.⁸²

The same thing might be said about *A Grain of Wheat*, as a stylization, in which the British civilising mission has here again been a failure. The settlers, similar to Prospero, have not succeeded in their designs in metamorphosing the natives into carbon copies of themselves; on the contrary, the more Thompson and the other whites tried, the more most of the natives endorsed their local identity. Ngũgĩ has made, likewise, through his story "John Thompson re-enact Prospero's failure to [civilise] Caliban in the colonial present"⁸³ of Kenya. The Mau Mau rebellion, imbued with Calibans' anger and spirit of sacrifice, has been the fatal blow to colonialism in the novel. The white settlers have, therefore, harvested constant defiance, resentment and resistance from, nearly all, the Calibans of the story, which is why the colonists have been disillusioned with the coming of the independence.

C- The Rhetoric of Good Intentions Slips towards Colonial Brutality:

Colonialism, as a well structured system, has always relied on a variety of intricate arguments to support its existence. It has been, for centuries, justified with its alleged mission which has rested on 'good intentions': spreading the lights of reason, educating, civilising the 'inferior' races and bestowing the benefits of scientific, technological, economic, and cultural values on the, so thought of, 'barbarous' 'other.' Each European colonial entity has

brandished, at one point or another, these ‘bright’ slogans and ‘well-meaning’ motives to firmly ground their military annexation of foreign territories. Against this interesting facade, colonialism has, in the course of its history, slipped towards colonial violence, brutality and more blood thirsty methods to face any rebellious, defiant and resisting ‘other.’ ““Civilization” is the privileged commodity” the coloniser offers to the ‘other’ races “and what stands in civilization’s way is simply an obstacle to be surmounted or destroyed.”⁸⁴ This might be the thread of ideological reasoning that has brought the radical shift of colonialism from its rhetoric of good intentions towards coercion and violence. A close look at *The Tempest* and *A Grain of Wheat* might reveal the presence of this kind of transformation. The mind of the white man, in these two texts, is “convinced of the virtuousness of its intentions with a will focused on demonstrating its mastery through force, which characterizes the colonialist temperament from Prospero on down to John Thompson.”⁸⁵

Prospero has fostered that his efforts towards Caliban were laden with pity, humanism and benevolence. The coloniser has ‘lodged’ the native in ‘his cave,’ ‘taught’ him new things, as Prospero contends; he even acquainted him with the English language and, in return, he overworked Caliban and exploited him as, some-sort of, a guide to explore the territory on which he has been stranded. Ngũgĩ has asserted that “Prospero, the stranger on the island, comes with the soft voice of the serpent. He is at first friendly to Caliban, and flatters him, but all the time he is learning the secrets of the island,”⁸⁶ yet the moment Caliban shows resistance, the coloniser never hesitates to deploy the necessary means, magic, spirits, threats, violence and coercion included, to bring him under control. There is a significant scene in which Prospero wanted to assign more work to Caliban who has just finished bringing a huge pile of wood; he responds with defiance and the white man brandishes the stick and pours his wrath by telling his native ‘slave,’

For this [defiance], be sure, to-night thou shalt have cramps,
Side-stitches that shall pen thy breath up; urchins
Shall forth at vast of night that they may work
All exercise on thee: thou shalt be pinch’d

As thick as honeycomb, each pinch more stinging
Than bees that made them.⁸⁷

Prospero's above words are full of violent threats mingled with an unscrupulous inclination to use torture as a 'legitimate' means against Caliban whose insubordination has grown when he claimed his natural right of inheritance over the island. Prospero could not anymore tolerate the native's resistance and again resorts to the use of an aggressive method,

If thou neglect'st, or dost unwillingly
What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,
Fill all thy bones with aches; make thee roar,
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.⁸⁸

Caliban has had no choice, but to beg for mercy, "[n]o, pray thee,"⁸⁹ he shouts to escape punishment; he has previously tasted his masters' wrath and, as a result, he complies with his orders. Although Prospero claimed his good intention, like any coloniser, he seems ready to endorse violence whenever faced with resistance. Ania Loomba's argument is not devoid of truth, when she states that "Prospero's rhetoric of noble intentions combined with his coercive actions was the strategy employed by later colonialists,"⁹⁰ John Thompson included.

A glance at *A Grain of Wheat* might uncover a stylization of this transition from the good intentions towards coercion since the Kenyan author has relied on the English playwright's last work from which he has stylized various features. John Thompson has been influenced by the supposed power of the civilising mission and the radical impact such a project might have on the natives. This mission, in both Shakespeare's play and Ngũgĩ's novel, is used "in order to justify, a murderous violence and a cultural annihilation in the performance of colonial benevolence, charity and love."⁹¹ When Thompson came to Kenya, he has believed that the British colonial designs "must surely lead to the creation of one British nation, embracing peoples of all colours and creeds, based on the just proposition that all men were created equal."⁹² He wanted, at all costs, to contribute to the spread of the British ideals and way of life based, as he thought, on reason and rational thinking which would 'save' the 'other' from his 'primitive' and 'savage' existence. It has to be emphasised that "Thompson's decision to enter the colonial service was [...] inspired by a very

Kiplingesque desire to spread the benefits of British civilization.”⁹³ This idealism imbued with good intentions fades away when the Mau Mau rebellion broke leaving space to the immergence of the true nature of colonialism with its utter brutality.

Thompson’s vision shifts, thereafter, from seeing the natives as children, towards the use of force as he maintains that “*with children, nothing can be done without the use of authority.*”⁹⁴ He has been disillusioned by the Kenyans’ resistance that he endorses cruelty, brutality, sheer violence, unbridled repression, burning entire regions and using torture whenever needed. To handle the ongoing situation of defiance, he thought that “[o]ne must use a stick,”⁹⁵ which is the ultimate conclusion his experience, as a colonial agent, has brought him to understand. To subdue the Kenyans, Thompson has been drawn to beating prisoners and it was, in fact, under his responsibility that “eleven detainees die under torture at Rira camp.”⁹⁶ It is all about his belief in the colonial ideals, which nothing is expected to obstruct, that he has been ready to exterminate all the natives if the preservation of civilisation requires it. Ngũgĩ has stylized this shift, from good intentions to scourging violence, most colonisers, if not all, undergo in the course of their adherence to the colonial enterprise. Through the colonisers in Shakespeare’s and Ngũgĩ’s texts, there is a marked “movement from an ethnocentric idealism that founders on difference and defiance to an equally ethnocentric pragmatism that rationalizes violence as a suitable response to frustration.”⁹⁷

3- Ngũgĩ’s *A Grain of Wheat*: A Hidden Polemic Directed at *The Tempest*:

The novel’s [*A Grain of Wheat*’s] attempt to grapple with the colonial legacy as it is telegraphed in *The Tempest* is part of a global reckoning with empire.⁹⁸

Given the fact that Ngũgĩ’s novel makes only two explicit references to *The Tempest*, this section of my research is meant to study the novel as a hidden polemic directed at Shakespeare’s text. I have to clarify that, in Bakhtin’s vision, the hidden polemic implies an indirect clash, which might be detected, with someone’s discourse without making its opposition visible;⁹⁹ hence, there is an antagonistic tone which might be spotted in the subsequent author’s text. I would, as a matter of fact, explore the variety of issues *A Grain of*

Wheat treats with antagonism as well as the elements its author deviates from while subverting and subtly launching an attack on myriad aspects in Shakespeare's last literary contribution through a process of appropriation.

A- The Setting: From an Unknown Island to Africa:

Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, at the temporal level, might be situated around the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods which would necessarily mean the end of the 16th (1590s) up to the beginning of the 17th centuries (1600s). The spatial dimension of the play, on the other hand, is complicated to handle; this literary work, as Peter Hulme contends, is unique "in its insistent spatial ambiguity,"¹⁰⁰ the aspect which leaves little room for geographical exactitude and opens much space for personal interpretation and speculation. The textual evidence, which is quite compelling, suggests that the play has an intricate setting since there are enough, even at times contradictory, references to the Mediterranean, the Caribbean (Bermuda) and the New World.

The narrative opens with Prospero orchestrating through Ariel the sea-storm in which Alonso, King of Naples, Antonio, the usurper duke of Milan, and the other European characters, who attended the marriage of Claribel to the King of Tunis, have been caught in their way back home to Naples, Italy. Prospero also, while shaping the background of the story, tells us about Ariel's earlier misfortunes at the hands of his former master the 'witch' Sycorax who "was banish'd"¹⁰¹ from Algiers for her evil deeds. Little knowledge is needed in geography, today, to understand that the locations, cities and names of countries, previously referred to, are situated in the Mediterranean basin. There is additionally reference to "the still-vex'd Bermoothes"¹⁰²; the place from which Ariel has once brought "dew"¹⁰³ for Prospero's magical concoctions, which has also been used to hide and shelter the ship of the king Alonso after its staged sinking. In another scene, Miranda, after seeing Alonso and Antonio and the others, speaks with amazement about the "brave new world" which is inhabited by such 'wonderful' human beings.¹⁰⁴ There is proof enough, it follows from the

above sketched arguments about the setting, that Shakespeare's last play is a "global play that testifies to" "England's emerging role in the complex networks of travel and traffic in diverse regions and nations".¹⁰⁵ The intricate setting of *The Tempest*, therefore, in the bard's imagination, points at 'an uninhabited island,' somewhere in the Mediterranean while at the same time close to the Caribbean and the New World regions.

The setting of *A Grain of Wheat* has been altered from that of the playwright's 17th century masterpiece. The events in the novel, unlike the play, in terms of space, do not take place in an 'uninhabited' island located somewhere, and may be even nowhere, at the intersection of the three continents: Africa, Europe and America. On the contrary, it has been set in British colonial Kenya. While the 'unpopulated' island might have been appealing to 17th century English people because it suggests lands to be appropriated and represents, as such, a powerful incentive to get engaged in the country's colonial adventures,¹⁰⁶ the setting of Ngũgĩ's novel, colonised Kenya, suggests lands which have been taken, usurped and annexed by the British and European settlers. The land is not a 'virgin' territory ripe for colonisation, but it has been peopled, from the dawn of history, from father to son, by dark skinned inhabitants; as most of the Calibans of the story keep interrogating, is not Kenya, after all, "the country of black people[?]"¹⁰⁷ Kenya's struggle with colonialism, by then, was the struggle of most, if not all, the African colonies, and Ngũgĩ knew and understood this aspect, perhaps more than anyone else, which has influenced his appropriation of *The Tempest*. The fact that he sees in Prospero's annexation of Caliban's lands "the entire history of the destruction of African cultures,"¹⁰⁸ is not a peculiar aspect. It follows from what has, so far, been said that colonial Kenya, as a setting, has been intended as a hidden polemic which not only addresses the struggle of its people but also the suffering of those Africans whom colonialism has repressed and suppressed. Cartelli's argument is of a high relevance when he says that through Thompson, the agent of the empire, Ngũgĩ has operated an, "imaginative transfer of Prospero from Shakespeare's fictionally cross-referenced island to Africa."¹⁰⁹

The events of the story, in terms of time, take place in 1963, four days prior to Kenya's official Independence Day. Yet, the significance of the plot and the right understanding of the narrative would have never occurred without the well-timed flash backs. The narrator carries us, at time, to the early days of British colonial annexation and, at other times, we are transported to the emergency years during which every single character, like most Kenyans by then, has been traumatised. If the temporal dimension locates *The Tempest* during the emergent ideology of colonialism, in a polemical turn, *A Grain of Wheat* might be situated, not paradoxically, at the other end with traditional colonial presence heading, at full speed, towards inevitable decline.¹¹⁰ It has to be stated that the play and the novel that has appropriated it, occur at a point in history "joining two moments when colonialism on the way up [in *The Tempest*] meets colonialism on the way down"¹¹¹ in Ngũgĩ's novel.

B- A Hidden Polemic through the Characters:

B- I- Caliban: From Utter Monstrosity to Full Humanity:

Caliban's history is cultural history.¹¹²

The very long list of epithets Prospero and the other whites of *The Tempest* have attributed to Caliban has drawn a portrait of a 'strange' creature which does neither belong to the realm of human beings nor to the kingdom of animals. The shape of the native is a mixture of 'unusual' traits which confine him, in the eyes of early modern English people, to the status of a monster. Prospero has asserted that his 'slave' is the 'unnatural' outcome of the sexual union between the devil and the witch Sycorax; he has been "got by the devil himself,"¹¹³ as the white man has clarified. The language Prospero has employed is imbued with negative expressions and words, "[a] freckl'd whelp, hag-born--not honour'd with/ A human shape/"¹¹⁴ "[f]ilth,"¹¹⁵ "savage,"¹¹⁶ "brutish,"¹¹⁷ "mis-shapen knave,"¹¹⁸ "demi-devil,"¹¹⁹ and "disproportioned"¹²⁰ in shape; these adjectives, Miranda's father has used, delineate the 'monstrosity' and 'inferiority' of his 'slave.' Trinculo, Alonso's jester, has pointed at him, in a significant scene, as being a "strange fish, [with] fins like arms."¹²¹ All these epithets have emphasised the 'monstrosity' and 'inhumanity' of Caliban.

In terms of personality and mental traits, the native has been denied humanity since he is used as a ‘type’ which has reduced him to a flat character. His name which is “an anagram of “cannibal””¹²² might explain the white man’s perception of his character which has not been endowed with an ability to become ‘civilised’. We never learn about any possible physical or mental development, at whatever stage of his life, or even about an earlier phase of his existence, like it happened with Prospero, who takes the readers/viewers in a journey to the distant past, back to the days when he was duke of Milan. Ngũgĩ has, moreover, affirmed that Caliban has been endowed with the “capacity or the voice to say ‘no’,”¹²³ yet on the first occasion he is free from Prospero’s grip, the native, ‘prone to be enslaved,’ crowns Stephano as his new master telling him I “swear [...] to be thy true subject.”¹²⁴ Ngũgĩ’s argument that Caliban “conflates liberty with slavery,”¹²⁵ is quite justifiable in this context.

Ngũgĩ’s Calibans, deployed as hidden polemics, have a clear perception of freedom with a different dimension. They are full human beings, both physically and mentally, with all their qualities and flaws; almost all of them have, somehow, betrayed or experienced, in one way or another, betrayal. Gikonyo stands out as an emblem since he, under the effect of torture and isolation in detention, has revealed to the British that he has taken the Mau Mau oath. On the other hand, he has been betrayed by his wife, Mumbi, whom he finds pregnant, in his way home six years later, with Karanja’s child. The readers can feel throughout these major tribulations the despair, the anger, and the internal struggle Gikonyo has gone through which render him a “profoundly human”¹²⁶ character anybody might identify or, at least, sympathise with. He is the kind of Caliban who is capable of loving and being loved; Mumbi, earlier in their life, chose him among all her suitors. He is above all a man who has shown bravery and a great deal of intelligence which made him a successful businessman.

Gikonyo’s features are valid for, another Caliban figure, lieutenant Koina whose conflicting emotions make him one of the most intricate characters of *A Grain of Wheat*. He is thoughtful and sensitive towards the discrepancies he has pointed-out between the lavish

life of the colonists and the stark misery the Kenyans were experiencing. This was the major incentive for his marked resentment to the whites, the consequence of which he has joined the struggle for independence. He is not the heartless, vengeful rascal by any means. Despite fighting a fierce coloniser, Koina has shown restlessness and even psychological torment when he remembers the sheer violence and the acts of hostility they —he and his freedom fighter friends— have perpetrated against the whites. The lieutenant is, besides, an artist who has the capacity to silence everybody when he is singing as the narrator tells us that, they have all “stopped talking and listened to Koina’s singing.”¹²⁷ Kihika, on a similar vein, has evinced a variety of positive human traits ranging from his unflinching sense of responsibility towards his people, to his unwavering desire to free Kenya even if it would cost him his life. In brief, through his portrayal of his Caliban characters, “Ngugi seeks to turn the manichean principle of racial allegory on its head in order to restore full humanity to the African”; likewise, the author gave “a voice to hitherto repressed voices of the colonial subject.”¹²⁸

B-II- Prospero and Thompson: The Beginning and the End of Colonialism:

Colonialism came to life, as an emergent ideology, during the so called early modern England which was precisely the time of the writing, publication and circulation of *The Tempest*. The impact of this aspect on Shakespeare is not, by any measure, to be understated since the latter has embodied, whether conscious or not, a variety of features tightly connected with this colonial context. Prospero, the absolutist, the bookish, the entity full of supernatural powers, the all seeing, controlling and hearing is the one who has established his control over the island and ‘his’ subjects. Shakespeare, it seems, has intended “Prospero [as] a humanist prince,”¹²⁹ who is expected to spread his knowledge, worldviews and ‘enlightened’ rule to other parts of the world. This kind of optimism-imbued spirit has served, somehow, as a justification for England’s nearly four centuries colonial overseas scramble for ‘exotic’ lands.

Ngũgĩ’s Prospero has been modelled, in many ways, on Shakespeare’s hero, yet Thompson has been revised in a wide range of other ways to get engaged in a hidden polemic with the source. The colonial agent has been used to debunk the pretext which might redeem

colonialism: that of having good intentions. Through the “existence of wellmeaning administrators such as Thompson,” Ngũgĩ has expressed “a stronger indictment [against colonialism] because it shows that the structure itself, rather than the characters of the agent, is responsible for the violence of colonialism.”¹³⁰ Although Prospero has, intermittently, been cruel to Caliban, his violence has never amounted to killing him; Thompson’s cruelty and apathy, in contrast, towards the Kenyans are, I have to say, quite unparalleled. He was immersed in brutality, incendiary warfare, abysmal tactics to kill prisoners and eliminate Mau Mau fighters that his moral degeneration has turned him to “a loathsome version of what Memmi termed the self-accepting “colonialist,””¹³¹ which “allegorises the crisis of the Empire as sick and decaying from within.”¹³² Prospero’s sojourn in Kenya has come to a disappointing end since colonialism has been swept away and he is compelled to return to England. Thompson’s psyche has been irreversibly damaged, which “recalls the Kurtz of *Heart of Darkness*,”¹³³ to the extent of losing his humanity, something which does not happen with Shakespeare’s hero, while preaching civilisation’s ideals. “The trouble with the processes involved in colonisation and imperial domination,” Ngũgĩ’s text seems to foster, “is that, far from bringing about the civilization of the barbarian, their effect is rather to bring about the de-civilisation of the colonisers themselves, turning them into primitive brutes.”¹³⁴ While Prospero is at the threshold of the colonial enterprise, opening overseas territories to the English people, Thompson, who is intended as a hidden polemic, stands at the other far end with colonialism in its death paroxysms and deathbed and with Ngũgĩ’s colonial agent packing-up his luggage and ready to leave, ‘once and for all,’ Kenya and the colonies.

C- Caliban’s Wrath: Miranda Sexually Abused:

But here the Negro is the master. He is the specialist of this matter: Whoever says rape says *Negro*.¹³⁵

The European colonial entities, Britain not exempt, have always seen in the colonised black people a powerful symbol of all that is “biological.”¹³⁶ It is not, therefore, unusual to associate Caliban’s race with cannibalism, laziness and irrationality. Furthermore, as Fanon’s above words might suggest, depicting those people as rape perpetrators is a common

occurrence in the white man's colonial literature and realm. *The Tempest* has given voice, through a major scene, to such concerns of native sexual violence against white women when Prospero brandishes Caliban's attempt "to violate/ [t]he honour of [his] child."¹³⁷ Caliban acknowledges the 'facts' and wishes "it had been done/";¹³⁸ because if it was not for Prospero who has thwarted his designs, he would have "peopl'd [the island] with Calibans."¹³⁹ If we might trust Prospero's narrative, this scene suggests that Caliban took advantage of the white man's 'generosity' since he sheltered him in the same dwelling as his daughter. This is the kind of plausible pretexts any coloniser, Prospero included, would look for to reduce the 'other' to subordination and servitude. Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda is represented, through Prospero's on-purpose magnifying lenses, as an act of backstabbing which "proclaims [the native's] bestiality."¹⁴⁰

Almost four hundred years of colonisation, full of oppression, discrimination and ill-treatment, contributed to fuelling the 1950s great wave of revolutions which, in many instances, saw violence, under all its forms, sexual included, as a means to struggle against the coloniser. The colonised has lost the remnants of patience he has had and ultimately came to the horrifying conclusion that only "such madness [unbridled violence] alone can deliver them from colonial oppression,"¹⁴¹ as Fanon has explained. *A Grain of Wheat* has pointed at the Mau Mau fighters who endorsed sheer violence against the British settlers, farms, establishments and military institutions. Ngũgĩ's words are more than relevant when he argued that "[v]iolence in order to change an intolerable, unjust social order is not savagery"; on the contrary, he believes that "it purifies man."¹⁴²

There is a subtle reference to one of the Caliban figures, lieutenant Koina, who, with the help of the freedom fighters, raided the settlement of Dr. Lynd, a British white woman, and committed rape against her. In an indirect reference to Caliban, Koina has been living in Dr. Lynd's settlement since he has been, for years by then, working for her. The day he would join the forest, he brought with him two Mau Mau rebels and called her, in the middle of the

night, to open the door. The three men then stormed in and “rushed at her and dragged her back to the sitting-room.”¹⁴³ The scene is imbued with violence, when told from Dr. Lynd’s viewpoint as the three Calibans “tied her hands and legs together and gagged her [...] what followed was no less cruel and barbaric than if they had killed her [...] She wished she could faint or die [...] But that was the terrible part, she saw everything, was fully conscious.”¹⁴⁴ After nearly four hundred years of Caliban’s thwarted endeavour to molest Miranda, Koina commits the vehement act of raping Dr. Lynd which seems, in that context of struggle, to be “an act of insurrection”¹⁴⁵ “against white supremacy.”¹⁴⁶

D- Language and Narrative Voice:

When it comes to language and narrative voice, Shakespeare’s plays are hard, if not impossible to match, by any means. *The Tempest* has, indeed, reached other dimensions in terms of eloquence, dexterity and mastery with the bard’s career drawing to its end. I have to clarify, from the beginning, that I am not interested in confronting Shakespeare’s and Ngũgĩ’s use of language in relation to figures of speech and literary techniques; I am not also interested in conducting an exhaustive study of the narrative voice in the source and its adaptation. My concern is related to the ways in which Ngũgĩ has deployed these two elements —language and narrative voice— as a hidden polemic and a means of resistance in an attempt to subvert the 17th century text.

The first aspect to highlight is the fact that *The Tempest* and *A Grain of Wheat* have been written in the English language. The reader or viewer has been told, from the onset, that Prospero “[t]ook pains to make [Caliban] speak,”¹⁴⁷ which might mean that the native has no history, no culture and no mother tongue; and as part of what has been termed linguistic imperialism, the protagonist has imposed his language on the local inhabitants. Ngũgĩ who understood this linguistic colonial mechanism, very well, has argued that once the English language imposed, “before [even] Caliban knows it, Prospero has taken his land.”¹⁴⁸ The power of language as a liberating tool, in Ngũgĩ’s perception, must not to be underestimated

since to him, the question of “the appropriate language for African literature [was all about] moving the centre: from European languages to all the other languages all over Africa.”¹⁴⁹

A Grain of Wheat has marked a turning point in its author’s literary vision since it is an early stage of his attempt “to reject the great tradition”¹⁵⁰ of using the coloniser’s language and other techniques to voice the colonised peoples’ concerns. The textual evidence suggests that a wide range of Gikuyu, Ngũgĩ’s mother tongue, words, proverbs and songs have been used as a hidden polemic to protest against the coloniser’s claim of absence of local culture and languages. The word for freedom and Independence Day, all along the novel, is the native word “Uhuru,”¹⁵¹ while the expression “Uhuru na Kazi”¹⁵² meaning ‘freedom and work’ is one of the main slogans brandished by the characters on the eve of independence. There are other examples of words which are not English, but rather taken from African mother tongues; the proverb Kihika used, in a public speech, is another instance which shows Ngũgĩ striking a hidden polemic at Shakespeare’s text. There are, moreover, various songs taken from the Kenyan people’s local cultures, folklore, that the main characters proudly sing. Through the use of such words, expressions, songs and proverbs, Ngũgĩ has asserted his desire to be part of a literary tradition “celebrating the right to name the world and *A Grain of Wheat* was part of that tradition of the struggle for the right to name the world for ourselves,”¹⁵³ not in the language of the coloniser.

In terms of narrative voice, *The Tempest* entails, any reader/viewer would understand, a one sided, even biased, vision since most, if not the whole story, is told from Prospero’s first person point of view. The events unfold, in a predictable fashion, through the eyes of Miranda’s father who arranges and plans nearly every single aspect. Thus, Prospero has “engineer[ed] all events [which makes it seem fair to argue that] the play is essentially his plot.”¹⁵⁴ The white man, given unrestrained authority, exploits and reorients all the events, as it pleases him; even Caliban’s own story is included since it has been interpreted from the coloniser’s viewpoint. The fact that “Caliban [is] reduced to the status of subplot,”¹⁵⁵ with the

history of the colonised diminished, to nothingness, is an intricate issue, many postcolonial critics and novelists alike, Ngũgĩ included, have ceaselessly tried to reckon with.

Ngũgĩ has addressed and got engaged in an indirect polemic with some of these major concerns by subverting the narrative voice. It is, hence, the first-person plural “we” that has been on purpose deployed all over the novel. The reliance on the “we-narrative [...] [and] the we-form allows the postcolonial author to forge a collective identity in contrast to imperial powers and Western individualist notions of subjectivity.”¹⁵⁶ Most of the events, reoriented towards another dimension, have been retold through the eyes of the Kenyan Calibans in favour of the colonised people’s collective history. The significance of such a collective narrative voice has not to be underestimated since it has resulted, as Ngũgĩ has expressed it, in making “the people – the village people – in their motion in history [...] the real hero of the novel.”¹⁵⁷ The story has shifted perspective from being centred on Prospero and the coloniser, towards being centred on Caliban and the colonised people(s) by extension.

4- Ngũgĩ’s *A Grain of Wheat*: Ideologically and Culturally Explored:

This section examines ideology and culture in Ngũgĩ’s appropriation of *The Tempest* through his novel *A Grain of Wheat*. My central argument, herein, would be related to Williams’ concepts of ‘residual,’ ‘dominant’ and ‘emergent’; they are expected to assist me in my endeavour to scrutinise Ngũgĩ’s text with regards to its cultural and historical background. These notions are central to my research, because I believe a thorough understanding of the novel would be an arduous task, if not impossible, without paying attention to the ideologies and cultural aspects in action at the time of its writing and publication.

A- The Residual in *A Grain of Wheat*:

Williams has referred, in his ideological and cultural continuum, to the residual as those “experiences, meanings and values, which [are not part of the dominant, yet they are allowed to exist by] the dominant culture, [the residual is] lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation.”¹⁵⁸ What

Williams terms the residual, therefore, points at those ideas, practices, and beliefs which, despite not being a leading structure in a society, since they are the result of a previous era's ideological and cultural formations, still emerge at a given historical moment as a remnant of the near or even distant past. There are three aspects which might be associated with the residual in Ngũgĩ's text; they are: colonialism, religion in the form of Christianity, and rural community (life).

The first residual element in the novel is colonialism. The latter, I have to remind the reader, was in *The Tempest* an emergent practice, which has evolved to a dominant ideology that preserved its dominance for almost four hundred years, the time when it has gradually reached its decline with the second half of the 20th century. Simon Gikandi's assertion that "*A Grain of Wheat* is a novel written under the strains created by the ghost of colonialism,"¹⁵⁹ is not, by whatever considerations, exaggerated. The colonial presence, in its traditional or military form is not an active entity in the cultural process of Kenya's history in (1965) onwards since the country proclaimed its independence in (1963) while Ngũgĩ's literary work has been first published in (1967). Yet, colonialism surfaces as a remnant through the memories of the natives who have, in so many ways, experienced the wrath of the British coloniser particularly during the Mau Mau rebellion and the state of emergency.

The events of the story take place the moment Kenya would become independent. Most of the white settlers and colonisers of *A Grain of Wheat* have packed-up their luggage to flee the country back to England. Some of them, however, have taken the decision to stay, despite Kenya's imminent freedom, which served as a constant reminder of the near colonial past. In a short visit to Githima, lieutenant Koina came accidentally across Dr. Lynd, the white woman he has raped, after years of their last bloody encounter. He was shocked because the white woman is still present in Kenya and the situation got even better for her since she,

still got the big house, and [her] property has even multiplied [...] Why was she still in Kenya? Why were all these whites still in Kenya despite the ringing of Uhuru bells? Would Uhuru really change things for the likes of him and General R.? Doubts

stabbed him [Koina]. Dr Lynd's unyielding presence became an obsession. It filled him with fear, a kind of premonition.¹⁶⁰

After this encounter, the lieutenant has been overcome by a sense of loss mingled with sheer disillusionment and despair; thus, he could do nothing, for days, except talking about "seeing the ghosts of the colonial past [which are] still haunting Independent Kenya."¹⁶¹ Colonialism, as a matter of fact, has become a residue taking the shape of a ghost which still hovers over both the people, who fought against it, and the country which has exorcised it during the emergency years. It seems that "[t]he Uhuru celebrations – and, accordingly, the notion of Uhuru itself – are thus haunted, disturbed by phantoms and remnants of the colonial yesterday."¹⁶²

The second residual aspect in Ngũgĩ's text is religion embodied through Christianity. It has to be stated that in Williams' central view, "organized religion is predominantly residual,"¹⁶³ at the level of any given society at any given moment in its history. Religion and its practices, Christianity in the case of the novel, although it is an active component in the present timeline, is the product of a bygone era which comes to the surface as a residue. The Christian notion of sacrifice which is linked to Jesus Christ might be pinpointed through Kihika who wanted, somehow, to materialise this idea of sacrifice by shedding his blood and paying with his life in the struggle against the British that would ultimately save the Kenyans by rewarding them with freedom. Kihika's words are imbued with these ideals,

In Kenya we want deaths which will change things, that is to say, we want true sacrifice [...] I die for you, you die for me, we become a sacrifice for one another. So I can say that [...] I am Christ. Everybody who takes [...] up the cross of liberating Kenya are the true Christs for us Kenyan people.¹⁶⁴

Kihika is among the few characters whose unwavering belief in such a Christian ideal, as sacrifice, convinced him to pay "the ultimate price when he is hanged by the colonialists."¹⁶⁵ It might be claimed that "the novel contains vestiges of [...] residual Christian [...] sympathies."¹⁶⁶ The other Calibans of the story, on the other hand, have relegated religion to a fleeting backdrop in society; General R, one of the Mau Mau fighters, for instance, with his almost atheist-framed vision believed that, Kihika's faith "did not help [him.] He [Kihika]

even read the Bible every day, and took it with him wherever he went”;¹⁶⁷ General R, thereby, could never understand, “[w]hy is it that God would not whisper a word – just one word – to warn [Kihika] not to walk into a trap?”¹⁶⁸ After all, in the General’s view, he was a true believer; was not he?

Rural life in a rural community is the third residual feature in Ngũgĩ’s appropriation of Shakespeare’s text. Williams maintains that “rural community is predominantly residual.”¹⁶⁹ Most of the events of the story, with some rare exceptions of setting shift, take place in the village of Thabai and the adjacent rejoin, far from Nairobi, where the characters have been caught in their respective rural communities. The main source of food for the inhabitants is agriculture through farming their small parcels of land in the hope of producing some subsistence crops. This rural way of life seems to hold a crucial position for the Kenyans because it stands in a stark contrast with the coloniser’s way of life centred in the cities. The land parcels are priceless since they “belong [...] to Kenyan people. Nobody has the right to sell or buy it. It is [every Kenyan’s] mother”;¹⁷⁰ they are, in this sense, sacred. In Ngũgĩ’s novel, in brief, “the rural topology [is] the signifier of genuine nationalism. The urban area is associated with modern degradation.”¹⁷¹ Despite this aspect, a character like Gikonyo, in the same fashion as many Kenyans at the time, has been amazed at the alarming rate with which cities were growing to the extent of nurturing a desire to invest his money in Nairobi.

B- The Dominant Capitalist Drive and Patriarchy:

In most colonies, Kenya not excluded, the colonisers have grounded an economic system related to capitalism to irreversibly tie the colonies, meaning the periphery, to what has come to be known as the ‘mother’ country, or the centre. The implemented capitalist dynamics —offer/demand, market-oriented exchanges, and capital circulation— are almost one sided in favour of the Europeans; in this context, “colonialism is a version of capitalism.”¹⁷² The economy of the colony, under this system, in which colonialism has “encouraged capitalism,”¹⁷³ becomes complementary to that of the colonial entity, Britain in

Kenya's case. The Kenyans have been inevitably caught in this system, endorsing, promoting, reproducing and even enacting the various capitalist dynamics in action.

There is a direct reference to capitalism endorsed by the natives, especially through Gikonyo. Once released from detention, he has been shocked with his wife's betrayal to him with Karanja; as a result, the incredulous Gikonyo devoted himself, body and soul, to hard work which turned him into a successful businessman. It might be argued that he "represents the Kenyan entrepreneur who embraces the capitalist ideology [since he even] exploit[s] his own people."¹⁷⁴ Gikonyo has internalised, like a coloniser, the capitalist system very well that his commercial activities were all centred on market orientation and speculation; the best example is when he buys agricultural products, maize and beans, for relatively low prices in their harvest season and he, 'cunningly,' gets them stocked in his mother's hut. The outcome is predictable in the capitalist system; he waits for those products to run-out from the markets with the drought season; then, he would flood them with his stocked products at the desired prices. The narrator has explained this when he has told of Gikonyo's skyrocketing rise to wealth, "[a]ll the time Gikonyo waited until the maize-grain [and beans were] very scarce [...]. At the right time, he poured what he had hoarded on to the market at a high price."¹⁷⁵

Gikonyo has become, after his detention years, a tight scheduled businessman who reinvests his capital to satiate his unbridled ambitious spirit. He has managed with his entrepreneurial vision to possess a shop at Rung'ei which he baptised "*Gikonyo General Stores*";¹⁷⁶ he has even bought a small farm and a lorry for his trade activities. While walking in the streets of Nairobi, which he visited for business, the Kenyan entrepreneur watched all those huge commercial facilities and "had a vision of African businessmen like himself taking over all those premises!"¹⁷⁷ The situation was favourable to Gikonyo that he has become an influential symbol, a powerful and successful businessman, whom all Kenyans respect and aspire to follow in his footsteps. The natives' admiration for the entrepreneur suggests that with "the traditional colonial model [...] no longer [...] in place after the departure of the

British, the capitalist perspective which Gikonyo represents becomes [...] the most significant ideological”¹⁷⁸ element for many, if not all, Kenyans.

Another dominant cultural feature, in *A Grain of Wheat*, is the patriarchal system. Kenya has been constructed as a site of “collusion between the colonial and anti-colonial patriarchies”;¹⁷⁹ that is to say, the Kenyan land, has become, during the emergency years, an arena in which the male colonised subjects wrestle with the white male colonisers. The Mau Mau, likewise, might be seen as a male rebellion “at the expense of female”¹⁸⁰ characters who have been depicted, in most cases, as passive, submissive and altogether weak. Most of the freedom fighters of the novel are male characters, while women have been restricted to their traditional roles, as mothers who would give birth to children and take care of the household, in the confines of the private sphere. In this context, the dominant “Gikuyu patriarchy places ‘women’ within a uterine social organization in which women’s bodies and identities are symbolically bound to motherhood.”¹⁸¹ The same dominant patriarchal system might be highlighted in the following passage,

As usual, on such occasions, some young men walked in gangs, carrying torches, lurked and whispered in dark corners and the fringes, really looking for love-mates among the crowd. Mothers warned their daughters to take care not to be raped in the dark. The girls danced in the middle, thrusting out their buttocks provokingly, knowing that the men in corners watched them.¹⁸²

The realm the above words describe is quite patriarchal and male-centred to a high degree with Kenyan men standing at its heart while women are relegated to the status of the weak and sexual partners; they have, therefore, to fear rape while trying to attract the best possible suitors who would perhaps safeguard them in such a society.

C- Emergent Features: Neocolonialism, Betrayal and the Corruption of the New Elite or the New Bourgeoisie:

The third layer in the ideological and cultural spectrum drawn by Williams is what he has labelled ‘the emergent.’ He delineates it as those “new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships [that] are continually being created.”¹⁸³ It is tightly related to those new ideological and cultural practices, worldviews, ideas, entities

and movements which spring into existence in a society's precise historical period. These features might be distinguished from the dominant; moreover, in Williams' vision, the emergent might either oppose and contradict or smoothly support and harmoniously work with the dominant. The historical moment, in which Ngũgĩ's novel has been produced, is the decolonisation era of the sixties. The decolonisation process, a long and arduous task which it proved to be, has been, in the case of many independent nations, Kenya not exempt, stained with various emergent issues including an almost immediate upsurge of neocolonialism, the betrayal of the ideals the masses fought for, mingled with the corruption and detachment of the new bourgeoisie from the common peasants.

The first emergent concern is the birth of neocolonialism propped with a local neocolonialist class that has exploited the masses for personal interests and also in favour of the imperial forces like Britain. The facade of British colonialism in Ngũgĩ's text is Thompson who has made, in a somewhat prophetic passage, a conspicuous allusion to the possibilities of future British indirect economic and social presence in Kenya. He has experienced the bitter taste of Kenya's coming independence telling his wife, Margery, that traditional colonialism is over, yet he has prophesied that in economic and social terms, "this is not the journey's end"; "[w]e [the whites] are not yet beaten, [...] Africa [...] cannot do without Europe."¹⁸⁴ This neocolonial presence finds resonance in Gikonyo's ideas; he keeps wondering that, despite imminent independence, the Kenyan cities, in terms of economic activity, are monopolised by the whites. In Nairobi's case, Gikonyo wondered, "why there was not a single African shop in the whole of the central and business area of Nairobi [...] The [...] Europeans controlled the commercial and the social life of the city."¹⁸⁵ The same thing could be said about Githima where the "exclusive white settlement seemed to have grown bigger instead,"¹⁸⁶ even though the country is on the eve of its independence. The concerns Ngũgĩ's work has expressed serve as a "reminder that there are still oppressive forces at work, that Kenya has not yet fully 'regained her Uhuru'."¹⁸⁷

Betrayal is quite central to the novel which might be seen through Mugo, who is often viewed as one of the independence war heroes; in fact, the opposite ought to be said about him since he was the traitor who sold Kihika to the British. Mugo, the hero of the people, and his ultimate treachery have been, on purpose, placed at the centre of the novel since this “gestures towards the possibility of betrayals of the ideals and goals of Uhuru by those who have assumed the reins of power in independent Kenya, and this is [...] because they are motivated by self-interest.”¹⁸⁸ The readers might feel the overwhelming presence of this new Kenyan elite or bourgeoisie, created by the coloniser, which has taken power as the dominant class after the country’s independence. These people ‘usurp’ the status of the white man by exploiting and manipulating the peasants, the revolutionary people, to serve their personal interests at the expense of the common good. Fanon has stated that all the new bourgeoisie wants is to take the colonist’s “place”; he explains that “[i]n their immense majority the colonized want the colonist’s farm [...] They want to take his place.”¹⁸⁹ Gikonyo seems to be afflicted that this new elite, whose majority used, during the revolution, to “ran to the shelter of schools and universities,” and used to be “even [...] outright traitors and collaborators,”¹⁹⁰ has hijacked Kenya, with independence, taking advantage of the nation’s luxuries. He has affirmed that, during meetings, all they do, is brandish slogans; “you hear them shout: Uhuru, Uhuru, we fought for”; “[f]ought where? [...] [t]hey knew suffering as a word”¹⁹¹ only, but never in reality. The peasants and workers, in Ngũgĩ’s point of view, have been reduced, by the new bourgeoisie, to poverty, dire living conditions, lack of initiative and democratic gains despite their active participation in Kenya’s fight for freedom.¹⁹²

The best example of the new elite is the Member of the Parliament the villagers of Thabai voted for. Once elected, like most of the leaders, he has “ran to Nairobi and [was] rarely seen in [the] areas, except when [he] came back with other national leaders to address big political rallies.”¹⁹³ Gikonyo has been mercilessly robbed, by this same parliamentarian, of his right to own a huge farm that Mr. Burton wanted to sell to return to England. Gikonyo

formed an alliance, with five other businessmen, to buy Mr. Burton's farm; unfortunately, they did not manage to collect its full price. Gikonyo, thereafter, went to Nairobi and in a scheduled meeting with their parliamentarian, he asked him for help. This member gave him a promise to secure a bank loan, which would allow them to pay Mr. Burton's farm. Gikonyo has been disillusioned, the next day, when he learns that "Burton had left Kenya for England. The new landowner [of Burton's farm] was their own MP."¹⁹⁴ The way this parliamentarian has backstabbed Gikonyo and the villagers might picture the new bourgeoisie "who will go to any lengths to acquire power and wealth at the expense of the underprivileged majority."¹⁹⁵

Conclusion:

I have explored herein *A Grain of Wheat* in relation to *The Tempest*. The impact of the historical background on Ngũgĩ's text is crucial contributing to the final outcome as we know it today. This chapter has attempted to shed light on the novel in connection with Shakespeare's play; I have, thereafter, scrutinised the way the author has stylized the source in terms of characters, paternalism, civilising mission, and the coloniser's good intentions which slip towards brutality. Then, I have uncovered the various ways in which Ngũgĩ has indirectly criticised *The Tempest* at the level of the setting, the characters of Caliban and his 'master'; I have also shown how Caliban has been given a voice and the myriad ways in which Ngũgĩ has deployed his linguistic and narrative techniques to get engaged in a hidden polemic with the source. Finally, my reliance on Williams' terms has uncovered the various ideological and cultural aspects as well as the dynamics including colonialism, religion, rural community, capitalism, patriarchy, neocolonialism, and the corruption of the ruling new bourgeoisie—all contributed to remodelling Ngũgĩ's appropriation of the original.

Endnotes:

¹. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 89.

². Ibid.

³. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 30.

⁴. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, (Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1987), p. 108.

- ⁵. Simon Gikandi, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 08.
- ⁶. Ibid., p. 40.
- ⁷. Harish Trivedi, "Ngugi Wa Thion'o," in Susheila Nasta, ed., *Writing Across Worlds Contemporary Writers Talk*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 327.
- ⁸. Ibid.
- ⁹. Ibid., p. 329.
- ¹⁰. Shamsul Alam S. M, *Rethinking the Mau Mau in Colonial Kenya*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 15.
- ¹¹. David A. Percox, "Mau Mau and the Arming of the State," in Atieno Odhiambo E. S and John Lonsdale, eds., *Mau Mau and Nationhood: Arms, Authority and Narration*, (Oxford: James Curry Ltd, 2003), p. 121, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=mbK0XGsytcIC&pg=PA121&dq=east+africa+protectorate+kenya+colony&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwix_LTA5sfIAhWDoXEKHabJCN44HhDoAQilATAJ#v=onepage&q=east%20africa%20protectorate%20kenya%20colony&f=false, Accessed on 05/12/2016.
- ¹². Patrick Williams, *Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p. 02, in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=owRz6pGiRkCoC&pg=PA2&dq=british+misinterpreted+land+kenya&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiXu5WL88fIAhUqyoUKHfAXAYoQ6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=british%20misinterpreted%20land%20kenya&f=false>, Accessed on 06/12/2016.
- ¹³. Ibid.
- ¹⁴. Godfrey Mwakikagile, *Africa and the West*, (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2000), p. 95, in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=iKVCGuSznHkC&pg=PA90&dq=kikuyu+central+association+ignored+demand&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwigt66b5tHIAhWnyoUKHUFqAm4O6AEINTAB#v=onepage&q=kikuyu%20central%20association%20ignored%20demands&f=false>, Accessed on 08/12/2016.
- ¹⁵. Lynn M. Thomas, *Politics of the Womb: Women, Reproduction and the State in Kenya*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), p. 02.
- ¹⁶. Simon Gikandi, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 26.
- ¹⁷. Shamsul Alam S. M, *Rethinking the Mau Mau in Colonial Kenya*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 144.
- ¹⁸. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Secret Lives and Other Stories*, (London: Vintage, 1975), p. 09.
- ¹⁹. Simon Gikandi, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 26.
- ²⁰. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 193.
- ²¹. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 33.
- ²². John Beverley, "Calibán," in "Spain, Latin America and the Philippines," in Prem Poddar et al., eds., *A Historical Companion to Postcolonial Literatures –Continental Europe and its Empires*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), p. 530.
- ²³. Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 27.
- ²⁴. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
- ²⁵. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 22.
- ²⁶. Ibid.
- ²⁷. Ibid., p. 23.
- ²⁸. Ibid., 24.
- ²⁹. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
- ³⁰. Ibid.
- ³¹. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 91.
- ³². Roberto Fernández Retamar, *Caliban and Other Essays*, trans., Edward Baker, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971), p. 14.
- ³³. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ³⁴. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 33.
- ³⁵. Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 178.
- ³⁶. Shamsul Alam S. M, *Rethinking the Mau Mau in Colonial Kenya*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 36.
- ³⁷. Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 178.

38. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 74.
39. Ibid., p. 71.
40. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 51.
41. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 73.
42. Ibid., p. 126.
43. Ibid.
44. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
45. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 126.
46. Raman Shankar, Cited in Kathleen E. McLuskie, “‘Abstraction and Allegory’: Making *The Tempest* Mean,” in Silvia Bigliuzzi and Lisanna Calvi, eds., *Revisiting The Tempest: the Capacity to Signify*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 239.
47. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 21.
48. Ibid., p. 22.
49. Ibid.
50. Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 178.
51. Rob Nixon, “*Caribbean and African Appropriations of “The Tempest”*,” in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, p. 573, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>, Accessed on 17/06/2020.
52. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 22.
53. Ibid.
54. George Lamming, Cited in Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, trans., Boleslaw Taboskorski (Warsaw: Doubleday and Company, 1964), p. 137.
55. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 124.
56. Ibid., p.96.
57. Delia Krause, “*A Grain of Wheat: Ngugi’s Tribute to the Armed Rebellion*,” in, *Wasafiri*, Vol 4: N° 9, 1988, p. 09, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02690058808574172>, Accessed on 18/06/2020.
58. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 21.
59. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 92.
60. Albert Memmi, Cited in Jennifer Gale de Saxe, *Critical Feminism and Critical Education: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Teacher Education*, (New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 18.
61. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 76.
62. Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 27.
63. Stasja Koot, “*Articulations of Inferiority: From Pre-colonial to Post-colonial Paternalism in Tourism and Development among the Indigenous Bushmen of Southern Africa*,” in, *History and Anthropology*, Vol 1: N° 1, 2020, p. 03, Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2020.1830387>, Accessed on 20/10/2020.
64. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 97.
65. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
66. Ibid.
67. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
68. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 31.
69. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
70. Ailsa Hemphill, “*Voicing Freedom: The Meaning of Uhuru in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s A Grain of Wheat*,” in *Grounding*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2013, Glasgow University Dialectic Society, Glasgow, Pp. 32-33.
71. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), Pp. 97-98.
72. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 101.
73. Margaret A. Majumdar, *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), p. 69.
74. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 87.
75. Ibid., p. 23.
76. Ibid., p. 24.
77. Wilson G. Knight, Cited in Russell West-Pavlov, *Transcultural Graffiti: Diasporic Writing and the Teaching of Literary Studies*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), p. 87.
78. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 41.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid.
81. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
82. Ibid., p. 87.
83. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 93.

- ⁸⁴. Ibid., p. 94.
- ⁸⁵. Ibid., p. 101.
- ⁸⁶. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *Homecoming*, (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972), p. 08.
- ⁸⁷. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ⁸⁸. Ibid., p. 24.
- ⁸⁹. Ibid.
- ⁹⁰. Ania Loomba, *Cultural Politics: Gender, Race Renaissance Drama*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), p. 145.
- ⁹¹. Linnell Secomb, *Philosophy and Love: From Plato to Popular Culture*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 76.
- ⁹². Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
- ⁹³. Edward Said, Cited in Margaret Kohn “Colonialism and the State of Exception,” in Jacob T. Levy and Iris Marion Young, eds., *Colonialism and Its Legacies*, (New York: Lexington Books, 2011), p. 251.
- ⁹⁴. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 42.
- ⁹⁵. Ibid., p. 43.
- ⁹⁶. Ibid., p. 09.
- ⁹⁷. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 96.
- ⁹⁸. Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare’s Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (London: Routledge, 2020), p. 119.
- ⁹⁹. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 196.
- ¹⁰⁰. Crystal Bartolovich, “‘Baseless Fabric’: London as a ‘World City’,” in Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, eds., *The Tempest and its Travels*, (London: Reaction Books, 2000), p. 18.
- ¹⁰¹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 19.
- ¹⁰². Ibid., p. 17.
- ¹⁰³. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁴. Ibid., p. 99.
- ¹⁰⁵. Jyotsna G. Singh, Cited in Mary Floyd-Wilson “Race and Early Modern Drama,” in Arthur F. Kenney and Thomas Warren Hooper, eds., *A New Companion to Renaissance Drama*, (Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), p. 483.
- ¹⁰⁶. Crystal Bartolovich, “‘Baseless Fabric’: London as a ‘World City’,” in Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, eds., *The Tempest and its Travels*, (London: Reaction Books, 2000), p. 18.
- ¹⁰⁷. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 48.
- ¹⁰⁸. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 99.
- ¹⁰⁹. Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰. This argument is inspired from, Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 8.
- ¹¹¹. Ibid., p. 165.
- ¹¹². Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare’s Caliban: A Cultural History*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. XI.
- ¹¹³. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 22.
- ¹¹⁴. Ibid., p. 20.
- ¹¹⁵. Ibid., p. 23.
- ¹¹⁶. Ibid., p. 24.
- ¹¹⁷. Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸. Ibid., p. 104.
- ¹¹⁹. Ibid.
- ¹²⁰. Ibid., p. 105.
- ¹²¹. Ibid., p. 52.
- ¹²². Tom Lindsay, “Which First was Mine Own King”: *Caliban and the Politics of Service and Education in “The Tempest”*,” in *Studies in Philology*, Vol 113: N° 02, 2016, p. 400, University of North Carolina Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43921892>, Accessed on 29/10/2020.
- ¹²³. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 33.
- ¹²⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 55.
- ¹²⁵. Ailsa Hemphill, “Voicing Freedom: The Meaning of Uhuru in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s *A Grain of Wheat*,” in *Grounding*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2013, Glasgow University Dialectic Society, Glasgow, Pp. 34.
- ¹²⁶. James Ogude, *Ngugi’s Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 75.
- ¹²⁷. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 24.

- ¹²⁸ James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 50.
- ¹²⁹ Jonathan Bate, *Soul of Age: A Bibliography of the Mind of William Shakespeare*, (New York: Random House, 2009), p. 84.
- ¹³⁰ Margaret Kohn "Colonialism and the State of Exception," in Jacob T. Levy and Iris Marion Young, eds., *Colonialism and Its Legacies*, (New York: Lexington Books, 2011), p. 251.
- ¹³¹ Albert Memmi, Cited in Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 31.
- ¹³² James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 49.
- ¹³³ John Skinner, *The Stepmother Tongue: An Introduction to New Anglophone Fiction*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), p. 103.
- ¹³⁴ Margaret A. Majumdar, *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), p. 53.
- ¹³⁵ Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin White Masks*, trans., Charles Lam Markmann, (London: Pluto Press, 2008), p. 127.
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 128.
- ¹³⁷ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ¹⁴⁰ Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 72.
- ¹⁴¹ Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans., Richard Philcox, (New York: Grove Press, 2004), p. 34.
- ¹⁴² Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Homecoming*, (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972), p. 28.
- ¹⁴³ _____, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 37.
- ¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁵ Peter Nazareth on Eldridge Cleaver, Cited in Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 178.
- ¹⁴⁶ Eldridge Cleaver, Cited in Jonathan L. Walton, *Watch This! The Ethics and Aesthetics of Black Televangelism*, (New York: New York University Press, 2009), p. 192.
- ¹⁴⁷ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ¹⁴⁸ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Homecoming*, (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972), p. 09.
- ¹⁴⁹ _____, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 28.
- ¹⁵⁰ Simon Gikandi, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 253.
- ¹⁵¹ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 14.
- ¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ¹⁵³ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*, (Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993), p. 21.
- ¹⁵⁴ Brinda Charry, "Recent Perspectives on *The Tempest*," in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 71.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁶ Rebecca Fasselt, "(Post)Colonial We-Narratives and the "Writing Back" Paradigm: Joseph Conrad's *The Nigger of the "Narcissus"* and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Vol 37: N° 01, 2016, p. 156.
- ¹⁵⁷ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, (Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1987), p. 77.
- ¹⁵⁸ Raymond Williams, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ¹⁵⁹ Simon Gikandi, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 121.
- ¹⁶⁰ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 126.
- ¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- ¹⁶² Ailsa Hemphill, "Voicing Freedom: The Meaning of Uhuru in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in Grounding, Vol 06: N° 01, 2013, Glasgow University Dialectic Society, Glasgow, Pp. 35.
- ¹⁶³ Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ¹⁶⁴ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 64.
- ¹⁶⁵ James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 91.
- ¹⁶⁶ Brendon Nicholls, *Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Gender, and the Ethics of Postcolonial Reading*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), p. 7.
- ¹⁶⁷ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 25.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶⁹ Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ¹⁷⁰ Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 65.
- ¹⁷¹ James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 48.

- ¹⁷². Grivas Muchineripi Kayange, *Capitalism and Freedom in African Political Philosophy*, (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), p. 93.
- ¹⁷³. Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁴. Byron Caminero-Santangelo, "Neocolonialism and the Betrayal Plot in "A Grain of Wheat": Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's Re-Vision of "Under Western Eyes," in, *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 29: N° 1, 1998, p. 145, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3820536>, Accessed on 05/11/2020.
- ¹⁷⁵. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 44.
- ¹⁷⁶. Ibid., p. 23.
- ¹⁷⁷. Ibid., p. 46.
- ¹⁷⁸. Byron Caminero-Santangelo, "Neocolonialism and the Betrayal Plot in "A Grain of Wheat": Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's Re-Vision of "Under Western Eyes," in, *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 29: N° 1, 1998, p. 145, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3820536>, Accessed on 05/11/2020.
- ¹⁷⁹. Brendon Nicholls, *Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Gender, and the Ethics of Postcolonial Reading*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), p. 31.
- ¹⁸⁰. Ibid., p. 86.
- ¹⁸¹. Ibid., p. 44.
- ¹⁸². Ibid., p. 121.
- ¹⁸³. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ¹⁸⁴. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 101.
- ¹⁸⁵. Ibid., p. 46.
- ¹⁸⁶. Ibid., p. 126.
- ¹⁸⁷. Ailsa Hemphill, "Voicing Freedom: The Meaning of Uhuru in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in *Grounding*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2013, Glasgow University Dialectic Society, Glasgow, Pp. 35.
- ¹⁸⁸. James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), Pp.74-75.
- ¹⁸⁹. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans., Richard Philcox, (New York: Grove Press, 2004), p. 23.
- ¹⁹⁰. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 50.
- ¹⁹¹. Ibid.
- ¹⁹². James Ogude, *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*, (London: Pluto Press, 1999), p. 37.
- ¹⁹³. Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *A Grain of Wheat*, (New York: Penguin Group, 1967), p. 45.
- ¹⁹⁴. Ibid., p.103.
- ¹⁹⁵. Delia Krause, "A Grain of Wheat: Ngugi's Tribute to the Armed Rebellion," in, *Wasafiri*, Vol 4: N° 9, 1988, p. 7, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02690058808574172>, Accessed on 07/11/2020.

Chapter Three:
**Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969): An Aggressive
Appropriation Embedded in Its Temporal
and Spatial Ideological Environment as a
Blatant Occupation of Shakespeare's Text**

Introduction

A great work of art such as Shakespeare's play belongs to all humanity—and, as such, it can undergo as many reinterpretations as do the myths of classical antiquity.¹

I continually broke away from the original.²

These are the words and statements Aimé Césaire has uttered in relation to his play *A Tempest* which might give us a clear hint at the kind of corrosive approach he has fostered towards Shakespeare's source text. Like many authors, thinkers and critics whose countries have been subject to the devastating effects of colonialism, he has understood, quite well, the power of rewriting, reinventing, re-appropriating, emulating, condemning and 'defusing' a cultural text like *The Tempest*. Césaire has identified, through the latter, the earliest colonial encounter which would subsequently result in four hundred years of coloniser/colonised cultural friction. It is this same duality, fraught with superior/inferior, master/slave, self/other, dynamics and tropes with its intricate cultural exchanges that he has sought to revise, criticise and undermine via his adaptation.

This third chapter, much like the two previous ones, is devoted to a scrutiny of Césaire's *A Tempest* as a reworking which has not attempted, in any way, to faithfully reproduce Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. I have tried, thereby, to explore the adaptation as a text that has appropriated its source in a wide range of ways. First of all, I have examined the life of the author and the surrounding socio-cultural, economic and political environment leading to his play as a final and finished product. To fulfil my designs, I have leaned, in the second and third sections, on Genette's concepts; the second section is crucial since it is supposed to allow me, through metatextuality, to see the adaptation as a work that has, with its super aggressive approach, commented on, criticised and even condemned its alleged 'original' at myriad dimensions, both thematic and formal; the third one, afterwards, deploys Genette's other categories of 'excision,' 'reduction,' and 'amplification' in order to have an insight into the kind of other changes which Césaire has implemented to transform and even

‘disfigure’ *The Tempest*. The last section appeals to Williams’ notions to see the extent to which Césaire has altered his source depending all the way on the ideological and cultural considerations of his historical moment.

1- Aimé Césaire’s Life and a Play not to be De-contextualised:

A- Aimé Césaire and Cultural Re-appropriation:

Aimé Césaire, the intellectual whose name is quite often associated with the revolutionary period of the second half of the 20th century, is a multi-skilled literary artist who wrote plays, poems and even political attempts; he was born into a peasant family in the French Caribbean island of Martinique in (1913). He received his early education in his hometown, Basse Pointe where he later joined Schoelcher secondary school when his family moved to Fort-de-France. His perseverance and hard work, although within the confines of the colonial education system, have not gone unrewarded, at this stage, since he was granted a scholarship in (1931) to pursue his studies in France where he has excelled in terms of academic career starting from the mid 1930s. Césaire’s eight years sojourn in Paris, during a period when the revolutionary spirit of the colonised peoples has germinated, contributed to widening his literary, cultural and political horizons especially through his contact with Léopold Sédar Senghor and Léon-Gontran Damas among many others. Later on, Césaire, who coined the term *negritude*³ during the 1930s, together with his friends Senghor and Damas, relied on this cultural diversity to underpin their attempt to counter argue the French colonial policy of assimilation by shedding light on the positive African originated cultural values.⁴

The year of the outbreak of the Second World War (1939) witnessed the end of the Paris chapter in his life with his return to Martinique where he integrated without much delay the function of a teacher. With the end of the war, Césaire’s political orientations have matured and, therefore, nurtured what would subsequently prove to be a long and prolific career as Mayor of Fort-de-France and a representative of the island in the French Assembly. The fact that Martinique was a French colony, that has almost lost its culture and got its

identity drowned in history, in addition to the large scale involvement of this traditional colonial force, France, in the land seizure enterprise, were some of the most, if not the most, problematic questions he grappled with, shaping thereby his anti-colonialist staunch vision which might be spotted in his literary legacy. The Harlem Renaissance of the early 20th century, a key context, which came to promote and revive interest in African American cultures —music, literature, theatre and other artistic forms— played a pivotal role in shaping Césaire’s concerns related to racial identity.⁵ The black identity and culture that was repressed, for close to four centuries, by the colonial entities acquired capital importance for Césaire who sought, through this cultural revival, to free the colonised from the condescending, arrogant, stereotyped and Eurocentric vision of the coloniser. Given this intricate context, with his acute sense of cultural re-appropriation of black heritage, the author’s interest in reworking *The Tempest*, with all the possibilities it might offer through its Prospero/Caliban and slave/master dualities, with all the dynamics they entail, is, thus, quite discernable and might even be predictable. Césaire’s major works, besides *A Tempest* (1969), include *Discourse on Colonialism* (1950), *The Tragedy of King Christophe* (1963), and *A Season in the Congo* (1966).

B- Aimé Césaire’s *A Tempest*: A Play Steeped in its Background:

The earliest European presence in the New World, to date, is Christopher Columbus’ discovery which occurred in (1492). The Europeans have ever since competed for the control of these territories which represented vital opportunities. Plantations and trade posts were a commonplace by the 16th century as they were widely scattered in the Caribbean, Martinique included, which paid dividends to those powers engaged in this mercantile and subsequently colonial enterprise. The backbone of such an economic activity, by the second half of the 17th and throughout the 18th centuries, was slavery since hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of slaves were taken by force from Africa to those remote parts as a source of cheap labour force.⁶ Nearly all the European powers were involved in colonising the New World especially

the French for whom Guadeloupe, St. Christopher islands and Martinique, Césaire's homeland, were of particular interest because of the huge quantities of sugar they produced.⁷ The French colonial enterprise in Martinique was, by the second half of the 17th century, already in full expansion with new territories annexed on a regular basis all over the island expanding, therefore, its plantations at the expense of plant, animal and especially human life with the native Caribs forced to servitude, just like the African slaves. Such a state continued until the 1840s when an abolitionist movement under the leadership of Victor Schoelcher, the French statesman whose name was given to the school in which Césaire studied and eventually taught a century later, ended slavery in (1848).⁸

A century later, with the (1950s), the process of decolonisation was, for one reason or another, accelerated after the end of the Second World War as it gained momentum in nearly all colonies. This decade was the arena in which several upheavals, to say the least, were enacted. The blazing wave of nationalist movements, which swept across the colonies during this period, gave rise to a vehement reaction against colonial agents, settlers, administrations and military institutions. The fact that political efforts at gaining freedom, during the earlier decades of the 20th century, were in many cases fruitless, reoriented, in turn, such struggles towards radicalised ideals due to which armed rebellions and violence were deployed against the colonisers all over the globe. The anti-colonial feelings, which have been nurtured by the injustices the colonisers/the white man perpetrated, reached their apogee as many black militants and intellectuals voiced their condemnation of the inferior status to which their peoples, cultures and mother lands were confined. People like Léopold Sédar Senghor, Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, Frantz Fanon, Léon-Gontran Damas and Aimé Césaire to list only a few, despite their different approaches to such thorny questions —coloniser/colonised, white/black relationships— have perhaps agreed on their firm stance in condemning colonialism, denouncing racism and even advocating freedom in all its dimensions.

The 1960s, imbued with this decolonisation spirit, which Césaire experienced in his late forties, brought the armed struggles, defiance and revolutions almost in all the colonies into fruition and accomplishment. The major European colonial forces were, although quite reluctant, compelled to relinquish their tight grip over the territories which for centuries, generations of colonial administrators and agents considered as ‘white man’s lands.’ The African continent, among all formerly colonised regions, benefited the most from these upheavals with an “intensive decolonization [which] occurred in [the] Sub-Saharan [destitute parts] where twenty-four republics then emerged.”⁹ Many of the newly born nations, despite their limited resources and restricted economic horizons, tried to foster very aggressive policies against the ex-colonisers by encouraging their black African cultural roots which stood in stark contrast with the Europeans’ values. Such is the influential background, against which Césaire’s voice emerged as one of the prominent proponents of the anti-colonial movement; this context left a permanent mark on his aggressive appropriation of *The Tempest*. The era’s anti-colonial struggle meanwhile coincided with the rise of a worldwide black consciousness which sought to fight for an unconditional equality with the whites. The Civil Rights Movement in the United States was arguably of prime importance since it was probably in Césaire’s mind at the time of the production of his play *A Tempest* (1969).

2- The Tempest and A Tempest through Metatextuality:

This section has been designed to shed light on *A Tempest* as a text which has been intended as a commentary on *The Tempest*. The theoretical foundation which is expected to frame my analysis is Gérard Genette’s notion of metatextuality. It might be deployed to read the link binding literary works in which the source has been commented on, criticised and even refuted by the subsequent text. The theorist has referred to this link as being “most often [...] “commentary”.”¹⁰ A metatext, Césaire’s play for this thesis, is a text which comments on, criticises and rejects aspects, subtly or explicitly, from Shakespeare’s play. My main focus

would be directed at pinpointing “the *critical* relationship,”¹¹ to use Genette’s words, in which *A Tempest* gets involved in relation to *The Tempest*. Césaire’s aggressive metatextual approach vis-à-vis the latter has resulted in an adaptation that has both commented on and criticised the latter to the extent that he has stated in an interview, “[w]hen the work [*A Tempest*] was done, I realized there was not much Shakespeare left”¹² in it.

A- A *Tempest*: A Commentary on the Reality/Unreality of Performance:

One of the key devices which served Césaire’s aggressive intention of metatextually commenting on *The Tempest* is the deployment of metatheatre¹³ which is a concept, to borrow a scholar’s words, that consists of a “theatrically self-conscious theatre, [a] theatre which is aware of its own nature as a medium and capable of exploiting its own conventions.”¹⁴ The use of this strategy has resulted in both a text which has, to a high degree, grasped its representative dimension devoid of any kind of truth and characters/actors whose, on purpose, sober consciousnesses allowed much room to comment on the surrounding events or/and the story they are trapped in. Césaire has, thereby, relied on “metatheatre in the play” to create a metatext which would “blur the otherwise overt distinctions between the stage and history,”¹⁵ which has had, in its turn, a reductive effect on the colonial dimension of *The Tempest*.

The show’s leader whose appeal to the actors, in the opening, to choose their masks and their roles, is quite representative of such a technique to comment on the source; the use of this “opening [...] signals that this is a complex work that uses performance”¹⁶ for the sake of “masking and unmasking [the native/colonial identities to join the] real and fictional worlds.”¹⁷ Everybody, in a metatextual touch, is light-hearted with the story about to be staged having no dramatic purport; he guides the actors, “[c]ome gentlemen help yourselves. To each his character, to each character his mask”;¹⁸ he asks an actor if he wants to play the role of Prospero because he “has reserves of will power he’s not even aware of himself.”¹⁹ Then, he addresses another if he would like to be Caliban, “[y]ou want Caliban? Well, that’s

revealing.”²⁰ These comments on the personalities of Prospero and Caliban have been imbedded in Césaire’s perception that considered the former as the thirsty-for-power coloniser while the latter, the native, might be the oppressed other who has no option but to resist. He inquired, later, about possible takers for the remaining roles with emphasis given to the role of the ‘creator’ of the storm; the master has spoken to an actor, whose physical strength is apparent, with these words, “I need a really big guy to do the wind.”²¹ This technique has helped Césaire to comment on *The Tempest*, as an entertainment show, where power might be the other’s/native’s/Caliban’s privilege by showing “command over the creation of the storm that Shakespeare’s Prospero conjures, which subsequently ensnares [...] the Boat and its crew”; this metatextual strategy “usurps Prospero’s—and Shakespeare’s—mastery.”²²

The same feature might be spotted in another scene with the tempest already onstage that seems to transcend the confines of reality to Césaire’s Miranda who has been concerned about the safety of the people whom she thought of as being jeopardised. She reacts, just like in Shakespeare’s masterpiece, by calling her father, the ‘powerful’ Prospero, to help the ‘foreign’ mariners out of their tribulation. Prospero, who is aware of the dimension of what is staged, evinces no concern telling his daughter “calm yourself! It’s only a play. There’s really nothing wrong.”²³ Through this comment on the source, Césaire has raised the reader’s/viewer’s consciousness to the entertainment oriented content of the play and has, hence, articulated through Prospero’s answer that the whole events of *The Tempest* are mere subjective representations, which, consequently, have not to be taken too seriously. The author’s appeal to metatheatre is as a “self-reflexive strategy [which] highlights the critical and [metatextual] impetuses that inform”²⁴ Césaire’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s text.

B- A Radical Shift in Perspective and Setting:

Most thinkers and writers, in the colonies or the newly independent nations in Africa and the Caribbean, have recognised, at various proportions, the possibilities appropriating *The Tempest* would offer to them. Like many intellectuals, Césaire has sought “to use the counter-

hegemonic *idea* of Caliban in order to destabilize colonial sets of ideas [embodied through Prospero-qua-colonizer”];²⁵ this might be the reason for which he has undertaken the task of using Caliban’s viewpoint while remodelling Shakespeare’s play.²⁶ This radical shift in point of view, which appropriates the bard’s plot, with major disruptions, “not only from another perspective but for another audience,”²⁷ is not quite apparent at first sight, although it has been subtly announced, in the cover page, by Césaire who has, in a far from being a random gesture, narrowed down the scope of his public as belonging to the coloured community.²⁸

Césaire’s intention is to address the sufferings of a whole race under Prospero’s/the coloniser’s hands with his Caliban, it might be argued, being deployed to denote the peoples, be they in the Caribbean or the African continent, who, for more than three centuries, have been burdened under the yoke of colonialism. Césaire has from the onset, in racial terms, made Ariel and Caliban, the key figures of the source, slaves of quite different ancestry; he has, thereby, refashioned the centrality of his “characters on the pattern of the colonial class structure.”²⁹ Césaire’s above precisions of the racial origins of the servants is far from being fortuitous; it emanates from a planned manoeuvre to shift the point of view from Shakespeare’s text, centred on the coloniser, towards the native with an intended overview of the sufferings the oppressed races have been condemned to endure. There is another strategy the writer has resorted to while trying to move the perspective from Prospero and the whites towards the centuries long dehumanised, objectified and so called ‘other’ which consists of the reliance on the Master of Ceremonies who, almost at whim, invites actors to voluntarily choose whatever role suits them which is a technique that does nothing but undermine all what Prospero stands for accentuating, as such, Césaire’s metatextual perspective at adapting, and even appropriating *The Tempest*. The role of the powerful wizard, which has been attributed to the Master of Ceremonies, has “replie[d] to Shakespeare’s Prospero, by usurping the power of the master of the island,”³⁰ which has reinvested, in turn, that power in the play’s ‘Other.’

The action and events have also shifted, in the same fashion, in *A tempest*. The setting of the source, which has “occupied an imaginary space,” has been relocated “within the frame of [Césaire’s] historical reality of imperialism and contemporary politics”;³¹ this situates Césaire’s island with a surgical “geographical [...] precision in the Caribbean.”³² There is enough textual evidence, to be collected, pointing at this location in Césaire’s work. When, for the first time, Stephano encounters Caliban, the King’s butler refers to him as “a real Nindian! An authentic Nindian from the Caribbean”³³ which might be a strong indicator, if combined with the racial origins of Prospero’s two slaves, that might be textual proof enough signposting the relocation of Shakespeare’s text from the Mediterranean/Atlantic ambiguous setting towards the Caribbean region in Césaire’s play.

C- Colonialism: A Commentary on Theory and Practice:

The history of colonialism has shown, with compelling evidence, that the coloniser’s behaviour, in the majority of contexts, has always been stained with ambivalence. The paternalist, benevolent and good intentioned facade the coloniser, from the onset, endorses in theory, tends, most of the time, to slide, in a predictable fashion, towards scourging tyranny, crude violence and other abysmal methods in practice. Now, if “the colonizer’s protestations of benevolence are hypocritical or sincere”³⁴ and if “they depend on a conscious or unconscious bad faith,” [this] “does not matter [as] long as they are exposed by the contrast between words and deeds [...] “civilization,” in practice, entails violence and murder,”³⁵ quite necessarily, for the coloniser. Césaire has pinpointed this discrepancy between theory and practice, which is why he has metatextually tackled it in an attempt to uncover the colonial double sided discourse the aim of which is the colonial subject’s pacification.

The encounter, in *A Tempest*, between Caliban, on the one hand, and Stephano and Trinculo, on the other, shows the hypocrisy of colonial benevolent outer discourse which has been, for almost four centuries, deployed as a pretext to take control of overseas territories. Stephano and Trinculo have evinced their desire to turn “these welcoming shores”³⁶ into

colonies and after looking at Caliban, Stephano maintains that “he doesn’t seem to be stupid. I’ll try to civilize him.”³⁷ Upon a second thought, Stephano reveals his true intention when he says, “[o]h...not too much, of course. But [I will civilize him] enough so that he can be of some use.”³⁸ This might illustrate “Césaire’s oppositional strategies [which] include debunking the notion that the white colonizer is benevolent [by] exposing his hypocrisy.”³⁹ Césaire has even commented on the white man’s mission by showing Stephano “perform [his] civilizing mission”⁴⁰ by forcing Caliban to drink from the bottle of wine to make him speak; this scene showing a drunkard who ill-treats the native only because he is a white man, all in the name of spreading civilisation, might be pinpointed as Césaire’s harsh and metatextual criticism of colonialism.

The pattern of using a glittering facade, but which is rotten underneath, might be spotted in Césaire’s Prospero whose colonial presence is all meant, as he claims, to “protect civilization.”⁴¹ Much like Thompson in *A Grain of Wheat*, the metamorphosis of Césaire’s white man, who has worn so far the mask of civilisation, from his seemingly good intension towards brutality occurs when Caliban endorses the ideals of political and cultural struggle and claims, thereafter, his identity and his right to possess the island. Césaire’s Caliban has summarised this shift in the following scene,

That’s right [...] In the beginning, the gentleman was all sweet talk: dear Caliban here, my little, Caliban there! And what do you think you’d have done without me in this strange land? Ingrate! I taught you the trees, fruits, birds, the seasons, and now you don’t give a damn... Caliban the animal, Caliban the slave! I know that story! Once you’ve squeezed the juice from the orange, you toss the rind away!⁴²

Caliban has pierced the thin shroud that concealed the shape and purport of kindness and benevolence which is initially used by Prospero to establish a grounded basis for his overseas life. Once this mission accomplished, his mask is bound to fall with Caliban’s materialisation of awareness which is countered by hideous strategies. *A Tempest* is, thus, a metatextual commentary on the “contrast between the theory and practice of post-Shakespearean colonialism, between benevolent words and ready threats and uses of violence.”⁴³

D- A Blow at the Colonial Pedagogy and the Civilising Mission:

A key factor which makes the reworking of *The Tempest* “a compelling and resolute postcolonial endeavour” is “the acutely uneven relations of power highlighting the civilising mission of Englishness when it encounters the ‘Other’.”⁴⁴ Prospero fosters his benevolent humanism when he tells Caliban that he has done everything “to make [him] speak, taught [him] each hour/ [o]ne thing or other”;⁴⁵ he has even claimed that it was him who has “endow’d [Caliban’s] purposes/ [w]ith words that made them known.”⁴⁶ He is also an intellectual whose interest in books has been boundless; he has been carved as an “admirable scholar” and “a well-intentioned ruler”⁴⁷ whose prime endeavour at bettering himself and others, morally and intellectually, has been metamorphosed, by Césaire, into “a cruel tyrant [and] a lonely and misguided power-monger on the brink of madness.”⁴⁸

Césaire’s play has developed a metatextual connection vis-à-vis its source which has been commented upon by criticising its colonialist’s pedagogy and civilising mission. It has featured Prospero as an unscrupulous white man who spared no effort to annex other people’s lands since he used his “studies and experiments [to help him] discover the exact location of [the island] for which [he] set forth to take possession.”⁴⁹ This expedition, with all the suffering it represents to the natives, is not a humanist endeavour to ‘spread’ and ‘bestow’ civilisation and the benefits of progress upon the, so thought of, primitive races; Césaire has highlighted, with his corrosive reworking of the hero, that “Prospero’s groundedness in humanist values are hence closely linked to imperial goals.”⁵⁰ There is a key moment in Césaire’s play with the scene where Prospero asks Caliban to be grateful to him since, the white man argues, it was him who tamed, educated and trained the native to master English and the European manners. This has resulted, as Césaire’s Prospero believes, in extirpating Caliban out of his ‘mute,’ ‘bestial’ and ‘savage’ world toward a more ‘enlightened,’ and ‘civilised’ existence. Césaire’s Caliban dismantles this argument by answering as follows,

In the first place, that's not true. You didn't teach me a thing! Except to jabber in your own language so that I could understand your orders: chop the wood, wash the dishes, fish for food, plant vegetables, all because you're too lazy to do it yourself. And as for your learning, did you ever impart any of *that* to me? No, you took care not to. All your science you keep for yourself alone, shut up in those big books.⁵¹

Caliban's answer dissolves Prospero's claim of teaching and educating him by linking it to the white man's schemes and desires to be the 'master' who enslaves natives, reduces them to illiteracy, and takes unfair advantage of their lands. *A Tempest* has, as such, remodelled its source in order to "attack the very foundations of the last avatars of the traditional colonialist discourse [which consists of the civilising mission and] the colonialist "pedagogy"."⁵²

E- A Commentary on *The Tempest*: Christianity and Its Values:

Colonialists and missionaries established a hegemonic relationship that used Christianity as a civilizing agent [...] Christianity [was supposed to] provide support for colonial rule as [native] converts [would] see the value of colonial rule.⁵³

Christianity has been used, the above epigraph suggests, by the colonisers as a significant entity in their civilising mission. The Christian values and principles of faith, love, forgiveness, brotherhood and mercy have, even with the earliest European invaders, been perceived as the hallmark which distinguish them as —the enlightened— from the pagan, vengeful barbarian other. Christianity and its values might not be apparent to the reader/viewer of *The Tempest* because of the prevalence of its man-centred Renaissance ideals, yet Césaire seems aware of the centrality of this religion and its principles to generations of colonisers, Prospero included, as one of the pillars upon which their mission has rested.

A meticulous reading of Shakespeare's text might reveal the presence, although in a subtle way, of the Christian ideals and faith which the Martinican playwright has sought to comment on and subvert. After the shipwreck and all the turmoil that issued on the island, Shakespeare's Prospero has been utterly merciful to nearly all his old enemies —King Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio— who have been granted pardon which might be read as "an expression of the Christian story in *The Tempest*."⁵⁴ John D. Cox has even gone further when he claimed that Caliban has, somehow, benefitted from Prospero's Christian values just like the other European white characters. Cox's words, with all the risk they run of being

interpreted as Eurocentric and racist, are more than needed to illustrate his vision; he states that Caliban's "encounter with Europeans has been [...] a moral and intellectual vaccination, given what he has learned—at least one European language, European ideas of justice, a dignified spiritual life involving self-recognition and "grace," both elements of the Christian story."⁵⁵ It is these Christian ideals which have long been brandished by the colonisers as part of their civilising mission that Césaire has sought to comment on and undermine in order to restore, if at all possible, the long lost equilibrium between the slave and master. There is one scene, not to be found in the source, of great relevance in which Caliban has been visited by Ariel to discuss the 'current' state of thing as Prospero's slaves. Ariel exposed his peaceful method of struggling against the oppressor and argued that he does not want nor does he believe in the use of brute force to amend their daily conditions. Caliban's metatextual response to the source text's Christian values is alarming as he says to Ariel, "[w]hat do you believe in, then? In cowardice? In giving up? [...] That's it, someone strikes you on the right cheek and you offer the left. Someone kicks you on the left buttock and you turn the right."⁵⁶

F- Prospero: From Protagonist/Humanist to Antagonist/Despotic:

To me Prospero is the complete totalitarian. I am always surprised when others consider him the wise man who "forgives." What is the most obvious, even in Shakespeare's version, is the man's absolute will to power. Prospero is the man of cold reason, the man of methodical conquest—in other words, a portrait of the "enlightened" European.⁵⁷

Prospero, the intellectual, authoritarian, timeless and malleable fictitious hero, perhaps a literary "representation of Shakespeare himself,"⁵⁸ has been the protagonist introduced to the world, as the bard's outstanding artistic show of mastery and dexterity, through his play *The Tempest*. I have already sketched a portrait of some of Prospero's qualities, in Shakespeare's sense, in the previous discussions including his unequalled sense of Christian morality, brotherhood and clemency. Césaire's Prospero, on the other hand, takes the decision to forgive his European enemies —Antonio, Sebastian and Alonso— not on account of any sense of moral or Christian basis since it emanates instead out of racist and supremacist

pillars. Césaire's Prospero tells Ariel to bring the tide of his forgiveness to the three white men in case they repent because "[t]hey are men of my race, and of high rank"⁵⁹ which stamps Prospero as a racist coloniser whose major concern is the well-fare of Europeans.

In the source text, in addition, Prospero has been endowed with supernatural powers thanks to which he has not only been the orchestrator of the storm but also the master-mind whose "god-like omnipotence" and omnipresence, throughout the play, has established him as the absolute ruler of the island in a subtle hint at King "James's own claims to divine authority."⁶⁰ He has also been portrayed, as the clement, rational and superior white man whose humanism has been directed at 'taming' the island's wilderness and its inhabitants. These are some of the aspects, as Césaire's words in the above epigraph have already signposted, against which *A Tempest* has reacted to shake and subvert the foundations of the coloniser. Césaire has even brought Caliban into prominence which resulted in Prospero's concomitant demotion into the invader's role with one major concern which is thwarting Caliban's aspirations for freedom. The storm, proof enough of the white man's might, has been something Césaire's Prospero could never ever enact since he has been devoid of the unearthly qualities required to bring into existence such a phenomenon; the role of 'brewing' the tempest has been attributed to a "big guy"⁶¹ who is supposed to 'create' "a storm to end all storms,"⁶² to the extent of, blowing away everything. Prospero's power has been undermined through this "move which seizes upon the [...] theatrical illusion"⁶³ attributing it, without any reliance on informed standards, to a man with the strongest physique.

Shakespeare's duke of Milan has been the kind of desired illustration and 'forceful' materialisation of what a 'superior,' and 'white,' man might do in overseas territories in order to 'help' 'the clueless' 'savages'; he has devoted his whole "human care"⁶⁴ to 'reform,' 'teach' and 'civilise' Caliban. This power based rhetoric, with its biased stance, has been a pretext to enslave and ill-treat the native while gaining more authority and a better seat in the island's social hierarchy. The white man might be interpreted, in the bard's standards, as

God's representative on earth, who annexes a 'virgin' territory, subjugates its people to his 'fair' judgement and, finally reigning over all his subjects with an enlightened vision. Any coloniser's identity, Prospero not exempt, is slippery compelling him to create mechanisms to control the 'other' while consolidating his grip over the colony. Césaire's view of Prospero, in the light of the above portrait, seems to categorise him under "the arrogance of the radical European humanist conscience, which [...] consolidate[s] *itself* by imagining the other."⁶⁵

Césaire's Prospero is evil to the point that it would be nearly impossible, no matter how hard one tries, to salvage any positive traits about him. Shakespeare's hero, who would have been seen by the early modern English people as "the apex of humanity,"⁶⁶ has been reworked into a "megalomaniacal power-monger"⁶⁷ despot drawn into the intricate power dynamics which obsessed him to the utmost. There is a remarkable scene in which Césaire's Prospero, with Ariel's help, has presented a banquet for Gonzalo, Antonio, Sebastian and Alonso only to snatch it moments later from them. When the banquet has been re-presented for the hungry men, Gonzalo and Alonso refuse to eat in the wake of which Prospero orders Ariel to "[h]arass them to eat"⁶⁸ because he desires to control them; Ariel, in response, accuses him, "[t]hat's despotism. A while ago you made me snatch it [the banquet] away just when they were about to gobble it up, and now that they don't want it you are ready to force feed them."⁶⁹ The scene unfolds as follows depicting Prospero's obsessive character which craves to feel that the other's spirit is being crushed,

PROSPERO: Enough hairsplitting! My mood has changed! They insult me by not eating. They must be made to eat out of my hand like chicks. That is a sign of submission I insist they give me.

ARIEL: It's evil to play with their hunger as you do with their anxieties and their hopes.

PROSPERO: That is how power is measured. I am Power.⁷⁰

Ariel's situation is horrible, despite his acquiescence to the coloniser; with Caliban, the rebel, Césaire's despotic Prospero has been ruthless. No matter how many loads of water and burdens of wood Caliban fetches, the white man keeps asking for more not for anything but to prove that he is the uncontested master. When Caliban tries to reason with him arguing

that he has piled enough wood and brought sufficient water for days, Prospero's tyrannical character emerges. His words to his 'slave' are imbued with despotism,

Enough! Careful, Caliban! If you keep grumbling you'll be whipped. And if you don't step lively, if you keep dragging your feet or try to strike or sabotage things, I'll beat you. Beating is the only language you really understand. So much the worse for you: I'll speak it, loud and clear. Get a move on!⁷¹

This passage shows the kind of white man Césaire has shaped; a Prospero who, despite his claims of being a humanist, who is ready to help the 'inferior' races, is not ashamed to threaten, harass, intimidate and even get violent with Caliban's insubordination. *A Tempest*, as a metatext, has articulated, hence, "that Prospero's "humanism" is decidedly inhuman."⁷²

By the end of *The Tempest*, Prospero has resigned all his powers and returned to Italy leaving behind, like any coloniser, the island/the colony and its fate, as one might imagine, to Caliban, son of Sycorax and the legitimate heir to her island. Césaire's Prospero, in contrast, has been unwilling to leave, with the kind of mindset he developed towards the play's end, which induced his choice, since he wants to "protect civilization!"⁷³ The reader/viewer, however, would understand that Césaire's Prospero has nothing to do with civilisation and the true reason for his choice to remain stems from his "need[...] [for] his slaves in order to feel superior."⁷⁴ The last scene hints at this when Prospero says "[w]ell, Caliban, old fellow, it's just us two now, here on the island...only you and me [...] You-me...me-you!"⁷⁵ This suggests that Prospero has grown dependent on Caliban and he cannot survive without him.

J- Further Stingy Comments on/Rejoinders to Shakespeare's Prospero:

Much like Ngũgĩ and many of his contemporaries whose countries have been caught in the colonial grip of imperial forces, Césaire has grasped the essence of Shakespeare's text with reference to the major upheavals witnessed in the colonies in the second half of the 20th century. He has pinpointed the quintessential role Prospero has been ascribed not only as "the central figure of *The Tempest*; [but also as] a portrait of the author – an embodiment of that spirit of wise benevolence which is supposed to have thrown a halo over Shakespeare's

life.”⁷⁶ There is, and there could be, no tempest if it has not been for Prospero who stands, four centuries later, as an instance of a white European implementing his colonial aspirations and fantasies in overseas territories; thus, any text which purports to adapt, comment on and criticise Shakespeare’s play, *A Tempest* not at any rate exempt, needs to “take a decidedly revisionist position toward”⁷⁷ Prospero.

As the master, in *The Tempest*, he has relied on slanderous words whenever he spoke to or about Caliban who is, not once or twice, referred to as a “wicked”⁷⁸ creature stamped as “filth”⁷⁹ whose “body uglier grows” and “mind cankers”⁸⁰ through time. A similar defamatory accusation is made by Césaire’s Prospero who degrades Caliban with these words, “[g]racious as always, you ugly ape! How can anyone be so ugly?” Césaire’s Caliban is not willing, under whatever circumstances, to take any of Prospero’s degrading linguistic boundaries in relation to his physique, which he wards off by commenting back on the white man’s physical appearance, “[y]ou think I’m ugly [...] well, I don’t think you’re so handsome yourself. With that big hooked nose, you look just like some old vulture”;⁸¹ “[you are] [a]n old vulture with a scrawny neck!”⁸² This laughter inducing commentary on Prospero’s physique has been meant to empower Caliban to speak for and defend himself against the white man’s discourse.

There is another aspect that has been commented on by the Martinican author which is Prospero’s denial of Caliban’s right to live with him in ‘his’ cave/house. The source text has knotted this expulsion with Caliban’s alleged attempt at raping Miranda; Césaire rewrites and even reverses this scene up-side-down in the native’s favour since his Caliban rebuts the accusations of sexual harassment by making it clear, thereafter, that it was him, Caliban, who “didn’t like living with you [Prospero] at all, as a matter of fact.”⁸³ The reason he has brandished, in a metatextual answer, for his hatred of living in the white man’s house is a blow at Prospero’s way of life and hygiene telling him, “[y]our feet stink!”⁸⁴ In Césaire’s text, Prospero has been silenced and objectified since he did not refute or even try to defend

himself against this allegation. This is the kind of stingy commentary which entails “disruptive humor,”⁸⁵ to borrow the expression of Sam Vásquez, for which the playwright has resorted in order to politically resist, rework and destabilise Prospero’s and the coloniser’s world, confidence and certitude.

H- Caliban Salvages His History and Identity:

Césaire’s choice to relocate his adaptation’s setting in the Caribbean, Martinique likely, away from the geographical imprecision of the source which might suggest an ‘empty’ space and a ‘virgin’ territory devoid of history and identity, is one of the strategies deployed to assert that Caliban possesses both a history and an identity before the dawn of the colonial enterprise. Shakespeare’s hero has relied on a defamatory language whenever he spoke of Sycorax, Caliban’s mother, as part of his colonial schemes to reduce the native’s history into nothingness as he called her, for instance, the “damn’d witch Sycorax/” whose “mischiefs manifold, and sorceries terrible/” have led her to be banished from Algiers.⁸⁶ These serious and ideologically oriented allegations of black magic have never been refuted by Sycorax’s son; this contributes to both veiling Caliban’s history and justifying Prospero’s mission.

Césaire’s Caliban with his self esteem, cultural and racial awareness, in contrast, has been empowered to speak for himself, but most importantly to speak, symbolically, on behalf of his mother, the island’s true owner, when she gets insulted by the coloniser. He is neither ashamed nor intimidated whenever reminded of being Sycorax’s son, despite Prospero’s vilification of her, since he has advocated, she is “my mother, and I won’t deny her!”⁸⁷ Césaire has intended his Caliban, unlike Shakespeare’s, as an active, ready to do whatever it takes, and uncompromising revolutionary agent who would not only be “an engine of history,” but also a man who would endorse his identity and “claim his place in history.”⁸⁸ If Shakespeare’s early modern readers and audience would have laughed at Caliban’s ‘superstition,’ ‘gullibility,’ and ‘monstrosity,’ then, Césaire’s coloured readers and audience

have intentionally been made to see through Caliban the rational, witty and revolutionary “hero who fights back against the enslavement the European coloniser brought upon him.”⁸⁹

As part of suppressing the native’s identity, *The Tempest* has depicted, furthermore, a Caliban who has never ever uttered a single word in another language, but English the fact which stamps him as a product of Prospero who ‘taught’ him to speak. The words of the Cornish proverb asserting that “[t]he tongueless man gets his land took,”⁹⁰ seem to have a certain relevance as they fit Caliban whose land, despite his apparent right of inheritance, has been taken because of his incapacity to speak in his mother tongue. Césaire understood the centrality of the native’s language in the process of fighting for economic, political and cultural liberty; which is why, the first word Caliban uttered is “Uhuru,”⁹¹ a native word meaning ‘freedom’ which is full of Mau Mau defiance and revolutionary purport;⁹² Prospero rebukes Caliban for “[m]umbl[ing] [in his] native language again!”⁹³ The white man voices his anger at this, “I’ve already told you, I don’t like it [your mother tongue].”⁹⁴

In addition to language, Césaire’s Caliban reacts against the name which has been attributed to him by Prospero whose aim through such a machination is to acculturate the native. I have to clarify that Caliban has been, in Césaire’s sense, like any colonised people, the creation of Milan’s duke/the coloniser who has robbed his ‘slave’ of his identity by dubbing him with a strange name that might have a negative purport. The power of naming is not peculiar to the Martinican writer who has a prior knowledge that “personal names are an essential part of a person’s identity and may highlight cultural and ancestral connections”;⁹⁵ as a result, his Caliban rejects his name and argues that it was “the name given [to] me by your hatred, and [that] it’s an insult.”⁹⁶ He demands instead, “[c]all me X. That would be best [...] Every time you summon me it reminds me of a basic fact, the fact that you’ve stolen everything from me, even my identity!”⁹⁷ This approach of cultural rebellion is one of Caliban’s “self-identifying moves”⁹⁸ that has been intended “to bridge the African experience of pre-independence movements with the American Civil Rights Movement” by conjuring the

needed ancestral origins particularly “the Afro-American practice of identifying oneself as “X,” after the Black Panthers, Malcolm X, and the 1960s U.S. Black Muslim movement.”⁹⁹

Césaire has monitored his metatextually corrosive agenda against the source by delving into the roots to bring forth Caliban’s pre-colonial African cultural origins connected with religious and spiritual identity. Reference has to be made, in this context, to local “Nigerian” deities/gods precisely Eshu, the trickster god, and Shango a “god of lightning.”¹⁰⁰ The addition of this form of spirituality brings into the surface a collective African “cultural memory” which arguably “connects” Caliban, Eshu, Shango and the coloured reader/viewer of Césaire’s play “to a long line of freedom fighters”¹⁰¹ who have, for centuries, struggled against colonialism. It even signals the native’s identity re-appropriation since, such cultural entities, stand as a symbol of what life looked like for Caliban’s ancestors before the arrival of Prospero who, like any coloniser, has suppressed these elements from the identity of the natives. Césaire seems to suggest through the use of these African-originated, metatextual and cultural references that the “Caribbean colonial subjects can best fortify their revolt by reviving, wherever possible, cultural forms dating back to before that wracking sea-change”¹⁰² and the coming of the invaders.

I- Refuting Rape and Sexual Harassment Accusations:

There is a key incident reported in *The Tempest*, from Prospero’s standpoint, which is the native’s outrageous attempt at sexually molesting and raping Miranda. Caliban has endorsed the reported events with all its aggressivity and hailed it as an attempt to people the island “with Calibans.”¹⁰³ Césaire has reworked this incident, in a metatextual fashion, when he made his native respond to, and comment on Prospero’s allegations of sexually harassing his daughter by saying “[r]ape! Listen, you old goat, you’re the one that put those dirty thoughts in my head. Let me tell you something: I couldn’t care less about your daughter.”¹⁰⁴ Now, if one of Ngũgĩ’s Calibans, lieutenant Koina, has perpetrated rape on Dr. Lynd, the white woman and the Miranda-like figure, in *A Grain of Wheat*, as “an act of

insurrection,”¹⁰⁵ then Césaire’s Caliban, in another context, has refuted, almost four centuries after the bard’s play, this central argument, rape, to vindicate the native and thwart the much desired pretext the coloniser/Shakespeare’s hero brandished to ill-treat, enslave and subjugate the colonised.

J- Disillusionment: From a Utopian to a Dystopian Vision of the Island:

The term ‘utopia’ has been used in the sense of “‘nowhere’”¹⁰⁶ and if we take the word as a signifier of the “‘unrealistic,’ ‘fanciful’ or ‘illusory,’”¹⁰⁷ then, there is a great portion of truth in calling *The Tempest* Shakespeare’s “seventeenth-century humanist utopia.”¹⁰⁸ The first thing to refer to is the location of the island, upon which the bard has set his play, that might suggest, with its geographical imprecision, a place located nowhere. This is the perfect arena, with its ‘enchanted’ and ‘strange’ atmosphere, for the enactment of Prospero’s illusions, colonial fantasies and the exhibition of his prowess. In such an environment, he and the other white European characters, with their early modern standards, have not failed to notice “the Edenic qualities of the island and the potential it offers for erecting an alternative Utopian society.”¹⁰⁹ This utopian matrix, with its ideal features and special ecosystem, is full of potential in the eyes of colonisers, who are not only supposed, but also expected to make use of the colony in the best possible ways to amend their entire existence. The greatest winner, in the process that has resulted in Caliban’s island being taken, is Prospero, the coloniser, who has regained his throne in Milan and carved a better rank, with interesting future possibilities, still for long term growth due to the eminent Miranda/Ferdinand marriage.

Such utopian visions, which have fuelled generations of colonisers, have reached the point of extinction with the decolonisation of the 1950s and the 1960s. The island that has once been for Prospero a source of “bountiful Fortune,”¹¹⁰ has been described by Césaire’s Prospero as a “disgusting place”;¹¹¹ the once welcoming colony has become a loathsome area full of danger, guerrilla and brutal schemes against the coloniser. Caliban’s crushed rebellion in the source which has finally resulted in his decision to “be wise hereafter/ [a]nd seek for

grace,”¹¹² has been altered by Césaire into a constant revolutionary spirit under which Caliban prefers to die rather than surrender. He strives to have his island and freedom back in the impossibility of which Caliban would destroy everything so that the coloniser would have nothing. Césaire’s revolutionary, stubborn, uncompromising, grudge-imbued and defiant Caliban sums this approach to Ariel,

Better death than humiliation and injustice. Anyhow, I’m going to have the last word. Unless nothingness has it. The day when I begin to feel that everything’s lost, just let me get hold of a few barrels of your infernal powder and as you fly around up there in your blue skies you’ll see this island, my inheritance, my work, all blown to smithereens...and, I trust, Prospero and me with it. I hope you’ll like the fireworks display –it’ll be signed Caliban.¹¹³

The island has, therefore, become an arena of insubordination, rebellion and unbridled hatred in which the lives of colonial agents like Prospero would on a regular basis be endangered.

The end of *A Tempest*, unlike its source, features a Prospero, much like Ngũgĩ’s Thompson, who has lost, or about to lose, his mental sanity; in a radical dystopian turn, Prospero has started a bottomless “descent into madness” which might be interpreted “as a prophecy” for “those colonial masters who [might] refuse [...] to abandon any of their control”¹¹⁴ over their colonies. The ‘unhealthy’ atmosphere of decolonisation, for the colonisers, with its growing resentment, schemes, guerrilla, and grudge against them, has disturbed Césaire’s Prospero and even the island, with its climate, which has become cold and unwelcoming; Césaire’s white man realises that “it’s cold” and complains that its “[o]dd how the climate’s changed [to become quite] [c]old on this island.”¹¹⁵ This ending might be seen as an “allegorical”¹¹⁶ move via which Césaire has shown the dystopian turn the island and by extension the colony has taken four hundred years from the onset of the colonial enterprise.

3- A Tempest: Excisions, Reductions and Amplifications of the Source:

Through this section, I would highlight the transformation a text like *The Tempest* has undergone in the hands of Aimé Césaire by making use of Genette’s concepts of ‘excision,’ ‘reduction’ and ‘amplification.’ I would check, thus, his aggressive approach through the wide

range of elements existent in the source, which the adaptation has deleted; thereafter, I have to shed light on the aspects that he has developed, yet in a short form, while they have been lengthily discussed by Shakespeare; finally, I would draw the reader's attention towards issues Césaire has extended in relation to *The Tempest*.

A- Significant Excisions at the Level of *A Tempest*:

An excision, in Genette's view, might never be dubbed as such if it does not entail the aggressive process of suppressing aspects the source includes; it consists of removing and deleting from the original; hence, the French thinker qualifies it as an "*amputation*."¹¹⁷ The first excisions in Césaire's text are related to Prospero's character. Shakespeare has portrayed him as a bookworm, to the extent of neglecting his dukedom, a philosopher and a forgiving Christian endowed with an unparalleled 'white' magical prowess. He is, besides, the loving father whose major concern is Miranda's well-being. These are the aspects that Césaire has erased to draw a sombre portrait of Prospero. After being enslaved, as the latter's house servant, Ferdinand has managed to hold a discussion with Miranda, to which Prospero has reacted negatively once he caught them. He has, the textual evidence suggests, verbally abused her by telling her "[t]hat's enough, daughter! I find your chatter irritating [...] let me assure you, it's not at all fitting";¹¹⁸ thus, Césaire has "eliminate[d] the serene, loving side of Prospero."¹¹⁹ Of the outstanding intellectual, hermit, philosopher and gentle Christian, of the original, there remained nothing, but the haughty coloniser whose arrogance spares nobody,¹²⁰ his 'beloved' Miranda included.

Another major excision Césaire has performed might be detected in Caliban's encounter with Stephano and Trinculo. It has been used in Shakespeare's text to put emphasis on the native's 'predisposition' to be enslaved since he claimed his freedom from Prospero, but on the spot accepted to be a slave for his new 'god' and master Stephano. Caliban even offered to "lick thy [Stephano's] shoe/"¹²¹ as a sign of submission to his 'brave' "lord."¹²² These degrading scenes have been elided by Césaire who, by contrast, has depicted an

insubordinate native taking the two drunkards as his “new-found friends”¹²³ whom he enrolls in his ‘army’ to fuel his rebellion against Prospero. Césaire’s has, with this excision, not only restored Caliban’s dignity, but also shown him to be the colonised who knows that Prospero, the tyrant, is better equipped than him; consequently, he “tries to trick Prospero’s own kind”¹²⁴ for help.

The original ends up with the words of Prospero in his famous epilogue where he renounces his unearthly powers; this passage shows and sums up Shakespeare’s literary dexterity and dramatic ingenuity. With *A Tempest*, things are different as Césaire’s Prospero feels the cold weather of the island in the aftermath of which he realises that he is in need to set a fire, but he does not know how to do. He is shown desperately shouting the name of Caliban to entice him to come to attend to his master’s needs. Prospero’s epilogue has been suppressed and the last words of the play have, hence, been uttered by Caliban whose ear shattering, defiant and rebellious song “FREEDOM HI-DAY FREEDOM HI-DAY”¹²⁵ might be heard in the distance. In an interview, Césaire has summed his vision by saying that “Caliban is [...] a rebel—the positive hero, in a Hegelian sense. The slave is always more important than his master—for it is the slave who makes history.”¹²⁶

B- *A Tempest*: Necessary Reductions:

To speak of a reduction, there has to be a shortening of ideas or elements which have been lengthily developed in the source; it means rendering issues or aspects briefer than the way they have been discussed in the original. In Genette’s view, nobody has the power to perform a reduction “without diminishing [a work] or, more precisely, without subtracting from it some part or parts.”¹²⁷ The first aspect Césaire has shortened is the plot of the source. The events of Shakespeare’s play have been interwoven around five acts; on the other hand, this structure has been reduced, in *A tempest*, into compact three acts only; this refashioning, in a new light, of the plot “from five acts into three [has] considerably altered [the events] to turn the play into an indictment of”¹²⁸ colonialism.

Another reduction to be pinpointed consists of Miranda's appeal to her 'powerful' father to save the sinking ship and its mariners caught in the storm at the beginning of the play. In Shakespeare's text, she expressed her distress in a long passage saying to Prospero the following,

If by your art, my dearest father, you have
Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.
The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
Dashes the fire out. O! I have suffered
With those that I saw suffer: a brave vessel,
Who had, no doubt, some noble creatures in her,
Dash'd all to pieces. O! the cry did knock
Against my very heart. Poor souls, they perish'd.
Had I been any god of power, I would
Have sunk the sea within the earth, or e'er
It should the good ship so have swallow'd and
The fraughting souls within her.¹²⁹

This appeal has been intended to show the huge power Miranda's father possesses since her above speech "nearly equates Prospero as the "heavenly power"" suggesting things "only a deity can do."¹³⁰ To serve a different corrosive approach towards *The Tempest*, Césaire has reduced the above plea Miranda has issued into one short sentence in which she calls for assistance "[o]h God! Oh God! A sinking ship! Father, help!" This diminishing of the full scene is a strategy meant to undermine and belittle Prospero's alleged powers.

Other reductions include the one touching the conspiracy that stripped Prospero of his power and the second is related to the roles of Miranda and Ferdinand. The source text, to begin with, has been, based on the struggle between the rightful duke of Milan and his brother, the usurper Antonio, helped by King Alonso of Naples. This struggle for power has been the driving force of the play. Césaire's adaptation in a total turnaround has diminished this aspect keeping the conspiracy of Antonio and Alonso; Prospero informs his daughter in one sentence "[h]ow their [Antonio and Alonso] ambitions were joined [...] the devil alone knows how all that came about."¹³¹ Very quickly Césaire skips this power struggle, which is not of interest to Césaire's audience, by assimilating Prospero, somehow, into Christopher

Columbus, “demoted as viceroy of the Indies by the Spanish sovereigns and accused of heresy and magical practices by the Inquisition.”¹³² One might, furthermore, refer to the roles of Ferdinand and Miranda which have been pivotal in the source while Césaire’s reworking has diminished them; their roles have been “whittled down to a minimum.”¹³³

C- Strategic Amplifications in Césaire’s Adaptation:

Gérard Genette asserts that amplification “is one of the “paths of creation”,”¹³⁴ in which the adaptation would entail extensions of issues, elements and ideas in relation to its source. The central conflict in Césaire’s play, unlike Shakespeare’s, is the struggle between Prospero and Caliban; this coloniser/colonised duality has been amplified to hold a tight grip on the, intended audience, coloured people. Césaire’s Prospero makes it clear that he is not concerned, anymore, with Antonio’s and Alonso’s treachery, so he tells Ariel to scare them but never ever hurt them because “Caliban is the [true] enemy.”¹³⁵ “The conflicts between the whites are given cursory treatment,” one might argue “for they are of merely superficial interest as compared with the primary struggle between the colonisers and the colonised.”¹³⁶ The playwright has fashioned his work as an allegory to the colonial dilemma in which Prospero, the coloniser/master, stands for the irrational despot seeking to subdue through Caliban all the colonised peoples. Accordingly, Césaire has extended the “play’s colonial dimensions [which] are writ large”¹³⁷ to suit the context of the 1960s.

A Tempest has multiplied, in addition, Caliban’s rebellious tendency and Ariel’s aspiration for freedom. The playwright has made of the son of Sycorax one of the anti-colonial revolutionaries of the 1950s and 1960s. Every single time he encounters Prospero, Caliban would assert his identity together with his desire for freedom while making sure to pour his long held grudge and wrath upon him. In one scene, for instance, Césaire’s Prospero has invited the native to “make peace”¹³⁸ to which the uncompromising revolutionary responded “[y]ou know very well that I’m not interested in peace. I’m interested in being

free! Free, you hear?”¹³⁹ The coloniser/colonised encounters have been turned into sites of daily struggle in which the native has brandished his rebellious spirit, dismantled Prospero’s colonial discourse and evinced self assertion. There is one scene, of particular interest, in which Caliban addresses him as such,

Understand what I say, Prospero:
For years I bowed my head
for years I took it, all of it—
your insults, your ingratitude...
and worst of all, more degrading than all the rest,
your condescension.
But now, it’s over! [...]
you’re an old hand at deception.
And you lied to me so much,
about the world, about myself,
that you ended up by imposing on me
an image of myself:
underdeveloped, in your words, undercompetent
that’s how you made me see myself!
And I hate that image...and it’s false!¹⁴⁰

Ariel has been, on the other hand, quite submissive in the source; there is only one situation in which the spirit has demanded his “liberty”¹⁴¹ as a reward for all his services performed for Prospero’s account. Césaire’s Ariel is quite different since he is a mulatto who criticises and although he attends to his master’s needs, he seems to do it with a dubious reluctance. After the shipwreck, he has orchestrated, Ariel has been afflicted by the cruelty of Prospero under whose orders he has acted. The mulatto, thereafter, has asked his master “to spare [him] this kind of labour,”¹⁴² in the future, which he finds inhuman and despicable. Prospero reminded him, just as in the original, of how he managed to break Sycorax’s spell to wrench him out of the tree in which he has been imprisoned. Césaire’s Ariel, is not the kind of Ariels who would be impressed or intimidated by such an argument which is why he retorts, “[s]ometimes I almost regret it... After all, I might have turned into a real tree in the end.”¹⁴³ This highlights how Ariel has, for years, been exploited on the basis of the tree episode to the extent of finding the imprisonment much more merciful than being the acquiescent slave who is easily spurred into action by a past favour. All in all, Caliban’s rebellious spirit together with Ariel’s

single protest against the white man and his slight desire for freedom in Shakespeare's text, have been amplified by Césaire as a strategy of disrupting the colonial narrative.

4- Residual, Dominant and Emergent Ideological and Cultural Elements:

There is a pressing need to conduct an analysis, through this section, of the ideological and cultural aspects which have been involved in the shaping of Césaire's adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The three concepts, 'residual,' 'dominant' and 'emergent,' as coined by Raymond Williams, would be deployed in an attempt to understand the environment that has brought about *A Tempest*. The key issues of this section would be related to the exploration, with textual evidence, of the precise historical moment of Césaire's text taking into consideration the myriad dynamics in action, ideological and cultural, leading to the adaptation as we know it today.

A- The Residual in *A Tempest*:

The "residual" has been delineated by Williams as those "experiences, meanings and values, [...] lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation."¹⁴⁴ It signifies all those ideas, values, and practices which are still active, in a given society during a specific historical period, not as the dominant but as a remnant from another era. The first residual aspect that might be detected in *A Tempest* is slavery and the slave/master relationship which have been ideological formations belonging to a past historical era, but which have resurged through the coloniser/colonised ties between Prospero/master and Ariel/Caliban/slaves. Césaire's Ariel has dared to visit Caliban to have a discussion with him in which the spirit has summed their situation with these words, "[g]reetings, Caliban. I know you don't think much of me, but after all we are brothers, brothers in suffering and slavery."¹⁴⁵ With the context of worldwide struggle against colonialism, during the second half of the 1940s up to the end of the 1960s, slavery and the slave/master dialectic still emerge, albeit in a different form, through the coloniser (master)

who exploits the colonised (slave) in a ‘modern’ form of servitude—in factories, foundries, mills, and farms— which are all made productive through one source of cheap labour force, the colonised peoples (Ariels and Calibans). Césaire has assured that *A Tempest* is “essentially about the master–slave relation, a relation that is still alive and which, in my opinion, explains a good deal of contemporary history: in particular colonial history.”¹⁴⁶

The second residual element in Césaire’s play consists of the African cultural heritage which has been revived to claim Caliban’s cultural independence from the coloniser. In terms of religion, the “[c]olonizers [have always] dismissed traditional forms of spirituality as magic, superstition, primitive, or mere animism”;¹⁴⁷ to counter this line of thought, the reference to Eshu and Shango, traditional Nigerian deities, has been deployed as an integral part of the revival of Caliban’s deep African cultural roots. In addition, although Césaire’s Caliban, just like Shakespeare’s, has used the language of the coloniser as a means of expression and struggle, he has relied on his mother tongue, the Swahili, to voice his desire for freedom through the use of the word “Uhuru.”¹⁴⁸ The appeal to the native’s African background, concerning language and religion, is crucial since “[e]ven if Césaire’s Caliban cannot throw off European influences entirely, his recuperation of a residual past is sufficient to secure his relative cultural autonomy.”¹⁴⁹

B- Dominant Ideological and Cultural Elements:

The majority of colonies, from the 1950s till the late 1970s, have witnessed a skyrocketing rise, into dominance, of the revolutionary spirit characterised by an unbounded optimism which triggered and sustained the process of decolonisation. The three decades, above mentioned, might be remembered for their, par excellence, dominated revolutionary optimistic environment. The global scale this atmosphere has taken might be embodied through the Algerian Revolution, anti-colonialism, the Civil Rights movement, the anti-Vietnam War protests, women’s emancipation and the counter culture movement with the

Angry Young Men and the Hippie movement in Great Britain and the United States respectively. Césaire's *A Tempest* has, therefore, been imbedded in this context making it one of the "anti-colonial *Tempests* of the 1960s and 1970s engaged with the material forces of capitalism and [...] imbued with revolutionary optimism."¹⁵⁰

The textual evidence in Césaire's play pointing at this direction is, the least to say, compelling. Caliban is aware of his position as a rebel whose confident, unwavering and optimistic perception of his revolution made him claim, "I'm going to have the last word"¹⁵¹ over not only Prospero but also all the white colonisers by extension. The native is aware of his condition as being outnumbered, less armed, and technologically not up to the coloniser's development, yet he defiantly and self assuredly asserts,

Of course, at the moment
You're still stronger than I am.
But I don't give a damn for your power
or for your dogs or your police or your inventions!
And do you know why?
It's because I know I'll get you.
I'll impale you! And on a stake that you've sharpened
yourself!
You'll have impaled yourself!¹⁵²

These confident and optimism imbued words show the revolutionary agenda the native has reserved to the invaders all over the colonies during the decolonisation era. Caliban has even rejected, in another passage, Prospero's proposal to make peace saying "I'm not interested in peace. I'm interested in being free! Free, you hear?"¹⁵³ *A Tempest* with its "explosive symbolism and revolutionary rhetoric"¹⁵⁴ is steeped, in brief, in its historical and cultural milieu which has been dominated by an optimistic revolutionary drive which believed in the inevitable defeat of Prospero, the coloniser.

C- Césaire's *A Tempest*: An Emergent Debate and Neocolonialism:

There are two emergent elements which might be brought into the surface in *A Tempest*. The first one is the public debate at the heart of the coloured community, in some colonies and the United States, related to the suitable reaction to adopt against the white man.

The second consists of the newly born neocolonialist tendency the traditional colonial forces have shown once their overseas territories lost. The 1960s have witnessed major upheavals as this decade has been tumultuous all over the world, but more specifically in the United States. This era has been marked with the Civil Rights and the Black Power movements whose militants have been divided into the supporter of peaceful and non-violent methods of struggle, epitomised through Martin Luther King Jr., and the advocates of violence and other disruptive strategies, embodied via the Black Panthers like Malcolm X, as 'legitimate' means to deal with the injustices¹⁵⁵ the blacks have been compelled to endure.

This debate has been reanimated by Césaire through, on the one hand, Ariel who has been cast as Martin Luther King through his non-violent approach and Caliban, on the other hand, who has been modelled, in a way, as Malcolm X in relation to the militant side of the fight for the coloured people's rights.¹⁵⁶ Ariel has fostered, much like King, a non-violent vision voiced through his statement, "I don't believe in violence";¹⁵⁷ his efforts for freedom, instead, have encompassed not only Caliban, but also a project to reform his 'master.' Ariel has expressed these ideas when he sates "I'm not fighting just for *my* freedom, for *our* freedom, but for Prospero too, so that Prospero can acquire a conscience."¹⁵⁸ There is a significant passage, in which Ariel tells Caliban the following,

I don't know what to do with you [Caliban]. I've often had this inspiring, uplifting dream that one day Prospero, you me, we would all three set out, like brothers, to build a wonderful world, each one contributing his own special thing: patience, vitality, love, will-power too, and rigor, not to mention the dreams without which mankind would perish.¹⁵⁹

These words would have a great resonance in the ears of the coloured people in the United States, by then, since Ariel's words sound like those uttered by Martin Luther King, seven years earlier, in his 1963 famous speech during the March on Washington. King has voiced, in the exert underneath, his peaceful and almost utopian vision when he addressed the black community with these words,

I have a dream that one day [...] the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood [...] I have a

dream today [that] we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together [...] to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.¹⁶⁰

Ariel's peaceful stance and his above words, in *A Tempest*, have been, it seems, inspired by King's speech and his non-violent views of black people's struggle. Caliban, in a radically different position, has been situated in the other end of the pole with his revolutionary ideas when he has demanded from Prospero, "Call me X."¹⁶¹ His rejection of his 'colonial' name while claiming a new identity through the name "X" might be interpreted as a gesture associating him with Malcolm X. Caliban has even assured his mulatto friend that submission and peace are "not Caliban's way";¹⁶² his resistance, rebellious spirit, defiant use of language and, finally, the plot he has devised against Prospero —have all integrated Césaire's Caliban into the revolutionary spirit and traits Malcolm X stood for. It might be argued, in brief, that "Caliban [is deployed to] represent Malcolm X, separatism, violence against the oppressor, while Ariel would personify the paradigm of Martin Luther King Jr., that is to say that of [...] moderation,[and] nonviolence."¹⁶³

In addition, neocolonialism is another emergent issue which Césaire text has subtly addressed. Gonzalo's portrait, in *The Tempest*, of the kind of utopia he envisions on the island has been altered to suit Césaire's temporal and spatial environment. His Gonzalo has shown his intention, much like Prospero, to possess this 'virgin' territory the inhabitants of which he has described as noble savages, yet he argues that Europeans "have to take every precaution not to import [their] shortcomings," [meaning their] "civilization."¹⁶⁴ The natives, Gonzalo asserts, "must stay as they are: savages, noble and good savages, free, without any complexes or complications."¹⁶⁵ Such passages entail an emergent neocolonial vision towards Caliban's island which must be kept, to use Gonzalo's words, as a "pool granting eternal youth where we [Europeans] periodically come to restore our aging, citified souls."¹⁶⁶ The island Caliban has fought for would, therefore, become a neocolonial touristic paradise where the Europeans would go regularly to look for rest and inspiration; this is "a neo-colonial form

of tourism”¹⁶⁷ and “in terms of contemporary Martinican reality [the island would remain] a prototype for the Club Méditerranée (idyllic but rigidly set apart from “native” life).”¹⁶⁸

Conclusion:

This chapter has, in fact, been centred on the study of *A Tempest* as an adaptation, which has aggressively ‘occupied’ and reworked its source, *The Tempest*. The first aspect brought into light is the importance of the Caribbean context and the 1960s background which have been invaluable to Césaire’s play. Afterwards, I have explored the latter as a metatext with disruptive features through which it has commented on elements of its original at various levels through the use of metatheatre. My concern has continued, on a similar thread, with having a glance at Césaire’s text as a work which has metatextually treated and criticised its source by shifting the perspective and setting to suit the playwright’s intentions. Prospero, the coloniser, has been corrosively refashioned into a quite disillusioned tyrant whose pedagogy, benevolence, colonialism, Christian values and civilising mission have been attacked. The metatextual rewriting Césaire has adopted gave Caliban a key role by restoring his history, identity, self esteem and also vindicating him from Prospero’s discourse stamping him as a rapist. The third section, which is linked to Genette’s concepts, has allowed me to dissect the alteration Césaire has performed including omitting, shortening and multiplying elements from Shakespeare’s work. The concepts of Williams, in the last position, have enlightened the ideological and cultural environment of *A Tempest*, as a text, which has been shaped under the influence of slavery, Caliban’s African cultural roots, his revolutionary optimism, the relevant debate on whether to opt for non-violent or violent methods of struggle and the neocolonial tendency to keep the island for the Europeans as a touristic outlet.

Endnotes:

¹. Aimé Césaire, Cited in Belhassen S, Cited in Pier Paolo Frassinelli, “Shakespeare and Transculturation: Aimé Césaire’s *A Tempest*,” in Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 175.

². Ibid.

- ³. Thomas A. Hale, "Aimé Césaire: A Bio-Bibliographical Note," in Callaloo, Vol 01: N° 17, 1983, P.p. 134, The John Hopkins University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3044019>, Accessed on 12/12/2016.
- ⁴. Ibid.
- ⁵. Gregson Davis, *Aimé Césaire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 09.
- ⁶. Herbert S. Klein, *African Slavery in Latin America and the Caribbean*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 51-53.
- ⁷. Ibid., p. 51.
- ⁸. Nick Nesbitt, "On the Political Efficacy of Idealism: Tocqueville, Schoelcher and the Abolition of Slavery," in Aurelian Craiutu and Jeffrey C. Isaac, eds., *America Through European Eyes: British and French Reflections on the New World from Eighteenth Century to Present*, (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), p. 104-106, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=RgjSY1DouwUC&pg=PA104&dq=France+Victor+Schoelcher+his+first+trip+to+america&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjNvc76oIX7AhUR_rsIHxjGAKYQ6AF6BAgKEAI#v=onepage&q=France%20Victor%20Schoelcher%20his%20first%20trip%20to%20america&f=false, Accessed on 15/12/2016.
- ⁹. Raymond F. Betts, *Decolonization*, (New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 111.
- ¹⁰. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 04.
- ¹¹. Ibid.
- ¹². Aimé Césaire, Cited in Pier Paolo Frassinelli, "Shakespeare and Transculturation: Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest*," in Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 174.
- ¹³. The relationship of Césaire's usage of metatheatricality to counter a source text like *The Tempest* is shown by Angela Eward-Mangione, *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Tree Adaptations of Tree Plays by William Shakespeare*, (2014); she has linked it to parody while I would link it to metatextuality.
- ¹⁴. Niall W. Slater, *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*, (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 2000), p. 183.
- ¹⁵. Angela Eward-Mangione, *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Tree Adaptations of Tree Plays by William Shakespeare*, (Florida: University of South Florida, 2014), p. 65.
- ¹⁶. Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 97.
- ¹⁷. Ibid., p. 98.
- ¹⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 01.
- ¹⁹. Ibid.
- ²⁰. Ibid.
- ²¹. Ibid.
- ²². Angela Eward-Mangione, *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Tree Adaptations of Tree Plays by William Shakespeare*, (Florida: University of South Florida, 2014), Pp. 72-73.
- ²³. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 06.
- ²⁴. Angela Eward-Mangione, *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Tree Adaptations of Tree Plays by William Shakespeare*, (Florida: University of South Florida, 2014), p. 66.
- ²⁵. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 08.
- ²⁶. Ibid.
- ²⁷. Mark Fortier, *Theory/Theatre: An Introduction*, (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 135.
- ²⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. Cover Page.
- ²⁹. Denise Ganderton, "Une Tempête: Play by Aimé Césaire" in Verity Smith, ed., *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 506.
- ³⁰. Russell West-Pavlov, *Transcultural Graffiti: Diasporic Writing and the Teaching of Literary Studies*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), p. 91.
- ³¹. Margaret A. Majumdar, *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), p. 69.
- ³². Ibid., p. 70.
- ³³. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 39.
- ³⁴. Laurence M. Porter, "Aimé Césaire's Reworking of Shakespeare: Anticolonialist Discourse in 'Une Tempête'," in *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol 32: N° 03, 1995, p. 370, Penn State University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247009>, Accessed on 15/11/2020.
- ³⁵. Ibid.
- ³⁶. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 40.
- ³⁷. Ibid.
- ³⁸. Ibid.

- ³⁹. Laurence M. Porter, "Aimé Césaire's Reworking of Shakespeare: Anticolonialist Discourse in *Une Tempête*," in *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol 32: N° 03, 1995, p. 366, Penn State University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247009>, Accessed on 15/11/2020.
- ⁴⁰. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 41.
- ⁴¹. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
- ⁴². *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁴³. Laurence M. Porter, "Aimé Césaire's Reworking of Shakespeare: Anticolonialist Discourse in *Une Tempête*," in *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol 32: N° 03, 1995, Pp. 361-362, Penn State University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247009>, Accessed on 15/11/2020.
- ⁴⁴. Roshni Mooneeram, *From Creole to Standard Shakespeare, Language, and Literature in a Postcolonial Context*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009), p. 143.
- ⁴⁵. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ⁴⁶. *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷. Christa Knellwolf King, "Une Tempête, Aimé Césaire's Subversion of the Imperial Scripts of Shakespeare's *Tempest*," in Werner Huber, et al., eds., *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 141.
- ⁴⁸. *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 07.
- ⁵⁰. Christa Knellwolf King, "Une Tempête, Aimé Césaire's Subversion of the Imperial Scripts of Shakespeare's *Tempest*," in Werner Huber, et al., eds., *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 140.
- ⁵¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), Pp. 11-12.
- ⁵². José Antonio Giménez Micó, "Occupying the Isle; or, Which Monster—and Which Island—Are We Talking About?," in *Hispanic Issues Online*, Vol 15: N° 1, 2014, p. 81.
- ⁵³. Chima J. Korieh "Conflict and Compromise: Christian Missions and New Formations in Colonial Nigeria," in Chima J. Korieh and Raphael Chijioke Njoku, eds., *Missions, States, and European Expansion in Africa*, (New York: Routledge, 2007), p. 154.
- ⁵⁴. John D. Cox, "Recovering Something Christian about *The Tempest*," in *Christianity and literature*, Vol 50: N° 01, 2000, p. 36.
- ⁵⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ⁵⁶. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 22.
- ⁵⁷. Aimé Césaire, Cited in Belhassen S, Cited in Pier Paolo Frassinelli, "Shakespeare and Transculturation: Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest*," in Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 175.
- ⁵⁸. Alden T. Vaughan, "Introduction," in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 06.
- ⁵⁹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 16.
- ⁶⁰. Russell West-Pavlov, *Transcultural Graffiti: Diasporic Writing and the Teaching of Literary Studies*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), p. 89.
- ⁶¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 01.
- ⁶². *Ibid.*
- ⁶³. Russell West-Pavlov, *Transcultural Graffiti: Diasporic Writing and the Teaching of Literary Studies*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), p. 92.
- ⁶⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ⁶⁵. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Cited in Jean-Jacques Hamm, "Caliban, Friday and their Masters," in Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*, (London: MacMillan, 1996), p. 118.
- ⁶⁶. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- ⁶⁷. Christa Knellwolf King, "Une Tempête, Aimé Césaire's Subversion of the Imperial Scripts of Shakespeare's *Tempest*," in Werner Huber, et al., eds., *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 141.
- ⁶⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 28.
- ⁶⁹. *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁰. *Ibid.*
- ⁷¹. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ⁷². Judith Holland Sarnecki, "Mastering the Masters: Aimé Césaire's Creolization of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*," in *The French Review*, Vol 74: N° 02, 2000, p. 280, American Association of Teachers of French, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/398722>, Accessed on 25/11/2020.
- ⁷³. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 68.

- ⁷⁴. Denise Ganderton, “Une Tempête: Play by Aimé Césaire” in Verity Smith, ed., *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*, (London: Routledge, 1997), Pp. 506-507.
- ⁷⁵. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 68.
- ⁷⁶. Lytton Strachey, Cited in James S. Shapiro, *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?*, (London: Faber and Faber, 2010), p. 134.
- ⁷⁷. Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 29.
- ⁷⁸. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 22.
- ⁷⁹. Ibid., p. 23.
- ⁸⁰. Ibid., p. 87.
- ⁸¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 11.
- ⁸². Ibid.
- ⁸³. Ibid., p. 13.
- ⁸⁴. Ibid., p. 14.
- ⁸⁵. Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 92.
- ⁸⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 19.
- ⁸⁷. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 12.
- ⁸⁸. Marta Pacheco Pinto, “Postcolonial Language: Rejection and Subversion,” in Babilónia, Vol 09: N° 08, 2010, p. 76.
- ⁸⁹. Ibid.
- ⁹⁰. A Cornish Proverb, Cited in J. Edward Chamberlin, “From Hand to Mouth: The Postcolonial Politics of Oral and Written Traditions,” in Marie Battiste, ed., *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*, ed., (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000), p. 130.
- ⁹¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 11.
- ⁹². Janis Pallister, Cited in Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 113.
- ⁹³. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 11.
- ⁹⁴. Ibid.
- ⁹⁵. Susanne Mühleisen, “Forms of address in English-lexicon Creoles: The presentation of selves and others in the Caribbean context,” in Susanne Mühleisen and Bettina Migge, eds., *Politeness and Face in Caribbean Creoles*, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005), p. 198.
- ⁹⁶. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 15.
- ⁹⁷. Ibid.
- ⁹⁸. Jonathan Goldberg, *Tempest in the Caribbean*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), p. 93.
- ⁹⁹. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 47.
- ¹⁰⁰. Ibid., p. 52.
- ¹⁰¹. Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 113.
- ¹⁰². Rob Nixon, “Caribbean and African Appropriations of “*The Tempest*,”” in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, p. 572, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>, Accessed on 05/12/2020.
- ¹⁰³. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ¹⁰⁴. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 13.
- ¹⁰⁵. Peter Nazareth on Eldridge Cleaver, Cited in Judith Anne Pocock, *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), p. 178.
- ¹⁰⁶. Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick, *Cultural Theory: The Key Thinkers*, 2nd ed., (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 372.
- ¹⁰⁷. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁸. Eglantina Rempert, “Marxist Utopianism and Modern Irish Drama, 1884–1904: William Morris, W. B. Yeats,” in Zsolt CZigányik, ed., *Utopian Horizons: Ideology, Politics, Literature*, (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2017), p. 132.
- ¹⁰⁹. Richard H. Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 34.
- ¹¹⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 15.
- ¹¹¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 09.
- ¹¹². William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 105.
- ¹¹³. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 23.
- ¹¹⁴. Christa Knellwolf King, “*Une Tempête*, Aimé Césaire’s Subversion of the Imperial Scripts of Shakespeare’s *Tempest*,” in Werner Huber, et al., eds., *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 142.
- ¹¹⁵. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 68.

- ¹¹⁶. Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 183.
- ¹¹⁷. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
- ¹¹⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 18.
- ¹¹⁹. Laurence M. Porter, “Aimé Césaire’s Reworking of Shakespeare: Anticolonialist Discourse in “*Une Tempête*,”” in *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol 32: N° 03, 1995, p. 364, Penn State University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247009>, Accessed on 07/12/2020.
- ¹²⁰. Christa Knellwolf King, “*Une Tempête*, Aimé Césaire’s Subversion of the Imperial Scripts of Shakespeare’s *Tempest*,” in Werner Huber, et al., eds., *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015), p. 140.
- ¹²¹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 65.
- ¹²². *Ibid.*
- ¹²³. *Ibid.*, p 43.
- ¹²⁴. Marta Pacheco Pinto, “Postcolonial language: Rejection and Subversion,” in *Babilônia*, Vol 09: N° 08, 2010, p 75.
- ¹²⁵. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 68.
- ¹²⁶. Aimé Césaire, Cited in Belhassen S, Cited in Pier Paolo Frassinelli, “Shakespeare and Transculturation: Aimé Césaire’s *A Tempest*,” in Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 181.
- ¹²⁷. *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁸. Denise Ganderton, “*Une Tempête*: Play by Aimé Césaire” in Verity Smith, ed., *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 506.
- ¹²⁹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 07.
- ¹³⁰. Kristen Poole, *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare’s England: Spaces of Demonism, Divinity, and Drama*, (Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 206-207.
- ¹³¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 07.
- ¹³². Denise Ganderton, “*Une Tempête*: Play by Aimé Césaire” in Verity Smith, ed., *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 506.
- ¹³³. Rob Nixon, “*Caribbean and African Appropriations of “The Tempest”*,” in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, p. 571, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>, Accessed on 10/12/2020.
- ¹³⁴. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 276.
- ¹³⁵. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 15.
- ¹³⁶. Margaret A. Majumdar, *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), p. 70.
- ¹³⁷. Rob Nixon, “*Caribbean and African Appropriations of “The Tempest”*,” in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, p. 571, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>, Accessed on 10/12/2020.
- ¹³⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 63.
- ¹³⁹. *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁰. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- ¹⁴¹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 18.
- ¹⁴². *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁴³. *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁴. Raymond Williams, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ¹⁴⁵. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 20.
- ¹⁴⁶. Aimé Césaire, Cited in Eric Livingston, Cited in Pier Paolo Frassinelli, “Shakespeare and Transculturation: Aimé Césaire’s *A Tempest*,” in Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia, eds., *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*, (Aldershot: Ashgate: 2008), p. 176.
- ¹⁴⁷. Alvin Dueck and Michael Marossy, “Prolegomena for the Development of Indigenous Psychologies of Spirituality: Colonization, Decolonization, and Indigeneity,” in Alvin Dueck, ed., *Indigenous Psychology of Spirituality in my Beginning is my End*, (Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, 2021), p 31.
- ¹⁴⁸. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 11.
- ¹⁴⁹. Rob Nixon, “From ‘Caribbean and African Appropriations of *The Tempest*,’” in Peter Childs, ed., *Post-Colonial Theory and English Literature: A Reader*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 69.
- ¹⁵⁰. Helen C. Scott, *Shakespeare’s Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*, (London: Routledge, 2020), p. 140.
- ¹⁵¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 23.
- ¹⁵². *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- ¹⁵³. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- ¹⁵⁴. Sam Vásquez, *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 92.
- ¹⁵⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

-
- ¹⁵⁶. Ibid., p. 96.
- ¹⁵⁷. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 22.
- ¹⁵⁸. Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁹. Ibid., pp. 22-23.
- ¹⁶⁰. Donald W. Whisenhunt, *Reading the Twentieth Century: Documents in American History*, (Lanham: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, 2009), pp. 205-206.
- ¹⁶¹. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 15.
- ¹⁶². Ibid., p. 22.
- ¹⁶³. José Antonio Giménez Micó, “Occupying the Isle; or, Which Monster—and Which Island—Are We Talking About?,” in *Hispanic Issues Online*, Vol 15: N° 1, 2014, p. 92.
- ¹⁶⁴. Aimé Césaire, *A Tempest*, trans., Richard Miller, (New York: Seuil, 1985), p. 25.
- ¹⁶⁵. Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁶. Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁷. Frank W. Brevik, *The Tempest and New World-Utopian Politics*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 75.
- ¹⁶⁸. James A. Arnold, “Césaire and Shakespeare: Two Tempests,” in *Comparative Literature*, Vol 30: N° 03, 1978, p. 240, Duke University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1770825>, Accessed on 25/12/2020.

Chapter Four:
**Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985): A Subtle, but
Forceful Feminist Takeover of
Shakespeare's *The Tempest* Ingrained in Its
Historical and Cultural Milieu**

Introduction

In *Annie John* [...] Jamaica Kincaid intertwines discussions of gender relations with colonial and postcolonial rebellion.¹

Jamaica Kincaid's [*Annie John* is] even [a] more aggressive repositioning of *The Tempest*.²

Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985) is a text that, if taken ostensibly, would have little bearings to one of the most cited, adapted, reworked and appropriated texts like Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The story of an Antiguan young girl coming-of-age whose development and growth from childhood to adulthood, both mentally and physically, has been charted, from ten to seventeen years old, would not have any seeming resonance, whatsoever, with the English bard's last play. Yet, a well-targeted reading of Kincaid's novel, this chapter proposes, would shed light on the wide range of ways in which the Antiguan-originated author has revised, revisited and adapted Shakespeare's text.

The above second statement, Thomas Cartelli (1999) has made, might give us a faint view of the potential link which might bind *Annie John*, as an adaptation, to its original *The Tempest*. It is this connection that this chapter seeks to investigate, in four sections, with the assumption that the Antiguan novelist has reworked and adapted the latter to suit a different environment both temporally and spatially. The opening of this chapter is a relevant glance at Kincaid's background and the novel's context without which, I believe, any possibility of objective interpretation of the text, under study, would vanish. The second and third sections would be centred on Bakhtin's concepts as I read *Annie John* as not only a stylization, in the first position, but also a hidden polemic, in the second, directed at its source. Finally, I would use Williams' notions to consider the ideological and cultural background of Kincaid's novel and society.

1- Jamaica Kincaid and *Annie John*: Life and Environment:

A- The Life of Jamaica Kincaid:

It was on the island of St. John's, in Antigua, the West Indies, that Elaine Potter Richardson was born in (1949). Her early childhood, as the first born, was to a certain extent

smooth, without much complexities, and once her brothers came to life, her mother's, in particular, and the family's attention, in general, was relocated from her, as the centre, towards the other children. She tasted, thus, the bitterness of being a woman in a masculine-centred realm and, like many of her female counterparts, she woke up to the reality of being neglected and marginalised, something which affected, in the up-coming years, her whole life. The kind of education she has had, which was impacted by the colonial system, has been imparted to her in her hometown that was, by then, under the domination of the British Empire. This firsthand experience, of life under colonial supervision, was a harsh background that has had, later on, a lasting effect on many of her writings, among which *Annie John*, where colonialism and its drawbacks featured as central issues. Through Annie, Kincaid rebuffs any kind of colonial education meant to reinforce her "acquiescence to the empire."³ More troublesome and traumatic to the author was her experience with the colonial system as an adolescent when she became aware that Antiguan, in the same way as other colonised people, were treated as second hand citizens who were relegated to serving the British.⁴

In (1966), Elaine Potter Richardson left Antigua at the age of seventeen to settle in New York; it has to be highlighted that her not-yet-born-protagonist, Annie, would reproduce a similar pattern of immigration, at the exact same age, heading to England. The novelist's deep attachment to the family, which was stormed by financial issues, back home, compelled her to prioritise finding a job in the United States. Her literary career commenced, once there, as a magazine writer in the early 1970s with articles written for *Ingenue* and the *New Yorker*.⁵ She changed her name—colonial one— during this period, much like Ngũgĩ, to materialise the spirit of rebellion against British colonialism; therefore, she opted for Jamaica Kincaid to recreate her emancipated identity through which she meant to emphasise her Caribbean origins and ancestry.⁶ Her first novel, *Annie John*, was published in (1985) and one year later, in (1986), she returned to Antigua, which was not under colonial grip since (1981), for a quick visit. Kincaid has, to a certain extent, been disappointed with the post-independence era,

which seemed to hold neither present opportunities for development nor any bright future prospects in store far in the horizon. Her becoming a prolific author was a question of time, in the coming years, as she published a variety of novels with myriad subjects ranging from mother/daughter relationship, the intricate dynamics it entails, colonialism with reference to the colonial era, to neocolonialism in post-independence Antigua.

B- The Background of *Annie John* (1985):

The island of Antigua, whose native inhabitants were Carib Indians, was discovered and came to be known to the Europeans after Christopher Columbus' second voyage to the new world in (1493) in the wake of which the first white and European footsteps landed on the island. Columbus Christianised this new territory by naming it Santa Maria de la Antigua, a saint's name given to a church in Seville, Spain, from where the Italian explorer started his journey.⁷ The island was not, for a variety of reasons, colonised on the spot; it remained, in the European's eyes, for more than a century, after Columbus' initial discovery, free of the white man's presence. It was in (1632) that the first Europeans, English settlers, colonised Antigua and declared it part of the English crown. The first half of the 17th century witnessed the emergence of plantations all over the Caribbean which were devoted to the large scale production and exportation of coffee, tobacco and sugar among many other products; Antigua was, likewise, not an exception since the English colonisers transformed it into a profitable sugar plantation. The pillar upon which this sugar based economy rested was slavery which supplied the plantations with the needed cheap work force from West Africa. The slave population grew at an alarming rate from (1672) to (1774) since more fields were cleared for plantations; accordingly, the slaves surpassed the white planters who in a century became a minority.⁸ This availability of the labour force led to a substantial rise in sugar production which made Antigua one of its major producers, in the Caribbean, while the British planters did not care much about the dire working and living conditions their slaves suffered from, on a daily basis, which increased mortality rates and reduced life expectancy among them.

The growing scale of slavery incrimination, by then, brought about the abolitionist voices to the island in (1834) with slavery officially abolished around that date and former slaves, with an immediate, effect becoming free workers. Although it changed their status, emancipation did not alter the direction of Antigua's coloured people who, in the course of the next century, suffered from the harsh measures and laws the planters passed to maintain them under their tight grip.⁹ This long history of colonialism, racism, oppression and slavery instigated a rigid system of division based on race and skin colour which would even outlive the British Empire. The dominant colonial order incited a stifling atmosphere of racial discrimination between British settlers plus other European planters, on the one hand, and all the other coloured races, whether indigenous to the land, imported slaves/descendants or of another lineage, on the other. Although it became hierarchical, the Antiguan society benefited from this complex cultural variety which might be noticed in the characters of *Annie John* who in many ways mirror and illustrate, through their daily lives, folklore, language, religious practices, customs and other aspects, Antigua's cultural matrix.

Kincaid was born three hundred and twenty years after Antigua's first English permanent settlement in (1632) and more than a century after the abolition of slavery on the island in (1834). Her novel, this thesis is concerned with, is set against the background of the (1960s) and (1970s) during which the British hegemony was a very effective aspect on the island; from civil and military organisation, decision making and school programs to economic policies —all were under the watchful eyes of the colonial administrators and governors. This, together with Antigua's slave past, exercised a substantial influence on the characters, especially the young Annie who, with her rebellious and critical spirit, was unable to stomach a wide range of notions the Eurocentric and colonial-based school introduced to her. She criticised Christopher Columbus, for instance, and was unable to see in him the hero, her teachers described, thanks to whom her island was found. The protagonist saw instead a symbol of colonialism or a coloniser who was relentless and unscrupulous in taking over her

ancestors' land. Kincaid was also aware, at the time of the publication of *Annie John*, of the anti-colonial upheavals that took hold of the world during the (1950s) and (1960s), which she has experienced in Antigua as a teenager whose country was under colonial oppression. She has moreover been under the shade of the countercultural wave of the (1960s) especially the Hippie movement which she has witnessed as a resident in the United States. This aspect might be pinpointed through Annie's antiestablishment viewpoints besides the kind of sexual relationships, homoerotic, some of the characters in *Annie John* have entertained.

2- Kincaid's *Annie John*: A Stylization of *The Tempest*:

This section is meant to look at *Annie John* as a novel through which Kincaid has stylized a few elements from *The Tempest*. Bakhtin's conception of stylization has made it clear that the second author's work, Kincaid's text in this situation, is expected to coexist, somehow, with its source. The Russian theorist confirms that the "author's thought, [which] once having penetrated someone else's discourse ['original' text] and made its home in it, does not collide with the other's thought [the source author]." ¹⁰ My aim would, therefore, be oriented towards the aspects which have been reproduced by the novelist showing cohabitation between her voice and Shakespeare's at various levels.

A- Kincaid's Novel and Shakespeare's Characters:

A- I- Miss Nelson: Kincaid's Female Prospero:

Kincaid's evocation of *The Tempest* suggests an analogy of Annie's situation with a situation between two characters in *The Tempest*, Prospero and Caliban. ¹¹

I would argue at this stage that because of the numerous connections, which might be sorted out between Miss Nelson, the teacher in charge of Annie's class, and Shakespeare's hero, she is a stylized version of Prospero. She is just one among the many English-originated teachers who came to Antigua as part of serving the British imperial designs in the colonies scattered all over the world. The name of Annie's teacher conjures, quite symbolically, a key historical figure in British naval expansion, Admiral Horatio Nelson, who has had a major role in the establishment of Britain's rule over large portions of the Caribbean, Antigua included. ¹² This might establish a link between Miss Nelson and Prospero as colonisers whose

efforts have been centred on taking possession of foreign territories. It has to be stated that being a teacher has fulfilled the needed function of connecting Miss Nelson to the hegemonic British order.¹³ The Europeans, the English people not exempt, might have seen in Prospero the white man's fortitude during overseas colonial ventures. He has assumed, three centuries and a half prior to Miss Nelson, the role of the teacher in the process of 'reforming' and 'enlightening' Caliban; his words to the latter saying, "[I] taught thee each hour/ One thing or other/"¹⁴ might be revealing of this colonial 'teaching,' 'reforming,' and 'civilising' tendency.

The way Miss Nelson, the self-disciplined colonial agent, holds a tight grip over her students, because she is the 'knowledgeable' coloniser, might recall Prospero's absolutist reign over 'his' island and its subjects which has stemmed from his readings and libraries. The two of them, Miss Nelson and Prospero, are "figures of authority"¹⁵ connoting the white man's power through technological development and knowledge of both abstract and practical usages of magic and science. The moment she enters the classroom, all the students are restored back "to order [standing] up stiffly at [their] desks"¹⁶ in what would invoke in the reader's mind a military fashion. The way she has been portrayed in the process of issuing orders telling her students what to do and what not to do has perhaps been reminiscent of Prospero's Eurocentric attitude towards Caliban. There might be a large portion of truth if "Annie and her classmate[s] consider Miss Nelson as Prospero who invades their island to enslave them [while] view[ing] herself and her classmates as Caliban[s]."¹⁷ This suggests, in brief, that Kincaid has stylized Shakespeare's hero, Milan's duke, through Miss Nelson.

A- II- Caliban-like Figures in *Annie John*:

It would be intricate, if not altogether impossible, to find a text that would purport to revise and rework Shakespeare's *The Tempest* without paying attention or making any reference, however slight, to Caliban or a native figure like him. The fact that "Kincaid's revision of *The Tempest* focuses [...] on the figure of Caliban"¹⁸ is not, thereby, under whatever circumstances a peculiar aspect. It has to be stated, in accordance with this thread of thought, that the Antiguan writer has never made a straightforward reference, by name, to

Caliban. A careful reading of *Annie John*, however, has uncovered to me the presence of, at least, four stylized Caliban-like versions; three of them, meaning Mr. Nigel, Sonia, and the Red Girl, have been bodily associated with the native's physical traits; the fourth, Annie John, on the other hand, has been endowed with Caliban's rebellious spirit.¹⁹

Shakespeare's text has given the reader/viewer the kind of jargon needed to visualise the 'strange' and even 'monstrous' shape of the islander. During his encounter with Caliban, Trinculo has been amazed with the physical appearance of this 'ambiguous creature'; he has wondered if it is a "man or a fish"²⁰ and in a quick rather dismissive fashion, he has concluded that this is nothing else, but "[a] strange fish!"²¹ Trinculo has continued his close examination of the 'fish-like' entity, he has stumbled upon, in the aftermath of which his verdict has stamped Caliban as a "fish, [which possesses] fins like arms."²² There is a reference in Kincaid's text to Mr. Nigel, a stylized Caliban, with almost similar features Trinculo has depicted; he is, the readers are told, the fishmonger in charge of fish provisions and distribution, who, during Annie's acute illness, which lasted for more than three months, has taken the initiative to pay a visit to her. The girl has given a portrait of a Caliban-looking man with his untidy and unfit-for-the-occasion uniform "[s]ince he was still wearing his fishing clothes [...] and [he was] covered with fish scales and blood";²³ which is why, it might be stated that the "Caliban-like Mr. Nigel,"²⁴ in this scene, has, much like Shakespeare's islander, been "aligned with fish";²⁵ this feature might be observed not only in relation to his physique and dress, but also in connection with his communication patterns.

The Tempest has delineated, based on these grounds, a Caliban who has been locked in a 'tongue-less,' childish and primitive realm allowing, as a matter of fact, the implementation of a thorough justification of Prospero's colonial mission. The way he speaks, with his ill-articulated words, makes him, in Prospero's perception, a 'creature' that would "gabble like/ A thing most brutish."²⁶ Mr. Nigel seems to have this pattern of linguistic expression during his short visit to the bed-bound Annie as the sentences he has uttered

sounded hollow, ill-arranged and meaningless to her ears; she has, accordingly, commented his words saying “I couldn’t make out all that he said.”²⁷ This encounter might suggest that “Mr. Nigel’s speech, like Caliban’s, appears to be only half-articulate.”²⁸ I have to clarify that Mr. Nigel is the only stylized male Caliban character in Kincaid’s text.

The second character that has been both mentally and physically stylized after Caliban is Sonia, Annie’s School-mate, who has been described as “a dunce”²⁹; Annie has claimed that she is very stupid that “sometimes she could not remember the spelling of her own name.”³⁰ This description of her mental capacities, which has been marked with ‘inferiority,’ might recall the scene when Caliban has assumed Stephano, the drunkard, to be “a brave god [who] bears celestial liquor”;³¹ on a similar vein, the native’s ‘gullibility’ is stressed as Stephano tells him that he has landed on the island from the moon which Caliban has believed saying “I have seen thee in her [the moon] and I do adore thee.”³² Besides intellect, Annie has explained, with regards to appearance, that Sonia has got a “long, thick black hair that lay down flat on her arms and legs; and then running down the nape of her neck.”³³ These characteristics and the fact that “Sonia is covered in [her] dark hair [...] along with her intellectual inferiority, make her seem almost animalistic (or Calibanistic).”³⁴ Sonia bears, hence, a stylized set of Caliban’s negative traits at the intellectual and physical dimensions.

The third figure which might be linked with Caliban’s physique is one of Annie’s friends whom the narrator has dubbed the Red Girl.³⁵ There is one particular scene in which Shakespeare’s islander has attempted to convince Stephano to be with his company in which situation Caliban would use his “long nails [to] dig[him] pig-nuts.”³⁶ This might give the reader/viewer an idea of Caliban’s ‘big’ and ‘rough’ hands which conjure a hideous appearance and lack of effective hygiene measures. These traits have been stylized through the Red Girl whose “dress was dirty, the skirt and blouse tearing away from each other at one side.”³⁷ As for her hair, Annie stresses that it has been “standing up on her head [...] matted [...] tangled [and] her hands were big and fat”;³⁸ besides, “her fingernails” have been so long

that they “held at least ten anthills of dirt under them.”³⁹ One might maintain, in the presence of such compelling textual evidence, that Kincaid has stylized through the Red Girl “the play’s representation of Caliban as a being who lacks civilization and cultivation.”⁴⁰

Unlike Mr. Nigel and the Red Girl whose stylizations to the native has mainly been drawn on grounds of physical appearance, Annie John, the last Caliban-like character, has been carved after Caliban’s defiant attitude towards the colonisers combined with his, from time to time, unbridled desire for freedom and rebellious spirit. The stylized resistance Annie evinces against any possible hegemonic orders and dominant entities has sprung, for the first time, into life as the child’s outlet within the confines of the household towards the mother figure. The latter’s negligence of her duties, at times, and her tight grip upon her daughter’s life, at other times, which has been, to a certain extent stifling, have all induced Annie’s rebellious action modes. It has to be shown that “Annie John’s defiance stems not only from the exercise of power as an adolescent teetering between childhood and adulthood but also from a calculated political rebellion”⁴¹ against the dominant and suffocating British order which has sought to monitor every single aspect of the Antiguans’ realm.

Caliban has claimed, in the source, that Prospero’s language has served him for nothing, but “to curse”⁴² which might seem relevant in Kincaid’s novel since Annie and her friends would always after school “sing bad songs [and] use forbidden words.”⁴³ Although Annie has been carved under a rigorous colonial education and might, therefore, be viewed as “a product of the British colonial school system,”⁴⁴ she has not been, much like Shakespeare’s Caliban, a “conformist,” in any manner, since she has been involved in “trouble for her rather naively politicised, radical responses.”⁴⁵ When she, for instance, has been sent in a course about the British manners, she misbehaves on purpose so that her English mentor would not admit her anymore to the sessions. In a similar fashion to Caliban upon whom education “can never stick,”⁴⁶ Annie, due to her rebellion, has never mastered the western etiquette and her manners, as such, have not been altered by her contact with the colonial educators. She has

even lied to her mother whom she told “my manners needed no improvement.”⁴⁷ Miss Edward’s session of history, at school, has been another outlet in which Kincaid’s heroine has, although not allowed, voiced her anger against the coloniser, in general, and Christopher Columbus, in particular, by ‘spoiling’ his picture and the history book to which she did not even show any signs of “remorse.”⁴⁸ It might be stated that “Annie [has] resist[ed] received imperial interpretations [of history] and a prescribed [inferiority] subject position.”⁴⁹

B- Stylized Colonial Dynamics:

The textual evidence has been very compelling when it comes to studying the relationship between Prospero and Caliban which has, indubitably, been a power based connection pillared on the colonial biased relationships paradigm. Prospero has on multiple occasions affirmed his ‘superior’ position which would, in the coloniser’s logic, entitle him to the status of the master while the ‘Other’s’ marked ‘inferiority’, in return, would confine him to eternal slavery. Brian Niro has argued, hence, that “*The Tempest’s* Prospero and Caliban have become a trope for the master/slave, colonizer/colonized dynamic.”⁵⁰ The white man has declared himself ‘the master’ by pointing at Caliban with the words “my slave,”⁵¹ “poisonous slave”⁵² and “most lying slave”⁵³ who “serves [Prospero] in offices/ That profit [him].”⁵⁴ This rapport lacking equilibrium, between the coloniser/master/Prospero and the colonised/ slave/ Caliban, has materialised a wide range of clichés entailed “in the colonial dynamic” which has sealed Caliban’s position as “the demonized subject who deserves to be ruled based on his fundamental [‘inferior’] nature.”⁵⁵

This connection binding Prospero, the master, and Caliban, the slave, has been stylized and transposed in Kincaid’s *Annie John* via Miss Nelson, the English teacher and those Antiguan students under her supervision.⁵⁶ The first session is a massive asset, in this sense, since Miss Nelson has assigned an activity to Annie and her classmates in the aftermath of which she has been immersed in “reading her book: an elaborately illustrated edition of *The Tempest*, as later, passing by her desk, [Annie] saw.”⁵⁷ Through this initial classroom contact,

“Kincaid [has] crystallize[d] the power structure behind the teacher/student relationship into one of master and slave, self and other.”⁵⁸ Miss Nelson’s choice of reading *The Tempest* and not any other text has not been, in any way whatsoever, fortuitous as it has the function of evoking centuries long intricate colonial dynamics/barriers which have been enacted and erected between the coloniser and the colonised; it has to be emphasised that Shakespeare’s play in the hands of Miss Nelson has become a sharp tool to “fixate the binary oppositions of a colonial power structure [...] by drawing associations between Prospero and Caliban’s master/slave relationship and the relationship between Miss Nelson and her students.”⁵⁹

C-The Civilising Mission and Colonial Education: A Deadlock:

The essence of Prospero’s presence, like any coloniser’s, on the island has been about his inherent belief in his alleged power, as a white man, to rule over exotic lands while at the same time ‘civilising’ and ‘educating’ the local inhabitants. This task has proved to be an arduous undertaking due to Caliban’s resistance and rebellion to the extent that Prospero has realised the failure of his designs by maintaining that “all [is] lost, quite lost.”⁶⁰ *Annie John* has stylized and reproduced, in a similar fashion to *The Tempest*, *A Grain of Wheat* and *A Tempest*, this situation in which the white man’s civilising mission reaches a deadlock.⁶¹ There is a scene relevant, to this context, in which Miss Nelson, while engrossed in her readings, seems to adopt a ‘nonchalant’ attitude towards her native students,

The morning was uneventful enough: a girl spilled ink from her inkwell all over her uniform; a girl broke her pen nib and then made a big to-do about replacing it; girls twisted and turned in their seats and pinched each other’s bottoms; girls passed notes to each other. *All this Miss Nelson must have seen and heard, but she didn’t say anything—only kept reading her book.*⁶²

The last sentence, I have italicised, suggests Miss Nelson’s carelessness towards the large scale havoc wreaked in her classroom to which she has not even reacted; she has been aware of the failure of the colonial mission, agents have been engaged in, since her “attitude towards her students is one of resignation where instruction is abandoned and discipline is ignored.”⁶³ This lack of discipline, with the Prospero-like figure in the position of power, is an indicator of the little progress made in the course of ‘reforming’ Annie, her classmates and the natives.

Although, in terms of education, Prospero has contended that he taught his ‘slave’ language, Caliban has retorted explaining that the coloniser’s language has not been advantageous to him; the only benefit he has discerned from it, has been linked to “know[ing] how to curse.”⁶⁴ Kincaid stylization of this feature has rendered her heroine conscious that the coloniser’s education would not be beneficial to her because “Annie is aware that like Caliban, she is learning in order to better serve the English, her colonial masters.”⁶⁵ The coloniser’s intention has been directed at ‘creating’ British carbon copies out of the native students, who would be British in every aspect, but complexion which Annie has recognised claiming, thereby, that “with our teachers and our books, it was hard for us to tell on which side we really now belonged—with the masters or the slaves.”⁶⁶ Through her constant criticism, however, of the colonial order and Queen Victoria, who has been portrayed as “a wrinkled-up woman wearing a crown on her head,”⁶⁷ Annie has aligned and sided with the “descendants of the slaves”⁶⁸ whom she holds to be her people. One has to argue, likewise, that “[j]ust as Caliban uses Prospero’s teaching against him, so too does Annie use her English education against the English.”⁶⁹

3- Kincaid’s Hidden Polemic Against Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*:

There is one direct reference to *The Tempest* in *Annie John*, yet a perusal of the novel has exposed to me a variety of subtle allusions which have been intended to clash with Shakespeare’s play. Bakhtin has asserted that the hidden polemic is all about the oblique criticism or collision someone’s discourse or text might express, without making its antagonistic stance blankly apparent,⁷⁰ in relation to the previous author’s discourse or text. My focus, here, is oriented at pinpointing the hostile undertone Kincaid’s literary work carries and voices against *The Tempest*. The key assumption with which I have commenced my inquiry regards the latter as the ‘original’ which has been revised in *Annie John* to fit in a distinct environment. The targeted task, as such, is linked to the aspects Kincaid’s work has subverted to launch its indirect raid on multiple issues in Shakespeare’s masterpiece.

A- Prospero's Perspective versus a Child's Point of View:

Prospero, the narrator, whose authoritative voice has been quite compelling that the reader/viewer of *The Tempest*, would never dare to picture events outside of what has been delineated by his words since he has had the power to manipulate every single aspect of the narrative intertwined with the past by presenting the only dimension which might suit his aims and version of the events.⁷¹ Sycorax who has been long dead and drowned in history by the present timeline of the play, for instance, might be illustrative of this tendency as Prospero has told her tale as the “damn'd witch”⁷² who has been exiled from Algiers because of her ‘heinous’ deeds; Caliban on a similar vein, has been portrayed as the “poisonous slave, got by the devil himself.”⁷³ What the readers/viewers understand, therefore, in relation to Sycorax and her son has been distilled through and even dictated by Prospero's narrative censorship and the fact that “Prospero tells us a lot about his past” has made him “a narrator with an authoritative view of the action rather than [...] a figure who speaks only for himself”;⁷⁴ consequently, viewers and readers alike “often find themselves judging things the way Prospero does.”⁷⁵ He also has a strong hold on the present, controlling our comprehension of the events; for example, Prospero's portrayal, at the end, of Antonio as the “brother who entertain'd ambition [and] [e]xpelled remorse,”⁷⁶ might not be contested or doubted by readers/viewer since the story has not been unveiled from Antonio's viewpoint.

Kincaid's hidden polemic in *Annie John*, on the other hand, has stripped Prospero of this power handing it to the only narrator of the story, Annie, from whose first person point of view perspective the whole tale has been retold, reinvented and rewritten. The fact that Annie, a native girl and one of the Caliban-like figures of the novel, has been established as the undisputed narrator has relocated power and reinvested it in the native rather than the coloniser. The deployment of the young Annie as a narrator to rework Shakespeare's text has allowed Kincaid to “effectively break [...] Prospero's monopoly of colonial reality.”⁷⁷ Christopher Columbus, who has been glorified and idealised by the British teachers, has been

denigrated when seen through Annie lenses; once confronted with his picture in chains, in the history book, the heroine has assured “I loved this picture—to see the usually triumphant Columbus, brought so low, seated at the bottom of a boat just watching things go by.”⁷⁸ The colonial narrative making of Columbus the hero, who bestowed upon Antiguans the favour of discovering their country, has been shattered by Annie’s viewpoint that has relegated him to the status of a brutal coloniser evincing, therefore, a developed political and historical sense, despite her young age, especially when she contrasted the ancestors of Ruth, an English white girl, with hers arguing that “[Ruth’s] ancestors had been the masters, while ours had been the slaves.”⁷⁹ One might argue that “Annie’s child perspective [has] allow[ed] reality to be reinterpreted, for conventional stereotypes to be broken down, and for new associations to be formed”;⁸⁰ hence, the coloniser’s perception of truth has been remodelled and dismantled⁸¹ in ways that would suit the colonised people.

The other striking element about Prospero might be the enormous amount of words he has spoken when contrasted with the others as he has been involved, one way or another, in all aspects related to the story. Although he has not been physically onstage at times, the readers/viewers could feel his overwhelming magical power weaving events and schemes due to which characters, even those of high rank, seem like puppets in the hands of a puppeteer whenever they are caught in Prospero’s orbit. Ferdinand and the way he has been manipulated into a relationship with Miranda might furnish an illustrative instance of this aspect. In Shakespeare’s standpoint, Prospero has perhaps been “more than a magician [...] manipulating the figures on the island [since he has assumed] the role of playwright and director.”⁸² Kincaid’s hidden polemic against *The Tempest* has portrayed a Prospero-like female figure, through Miss Nelson, who has been devoid of any power, because the whole tale and events have not been unfolded from her perspective, but through a Caliban-like native named Annie, the aspect which has reduced Miss Nelson’s amount of speech, unlike Prospero’s in the source, to the strict minimum. At the moment when her students have been spreading chaos in

the classroom trespassing all the colonial laws of ‘measure,’ ‘order’ and ‘discipline,’ “Miss Nelson [despite having] seen and heard [everything,] didn’t say anything—only kept reading her book.”⁸³ The coloniser, who once possessed a strong mindset, has become, in this hidden polemical scene, an object of depiction seen through Annie’s or the native’s eyes which deprived Miss Nelson of the ability to speak for herself and reduced her to muteness and worst of all, carelessness. This scene has enacted the kind of turnaround in position at the level of the coloniser/active and colonised/passive dualities due to which Miss Nelson’s voice has been suppressed and Annie took over the floor to tell her account.⁸⁴ By eschewing “the imperial gaze through the act of narration, Annie [has] “overthrow[n]” Prospero’s charms (the master’s books) by seizing the master’s discourse through a narrative (description) of her own that [has] displace[d] the imperial text from its position as signifier.”⁸⁵

B- The Island Setting Retrieved in Kincaid’s Novel:

[I] show’d thee all the qualities o’ th’ isle,
The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place, and fertile.⁸⁶

Such are Caliban’s words when he has sketched the dazzling ecological diversity of the island of which he has been dispossessed of by Prospero. The native has also referred to the wide range of sounds,⁸⁷ which once intermingled, would be, to Caliban’s ears, quite charming and delightful since he has claimed that such a ‘melodious’ cacophony and “sweet airs [...] give delight, and hurt not.”⁸⁸ This truth about the island has been concealed, lost and drowned in discourse once delineated through Prospero’s or the other white men’s gaze which overturn its geography into the realm of the exotic, secluded and bizarre. The colonisers have spoken of the area with the following words, “this island seem to be desert”⁸⁹ “[u]ninhabitable, and almost inaccessible”⁹⁰ “this most desolate isle”⁹¹ “a poor isle”⁹² and “bare island”;⁹³ these epithets have veiled the island’s ecological diversity and have, thereby, drawn a colourless portrait of its atmosphere which has confined it, in the colonisers’ vision, to the restricted jargon of ‘isolated,’ ‘exotic,’ ‘strange,’ and altogether ‘unreal.’ The fact that it has been shrouded in “spatial ambiguity”⁹⁴ without pinpointing its geographical location has enforced the coloniser’s perception of its territory being engulfed in mystery.

I argue, herein, that Kincaid has launched a hidden polemic through which she has addressed the above issues by reversing them in a manner that would fit both Caliban's perception, in the source, and the colonised Antiguans' vision of their island and most importantly their version of history. The novel has been set in the Caribbean region in Antigua, an island, which is Kincaid's homeland; this has "serve[d] to radically rewrite the specter of colonization indicated in the [...] source text."⁹⁵ The sounds of the island⁹⁶ and its ecological diversity, in addition, have been brought into prominence. While Annie has been reading her autobiographical essay, Miss Nelson has earlier assigned as an exercise, she could discern, in a subtly crafted polemical manoeuvre, other pleasant sounds like "the chirp of some birds, the hum of bees looking for flowers, [and] the silvery rush-rush of the wind in the trees"⁹⁷ which, to Annie's ears, have all been united into a, somewhat, symphony. Annie has come, at this specific instant, to an awareness of her whole existence which might indicate that "recovering the sensuous island-reality that Prospero [has] suppress[e]d"⁹⁸ "or marginalized in Shakespeare's text [has] become [...] a condition for the (re)formation of the colonial subject's identity."⁹⁹ Unlike Shakespeare's 'original,' the atmosphere of the island has nothing exotic or unfamiliar once viewed through the eyes of the native heroine.

The island's territory has no longer been constructed as Prospero's private domain where he might reign as "the lord on't."¹⁰⁰ Kincaid has retrieved and revalorised various locations, dispersed all over Antigua, which the coloniser has neglected or given little attention.¹⁰¹ One of those areas has been dubbed, by the female narrator, as "Rat Island" which is "a place that nobody seemed to have ever been."¹⁰² The name of this place might signify an area of a lower status, from the coloniser's eyes; however, from the native's view, this area has, somehow, been a coloniser free spot where "all the markers of [Prospero's] civilization are stripped and cast away";¹⁰³ accordingly, the female Caliban-like characters of the story could rely on these 'unmolested' spaces to inhale freedom by swimming "naked in the seawater"¹⁰⁴ without Prospero's omnipresent authoritative rule and watchful eyes.

C- Who Smells Like Fish? Other Caliban-like Figures?

Frantz Fanon has dissected the coloniser's language which often has the tendency to lean on a zoological terminology whenever the native colonised is referred to; this jargon is used to "dehumanize [...] the colonized subject [who] is reduced to the state of an animal."¹⁰⁵ He has, moreover, asserted that, in the coloniser's psyche, the native is equated with bestial vocabulary such as "the odors from the "native" [...] the hordes, the stink, the swarming, the seething, and the gesticulations."¹⁰⁶ The situation with Shakespeare's native is not, at any rate, an exception as Prospero and the other white Europeans have emphasised Caliban's alleged bestiality through such zoological terms. Trinculo, after a close scrutiny of Caliban, has reported to the readers/viewers his findings as follows, "[w]hat have we here? a man or a fish? [...] A fish: he smells like a fish: a very ancient and fish-like smell; a kind of not of the newest."¹⁰⁷ These stereotypes have been reworked in *Annie John* with a hidden polemical approach and from a different standpoint to either criticise and debunk the coloniser, at times, or recast the native from a new positive light, at other times.

While launching her hidden polemic against *The Tempest*, Kincaid has reoriented the zoological language and the fish stink against the British coloniser.¹⁰⁸ The headmistress in the school, the heroine has attended, is named Miss Moore whom Annie took for a fact to have "come to Antigua from England, for she looked like a prune left out of its jar a long time and she sounded as if she had borrowed her voice from an owl."¹⁰⁹ Kincaid's subtle polemic and response to Shakespeare's text might also be sensed when Annie has said that Miss Moore's "throat would beat up and down as if a fish fresh out of water were caught inside. I wondered if she even smelled like a fish";¹¹⁰ we might grasp, therefore, that in this reworking, it is the English coloniser who has been stigmatised with the unbearable stink of fish because, as Annie's mother has argued, the "English people [...] didn't wash often enough, or wash properly when they finally did."¹¹¹ She has even rhetorically inquired from her daughter "[h]ave you ever noticed how they smell as if they had been bottled up in a fish?"¹¹² The

reader might see the extent to which *Annie John* has overturned *The Tempest* since Kincaid has retargeted the fish smell and the coloniser's allegations that stamp the indigenous people with a bad stench towards the Europeans.¹¹³

As for the other Caliban-like characters such as Mr. Nigel, Sonia and the Red Girl, I have discussed earlier in this chapter, it might be stated that although they have been associated with some of Caliban's negative traits which have been appropriated, Kincaid has, in various manners, redeemed them by showing them from a positive angle.¹¹⁴ Mr. Nigel who looks like Caliban in his dirty clothes "covered with fish scales and blood,"¹¹⁵ to begin with, has been reconsidered, in a hidden polemic, as a pleasant human being whose dirty "fishing clothes [...] were beautifully mended with patches all over."¹¹⁶ Annie has "always liked" Mr. Nigel because he has often "reminded [her] of [her] father [since he] was quiet and thoughtful."¹¹⁷ It has to be highlighted that Mr. Nigel is a fisherman and not, at any rate, a fish; this might be considered as an "uncanny reversal in *Annie John*"¹¹⁸ of the source text. Nearly the same strategy has been deployed with Sonia who has Caliban-like features in terms of her hair and facial expressions; however, Annie has inverted the situation since she finds her attractive. Annie "would then stare and stare at [Sonia], narrowing and opening wide [her] eyes"¹¹⁹ for a long time because she likes her appearance. There is, finally, the figure of the Red Girl who has been depicted like Caliban with long nails and dirty clothes, yet the novelist's hidden polemic has refashioned her positively. Stephano and Trinculo have settled on calling the native a "moon-calf"¹²⁰ which is a very derogatory term "suggesting [foolishness,] stupidity and an amorphous shape"¹²¹ at which the early modern English people would have laughed. These denigrating epithets have been reworked through the Red Girl whom Annie has regarded as "a beautiful thing [with a] face [...] big and round and red, like a moon—a red moon."¹²² Despite her unclean long nails and slovenly appearance, Annie has said that she "had such an unbelievable, wonderful smell, as if she had never taken a bath in her whole life."¹²³ Through the Red Girl, in a nutshell, "Kincaid [has] reassemble[d] all of

Caliban's [...] worst features –his unshapeliness, uncleanness, nudity, and unsophistication – only to reappraise them [...] transforming Caliban into a creature of beauty.”¹²⁴

D- ‘Usurping’ Prospero’s Magus Powers:

The opening scene of *The Tempest* has been utilised as an elaborate ‘unearthly’ scene to entertain the early modern audience bringing forth Prospero’s powers as a potent magus whom Shakespeare has, likewise, endowed with supernatural aptitudes to “control [...] the very elements of the earth”,¹²⁵ his “raising of the thunderstorm that [has] flood[ed] the ship and its passengers [has] evoke[d] [an] extravagant show of power [demonstrating] how Prospero is able to manipulate the elements and the ecosystem.”¹²⁶ This opening might, as a matter of fact, be considered as ‘vital’ to the text and a key occurrence, in the establishment of Prospero as a ‘superior’ human being whose supremacy in terms of ‘white magic’ knowledge has entitled him to be the ‘master’ over the island, its natural environment and the inhabitants. Kincaid has perceived the importance of this opening which is why she has reworked it, in the middle of her novel, to subvert the coloniser’s codes of power in the source.¹²⁷

The Red Girl, for whom an entire chapter has been devoted, is portrayed as one of the best friends Annie has ever had, yet their friendship has abruptly been ended when the Red Girl joined her grandparents in Anguilla. In the wake of this separation, Annie has seen her friend in a dream in which “the boat on which [the Red Girl] had been traveling suddenly splintered in the middle of the sea, causing all the passengers to drown except for her.”¹²⁸ Kincaid’s main character has told the readers that she has “rescued [the Red Girl] in a small boat [and] took her to an island, where [they] lived together forever [eating] wild pigs and sea grapes.”¹²⁹ The Antiguan-originated writer has taken power, be it supernatural, physical or mental, from the coloniser, Prospero, and attributed it, through this re-enactment of the shipwreck, to her native narrator. This hidden polemic to *The Tempest* might be interpreted as a strategy due to which “Annie [...] is aligned with Prospero since she plays the rescuer”,¹³⁰ the result has been the reversal of the power dynamics in favour of the colonised subject.

Kincaid's hidden polemic has gone a little further in her revision of *The Tempest* by using subtle aspects throughout Annie's dream sequence. Prospero is no longer the orchestrator of the shipwreck and this mission has been confided, during the dream, to Annie and the Red Girl; together at "night [they] would sit on the sand and watch ships filled with people on a cruise steam by."¹³¹ The two Caliban-like figures and once inferior other, thereafter, would emit "confusing signals to the ships, causing them to crash on some nearby rocks";¹³² this might be read as a hidden polemic where the coloniser's powers have been claimed which inverted the scale towards the colonised Caliban. Such a "game of crashing ships, which inevitably recalls Prospero's unleashing of the tempest, [has] empower[ed] the girls to control [...] their destiny"¹³³ by elevating them, as natives and colonised, to the coloniser's rank in terms of power/ability to bring forth mighty storms and shipwrecks.

E- Sycorax: A Strategic Resurrection:

Most African/Caribbean adaptations and revisions of *The Tempest*, Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* and Césaire's *A Tempest* are not exceptions, have had a male centred perspective¹³⁴ which viewed Caliban as a revolutionary hero, whose spirit of defiance and sacrifice, is key to the liberation movements. The 'rebel' has rested his claim of inheritance over the island on his lineage traced back to Sycorax when he has stated "[t]his island's mine, by Sycorax my mother/ Which thou [Prospero] tak'st from me."¹³⁵ This kind of historical legitimacy, Caliban has deployed, has entailed a syllogism in which Sycorax has been the first to land on the island; as a result, she has to be regarded as the true owner of its territory; on the other hand, Prospero is a foreigner who has come a decade after Sycorax's death while Caliban is Sycorax's son and; therefore, historically speaking, Caliban has to be the rightful heir of the island. This might explain the marked interest African/Caribbean writers have had in Caliban during the 1960s. Kincaid's approach, in contrast, has directed a hidden polemic at *The Tempest* by subtly, but intentionally retrieving Sycorax through the figures of Mrs. John, Ma Jolie and Ma Chess; these characters might stand for "maternal figures existing prior to"¹³⁶ Caliban which would entail more legitimacy for the colonised over the invader, Prospero.

The readers/viewers have come to understand, through Prospero's viewpoint, that Sycorax has been the "foul witch"¹³⁷ who has had the out-of-ordinary powers of 'black magic' due to which she has had the ability to enact "mischiefs manifold, and sorceries terrible/ To enter human hearing."¹³⁸ She has been forced to exile from Algiers as "sailors"¹³⁹ have brought her and left her with Caliban on the island. Kincaid has restored the supernatural powers Sycorax has once possessed through Mrs. John, Ma Jolie and Ma Chess; however, she has reoriented it, in a subtle polemical mode, from 'black magic' capable of causing heinous mayhem towards an extraordinary force which has the capacity to heal and protect against any evil entities. Mrs. John, Annie's mother, has been living in Dominica, with her parents, and in the aftermath of a quarrel with her father, she has left her homeland and headed towards Antigua at the age of sixteen. She has brought nothing with her except an "enormous wooden trunk"¹⁴⁰ which is used to store various souvenirs to recall specific incidents in her daughter's childhood or the family's key instances in general. Mrs. John's trunk has the symbolic function of storing the collective cultural memory which might be brought into the surface whenever necessary to guard the family values against the coloniser's intruding way of life.¹⁴¹ Kincaid has consequently shifted centrality from the native's political fight for independence, "toward the affirmation of a female lineage [which has] reorient[ed] her [...] focus away from short-term politics towards a more extended process of cultural recuperation."¹⁴² Mrs. John has, like Sycorax, been exiled to the island of Antigua where she has initiated her life anew. Annie and her mother have also had the habit of taking "a special bath [once in a while] in which the barks and flowers of many different trees, together with all sorts of oils, were boiled in the same large caldron"; then, they take their seat "in this bath in a darkened room with a strange-smelling candle burning away."¹⁴³ These mysterious rituals are worthy of a sorcerer's black magic with its concoctions and potions recalling, thus, Sycorax and her "sorceries terrible,"¹⁴⁴ yet these strange baths have neither been designed to hurt nor intimidate anybody on physical or mental grounds; in a radical turn, they have been arranged

to either cure Annie's "small scratch on [her] instep [which took a] long [time] to heal"¹⁴⁵ or to ward-off "bad spirits"¹⁴⁶ which have been set-up against them and their beloved ones.

Ma Jolie and Ma Chess have been endowed, like Sycorax, with supernatural powers; however, their magic has been harnessed for noble services such as healing various illnesses, shielding and keeping united the family members. Ma Jolie, Annie told us, has had a massive first-hand experience with obeah, which is the Caribbean witchcraft, since she is "an obeah woman";¹⁴⁷ this form of black magic, used by Ma Jolie, has been deployed not as an instrument to damage people's lives, but as a "form of medicine."¹⁴⁸ The mysterious condition Annie has had, during which she has been bed bound for almost three months and a half, has been an occasion for Ma Jolie to appeal to her "little black satchet"¹⁴⁹ full of "vials filled with fluids"¹⁵⁰ which must be administered to Annie "at different times of the day."¹⁵¹ Although she has shown some positive signs, her illness has not, by any means, subsided; the turn of Ma Chess, Annie's grandmother, has come to exhibit her 'unmatched' obeah knowledge to cure the heroine. The latter has made it clear that "[w]hatever Ma Jolie knew, [her] grandmother knew at least ten times more"¹⁵² which is an indication of her Sycorax-like mastery of the supernatural elements. Notice that Ma Chess has been living in Dominica by the time of the illness of her Granddaughter, therefore, the way she has reached Antigua is not only bizarre, but also mind boggling "for [Ma Chess has] appeared on a day when the steamer was not due."¹⁵³ This mysterious mode of movement from one place to another has convinced Timothy Helen Pyne to associate Ma Chess with "the mythological 'flying African' able to cross the seas without a boat [as] the flying [...] female witch";¹⁵⁴ this might bring into memory Shakespeare's Sycorax. Annie has, furthermore, informed the reader that her grandmother has also had the same ritual of taking one of those strange baths with "water in which things animal and vegetable had been boiled for a long time."¹⁵⁵ Like her daughter Mrs. John, she has had a trunk where every family souvenir has been appropriately kept to be brandished at a propitious moment. This might illustrate the extent to which "Caribbean [...]"

women play a central role in passing on values to young people”¹⁵⁶ through these trunks. In a remarkable fashion, a few weeks have been enough for Ma Chess to heal Annie by just hugging her all day long; once her granddaughter has got better, she has all of a sudden disappeared from sight and perhaps went back to Dominica, highly likely, in the same mysterious way she has managed to reach Antigua. All in all, Kincaid has launched a hidden polemic at *The Tempest* by recovering the deceased Sycorax through the figures of Mrs. John, Ma Jolie and Ma Chess which has implemented a strategic recuperation of “Caribbean identity beyond [Caliban’s] grounds that are merely political and extends the rehabilitative process into the vaster terrain of cultural tradition, continuity and origins.”¹⁵⁷

F- From Heterosexual to Homoerotic Modes:

The prevalent ideals/modes of sexual relations in *The Tempest* might be pinpointed as revolving around heterosexual connections, involving a man/woman union, which might be observed through Prospero/his wife and Ferdinand/Miranda dualities. Prospero has, first, addressed this idea when he told Miranda “[t]hy mother was a piece of virtue, and/ She said thou wast my daughter”;¹⁵⁸ this announcement has not only traced his daughter’s lineage but has also established the colonial desire patterns as being limited to relationships that would comprise a man/male and a woman/female or the other way down. The other story of desire/love which might be spotted, in the play, is that of Ferdinand and Miranda which, here again, has fallen within that same mode of heterosexual boundaries and confinements. The colonial system with its intricate discourse, related to gender modes and power dynamics, has always associated colonialism with the act of desire in which the mother country, that is to say, the colonising entity, would stand for the male whose attempts would be crowned once the female or the colony is being ‘conquered’ and ‘subdued.’ In this “theoretical hierarchy [...] the colonial power [is] figured as highly and normatively masculine, aggressively progressive: technically masterful, sophisticated in philosophical terms, rationally civilised”¹⁵⁹ just like Prospero; whereas, “[t]he conquered or colonised [is] therefore figured as concomitantly female: passive, backward [and] emotional”¹⁶⁰ the way Caliban has been delineated.

Kincaid's subtle polemic has reacted against this colonial worldview and order where heterosexuality seems to be the norm of desire patterns by subverting, in a multitude of ways, the European coloniser's desire norms and homogenous world full of certainties; the insertion of various homoerotic subplots subtly crafted around Annie, the heroine, and other girls like Albertine, Gwen, Sonia, the Red Girl and the rest of the school girls¹⁶¹ who, after school, "would sit and sing bad songs, use forbidden words, and, of course, show each other various parts of [their] bodies,"¹⁶² has contributed to the story's approach toward its source. Now, if the heterosexual Ferdinand/Miranda potential union has come to consolidate such a pattern, it has been brought out of context to suit Kincaid's female/female desire modes through Annie who has declared, a few moments in the new school she has been transferred to, "I liked a girl named Albertine, and I liked a girl named Gweneth. At the end of the day, Gwen and I were in love";¹⁶³ she has had a special bond with Gwen which might fall within the homoerotic category to the extent of having "overpowering feelings for her."¹⁶⁴ These female centred connections have been devised as a hidden polemic which has targeted subverting the coloniser's/Prospero's desire standards. The words of Keja Valens are relevant, following this argument, as she says, "[t]he pursuit of desire between girls in *Annie John* is intertwined with anticolonial struggle, for it [has] undermine[d] colonial heteronormativity."¹⁶⁵

The life of Annie has, for a while, been altered in the wake of her encounter with the Red Girl to whom she is attracted; the two have been caught in a passionate link in which the heroine seems dependent on this 'mysterious' girl. They have grown so accustomed to meeting in an abandoned lighthouse on top of a hill to the point that the heroine asserts "I now worshipped the ground her [the Red Girl's] unwashed feet walked on."¹⁶⁶ The girl has had the habit of pinching Annie, but on the spot, this would, then, be followed by kisses "on the same spots";¹⁶⁷ Annie has commented this situation as follows, "[o]h, the sensation was delicious [...] [a]nd so wonderful we found it that, almost every time we met, pinching by her, followed by tears from me, followed by kisses from her were the order of the day."¹⁶⁸ Thus, Kincaid

has revised *The Tempest* through a homoerotic female/female Caribbean sexual pattern which rejects and rewrites the heterosexual foundations of colonialism and its colonial matrix.¹⁶⁹

G- *Annie John*: A Condemnation of Colonialism:

The Tempest does not simply reflect early European attempts to colonize the world; the play itself functions as a colonial text, i.e. in its plot and language the play reenacts colonial discourse, and because of its canonical position it has helped perpetuate colonial ideology.¹⁷⁰

These are Brinda Charry's words through which she has summarised the perception of the crushing majority of postcolonial scholars who have, with ample textual evidence, connected Shakespeare's play to colonialism. Prospero has professed that he is "the lord on"¹⁷¹ the island which, in his perception, has entitled him to be the absolute master whose commands Ariel and Caliban, the only indigenous inhabitants, must eagerly receive and perform. He has allegedly freed Ariel from Sycorax's prison only to exploit his unordinary powers almost in the same way Caliban has been enslaved and reduced to servitude; he has also announced, like any coloniser, his civilising mission through which Caliban has been 'taught' to speak and express his ideas via the English language. Once stranded on the island, the rest of the white Europeans whether from high rank, like Gonzalo, or the lowest social categories, like Stephano and Trinculo, have all expressed, at one stage or another, their colonial vision towards both the island and its inhabitants. It would not, hence, seem or be peculiar, to know that modern criticism of the English bard's text has associated it with the direct colonial military intervention in foreign territories.¹⁷² Kincaid's aggressive hidden polemic against its source, on the other hand, has addressed the issue of colonialism through a series of indirect strategies which has attempted to wreck the colonial worldview.

The fact that the novel has been dubbed *Annie John*, on behalf of the heroine, might signal, from the onset, the radical retelling of *The Tempest* from the eyes of the colonised; this has had the effect of distancing the tale from the coloniser's/Prospero's biased and one-sided narrative by revising it from the eyes of the Caliban-like Annie. The gaze that has once been the coloniser's privilege, has shifted to the colonised whose scourging perception has been unleashed against the invaders; Prospero and the colonisers have been, in many

instances, silenced and reduced into objects to be observed and commented upon. Annie's spirit of rebellion against all forms of authority, her mother's included, and her struggle for affirmation mingled with her quest for identity have all intersected with "issues of gender, race, and colonialism"¹⁷³ which entail power-based connections. Her scathing criticism of the settlers and English teachers alike might be seen as a perspicuous rejection of the kind of training which pertains to convey docility and compliance to the dominant colonial entity.¹⁷⁴

Annie's teachers, who have been Prospero-like figures and the colonial education system, have been attacked to reject the colonial order, mindset and worldview. Those tutors, who have allegedly left the comfort of the motherland to participate in its 'civilizing mission' in the Caribbean region, have been equated with the most brutal colonial agents which is why they have been branded as being oppressive and abusive. With all that it connotes, the history class can be viewed as being illustrative of this aspect; the fact that two students have been unable to answer Miss Edward's question, has been more than enough as a pretext, for her, to verbally exteriorise and materialise her colonial abusive nature. Annie has fostered that after "two [failed] attempts Miss Edward had launched into a harangue about what a worthless bunch we were";¹⁷⁵ these quite oppressive remarks have been allowed by the colonial power based dynamics which target the total pacification of the natives. Prospero has deployed similar tactics involving threats and violence whenever necessary. He has once told Caliban that he will "rack [him] with old cramps/ Fill all [his] bones with aches; make [him] roar"¹⁷⁶ because he has dared to diminish the education he, the coloniser, has imparted on him. Kincaid's heroine has had a firsthand experience with her teachers' murky methods in the aftermath of which she has portrayed one of them as the "bellowing dragon in the form of Miss Edward."¹⁷⁷ The latter has had the habit of humiliating her students, a routine in which she seems to revel, after each test since the one who has "scored lowest [would be] made to wear the dunce cap all day"¹⁷⁸ which might have devastating effects on the learner's psychology. This colonial oppressive approach to education has been criticised by the

narrator; thus, the novelist has sought to reveal the colonial hideous truth which is the fact that education is being abusively deployed by colonial agents and teachers alike.¹⁷⁹

Some of the students have been aware, especially Annie, that their Prospero-like teachers represent the colonial mindset and order which seek to subjugate them just as Prospero has subdued Caliban. Although native games and songs, which are vital cultural items, have been “absolutely forbidden”¹⁸⁰ Annie and her friends, as part of the novel’s subtle polemic, reject colonialism, by playing those games and “sing[ing] [from time to time] a popular calypso song which usually had lots of unladylike words to it”;¹⁸¹ this outlet reaction has implied the native’s/Caliban’s rebellion against the coloniser’s authority. The heroine and the rest of her schoolmates have, as a result, appealed to the Antiguan folklore, in particular, and the Caribbean cultural background, in general, to combat colonialism’s intricacies.¹⁸²

The episode in which Annie has deformed, during Miss Edward’s session, the picture in the schoolbook, of Christopher Columbus, a symbol of conquest, who has been portrayed humiliated in chains, might be interpreted as a rejection of the whole colonial enterprise. Columbus, the first European to sail to the Caribbean and to land in Antigua, has been equated in Annie’s unconscious with Prospero since both have been involved, somehow, in the ‘discovery’ and conquest of foreign areas. The colonial system has glorified Columbus and has raised him to the status of a myth an opinion Annie has never shared and has, thus, been pleased with him being disgraced and maltreated.¹⁸³ She has inscribed under his picture the following, “The Great Man Can No Longer Just Get Up and Go”¹⁸⁴ which Miss Edward and the administrators have considered as not only a defamatory statement, but also a ‘despicable’ crime against “the great men [who has] discoverer[ed] [...] the island that was [Annie’s] home.”¹⁸⁵ Despite the fact that she has been berated by her teachers, Annie has not even manifested a single sign of remorse which is why her statement and behaviour against Columbus might be perceived as “a sentence of historical justice [which has served the white man] the punishment he [has] deserve[d]”;¹⁸⁶ as such, the historical manacles, which have, so

long, been decreed upon the colonised by colonisers like Columbus and Prospero, have been broken by the heroine, Annie.¹⁸⁷

The English people have been satirised and criticised through Kincaid's hidden polemic which has contributed to the novel's stance of rejecting colonialism. The fish stench, with which Caliban has been stigmatised, has been redirected against the coloniser¹⁸⁸ since the readers have been told that the "English people [...] didn't wash often enough";¹⁸⁹ they have been associated with the stinking fish, Shakespeare's text has referred to. Annie has even inversed the coloniser/colonised roles in which she has presumed that the Africans would have never ever ill-treated the whites, in any manner whatsoever, if they have been in the coloniser's position by arguing "I was sure that if our ancestors [black people] had gone from Africa to Europe and come upon the people living there, they would have taken a proper interest in the Europeans on first seeing them, and said, "How nice," and then gone home to tell their friends about it."¹⁹⁰

The novel has, furthermore, painted a bright portrait of Annie as one of the most intelligent students who has even surpassed some of her English-originated classmates like Ruth. She has, in more than one occasion, been the best student exceeding, by far, the rest of the girls. There is one occasion, of interest to this research, in which Annie has "been given a prize, a copy of a book called *Roman Britain*"¹⁹¹ as a reward, from the colonial education system, to recompense her efforts. This prize has entailed Kincaid's hidden polemic directed at colonialism since from the title, one might understand that Britain itself has been, at one point of its history, colonised and its people have been subject to the Romans' control. The subtle reliance on the book which has been gifted to Annie might be interpreted "as an inside joke to anyone who stands outside metropolitan indoctrination: Romans, after all, [have] colonized the British who are still attempting to condition Antiguan to accept imperial ideology";¹⁹² this might suggest that in the same way Britain has been freed from Rome, Antigua would also be, at a given time of its history, freed from the British colonial grip.¹⁹³

Despite her young age, Annie has evinced a high cultural and political awareness due to which she has understood that the Antiguans have been, for centuries, reduced to slavery by the English invaders. Kincaid has empowered her to address these issues, of colonialism and slavery, as part of the hidden polemic the novel has launched against its source. Ruth, the white English student, in contrast to Annie, has been represented as one of the weakest, if not the weakest, elements within the group; she has been branded as the silly English originated girl.¹⁹⁴ Ruth has had little knowledge, to say the least, of the colony's traditions, let alone history for that matter, which has been an issue for her to reckon with. Annie has even imagined what it felt like to be in Ruth's skin because "her father [has been] a missionary in Africa [and] [h]er ancestors [have] been the masters, while [the natives' have] been the slaves."¹⁹⁵ She has asserted that Ruth, as such, is able to see "the terrible things her ancestors had done";¹⁹⁶ therefore, she has "a lot to be ashamed of."¹⁹⁷ Annie has altered the version of history the colonial system has taught her when she has claimed that, unlike Ruth, the natives "could look everybody in the eye, for [their] ancestors [have] done nothing wrong except just sit somewhere, defenceless."¹⁹⁸ With Annie, Kincaid has "challenge[d] racism and colonialism through questioning received versions of history."¹⁹⁹

4-Kincaid's Novel Linked to the Residual, Dominant, and Emergent:

At this point, an ideological and cultural exploration of *Annie John* is much more than relevant; it would entail a close reliance on Williams' 'residual,' 'dominant' and 'emergent.' These categories have been adopted and used as tools which are expected to not only backup my understanding of the novel, but also help me dissect the historical and cultural background which, I assume, has had a massive impact on Kincaid's adaptation of *The Tempest*. Unless the exact historical and cultural milieu of the novel is examined using Williams' concepts, one might overlook myriad aspects involved in this whole process of adaptation.

A- *Annie John* and the Residual Ideological and Cultural Features:

It would be of high relevance, herein, to remind the readers of the meaning of the notion Williams has dubbed the 'residual.' In *Marxism and Literature* (1977), he has pointed

at this ideological and/or cultural element as “[being] effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process.”²⁰⁰ It encompasses all those practices, beliefs, “experiences, meanings and values, which [are] lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation.”²⁰¹ The residual might refer to those ideological and/or cultural elements that have come into existence at an earlier historical stage in a given society, yet they remain effective at the present under a residual form or a remnant. Although it does no longer belong to the dominant forces, it plays, somehow, an active role. There is one significant aspect in *Annie John* which is African/Caribbean obeah that might be surfaced as being a cultural residue.

A scrutiny of Kincaid’s novel is bound to reveal the permanence of the practice of obeah, which has travelled all the way from Africa with the earliest slaves who have been brought to Antigua in order to work in the fields and plantations. This cultural practice which has, for centuries, been used once it has reached the Caribbean both as a form of witchcraft and a healing instrument, might be counted as “another complex [...] tradition of African origin that survived in the West Indies”²⁰² as a remnant; despite this, it has remained an effective residue in Antigua’s cultural environment from the 1960s until the 1980s. This might be observed throughout Kincaid’s text in which obeah, although rejected by the British dominant colonial order, has been quite active through characters like Ma Jolie and Ma Chess. These women have intervened in matters related to the John family especially when Annie has had the strange illness which has coincided with the rainy season. Although Mrs. John has sought the assistance of Dr. Stephens, a “doctor [...] from England,”²⁰³ the cure to her daughter’s condition has, finally, come from Ma Chess who seems to embody, through her obeah, which might appear ‘irrational’ when contrasted with the coloniser’s medicine, the counter strategy to imperial science.²⁰⁴

Obeah has additionally had a massive function not only in Kincaid’s life, but also in her literary work, as well, in the sense of regulating the characters’ interactions and setting the

pace of their daily lives. Kincaid has admitted in an interview that obeah has been “lodged [...] in [her] memory [and] in [her] own unconscious”;²⁰⁵ this residual practice has had a considerable impact on her artistic production. She has, from this perspective, stated the following, “the role *obeah* [has] play[ed] in my work is the role it [has] played in my life.”²⁰⁶ In the novel, Mrs. John, Annie’s mother, has resorted to ‘special’ baths as a form of protection to shield her family from ‘malevolent’ spells and evil spirits. The young narrator has fostered that such showers are meticulously arranged and performed “after my mother had consulted with her obeah woman, and with her mother and a trusted friend, and all three of them had confirmed that [...] one of the [...] women [...] was trying to harm my mother and me by setting bad spirits on us.”²⁰⁷ Annie has been settled, by the end of the novel, on travelling to England to study nursing, yet her clothes and jewellery have been presented to an obeah lady whose role is to cast spells on them to safeguard her against mischance and wicked entities.²⁰⁸

B- The Dominant: Anti-colonial Spirit and Hippie Cultural Values:

The background of the 1960s till the 1980s against which *Annie John* has been published, has contributed, in numerous ways, to the final course her vision of *The Tempest* has taken. Kincaid has had a firsthand experience with the British colonial system for seventeen years before she left Antigua in (1966) and headed to the United States. She has also witnessed, as many thinkers in the colonies, the domino effect of the decolonisation process that has spread all over the colonies resulting in the birth of several nations. Besides, she has had, after settling in New York, an unmediated view of the Hippie Movement and the counterculture spirit of the era which have been gaining momentum in the United States, during the late 1960s up to the early 1980s. The rest of the world, the colonies, Antigua included, and the new nations have not been exempt from this prevalent ideological and cultural environment which has resulted in two dominant aspects in Kincaid’s novel: The dominance of the anti-colonial spirit and the Hippie countercultural values.

The anti-colonial spirit, to begin with, has been voiced through Annie whose rebellion against oppression under whatever shape, of the British teachers and colonial education

system has been, to a certain extent, an effective strategy. The administrators and teachers alike have complained to Mrs. John that her daughter “is well behaved in class, at least in the presence of her masters and mistresses, but behind their backs and outside the classroom [she gets metamorphosed into] quite the opposite.”²⁰⁹ The one Annie could not stand the most is Miss Edward who has been assigned to instruct her students in the history of the West Indies. The games played and the Antiguan folklore songs performed by the native girls have been viewed with disdain by the teacher and Annie has even once “wished the ground would open up and take her [Miss Edward] in”²¹⁰ perhaps because she has been the embodiment of the colonial authority. Annie’s anti-colonial vision, despite being young, has prompted her to rebuff, whenever possible, the colonial education designed to engrave within her blind compliance with and subjugation to the British Empire.²¹¹ Christopher Columbus, the “discoverer of the island that [would become Annie’s] home,”²¹² has been ‘defamed’ by the heroine, which Miss Edward and Miss Moore, the headmistress, have deemed not only outrageous, but also blasphemous. Annie has shown, nevertheless, no regret towards what she has done to the symbol of the white man’s conquest of the new world.

The second dominant cultural element in *Annie John* is the hippie antiestablishment spirit which subverted, in the context of British colonised Antigua, the colonial order with its firmly held worldviews. The hippies, with their utopian visions and countercultural stance, have had a negative view of mainstream culture which they have associated with repression; therefore, they have adhered, as part of their rebellion, to the sexual revolution of the late 1960s and 1970s which has encouraged and even idealised drugs and sex. Kincaid’s text has made a reference to such a hippie way of life through Mr. John, Annie’s father, who has had a tumultuous premarital life. The heroine has clarified that there have been “many women my father had loved, had never married, but with whom he had had children.”²¹³ Another illustrative example would be Mr. Nigel and Mr. Earl, “the two fishermen who supplied”²¹⁴ Annie’s family with fish, who have endorsed the countercultural values and created, as a

matter of fact, their own hippie-like community in which absolutely everything, from the job, the boat, the house to the wife, is shared between them without even getting, at any moment, into ‘mundane’ quarrels. Annie has summarised the whole life they have been leading with these words,

Mr. Nigel and Mr. Earl shared everything. At sea, they shared the same boat, the same catch. At home, they shared the same house, with Mr. Earl’s entrance from the street and Mr. Nigel’s entrance through the yard. The house had a door inside that connected their two parts, but the door was never locked. They shared the same wife, a woman named Miss Catherine, and though she did not live with them completely, her own house was just a few doors away, and she visited them quite regularly, sometimes entering from the street, sometimes entering through the yard. There, Miss Catherine cooked food, and the three of them, sitting at a table, ate from the same pot with their bare hands.²¹⁵

The fact that they “share the same woman” can be seen, from mainstream viewpoint, as a “peculiarity”²¹⁶ which might be traced back to the era’s hippie countercultural ideals.

Those who have been enrolled in the hippie spirit, be they teenagers or adults, have been ‘liberated’ from the ‘manacles’ of social conventions since they have had, to a great extent, an unbridled sexual freedom. The period, in general, is also remembered as “women’s liberationists emerged from the counterculture and embraced its spirit and drive in the early 1970s to push for reform.”²¹⁷ These aspects might be detected in Kincaid’s novel where women occupy the centre, with Annie and her mother, and the rest of the female characters like Ma Jolie, Ma Chess and the school girls who have been given importance. Men in this feminine environment have, on the other hand, been relegated to second hand citizens whose presence, or absence, is barely noticeable. Their characters, in this one-dimensioned matrix, have been constructed as quite flat devoid of substance and without any expected evolution whatsoever. The relationship between Annie and the other girls has been pillared on a hippie homoerotic basis with their secret meetings in which they have had the habit to “show each other various parts of [their] bodies.”²¹⁸ The countercultural values have, in brief, been voiced by Kincaid through her female characters since “[d]esire between girls in *Annie John* [might be located] within any one relationship as well as in simultaneous or interlacing relationships.”²¹⁹

C- The Emergent: An Upsurge of Neocolonialism:

The following discussion has the purpose of investigating the emergent cultural and ideological aspects in *Annie John* making reference to Williams' perception of this category. I have to refresh my reader's memory, before taking any further steps towards immersing in my analysis, of the exact purport of the 'emergent.' As a concept intertwined with culture and ideology, it points at the new aspects, values, meanings, relationships, features and practices which might spring into life in a society and at any given stage of its history.²²⁰ The background of the 1970s and early 1980s, against which Kincaid's adaptation of *The Tempest* has been published, has had a significant imprint on *Annie John*. The traditional colonial entities, Britain and France, have been compelled, during the 1960s, to release their grip over vast overseas territories. This has brought into the surface new issues to reckon with since Caliban's military resistance and armed rebellions have become irrelevant and even futile with the emergence of the neocolonial tendencies.

The central concerns, in the so called Third World, have shifted from political and armed struggle towards finding the resources to wrestle with the prominent upsurge of neocolonialism, with the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, which has mainly been cultural and economic. The Antiguans' concerns over neocolonial issues in Kincaid's novel have been brought into the surface; because Caliban's involvement and struggle, in this context, has been ineffective, the role of women has been brought into the surface with the resurrection of Sycorax, through Mrs. John, Ma Jolie and Ma Chess. These Antiguan women, with their oral tradition, not Caliban, stand for the roots since they have access "to the great trunks of cultural memory, from which may be recuperated cultural traditions, identities, and meanings that are more enduring"²²¹ amidst the era's ascending neocolonial tendencies.

It is worth to discuss, herein, the episode in which Miss Nelson has assigned to her students to write an autobiographical essay. Annie has taken advantage to tell everybody about the day she has spent with her mother at the beach during which these events have

occurred, “[o]ne day, in the midst of watching my mother swim and dive, I heard a commotion far out at sea. It was three ships going by, and they were filled with people. They must have been celebrating something, for the ships would blow their horns and the people would cheer in response.”²²² This incident has hinted at the neocolonial presence of European tourists who would ultimately wreak havoc in one of their favourite touristic havens; their celebrations are dirty and noisy heedless of any considerations towards the surrounding milieu; likewise, the white “people on these ships represent an invasive neocolonialism.”²²³

The dream sequence reuniting the Red Girl and Annie on a ‘virgin’ island has come as a result of the departure of the Red Girl to Anguilla to join her grandparents. The two heroines in this dream “would sit on the sand and watch ships filled with people on a cruise steam by.”²²⁴ However, their status has been readjusted, to topple power-based dynamics, from passive spectators to active actors who interfere and interact with the whole scenery. The two girls would take their seat on the sand and send “confusing signals to the ships, causing them to crash on some nearby rocks”;²²⁵ the narrator has commented this situation with these words, “[h]ow we laughed as their cries of joy turned to cries of sorrow.”²²⁶ To cut it short, this scene of the dream, imbued with symbolism, has been intended to “extend [...] Annie John[’s] and the Red Girl’s resistance to neocolonialism, as they attack tourists on cruise ships as the latest incarnation of the conquerors.”²²⁷ The presence of these whites in Antigua might be a reminder of the near colonial past, with history almost repeating itself, one way or another, as these tourists exploit the region under other forms and for other ends.

Conclusion:

I have studied, in this chapter, Kincaid’s text in relation to the bard’s last play. First of all, light has been cast upon the life of the author and the entire background of the 1960s to the early 1980s which has had an impact on the Antiguan writer’s novel. The second section has revealed the way *Annie John* has stylized *The Tempest* in terms of characters by introducing not only a female Prospero, but also, with the exception of Mr. Nigel, female Caliban-like figures. The master/slave dynamics have, here again, been reviewed through the

teacher/student duality; the civilising mission entailed in both source and adaptation, have been explored stressing the failure of the white man's designs. The third section has dealt with the ways Kincaid's novel has got engaged in a hidden polemic with Shakespeare's work by reorienting the narrative from Prospero's scope to Annie's with a significant relocation of the events in terms of setting. The stereotypes, like the smelling native, which has been deployed in the source together with the detainer of power, have been reversed by Kincaid imputing the foul smell to the English people while handing the keys of power to the native. Kincaid's subtle but utterly aggressive approach towards *The Tempest* has culminated in the strategic resurrection of Sycorax which has had huge cultural significance; and as shown, colonialism as well as the heterosexual values of Shakespeare's play have been indirectly criticised. The last section has given me the chance to deploy Williams' concepts to shed light on the African roots of obeah, the anti-colonial feelings prevalent during the era, mingled with the hippie countercultural values; the section has ended with the emergent neocolonial concerns which have sprung into life with traditional colonialism on its death bed.

Endnotes:

¹. Moira Ferguson, "A Small Place: Glossing Annie John's Rebellion," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 03.

². Thomas Cartelli, *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 204.

³. This idea has been introduced by Craig Tapping paraphrased in: Yimitri Jayasundera, "Jamaica Kincaid," in Emmanuel S. Nelson, ed., *Contemporary African American Novelists: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 262.

⁴. Maria Mikolchak, "Jamaica Kincaid," in Yolanda Williams Page, ed., *Encyclopedia of African American Women Writers*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007), p. 341.

⁵. Ibid.

⁶. Ibid.

⁷. Paris Permenter and John Bigley, *Antigua and Barbuda*, (Edison: Hunter Publishing, 2001), p. 35.

⁸. Riva Berleant-Schiller et al., *Antigua and Barbuda World Bibliographical Series*, (Oxford: Abc-Clio, 1995), p. xvii-xviii.

⁹. Ibid., p. xx.

¹⁰. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 193.

¹¹. Derick J. Mbungang, "Intertextuality in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, Vol 02: N° 01, 2017, p. 526, International Open Access Journal, www.ijtsrd.com, Accessed on 01/01/2021.

¹². Keja Valens, "Obvious and Ordinary: Desire between Girls in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in A Journal of Women Studies, Vol 25: N° 02, 2004, p. 140, University of Nebraska Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3347307>, Accessed on 01/01/2021.

¹³. Ibid.

¹⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.

- ¹⁵. Michelle Collette Beal, *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*, (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998), p. 07.
- ¹⁶. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 21.
- ¹⁷. Derick J. Mbungang, "Intertextuality in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, Vol 02: N° 01, 2017, p. 527, *International Open Access Journal*, www.ijtsrd.com, Accessed on 01/01/2021.
- ¹⁸. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 109, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 05/01/2021.
- ¹⁹. Note: reading Gilbert Yeoh's article "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," contributed to shaping my argument at this stage in relation to physical and mental traits.
- ²⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 52.
- ²¹. Ibid.
- ²². Ibid.
- ²³. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 57.
- ²⁴. Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 154.
- ²⁵. Ibid.
- ²⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ²⁷. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 57.
- ²⁸. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 109, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 05/01/2021.
- ²⁹. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 07.
- ³⁰. Ibid.
- ³¹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 55.
- ³². Ibid., p 56.
- ³³. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 07.
- ³⁴. Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 151.
- ³⁵. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 110, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 05/01/2021.
- ³⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 57.
- ³⁷. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 30.
- ³⁸. Ibid.
- ³⁹. Ibid.
- ⁴⁰. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 110, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 05/01/2021.
- ⁴¹. Moira Ferguson, "A Small Place: Glossing Annie John's Rebellion," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 12.
- ⁴². William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ⁴³. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 40.
- ⁴⁴. Zarina Mullan Plath, "Issues of Identity in the Politics of Race: Jamaica Kincaid and the Post-Colonial Fiction of Invention," in *Journal of West Indian Literature*, Vol 07: N° 02, 1998, p. 30, *Journal of West Indian Literature*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23019708>, Accessed on 07/01/2021.
- ⁴⁵. Gina Wisker, *Post-colonial and African American Women's Writing: A Critical Introduction*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 103.
- ⁴⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 87.
- ⁴⁷. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 17.
- ⁴⁸. Ibid., p. 41.
- ⁴⁹. Moira Ferguson, "A Small Place: Glossing Annie John's Rebellion," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 12.
- ⁵⁰. Brian Niro, *Race*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), Pp. 44-45.
- ⁵¹. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 21.
- ⁵². Ibid., p. 22.
- ⁵³. Ibid., p. 23.
- ⁵⁴. Ibid., p. 22.
- ⁵⁵. Brian Niro, *Race*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.45.

- ⁵⁶. My argument in relation to stylizing this element has been sharpened with, Michelle Collette Beal, *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*, (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998), p. 07.
- ⁵⁷. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 22.
- ⁵⁸. Michelle Collette Beal, *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*, (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998), p. 07.
- ⁵⁹. Ibid.
- ⁶⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 87.
- ⁶¹. Note: The argument developed here owes a great deal to Michelle Collette Beal's work *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*.
- ⁶². Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 22. [Emphasis is mine]
- ⁶³. Michelle Collette Beal, *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*, (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998), p. 07.
- ⁶⁴. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ⁶⁵. Derick J. Mbugang, "Intertextuality in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, Vol 02: N° 01, 2017, p. 527, International Open Access Journal, www.ijtsrd.com, Accessed on 10/01/2021.
- ⁶⁶. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 38.
- ⁶⁷. Ibid., p. 22.
- ⁶⁸. Ibid., p. 38.
- ⁶⁹. Granite Pare, "'Burn But His Books': Education and Colonization in *The Tempest* and *Annie John*," in The Ashen Egg, Vol 07: N° 01, 2019, Western Kentucky University, Kentucky, p. 56.
- ⁷⁰. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 196.
- ⁷¹. Richard Gill, *Mastering Shakespeare*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), p. 206.
- ⁷². William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 19.
- ⁷³. Ibid., p. 22.
- ⁷⁴. Richard Gill, *Mastering Shakespeare*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), p. 206.
- ⁷⁵. Ibid.
- ⁷⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 94.
- ⁷⁷. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in World Literature Written in English, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 104, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 13/01/2021.
- ⁷⁸. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 39.
- ⁷⁹. Ibid., p. 38.
- ⁸⁰. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in World Literature Written in English, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 104, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 13/01/2021.
- ⁸¹. Ibid.
- ⁸². James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 80.
- ⁸³. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 22.
- ⁸⁴. Michelle Collette Beal, *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*, (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998), p. 08.
- ⁸⁵. Ibid.
- ⁸⁶. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ⁸⁷. Gilbert Yeoh's article "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," has framed the current discussion of the island sounds.
- ⁸⁸. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 70.
- ⁸⁹. Ibid., p. 35.
- ⁹⁰. Ibid.
- ⁹¹. Ibid., p. 75.
- ⁹². Ibid., p. 101.
- ⁹³. Ibid., p. 107.
- ⁹⁴. Crystal Bartolovich, "'Baseless Fabric': London as a 'World City'," in Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, eds., *The Tempest and its Travels*, (London: Reaction Books, 2000), p. 18.
- ⁹⁵. Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in Postcolonial Interventions, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 146.
- ⁹⁶. The influence of Gilbert Yeoh's article "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," cannot be overlooked as it has framed the current discussion of the island sounds.
- ⁹⁷. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 23.

- ⁹⁸. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 105, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 15/01/2021.
- ⁹⁹. Ibid., p. 106.
- ¹⁰⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 29.
- ¹⁰¹. Note: Gilbert Yeoh's influence with his article, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," is apparent
- ¹⁰². Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 23.
- ¹⁰³. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 105, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 15/01/2021.
- ¹⁰⁴. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 23.
- ¹⁰⁵. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans., Richard Philcox, (New York: Grove Press, 2004), p. 07.
- ¹⁰⁶. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁷. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 52.
- ¹⁰⁸. Note: This discussion has been influenced by Gilbert Yeoh's and Chantal Zabus' works already referenced
- ¹⁰⁹. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 20.
- ¹¹⁰. Ibid., p. 21.
- ¹¹¹. Ibid.
- ¹¹². Ibid.
- ¹¹³. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 129.
- ¹¹⁴. Note: The influence of Gilbert Yeoh's Article is clear at this level.
- ¹¹⁵. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 57.
- ¹¹⁶. Ibid.
- ¹¹⁷. Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 128.
- ¹¹⁹. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 08.
- ¹²⁰. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 55.
- ¹²¹. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 14.
- ¹²². Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 30.
- ¹²³. Ibid., p. 30.
- ¹²⁴. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 105, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 17/01/2021.
- ¹²⁵. Amy L. Tigner, *Literature and the Renaissance: From Elizabeth I to Charles II*, (Farnham, Ashgate: 2012), p. 144.
- ¹²⁶. Ibid.
- ¹²⁷. Note: The influence of Suzy Woltman and Chantal Zabus, in framing this argument, cannot be denied.
- ¹²⁸. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), Pp. 35-36.
- ¹²⁹. Ibid., p. 36.
- ¹³⁰. Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 153.
- ¹³¹. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 36.
- ¹³². Ibid.
- ¹³³. Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 131.
- ¹³⁴. Joyce Green MacDonald, *Shakespearean Adaptation, Race and Memory in the New World*, (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), p. 26.
- ¹³⁵. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 23.
- ¹³⁶. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 105, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 20/01/2021.
- ¹³⁷. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 19.
- ¹³⁸. Ibid.
- ¹³⁹. Ibid., p. 20.
- ¹⁴⁰. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 13.
- ¹⁴¹. Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 113, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 24/01/2021.
- ¹⁴². Ibid., p. 114.
- ¹⁴³. Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 11.

- ¹⁴⁴ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 19.
- ¹⁴⁵ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 11.
- ¹⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁷ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 52.
- ¹⁴⁸ Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 135.
- ¹⁴⁹ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 56.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁵² Ibid., p. 58.
- ¹⁵³ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁴ Timothy Helen Pyne, Cited in Jana Evans Braziel, *Caribbean Genesis: Jamaica Kincaid and the Writing of New Worlds*, (New York: State University of New York Press, 2009), p. 56.
- ¹⁵⁵ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 58.
- ¹⁵⁶ Merle Collins, Cited in Gina Wisker, *Post-colonial and African American Women's Writing: A Critical Introduction*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 95.
- ¹⁵⁷ Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 114, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 26/01/2021.
- ¹⁵⁸ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 09.
- ¹⁵⁹ Jarlath Killeen, *The Fairy Tales of Oscar Wilde*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 86.
- ¹⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁶¹ Note: The influence of Keja Valens and Suzy Wolman upon this topic is apparent throughout the discussion
- ¹⁶² Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 40.
- ¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 19.
- ¹⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁵ Keja Valens, "Obvious and Ordinary: Desire between Girls in Jamaica Kincaid's "Annie John"," in *A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol 25: N° 02, 2004, p. 124, University of Nebraska Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3347307>, Accessed on 05/02/2021.
- ¹⁶⁶ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 31.
- ¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 32.
- ¹⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁹ Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 152.
- ¹⁷⁰ Brinda Charry, "Recent Perspectives on *The Tempest*," in Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*, (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014), p. 67.
- ¹⁷¹ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 29.
- ¹⁷² Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 186.
- ¹⁷³ Craig Tapping, Paraphrased in Ymitri Jayasundera, "Jamaica Kincaid," in Emmanuel S. Nelson, ed., *Contemporary African American Novelists: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 262.
- ¹⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁵ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 39.
- ¹⁷⁶ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 24.
- ¹⁷⁷ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 39.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 38.
- ¹⁷⁹ Granite Pare, "Burn But His Books": Education and Colonization in *The Tempest* and *Annie John*," in *The Ashen Egg*, Vol 07: N° 01, 2019, Western Kentucky University, Kentucky, p. 57.
- ¹⁸⁰ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 40.
- ¹⁸¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁸² Moira Ferguson, "A Small Place: Glossing Annie John's Rebellion," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 11.
- ¹⁸³ Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 39.
- ¹⁸⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 41.
- ¹⁸⁶ Fabienne Viala, *The Post-Columbus Syndrome: Identities, Cultural Nationalism, and Commemorations in the Caribbean*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 255.
- ¹⁸⁷ Victoria Burrows, *Whiteness and Trauma: The Mother-Daughter Knot in the Fiction of Jean Rhys, Jamaica Kincaid and Toni Morrison*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 76.

- ¹⁸⁸ . Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 114, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 17/01/2021.
- ¹⁸⁹ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 21.
- ¹⁹⁰ . Ibid., p. 38.
- ¹⁹¹ . Ibid., p. 37.
- ¹⁹² . Moira Ferguson, "A Small Place: Glossing Annie John's Rebellion," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 11.
- ¹⁹³ . Derick J. Mbungang, "Intertextuality in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, Vol 02: N° 01, 2017, p. 527, International Open Access Journal, www.ijtsrd.com, Accessed on 25/02/2021.
- ¹⁹⁴ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 37.
- ¹⁹⁵ . Ibid., p. 38.
- ¹⁹⁶ . Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁷ . Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁸ . Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁹ . Gina Wisker, *Post-colonial and African American Women's Writing: A Critical Introduction*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 104.
- ²⁰⁰ . Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ²⁰¹ . _____, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ²⁰² . Pratik Chakrabarti, *Medicine and Empire 1600-1960*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 08.
- ²⁰³ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 52.
- ²⁰⁴ . K. B. Conal Byrne, "Under English, Obeah English: Jamaica Kincaid's New Language," in Harold Bloom, ed., *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*, (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008), p. 71.
- ²⁰⁵ . Jana Evans Braziel, *Caribbean Genesis: Jamaica Kincaid and the Writing of New Worlds*, (New York: State University of New York Press, 2009), p. 56.
- ²⁰⁶ . Ibid.
- ²⁰⁷ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 11.
- ²⁰⁸ . Ibid., p. 64.
- ²⁰⁹ . Ibid., p. 39.
- ²¹⁰ . Ibid., p. 40.
- ²¹¹ . Craig Tapping, Paraphrased in Ymitri Jayasundera, "Jamaica Kincaid," in Emmanuel S. Nelson, ed., *Contemporary African American Novelists: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 262.
- ²¹² . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 41.
- ²¹³ . Ibid., p. 11.
- ²¹⁴ . Ibid., p. 57.
- ²¹⁵ . Ibid., p. 58.
- ²¹⁶ . Chantal Zabus, *Tempests after Shakespeare*, (New York: Palgrave, 2002), p. 128.
- ²¹⁷ . Neil A. Hamilton, *Eyewitness History: The 1970s*, (New York: Facts on File, 2006), p. VI.
- ²¹⁸ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 40.
- ²¹⁹ . Keja Valens, "Obvious and Ordinary: Desire between Girls in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol 25: N° 02, 2004, p. 140, University of Nebraska Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3347307>, Accessed on 20/03/2021.
- ²²⁰ . Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ²²¹ . Gilbert Yeoh, "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, p. 114, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>, Accessed on 25/03/2021.
- ²²² . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 23.
- ²²³ . Suzy Woltmann, "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020, p. 153.
- ²²⁴ . Jamaica Kincaid, *Annie John*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985), p. 36.
- ²²⁵ . Ibid.
- ²²⁶ . Ibid.
- ²²⁷ . Keja Valens, "Obvious and Ordinary: Desire between Girls in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol 25: N° 02, 2004, p. 140, University of Nebraska Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3347307>, Accessed on 28/03/2021.

Part Three:
**Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) Rewritten,
Remodelled, Revised and Reinvented
through Gordimer's *Friday's Footprint*
(1960), Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978) and
Coetzee's *Foe* (1986)**

Chapter Five:
The Crusoe/Friday Story and Men/Women
Dualities under the Apartheid Regime in
Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960)
Framed with Feminist, Ideological and
Cultural Influences

Introduction

Nadine Gordimer had already rewritten *Robinson Crusoe* as “Friday’s Footprint.”¹

[For Nadine Gordimer,] *Robinson Crusoe* has emerged as an important metaphor in the process of both representing the act of writing fiction itself and also in writing political dissent. Gordimer [has] “writ[ten] Africa” in a way that Defoe never attempts to and [she has] use[d] *Robinson Crusoe* in particular to signpost the problem of writing fiction under an oppressive regime [The Apartheid South Africa].²

Nadine Gordimer’s story, under scrutiny, the title of which is “*Friday’s Footprint*” (1960), might suggest an ‘apparent’ relationship with *Robinson Crusoe*; however, one has to clarify that such a link is not obvious to be pinpointed the moment a reader gets immersed in her narrative. The tale of a woman, in her forties, whose husband died taking, thereafter, his stepbrother for a spouse, while managing the business, in the form of shops and a hotel located, in the frontier area, somewhere, in South Africa, her deceased husband left, might indicate little, if any, connexion with or reference at Defoe’s novel. On the other hand, an analysis of Gordimer’s text, away from this surface layer, might uncover the ways in which the South African author has appealed, as the second above epigraph confirms, to *Robinson Crusoe* to voice concerns Defoe would have never ever thought about.

The purpose for which this fifth chapter has been devised is to explore Gordimer’s reliance on “the Crusoe myth [as a] myth of modern individualism”³ in a different matrix from 18th century British empire construction environment shifted towards the 1960s South African social and political structures under the Apartheid regime. This temporal and spatial distance from Defoe’s source has resulted in “*Friday’s Footprint*” as a text which has reworked and refashioned *Robinson Crusoe* in a new milieu. The first section dissects Gordimer’s life as a committed intellectual who has been conscious of South Africa’s racial and gender issues by then; moreover, the socioeconomic and political context, which brought about the adaptation, is highlighted. Bakhtin’s conception of stylization is, afterwards, deployed to study the link between “*Friday’s Footprint*” and its alleged source. The third section makes use of two notions: Bakhtin’s ‘parody’ and Gérard Genette’s ‘metatextuality’;

this theoretical grounding has been fostered to examine Gordimer's text as not only a parody, which has mocked its original, but also a metatext, which has criticised aspects from Defoe's text. To finish with, Williams' categories of 'residual,' 'dominant' and 'emergent' are crucial to my reading of Gordimer's tale in relation to its ideological and cultural environment.

1- Nadine Gordimer's Life and "Friday's Footprint" in Context:

A- Nadine Gordimer: The Life of an Engaged Intellectual:

Nadine Gordimer's long and prolific career is proof enough testifying on behalf of a distinguished scholar and an intellectual who devoted her whole life to uncovering her country's racial discrepancies and struggling against its injustices. She is a South African essayist, novelist, fiction writer and political activist who was born in (1923) to a European immigrant-originated family which has earlier settled in Springs. Unlike the majority of her female counterparts, who were illiterate, she received her early education at a Catholic convent (girls) school, a fact which has had a considerable impact on her fiction.⁴ This has encouraged her, in the upcoming years, to voice the gender issues the country has been struggling with, under apartheid, while endorsing the fight for women's rights in such a complex patriarchal milieu. Such a problematic status, to which women have been reduced, in the South African context of the 1960s, might be viewed as the core aspects the author has moulded into her tale while attempting to shape and reframe Defoe's text to suit another dimension of oppression which is not racial (Crusoe/Friday), but rather reoriented towards gender (men/women). From the onset, Gordimer was the kind of intellectuals who wanted nothing, but read to expand her horizons which led her, at an early age, to give writing stories and poems a try. Her University sojourn and academic career, which any reader of her novels might expect to be long, turned out, for some reason, to be quite brief and in (1953), after her initial attempts under the form of short stories, she authored her first novel *The Lying Days*.⁵

Gordimer's enthusiasm and zeal for reading and writing made it possible for her to have a fine eye, and a sophisticated taste for arts, but most importantly gave her the ability to sharpen her political commitment and consciousness against the country's apartheid

background.⁶ She has tasted, from within the country's dominant structures, first-hand racial segregation, life's ongoing and repetitive crises combined with political and economic favouritism in a country torn by a strict system of racial division. These harsh circumstances, with all the prejudices and injustices they entail, have inflected her writings towards the country's major political concerns. "I am not a political person by nature," she has once confirmed; "if I had lived elsewhere, my writing would [not] have reflected politics much, if at all [...] I didn't know what politics was about until I saw it all happening to people."⁷ The injuries done to her fellow coloured men/women, she eye-witnessed, under apartheid, teamed with her friendship with political activists, politicised her worldviews, which directed her at engaging in a staunch opposition against racial oppression and skin/colour segregation, the blacks suffered from. Thus, it would not seem unusual if she has, at one point in her career, felt the pressing necessity to get engaged in a dialogue with and rewrite a colonial text like Defoe's through "*Friday's Footprint*." She got involved, later on, in political activism and expressed her anti-apartheid stance while continuing to be prolific, for the next five decades, publishing several short stories, novels and essays until she died in (2014).

B- Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960): Context and Influences:

Racism and discrimination in South Africa might be traced back as far as the second half of the 17th century (Dutch East India Company trade post), then, throughout the 18th and the first half of 19th centuries with the Dutch occupation and rule.⁸ Afterwards, the country was annexed, in a gradual fashion, with the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, by the British Empire which did nothing but perpetuate the existing and ongoing ethnic division and racial discrimination. The white minority, the Afrikaners — descendents of early Dutch occupants— and British settlers established their control over the marginalised and politically dominated black majority from the 1870s till nearly the 1990s.⁹ These whites, imbued with a supremacist ideology, brought into existence a rigid system of territorial and regional segregation separating black and white populations through the

establishment of what came to be known as native reserves together with separate locations for the blacks in rural areas and cities respectively.¹⁰

These segregation policies, whether social or political, were tightened through time, the aspect that deprived the blacks of their basic civil rights among which enjoying a full citizenship. With these procedures being implemented with judiciary support —throughout the first half of the 20th century, racism burgeoned which did not only impact negatively the rights of black South Africans to possess land, but also hindered them from voting, having equal job opportunities, occupying office/high ranking responsibilities, and even living or travelling wherever and whenever they want. Things culminated in (1948) with the rise to power of the Afrikaners' National Party which materialised the implementation of massive racial discrimination by extending and legalising the white supremacist ideology and racial segregation policies via the country's newly adopted system, Apartheid. Legislations like Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act (1949), Immorality Act (1950) which prohibited any sexual intercourse involving the white Europeans with the blacks, and the Group Areas Act (1950) were some of the sour fruits of the Afrikaners' ascendance to power. These upheavals have exercised a lasting influence on Gordimer, modelled her writings, reoriented her interests and sharpened her political stance/resistance against apartheid. It has to be stated, likewise, that "Gordimer [has] assume[d] the role of writer in the ambiguities of the South African interregnum, positioning herself clearly on the side of the anti-apartheid struggle."¹¹

Political opposition to apartheid grew during the (1950s) and (1960s) with the African National Congress reacting in (1952) through what has come to be termed as a Defiance Campaign which called for stay-at-homes, mass rallies and organised marches to ask for the immediate repeal of apartheid laws.¹² The fact that these counter measures did not achieve their primary designs, as the National Party leaders might have expected, was an incentive that helped intensify, instead of weakening resistance; this sparked, although in an intermittent fashion, a fiercer political engagement to oppose racism. Nelson Mandela, a

secret member of the African National Congress, who has been banned from giving public speeches between (1953) and (1961),¹³ and later on imprisoned from (1963) to (1990), remains a key figure of this resistance against the ongoing institutionalised racial segregation.

The (1960s) were tumultuous throughout the continent, and South Africa might not be de-contextualised from this wider picture. The rise of nationalist movements in the colonies that rejected the colonial domination spurred marked efforts for independence which brought about an unprecedented wave of decolonisation that spread in a quick domino effect reaching nearly all the colonies. The subjugated races no longer perceived themselves as the inferior ‘other’ to be ‘tamed’ and ‘civilised’; with a more defiant spirit that roamed all over the colonies, which predominated the era, the natives were induced to request for stark equality with the white man. This atmosphere, full of rebellion, revolutionary optimism and guerrilla, contributed to weakening the latter’s ideological position since his alleged ‘superiority’ rested on the already outdated and refuted racial theories. The colonised indigenous, who was subject to racism, ill-treatment and racial discrimination during the colonial period, waged revolutionary wars which led to the birth of several independent nations.

The resistance against apartheid, in particular and discrimination, in general, continued with one more major event during the (1960s) which is the Sharpeville Massacre on March 21st, 1960 which was initially a pacific action against the Pass Laws which compelled the blacks to take their passes with them, in case they trespass to white, non-authorised, areas in order to justify their presence there. The demonstrators in Sharpeville, like their counterparts all over the country, pacifically assembled at police stations not carrying with them their passes when all of a sudden, in the wake of scuffles, the police opened fire on them killing (69) people and injuring (180) other.¹⁴ Seeing “*Friday’s Footprint*” in the light of these events would, therefore, facilitate its understanding, and comprehending the author’s choice to adapt Defoe’s novel, one of the founding colonial myths, would not, under any condition, be a mystery nor would such a choice seem, in any manner, whatsoever, fortuitous.

2- “Friday’s Footprint”: A Stylization of Robinson Crusoe:

Although “*Friday’s Footprint*” has made only two direct references to *Robinson Crusoe*, a meticulous perusal, this section targets, might reveal a variety of elements which have been borrowed by Gordimer from Defoe’s text. To this purpose, there is a pressing necessity to appeal to Bakhtin’s ‘stylization’ which voices coexistence between the adaptation and its source. As outlined in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (1984), it points at an ulterior text whose “author’s thought, once having penetrated someone else’s discourse and made its home in it, does not collide with the other’s thought.”¹⁵ Given this view, my efforts would be directed at revealing the cohabitation between the two texts under study, Gordimer’s and Defoe’s. Various aspects and layers—including characters, the status of women, the coloniser/colonised and Crusoe/Friday dichotomies as well as other robinsonade features—would be inquired into, in Gordimer’s tale, in terms of the ways they have been reproduced and, as a result, correspond with Defoe’s novel. Some of the key aspects of the robinsonade might entail “[a] resourceful loner, a dangerous voyage, a shipwreck, a desert island, a life of almost unimaginable solitude, desperate scavenging, despair, hope, the discovery of a footprint, conquest in the guise of love, bloody warfare [and] escape.”¹⁶ These are features, Defoe’s novel has outlined, upon which a glance would be cast throughout my reading of Gordimer’s work in an attempt to spot the way they have been stylized in a different context and environment, the 1960s South Africa.

A- The Characters in Gordimer’s Adaptation and Defoe’s Source: A- I- Crusoe Retrieved through Arthur and Johnny:

The protagonist of Defoe’s work under the name of Robinson Crusoe and on behalf of whom the story and novel has been labelled, has acquired a worldwide and timeless reputation to the extent of taking the dimension of a “larger- than-life hero[...].”¹⁷ Crusoe has even been “supposed [to be] the author as well as the hero” by many early 18th century readers since “nowhere did Defoe’s name appear on the first edition”¹⁸ published in (1719). Therefore, the

castaway's character is inevitable to the extent that any work of fiction which might pertain to rewrite and adapt Defoe's adventure story has a certain obligation to make reference, direct or indirect, to Crusoe in order to establish its position in relation to the novel. Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" might not be singled out as an exception since it has stylized and retrieved the character of Crusoe through two central-to-the-story figures: Arthur and Johnny.

The first Crusoe-like figure in Gordimer's text is Arthur Cunningham, who has been fashioned, in a variety of ways, on behalf of Defoe's 'indomitable' hero. The reader of the source is often pervaded with the impression that Crusoe has the ability to be assertive and steadfast whenever these qualities are required. Once aged eighteen years, he has taken the decision to leave his parents' house, although they have advised and warned him against it, to pursue a sailor's career, with all the risks and adventures it might entail. Crusoe has, in this sense, articulated such a spirit with these words, "I would be satisfied with nothing but going to sea; and my inclination to this led me so strongly against the will, nay, the commands of my father, and against all the entreaties and persuasions of my mother and other friends."¹⁹ Arthur, on a similar vein, has been endowed with the same qualities of being assertive and steadfast in terms of decision making and business conducting. The narrator has pinpointed these traits, which underpin his character, with a remark that has summarised his resolute state of mind as follows, "[h]e always did whatever he liked and got whatever he wanted."²⁰ This sentence, as any familiar reader of *Robinson Crusoe* might affirm, would fit Crusoe, if applied on him, since his acts and achievements alike, in most cases, if not all, have emanated from and been the result of his individualist approach to life that has been driven by freewill.

Defoe's hero has also shown an unmatched 'strength' and an 'indomitable' spirit with a workaholic tendency while attempting to achieve self-sufficiency on the island. This very demanding state of mind has special requirements in terms of careful planning and hard working, which Crusoe has not lacked, to achieve his daily objectives relying exclusively on his mental and physical resources. He has put emphasis on this mentality when he has argued,

“I was very seldom idle [and I have] regularly divided my time according to the several daily employments that were before me.”²¹ To better his life, he has strived to make his clothes, build appropriate shelters, for winter and summer, contrive adequate tools and, above all, come back home, everyday, with enough resources and food to survive. Crusoe’s endeavours have, on a regular basis, been rewarded; although after painstaking efforts, he has asserted “I [...] very seldom failed [to] bring[...] home something fit to eat.”²²

Arthur, Gordimer’s stylized version of Crusoe, has displayed, in many instances, the exact Crusoe-like mindset, strength and workaholic nature. The narrator has referred to him as a “strong [...] man”²³; while Rita, his wife, has pointed at him as someone who has achieved wonders and has “done [so many things] in his time, and never come to any harm.”²⁴ This has paralleled Arthur’s life with Crusoe’s in the sense that both have gone through a wide range of strange and dangerous experiences without getting hurt or even injured at whatever stage of their adventures. We might furthermore sense, in some scenes in which Arthur is spoken of, that he is the kind of workaholic colonial agents whose genealogy might be traced back to Defoe’s Crusoe. In one scene, in which Gordimer’s Crusoe might be seen “doing what he had done dozens of times before,”²⁵ Arthur has been tirelessly working, going “back and forth”²⁶ to both load on board of his ship and transport across the flooded river “all the food for the hotel and the store goods”²⁷ needed for his business. The narrator, in an oblique stylization of Crusoe, has fostered that “Arthur Cunningham [has been] the sort of man who got things done himself; that was the only way to get them done.”²⁸ These words, which have been deployed to portray him, contain one of the major traits Defoe’s hero has been marked with which is the work driven spirit and self reliant approach towards daily life. The fact that Arthur has had a preference to get things performed by himself, although he has had many ‘native’ employees, might be interpreted as a feature which might align him with Crusoe who, on his own, has managed to invent tools, make his bread, master pottery, build his ‘castles,’ houses, barns, farms and fortifications.

Arthur Cunningham, on whom the readers learn aspects through flashbacks, has already been dead with the tale's 'actual' timeline; this has reoriented the narrative towards and refocused the story on Arthur's stepbrother, Johnny, who might be considered as the second Crusoe-like character in Gordimer's work. He has been one of the most devoted employees Arthur, once alive, has ever had and this has brought him into the vicinity of Rita who has felt his 'impressive' presence once Arthur has no longer been around to support her. In a record time, "Johnny had taken over most of Arthur's work"²⁹ which has allowed him to exhibit Crusoe's same workaholic spirit and managerial skills at the level of making plans and persevering towards their final fulfilment. Once "the summer rainy season came round," Johnny has replaced Arthur as "the one who [has been] bringing the supplies across the river in the boat."³⁰ This presence of another Crusoe-like figure, in such a desolate colonial and oppressive patriarchal milieu, is of a crucial value, since it has allowed Gordimer to address the problematic status women have had in such an environment. It might be argued that Rita has been "marrie[d] [to] a surrogate Crusoe in the form of her former husband's stepbrother, Johnny Cunningham."³¹ All in all, the latter is a stylized replication of Defoe's castaway hero.

A- II- Rita Cunningham: Gordimer's Friday:

Robinson Crusoe, who has begun to see himself as the master and king of the uninhabited island, is able to reinforce this sense of himself when he 'acquires' Friday and determines that Friday is the slave ³²Other to him.

Defoe's choice to include a native figure like Friday is not fortuitous since it has fulfilled its function, as the above words might suggest, of modelling Crusoe's identity as the 'civilised,' 'master,' and 'superior white self'; Friday, on the other hand, would be positioned at the other end of the pole serving as the 'bestial,' 'slave,' and 'inferior coloured 'other'.' The Crusoe/Friday relationship has been advantageous to the English adventurer whose status as the 'civilised' entity has been established through his encounter with the 'barbarian' and 'cannibal' native. Friday, in this link, has been relegated to servitude with a depiction that has annihilated in him any signs of insubordination and stamped him as one of the most faithful,

loyal and docile servants a coloniser might ever have. It would not be peculiar, as such, if Gordimer has been interested in this Crusoe/Friday duality as a symbol of oppression which might be adapted to tackle a similar, but not less intricate, power-based connection between men and women during the 1950s and 1960s Apartheid South Africa.

The fact that Gordimer has stylized Crusoe, in such a patriarchal dominated political and social system, through Arthur and Johnny might entail both a presence and a stylization of Friday who has been replicated, on purpose, as a female figure through Rita Cunningham. Friday's situation, character and main traits, as shown by Defoe, —including his servility, loyalty and docility— have all been associated, in Gordimer's perception, with the South African white woman. Accordingly, one might claim that “[t]he revision operating in [Gordimer's] text is a comparison between Mrs. [Rita] Cunningham and Friday.”³³ The readers are informed, as the events of Gordimer's tale unfold, that Rita has been married to the story's two Crusoes; she has been, for many years, the spouse of Arthur and the moment he died, without much delay, Johnny has taken her for a wife. While analysing “*Friday's Footprint*,” I have noticed that Rita's whole life has been, just like Friday's, linked to and regulated by both Crusoe-like characters: Arthur and Johnny.

The encounter between the white European and the native in *Robinson Crusoe* might supply the readers with an indication of the course their relationship would take. Crusoe has stated in one scene, with a massive symbolic purport, that after saving the native from the cannibals, the following has issued, “[a]t last he [Friday] lays his head flat upon the ground, close to my foot, and sets my other foot upon his head [...] and after this made all the signs to me of subjection, servitude, and submission imaginable, to let me know how he would serve me so long as he lived.”³⁴ There is another scene, a few years after this initial encounter, in which Crusoe has taken the decision to construct a solid boat to send Friday back to his own people and nation while he (Crusoe) would remain on the island; at the mere suggestion of this, Friday, who has grown ‘dependent’ on the white man, has been irritated and thought that

his 'master' would abandon him. His reaction has been voiced in fragmented English saying to his 'master' "kill Friday, no send Friday away."³⁵ These instances shed enough light on the kind of characters Friday has been, as intended by Defoe, with his acceptance of slavery, his submission, docility, subordination and loyalty. It is these traits that Gordimer has, on various occasions, stylized and projected on Rita, in particular, and the South African white women, in general, during the 1950s and 1960s.

Rita has been infused with various Friday-like traits and characteristics which encompass an unfailing sense of loyalty towards both Arthur and, later on, Johnny. The narrator has drawn a portrait of a dutiful woman who has endorsed the housewife status sparing no efforts to serve Arthur; she has even deployed her acute sense of remark, to his service, spotting any signs of potential threat against him. The readers have been told that Rita has "had a strong sense of loyalty and was always watchful of any attempt to take advantage of her husband, who had in such careless abundance so many things that other men wanted."³⁶ Despite the misogynist treatment reserved to the likes-of-her under apartheid, Rita has complied, just like Friday has done, with the prevalent white patriarchal values. She has even been, on so many occasions, amazed at how docile she might be without the ability to cherish any thoughts about possible future perspectives away from her attachment to the 'Crusoe' she has been married to. These ideas have been voiced when the narrator has claimed, "for some reason she didn't understand – the fact, the plain fact that she had never committed the slightest disloyalty to Arthur all through their marriage."³⁷ Everything about her, her sexual life included, has been framed even regulated by Arthur's views, tastes and desires without having any opinions of her own whatsoever. Like the majority of South African white women of the era, on behalf of whom she has been fashioned, Rita has aligned herself with the societal norms of chastity. These values have prohibited any sexual intercourse before marriage; therefore, "she had never been made love to by a young man"; which is why, with utter submission "she [has] accepted [Arthur's] command of her in bed as the sum of love."³⁸

Thus, she could not think for herself in the massive presence of her Crusoe who monitored her life, guided her choices and shaded her whole world.

Rita's relationship with Johnny has not been different, in the slightest manner, from what she has experienced with Arthur. After the latter's death, she has been perplexed and, at one point, she has realised that her situation, as a widow in such a patriarchal environment, would be very intricate, if not impossible to handle. She has pictured, in her desperate stance, the 'overwhelming' absence of her Crusoe-like husband and she has come to the conclusion that she is "[b]ut a woman."³⁹ She has become conscious of her 'frailty' and 'inferiority,' based on her society's biased gendered standards, to the extent of inquiring with the following words, "how can I carry on?"⁴⁰ That is to say, how is she, who is only a widow and a housewife, supposed to continue living without her husband? In her viewpoint, life would be harsh in the absence of Arthur. This might bring into the reader's mind Friday's anger in the source at the thought of being abandoned by his 'master' the reason for which he has preferred to be killed by the white man rather than being returned to his own people.

As for Johnny, he has not dallied to show his true nature with his domineering, masculine, aggressive and manipulative personality. His misogynist treatment towards her has been, the least to say, excessively rude, if not ruthless and cruel at times. He has not bothered himself to understand the way she used to think nor has he taken the trouble, at any stage of their relationship, to treat her as a human being with delicate feelings since he has betrayed her with numerous other women. Johnny has never cared whether Rita has had any concrete knowledge or account of the "tales of his brief ventures into the beds [of] other men's women."⁴¹ She has not only been dominated by her new husband, but has also been neglected; after a few months of their marriage, Johnny "made love to her less and less often, and she waited for him. In tremendous shyness and secrecy, she was always waiting for him. And, oddly, when he did come to her again, next day she would feel ashamed."⁴² Rita has been confined, hence, within the strict limited boundaries of a housewife whose existence has

been doomed to revolve, in never ending circles, around her own Crusoe's fluctuating orbit. Much like Friday in relation to the master, she has been expected to serve and attend to Johnny's needs without any complaints. Through Rita and her traits, in brief, it might be stated that Gordimer has stylized and "translate[d]" Friday into the life of a South African housewife"⁴³ during the beginning of the Apartheid era.

B- Colonialism, Coloniser/Colonised, Slave/Master and Crusoe/Friday: Dynamics, Binaries and Dualities Stylized in Gordimer's Text:

The fact that Defoe's novel has acquired the reputation of both a "colonial parable par excellence"⁴⁴ and a "myth of English imperialism"⁴⁵ might not be considered the fruit of hazard as it contains a wide range of aspects which might connect it to the so called colonial literature. The hero, Crusoe, has been depicted as an unscrupulous coloniser who might stand as not only the embodiment of the coloniser's spirit, but also the earliest favourable matrix in which the colonialist mindset has germinated. The immediate confusion that has issued, following the shipwreck of the vessel on board of which he has been bound to Africa to buy slaves, has not deterred him from thinking about the 'appropriate' ways to survive and 'preserve' civilisation once on the island. It might be argued, likewise, that "Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* [has been] both indicative *and* formative of the European mentality at a time of burgeoning exploration and colonial expansion."⁴⁶ The final outcome, to the targeted 18th century English reader, has been satisfying since Crusoe has managed to 'recreate,' although with not much accuracy, a model of English civilisation, with its economic, social, cultural and political tropes and modes, in an overseas territory, by 'taming' nature and 'savages' alike. This propitious colonial setting has another fundamental requirement which is the presence of the native(s) who would stand as the 'inferior' 'other' upon whom the white man would perform his alleged civilising mission. This is what Defoe has dished his contemporary readership with once Friday has been introduced to Crusoe's vicinity and the novel's scenery; his arrival has both supplied the coloniser with the much needed 'slave' 'other' and allowed

“Robinson [...] to exercise absolute sovereignty”⁴⁷ as the undisputed ‘superior,’ ‘self’ and ‘master.’ Like many of her contemporaries who have attempted to rewrite Defoe’s text, Gordimer has been aware of these dynamics, binaries and dualities in action at the level of the source; this is the reason for which she has subtly stylized them in “*Friday’s Footprint*.”

Gordimer’s tale, unlike Defoe’s, has not been set on an island, yet the setting and the entire surrounding of her story might be characterised as an exotic and prone to be a colonial environment. The narrator has made it clear that the events are taking place in a remote hotel, which might recall Crusoe’s isolated island, located somewhere in a “part of Central Africa”⁴⁸ far thousands of miles from the nearest city, Johannesburg. The events being told revolve around Arthur, Johnny and “Rita Cunningham [...] in a colony in Central Africa” in an attempt to explore the white woman’s “uncertain identity in the remote colonial [and patriarchal] terrain.”⁴⁹ The hotel which has been placed in the middle of nowhere in an isolated area, with few people to be sighted, away from any signs of civilization might stand as a reference to Defoe’s island. Gordimer has, thus, opted for “an exotic African locale” which is “the colonial-style hotel”⁵⁰ to investigate various issues among which the white man’s presence in foreign territories. It is in the same way that Defoe’s “Crusoe [has] dominate[d] his island, [built], plant[ed] and gather[ed] crops, [...] tend[ed] herds of goats, [and] create[d] a colony”⁵¹ that Arthur Cunningham has evinced an unequalled work ethic due to which he has managed to ‘tame’ wilderness, construct, for the colonists, a hotel in a hostile area, invest his money at the level of shops, own boats to transport goods and employ native workers to drudge for him. The link that has been formed between Arthur, the white man who has taken advantage of a remote ‘virgin’ territory, and the coloured natives, whom he has employed, is reminiscent of the connection between coloniser/colonised and Crusoe/Friday in the source. Arthur has been depicted, in one scene of interest, like any coloniser, in the process condescending, harassing and “bullying the Africans as they load his skiff.”⁵² The scene has unfolded as follows,

When the boat was fully loaded for the fifth trip, he [Arthur] noticed the black-japanned double bed, in its component parts, but not assembled, propped against a crate. 'What about that thing?' he yelled. 'Don't keep leaving that behind for the next lot, you bloody fools. Get it on, get it on [...] 'You shouldn't be too young to know how important a nice comfortable big bed is? You expect the old Chief to wait till tomorrow? How'd you feel, if you were waiting for that beautiful bed for a beautiful new woman—',⁵³

Defoe's Crusoe has struggled on a daily basis to learn new things, methods and techniques in order to survive and secure food, water as well as contrive the necessary tools to fulfil his designs. Whenever he has felt the need for an object, a tool or a machine, he would somehow find a way to invent it. For instance, he has succeeded in contriving an umbrella to shelter himself from the sunny season's scourging sun; he has also managed to make a tobacco-pipe and plenty "wicker-ware [...] necessary baskets."⁵⁴ Although he lacked the 'know how,' Crusoe has found a way not only to make his own bread, but also to fashion earthenware tools; he has told the readers, "I arrived at an unexpected perfection in my earthenware, and contrived well enough to make them with a wheel, which I found infinitely easier and better."⁵⁵ The readers often end-up with the impression that there is almost nothing impossible to the 'indomitable' Crusoe who has been modelled as a 'superior' creature over nature, slaves and 'savages.'

The above aspects —the power to do everything, ingenuity, and 'natural' 'superiority'— have all been stylized and vested, by Gordimer, in Arthur, the text's coloniser and one of her Crusoe-like figures. Arthur's personality has been referred to, from the onset, as someone who has had the "superior manner of a hotelkeeper."⁵⁶ The fact that he has had the habit of ill-treating and rebuking his employees has not been interpreted, by the natives, as a sign of disrespect; on the contrary, it has been seen as an indication of his superiority. The narrator has confirmed that the "Africans took his [Arthur's] manner - snarling, smiling, insulting in its assumption (true) that he could do everything his workers did, but in half the time and twice as well - better than the [other] white men."⁵⁷ This might bring into memory Friday's words once he has invited Crusoe to go with him to his native people; he has told his 'master' in his ungrammatical sentences, "'[y]ou do great deal much good, [...] you teach

wild mans be good, sober, tame mans; you tell them know God, pray God, and live new life”.”⁵⁸ It might be fostered, thereby, that Arthur and Crusoe have been modelled as the ‘superior’ colonisers standing for the ‘masters’; the natives, on the other hand, have been portrayed as the ‘inferior’ colonised for whom the role of the ‘slaves’ has been assigned. As for the Crusoe/Friday duality, in the source, which might be qualified as a connection “of master and servant, of master and slave,”⁵⁹ Gordimer has stylized it through the relationship Arthur and Johnny, the story’s two Crusoes, have had with Rita, the tale’s female Friday.

C- “*Friday’s Footprint*”: The Shipwreck, almost a Desert and Loneliness:

One of the secrets to the everlasting and worldwide appeal *Robinson Crusoe* has had, in the centuries following its publication, might be the breathtaking elements it has featured, including a shipwreck, a life on a desert island away from civilisation, a struggle for survival and a wrestle with loneliness. These storylines have given birth to the robinsonade which often features a ready-to-fight for subsistence protagonist who is, most of the time, “isolated from the comforts of civilization [usually because of] a shipwreck [leading to his] arrival on a desert island [where he] must then improvise the means of survival from the limited resources at hand”⁶⁰ while dealing with solitude. The fact that Crusoe has tasted, throughout his adventures, this multitude of situations and dilemmas, has rendered him a universally memorable character. Gordimer has stylized, from the source, the above discussed features of the robinsonade reproducing them, although with some variations, to suit a different context.

To begin with, the key into the adventure realm of what has been dubbed the robinsonade might be signposted with a ‘shipwreck.’ This crucial event has initiated new horizons to the hero by reorienting his existence towards an outlook that would revolve on daily struggle for survival in a hostile area. Defoe’s protagonist has asserted that he has been “shipwrecked during a dreadful storm in the offing” as a result of which he has landed “on shore on [a] dismal, unfortunate island [while] all the rest of the ship’s company” have been “drowned.”⁶¹ Knowing the relevance of this incident, Gordimer has, on a similar vein, woven

a shipwreck into “*Friday’s Footprint*.” The unfortunate event, the narrator has told about, occurred with the arrival of the rainy season, around December, during a day when the river “was flooded and the bridge was down [...] under water [hence] the only way to reach the village was by boat.”⁶² Around this time, Arthur, Gordimer’s Crusoe, has been in an urgent need to supply his hotel and stores with the adequate quantities of food and goods wanted for the well being of his business in the tiny and isolated village where he has invested his money. The supplies, under question, have already been delivered and stationed in a region far north of the river; consequently, Arthur has been compelled to rely on one of his boats, as the only means available to cross the flooded river, to bring the necessities and products home. Everything has been going as planned until the fifth trip during which the boat has been overloaded to avoid coming back for a sixth trip; the dreadful occurrence, just like in Defoe’s novel, has been inevitable. The scene has been reported with these words,

[T]he boat [was] moving slowly under its heavy load. It was their biggest boat; it was carrying eight sewing machines and a black-japanned iron double bedstead as well as the usual stores, and Arthur and three store boys were sitting on top of the cargo. As the boat reached the middle of the river, it turned over, men and cargo toppled.⁶³

The second important aspect of a robinsonade is the landscape of the story which, as established in Defoe’s text, has to be a desert island, or at least, an equivalent. This environment, characterised by isolation and despair, has been replaced in Gordimer’s tale with a reclusive hotel located in a tiny village which is almost disconnected from the rest of civilisation. It might be stated, in this sense, that “Nadine Gordimer’s story [has] depict[ed] the most remote site, a hotel that appears to be on the very edge of memory [...] nation”⁶⁴ and even the world. The visitors to the village, in which the hotel is situated, to put it no less stronger, are rare especially in summer when the sun is burning hot. The scarce individuals interested in the area, for some reason or another, are forced, in order to reach the hotel, to travel for “two days from the last village over desert and dried-out salt pans; they” are also compelled to sleep “out under the crushing silence of a night sky that ignore[s] them and [holds] no human sound other than their own small rustlings.”⁶⁵ This desolate-like place

might recall Crusoe's "Island of Despair";⁶⁶ the hotel has, therefore, been used to fulfil the function of the island in the source. The three permanent residents in the facility in addition to the Cunningham owners have been overwhelmed by the surrounding nature; Rita has been drowned in solitude after the death of her husband, Arthur. The unbearable silence shattered, at long intervals, with a quick discussion, here and another there, has been a pervading feature throughout the tale. All in all, one might affirm that through such a secluded territory, which is "empty, alienating, [...] so unaccommodating as to be crushing [and] fear-provoking," "Gordimer [has] invoke[d] the familiar loneliness of Robinson Crusoe's island."⁶⁷

D- The Struggle Against Nature with Breathtaking Adventures:

What has made a difference between Defoe's first novel and the previous adventure stories is the fact that *Robinson Crusoe* has told the tale of a solitary, common, middle-classed man who has, with great success, defied the forces of nature. This has left a permanent mark on world literature as it has stood in a sharp contrast with the old narratives which used to recount, almost in the totality, the adventurous errands of heroes who have braved giants, monsters, real or supernatural, legendary creatures and/or other powerful human beings. Accordingly, it has to be maintained that "*Robinson Crusoe* [has] derive[d] dramatic power from its understanding of man's struggle against nature,"⁶⁸ the aspect with which any human being, almost without exception, might identify. These elements involving an individual man in thrilling ventures and voyages while wrestling with the forces of nature have been stylized by Gordimer in "*Friday's Footprint*."

The South African author has "allude[d] to [Crusoe's] adventure story when she [has] describe[d] [the life of Rita's] first husband, Arthur"⁶⁹ who has had the chance to travel throughout Africa. The hostile environment of the continent has been a real challenge, but he has each time found, somehow, a loophole to emerge victorious against all odds. The much needed night's sleep, the potable water and the cosy feeling of safety from wild beasts often taken for granted once an individual is surrounded with the comforts of civilisation, have

become real issues Arthur has reckoned with. Much in Crusoe's fashion, Gordimer's white man has survived all the dire situations he has encountered; this has contributed to shaping his personality and reinforced his sense of 'superiority' over other human beings and nature. The narrator has exposed an insight into Arthur's past life as follows,

He had hunted and fished and traded all over Africa, and he had great contempt for travellers' tales. When safari parties stayed at his hotel, he criticised their weapons (What sort of contraption do you call that? I've shot round about fifty lion in my lifetime, without any telescopic sights, I can tell you), their camping equipment (I don't know what all this fuss is about water filters and what-not. I've drunk water that was so filthy I've had to lean over and draw it into my mouth through a bit of rag, and been none the worse for it), and their general helplessness.⁷⁰

The above stylized experiences from the Crusoe tale show the kind of challenges, hardships and adventures Arthur has taken and braved with nothing special, in terms of equipment, but intrinsic talent, wit, analytical spirit, fortitude, physical and mental strength.

3- "Friday's Footprint": A Parody and a Metatext of *Robinson Crusoe*:

The aim of the current section is to have a look at "*Friday's Footprint*" as being both a parody and a metatext against *Robinson Crusoe*. I would foster, thereby, that the former might be viewed as an adaptation which has not only mocked the latter, but also got engaged in a critical relationship with it. This double undertaking has been pillared on Bakhtin's and Genette's notions of parody and metatextuality respectively. To begin with, Bakhtin's viewpoint has placed what he has dubbed as 'parody' within the double voiced discourse that entails two voices which vehicle conflicting intentions and directions.⁷¹ The text, Gordimer's, which purports to parody an earlier one, Defoe's, has, to show, hence, a hostility against its source by making fun of its referents, characters and/or other aspects.

Metatextuality, on the other hand, has been deployed to scrutinise the connection that is in nature a "*critical relationship*,"⁷² between texts in which one, the adaptation, has the purpose of commenting on, dismissing and even distorting its source. The French thinker has pointed at this link as being "most often [...] "*commentary*"";⁷³ the second literary work, Gordimer's, has been intended to review and comment on, and even rebut aspects of Defoe's

novel. This double theoretical foundation has not been fortuitously combined; it has been adopted because of the complementary aggressive and critical tone parody and metatextuality imply. In a Nutshell, Ann Marie Fallon's words, which I would borrow, hereafter, are expressive of the multitude of issues this section would shed light upon when it comes to delving into the connection that might bind "*Friday's Footprint*" to *Robinson Crusoe*,

Writers create surrogate visions of Crusoe as well as anti-Crusoes, and by making Crusoe unfamiliar, they interrupt our comfortable assumptions about *Robinson Crusoe* [...] Because *Robinson Crusoe* is often considered the first English novel, retelling the novel allows writers to create alternative histories of colonialism, racism, and other forms of oppression.⁷⁴

3- I- Gordimer's Text: A Parody of *Robinson Crusoe*: A- Undermining the Coloniser's Identity and Capacity for Survival:

The coloniser's claim to 'superiority' has, for centuries, rested on his capacity to find an outlet and survive even in the harshest conditions with a strict dependence only on his ingenuity and acumen to make the best use of the available resources. Crusoe, who might be "identified as the first coloniser of the English novel,"⁷⁵ might not be considered, by any means, an exception since he has "spared no pains to bring to pass whatever appeared necessary for [his] comfortable support."⁷⁶ He has succeeded, in this way, in building shelters, constructing fortifications, cultivating whole areas, making his own bread, inventing his own umbrella, and finding ways to produce his own earthenware pots; in addition, he has rendered it possible to contrive his own livestock, useful to get milk and meat, by taming wild goats which "depended entirely upon [Crusoe's ability to] perfect[...] [his] enclosures"⁷⁷ for safety. Nearly the same thing might be said of Arthur's adventures all over Africa, in "*Friday's Footprint*," since he has faced lions and "drunk water that was so filthy [he has] had to lean over and draw it into [his] mouth through a bit of rag";⁷⁸ however, the author has operated some major and profound changes at this level.

To destroy one of the pillars of the coloniser's identity, Gordimer has mocked Crusoe's alleged ability to survive in an arid and hostile wilderness. Although Arthur has had 'the courage' to kill lions with his guns, he has never dared to face them with his bare hands;

besides, despite the fact that he has drunk unfit water, his situation, as a hotel owner in a desert-like territory, is funny since he is compelled to depend, for survival and business alike, on the regular amount of supplies, including food, water, amenities, furniture, and other products which must be transported from one of the, miles faraway, cities to the area either on truck or boat, if the river is flooded. Without those supplies, the Crusoe-like Arthur, his business and the rest of the white men and women occupying the hotel would never ever think or even dream of surviving in such a remote and hostile colony. This has demonstrated the ridiculous side of the coloniser's survival, in Gordimer's story, that has been achieved due to an "urban basis" that has sustained this "rural existence"; such a basis, "is not metropolitan Britain, but the suburban world of" big and adjacent cities like "Johannesburg"⁷⁹ which Arthur or any other member of the Cunningham family often visit to educate their children and fetch what might be needed for survival once back into the village.

The tourists who travel for days crossing a desert to reach the hotel are received by Rita. She has been used by the writer "as the outward symbol of white colonial identity"⁸⁰ which has been weakened during the 1950s and 1960s all over the colonies. What has remained of the coloniser's identity, initiated by Defoe's hero, has been tied, in Gordimer's text, to Rita whose general appearance "in her flowered print dress, with a brooch on her big bosom, and her big, bright-skinned face looking clerically dazed beneath her thick permanent, was the known world, to [newcomers to the hotel,] Friday's footprint in the sand."⁸¹ The way Rita has been dressed, her countenance, and body have been portrayed as such to ridicule her, in particular, and the colonisers, in general; the urgent question to be asked, herein, is: how might someone 'delicate' like her survive without the supplies from a nearby city? It might be argued, in brief, that this has been "an effective parody of the Crusoe theme of the known imperial surviving in the alien world of the colonial interior."⁸² There is proof enough from the text, in a nutshell, that Gordimer has mocked the coloniser's identity and made fun of Rita's/Arthur's survival capacity which is tied in, an inevitable turn, to the incoming supplies.

3- II- Gordimer's Tale: A Metatextual Rewriting of Defoe's: A- Criticising and Diminishing Crusoe:

For less than two centuries and a half, 1719-1950, Crusoe has not only come, at least in Western literature, to be regarded “as the embodiment of eighteenth-century Englishmen,”⁸³ but also as the incarnation, in myriad ways, of the whole Anglo-Saxon race which has claimed ‘superiority’ over other races. The English overseas conquests and interventions, to which Crusoe might stand as a literary prototype, have incorporated vast territories into the Empire. In this colonial enterprise, Crusoe has evinced a capacity to ‘cultivate’ wilderness and an ability to implement the ‘civilising mission’ on the ‘savages.’ This tale of adventures, struggle and individual heroism has travelled worldwide and, in the course of this, “Crusoe has proved to be an endlessly malleable figure”⁸⁴ who has been adjusted to suit different contexts. The second half of the 20th century has, thereby, witnessed the emergence of many versions of *Robinson Crusoe* among which “anti-Crusoes”⁸⁵ and Gordimer’s Arthur and Johnny Cunningham fit into this category since they have been subtly used, despite their various Crusoe-like features, to denigrate and criticise Defoe’s protagonist.

Although Arthur has had a vast array of qualities which might be traced back to Crusoe, he has been diminished when it comes to one of the essential parts of the robinsonade which is the shipwreck. The hero of what has come to be viewed as the first English novel would have neither existed nor enjoyed the fame he has had if he did not manage to emerge from the “dreadful storm”⁸⁶ unharmed which brought about all his subsequent adventures. In a sharp contrast, Arthur has not been empowered to survive such a disaster and the readers have been informed through flashbacks that his death has been caused by an unfortunate shipwreck. His image in the process of “filling his lungs with water with every breath”⁸⁷ while struggling for his life, has haunted Rita even though she did not witness the incident. The circumstances of his drowning have been associated with the December day during which he has been compelled to bring, it turned out for the last time, the needed supplies using one

of his boats. The events have been retold as such, “the boat with the eight sewing machines and the black-japanned double bed [has been] coming over the water,” and because it has been overloaded, “[it] turn[ed] over”;⁸⁸ the “arms of [Arthur and his] men [...] came through the iron bedhead [and] it took [them] down with it – Arthur with his mouth suddenly stopped for ever with water.”⁸⁹ This scene in which Arthur has been drowned “while trying to take too many goods on a ferry over the river by the hotel” signifies that “[t]he avarice of the coloniser has reaped its due reward.”⁹⁰

A similar metatextual pattern of diminishing Crusoe has been followed with Johnny Cunningham, Gordimer’s second Crusoe-like figure, with whom the narrator has appealed, in many instances, to a language that has had the effect of reducing him to an animal-like state. The author has deprived Johnny of Crusoe’s vivacity, strength and sturdiness; which is why, his final portrait has given the impression of someone who looked boyish imbued with frailty, rather than an indomitable adventurer. The narrator has referred to Johnny as being “small [...] slender” and “[o]utdoors, [...] in the daylight, his slenderness was the leanness of cured meat.”⁹¹ This appearance has been intended to deny the coloniser’s masculine features which have, from the onset of the colonial enterprise, been connected with aggression, domination and power. Johnny’s facial expression has been diminished with animal looking features through these words, “with [his] satyr-shaped head of upstanding curly hair, the black, frown-framed eyes and forward jutting mouth, [he has had] a monkey face, lined, watchful, always old.”⁹² One might foster that Gordimer has criticised a key element of Defoe’s text, Crusoe, through diminishing both Arthur and Johnny; the critical relationship is, thereby, apparent which would make “*Friday’s Footprint*” a metatext of *Robinson Crusoe*.

B- Women: Hearing the Voice of the Silenced and Oppressed:

One aspect of Defoe’s story that has captured modern interest is Crusoe’s relationship with Friday.⁹³

The above words, which are James V. Morrison’s, might suggest the universal appeal together with the centrality of the Crusoe/Friday duality to modern readers of Defoe’s novel.

This unbalanced, intricate and power-based connection has come to be perceived as a living image of oppression and injustice; therefore, using it while “retelling the novel” has “allow[ed] writers [Gordimer included] to create alternative histories of colonialism, racism, and other forms of oppression.”⁹⁴ These “other forms of oppression” might encompass the link binding men and women; this is Gordimer’s intention through “*Friday’s Footprint*.” She has grasped the essence of the Crusoe/Friday combination and the potential it entails if deployed to deal with men/women relationships. Through Defoe’s duality, which has been replicated through Rita’s life with Arthur and Johnny, Gordimer has managed to voice not only her criticism of the status of women in Defoe’s text, but also the major concerns of South African white women who have been silenced and oppressed under the Apartheid regime.

What might strike today’s readers of Defoe’s work as being peculiar is the stark absence of women whose existence, if any, has been translucent and their roles, the least to say, have been restricted to the private sphere. Gayatri Spivak’s assertion when she has claimed that *Robinson Crusoe* as “the original [text] had no room for women”⁹⁵ would not seem, in any sense, prejudiced. There is significance and proof enough in what Crusoe has told about once rescued from the island and settled back in England, “I married [...] and had three children, two sons and one daughter; but my wife dying, [...] my inclination to go abroad [to the East Indies] prevailed.”⁹⁶ The marital life that usually takes an entire life-long course has been abridged into a sentence⁹⁷ in which Crusoe’s marriage and his wife’s death have been intertwined and connected into what might seem, to the contemporary readers, an incongruent chain entailing a set of ‘absurd’ and even, ‘random’ occurrences. This might stamp Defoe’s text and the robinsonade as being “profoundly masculinist, both in [their] characters’ indifference to women, and in the stimulus [they] gave men to find fulfilment exclusively in bonds to other men.”⁹⁸

The connection that has been drawn by Gordimer between Rita and Friday has delineated the inferior position the South African white women have been confined to since

they have been, like Crusoe's servant, oppressed and silenced. The author has "use[d] the colonial exploitation of "Friday" to highlight the victimization of white women under the patriarchal South African System."⁹⁹ The way the domineering Johnny used to address her, after only a few month of their marriage, might be characterised as disdainful and even, at times, aggressive whenever she dared to confront him with the countless affairs he has had with other women. There is one incident of relevance, herein, that has occurred after a dance party, in the aftermath of which Rita has attempted to articulate her discontent with the behaviour of Mrs Burns, a newcomer to the hotel, who has been the whole night in the vicinity of Johnny. The latter "gave a long, curly-mouthed yawn" and said to her in his contemptuous tone that Mrs Burns is "a silly cow."¹⁰⁰ There seemed, to Rita, something pretty suggestive, scornful and surrealist about the way he has uttered these words combined with the way he "put his hand experimentally on her neck, and tweaked her earlobe."¹⁰¹ This situation has been oppressive to her to the extent of taking her husband's offensive remark as being addressed to her; "she put it to herself"¹⁰² because she knew very well that she is the big-bodied woman and not Mrs Burns. Rita's psyche has been damaged, and she felt devastated after this incident; however, she could do nothing except remaining silent while her husband trespassed all boundaries. Johnny has the tendency to "maintain[...] his dominance by wholly or partly silencing the views and suggestions of his female partner."¹⁰³

There is another key instance of the same pattern of using an aggressive language in which Johnny and Rita played a psychological quiz he has found in a Johannesburg newspaper. This game has been intended as an amusing evaluation which couples might take to assess their relationship and the extent to which their marriage is faring well or not. Johnny has taken the initiative to answer the questions related to the husband in the presence of a few guests, who have enjoyed the entire situation. Rita has overturned the course of the quiz by taking those inquiries addressed to the wife. Once her portion of the quiz completed, she has been eager to know the verdict from her husband who has been marking her answers

throughout the game. Johnny knew that what he is about to say would hurt the feelings of his wife; nonetheless, he has read, in the most inconsiderate fashion, the following passage from the newspaper, “[t]here is clearly something gravely wrong with your marriage. You should see a doctor or better still, a psychiatrist” [...] “and seek help, as soon as possible!”¹⁰⁴ These words have been received by Rita with laughter, but she has been the only one to hear “the catches and trips in her throat like the mad cries of some creature buried alive [and] [t]he blood of a blush burned her whole body with agonising slowness.”¹⁰⁵ These intense feelings Rita has experienced might show the extent to which she has been, like most South African white women, oppressed and silenced by the country’s patriarchal system.

To come back to Defoe’s novel, one might say that women have been reduced to a commodity which the dominant white male, Crusoe, in this sense, might use to fulfil his schemes and designs. The references to women, although scarce they might be, have been concomitant, almost with everything that is biological, and with what is needed to populate and colonise the ‘empty’ island that has been left, by the protagonist, in the hands of his fellow countrymen; Crusoe’s words might be appalling to nowadays’ readers as he states,

From thence I touched at the Brazils, from whence I sent a bark, which I bought there, with more people to the island; and in it, besides other supplies, I sent seven women, being such as I found proper for service, or for wives to such as would take them. As to the Englishmen, I promised to send them some women from England, with a good cargo of necessaries, if they would apply themselves to planting [...] I sent them, also, from the Brazils, five cows, three of them being big with calf, some sheep, and some hogs, which when I came again were considerably increased.¹⁰⁶

Gordimer’s adaptation, which has initiated a metatextual relationship with *Robinson Crusoe*, has reviewed, in contrast, the status of women, through a wide range of strategies, away from both the source and the repressive Apartheid South African society.

Arthur’s death has made Rita the only legitimate heir to his estate which, in turn, has compelled her to develop high managerial skills becoming ultimately a successful businesswoman. Although she has been scared of the burden of responsibility that would befall upon her, she has managed, in a record time, to perform, on her own, all the tasks which

had been, until the near past, assigned to her deceased spouse. The sensation of deep relief has, for the first time, pervaded Rita's existence because she has experienced "the happiness of confidence. She did not have to wonder if she could manage – she had been managing all the time!"¹⁰⁷ All of a sudden, she has felt the power to influence, act and react not only at home, but also outside like "a good businesswoman."¹⁰⁸ The narrator has asserted that she has begun "to take a firm hand with the children, with the hotel servants, with the assistants at the stores. She even wrote a letter to the liquor wholesaler, demanding, on a certain brand of gin, the same special discount that her late husband had squeezed out of him."¹⁰⁹ These skills would remain latent, and Rita would forever be unaware of her potential if it has not been for the death of her Crusoe-like husband, Arthur, which finally has opened to her new horizons bringing the best out of her. Gordimer's metatextual approach towards Defoe's text has allowed her, in brief, to shed light on two designs: revealing women's sufferings, on the one hand, in patriarchal-dominated environs, be they fictitious/literary as in Defoe's text or real life contexts as in apartheid South Africa; suggesting, on the other, possible outlets and future prospects that might contribute to women's emancipation, such as doing business.

4- "Friday's Footprint": Ideological and Cultural Aspects:

Throughout the following section, the ideological and cultural elements which have had an influence on the South African author while adapting *Robinson Crusoe* would be examined. To this end, Williams' three concepts namely, 'residual,' 'dominant' and 'emergent' are expected to be of high relevance in order to dissect the historical, cultural and ideological background that brought about "*Friday's Footprint*." Thereby, the central questions this section is about to ponder would be handled from a cultural materialist viewpoint by focusing on the compelling textual arguments which might be sorted out from Gordimer's literary work.

A- "Friday's Footprint" and the Residual Rural Community:

What has been distinguished by Williams, in his cultural and ideological spectrum, as the 'residual' has been delineated in *Culture and Materialism* as all of those "experiences,

meanings and values, which [are] lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation.”¹¹⁰ He has pointed at it, as all the beliefs, ideas, visions and practices that do not belong, in any manner, whatsoever, to the dominant social and cultural structures. Such residual elements have the tendency, nonetheless, to come back and make their appearance as a remnant of an older formation. What might be linked with the residual in “*Friday’s Footprint*,” is the rural community and life prevalent throughout the narrative. It might be appropriate, in this direction, to recall the fact that Williams has asserted that “rural community is predominantly residual”¹¹¹ with its tropes, patterns of life and modes of action in the lack of technical and technological support.

Most of the events of Gordimer’s story, with a few exceptions transporting us to the Johannesburg area, have been revolving around a secluded tiny village somewhere in the South African frontier where the characters are trapped in a kind of ‘eternal’ suffocating solitude. The scenery is devoid of the major signs of scientific, technical and technological development with the exception of the ‘monotonous’ sound of “the radio going in the hotel office [with] a cricket commentary on [or] a little background music.”¹¹² These dull sounds are mingled with nothing, but the quiet air of the desert area which has been intended to accentuate the loneliness hovering around. People in this small “community [with] the size of the village”¹¹³ have been forced on a daily basis to struggle for survival by performing the same tasks “time and again.”¹¹⁴ What might be striking is that “this rural existence”¹¹⁵ has no longer the capacity to support itself, through structured agricultural activities, as the land in that secluded area is almost barren, and the country has been heading towards urbanisation. The heroes and other villagers have, accordingly, been obliged to rely on the regular amount of supplies to sustain their way of life. We can, thus, see that the rural style of Gordimer’s story has been an effective residual aspect which might be viewed in a stark contradiction with the progressive South African tendency, during the 1950s and 1960s, towards a life in the cities that has to be propped with modern techniques and technologies.

B- The Dominant: Capitalism and the Apartheid System:

Capitalism, which has emerged during the 17th century, has already been a dominant ideology, in Britain, by the time Defoe has published *Robinson Crusoe* with the early 18th century. The protagonist's individualism and his relentless drive to both generate and accumulate capital, whenever the situation is fit, have spurred him to take various initiatives, among which leaving the parental house, finally resulting in myriad adventures imbued with material success and achievements. It has to be argued that Crusoe can "count as the emblematic incarnation of the bourgeois individual that – unimpeded by any governmental interference or by societal regard for others less fortunate – [has] exercise[d] his [...] talents [...] to amass as many material goods as he can."¹¹⁶ What might be striking is the fact that, almost two centuries and a half later, with Gordimer adapting Defoe's novel through "*Friday's Footprint*" in (1960), capitalism has, in various ways, remained authoritative, appealing, and robust; it has even reinforced its dominance over vast areas all over the globe; South Africa might not be exempt.

Although the general frame of the tale has been intended to transport readers to a secluded area where the villagers have, to a certain extent, been cut-off from the outside world, the presence of capitalism and its signs, which weigh upon both Gordimer's characters and plot, might not be overlooked. The opening of her story has entailed a variety of references and signs denoting the capitalist dominance over the scenery. The inaugural words which have carried the tale's imbued capitalist spirit, read as follows, "[t]he hotel stood a hundred yards up from the bank of the river. On the lintel above the screen door at the entrance, small gilt letters read: J. P. CUNNINGHAM, LICENSED TO SELL MALT, WINE AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS."¹¹⁷ The fact that the backboard referring to the owner and the various products the establishment is allowed to sell, have been written in capital letters with the golden yellow colour might be read as a symbol of the presence of capitalism even in such an arid surrounding.

As for Arthur Cunningham, he might be regarded as one of the pioneers of the capitalist ideology in the South African literary frontier whose entire time and energy have been invested in accumulating wealth and power. The fruit of his efforts have culminated in the establishment of his grip over the only hotel in the region in addition to the two stores which supply the villagers with the needed goods and amenities. This 'privileged' capitalist position has contributed to Arthur's societal stance among his own people since he has managed, somehow, to lay his hands on every single investment, source of money, and key of power existent in the area. Such an 'enviable' situation has enlarged the list of his enemies, the aspect of which he has been aware; as a result, he has worked even harder to preserve his position against any possible conspiracies and machinations. The narrator has maintained that, on the one hand, Arthur has been "conscious of his good standing, of the fact that everybody knew him, and of his ownership of the hotel, the two stores, and whatever power there was in the village"¹¹⁸ and he has, on the other hand, been "conscious of having made a number of enemies, thinly scattered in that sparsely populated territory."¹¹⁹

It is in the same way that "Crusoe himself appears to represent a lot of the [dominant] bourgeois [capitalist] economic attitudes familiar to [...] Defoe's own time"¹²⁰ that Arthur's life and even death might be associated with the capitalist mindset. He has had a tight schedule because he has been under the pressure of preserving and developing his business in an attempt to secure his position as the only supplier of goods to the region. The fear of running out of supplies has enticed Arthur to overload his boat with "eight sewing machines and a black-japanned iron double bedstead as well as the usual stores"¹²¹ under the burden of which it has sunk with the boss losing his life in the incident. It has to be stated that such a scene has been meant to demonstrate that "[t]he avarice of the [capitalist] coloniser has reaped its due reward."¹²² Hence, it is capitalism's dynamics, greed for more money and thirst for extra power, which keep the zeal of any capitalist ongoing, that have brought about the tragic end of Gordimer's hero.

The second dominant ideology in “*Friday’s Footprint*,” in accordance with the South African social, economic and political background of the 1960s, is the Apartheid system. Although Gordimer has expressed her position, as a staunch anti-Apartheid thinker, there are several scenes which reveal the widespread implementation of the segregation-and-racism-based system among white and black populations. The ‘superior,’ the boss, and the business owner in the story is always a white man belonging to the Cunningham family. Arthur started the investment and made it flourish while Johnny has tried to follow in his footsteps after his death. The narrator has ruminated, through flashbacks, the old days when Arthur has had the power to exploit, overwork and scold his African-coloured employees while showing a haughty attitude “snarling [and] insulting”¹²³ them in impunity. He has also been shown as a white boss who is ready to do whatever it takes to protect his business and make it prosper; this might include exploiting, condescending and “bullying the Africans”¹²⁴ who have been hired to work under his watchful eyes and close supervision. Arthur has, consequently, felt free to yell at them and call them “bloody fools”¹²⁵ while hurling at them a bunch of other degrading insults.

B- The Emergent Notion of Women Empowerment:

Despite being of white racial origins, Gordimer has experienced, like the majority of African women, white or coloured, the marginalisation women have had to endure during the 1940s and 1950s. The onset of feminist activism, in the African continent, which has attempted to liberate women from the yoke of gender discrimination and segregation, has dawned, almost in the same way as the era’s other revolutionary ideas and movements, with the great wave of decolonisation. There has been, therefore, a marked “surge of women’s activism that had emerged by the [...] 1960s [which] contained a pronounced feminist agenda”¹²⁶ that has fostered the aim of empowering women in the public sphere. This emergent aspect might be spotted in “*Friday’s Footprint*” which has entailed a key female figure named Rita Cunningham, who has been empowered, at times, to be an active

participant in the public life, away from the private sphere, mainly after the death of her husband, Arthur, which compelled her to become a successful businesswoman.

With Arthur's death, Rita has been left alone with many investments to manage in a patriarchal South African society in a very hostile environment. She has never ever been confronted to such a situation where she has to both plan and execute every single step of her life since Arthur used to take care of whatever arrangements needed in terms of their personal life and business. She could not believe that she might have the power and courage to run the family's hotel and other investments and bring them to a safe harbour. Rita has had, at the beginning, a distorted image of herself which has been full of lack of self-esteem and she has seen herself as nothing "[b]ut a [weak] woman [so] how can [she] carry on"¹²⁷ depending on her own. A few weeks, however, have been more than enough to Rita to prove for herself, before anybody else, that she has been gifted with the mind of a businesswoman who has the skills to perform Arthur's tasks, and even more, since she has made the business boom and flourish. As a matter of fact, Rita has tasted a certain "happiness [due to her newly found] confidence" as she has seen that "she could manage [since] she had been managing all the time!"¹²⁸ These sensations, of freedom and power to influence her environment, she experienced after the death of her husband, have given her enough courage to take her existence into a new level of self awareness as she has taken "a firm hand with the children [...] the hotel servants [...] the assistants at the stores."¹²⁹ It might be argued, accordingly, that Rita has benefited from the emergent notion of women empowerment during the 1960s which brought the South African white women into prominence in the public sphere.

Conclusion:

To bring this fifth chapter to a conclusion, I might confirm that it has revolved around the study of "*Friday's Footprint*," as a text which has been inspired and influenced by Defoe's first novel. The opening section has dealt with the author's life as an intellectual committed to her own time and country's issues, in addition to an exploration of the

atmosphere which has brought about her story into existence. The second has examined the wide range of ways through which Gordimer's tale has stylized its source including the reproduction of Crusoe and Friday through Arthur/Johnny, for the former, and Rita for the latter. Moreover, robinsonade features such as colonialism, coloniser/colonised, slave/master, the shipwreck, the desert environment and the individual's struggle against nature, have been scrutinised at the level of Gordimer's work to demonstrate its relationship with Defoe's. Afterwards, I have looked, through the third section, at the ways Gordimer's story has undermined Crusoe by mocking the coloniser's identity and denying him the capacity to survive in an arid atmosphere like a desert island. I have, then, shifted my attention towards "*Friday's Footprint*" as a metatext which has criticised Defoe's hero, and voiced women's concerns which have been for centuries silenced. In the last position, Williams' concepts have given me the opportunity to explore the rural community in Gordimer's tale as a residual element while capitalism and the Apartheid system have been dominant since they have underpinned and supported each other in South Africa during that era. I have also had a glance at the emergent notion of women empowerment which has allowed women, Rita as an example from the text, to express their aptitudes and show their abilities in the public sphere.

Endnotes:

¹. Regina Janes, "'Writing Without Authority': J.M. Coetzee and His Fictions," in Salmagundi, Vol 01: N° 114/115, 1997, p. 111, Skidmore College, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40548964>, Accessed on 13/12/2016.

². Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 77. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oO6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 14/12/ 2016.

³. Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 180.

⁴. Stephen Clingman, "A Sport of Nature and the Boundaries of Fiction," in Bruce King, ed., *The Later Fictions of Nadine Gordimer*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993), p. 186.

⁵. Michael Wade, "A Sport of Nature: Identity and Repression of the Jewish Subject," in Bruce King, ed., *The Later Fictions of Nadine Gordimer*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993), p. 156.

⁶. Pam Morris, *Realism*, (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 161.

- ⁷. Horst Zander, *Fact - Fiction – “Faction”: A Study of Black South African Literature in English*, (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1999), p. 108, in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=Thw5n9IZLowC&pg=PA108&dq=if+I+had+lived+elsewhere,+my+writing+would+%5Bnot%5D+have+reflected+politics+much,+if+at+all+%5B...%5D+I+didn%E2%80%99t+know+what+politics+was+about+until+I+saw+it+all+happening+to+people&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwin1dD9nIX7AhVchPOHHaz9De8Q6AF6BAGIEAI#v=onepage&q=if%20I%20had%20lived%20elsewhere%2C%20my%20writing%20would%20%5Bnot%5D%20have%20reflected%20politics%20much%2C%20if%20at%20all%20%5B...%5D%20I%20didn%E2%80%99t%20know%20what%20politics%20was%20about%20until%20I%20saw%20it%20all%20happening%20to%20people&f=false>, Accessed on 16/12/ 2016.
- ⁸. Nancy L. Clark and William H. Worger, 2nd ed, *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*, (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 03.
- ⁹. Roger B. Beck, *The History of South Africa*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000), Pp. 95-96.
- ¹⁰. Ibid., p. 96.
- ¹¹. Ulrike Auga, “*Intellectuals between Resistance and Legitimation : The Cases of Nadine Gordimer and Christa Wolf*,” in *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa*, Vol 15: N° 01, 2003, p. 08, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2003.9678139>, Accessed on 20/12/2016.
- ¹². Nancy L. Clark and William H. Worger, 2nd ed, *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*, (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 59.
- ¹³. Ibid., p. XV.
- ¹⁴. Roger B. Beck, *The History of South Africa*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000), p. 142.
- ¹⁵. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 193.
- ¹⁶. Heather J. Hicks, *The Post-Apocalyptic Novel in the Twenty-First Century: Modernity beyond Salvage*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 01.
- ¹⁷. Gary Hoppenstand, *Perilous Escapades: Dimensions of Popular Adventure Fiction*, (Jefferson: McFarland and Company, 2018), p. 03.
- ¹⁸. John Mullan, *How Novels Work*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 40.
- ¹⁹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 03.
- ²⁰. Nadine Gordimer, “*Friday’s Footprint*,” in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 91.
- ²¹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 108.
- ²². Ibid., p. 69.
- ²³. Nadine Gordimer, “*Friday’s Footprint*,” in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ²⁴. Ibid., p. 89.
- ²⁵. Ibid., p. 90.
- ²⁶. Ibid.
- ²⁷. Ibid.
- ²⁸. Ibid.
- ²⁹. Ibid., p. 93.
- ³⁰. Ibid., p. 94.
- ³¹. Paul Rich, “*Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966*,” in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 20/04/2021.
- ³². Pramod K. Nayar, *The Postcolonial Studies Dictionary*, (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), p. 07.
- ³³. Ann Marie Fallon, “*South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head*,” in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 83, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 23/04/ 2021.
- ³⁴. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), Pp. 193-194.
- ³⁵. Ibid., p. 213. [Sic]
- ³⁶. Nadine Gordimer, “*Friday’s Footprint*,” in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 91.
- ³⁷. Ibid., p. 96.
- ³⁸. Ibid.
- ³⁹. Ibid., p. 93.
- ⁴⁰. Ibid.
- ⁴¹. Ibid., p. 96.
- ⁴². Ibid.

- ⁴³. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 83, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 30/04/ 2021.
- ⁴⁴. Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*, (London: Duke University Press, 1997), p. 102.
- ⁴⁵. Martin Green, Cited in Suvir Kaul, *Eighteenth-Century British Literature and postcolonial Studies*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), p. 78.
- ⁴⁶. Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*, (London: Duke University Press, 1997), p. 102.
- ⁴⁷. Michael Mckee, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 333.
- ⁴⁸. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 87.
- ⁴⁹. Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 72, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 08/05/2021.
- ⁵⁰. Martin Trump, "The Short Fiction of Nadine Gordimer," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 17: N° 03, 1986, p. 344, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3819220>, Accessed on 12/05/2021.
- ⁵¹. Stuart Hannabuss, "Castaway Themes in Children's Books," in *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2009, p. 03, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614540009510625>, Accessed on 15/05/2021.
- ⁵². Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 88, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 28/05/ 2021.
- ⁵³. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ⁵⁴. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 136.
- ⁵⁵. Ibid.
- ⁵⁶. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 87.
- ⁵⁷. Ibid., p. 90.
- ⁵⁸. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 213. [Sic]
- ⁵⁹. Stuart Hannabuss, "Castaway Themes in Children's Books," in *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2009, p. 04, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614540009510625>, Accessed on 06/06/2021.
- ⁶⁰. Emer O'Sullivan, *Historical Dictionary of Children's Literature*, (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), p. 214.
- ⁶¹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 65.
- ⁶². Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ⁶³. Ibid., p. 88.
- ⁶⁴. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 78, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 15/06/ 2021.
- ⁶⁵. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 87.
- ⁶⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 65.
- ⁶⁷. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 88, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false

[+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false](https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false), Accessed on 16/06/ 2021.

- ⁶⁸. J. Paul Hunter, Cited in Pat Rogers, *Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Unwin Critical Library, 1979), p. 52.
- ⁶⁹. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 88, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAGTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 22/06/ 2021.
- ⁷⁰. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 91.
- ⁷¹. Mikhail Bakhtin, "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," in Michael Holquist ed., *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans., Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 76.
- ⁷². Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 04.
- ⁷³. Ibid.
- ⁷⁴. Ann Marie Fallon, "Anti-Crusoes, Alternative Crusoes: Revisions of the Island Story in the Twentieth Century," in John Richetti, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to "Robinson Crusoe"*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), Pp. 207-208.
- ⁷⁵. Michela Canepari-Labib, *Old Myths – Modern Empires Power, Language and Identity in J.M. Coetzee's Work*, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), p. 71.
- ⁷⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 145.
- ⁷⁷. Ibid.
- ⁷⁸. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 91.
- ⁷⁹. Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 18/07/2021.
- ⁸⁰. Ibid.
- ⁸¹. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 87.
- ⁸². Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 20/07/2021.
- ⁸³. Leslie Stephens, Cited in Christopher Borsing, *Daniel Defoe and the Representation of Personal Identity*, (London: Routledge, 2017), p. 73.
- ⁸⁴. Andreas K. E. Mueller and Glynis Ridley, "Introduction," in Andreas K. E. Mueller and Glynis Ridley, eds., *Robinson Crusoe after 300 Years*, (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2021), p. 01.
- ⁸⁵. Ann Marie Fallon, "Anti-Crusoes, Alternative Crusoes: Revisions of the Island Story in the Twentieth Century," in John Richetti, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to "Robinson Crusoe"*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), Pp. 207-208.
- ⁸⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 65.
- ⁸⁷. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ⁸⁸. Ibid., p. 96.
- ⁸⁹. Ibid.
- ⁹⁰. Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 13/08/2021.
- ⁹¹. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 88.
- ⁹². Ibid.
- ⁹³. James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 157.
- ⁹⁴. Ann Marie Fallon, "Anti-Crusoes, Alternative Crusoes: Revisions of the Island Story in the Twentieth Century," in John Richetti, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to "Robinson Crusoe"*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), p. 208.
- ⁹⁵. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 179.
- ⁹⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 285.
- ⁹⁷. When I wrote this, I was under the influence of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 179.

- ⁹⁸. Martin Green, Cited in Andrew O'Malley, "Island Homemaking: Catherine Parr Traill's Canadian Crusoes and the Robinsonade Tradition," in Mavis Reimer, ed., *Home Words: Discourses of Children's Literature in Canada*, (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008), p. 85.
- ⁹⁹. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 88, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAgTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 25/11/ 2021.
- ¹⁰⁰. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 95.
- ¹⁰¹. Ibid.
- ¹⁰². Ibid.
- ¹⁰³. Tillie Olsen, Paraphrased by Martin Trump, "The Short Fiction of Nadine Gordimer," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 17: N° 03, 1986, p. 344, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3819220>, Accessed on 28/11/2021.
- ¹⁰⁴. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 98.
- ¹⁰⁵. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), Pp. 285-286.
- ¹⁰⁷. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 94.
- ¹⁰⁸. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁹. Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰. Raymond Williams, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ¹¹¹. _____, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ¹¹². Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 88.
- ¹¹³. Ibid., p. 91.
- ¹¹⁴. Ibid., p. 90.
- ¹¹⁵. Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 15/12/2021.
- ¹¹⁶. Erhard Reckwitz, "Otherness? Towards an Intercultural Literary Anthropology," in Rösen Jörn and Spariosu Mihai, eds., *Exploring Humanity: Intercultural Perspectives on Humanism*, (Taiwan: National Taiwan University Press, 2012), p. 231.
- ¹¹⁷. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 87.
- ¹¹⁸. Ibid., p. 91.
- ¹¹⁹. Ibid.
- ¹²⁰. Stuart Hannabuss, "Castaway Themes in Children's Books," in *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, Vol 6: N° 1, 2000, p. 04, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614540009510625>, Accessed on 20/01/2022.
- ¹²¹. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 88.
- ¹²². Paul Rich, "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, p. 73, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>, Accessed on 24/04/2022.
- ¹²³. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ¹²⁴. Ann Marie Fallon, "South African Revision: J. M. Coetzee, Nadine Gordimer, and Bessie Head," in Ann Marie Fallon, *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), p. 88, in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=Eal754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_0N8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAgTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%2C%20Nadine%20Gordimer%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false, Accessed on 27/04/ 2022.
- ¹²⁵. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 90.
- ¹²⁶. Rebecca DeWolf, *Gendered Citizenship: The Original Conflict over the Equal Rights Amendment, 1920-1963*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021) p. 223.
- ¹²⁷. Nadine Gordimer, "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*, (London: Penguin Books, 2010), p. 93.
- ¹²⁸. Ibid., p. 94.
- ¹²⁹. Ibid.

Chapter Six:

**Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978): The
Crusoe/Friday Encounter and Colonial
Story Retold by the "Black Crusoe" as a
Struggle for Identity in a Quite Different
Cultural and Ideological Matrix**

Introduction:

Crusoe is a figure from our schoolboy reading. He is a part of the mythology of every West Indian child.¹

The Crusoe fable, as presented by Defoe, is a thing every Caribbean child knew, and maybe still knows—the idea of Friday’s footprint in the sand and then the relationship with Friday, Crusoe’s servant and Companion. We all learned that very early, from childhood [the novel is so fascinating] [b]ecause the legend of Crusoe is set in the Caribbean. It is supposed to have taken place in Tobago. I guess the Attraction is that it’s an island fable. But also it’s the idea of the isolated person, shipwrecked. That’s a very old fable.²

It is with the above words that Derek Walcott has synthesised the sturdy and durable appeal of *Robinson Crusoe* which has exercised an influence upon every West Indian, intellectuals and commoners alike. Walcott has attributed such a zeal, prone to an obsession, which Defoe’s story has the tendency to generate, in the region, to the coloniser’s training system which has deployed it with the aim of the enculturation of the locals in mind. The author has also pointed at the universal themes —coloniser/colonised, slave/master (conveyed through Crusoe and Friday), shipwreck, island life, man against nature and solitude— which have been tackled in Defoe’s text resulting in its enduring reputation. Walcott’s interest in the novel, seen from this angle, might not be regarded or treated as an unusual occurrence since it has allowed him to voice a multitude of issues from a West Indian viewpoint.

At the level of this sixth chapter, my energy would be focused on reading *Pantomime* (1978) in a close relationship with *Robinson Crusoe* to uncover, with textual evidence, the extent to which Walcott has leaned on, revised, subverted and reworked Defoe’s masterpiece. In a similar fashion as most of the previous ones, the present chapter is divided into four sections; to begin with, there is a need to shed light on Walcott’s life and the entire socio-economic, political and cultural background from the 1950s to the 1970s which played, one might assume, a paramount role in the direction his adaptation of the Crusoe tale has taken. The following sections, second and third, rely on Bakhtin’s and Genette’s overt polemic and metatextuality respectively, which are used to dissect the strategies the Saint Lucian writer

has resorted to in his adaptation. Finally, Williams' residual, dominant and emergent are quite crucial for an understanding of the cultural and ideological environment of Walcott's work.

1- Derek Walcott's Life and *Pantomime* (1978) in Context:

A- Derek Walcott (1930-2017):

It takes a West Indian a long time to say who he is.³

Derek Alton Walcott, the poet, essayist and playwright, was born in (1930) in Castries, the capital city of Saint Lucia, a former British colony located in the West Indies. His father, Warwick Walcott, who used to have a passion for painting, died when his would-be-playwright son was barely one year old; while his mother, Alix Walcott, who was fond of English classics, was a teacher and was influential as she encouraged her son's literary and artistic drive.⁴ His ancestors who were of mixed English, Dutch and African blood,⁵ provided the author with a complex, but favourable cultural matrix which, nonetheless, brought him head to head with hard to resolve issues related to race, identity, slavery and colonialism. It was in his hometown that he has had access to an early education in the wake of which he attended college. The British educational system on the island which prioritised Western classics, like the works of Dante Alighieri, William Shakespeare, Ezra Pound, Virgil and Homer, to which the playwright had been exposed, made a strong impact on his literary and artistic career.⁶ The kind of confusion, uncertainty and slippery grounds Walcott experienced and reckoned with as a result of this mixed ancestry and colonial education, which is shown in his words quoted in the above epigraph, is not intrusive and might not be hard to justify.

The fact that Walcott secured a scholarship got his academic career initiated as he left his native island aged only twenty years old in (1950) heading to Jamaica where he has been given the opportunity to attend a university. He published one of his major works entitled *Poems* in (1951) during those years of his Jamaica sojourn from where he graduated in (1953) with Bachelor of Arts degree that might testify on behalf of early ingenuity and dexterity. The saint Lucian poet moved after graduation to Trinidad where he founded the Little Carib Basement Theatre which has come to be known as Trinidad Theatre Workshop.⁷ Meanwhile,

he witnessed during the (1940s) and (1950s) the nationalist fervour that seized most colonies, the Caribbean region not exempt, and afterwards the independence movements of the (1960s) which came as an immediate effect. The Caribbean colonial experience, with its traumatic implications together with the reaction of the colonised, became to him, like it did to so many of his Caribbean intellectual contemporaries, a central issue to reckon with. This context exercised a lasting influence on his play *Pantomime* (1978) in which he chose, not without a purpose, to rewrite *Robinson Crusoe*, a text James Joyce labelled, “an imperial prototype,”⁸ from the perspective of the colonised/oppressed. Walcott, who died in (2017), published a wide range of works during the previous four decades that earned him artistic recognition among which a Nobel Prize for literature in (1992).

B- Events in History: *Pantomime* (1978):

The earliest inhabitants of Saint Lucia, to date, were the peaceful Arawak Indians conquered, thereafter, by more aggressive Caribs who have populated the island long before the arrival of the Europeans.⁹ There were several French and British attempts to establish permanent settlements, without much success, during the 16th century, and the island, for the next two centuries (17th and 18th), has been under constant dispute between France and Great Britain, the major imperial forces at the time, since each one of them claimed possession over its territory. Slaves have been brought, during the 18th century, from Africa to farm the cotton and sugar plantations scattered all over the island; hence, it is not devoid of truth if I claim that the identity of the Saint Lucians has for so long been an intricate, but perhaps favourable mix of French, British, African, and local cultures. Walcott’s words, with which I have opened his above biography, capture the sense of identity confusion concomitant with being a West Indian and a Caribbean by extension. Every Saint Lucian and, as a matter of fact, West Indian, experiences, at one time or another, that sense of confusion as he encounters, from childhood the various cultures —languages, religions, thinking modes, traditions... etc— in action which exercised an influence on that area’s intellectuals and ‘commoners’ alike.

The (1960s) brought the tide of change as the traditional colonial and imperial forces lost ground all over the globe and the Caribbean region was not in a nutshell from this decolonisation wave as Jamaica (1962), Trinidad and Tobago (1962), where Walcott lived for several years, Barbados (1966) and other islands became sovereign states. It was in (1979), one year after the publication of *Pantomime* that Saint Lucia achieved, although within the spirit and ideals of the commonwealth, its independence. Nearly six centuries of direct European military and political intervention, French then British, have left a mark on every oppressed Saint Lucian which is why the Caribbean scholars' interest in *Robinson Crusoe* and Walcott's, in particular, might find significance if seen in the light of this background. The fact that Defoe's text and its protagonist, Crusoe, are Walcott's favourites,¹⁰ in the same way they are for many West Indians, is not altogether peculiar; they have seen through it — the first English novel— a typical Western myth of “early paradigmatic [...] European colonial experience,”¹¹ to be rewritten, commented upon, mocked, attacked and subverted.

2- Walcott's *Pantomime*: An Overt Polemic Against *Robinson Crusoe*:

My analysis is pillared, in this context, on Bakhtin's ‘overt polemic,’ which is deployed in this second section, as a means to have a closer glance at Walcott's text as a literary work which has not attempted to replicate in a verbatim fashion Defoe's source. The Russian theorist has referred to the concept as being “quite simply directed at another's discourse, which it refutes [...] directly striking a blow at the other's discourse, clashing with it.”¹² Bakhtin's notion might contribute to a dissection of the ways through which Walcott has reworked, revised and even rewritten Defoe's novel. In brief, *Pantomime* is a “neat twist on the Robinson Crusoe theme [which has] giv[en] vent to some painful historical taboos for the black community about race, gait and language.”¹³

A- What if the “Subaltern [...] Speak[s]”:¹⁴ Narrative and Perspective:

Walcott's *Pantomime*, under the form of a play, has told the story of two protagonists, the capitalist and his employee, who have shared the experience of being in a hotel, which has

been “closed for repairs”¹⁵ in Tobago. The facility owner, Harry Trewe, is an English man, who after a marital separation and the death of his son, has got all his current assets deployed in such a tourist haven, in the Caribbean, while Jackson Phillip, who has had a massive experience in the field, is the black native employee, and has been, a long time ago, a prolific native artist. Everything has been sketched the moment Trewe tried to enrol Jackson in a performance based on efforts which purport to recount the Crusoe/Friday initial contact as a means to please and induce laughter among the white tourists when the time is ripe. Unlike Defoe’s novel, Walcott’s work has been designed as a play in the course of which *Robinson Crusoe* has been turned upside-down since Jackson has opted to play Crusoe while Trewe has been relegated to the role of Friday. The intention, with a premeditated subversive vision, has been a reversal of the ‘original’ re-appropriating and remodelling, likewise, every single event and aspect from the eyes of the oppressed ‘other’; thus, “[t]he tale of Crusoe and Friday has been recontextualized [...] from the black islander’s perspective.”¹⁶

The final result is overtly polemical with the radical change of perspective and narrative enacted against Defoe’s Crusoe; it is the subaltern, black man, Jackson, who has to get shipwrecked on a remote island, like Crusoe has been more than two hundred years ago, where the circumstances would unite him with a white man who has been, for years, immersed in cannibalism. The perplexed Harry Trewe has been unable to digest what he has understood from Jackson’s suggested plot which he summarised by inquiring as follows, “[i]f you did the whole thing in reverse [...] you’ve got this black man ... no, no ... all right. You’ve got this man who is black, Robinson Crusoe, and he discovers this island on which there is this white cannibal, all right?”¹⁷ The outcome of this reversal is *Pantomime* which does not refer, as a word, to “a Christmas satire” as English-originated people might picture, but “it has been redefined,” in Walcott’s sense, “as the slave’s imitation of the European master class.”¹⁸ There is one small, nonetheless significant, discrepancy at the level of the plot which is the fact that it is Trewe, the white cannibal, who would imitate Jackson, the black Crusoe.

B- A Blow at the Setting: The Crusoe Tale in the Post-independence Era:

What people, be they children or adults, students, scholars, or commoners alike, tend to remember years after reading *Robinson Crusoe* is the story of a solitary man who has, due to some unfortunate circumstances, been marooned on a desolate island where he has been compelled to fight for his daily subsistence. I might claim that it would be hard, if not impossible, for Defoe's story to keep a tight grip over its readers, through centuries, without the hero's island solitary sojourn; therefore, "[t]he island setting is fundamental"¹⁹ and it has contributed to the tale's universal and timeless appeal. In terms of place and time exactitude, Defoe's version, once the protagonist shipwrecked, has been situated, somewhere, in one of the Caribbean islands around the second half of the 17th century with a reference to the date of the shipwreck which is "the 30th [of] September 1659."²⁰ Augustan English people, that is to say Defoe's literary contemporaries, used to perceive those territories, and all other non-European lands for that matter, as the realm of savages, barbarians, cannibals, pagans and inferior black 'sub-humans.' Therefore, "[b]y placing Crusoe's island in the Caribbean and making his savages cannibals, Defoe" has strengthened "his ability to argue persuasively [...] for some of his most strongly held convictions about the English colonial venture"²¹ during his lifetime. Walcott's *Pantomime*, with its overtly polemical approach, has given, on the other hand, more precision about its location specified as Tobago, which is considered, today, by many, as being the exact place where Defoe's hero was marooned.²²

Despite the same island setting, the events in Walcott's play are taking place in independent Trinidad and Tobago in the West Indies, meaning in a the post-colonial era, in what has been dubbed the "Castaways Guest House,"²³ a hotel owned by an Englishman, in his forties, named Harry Trewe. The Crusoe narrative has, hence, been made to transcend the confines of time, with a forward leap, almost three hundred years towards the late 1970s and early 1980s by redefining and readjusting its boundaries to suit a quite different time and audience in the wake of the great wave of independence which has given birth to several

nations. The only waiter is Jackson Phillip, a black Trinidadian who is, only initially, expected to be up to Mr. Trewe's standards; the native has described the hotel in terms, which have been used for nothing, but to relegate and stamp the whole facility with sickness underdevelopment, misery, dire conditions, social and economic recession. Phillip has clarified following this thread that the hotel is "like a hospital. The toilet catch asthma, the air condition got ague, the front-balcony rail missing four teet', and every minute the fridge like it dancing the Shango [...] Termites jumping like steel band in the foundations." [Sic]²⁴ This miserable state, into which the hotel has fallen, might invoke the dire reality of myriad nations after their farfetched and hard-earned emancipation from the dominant colonial force. Walcott has managed, with reference to Tobago not being exempt, through such an overt polemic over the setting, to show the dire conditions in which the country has been left after the departure of the British Crusoes/colonisers who have annexed the island centuries earlier.

Unlike Defoe's colonial setting, the post-independence location of *Pantomime*, just like any other old colony, is either slightly or no longer appealing, at any rate, to most British colonisers; it has lost the lure it possessed during the colonial era and became the kind of either boring or risky hotspots where the Europeans' presence is either way endangered. Crusoe's portrayal of an area, he has explored, might be a sample of the kind of enthusiastic perception and optimism-imbued spirit the colonisers have once had in the colonies; his findings have been reported as follows, "I descended a little on the side of that delicious vale, surveying it with a secret kind of pleasure [...] I was king and lord of all this country."²⁵ The opposite, if not altogether the antithesis, is in store, in Walcott's play as the independent Caribbean states, like Trinidad and Tobago, have turned into murderous, boring and static environs in the eyes of settlers and investors alike. Trewe has confirmed that,

[After the initial excitement, the whole setting] just becomes another back yard. God, is there anything deadlier than Sunday afternoons in the tropics when you can't sleep? The horror and stillness of the heat, the shining, godforsaken sea, the bored and boring clouds? Especially in an empty boarding house. You sit by the stagnant pool counting the dead leaves drifting to the edge.²⁶

The language which has been used, in the above epigraph, by the ex-colonial English agent, has delineated an emerging reality, with new dynamics, within the independent Caribbean soils where Crusoe might be a tourist for a few days, almost at whim, but can never ever be a regular settler in such a suffocating matrix. Walcott's play has, in short, taken "Defoe as a semi-ironic emblem for states of contemporary life in the Caribbean [...] stag[ing] a contest to read reality in a different way from before—from an angle unimaginable to the colonizer."²⁷

C- A Black Civilised Crusoe and a White Cannibal Friday:

Robert Stam has once claimed that "[w]ithin the Western tradition, cannibalism has often been the "name of the other," the ultimate marker of difference in a coded opposition of light/dark, rational/irrational [and] civilized/savage."²⁸ Stam's remark on the usage of the term 'cannibalism' in Western literature is not, in any manner whatsoever, devoid of substance since it has often been brandished, to stamp the non-white races as the 'Other,' in myriad Western canonical texts. *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* have not been exempt. Through the words 'cannibal' and 'cannibalism,' Defoe has, for instance, delineated a clear-cut distinction between Crusoe and Friday which has had the effect of confining the latter to the status of the coloured, 'irrational' and 'savage' 'Other,' while the former has been established as the white, 'rational' and 'civilised' 'Self.' I claim, herein, it is this kind of discourse, with its binaries that Walcott's *Pantomime*, which fostered an outright aggressive approach, has sought to attack when it has jumbled and blurred the aforementioned colonial constants.

The author's intention to get engaged in an overt polemic, from the onset, with Defoe's novel might be palpable when Trewe suggested to the native, Jackson, to stage a show with reference to *Robinson Crusoe* for the potential European tourists. This offer, with all the dynamics it might surface, has been declined by the waiter, who has had an awareness of the murky side such a performance could expose. The idea of playing the role of the cannibal Friday, the inferior, seemed not only surreal, but also inadmissible because he has "suspect[ed] that the plot" is intended to "legitimize[...] the oppressive situation"²⁹ of the

source. Jackson responds, in his Creole and fragmented sentences, with these words, “Mr. Trewe, you come back with that same rake again? I tell you, I ain’t no actor, and I ain’t walking in front a set of tourists naked playing cannibal [*Sic*].”³⁰ His stance is full of fortitude, revolutionary mindset and ideals which is why it has to be confirmed, that his outright rejection of the role of the men-eater, is an act of rebellion against “the part traditionally ascribed to the black man, with all its racial and prejudicial connotations.”³¹

Walcott’s overt polemic-imbued designs might become apparent when the two protagonists agreed that the white man would take the initiative of playing Friday while Crusoe’s role would be ascribed to the Trinidadian black worker. They have had a heated argument in the aftermath of which Jackson has expressed his bewilderment at the whole idea telling the English man, “[y]ou mean you [are] prepared to walk round naked as your mother [has made] you, in your jockstrap, playing a white cannibal in front of your own people?”³² They have agreed, ultimately, to reverse the roles and Jackson has finally assumed the black civilised Crusoe, a monumental reversal, in the course of which, it is worth mentioning that, Jackson has evinced ‘superiority’ in terms of acting, cultural knowledge and civilisation standards. There is one scene, of interest, in which Trewe almost got naked to comprehend “what it was like to be Friday”;³³ the black native, Jackson, is appalled and even infuriated when his entrance on the stage is met with the sight of his boss in such a primitive state. All Jackson thought about, at that moment, is preserving his reputation by not attending to the white man’s needs unless he gets, in cultural terms, appropriately dressed. The native has maintained “if anybody should happen to pass, my name is immediately mud. So, when you put back on your pants, I will serve your breakfast.”³⁴ The two heroes have had a detailed discussion, in which the native has attempted to convince the English man to put on his clothes, but without much success; Jackson has, then, ordered “[p]ut on your blasted pants, man! You [are] like a blasted child, you know!”³⁵ Trewe has even requested if he is expected to wear his “[s]hirt, too?”³⁶ The boss, despite being both English and white, has been, in this

scene, lectured on “[m]anners”³⁷ by his servant, in a reversal of the civilising mission; the two heroes have, shortly, agreed to have breakfast and Trewe has confessed “[y]ou [Jackson] can teach me manners. There [are] more manners in serving than in being served.”³⁸ The Trinidadian has even gone further, in the essence and spirit of overt polemic, by accusing the English people, Trewe included, and the whole white race of lacking hygiene because, in his words, they “just wipe [their] hands [...] fast or not at all”³⁹ after using a bathroom.

All along their rehearsals for the Crusoe/Friday show, the two have exhibited not only tropes, modes of thinking and other kinds of norms, which were in favour of the black man, but also a disparity in terms of confidence. Unlike the source, where Defoe’s hero has been constructed as a man beaming with self assurance while ‘his’ servant has been a shadow, Walcott’s overt polemic has turned the tendency upside-down in favour of the black natives. It has to be said, in this regards, that the way Crusoe pictures himself “with a growing sense of confidence and self-importance, is contingent on the colonial setting of the novel,” the matrix where the hero has managed to dominate the island and its inhabitants.⁴⁰ In the absence of that ripe colonial surrounding, with the post-independence era, Walcott’s Jackson has been, the least to say, engrossed in his existence while Trewe has been delineated, in a radical turn, as the white man looking for both the much needed auto-conferred esteem and acceptance from his servant. After exposing, for instance, his idea of the Crusoe/Friday concept, the English man tried to convince the waiter to have his adherence to the show; Jackson, who has already been an actor, dismissed the whole concept, with what he has termed his “honest [and] professional opinion,” as being complete nonsense.⁴¹ He has not, thereby, been afraid of expressing his viewpoint, at any moment, and like any civilised man, he has been able to initiate debates from which he has emerged victorious.

D- What if the Master/Slave Dynamics Are Toppled?

James Joyce has been right when he once commented, at the beginning of the 20th century, through Leopold Bloom’s thoughts with these, somewhat, prophetic words, “[b]ury

the dead. Say Robinson Crusoe was true to life. Well then Friday buried him. Every Friday buries a Thursday if you come to look at it.”⁴² These words seem to suggest that, no matter what history’s course would be, the native-enslaved Friday/Caliban/colonised would ultimately ‘bury’ the ‘master’ Crusoe/Prospero/coloniser and get the upper hand over their intricate, centuries long, relationship with colonialism, in an inevitable cycle, bound to extinction. Jackson has voiced similar concerns when he improvised a song that has had the same purport running as such,

I want to tell you 'bout Robinson Crusoe. He tell Friday, when I do so, do so.
Whatever I do, you must do like me. He make Friday a Good Friday [a doll effigy];
That was the first example of slavery, 'Cause I am still Friday and you ain't me. Now
Crusoe he was this Christian and all, And Friday, his slave, was a cannibal, But one
day things bound to go in reverse, With Crusoe the slave and Friday the boss. [Sic] ⁴³

This is the kind of overtly polemical reversal which has been enacted, in Walcott’s literary work, once Jackson has wrenched the role of Crusoe from the white man. Trewe has been left with no choice, but to play Friday’s side. The native Trinidadian has announced the imposition of his own worldview upon the English man saying that the entire “master-and-servant shit [is] finish[ed] [Sic].”⁴⁴

The readers and viewers are, accordingly, confronted with a revision of the source which has entailed a direct reversal of the master/slave relationship, with all its tropes, intricacies and dynamics, in favour of the once enslaved black man. Jackson has taken the commands and ordered, therefore, the English hotel owner to “[b]ring [him] a beer”⁴⁵ to which Trewe, in the most subordinate fashion, has responded “[t]here’s no more beer. You want a sip of Scotch?”⁴⁶ Then, he has handed a cup to his new self-proclaimed ‘master’ and ‘boss,’ the native, Jackson Phillip. There is another scene full of symbolism, in which Trewe has not only handed a cigarette to the latter, but has also lighted it for him. To cut it short, with only a few exceptions, Jackson has imposed his version of history and events alike over the re-enactment of the Crusoe/Friday encounter; hence, he has “control[ed] and manipulate[d] Harry”⁴⁷ which is a strategy that has been intended to “signif[y] the radical

destabilization and deconstruction of the colonizer's [master/slave] repressive paradigm, which he relieves of power to define, control, and deny his [native] own reality."⁴⁸

In Walcott's realm, the days when Crusoe/Trewe had the power, over both natives and island, have come to an end with the independence of the colony, Trinidad and Tobago; consequently, it is up to the indigenous population, represented by Jackson, to write and even create, if possible, their own version of history. Trewe has had a clear idea of what was happening during the rehearsal for the play within the play; he has told, likewise, his employee, "you've manipulated [the show] your way [so that] you can spew out all that bitterness in fun."⁴⁹ To counter this aspect, he has taken the decision to come back to 'reality' to assume the role of the authoritative boss telling the 'other,' "[y]ou're still on duty [...] your job is at stake."⁵⁰ Jackson has understood the racial and power-based discourse such white/boss and black/employee situations necessarily entail. Thus, he drew a line connecting his employer with Defoe's protagonist, in a suggestive scene, when he (Jackson) called Trewe, "Crusoe-Trusoe, Robinson Trewe-so!"⁵¹ One might argue that Walcott's native has 'outwitted' and even 'outlived' the white man since he has, to a certain extent, succeeded in reversing the master/slave dynamics in his own favour voicing the concerns of generations of Fridays/Calibans who have been silenced, condescended and oppressed.

3- Pantomime: A Metatextual Reconstruction of *Robinson Crusoe*:

In this third section, my argument revolves around the ways *Pantomime* has criticised and commented upon issues in relation to its source text. These designs, I have set, would have been, to a certain extent, an arduous undertaking without Gérard Genette's concept he has labelled metatextuality. This notion, whenever deployed, has to involve, at least, one text which criticises, rebuffs and comments upon another; he has argued, in *Palimpsests*, that this connection is "most often [...] "commentary".⁵² As such, I read Walcott's play as a metatext which has been caught in a "critical relationship"⁵³ against its source throughout which *Pantomime* has not only criticised, but has also commented on elements from Defoe's novel.

A- Colonialism: A Scathing Commentary:

There is no peculiarity to be pinpointed if some scholars consider Defoe's first novel a typical colonial text which has portrayed the colonial enterprise and mindset, through its protagonist, Crusoe, and his solitary life on a remote island.⁵⁴ The British castaway has established his authority over the area calling himself "majesty the prince and lord of the whole island"⁵⁵ which has given him, at whim, "the lives of all [his] subjects at [his] absolute command";⁵⁶ thereby, he could do whatever pleases him, "hang, draw, give liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all [his] subjects."⁵⁷ The colonial dimension of Defoe's masterpiece, given this mindset and approach to overseas territories, is hard to be understated or overlooked. Brett McInelly's assertion that "British colonialism [has] inform[ed] nearly every feature of Defoe's first novel"⁵⁸ has a great portion of, if not the whole, truth. It is this colonial dimension which author's, like Walcott, in the colonies or newly independent nations, have sought to counter and comment on through their texts, *Pantomime* included.

The first aspect Walcott's play has metatextually unveiled, as part of its commentary on, and rejection of colonialism, is Jackson's choice to resist the old colonial narrative, which objectified the colonised, by recreating the Crusoe/Friday story from the native's eyes. He has stated "if I [Jackson] am supposed to play Robinson Crusoe my way, then I will choose the way in which I will get shipwrecked."⁵⁹ It is due to this initial rebellion which might be beheld as a gesture of auto-emancipation that he has managed to "profane[...] the colonizer's symbols."⁶⁰ The black Crusoe has undermined and even enacted 'dirty' tricks on Trewe who, under Jackson's machinations, has been cornered into a zoological realm by acting as, a bird or a goat, before the coloniser/colonised stumble upon each other in the aftermath of which the English boss, the two protagonists agreed, would fulfil the function of the colonised white cannibal. The latter, unlike the source, has been given a new name, by the black, which is not Friday, but "Thursday"⁶¹ to denote Crusoe's colonial stance whose key concern is the suppression of the Other. Walcott has grasped the essence of an appellation as an intentional

exercise of power, which is ideologically oriented, since he has once declared, “[t]o name is to contradict”;⁶² therefore, the choice of ‘Thursday’ is far from being fortuitous, as it might signpost the existence of a pre-colonial culture before the arrival of Crusoe, the coloniser.

Jackson has affirmed that via the Crusoe/Friday show, which is not the ultimate display of innocence, they would not only be amusing tourists, but the two heroes would also be “acting [...] the history of imperialism [and colonialism].”⁶³ The first time they met, with its traumatic implications, might be the accurate instant of confrontation between two cultural poles, which has dragged, centuries long, colonial friction. There is a scene in which Jackson has tried to make Trewe taste the injustice of what has been designated as the coloniser’s ‘civilising mission’ when he ordered him, “Robinson obey Thursday now. Speak Thursday language. Obey Thursday gods.”⁶⁴ The reversal which has been sketched, by Walcott, has reactivated power-based connections of the original with a major alteration through the Black Crusoe/master/Jackson, on the one hand, and the white cannibal/servant/Trewe, on the other. Because the former is a coloniser, he felt entitled, in a symbolic manoeuvre, to force his African cultural modes upon the latter to make him taste what it was “like to have to acquire an alien language that belonged to the master [and] what [...] it feel[t] like to have a new god thrust on him.”⁶⁵ Trewe has not been impressed with the one sided dimension this racially biased show has taken with the core subversions quite to the heart of the tale running as such,

He [the black Crusoe] comes across this naked white cannibal called Thursday, you know. And then [...] [t]his cannibal, who is a Christian, would have to start unlearning his Christianity. He would have to be taught ... I mean ... he’d have to be taught by this this - African ... that everything was wrong, that what he was doing ... I mean, for nearly two thousand years ... was wrong. That his civilisation, his culture, his whatever, was ... *horrible*. Was all ... wrong. Barbarous, I mean, you know. And [this black] Crusoe would then have to teach him things like, you know, about ... Africa, his gods, patamba, and so on.⁶⁶

The above version has been, in Walcott’s sense, the white man’s discourse embodied in Defoe’s text, but in reverse, in favour of the coloniser, Crusoe, who has not only baptised the native as Friday, but has also mutated him into a carbon copy or a shadow whose function is to mimic its master. Trewe is taken aback, to say the least, by this subversive approach

which coaxed in him the realisation that the old colonial methods, his ancestors used to enact on the ‘other’ races, under civilisation’s shimmering shroud, are about to be re-enacted on him in post-independent Tobago. One might confirm that “the ramifications of colonisation are revealed”⁶⁷ in *Pantomime*, as a metatext, with the episode of the white cannibal who is to be forced to foster African cultural modes and suppress his Christian ideals in the same fashion as those colonised peoples who have been “during the colonial past [...] asked to “unlearn” their religion, language, and customs.”⁶⁸ One encounter with black Crusoe’s African language has been more than enough to get the white cannibal, Trewe, immersed in the colonial system’s complexities under which abysmal methods, torture, burning villages and massacres, are seen a necessary evil to implement the invader’s ‘superior’ cultural modes, with all their dimensions. The African tongue spoken by Jackson, when he has assumed the coloniser’s part, has sounded unbearable to Trewe’s ears to the point of saying, “I’ll tell you one thing [master] If you want me to learn your language, you’d better have a gun,”⁶⁹ which is the colonial strategy European, the British not exempt, empire agents and officials, be they military or administrative, have resorted to in the process of acculturation fostered against the conquered peoples. Trewe’s words have, in other terms, voiced vast “colonial implications [which] are glaring since it was through [the] force [of the gun] that the colonised people were made to learn the language of the colonisers while theirs was eradicated.”⁷⁰

It was in this systematic procedure of acculturation, that the indigenous subjects, like Caliban/Friday/the colonised, have been modelled through what Homi Bhabha conceptualised as “colonial mimicry” producing “mimic man” who is “a reformed, recognizable Other [...] *a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.*”⁷¹ This is Caliban’s and Friday’s dilemma in Shakespeare’s and Defoe’s texts; Friday is, in the coloniser’s view, someone who “could understand almost all [Crusoe] said to him, and speak pretty fluently, though in broken English.”⁷² Despite the alterations the white man has brought upon the native’s appearance, language, religious values, dressing and eating habits, there are always a few signs, at times

barely perceptible, which might denote that he can never ever be an exact copy of his 'master.' Immersed in his metatextual rewriting of *Robinson Crusoe*, Walcott has scathingly commented on this aspect of mimicry through Jackson's following words,

For three hundred years I served you. Three hundred years I served you breakfast [...] in that sun that never set on your empire I was your shadow, I did what you did [...] Every movement you made, your shadow copied [...] Mr. Crusoe [...] until it is the shadow [which controls] the child, it is the servant that start dominating the master [...] and that is the victory of [Friday/the colonised] the shadow.⁷³

The image, this passage has conveyed about Caliban/Friday/the native, which has been for centuries regurgitated and recycled, by the colonisers, is that of a mere shadow, at most a mocking bird, which does nothing, but copy. Walcott's metatext, however, has let the colonised to tamper with Crusoe through discursive machinations in the post-independent era.

The mocking bird might be found in Defoe's text with "Poll,"⁷⁴ Crusoe's parrot, being taught to pronounce a few words and Walcott, in a metatextual shunt, has endowed Trewe with one. Jackson's gaze indicted it as a "pre-colonial parrot"⁷⁵ because it reiterates "Heinegger"⁷⁶ which might sound like the degrading 'hey nigger' and as he could no longer bear the innuendo, the phrase might entail, he threatened Trewe that "if [the parrot] want[s] to last in Trinidad and Tobago, then it [has] to adjust."⁷⁷ The moment the bird trespassed the boundaries unchecked, Jackson, in a rhetorical artifice, strangled it to death to suppress, once and for all, the racist's/coloniser's mindset. Patrick Taylor is right when he claimed that "killing [...] the parrot is [...] a symbol of the violence inherent in the situation, of the violence that may be necessary at any time to further the liberation process and preserve it from the aggressor."⁷⁸ The execution of the bird might additionally recall Fanon's view that sheer violence might, at times, be liberating for the colonised when he has said that "such madness," meaning stark violence is the only means which "can deliver [the colonised/Caliban/Jackson] from colonial oppression."⁷⁹

B- Language and Creole: Subverting the Centre:

Colonialism, with all its intricate dynamics, has leaned on language as a powerful instrument to ground and justify, if needed, the power-based bond it has created between the

coloniser/master and the colonised/slave.⁸⁰ Such a usage of language might be seen as part of what has been designated as the ‘colonial discourse’ to which Peter Hulme has referred as “an ensemble of linguistically-based practices unified by their common deployment in the management of colonial relationships.”⁸¹ At one point, although nearly four hundred years after annexation, Jackson/Caliban/the colonised/the slave has, somehow, grasped the weight language, as a means for communication, might have if deployed like a sharp tool to wield and craft an antithesis to colonial discourse and wrestle with the oppressor. This situation has been wrapped up, with a surgical precision, when a thinker states, “it was in language that the [colonised] slave was perhaps most successfully imprisoned by [the coloniser] his master, and it was in his (mis-)use of it that he [the colonised/slave] perhaps most effectively rebelled.”⁸² Walcott has, like most of his contemporaries, understood this aspect well; therefore, he has, through Jackson, both ‘used’ and ‘misused’ the coloniser’s/ Crusoe’s/ Prospero’s language.

The first argument to be highlighted, in this direction, is the beginning of *Pantomime* in which Jackson has evinced not only mastery but also accuracy in navigating the shallow waters between accents. The Trinidadian’s words run as follows, “Mr. Trewe? (*English accent*) Mr. Trewe, your scramble eggs is here! *are* here! (*Creole accent*) You hear, Mr. Trewe? I here wid your eggs! (*English accent*) Are you in there? [*Sic*]”⁸³ This quite relaxed, targeted and mastered ‘use’ and ‘misuse’ of English mixed with Creole has, indeed, fulfilled the function of a metatext, which is to comment on and criticise Defoe’s novel, since Jackson, the black man, has had the power to do it. Thus, such “imitations of the master’s language by Jackson [have been intended to] make us very aware that this highly self-conscious role-playing is hardly that of an imitative, enslaved Friday.”⁸⁴ There is another element I have, on a similar vein, to bring under light, which is Jackson’s capacity to appeal to English and Creole to express himself artistically. Unlike what has been propagated in colonial literature, Defoe’s not exempt, Walcott’s native has had enough talent, in terms of acting and language using, not only to improvise songs, but also to act unexpected roles like that of Crusoe.

Walcott has, moreover, carried on his metatextual version of the source through Jackson's intentional 'misuse' of the coloniser's language at the level of grammar and spelling. The Trinidadian has appealed, on many occasions, to ungrammatical sentences which contain sheer infringements of the English grammatical rules. At the beginning, for instance, when he has declined the offer of his boss to participate in the Crusoe/Friday show, Jackson has fostered "I ain't no actor"⁸⁵ and in another scene, he has told Trewe, "you ain't no parrot to repeat opinion."⁸⁶ These two sentences have entailed, in terms of grammar, the same apparent, on purpose, mistake which falls within the category of 'double negation.' Walcott has even transcended these boundaries towards the spelling of words which is another field that has, at intermittent occasions, been wrecked. The words 'tragedy' and 'mariner', following this thread, have been mispronounced by Jackson as "tradegey"⁸⁷ and "marina."⁸⁸ A similar metatextual usage of language has been resorted to when Jackson has opted to name the native white cannibal "Thursday"⁸⁹ rather than 'Friday,' Defoe's novel has referred to. One might affirm, accordingly, that "Jackson [has] Carrie[d] on his creative resistance through revisionary language games [which have been designed to] irritate his master."⁹⁰ These linguistic metatextual subversions have been operated to demonstrate that the native is not the mere 'parrot' depicted in colonial literature since Jackson has been endowed with the capacity to both 'use' and 'misuse' the master's language whenever he sees fit.

C- *Pantomime*: A Metatextual Reinterpretation of the Past:

The coloniser has attempted, in the course of centuries-long land annexation, to control and suppress the local inhabitants' identity and history by associating them with primitivism, superstition, cannibalism and paganism. He has, for a moment, succeeded to a high degree, in vilifying the native's cultural and historical origins while elevating his own to the status of the reference. This is apparent in literature through Crusoe who has engraved in Friday the 'superiority' of his standards when the native admitted "you teach wild mans be good, sober, tame mans; you tell them know God, pray God, and live new life. [*Sic*]"⁹¹ The

crucial entities, namely identity and history, might be considered, to post-colonial thinkers, Walcott included, as some of the most knotted issues which tend to raise thorny questions they have been expected to reckon with. Walcott has addressed such questions metatextually to wrestle with such demons in *Pantomime* in order to inverse the tendency in favour of the native while reclaiming Jackson's roots and identity.

There is one scene of high relevance, in this context, when Jackson has associated the Christian religious practice of "communion," which is the "symbolic[...] eat[ing] [of] the body and drink[ing] [of] the blood of Christ,"⁹² with cannibalism.⁹³ Jackson has overturned the tendency by commenting on one of the pillars of the coloniser's/Crusoe's/Prospero's identity which is Christianity when he has affirmed "[there] [i]s no more cannibalism than to eat a god."⁹⁴ Later on, when Walcott's two protagonists have reached an agreement to stage the Crusoe/Friday encounter, Jackson has taken this chance to rewrite history and reclaim his identity by sketching, as such, his version of the events, from the eyes of the subaltern, away from the dominant colonial discourse, thereby, supporting his narrative with forceful sentences when he says that the show, "is the story ... [it] is the history [...] of imperialism."⁹⁵ Jackson has also painted a negative portrait of Crusoe as a ruthless coloniser while colonialism has been vilified by signalling the stark violence that is, most often, involved in its entire process. The native has not only grounded his version of the story, but has also established it as the ultimate truth through metatextual counter-discourse when he has stated that violence, bloody repression, inhuman subjugation and exploitation are the aspects which represent "the story of the British Empire [...] [I mean] [t]he history of the British Empire."⁹⁶

The heroes have, furthermore, been used to highlight quite divergent viewpoints in relation to origins with Harry Trewe's European ancestry and 'refined' tastes which might be denotative of the British coloniser while the black African-originated, Jackson Phillip, whose entire perception is bound to the Caribbean, might stand as a symbol for all the natives. Trewe, whose current assets safeguard his pole position even in a post-independent era, has

wanted the coloniser/colonised encounter, in Defoe's text, as a means to induce laughter, while Jackson has categorised it, on the other hand, as the beginning "of slavery."⁹⁷ If Friday has accepted this institution, with its harsh and rigorous binary demarcations, since he "worked not only very willingly and very hard, but did it very cheerfully,"⁹⁸ Jackson has subversively commented upon it to demolish its ideological and cultural foundations. In a nutshell, Walcott has staged the coloniser/colonised encounter in which the two entities have "struggle[d] not only over the play but also about how to interpret the past."⁹⁹

D- Women the Excluded: A Metatextual Response:

The colonial world has been marked by a certain tendency to focus, in the majority, if not totality, of cases on males' adventures and errands in overseas territories, which has stamped the entire enterprise as a masculine domain where women, devoid of opportunities, are reduced to a translucent presence on the margin.¹⁰⁰ *Robinson Crusoe* is a prominent example of this tendency, at the literary level, as women have been, on a few occasions, referred to, yet they have never existed in the novel's reality as round characters that would evolve throughout the story with the power to influence the course of events. The reasoning of Christopher Flint following this thread of argument is relevant since he believes that the invisibility and stark absence, to which women have been sentenced, in the Crusoe story, is not solely the fruit "of a plot that strands a man on a deserted island; it is the result also of a powerful rhetorical exclusion of the female."¹⁰¹ This kind of intentional exclusion has been metatextually countered and criticised in *Pantomime* through a few positive references to women, which have brought into prominence their complementary role with men.

The landscape of the colony has been described by Walcott's Crusoe, much like 18th century colonial agents, with the same colonial terminology which has often painted an exotic environment full of wonders and adventures, in store; in this direction, he has fostered, "O silent sea, O wondrous sunset [...] this is paradise, I know. For I see around me the splendors of nature [:] [t]he ferns, the palms like silent sentinels, the wide and silent lagoons that briefly

hold my passing, solitary reflection. The volcano wreathed in mist.”¹⁰² This setting, which would have been quite fulfilling to any 18th century coloniser, Defoe’s hero included, has not been enough to Walcott’s Crusoe who voiced his dissatisfaction when he has rhetorically asked and commented with these words, “[b]ut what is paradise without a woman? Adam in paradise had his woman to share his loneliness.”¹⁰³ I claim that this is a metatextual comment on the source text in relation to women’s exclusion by focusing on the solitary life to which Defoe’s main character has been reduced. If Crusoe has pointed at loneliness, with the absence of women it entailed, as being “nothing [and] did not [even] pray to be delivered from it or think of it [once he discovered God’s grace],”¹⁰⁴ Walcott’s Crusoe has amplified such an aspect declaring, “I miss the voice [...] of even one consoling creature, the touch ... of a hand ... the look of kind eyes ... [w]here is the wife from whom I vowed ... never to be sundered?”¹⁰⁵ There is, in addition, another scene in which Jackson has assumed the role of Harry Trewe’s wife by “holding [her] photograph before his face,”¹⁰⁶ to remind him of what does it look like to be in a woman’s vicinity, and the English man has been more than pleased to express his anger-mixed feelings towards her. Any reader or viewer of Walcott’s play might, therefore, see the metatextual comments on women’s position, away from the source, by demonstrating Crusoe’s yearning to the female presence on the island which has been suppressed under the impact of the era’s unbridled colonial tendencies.

4- Pantomime and the Residual, Dominant and Emergent:

This fourth section relies on Williams’ layers to scrutinise the cultural and ideological milieu which has contributed to Walcott’s play, as a rewriting of Defoe’s novel. Without this in-depth analysis targeted, herein, a thorough understanding of *Pantomime* is an arduous assignment, if not impossible. The questions, I reckon with, at this stage, are related to colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, neocolonialism and multiculturalism. These cultural and ideological aspects which have been raised by the play have to be critically categorised using Williams’ notions to comprehend Walcott’s choice to write his adaptation as such.

A- Colonialism and Eurocentrism: Residual Elements:

What has been designated as the ‘residual,’ by Williams, is pointed at as all of those elements, be they ideological or cultural, which have been “formed in the past, but [are] still active in the cultural process.”¹⁰⁷ Those past-born aspects, in any society, might arguably entail practices, “experiences, meanings and values,” which are not part of the dominant dynamics, nonetheless, they are “lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation.”¹⁰⁸ The residual features tend to preserve their active and effective nature as a cultural or ideological remnant of a past historical era. Given this vision of Williams’ concept, it might be argued that *Pantomime* has encompassed two major residual elements which are colonialism and Eurocentrism.

To begin with traditional colonialism, it has been dismantled, with the wave of decolonisation (1960s), since almost all the colonies have gained their independence with the process lasting until the late 1970s and early 1980s. Trinidad and Tobago, where Walcott has lived for years, has become a free nation in (1962) after more than a century and half of British colonial domination. The presence of colonialism, as a residual element, in Walcott’s adaptation of Defoe’s novel would not, in any case, whatsoever, seem unusual and out of context. The textual evidence is striking with a few, but effective references to the ongoing colonial dynamics in *Pantomime*. The first remnant of the country’s colonial history is Trewe’s old parrot which is a powerful symbol since it has “survive[d] from a pre-colonial epoch.”¹⁰⁹ Despite the departure of the European settlers and British colonists from that region of the Caribbean, the bird has kept regurgitating the same racial insults the invaders used to hurl at the local inhabitants since they used to call them ‘negroes.’ Thereby, it might be asserted that “the parrot of colonial days [...] whose language is still colonial”¹¹⁰ is a residual element which functions as a reminder of British colonialism, in the near past.

There are other instances in which colonialism has been intertwined with Eurocentrism through Harry Trewe, who might stand as a figure of the empire, especially

when he has acted like a colonial agent. When he has invited Jackson to take part in the Crusoe/Friday show, at the onset of the play, Trewe has evinced his colonial and Eurocentric vision. He has presented the script of the performance, to his Trinidadian employee, with the ‘condescending’ remark that he “can bring it [the script] all down to your [Jackson’s] level.”¹¹¹ The same patronizing mindset might be detected when he has rebuked Jackson for killing the parrot with these words, “[y]ou people [the natives] create nothing. You imitate everything.”¹¹² From these instances, the readers/viewers of *Pantomime* might notice that the English hotel owner, who has been imbued, at times, with his Eurocentric worldview of the white man’s alleged ‘superiority,’ has “fall[en] into the role of [the Eurocentric] colonizer with such egregious insouciance.”¹¹³

There is another aspect which is the fact that Trewe has not missed the occasion to diminish even Trinidad and Tobago, to which he has referred as “a Third World country” where even a suicide attempt is almost impossible since “[y]ou can’t leave a note because the pencils break [and] you can’t cut your wrist with the[ir] local blades.”¹¹⁴ Through these words, Trewe has attacked and made fun of the country’s economy by portraying its industry as being of a bad quality since, for him, even the local pens and knives are not reliable. In addition, the moment the employee has taken the initiative to call his boss with the first name, Jackson has noticed that this has “give[n] [Trewe] a slight shock. Just a little twitch of the lip, but a shock all the same.”¹¹⁵ This might suggest that he has been unable to digest the idea of being equal to the natives even in the post-independence era. One might affirm that the sour remnant of the colonial world has been depicted in *Pantomime*¹¹⁶ which has been intermingled with the English man’s European self-centredness that characterised the 1970s and 1980s. These cultural and ideological elements, although they belong to the past, might be brought into the surface as an effective residue since the natives suffered from many western whites’ colonial mindset, racism and supremacist ideals which hindered the ex-colonies from having political and economic equality based ties with the old colonial forces.

B- Capitalism and *Pantomime*: The Dominant:

One might find it pertinent to refresh, at this stage, the reader's memory with the meaning of the dominant; as a theoretical notion, Williams has considered it "the [most] effective [...] culture"¹¹⁷ and ideology in a particular society at a given moment of its history. When applying it on *Pantomime*, dealing with Trinidad and Tobago in the late 1970s and early 1980s, there is one dominant aspect which is nothing, but capitalism that has become quite central and domineering over that post-independence society. There is enough evidence, pointing at this direction, in the play which has voiced the underlying capitalist dynamics and the vast array of values it has stood for through various elements such as the setting, the characters, Trewe and Jackson, in addition to their suggestive verbal exchanges which have revealed the system's sturdy presence in the country.

The setting in which the events of Walcott's text have taken place is a hotel, a tourist facility in Tobago, which in itself might represent a substantial capital investment. There is a specific dialogue between Trewe and his employee in which the former has confessed, "everything I own is sunk here";¹¹⁸ this means that all his money has been devoted to acquire this business away from England. He is, therefore, the boss or the business owner, while Jackson is his only waiter. All that matters to a capitalist, like Trewe, is the amount of profit he would make; even the basic life necessities have not been made available for the tourists despite the fact that "they pay in advance for their vacation."¹¹⁹ Jackson has, on a similar vein, suggested to his boss to "[t]ry giving them [the tourists] the basics: Food. Water. Shelter. They ain't shipwrecked."¹²⁰ There is another paradox herein; on the one hand, the hotel has been ignored and the needed repairs have not been performed, for a long time, which has left the place in dire conditions; on the other hand, Trewe is full of expectations waiting for the tourist season to accumulate capital gain.

The relationship between the protagonists, Trewe and Jackson, has been framed with the capitalist dynamics which, often, involve ruthlessly exploiting and overworking the

employees. Jackson has, for instance, made it clear that the carpenter, in charge of the woodwork, would never ever come back because the boss has paid him “peanuts [...] for overtime”¹²¹ work. This is an indicator that the white man is not only a greedy, but also a stingy capitalist for whom the exploitation of workers is a common practice. Even the Trinidadian waiter has been subject to the capitalist’s greed since, at the end of the play, he has associated Trewe with Crusoe when he has addressed him with these words, “Robinson, we could talk ’bout a raise?”¹²² With this inquiry, the play has come to an end and Jackson has shattered, as such, the world of the boss and capitalist by asking for a better wage.

C- Emergent Neocolonial Concern and Multicultural Vision:

Just like any literary work, which is bound in Williams’ sense to vehicle newborn elements, *Pantomime* has voiced, in a way or another, the emergent features which have come into existence in the Caribbean region during the late 1970s and early 1980s. One might speak in this sense about two emergent aspects; in the first position, I have to point at the neocolonial concerns, which have swept over most, if not all, the newly independent nations. Second, there is the multicultural tendency which, once born, has started to propagate the spirit of coexistence among quite different races and divergent cultures.

The upsurge of neocolonialism, after the colonies’ independence, was a major issue Trinidad and Tobago has had to reckon with. Economically speaking, the island has been, as Walcott’s text exemplified, tied to the mother nation. The fact that an English man, Trewe, whose presence would have been undesirable for the natives, a few years ago, has managed to own a hotel after the departure of his own people (the British colonisers), is very symptomatic of those neocolonialist concerns. The link which has bound him, as the boss, to the Trinidadian Jackson, the waiter, might be characterised “as [an] embodiment[...] of [...] a neo-colonial relationship.”¹²³ Trewe might be interpreted, from this perspective, as one of those colonial shadows or even ghosts that are still haunting the country despite its political independence from Britain.

There is a scene of tremendous importance in which the white man, because he is the business owner, has relied on his economic strength to reinvent the old colonial power structures issuing orders to Jackson with the following words, “Friday, you, bring Crusoe, me, breakfast now.”¹²⁴ The black native has been relegated, in this instance, by the white English investor to the status of a Friday/servant on the basis of post-independence economic power dynamics. It has to be said that “a play such as *Pantomime* is a classic exposé of the neocolonial interaction of race and class.”¹²⁵ This has been embodied through those interactions between the employer and his employee in which the former, who is white and English-originated, has exploited his privileged position to control the latter, who is a black and native. In those European favourite tourist destinations, like the Caribbean region, “there is still an enormous gap between [local employees] and the tourists and hotel managers.”¹²⁶

Furthermore, Walcott’s play has articulated multiculturalism as another emergent aspect. This vision has advocated tolerance and coexistence among races. The footprint on a sandy beach which has been horrifying to Defoe’s Crusoe, has been cast from a new positive approach with the black Crusoe of *Pantomime* pointing at it as the “naked footprint that is the mark of [Crusoe’s] salvation.”¹²⁷ The ‘other’ is no longer perceived as a potential danger which might threaten or shatter the homogenous world of the ‘self.’ Seen as such, it might be argued that Jackson has “advocate[d] the embrace of otherness, of mutual human recognition, rather than the xenophobia [...] that [has] drive[n] Crusoe first to terror.”¹²⁸ There has been, throughout Walcott’s text, a renegotiation of race-colour-based relationships, with them being inflected towards a multicultural dimension, to suit the Caribbean region during the 1970s and early 1980s which represent a different milieu from 18th century England. The end of the play has suggested and even reinforced the impression of advocating cohabitation between human beings; the protagonists have been shown “*laughing*”¹²⁹ at the jokes they were cracking. The old colonial power-based relationships have been metamorphosed to the extent that Defoe himself would have been quite puzzled at the radical turnaround his novel has taken. Walcott

has affirmed, in an interview, that “[t]he idea of some reconciliation or some adaptability of being able to live together [is] possible.”¹³⁰ This might confirm the era’s multicultural aspirations advocating coexistence among races.

Conclusion:

To conclude with, this chapter has revolved around the analysis of Walcott’s *Pantomime* in relation to Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*. The Saint Lucian author has attributed a tremendous importance to the Crusoe/Friday connection which has been reworked away from the original. The background of the playwright, with his life and other influences, in addition to his literary work’s environment have been sketched, from the onset, in order to better understand the course the author’s adaptation of Defoe’s novel has taken. I turned my attention to studying Walcott’s play as a text which has engaged in an overt polemic with its original. The radical shift in terms of perspective, setting mixed with the reversal of races and roles (a black/master Crusoe and a white/slave Friday) have all been read as being intended to strike a direct blow at the source. At the level of the third section, I have wrestled with questions related to colonialism, language, history, and women’s marginalisation; the myriad ways these issues have been deployed against the white man and in favour of the native ‘other,’ have made the play a metatextual rewriting which has not only criticised, but also commented on *Robinson Crusoe*. Finally, Williams’ critical notions have revealed to me the presence of colonialism and Eurocentrism as remnants or residual aspects in a society which has been dominated by capitalism while witnessing the emergence of neocolonial concerns and multicultural tendencies.

Endnotes:

¹. Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), p. 38.

². William R. Ferris, “A *Multiplicity of Voices: A Conversation with Derek Walcott*,” in *Humanities*, Vol 22: N° 01, 2001, The National Endowment for Humanities, p. 50.

³. Derek Walcott, Cited in Paul Breslin, *No Body’s Nation: Reading Derek Walcott*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 11.

⁴. Paul Breslin, *No Body’s Nation: Reading Derek Walcott*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), Pp. 11-12.

⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

-
- ⁶. Paul Breslin and Robert Hamner, “Derek Walcott,” in *Callaloo*, Vol 28: N° 01, 2005, p. 01.
- ⁷. Edward Baugh, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Derek Walcott*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. x.
- ⁸. James Joyce cited in John Richetti, *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography*, (London: Blackwell publishing, 2005), p. 185.
- ⁹. David Hoffmann, “*Saint Lucia Guide*,” in DHB Guides, Vol 43: N° 01, 2013, p. 04.
- ¹⁰. David Mikics, “Derek Walcott and Alejo Carpentier: Nature, History, and the Caribbean Writer,” in Harold Bloom, ed., *Derek Walcott*, (Broomall: Chelsea House Publishers, 2003), p. 125.
- ¹¹. Elleke Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 18.
- ¹². Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 196.
- ¹³. Trevor R. Griffiths and Carole Woddis, *The Theatre Guide*, 3rd ed., (London: A and C Black Publishers, 2003), p. 338.
- ¹⁴. This title is intended to send the reader to: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s article, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin eds., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 24.
- ¹⁵. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 04.
- ¹⁶. James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 158.
- ¹⁷. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 36.
- ¹⁸. James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 158.
- ¹⁹. Mathew Watson, “Competing Models of Socially Constructed Economic Man: Differentiating Defoe’s *Crusoe* from the *Robinson of Neoclassical Economics*,” in *New Political Economy*, Vol 16: N° 5, 2011, p. 612.
- ²⁰. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 59.
- ²¹. Dennis Todd, *Defoe’s America*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 60.
- ²². Edward Baugh, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Derek Walcott*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 132.
- ²³. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 01.
- ²⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 07.
- ²⁵. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 95.
- ²⁶. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 46.
- ²⁷. Elleke Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 196.
- ²⁸. Robert Stam, *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), p. 125.
- ²⁹. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 56.
- ³⁰. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 04.
- ³¹. Giselle A. Rampaul, “*Black Crusoe, White Friday: Carnavalesque Reversals in Samuel Selvon’s Muses Ascending and Derek Walcott’s Pantomime*,” in *Culture, Language and Representation*, Vol 01: N° 01, 2004, p. 74.
- ³². Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 10.
- ³³. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ³⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ³⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ³⁶. *Ibid.*
- ³⁷. *Ibid.*
- ³⁸. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ³⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- ⁴⁰. Brett, C. McInelly, Paraphrased by Charlotte Boyce and Joan Fitzpatrick, *A History of Food in Literature: From the Fourteenth Century to the Present*, (New York: Routledge, 2017), p. 132.
- ⁴¹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 21.
- ⁴². James Joyce, *Ulysses*, (London: Penguin Group, 2000), p. 107.
- ⁴³. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 28.
- ⁴⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- ⁴⁵. *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶. *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷. Renu Juneja, “Derek Walcott,” in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Common Wealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1992), p. 263.

- ⁴⁸. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 58.
- ⁴⁹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 67.
- ⁵⁰. Ibid.
- ⁵¹. Ibid., p. 44.
- ⁵². Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 04.
- ⁵³. Ibid.
- ⁵⁴. Among these scholars Brett, C. McNelly is quite representative with his article, “*Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and Robinson Crusoe*,” in *Studies in the Novel*, Vol 35: N°1, 2003.
- ⁵⁵. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 141.
- ⁵⁶. Ibid.
- ⁵⁷. Ibid.
- ⁵⁸. Brett, C. McNelly, “*Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and Robinson Crusoe*,” in *Studies in the Novel*, Vol 35: N°1, 2003, p. 01.
- ⁵⁹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 32.
- ⁶⁰. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 56.
- ⁶¹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 24.
- ⁶². Walcott, Cited in George B. Handley, *New World Poetics: Nature and the Adamic Imagination of Whitman, Neruda, and Walcott*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007), p. 299.
- ⁶³. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 35.
- ⁶⁴. Ibid., p. 24.
- ⁶⁵. Renu Juneja, “Derek Walcott,” in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Common Wealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1992), p. 262.
- ⁶⁶. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 37.
- ⁶⁷. Giselle A. Rampaul, “*Black Crusoe, White Friday: Carnavalesque Reversals in Samuel Selvon’s Muses Ascending and Derek Walcott’s Pantomime*,” in *Culture, Language and Representation*, Vol 01: N° 01, 2004, p. 75.
- ⁶⁸. James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 160.
- ⁶⁹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 28.
- ⁷⁰. Giselle A. Rampaul, “*Black Crusoe, White Friday: Carnavalesque Reversals in Samuel Selvon’s Muses Ascending and Derek Walcott’s Pantomime*,” in *Culture, Language and Representation*, Vol 01: N° 01, 2004, Pp. 75-76.
- ⁷¹. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 86.
- ⁷². Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 209.
- ⁷³. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), Pp. 23-24.
- ⁷⁴. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 113.
- ⁷⁵. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 08.
- ⁷⁶. Ibid.
- ⁷⁷. Ibid., 09.
- ⁷⁸. Patrick Taylor, Cited in Paul Breslin, *Nobody’s Nation: Reading Derek Walcott*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 120.
- ⁷⁹. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans., Richard Philcox, (New York: Grove Press, 2004), p. 34.
- ⁸⁰. Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*, (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 01.
- ⁸¹. Ibid., p. 02.
- ⁸². Kamau Brathwaite, Cited in Johan Ramazani, “Contemporary Postcolonial Poetry,” in Neil Roberts, ed., *A Companion to Twentieth-Century Poetry*, (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), p. 604.
- ⁸³. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 02.
- ⁸⁴. Renu Juneja, “Derek Walcott,” in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Common Wealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1992), p. 261.
- ⁸⁵. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 04.
- ⁸⁶. Ibid., p. 47.
- ⁸⁷. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 50.
- ⁸⁸. Ibid., p. 79.
- ⁸⁹. Ibid., p. 24.
- ⁹⁰. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 56.
- ⁹¹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 213.
- ⁹². James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), Pp. 162-163.

- ⁹³. Ibid.
- ⁹⁴. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 23.
- ⁹⁵. Ibid., p. 35.
- ⁹⁶. Ibid., p. 38.
- ⁹⁷. Ibid., p. 28.
- ⁹⁸. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 201.
- ⁹⁹. James V. Morrison, *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*, (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014), p. 158.
- ¹⁰⁰. Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*, (London: Routledge: 1994), p. 59.
- ¹⁰¹. Christopher Flint, Cited in Ulla Grapard, "Robinson Crusoe: The Quintessential Economic Man?," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 105.
- ¹⁰². Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), Pp. 81-82.
- ¹⁰³. Ibid., p. 82.
- ¹⁰⁴. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 91.
- ¹⁰⁵. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 82.
- ¹⁰⁶. Ibid., p. 77.
- ¹⁰⁷. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ¹⁰⁸. _____, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ¹⁰⁹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 09.
- ¹¹⁰. Renu Juneja, "Derek Walcott," in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Common Wealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1992), p. 262.
- ¹¹¹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 07.
- ¹¹². Ibid., p. 69.
- ¹¹³. Edward Baugh, *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Derek Walcott*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 135.
- ¹¹⁴. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 05.
- ¹¹⁵. Ibid., p. 49.
- ¹¹⁶. Ghaith Saleh Mahdi, "Derek Walcott's *Pantomime* as a Postcolonial Critique," in American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research, Vol 04: N° 09, 2020, p. 345.
- ¹¹⁷. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ¹¹⁸. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 46.
- ¹¹⁹. Ibid., p. 07.
- ¹²⁰. Ibid.
- ¹²¹. Ibid., p. 04.
- ¹²². Ibid., p. 86.
- ¹²³. Rob Canfield, "Theatralizing the Anglophone Caribbean, 1492 to the 1980s," in James A. Arnold et al., eds., *A History of Literature in the Caribbean English-and Dutch –Speaking Regions*, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001), p. 306.
- ¹²⁴. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 04.
- ¹²⁵. Paula Burnett, *Derek Walcott: Politics and Poetics*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000), p. 73.
- ¹²⁶. Renu Juneja, "Derek Walcott," in Bruce King, ed., *Post-Colonial English Drama: Common Wealth Drama since 1960*, (Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press, 1992), p. 262.
- ¹²⁷. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 79.
- ¹²⁸. Paul A. Griffith, *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 57.
- ¹²⁹. Derek Walcott, (1978), *Pantomime*, (Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005), p. 84.
- ¹³⁰. Derek Walcott, Cited in Paul Breslin, *No Body's Nation: Reading Derek Walcott*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), p. 119.

**Chapter Seven:
Coetzee's *Foe* (1986): Telling the 'Untold,'
those Silenced Stories of the 'Others,'
Friday and Women, with Ideological and
Cultural Bearings**

Introduction:

If I translate your question into practical terms, it becomes a question about closure: how does a novel that is as much an interrogation of authority as *Foe* find an end for itself?¹

The true story will not be heard till by art we have found a means of giving voice to Friday.²

How can one question power [...] from a position of power? One ought to question it from its antagonist position, namely, the position of weakness.³

The fact that J. M. Coetzee has pointed, in the first epigraph, at *Foe* (1986) as a text which has ‘interrogated authority’ might, somehow, be revealing of his entire approach towards Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*. His words in the second and third epigraphs, taken respectively from *Foe* and an interview, he has given in the (1990s), can only display his subversive literary vision through which he has intended to rewrite, in a variety of ways, the source from the position of those who have been oppressed, those whose voices the canon has silenced and suppressed. This task, Coetzee has undertaken, of questioning the kernel of power and authority, with the risks it entailed in apartheid South Africa, as epitomised through *Crusoe*, the dominant white, male, master and coloniser, is altogether reviewed and even subverted from the perspective of the ‘weak,’ the coloured Friday and women.

It has to be highlighted that any reader who is, to a certain degree, accustomed with *Robinson Crusoe* would find little, if any, difficulty to bring its story and characters to memory while going through Coetzee’s literary work. There is, as such, a close link which might be established between the latter, as an adaptation, and the former, as its original; thus, the major concerns, this seventh chapter tackles, are revolving around the study of this link binding *Foe* to Defoe’s novel. To begin with, there is a pressing necessity to dig into both Coetzee’s and his, under scrutiny, text’s background to have an overall view of the direction the 20th century novel has taken. With the second and third sections, relying on Bakhtin’s concepts, I glance at *Foe* as a stylization of the original; afterwards, I shed light on the ways it has initiated an overt polemic against the source. The ending of this chapter pillared on

Williams' 'residual', 'dominant' and 'emergent' is devoted to the dissection of the ideological and cultural considerations, which I deem crucial, because they have shaped Coetzee's novel.

1- J. M. Coetzee and *Foe* (1986): The Full Background:

A- J. M. Coetzee: A Life of Cultural Conflicts:

John Maxwell Coetzee, one of the most distinguished and acclaimed authors and novelists in English, in today's world,⁴ was born in Cape Town, South Africa, on February, 09th, 1940 to Afrikaner-originated parents. The latter, Zacharias Coetzee, his father, was a lawyer, while his mother, Vera Coetzee, was a primary school teacher, have both, in fact, idealised English upbringing modes with English as a priority instead of Afrikaans language, which he, the novelist, used only in restricted circles. The early ancestors of the Coetzee family might be traced back to the 17th century United East Indian Chartered Company and the early Dutch settlers who established one of the first trade posts in what once used to be the Cape of Good Hope, today's Cape Town.⁵ Despite this Dutch and Afrikaner background, which used to be a coveted position during the country's apartheid era, J. M. Coetzee, the white English-speaking, has not seen his lineage as a privilege, whatsoever, since he believed that he is, before anything else, a South African. This might be the reason for which, he not only sympathised, but also got committed to and even fostered, although at times very subtly, the cause of all those who have been 'oppressed,' blacks, women, and the colonised.

Coetzee received his early catholic education, like most of his fellow people, in his hometown in the wake of which he joined the University of Cape Town in (1957), where he showed dexterity, and excellence in English and Mathematics. His graduation was not delayed since it came in (1960), and two years later, he moved to London where he evinced knowledge in computers and earned a living, accordingly, by being a programmer until (1965). Coetzee, around this date, took the decision to head towards the United States where he reintegrated university as a student initially and, later on, as a teacher from (1968 to 1971). It was there, in that boiling atmosphere imbued with upheavals and revolutionary spirit, that Coetzee showed commitment to the cause of the 'Other,' with his unfailing support to the

colonised peoples and especially his visible anti-Vietnam War stance on the account of which his application for a permanent residence in the U.S was denied.⁶ The year (1972) witnessed his return from the United States to South Africa where he had a long teaching career until (2000), the date around which he has retired. His literary and artistic career has, so far, spawned through five decades, during which he did not fail to be prolific. Through his first novel in (1974) to *Foe* (1986), this dissertation's subject matter, and many others, Coetzee has spurred worldwide recognition among which a Nobel Prize in Literature in (2003).

B- *Foe*: A Work Imbedded in its Context:

J. M. Coetzee, the white Afrikaner-originated, was only eight years old when the National Party, the white minority rule, and with it apartheid regime, came to power. He lived for four decades until (1990) under the hegemony of this political system which, not only allowed, but also legalised racial discrimination. Therefore, it would not be surprising if one, at one point, contends that his literary career has been shaped by this tumultuous period. It was in his twenties that he witnessed, although from his white Afrikaner much coveted position, the Sharpeville Massacre (1960), the violent repression of anti-regime activist, the trial and imprisonment of Mandela (1963), together with the skyrocketing rise and then spread of the defiant spirit of anti-colonial movements in the colonies—all contributed to framing his literary identity as well as his “subtle interrogations of the colonial psyche.”⁷

Furthermore, Coetzee witnessed, during his thirties while in the United States, from the late (1960s to the early 1970s), the subsequent waves of the Civil Rights Movement, the counterculture Hippie resistance movement, the American involvement in Vietnam, the massive anti-war protests and, once back in South Africa, the repression of black school children protests in (1976). These historical events have, each in its way, shaken the novelist and contributed to shaping his anti-establishment position, which scarcely, if at all, troubled “the censorship board in the apartheid era.”⁸ He has, as a result, been criticised, by many South African intellectuals and fellow novelists alike, Nadine Gordimer not exempt, for his

alleged lack of direct commitment while his work has been “perceived as too oblique, with an insufficient political charge,”⁹ to disturb the apartheid ideological apparatus. Yet, Coetzee, I have to say, despite his Afrikaner origins, voiced his discontent and anger, from time to time, against apartheid, even if subtly, which showed his willingness to quit and even shatter his comfort zone. He goes further, at times, to even recognise the atrocities, perpetrated against blacks in South Africa when he states, that the country’s whites have taken part “in various degrees, actively or passively, in an audacious and well-planned crime against Africa.”¹⁰

The apartheid regime, despite the anger it caused, among political leaders, activists and commoners alike, all over the globe, continued throughout the (1980s), in a systematic fashion, with the process of legalising racial discriminatory measures while brandishing the stick to suppress unrest, through violence, against protestors and its fierce opponents. The year of (1983) saw a referendum that might be regarded as the last straw, since the whites approved the country’s new constitution which did not grant any parliamentary visibility to Africans. Two years later, after much unrest and resistance against the new measures, the apartheid regime reacted in the same way, it earlier did, through unleashing its brutal officers, jailing almost anyone who showed resistance and declaring the state of emergency that lasted until (1990). These upheavals did not go unnoticed or without a consequence on Coetzee’s life and literary career since it was in the midst of this sulphurous matrix that he rewrote, appropriated and subverted the Crusoe story, through *Foe* (1986). His choice which is, to a certain extent, enticed by such a context, might be justifiable given the white/black, coloniser/colonised and apartheid/anti-apartheid dualities in action all along his career.

2- Stylizing *Robinson Crusoe* through *Foe*:

With the intention of delving into *Foe* as a text which has stylized *Robinson Crusoe*, I resort, at this stage, to Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* where he has elucidated his vision of this concept. Stylization has been categorised under what the theorist has dubbed the ‘double voiced discourse’; it is a notion which points at the possibility of cohabitation

between a subsequent text, an adaptation, for instance, and its original. He has summarised what happens in it as follows, there is a second “author’s thought, [which] once having penetrated someone else’s discourse and made its home in it, does not collide with the other’s thought [the source].”¹¹ It is this coexistence, between Defoe’s and Coetzee’s voices, that I focus my attention upon while analysing a variety of items.

A- *Foe* in Time and Place: Back to Defoe’s Source:

My claim, that Coetzee has stylized a few aspects from Defoe’s masterpiece, among which the setting, might find resonance in what Julie Sanders has once claimed that *Foe* has “play[ed] more widely with eighteenth-century printing conventions in its use of quotation marks, enacting literary imitation at the level of form as well as content.”¹² Sanders’ words pointing at both ‘form and content’ seem to support the standpoint I foster, herein, and the fact that Coetzee has attempted to stylize the source text’s time and place, although elusively, should not be overlooked. The readers have been transported, almost three centuries backwards, to the late 17th and early 18th centuries towards the exact era during which Defoe’s novel has been set. The heroine, Susan Barton, has been cast away, just like Crusoe, although with different circumstances, on the same island upon which Defoe’s hero has been shipwrecked a few years ago. There is a spatial affinity, between the two literary works, which might be detected since the “island in *Foe* is located off the coast of Brazil in an area close to that described in Defoe’s novel.”¹³ Such a spatial element, if combined with the temporal aspect of Coetzee’s text, might, in a way or another, have the power of “establishing a line of continuity with *Robinson Crusoe*.”¹⁴ The island in both works, there is an urgent need to assert, has not been pinpointed with precision and the only certainty which might be surfaced would designate the territory, in the source and its adaptation, as a ‘virgin’ landscape since the indigenous inhabitants are nowhere to be seen.

B- *Crusoe and Friday: Dynamics Stylized and Resuscitated:*

Crusoe and Friday have been key figures not only in Defoe’s literary realm, but also in world literature to the point where I might suggest that the whole story would not have been

so appealing, nor would it be so enduring to generations of readers, from quite different contexts, if any of them has not been brought into existence. The moment they have come into contact, their encounter and relationship have been those of a master/servant, in which the former has forced a “pet name” on the latter which has had the intention of confining him in an eternal debt to the English man.¹⁵ Coetzee has, on a similar vein, made reference to these characters with the native who remained the same old Friday, while Defoe’s white man has been dubbed with a spelling mistake as Robinson Cruso. The fact that these figures are involved, made the slave/master dichotomy inescapable in *Foe* which has entailed, through Cruso and his servant, the entire dynamics, clichés, intricacies and discourse such a connection is imbedded in. Cruso told Susan that Friday “has known no other master [but himself; which is why,] [h]e follows me in all things.”¹⁶ This might stamp Coetzee’s Friday, just like Defoe’s, as a mocking bird, mimic man and shadow to the white colonial master.

Moreover, Crusoe has experienced the native’s devotion to him. Friday has, therefore, served his ‘master’ heartily and faithfully which Defoe’s hero has acknowledged saying “never man had a more faithful, loving, [and] sincere servant than Friday was to me.”¹⁷ Coetzee has reproduced this aspect since, during the island sojourn, the native has been relegated to the status of the ‘inferior’ colonised who is expected to perform the servant’s/slave’s tasks from fetching wood to serving food. Barton has pinpointed these patterns in action; as a result, it has not come as a surprise that the white woman’s “first thought was that Friday was like a dog that heeds but one master.”¹⁸ This image might invoke, on the one hand, the servant’s faithfulness associated with the animal and it establishes, on the other, the slave’s blind obedience, docility and acquiescence whenever the master is around.

C- The Basic Storyline and Style:

There is truth enough in Genette’s claim that the essence of Defoe’s novel, to which readers are often glued, is the narrative portion dealing with the ship’s sinking and its aftermath with the hero’s life on a deserted island.¹⁹ He has referred to this part as being the

story's kernel as it contains the ““Robinsonian””²⁰ element of the tale. This might denote that any text, Coetzee's included, which attempts to revise or rewrite *Robinson Crusoe*, has to feature these aspects in its plot. This is the case with *Foe* which has opened with Barton's struggle to reach an island after she has been cast away in the offing by mutineers who have killed their captain and taken control of the ship she has boarded from Brazils to Lisbon.

Once on the island, Barton has made acquaintance with Cruso, an English white man, and Friday, a coloured 'slave,' with whom she has spent a strenuous year before being rescued by a ship heading to Bristol, England. She has experienced with them the bitter life away from the comforts of civilisation with harsh weather conditions and an acute lack of food resources; she has also had a taste of the solitary existence castaways, like Cruso, often lead once stranded without human company. It might be stated that *Foe* has stylized from and, hence, shared with Defoe's original “[t]he most basic narrative element—an English castaway on an island, living with his non-white companion.”²¹ Although Barton and Friday have been rescued and brought back to England, the readers might notice that much of the later narrative has remained focused on the time they have had on the island by flashing back to the key events and discussions, which have taken place there while regurgitating the same questions, thorny issues and dilemmas the castaways' life brought into prominence.

Coetzee's attempt at stylizing *Robinson Crusoe* has gone beyond the storyline towards reproducing the literary stylistic element which were in vogue during the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Writing literary works, with all their complexities, via a strict or partial reliance on letters, what is known as “epistolary” accounts,²² has been a valid option for many contemporaries of the period, the aspect which Coetzee has, more or less, been stylized and copied; the second part of *Foe*, one might assert, is made of the letters Barton has written and addressed to Mr. Foe, an author, whom she expected to model her story based, on nothing, but her testimonies, version and words. In this part, Coetzee has “re-enact[ed] literary history [with the] eighteenth-century epistolary narrative”²³ style. There are other major aspects of

Defoe's lifetime like travel, adventures, exploration and sea voyages mingled with a high touch of realism,²⁴ that the South African novelist has stylized from the original. Barton has travelled to and lived in Brazils, just like Defoe's hero, although they have done it for utterly different reasons. After a period of time there, she came back to England; thus, she undertook her second voyage in the course of which she has been marooned by mutineers on a desert island. One might argue, in short, that Coetzee has stylized a wide range of aspects in relation to its source's basic storyline and writing pattern.

D- Paternalism and the Civilising Mission:

Enlightenment British people, Defoe's own contemporaries, have probably seen in *Robinson Crusoe* the "ideal prototype for the encounter between the civilized and the wild."²⁵ It has epitomised the whole range of their colonial fantasies which revolve around a white man, who despite his seemingly hopeless situation, gets involved in the process of annexing overseas territories, cultivating lands, establishing coherent economies and spreading his European/British ideals among the 'inferior,' 'childish,' 'soulless,' 'pagan' and 'cannibal' natives. Defoe's tale, perhaps more than any other literary work, has allowed the whites to see a vivid picture of a fleeting western 'scientist,' although Crusoe was not one, who implements the civilising mission in the aftermath of which he would go back home.²⁶ Following this thread, *Foe* has addressed similar question; the English, Barton and Cruso, have been at the story's centre while Friday has to be civilised as he is treated as the 'Other.'

There are numerous occasion, Coetzee's reader have been confronted with, which brandish the image of the white people, either Barton or Cruso, speaking of or addressing Friday as an 'ignorant' child. This would suggest that the native has no capacity, whatsoever, to cater for himself even in terms of basic needs, let alone discuss sublime and refined intellectual matters, which is thought of as being beyond his reach. With the arrival of an English ship to rescue them, Friday has been frightened and hence, made his escape to a craggy region so that he would not get caught by the whites. Barton has expressed her desire

to take him to England by bringing forth the old colonial clichés saying the following, “inasmuch as Friday is a slave and a child, it is our duty to care for him in all things, and not abandon him to a solitude worse than death.”²⁷ Such a paternalistic view, which is not unusual among Defoe’s contemporaries, has made Friday the ‘inferior’ upon whom the whites have to bestow their benevolence. This might be seen in the source text with Crusoe endorsing the mission of teaching, reforming, Christianising, and, all in all, civilising his servant, Friday. A slightly similar burden has befallen upon Barton when she discovered that the native, although he understands a few commanding words, has no capacity to full human speech. As such, she has taken the decision to teach him the English language; however, she has no idea of the correct approach to foster. She has articulated her uncertainties in these words, “whereas one may take a dull child and twist his arm or pinch his ear till at last he repeats after us, *Spoon*, what can I do with Friday?”²⁸ She has opted to an illustrative perspective by “hold[ing] up a spoon and say[ing] “Spoon, Friday!” and giv[ing] the spoon into his hand.”²⁹ These are, in brief, some of the features, cultural and political aspects, Coetzee has stylized from the source text which pertain mainly to reproduce, although for another readership and audience, Crusoe’s civilising mission and paternalistic modes of thinking.

3- Coetzee’s *Foe*: An Overt Polemic Against the Source:

Before exploring further horizons, a quick review of Bakhtin’s conception of overt polemic would not be harmful to the readers. This notion, which belongs to the ‘double voiced discourse,’ has been delimited as a category that carries a critical tone which is “directed at another’s discourse, which it refutes [...] directly striking a blow at the other’s discourse, clashing with it.”³⁰ At this stage, I argue that *Foe* has launched an overt polemic against *Robinson Crusoe*; maintaining, thereby, that it has openly shown animosity towards key elements, from the original, which it has treated with hostility. The final result is a work that has retold the Crusoe story with a scourging criticism and intentional twists which have to do with Coetzee’s cultural and ideological environment rather than Defoe’s.

A- The Castaways: From Crusoe to Barton:

The castaway stories, adventures and empire building narratives have, from *Robinson Crusoe* onwards, been correlated, in literature, with colonial ventures as a masculine realm where men are the central entities.³¹ Crusoe is a white middle-classed English man who has been castaway on a 'virgin' territory where he has managed, aided by his self-esteem, workaholic mentality and adventurous spirit, to enact the masculine colonial fantasies of Enlightenment English people. The story is that of Crusoe, without any other subplots which might distract the readers; this has grounded him as a banner of Western masculine identity in literature.³² It is arguably the remodelling of this masculine world that *Foe* has targeted, to launch its overt polemic against its original by imposing a female figure at the heart of what used to be a male domain to the core, the castaway and adventure narratives.

The central character of Coetzee's text has been shifted from Crusoe, the male colonial agent with aspirations at expansion, to Barton, a female heroine of English origins, who has been cast away on the island that used to be Crusoe's. The story is no longer revolving around the colonial fantasies of a white male; it has been interwoven, otherwise, around a female figure whose adventures are the outcome of looking for her lost daughter in South America. The key aspect, which brought about her miseries, has to do, unlike Crusoe's capitalist driven mindset, with motherhood, as a powerful incentive which compelled her to break into the male-centred castaway realm and imagination. The narrator of *Foe* has claimed that a suitable title to the story might be "The Female Castaway [as] a True Account of a Year Spent on a Desert Island [...] [w]ith [m]any Strange Circumstances [n]ever Hitherto Related,"³³ which stands in a direct polemic, in terms of intentions, at Defoe's original which has been first published with the following title, "*The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner: Who lived Eight and Twenty Years all alone in an uninhabited Island on the Coast of America, near the mouth of the Great River of Oroonoke [Orinoco]; Having been cast on Shore by Shipwreck, wherein all the Men perished but himself, With An*

Account how he was at last as strangely deliver'd by Pirates. Written by himself."³⁴ The masculine castaway's world has been turned upside down by Coetzee, since "the masculine hero of the Robinsonade"³⁵ has been ignored and substituted with a female heroine.

B- Breaking the Tyranny of Crusoe's Voice/Gaze: Hearing the 'Other':

Edward Said's claim that "texts are fundamentally facts of power,"³⁶ might find resonance in *Robinson Crusoe* which has become, all along the colonial era, one of the most, if not the most, 'despotic' colonial texts which has dictated, at least for so many generations of colonisers, colonial agents and administrators, 'reality' in terms of coloniser/colonised dynamics. The events have been 'reported' from Crusoe's first person point of view that rendered him the only voice which, through discourse and rhetorical propaganda, defined the boundaries of falsehood, facts, certainties, uncertainties and altogether reality, to the point of tyranny. His words have, therefore, to be taken for what they are, without any power to repudiate them, because he is the only one who 'witnessed,' at least within the imaginative and literary realms, the events being narrated with no counter version being provided. This authority which has been vested in Crusoe's voice has been subverted in *Foe* with the female heroine, Susan Barton, from whose eyes the castaway story has been retold.

The opening of Defoe's novel has displayed Crusoe as follows, "I was born in the year 1632, in the city of York, of a good family";³⁷ now, is there anybody who might have the audacity to question the 'truthfulness' of this statement and submit it to doubt? The answer, I believe, is 'no' because Crusoe's 'totalitarian' voice has delimited 'reality' and 'facts' in the confines of his own discourse. The beginning of Coetzee's adaptation, with its overtly polemical purport, on the other hand, has been in Barton's statements which run as such, "[a]t last I could row no further. My hands were blistered, my back was burned, my body ached";³⁸ these utterances have shifted the perspective from Crusoe to the heroine who has been given the narrative power to express women's concerns. Coetzee has allowed the female, through this disruptive technique and many others, to break the tyranny of Crusoe's gaze and authorial

voice. The crushing majority of the tale's events, with the exception of the final part, have been told by Barton who has appropriated the narrative confirming that she prefers to "be the author of [her] own story."³⁹ This willingness to control the narrative might be interpreted as an overt polemic which is meant to respond to Defoe's text that has silenced women.

The fact that Cruso's slave is mute, as his tongue was cut-off, has pushed the heroine/narrator to take the decision to unveil not only her story, but also Friday's. Her attitude, at the very beginning, towards him has not been special; however, the moment she realises his incapacity to talk, she has become obsessed with his reality. His inability to utter a single word has nurtured in her a desire to know his background. Her attitude has evolved, in this way, from nonchalance to attachment as she could perceive that if he is to be silenced, she would also be since her sojourn on the island is, in one way or another, intertwined with Friday's fate. Barton has confirmed that "[t]o tell my story and be silent on Friday's tongue is no better than offering a book for sale with pages in it quietly left empty."⁴⁰ Despite her forceful narrative voice, she has not been endowed with enough literary knowledge to write her own account which is why she has appealed to the services of Mr. Foe, an author, who would turn her tale into a literary text. The kind of polemic, Coetzee overtly initiated through these alterations, has brought into the surface the marginalisation of women and the coloured/colonised subjects since "Susan and Friday embody the missing stories and silenced others of the history of the English novel."⁴¹ Although Mr. Foe has manoeuvred to reorient the course of her account, Barton has quelled his attempts confirming that all she desires is "to be father to [her and Friday's] story"⁴²; this would imply, in a polemical turn, that the account has to be recorded, by the professional author, the way he has heard it from the female narrator.

Mr. Foe tried to pierce Barton's mystery by pressurising her with inquiries related to her survival in Brazils and on board of ships full of men, a masculine realm, as he knew that, during these adventures, she has endured rape and other forms of sexual harassment, something Barton has admitted. However, she opted to mute that murky part by voicing only

her island tribulations by maintaining, “[t]he story I desire to be known by is the story of the island.”⁴³ She has deliberately silenced all her scandalous past asserting that “the silence I keep regarding Bahia and other matters is chosen and purposeful: it is my own silence,”⁴⁴ but she has stressed that this has, in no way, to be conflated with Friday’s incapacity to speak confirming that Mr. Foe is making a mistake “in failing to distinguish between [her] silences and the silences of a being such as Friday.”⁴⁵ For her, the latter “has no command of words and therefore no defence against being re-shaped [...] in conformity with the desires of others. I say he is a cannibal and he becomes a cannibal; I say he is a laundryman and he becomes a laundryman.”⁴⁶ Through Barton’s voice, Coetzee has managed, with overt polemic tactics and patterns, to shatter the narrative of Defoe’s *Crusoe* by reducing his account into an illusory account which has silenced and slandered whoever pleased him, women and the natives.

C- An Overt Polemic to the Island: From Utopia to Dystopia:

Despite being shipwrecked on a desert island, which confronted him with a tough reality, *Crusoe* has, with his civilisation’s ideals in mind, tamed its wilderness and ‘taught’ its savages. He has succeeded, through perseverance, in transforming its environment into an ‘ideal’ habitat which yielded all its secrets, to him, with abundance. Accordingly, he has been ‘blessed’ with a ‘picturesque’ surrounding sea, valleys, forests and had enough potable water, a shelter for summer, one for winter, a diversified diet with sufficient bread, milk, corn, fruits, vegetables, and meat—all he enjoyed with the extra bonus of safety in the absence of wild beasts. Wild life on the island might be characterised as being varied in terms of flora with “delicious”⁴⁷ valleys, “pleasant savannahs or meadows,”⁴⁸ plenty of “tobacco [and] divers other plants”⁴⁹ and in some areas, “the country appeared so fresh, so green, so flourishing, everything being in a constant verdure or flourish of spring that it looked like a planted garden.”⁵⁰ The island’s fauna has ranged from goats to “innumerable [...] fowls, of many sorts”⁵¹ –the matrix which was propitious for self reinvention and the enforcement of the white man’s supremacist fantasies; which is why, many scholars have declared “*Crusoe*’s

island [as] a colonial utopia”⁵² and the novel “as a utopian narrative.”⁵³ *Foe*’s overtly polemical perspective has reworked this utopian setting towards an uninhabitable dystopian area to uncover the coloniser’s futile struggle and his powerlessness in the middle of nowhere.

Coetzee’s island is not only a sterile desert, literally and figuratively, but also a potential threat to a human’s physical and mental health as it would have complicated life to even the most zealous colonisers, Defoe’s *Crusoe* included, and rendered their existence a mere absurdity and a constant misery. Barton has described the place as a “rocky hill with a flat top”⁵⁴ which might bring to the reader’s memory the picture of an arid desert where the flora, the heroine has observed, is poor both in quantity and quality since it is limited to the “drab bushes that never flowered and never shed their leaves,”⁵⁵ in addition to the “brown seaweed which [...] gave off a noisome stench and supported swarms of large pale fleas.”⁵⁶ The negative epithets, she has deployed, in these passages, have painted a loathsome portrait of the island as a filthy, despicable and barren rock which is good for nothing but to be either a prison for outlaws to atone for any felony or a habitat for parasites and wild beast. Its fauna, on the other hand, is worthy of alien forms of life with ants, carnivorous “tiny insect[s] that hid between your toes and ate [their] way into the flesh,”⁵⁷ and lizards, too, which are not edible and have been of no use to the castaways.

Unlike the source, Coetzee’s island is not the kind of Eden where ripe fruits, all sorts of vegetables and, in sum, a varied diet might be expected in store for the colonisers. Barton has not seen anything worthy of interest, no diet, let alone eating healthy and testified that, during her stay with *Cruso* and *Friday*, they have had, in what would invoke a form of punishment to the readers, to ingest the same “bitter lettuce [...] with fish and birds’ eggs [which] formed [their] sole diet on the island.”⁵⁸ The latter’s unfavourable matrix, soil and weather, with the exception of a few parcels subject to reclamation, is a dry, incessantly windy to madness, arid and useless desert even to bury carrion let alone thinking of its being fertile for agriculture. As such, the island in *Foe* is worthy of the outer space or Mars with its

zero safety dystopian vision, especially with the apes, a palpable reference to primitive life, which Crusoe has pointed-out as a threat. Coetzee has revisited, through an overt polemic, the paradise-like space where Defoe's hero has been cast away, for nearly three decades, transforming it into an abominable and hostile spot to be escaped as soon as possible.

D- Crusoe and Cruso: Two Sides of the Same Coin:

Defoe's Crusoe and Coetzee's Cruso, beyond the surface layer and the difference in spelling, might be positioned at two opposite extremes of history with the former standing at the peak of the colonial enterprise and the latter at the other far end with its decline. Despite being adapted from Defoe's protagonist, Coetzee's character has introduced a divergent vision of the old colonialist figure that has been reworked to fit in a new historical, social, cultural and political reality. There is truth enough in Dominic Head's words when he has qualified "Coetzee's Cruso [as] a postcolonial figure [who] is emblematic of exhausted imperialism."⁵⁹ Although they have a few aspects in common, Defoe's and Coetzee's characters have been deployed in different direction to suit their authors' purposes. I foster, likewise, that Coetzee has relied on Cruso, to strike a direct blow or an overt polemic at Defoe's protagonist who has been distorted and emptied of his substance.

One hallmark and central features of the colonial period and its texts, *Robinson Crusoe* not exempt, is the presence of a diary⁶⁰ where the coloniser, whether an agent of the empire or a civilian settler, often gives vent to day-to-day life under the form of a personal journal. This practice, beyond being a hobby or a means to keep track of one's life, is vital to the colonisers as it might be seen as way for them to reshape themselves;⁶¹ it has been an effective way to construct "a literary 'self'."⁶² That is to say, the diary or journal has served the function of creating the coloniser's identity which set him apart from the natives as the 'superior' and 'enlightened' entity. Defoe's Crusoe has kept a record of his adventures on the island and in his words he confirmed "I began to keep a journal of every day's"⁶³ occurrences. Coetzee's Cruso, in contrast, has had no willingness to keep a diary of any form whatsoever

and Barton has asserted that “Cruso kept no journal [...] because he lacked the inclination to keep one.”⁶⁴ This might denote the coloniser’s loss of interest in the colonial enterprise, with the late 20th century, and the whole life he has been leading on the island is no longer thrilling the way it once used to be. If the hero has contrived a calendar, in the source, to keep track of time, by using a wooden post upon which he “cut every day a notch with [his] knife [...] and thus [he] kept [his] yearly reckoning of time,”⁶⁵ Coetzee’s Cruso, on the other hand, has had no interest in a calendar or time, for that matter. Barton has examined all “the poles that supported the roof, and the legs of the bed, but found no carvings, not even notches to indicate that he counted the years of his banishment or the cycles of the moon.”⁶⁶ This overtly polemical portrayal has subverted the 18th century colonial figure making him a nonchalant being devoid of any sense of time and space considerations Crusoe is characterised with.

Unlike Defoe’s hero, Coetzee’s Cruso is a stubborn and shallow figure, who has had no desire to leave the island, with little concerns, if not absolutely none, about amending his everyday reality which is why Barton has pointed at him “in terms of refusal and negation,”⁶⁷ because he would not do anything to help himself out of his misery. She has realised, almost instantly, that his accounts are not worthy to be lend ears with his ‘absurd’ realm revolving on the mechanically constructed terraces that serve nothing, but accentuate his forlorn state without any gripping adventures. He is the kind of haggard, outworn and dying coloniser with nothing exceptional about him; therefore, she has come to the conclusion that “Cruso rescued will be a deep disappointment to the world; the idea of a Cruso on his island is a better thing than the true Cruso tight-lipped and sullen in an alien England.”⁶⁸ Coetzee’s overt polemic has engrossed the white man in his illusions without any capacity to accept someone else’s opinion and all he has had, as a subject, is his mute slave Friday. In this context, Cruso has become “old on his island kingdom with no one to say him nay [which] had so narrowed his horizon” to the extent of seeing himself as the incarnation of knowledge.⁶⁹ Quite different from Defoe’s protagonist, who has done everything to come back to England, Cruso seemed

to be ready to spend the remaining of his days away from his mother country. In another overtly polemical twist of the 'original,' Coetzee's castaway has dismissed Barton's suggestion of exploiting the wreck of the ship which brought him to the island despite her insistence that they could salvage valuable tools that would make their lives easier. Crusoe's answer is imbued with submission to his reality, "[w]e have a roof over our heads, made without saw or axe. We sleep, we eat, we live. We have no need of tools."⁷⁰ This response might be viewed as the antithesis of the worldview Crusoe has nurtured with his desire for welfare, more food, goods, tools, inventions, and money. Crusoe's words are, thus, an overt polemic which might stand as the motto to his life, in isolation, with a state of mind which is satisfied with nothing more than the basic necessities.

If Defoe's Crusoe is the incarnation of credibility, organisation, spirit of reason, and the sturdy youth, Coetzee's Crusoe is, in an overtly polemical turnaround, the embodiment of unreliability, anarchy, madness, and the infirmity of an old aged man. *Foe*'s readers might notice the white man's jumbled up and uncoordinated speech pattern which confined him to being the kind of 'villains' whose stories one has to comb through for remnants of truth, if any. Barton has asserted that "the stories [Crusoe] told me were so various, and so hard to reconcile one with another, that I was more and more driven to conclude age and isolation had taken their toll on his memory, and he no longer knew for sure what was truth, what fancy."⁷¹ At times, he would speak of himself as a man of high rank back to when he was in England and at other times, he would trace his lineage to a low-classed family, the aspects that led to the creation of a "labyrinth of stories"⁷² which might entice us to question his mental sanity. Moreover, because he has grown old, Crusoe has lost nearly all his teeth, the remaining ones in a severe state of decay, with abrupt fever seizures the origin of which is unknown. Coetzee's overt polemical approach metamorphosed him from a strong youthful man to a feeble old 'shadow,' of what he once used to be, to the extent of not even being able to cater for his needs. The heroine has confirmed that he often "raved with fever";⁷³ after being rescued by

English sailors, Crusoe has wept because he has been taken away from 'his' island and a few days later, in a radical twist, he has become bed-bound in the aftermath of which he died. The aging Crusoe with his strange condition might be seen as a reference to an 'ill,' aging and "exhausted imperialism,"⁷⁴ which has no longer the resources to sustain itself while his death, an overtly polemical crafted occurrence, might be interpreted as the end of the traditional colonial system with the second half of the 20th century.

E- Crusoe/Cruso: Sexual Desire Revised in *Foe*:

The presence of Susan Barton, the female character and narrator in Coetzee's novel, has also been intended to ponder the question of the castaway's sexual drive which has been repressed and altogether suppressed in Defoe's 'original.' There is not a single instance where Crusoe has expressed any sexual desires of any kind, at whatever stage of his life, despite his solitude on the island. His stance towards women is characterised with an excessive "inhibition of what we now consider to be normal human feelings";⁷⁵ there was no room left, in his realm, for either emotions or sexual instinct because he has been overwhelmed with chasing his 'logical' vision of capitalist individual success.⁷⁶ In Coetzee's adaptation of the 18th century text, Barton has allowed Crusoe to have a sexual intercourse with her despite her ability to repel him because he was a weak old man; she thought that "[h]e has not known a woman for fifteen years, why should he not have his desire?"⁷⁷ Following this thread, she has taken the decision to "resist[...] no more but let him do as he wished."⁷⁸ Coetzee has tackled, through this overtly polemical alteration, the issue of the castaway's eliminated instincts which revealed that such aspects were dropped from the white man's adventures because the novel has been subject to Defoe's censorship under the constraints of his context.

F-Colonialism, Colonial Brutality and the Question of Slavery:

Among the aspects which the South African author has reworked in *Foe* to initiate his overt polemic towards Defoe's text, I have to point at colonialism, colonial brutality and the question of slavery. These topics, which might be appalling to modern and post-modern

readers, were not in any way, whatsoever, the kind of thorny issues that might deserve attention to 18th century Europeans. To begin with, Crusoe's overseas adventures, the way he treated the island as a 'virgin' territory and his interventions to keep a steady economic activity, even in the absence of human company, might all be seen as an outcome of the flourishing colonial enterprise. This story of a man who has conquered a new area subjugating it, with its inhabitants, to his authority might find resonance in Britain's growing colonial aspirations; thus, a meticulous analysis of the text might show that "colonialism [has] shape[d] Defoe's novel both formally and thematically."⁷⁹ With its overt polemic orientation, Coetzee's novel, which has been produced with the end of the great wave of decolonisation, has attacked colonialism by questioning and subverting the white man's colonial fantasies.

There were neither fruitful trees, nor vegetables on the island upon which Coetzee's castaways have been shipwrecked, and even worst, meadows, forests and rivers were nowhere to be seen, while Cruso did not have, nor did he salvage from the ship's wreck, seeds of any kind in the future perspective of developing some form of subsistence agriculture. Cruso has told Barton that their dilemma consists of the fact that they "have nothing to plant";⁸⁰ for him, "[t]he planting is reserved for those who come after us and have the foresight to bring seed."⁸¹ Coetzee's white man, unlike Defoe's, has colonised the island and annexed its territories, but has had nothing to plant without seeds which is why his existence is devoted to earth reclamation by constructing terraces for subsequent colonisers who would perhaps initiate the agricultural process. After more than a decade on the island during which Cruso was immersed in digging stones, from all over the area, transporting them to the construction site and building the walls, there has been the finalisation of eleven terraces in which "[a] hundred thousand or more"⁸² stones have been used. The absurdity of Cruso's condition with this kind of futile labour might recall to the contemporary reader's memory "a Sisyphus-like" effort which is doomed, despite its being compulsively repetitive, to failure and uselessness.⁸³ Barton could not understand the futility of the white man's entire situation with his fruitless

endeavours she has qualified as “a foolish kind of agriculture.”⁸⁴ Unlike Defoe’s *Crusoe*, who has had “two seed-times and two harvests every year,”⁸⁵ the colonial efforts of *Cruso*, with the kind of overt polemic Coetzee has fostered, lead to no economic productivity with the exception of edifying terraces which seemed, to the heroine, from afar “like [...] those tombs the emperors of Egypt erected for themselves in the desert.”⁸⁶ The white man’s colonial fantasies, of hard work and exuberant harvests, have been subverted with the terraces which were good for nothing; through this visibly polemic-imbued addition to the source, “Coetzee [has] emphasize[d] the fruitlessness of the whole colonial venture.”⁸⁷ There is nothing good to be expected from the colony, *Foe* seems to argue, only continuous and unproductive toil which would lead to the coloniser’s physical destruction and mental degeneration.

Another aspect which has been brought into light, in Coetzee’s novel, is the colonial brutality which is most often involved in the subjugation of the so called ‘inferior’ races. The question of erasing Friday’s identity—teaching him a new language, forcing upon him a new diet, new manners, and imposing upon him a new god—has been justified, to use *Crusoe*’s words, in the name of “enlightening [the] savage creature[s]”⁸⁸ to ‘extirpate’ them from irrationality, savagery, cannibalism, paganism, and other heathenish practices, bestowing upon them, in return, the ‘lights’ of reason, science, Christianity and civilisation. From a new perspective, Coetzee’s adaptation has addressed the above issues, concomitant with colonialism, referring to the brutality of the coloniser who has relied on sheer force in the process of vanquishing over the natives. There is a scene in which *Cruso* is shown “[g]ripping Friday by the hair”⁸⁹ telling him to open his mouth so that Barton might see inside it; the horrifying discovery, she has made, much more shocking than *Cruso*’s brutality, almost rendered her speechless when she understood that Friday’s tongue has been severed by “[t]he slave-hunters.”⁹⁰ On other occasions, the sceptical heroine has doubted the white man’s version of the incident by drawing her own conclusions that it was “*Cruso* [who] cut out Friday’s tongue”⁹¹ with the intention of reducing him to an eternal silence. There are also

other testimonies of the heinous violence Friday has been subjected to when Barton has, for instance, discovered that he was sexually mutilated since his reproductive organ has been entirely cut-off. She has even seen, in another occasion, on Friday's neck "a scar like a necklace, left by a rope or chain."⁹² These wounds and scars have been carved on the native's body as a reminder of the horrendous violence of colonialism the reason for which many critics have interpreted *Foe* as "an allegory of colonial brutality."⁹³

Slavery, as an institution, in which the white Europeans used to be the 'masters' while the coloured natives the 'slaves,' is also an issue, to postmodern reader, that has been regarded by Defoe, and his contemporaries, as being a 'natural' process; it has been treated antagonistically via Coetzee's overt polemic. Despite being an 18th century female narrator, Barton's way of thinking, under the influence of the author's approach, is rooted in and springing from the second half of the 20th century especially the 1980s as she questioned all the certainties and conventions of both Defoe's novel and lifetime. She could not see or understand "the justice in [Friday's being] a slave [...] consigned to a life of silence."⁹⁴ She could not accept the violence deployed against the likes of Friday as his body would forever be a living testimony, with his incapacity to speak, deep scars and appalling mutilations, to the atrocities slaves, throughout history, have suffered. She could not, additionally, grasp the reason that has "held Friday back all these years from beating in his master's head with a stone while he slept, so bringing slavehood to an end and inaugurating a reign of idleness?"⁹⁵ Though many injuries have been inflicted on him, not only physically but also morally, the native has opted to remain loyal to his 'master' the aspect which has trouble Barton much. Even when the two castaways, Crusoe and Friday, were the only inhabitants of the island, Friday has succumbed to his master; although she knew, in advance, that she would not receive an answer, she has asked the native, "[w]hy [...] did you submit to his rule, when you might easily have slain him, or blinded him and made him into your slave in turn?"⁹⁶ Coetzee has reacted, in a nutshell, against slavery and the enslavement of Friday, who seemed pleased

with docility and servitude, by bringing into the surface the horrid side of colonialism and slavery, the issues upon which the source text has turned its back to and reconciled itself with.

G- Who is Coetzee's Friday in Relation to Defoe's?

Defoe's Friday is inserted into the social atmosphere of the island, which has been, until his arrival, populated by one coloniser, Crusoe, who was immersed, for twenty five years, in annexing new areas and altering the natural surroundings. The narrator has described the native as being Caribbean-originated with "the sweetness and softness of a European in his countenance [...] His hair was long and black, not curled like wool";⁹⁷ the description proceeds with more details concerning his physical features pointing at "[t]he colour of his skin [which] was [...] very tawny [...] his nose small, not flat, like the negroes; a very good mouth, [and] thin lips."⁹⁸ From his late 20th century scope, Coetzee, with his overt polemic at the source, has suppressed these European features of a new world native and, in return, he has given him an African guise, in a more than planned manoeuvre, as the physical traits Barton has observed might suggest. The first reported encounter, on the island, is that of the narrator with Friday, and upon the latter, the readers have no prior information, except the expectations, inquiries and descriptions, emanating from the female castaway, which further shrouded him in mystery. The overt polemic Coetzee has launched, at the original, might be apparent in Barton's depiction of Friday as being "black [...] a Negro with a head of fuzzy wool [...] I lifted myself and studied the flat face, the small dull eyes, the broad nose, the thick lips."⁹⁹ This depiction is opposite, if not the antithesis, of what has Defoe sketched in relation to Friday's features which suggests that Coetzee's blow directed at Defoe's Friday is related to the native's physical traits that made him "a black African slave."¹⁰⁰

Crusoe and Friday, in the 18th century masterpiece, have lived as 'master' and 'slave' for three 'blissful' years during which they have had the opportunity to discuss not only religion and culture, but also geography and a wide range of other topics. The white man has had, the chance, during, that time, to covert Friday into Christianity, alter his eating as well as

dressing habits, and teach him the English language; he has, additionally, told his ‘servant’ about England and its location and even debated with him philosophical matter related to the universe. Coetzee’s Friday, on the other hand, has not been endowed with the ability to utter a single word because his tongue has been ripped-off from its roots. Although he has remained speechless and silent throughout the novel, his story has been at the heart of Barton’s inquiries. As a white South African writer, Coetzee has understood in advance that if he has given Friday a voice, there is the high risk of “appropriating” the native’s voice,¹⁰¹ in which case, the finality would be the same: Friday would still be spoken for, but without the capacity to speak for himself.¹⁰² The fact that Coetzee has refused to speak for Friday by making him mute has, thereby, emanated from a deliberate choice which has been intended as an overt polemic to free him from the grip of being objectified.

In this way, his silence is not to be seen as a token of inferiority or incapacity since it has been deployed as “a counter-strategy through which the other preserves, even asserts, its alterior status and in so doing interrogates the fixity of dominant power structures and positions.”¹⁰³ The silence of Coetzee’s Friday, besides, might confirm many aspects about Coetzee’s lifetime than the Friday of the source text. Because he has been portrayed as a black figure, he might be associated, at this point, with the black South Africans under apartheid’s harsh ideological apparatus¹⁰⁴ which makes clear “[t]he allegorical correspondences [...] in connection with Friday, whose silence seems to suggest the repression of the black majority in South Africa.”¹⁰⁵ The context of the second half of the 20th century is of capital importance since it has, as a matter of fact, contributed to the shaping of *Foe* and the direction which Coetzee’s adaptation of Defoe’s novel has taken.

If we go back to *Robinson Crusoe*, there is almost nothing sublime or admirable to be pinpointed about Friday’s culture, prior to being ‘saved’ by his ‘master’ as his indigenous identity has, at times, been ignored and, at other times, relegated to primitivism and cannibalism. There are no artistic forms whatsoever or any other notions of arts, for that

matter, which might be connected with the natives; as for religion, Crusoe has found little, if any, complexity in converting Friday from his ‘heathenish’ practices to Christianity. Defoe’s Eurocentric vision, with that of his contemporaries included by extension, has pictured Friday as an ‘inferior’ being who did not possess “‘Art and Grace’” that represent the line which “separate[...] the civilized from the savage.”¹⁰⁶ Coetzee’s late 1980s adaptation, of Defoe’s work, has reacted against these elements by giving the native a different portrait which has been shaped and carved with hidden polemic intentions to fit another audience and most importantly another spatial and temporal reality. Though he had no power to speak, Friday has been endowed with two artistic patterns: playing a note on his flute and reiterating the same movements while dancing which might signify that he has been given, unlike in the source novel, a cultural dimension through his ability to both use a musical instrument and dance which might be traced back to the times prior to the coloniser’s/Cruso’s/Prospero’s/white man’s arrival. Coetzee’s Friday has, moreover, been observed throwing buds and flower petals to the sea which has been interpreted, by Barton, as a religious practice, in a way, designed to either thank his own gods or as a ritual with some other religious purport.¹⁰⁷ The fact that Friday has kept his native religion or other practices, which the coloniser/Cruso did not infect, might betoken the subsistence of an indigenous culture, within the native, which is in itself an overt polemic imbued response to *Robinson Crusoe*, where the native’s existence does not exceed the boundaries of being a shadow to Crusoe at religious, linguistic, economic and cultural dimensions. The above strategies combined —playing a flute, dancing and practicing a religion— might frame “a counter-representational mode designed to escape the force of the discursive polarities still operative as images of resistance to, and rebellion against, the practices that prevent Friday’s”¹⁰⁸ real emancipation by thwarting any attempt to speak for himself. In contrast to Defoe’s Friday, Coetzee’s, despite his muteness, is quite central to the novel to the point “that one of the titles Coetzee [has] considered was, simply, *Friday*,”¹⁰⁹ instead of *Foe*.

H- Cannibalism Countered and Subverted:

The fact that Crusoe has been shipwrecked in the Caribbean, in the original, has perhaps filled Defoe's readers with expectation and apprehension since, during 16th and 17th centuries, most Europeans, often thought of the inhabitants of those regions as being savages and cannibals.¹¹⁰ The novelist has confirmed this common stereotype, among the English people, by then, through Crusoe who has asserted, "I had heard that the people of the Caribbean coast were cannibals or man-eaters."¹¹¹ It is not peculiar, accordingly, to the readers when they are confronted with Crusoe's statement saying that "Friday [is] a cannibal in his nature."¹¹² The overt polemic *Foe* has initiated against *Robinson Crusoe* has denied any claims which might stamp Friday as a cannibal vindicating him from all that has been imputed to him in the source. Barton has had the chance, on numerous occasions, to observe him, either on the island or once back in England; she concluded that he cannot be a cannibal because he has not shown a desire to eat human flesh, at any moment and so she concluded "I did him wrong to think of him as a cannibal or worse, a devourer of the dead."¹¹³

Cannibalism has, furthermore, been reconsidered, by the heroine, as a rhetorical pattern and an exercise of power and since Friday could not speak for himself, anything imposed through language, upon him, would be glued to his existence as 'truth.' Barton has illustrated this aspect of using language to create realities by asserting, "I say he [Friday] is a cannibal and he becomes a cannibal; I say he is a laundryman and he becomes a laundryman."¹¹⁴ She has even revealed that it was the white man's usage of language which has conditioned her to see the native as a cannibal when she claims, "Cruso had planted the seed [of seeing him as a cannibal] in my mind, and now I could not look on Friday's lips without calling to mind what meat must once have passed them."¹¹⁵ This might denote that Coetzee's overt polemic regards the source, with the language its narrator has deployed, as an exercise of power in which language has been wielded to shape 'reality' and that same 'reality' has been countered and subverted throughout *Foe* to render justice to Friday.

I- *Foe*: A Blow at Daniel Defoe:

The overt polemic Coetzee has launched against *Robinson Crusoe* has not spared its writer, Daniel Defoe, who has been attacked and scathingly criticised by the South African novelist who has made use of Defoe's personal life to strike a blow not only at the 'original,' but also at its author. Before adding "the honorific "De-,""¹¹⁶ it has to be emphasised that "Foe is Defoe's proper patronymic";¹¹⁷ it is no secret, today, to those who have a certain degree of familiarity with his works, that Defoe's birth name is Daniel Foe. This has been alarming to me and perhaps it would be, to many of Coetzee's readers, who might find a certain subtle resonance, if not a direct connection, between Daniel Foe and the fact that Coetzee has opted to call his adaptation, of the Crusoe story, with the name *Foe*; another intricate, but crucial aspect is the presence of an English author, whom Barton contacted to write her story which has woven an overt polemic where Coetzee's Mr. Foe strikes a blow at Daniel Defoe. Barton has had a close connection with him and has even had, at one point, an affair with him, the incident which she has narrated as follows, "I coaxed [Mr. Foe] till he lay beneath me [t]hen I drew off my shift and straddled him";¹¹⁸ Barton has, hence, during the act, "reduc[ed] him [Mr. Foe/Defoe] to "feminine" submission."¹¹⁹ This overt polemic has not only shattered the 18th century male-centred world, but has also given her power over Mr. Foe/Defoe by assuming the full authority over her life, actions and narrative.

Daniel Defoe has gone into trouble during his lifetime and, at one stage, he has been burdened with debts which might perhaps be one of the reasons for which he has given writing adventure stories, like *Robinson Crusoe*, a try to make money and profit.¹²⁰ Coetzee, it seems, has read about Defoe's financial issues because he has knitted them into Barton's account. On many occasions, when she has been looking to schedule a meeting with Mr. Foe, she has been met with the impossibility of doing so "because Mr Foe has run away from his debts."¹²¹ Such a negative portrayal of Mr. Foe/Defoe has resulted in the final portrait of a 'dishonest' novelist who has had to borrow money in the wake of which he would flee from

his creditors. There is overt polemic through a symbolic scene in which Mr. Foe has injured and made Barton bleed and immediately “suck[ed] [her] wound,”¹²² and, afterwards, muttered to her, “[t]his is my manner of preying on the living.”¹²³ This has shown the English author as a vampire that has to dry its victims of their blood in order to survive. Coetzee has even initiated an overt polemic by putting into question the originality of Defoe’s first masterpiece; he has, in this sense, hinted at the fact that Mr. Foe/Defoe has relied on other sources to get the inspiration to write his novel. Barton has told him in an expressive message, “[m]any strengths you [Mr. Foe] have, but invention is not one of them.”¹²⁴ In brief, Coetzee has attacked not only *Robinson Crusoe* but also Daniel Defoe whose biography has been deployed to vilify him.

4- The Residual, Dominant and Emergent in Coetzee’s *Foe*:

At the level of this fourth section, I have appealed to three cultural materialist notions which have been introduced by Williams; they are in the following order, ‘residual,’ ‘dominant’ and ‘emergent.’ These categories are supposed to contribute to enlightening the exact ideological and cultural context which has had a crucial impact on Coetzee’s adaptation of the Crusoe story after more than two centuries and a half from its first appearance. This cultural materialist scrutiny dissects the environment that has shaped *Foe* which, in turn, might help the readers to better grasp the essence of Coetzee’ text. I have grappled with issues connected with slavery, Eurocentrism, feminism, Apartheid system and Capitalism. My prime task, herein, is centred on categorising these ideological and cultural elements using Williams’ scale or three-fold spectrum.

A- *Foe* and the Residual: Slavery and Eurocentrism:

The residual has been identified, by Williams, in his continuum as the whole range of aspects which might, in terms of formation, be traced back to “the past, but [they are] still active in the cultural process.”¹²⁵ Such elements, though formed in the past of a given society, have the ability to encompass all of those practices, “experiences, meanings and values,”

which, despite not belonging to the hegemonic class or values, are still “lived and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social formation.”¹²⁶ In this way, the residual, whether cultural or ideological, keeps exercising a degree of influence, at the level of a society, as a remnant of a bygone era. The residual features which might be spotted in Coetzee’s *Foe*, following this thread of argument, would entail two aspects, slavery and Eurocentrism, which were very common and even dominant during Defoe’s lifetime and in his novel by extension.

Slavery and the enslavement of the black natives are the first residual aspects *Foe* has encompassed. Although this practice has been abolished, more than a century ago, the way the coloured people were treated in apartheid South Africa is akin to slavery. They have been ill-treated, exploited and overworked, by the white ruling minority, without the ability to voice their discontentment. Coetzee’s awareness, that slavery has been perpetuated often under different economic covers, has surfaced in his adaptation of the Crusoe story, with Friday relegated to slavery almost in the same fashion as the black South Africans under apartheid. Seeing Coetzee’s text, in this direction, as “an allegory of contemporary South Africa”¹²⁷ is neither devoid of truth or rationality. Despite being fascinated with his untold story, Barton, the white English woman, has referred to Friday as “a Negro slave.”¹²⁸ His main tasks, in the novel, have been limited to obeying either Crusoe, his master, when they were on the island or Barton once she brought him back to England. Although she has issued a document “granting Friday his freedom and signed it in Crusoe’s name,”¹²⁹ he has been perceived as a slave by the whites they have encountered in her homeland. This situation has to be juxtaposed with that of the coloured South Africans who, despite being free under apartheid, have been treated as second hand citizens, without any opportunities, which was another form of slavery.

Additionally, there is Eurocentrism that once used to be one of the hegemonic norms in Defoe’s era and text which has to be brought into light as another residual aspect in Coetzee adaptation. Nearly all the white characters in *Foe*, Barton included, have, at one stage

or another, condescended Friday and boasted with their alleged superiority over other races. Though he has been freed from Crusoe's grip, Friday has remained under another white figure's watchful eyes and 'oppressive' control. He has fled to avoid being taken to England with the heroine once a ship sought to help them; however, Barton has 'usurped' the right to think for the native, because she is a European, allowing herself to make the decision of uprooting him from his environment in favour of England. Her argument with the English Captain is imbued with Eurocentric assumptions and stereotypes especially when she has fostered that Friday has to be considered as a mere unconscious child which is why "it is our [English and Europeans] duty to care for him in all things, and not abandon him."¹³⁰ These words have the effect of suggesting that the native has had no capacity to make decisions nor has he had the ability to provide food for himself; at this stage, the white/European and 'superior' entity has to intervene to 'bestow' assistance on the 'inferior' races.

The language which has been deployed to speak about Friday has been, on many occasions, Eurocentric. He has been pointed at, as the "poor simpleton"¹³¹ figure which is patronising. When the propitious time came so that the heroine would send him back to Africa, since she has noticed his incapacity to adapt to his new life, Barton has been reluctant; her Eurocentric viewpoint has prevailed as she has opted to keep Friday under her sway. She has even appropriated the native when she has stated "[a] woman may bear a child she does not want, and rear it without loving it, yet be ready to defend it with her life [...] I do not love him [Friday], but he is mine. That is why he remains in England. That is why he is here."¹³² Her words might epitomise the feeling of 'superiority' that most, if not all, whites have felt in relation to the black population under the apartheid reign over South Africa.

B- *Foe* and the Dominant: Apartheid and Capitalism:

The central feature or entity in Williams' cultural materialist spectrum is what he has dubbed the 'dominant' which stands for those most hegemonic values, whether cultural and/or ideological, at a particular moment of a specified society. The theorist has drawn the

boundaries of this notion in *Marxism and Literature* where he has stated that the dominant might be used to denote “the [most] effective [...] culture”¹³³ and/or ideology which is often that of the ruling class. One has to state that, in Coetzee’s text, apartheid and capitalism might be identified as the two dominant aspects. In political terms, *Foe* has been published almost four decades after the ascension to power of the white Afrikaners who have established and consolidated their control over South Africa. It would not be out of common, likewise, if I maintain that apartheid, although Coetzee has never openly made reference to it, has played a major role in the shaping of his entire adaptation of the Crusoe story.

The exact time of the writing, publication and circulation of *Foe* has been one of the most tumultuous epochs, if not the most, in the history of South Africa. There was much turmoil and confusion around the country’s racial policies, especially with the emergency state (1985), which were propped with the interventions of the white police officers to repress and harass the coloured protesters. This unbridled violence has been premeditated to silence any voices, of activists and commoners alike, who would dare to express their discontent against that era’s status quo. The fact that Coetzee’s Friday is unable to speak due to a major amputation might symbolise the whole sufferings of the black ‘citizens’ under the hands of the whites; in this sense, “Friday’s muteness readily associates itself with the silencing of South Africa’s black peoples who not least were denied the rights of free citizens and a voice in matters of the state.”¹³⁴ It was this daily ordeal, of the injustices perpetrated on behalf of his fellow citizens, that has occupied Coetzee’s thoughts and whole existence at the time of the conceptualisation of his adaptation of the Crusoe story.¹³⁵

In economic matters, if Williams’ continuum is to be applied in this context, the South Africa of the apartheid regime, as it would be demonstrated in Coetzee’s novel, has been dominated by capitalism. At the level of the source text, capitalism has been a dominant ideology; therefore, fostering that Defoe’s protagonist has been an invader imbued with the capitalist mindset would not be, under whatever circumstances, a stunning claim.¹³⁶ Almost

three centuries later, capitalism is still standing as sturdy and spirited as it has never been in both Coetzee's novel and South Africa. After a few days from Barton's arrival on the island, she has realised that the castaways were compelled to toil on a regular basis either in the terraces or for their food. Cruso has asserted that the only law that the inhabitants of the island must stick to is that they "shall work for [their] bread, which is a commandment."¹³⁷ Hard work and perseverance, which are some of the most estimated values in the capitalist system, have also been at the heart of *Foe*.

Even the language the white man has resorted to might denote the dominance of the capitalist drive over Coetzee's time and story.¹³⁸ The moment the heroine has inquired from Cruso about his precise aim behind teaching Friday only a limited amount of words; he has answered in the fashion of a businessmen looking to amass material gains. He has said, accordingly, "[t]his is not England, we have no need of a great stock of words";¹³⁹ Barton has retorted telling Cruso that he "speak[s] as if language [is] money."¹⁴⁰ The white man's worldview seems to have been programmed on the capitalist mindset which values thrift and minimising expenditures even in linguistic terms. Moreover, human beings, like the slave Friday, are seen and, at times, treated as a commodity;¹⁴¹ in a prominent example, the narrator has asked the following question, "[i]f Friday is not mine [...] whose is he?"¹⁴² She has finally concluded that the native "is mine."¹⁴³ Nicole Bracker's assertion that *Foe* "is a text haunted, if not obsessed, with notions of both ownership and dispossession,"¹⁴⁴ is not destitute of truth; these capitalist notions have encompassed a wide range of aspects among which language, human beings and material success.

Capitalism is also present in the figures' main motives, haggles and bargains.¹⁴⁵ In her road to Bristol to send Friday back to Africa, Barton has performed a transaction with a cobbler in which she has exchanged or traded a book, that has been in her possession, with "a pair of shoes,"¹⁴⁶ the craftsman has given her in return. When she has, additionally, recounted her tale to the English captain, he has not hesitated to advise her to write her account to make

profit; he has confirmed, “[t]here has never before, to my knowledge, been a female castaway of our nation. It will cause a great stir.”¹⁴⁷ The captain’s direct thought has revolved around making the best use of the available means, an interesting story in the heroine’s case, to achieve material gain. Later on, Barton has had the desire to convert her narrative into money¹⁴⁸ to feed herself and Friday who ended up at her charge which is why she has contacted, to this end, Mr. Foe, the ‘skilful’ author, who was expected to knead her tale into a literary work. She has told Friday that “Mr Foe is weaving [our] story which will make us famous throughout the land, and rich too.”¹⁴⁹ The same could be said about Mr. Foe who has been in desperate need for money¹⁵⁰ because he has been struggling with his financial troubles as he has been debt laden with many creditors at his heels. Writing Barton’s account is, consequently, not only vital to the heroine, but also to Mr. Foe/Defoe, because both of them have been looking for material success. All in all, it has to be argued that the “economic motives [have] dominate[d] *Foe*”;¹⁵¹ money and material gain are, thereby, at the heart of Coetzee’s text just like they has been, in the early 18th century, at the level of Defoe’s.

C- The Emergent: Neocolonialism, Multiculturalism and Feminist Issues:

If the residual might be positioned at the first extremity of Williams’ continuum, the emergent has to be located at the other far end of the pole as the last layer. He has pointed at it, as encompassing all the “new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships [that] are continually being created.”¹⁵² There is enough room in it to all those ideas, movements, practices and values which come into existence, in a society, as being recent aspects which might be either cultural or ideological. There are three elements to be sorted-out as being the residual in *Foe* and the South African society, by then; they are: neocolonialism, a call for multiculturalism and an expression of feminist aspirations.

To begin with neocolonialism, Coetzee has hinted at an eventual return of the traditional imperial forces, to the colonies, though they have been dismantled during the second half of the 20th century. The building of the terraces and the incessant work that has to

be performed by Cruso, on a daily basis, has had the aim of preparing the ground for future colonisers. The white man has argued that the processes of “planting is reserved for those who come after us [...] I only clear the ground for them.”¹⁵³ Coetzee’s novel seems to ponder the following question: what if the whole colonial adventures have been but a preparation for future invasions, under different forms from traditional colonialism, to take hold of the colonies? The ground evidence has, indeed, shown that it has been thus with the multinational corporations which have tightened their grip over the economies of many new nations after the wave of decolonisation. Coetzee’s text has voiced one of the major emergent concerns thinkers and commoners alike have had to reckon with all over the so called third world.

Foe has, furthermore, expressed the tendency to accept the other, coexistence and multiculturalism that have swept over the world in the late 1970s onwards. Although Barton has never caught Friday in the act of cannibalism, she has pictured him as a human flesh eater; this is what has annoyed her calling it “the seed[...] of madness.”¹⁵⁴ She has argued, in accordance with multiculturalism, that Friday must not be judged for what he has once been, if he ever was a cannibal in his past, but he has to be tolerated as a fellow human being whom she has never observed perpetrating cannibalism. The narrator has contended that “[w]e cannot shrink in disgust from our neighbour’s touch because his hands, that are clean now, were once dirty”;¹⁵⁵ she has then continued, “[w]e must cultivate, all of us, a certain ignorance, a certain blindness, or society will not be tolerable.”¹⁵⁶ This might be regarded as an ear shattering multicultural outcry to implant tolerance in every South African, whether black or white, to secure a harmonious and prosperous environment for everyone.

I have also to deal, in the last position, with the feminist aspirations to empower women as another emergent element in *Foe*. The fact that Coetzee has chosen a female narrator, from whose perspective the castaway’s story would be revisited, has had the significance of allowing women to voice their concerns. Any feminist might feel Barton’s struggle to be the legitimate author of her account resisting Mr. Foe’s attempts to appropriate

it in the direction he wished, which is in itself an endeavour “that no feminist reader can fail to identify with.”¹⁵⁷ She has not yielded, in the fashion of any contemporary feminist, to the oppressive patriarchal system which often reduces women to passive subjects. She has emphasised, “I am a free a free woman who asserts her freedom by telling her story according to her own desire.”¹⁵⁸ This sentence has epitomised the entire feminist vision through which Coetzee has sought to empower Barton, by extension all South African women, to take the initiative of claiming their independence by being active members in society.

Conclusion:

This last chapter, to end up with, has delved into *Foe*, as an adaptation, in connection with *Robinson Crusoe*. In four sections, I have brought under scrutiny a multitude of issues. In the first position, Coetzee’s life and his novel’s background, under the apartheid regime, have been exposed to grasp the matrix in which the adaptation has evolved. The second section has targeted the exploration of Coetzee’s text as a stylization of its source. *Foe* has, in this direction, reproduced Defoe’s setting, the Crusoe/Friday duality, and the basic castaway storylines, in addition to replicating the original’s paternalist vision and the civilising mission. Afterwards, I have centred my designs on reading Coetzee’s novel as an overt polemic which has directed blows at Defoe’s text. The shift of the robinsonade from its male-centred world towards Barton’s female-centred account has been innovative. I have also reviewed the strategies, the South African author has deployed to amplify the voices of those who have been, for centuries, oppressed namely women and the colonised/Friday. Besides, he has launched his overt polemic, at his source, by portraying a dystopian island, altering Crusoe’s character, voicing the sexual desires repressed in Defoe’s work and criticising colonialism with its concomitant brutality and enslavement of the subjugated races. I have moved then to Coetzee’s Friday who has been reworked and even vindicated of cannibalism. The novelist has additionally attacked not only the source, but also its writer, Defoe. The fourth section has appealed to Williams’ notions which have uncovered slavery and eurocentrism as residual

elements, while apartheid and capitalism stand as the dominant. On a similar vein, neocolonialism, multiculturalism and feminist aspirations have been quite emergent in Coetzee's text and society.

Endnotes:

- ¹. J. M. Coetzee, in David Attwell, ed., *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 247.
- ². J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 118.
- ³. J. M. Coetzee interviewed by Tony Morphet, Cited in Matthew Greenfield, "Coetzee's "Foe" and Wittgenstein's "Philosophical Investigations": Confession, Authority, and Private Languages," in *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, Vol 25, N° 03, 1995, p. 234.
- ⁴. Tim Mehigan, ed., *A Companion to the Works of J. M. Coetzee*, (New York: Camden House, 2011), p. 09.
- ⁵. J. C. Kannemeyer, trans., Michiel Heyns, *J. M. Coetzee: A Life in Writing*, (Victoria: Scribe, 2012) p. 13.
- ⁶. Tim Mehigan, ed., *A Companion to the Works of J. M. Coetzee*, (New York: Camden House, 2011), p. 09.
- ⁷. Dominic Head, *The Cambridge Introduction to J. M. Coetzee*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 02.
- ⁸. Ibid.
- ⁹. Ibid., p. 22.
- ¹⁰. J. M. Coetzee, in David Attwell, ed., *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 342.
- ¹¹. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 193.
- ¹². Julie Sanders, "Adaptation/Appropriation," in Peter Melville Logan, ed., *The Encyclopedia of the Novel*, (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2011), p. 03.
- ¹³. Teresa Pinto Coelho, "Robinsonaden in the Feminine? Coetzee's Foe and Muriel Spark's Robinson," in Sue Kossew and Melinda Harvey, eds., *Reading Coetzee's Women*, (Gewerbstrasse: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 132.
- ¹⁴. Ibid., p. 135.
- ¹⁵. Philip Ball, *The Modern Myths: Adventures in the Machinery of the Popular Imagination*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2021), p. 34.
- ¹⁶. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 21.
- ¹⁷. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 196.
- ¹⁸. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 37.
- ¹⁹. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*, trans., Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 230.
- ²⁰. Ibid.
- ²¹. Brian McAllister, "I Am Becoming an Island Dweller: Postmodern Space-Time in J. M. Coetzee's *Foe*," in M. B. Hackler and Ari J. Adipurawidjana, *On and Off the Page: Mapping place in Text and Culture*, (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), p. 71, in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=xwQZBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA71&dq=island+important+to+Coetzee+Foe+Daniel+Defoe+Crusoe&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKewiG4KzrYP7AhWaSfEDHfxpBwkQ6AF6BAGGEAI#v=onepage&q=island%20important%20to%20Coetzee%20Foe%20Daniel%20Defoe%20Crusoe&f=false>, Accessed on 05/11/2022.
- ²². Marion Fries Dieckmann, "Castaways in the Very Heart of the City," in Laurenz Volkmann, Nancy Grimm, Ines Detmers, and Katrin Thomson, eds., *Local Natures, Global Responsibilities: Ecocritical Perspectives on the New English Literatures*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), p. 172.
- ²³. Ibid.
- ²⁴. Paul Smethurst, "Fictional (Epigraph) Travel Writing," in Jennifer Speake, ed., *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*, (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 432.
- ²⁵. Mustapha Marrouchi, "Fear of the "Other", Loathing the Similar," in *The Profession of Literature at the End of the Millennium*, Vol 26: N° 3, 1999, p. 29, *College Literature*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25112474>, Accessed on 12/11/2022.
- ²⁶. Ibid.
- ²⁷. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 39.
- ²⁸. Ibid., p. 57.
- ²⁹. Ibid.

- ³⁰. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, in Carl Emerson, ed., trans., Carl Emerson, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 196.
- ³¹. Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*, (London: Routledge: 1994), p. 59.
- ³². Laurenz Volkmann, "Fortified Masculinity: Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* as a Literary Emblem of Western Male Identity," in Stefan Horlacher, ed., *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, (Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2011), p. 129.
- ³³. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 67.
- ³⁴. Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 146.
- ³⁵. Geoffrey Sill, "Robinson's Transgender Voyage: or, Burlesquing Crusoe," in Andreas K. E. Mueller and Glynis Ridley, eds., *Robinson Crusoe after 300 Years*, (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2021), p. 53.
- ³⁶. Edward W. Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 45.
- ³⁷. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 03.
- ³⁸. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 05.
- ³⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ⁴⁰. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- ⁴¹. Rachel Hollander, *Narrative Hospitality in Late Victorian Fiction: Novel Ethics*, (New York: Routledge, 2013), p. 179.
- ⁴². J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 123.
- ⁴³. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
- ⁴⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- ⁴⁵. *Ibid.*, 121
- ⁴⁶. *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 95.
- ⁴⁸. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
- ⁴⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
- ⁵⁰. *Ibid.*, Pp. 94-95.
- ⁵¹. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
- ⁵². Richard Phillips, "From 'The Geography of *Robinson Crusoe*,'" in Peter Childs, ed., *Post-Colonial Theory and English Literature: A Reader*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 126.
- ⁵³. Louis James, "From Robinson to Robina and Beyond: Robinson Crusoe as a Utopian Concept," in Krishan Kumar and Stephen Bann, eds., *Utopias and the Millennium*, (London: Reaktion Books, 1993), p. 33.
- ⁵⁴. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 07.
- ⁵⁵. *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁶. *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁷. *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁸. *Ibid.*, p. 09.
- ⁵⁹. Dominic Head, *The Cambridge Introduction to J. M. Coetzee*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 63.
- ⁶⁰. Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *Imperial Boredom Monotony and the British Empire*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 06.
- ⁶¹. Thomas and Eyes, Stephen Greenblatt and John Martin, in *Ibid.*
- ⁶². James Brennan, "Communications and Media in African History," in John Parker and Richard Reid, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Modern African History*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 547.
- ⁶³. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 64.
- ⁶⁴. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 16.
- ⁶⁵. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 59.
- ⁶⁶. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 16.
- ⁶⁷. Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*: The 'Amazement of Reading'," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 235.
- ⁶⁸. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), Pp. 34-35.
- ⁶⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁷⁰. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- ⁷¹. *Ibid.*, Pp. 11-12.
- ⁷². Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*: The 'Amazement of Reading'," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 239.
- ⁷³. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 35.

- ⁷⁴. Dominic Head, *The Cambridge Introduction to J. M. Coetzee*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 63.
- ⁷⁵. Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 169.
- ⁷⁶. Ibid.
- ⁷⁷. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 30.
- ⁷⁸. Ibid.
- ⁷⁹. Brett, C. McNelly, "Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and Robinson Crusoe," in *Studies in the Novel*, Vol 35: N° 1, 2003, p. 02.
- ⁸⁰. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 33.
- ⁸¹. Ibid.
- ⁸². Ibid.
- ⁸³. Edith. W. Clowes, "The Robinson Myth Reread in Postcolonial and Postcommunist Modes," in *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol 36: N° 2, 1995, p. 152.
- ⁸⁴. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 34.
- ⁸⁵. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 99.
- ⁸⁶. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 83.
- ⁸⁷. Edith. W. Clowes, "The Robinson Myth Reread in Postcolonial and Postcommunist Modes," in *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol 36: N° 2, 1995, p. 152.
- ⁸⁸. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 209.
- ⁸⁹. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 22.
- ⁹⁰. Ibid., p. 23.
- ⁹¹. Ibid. p. 68.
- ⁹². Ibid., p. 155.
- ⁹³. David Attwell, *J. M. Coetzee and the Life of Writing: Face-to-Face with Time*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2015), p. 96.
- ⁹⁴. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 23.
- ⁹⁵. Ibid., p. 36-37.
- ⁹⁶. Ibid., p. 85.
- ⁹⁷. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 193.
- ⁹⁸. Ibid.
- ⁹⁹. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), Pp. 05-06.
- ¹⁰⁰. Jane Poyner, *J. M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), p. 93.
- ¹⁰¹. Alexandra Effe, *J. M. Coetzee and the Ethics of Narrative Transgression: A Reconsideration of Metalepsis*, (Gewerbestrasse: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 25.
- ¹⁰². Ibid.
- ¹⁰³. Michael Marais, "The Hermeneutics of Empire: Coetzee's Post-Colonial Metafiction," in Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson, eds., *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*, (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996), Pp. 74-75.
- ¹⁰⁴. Dominic Head, *The Cambridge Introduction to J. M. Coetzee*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 64.
- ¹⁰⁵. Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶. Dennis Todd, *Defoe's America*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 44.
- ¹⁰⁷. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 31.
- ¹⁰⁸. Giles Gunn, "Human Solidarity in Postcolonial, Holocaust and African-American Literature," in David Chidester et al., eds., *What Holds Us Together: Social Cohesion in South Africa*, (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council, 2003), p. 287.
- ¹⁰⁹. J. M. Coetzee, Paraphrased in David Attwell, *J. M. Coetzee and the Life of Writing: Face-to-Face with Time*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2015), p. 96.
- ¹¹⁰. Markman Ellis, "Crusoe, Cannibalism and Empire," in Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*, (London: MacMillan, 1996), p. 46.
- ¹¹¹. Daniel Defoe, (1719), *Robinson Crusoe*, (San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005), p. 118.
- ¹¹². Ibid., p. 195.
- ¹¹³. J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 106.
- ¹¹⁴. Ibid., p. 121.
- ¹¹⁵. Ibid., p. 106.
- ¹¹⁶. Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 147.
- ¹¹⁷. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 179.

- ¹¹⁸ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 139.
- ¹¹⁹ . Jane Poyner, *J. M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), p. 95.
- ¹²⁰ . Ian Watt, *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 147.
- ¹²¹ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 87.
- ¹²² . *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- ¹²³ . *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁴ . *Ibid.*, p. 72.
- ¹²⁵ . Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
- ¹²⁶ . Raymond Williams, *Culture and Materialism*, (London: Bookmarque, 1980), p. 40.
- ¹²⁷ . Robert M. Post, Cited in David Cowart, *Literary Symbiosis: The Reconfigured Text in Twentieth-Century Writing*, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993), p. 166.
- ¹²⁸ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 39.
- ¹²⁹ . *Ibid.*, p. 99.
- ¹³⁰ . *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- ¹³¹ . *Ibid.*
- ¹³² . *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- ¹³³ . Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ¹³⁴ . Jane Poyner, *J. M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), p. 93.
- ¹³⁵ . Andrew Dean, "Double Thoughts Coetzee and the Philosophy of Literary Criticism, in Patrick Hayes and Jan Wilm, eds., *Beyond the Ancient Quarrel Literature, Philosophy, and J. M. Coetzee*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 64.
- ¹³⁶ . Lieve Spaas, "Narcissus and Friday: From Classical to Anthropological Myth," in Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*, (London: MacMillan, 1996), p. 105.
- ¹³⁷ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 36.
- ¹³⁸ . I was influenced, herein, by Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's Foe: The "Amazement of Reading"," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 237-238.
- ¹³⁹ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 21.
- ¹⁴⁰ . *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ¹⁴¹ . While writing this, I was influenced by, Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's Foe: The "Amazement of Reading"," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 237-238.
- ¹⁴² . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 99.
- ¹⁴³ . *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- ¹⁴⁴ . Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's Foe: The "Amazement of Reading"," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 234.
- ¹⁴⁵ . *Ibid.*, Pp.234-237.
- ¹⁴⁶ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 100.
- ¹⁴⁷ . *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ¹⁴⁸ . While writing this, I was influenced by, Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's Foe: The "Amazement of Reading"," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 236-237.
- ¹⁴⁹ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 58.
- ¹⁵⁰ . Nicole Bracker, "J.M. Coetzee's Foe: The "Amazement of Reading"," in Ulla Grapard and Gillian Hewitson, eds., *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 236-37. The influence of this article and book upon the element developed, herein, is undeniable.
- ¹⁵¹ . *Ibid.*, p. 234.
- ¹⁵² . Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 123.
- ¹⁵³ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 33.
- ¹⁵⁴ . *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- ¹⁵⁵ . *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁶ . *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁷ . Chris Bongie, ""Lost in the Maze of Doubting": J. M. Coetzee's Foe and the Politics of (Un)Likeness," in *Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol 39: N° 2, 1993, p. 264.
- ¹⁵⁸ . J. M. Coetzee, *Foe*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 131.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

General Conclusion:

This research which has been entitled **Shakespeare and Defoe in Modern and Post-modern African/Caribbean Literature**, has brought under examination, on the one hand, Shakespeare's last play, *The Tempest* (1611), in relation to Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969) and Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985); it has scrutinised, on the other hand, Defoe's first novel, *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), in connection with Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*" (1960), Walcott's *Pantomime* (1978) and Coetzee's *Foe* (1986). I have studied, therefore, the evolution of two of the most enduring Western canonical texts, Shakespeare's and Defoe's, in markedly different environments both at the temporal and spatial dimensions. The two literary works have been imitated, adjusted and revised to fit in new moulds in the African/Caribbean contexts where thinkers and commoners alike have had conflicting and even hostile opinions, at times, towards the way their regions and fellow native populations have been portrayed in the two source texts, which have been, through time, relegated to the status of colonial literature.

This thesis, in terms of scope, has fostered Mikhail Bakhtin's continuum of discourse with its historicist dialogism, in addition to Gérard Genette's notions—all have been interwoven with Raymond Williams' cultural and ideological spectrum to explore the six African/Caribbean adaptations falling, thereby, into what might be designated as comparative literary and cultural aesthetics and poetics. For a thorough achievement of my purpose, three parts have been designed, with the first encompassing one chapter, and the two remaining ones entailing three chapters each; all in all, seven chapters have been written. The first chapter which bears the following name, "***The Tempest and Robinson Crusoe: History, Lives, Times in Context, Intertextual Dialogic Perspectives and Ideological Concerns,***" has dived into history surfacing, accordingly, the exact context of the English bard's last play and Defoe's first novel. This effort has made it possible, for me, to reveal the myriad dynamics, in action, which have brought about the final carving of these two masterpieces the

way they are read, known and enjoyed today. The intertextual and historicist dialogic inquiry, to which I have submitted the two literary works, has shown that even Shakespeare's play and Defoe's novel, which are often perceived as source texts, have been themselves inspired from or adaptations of formerly existing literary works, since both the playwright and the novelist have relied on previous stories or sources while looking for inspiration to fashion what would become their own masterpieces. I have also read *The Tempest* and *Robinson Crusoe* from a cultural materialist viewpoint applying on them Williams' cultural and ideological continuum. This has brought into light, in Shakespeare's play and early modern England, feudalism as a residual aspect while absolutism and mercantilism have been dominant; the spectrum is completed with capitalism as the emergent ideological entity. I have, on a similar vein, found, in Defoe's novel, that absolutism and commercial-based, mercantile activities have been residual political and economic structures during 18th century Enlightenment Britain; while at the centre of the continuum, capitalism, Eurocentrism and colonialism have been dominant; individualism, industrialisation and spirit of invention close Williams' spectrum as the emergent.

The second chapter which has been dubbed, "**Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967): A Stylization and Subtle Rewriting of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in Relation to Cultural and Ideological Considerations,**" has investigated Ngũgĩ's novel, though not apparent at first sight, as an adaptation of Shakespeare's play. Ngũgĩ's historical background and that of his text have been scrutinised, in the first position, to comprehend the Kenyan author's vision about a play like Shakespeare's. I have found, thereafter, that Ngũgĩ has stylized *The Tempest* on various stages including the characterisation, paternalist purport, civilising mission, and the coloniser's slippage from benevolence to colonial violence. With the help of Bakhtin's hidden polemic, I have tried to dissect the techniques, used in *A Grain of Wheat*, to strike an indirect blow at its source text. The novelist's methods, of so doing, have comprised a shift of the setting and an updated look at both Caliban and Prospero who have been resurrected on

the eve of Kenya's independence with the former given a voice of his own and the latter reduced into a desperate and brutal coloniser on the verge of going back home. Other narrative and linguistic techniques have been analysed such as the narrative point of view and the reliance on a Kenyan native language which have served the desired effect. Williams' concepts have been crucial, lastly, since they have displayed the presence of colonialism, Christianity and rural community as residual elements; the spectrum proceeds with capitalism and patriarchy quite dominant at the heart of the Kenyan society; while neocolonial concerns have been emergent on the brink of the country's independence.

“Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969): An Aggressive Appropriation Embedded in Its Temporal and Spatial Ideological Environment as a Blatant Occupation of Shakespeare's Text” is the label given to the third chapter which has been devoted to the inspection of Césaire's ultra aggressive 'occupation' of the English bard's play. The first issue, I have endeavoured to highlight, is the centrality of the Caribbean context of the 1960s to Césaire's play. The second section has focused on interpreting the latter as a metatextual takeover of its source through the reliance on metatheatre. Césaire's approach has produced an aggressive commentary on *The Tempest* that has altered both its perspective and setting in favour of Caliban and the Caribbean region. Prospero, on a similar vein, has been metamorphosed into a disillusioned despot whose 'civilising mission,' with its superficial Christian values and shallow colonial benevolence have all been subverted, criticised and rendered fruitless. Caliban has been given, on the other hand, importance in an attempt to highlight his history and restore his identity, language and self esteem by rejecting Prospero's accusations of sexual harassment. In the third section, Genette's terminology, of 'excision' 'reduction' and 'amplification,' has allowed me to see the changes Césaire has implemented by deleting, reducing and amplifying aspects, in Shakespeare's text. Williams spectrum, in the fourth section, has clarified the cultural and ideological matrix of *A Tempest* with slavery and the revival of Caliban's African cultural roots as being the residual; the optimistic

revolutionary spirit has been dominant not only in the Caribbean, but also all over the colonies which have been set ablaze with the great wave of decolonisation. The emergent features have consisted of the era's prominent debate over opting to violent or peaceful ways of struggle against the oppressors with the neocolonial apprehension that came to life as a consequence of the Europeans' aspirations to preserve the Caribbean as a tourist haven to be used whenever needed for their vacations.

At the level of the fourth chapter which has been named "**Kincaid's *Annie John* (1985): A Subtle, but Forceful Feminist Takeover of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* Ingrained in Its Historical and Cultural Milieu**," I have drawn the connection between Kincaid's novel, as an adaptation, and Shakespeare's play, as the source. The author's life with the context of the 1960s until the 1980s has been brought under light showing the effect this background has had on Kincaid's novel. My intention has moved to digging into *Annie John* with the hypothesis that it has stylized the bard's text; my reading of Kincaid's Caliban-like characters, the way she has revisited the slave/master dialectic and the failure of Prospero's civilising mission have demonstrated that the Antiguan author's novel might be regarded as a stylization of *The Tempest*. Using Bakhtin's hidden polemic, moreover, my analysis has uncovered that Kincaid has not only switched the narrative perspective from Prospero to the native girl, but has also shifted the story in terms of space and time. The contemporary novelist has rebuffed the accusations of the bad smell imputed to Caliban, turning them on the English people, while Shakespeare's white man has been deprived of his magical powers which were transferred to Annie. Kincaid's indirect attack on the source play has additionally brought back to life Sycorax in order to resist the coloniser's cultural imperialism. She has, on a similar thread, questioned the play's colonial and heterosexual dimensions by introducing a wide range of antiestablishment sexual patterns. To bring this fourth chapter to an end, Williams' cultural materialist spectrum has disclosed African-originated witchcraft named obeah as the residual; the era's anti-colonial and hippie spirit

have occupied the centre as the dominant while the emergent has been revolving around the fear of European neocolonial ambitions.

With the fifth chapter which has been referred to as **“The Crusoe/Friday Story and Men/Women Dualities under the Apartheid Regime in Gordimer’s *“Friday’s Footprint”* (1960) Framed with Feminist, Ideological and Cultural Influences,”** I have explored the link between Gordimer’s story and Defoe’s novel. At the onset, her life and the South African matrix, in which her work has germinated, have been presented. The multitude of ways **“Friday’s Footprint”** has replicated Defoe’s ‘original’ have next been exhibited, with ample evidence, pointing at the Crusoe/Friday duality refurbished, through a feminist purport, to match the writer’s 1960s background. The colonial tenor, coloniser/colonised, slave/master in addition to the shipwreck, the desert surrounding and man versus nature struggle have all been stylized from ***Robinson Crusoe***. Afterwards, Bakhtin’s and Genette’s notions of parody and metatextuality have been useful since they have opened for me the possibility of viewing Gordimer’s tale as a work which has not only mocked Crusoe’s identity, but has also criticised him while allowing women’s voice to be heard in a patriarchal era. Williams’ ideological and cultural notions have highlighted South Africa’s residual rural community; capitalism and apartheid, at the centre, have been dominant. The emergent has consisted of the desire to empower women to act and react outside the private sphere through Rita Cunningham who has managed, though for a short time, to be a successful businesswoman.

The sixth chapter has been indicated with the following heading **“Walcott’s *Pantomime* (1978): The Crusoe/Friday Encounter and Colonial Story Retold by the “Black Crusoe” as a Struggle for Identity in a Quite Different Cultural and Ideological Matrix.”** It has juxtaposed Walcott’s late 1970s play with Defoe’s text. The environment of the Saint Lucian author’s work has been valuable to his adaptation of the Crusoe story. ***Pantomime*** has been interpreted, in the second position, as an overt polemic since it has altered Defoe’s narrative perspective and setting by inverting the Crusoe/Friday roles. The

issues related to colonialism, language, history and women's silencing, in the source, have been metatextually treated by Walcott who has commented on some of these aspects, rejected some of them, subverted others and even elevated Friday's status in post-independence Antigua. Despite being in the late 1970s, Williams' cultural materialist continuum has allowed me to detect the residual existence of colonialism and Eurocentrism in Walcott's play. The dominant feature has to do with capitalism and just like most of the literary texts this thesis is concerned with, neocolonial issues have been emergent together with the rise of the multicultural orientations the world has witnessed in the second half of the 20th century.

The last chapter in this research, the seventh, is labelled "**Coetzee's *Foe* (1986): Telling the 'Untold,' those Silenced Stories of the 'Others,' Friday and Women, with Ideological and Cultural Bearings.**" It has studied Coetzee's novel which has been paralleled with *Robinson Crusoe*. The entry to this chapter has been connected with the South African author's life in the wake of apartheid's ascendance to power. I have proceeded with a glance at the aspects which Coetzee has stylized from the source text; they include the setting, the Crusoe/Friday relationship, the heart of the castaway narrative, paternalism and the civilising mission. The deployment of Bakhtin's overt polemic has enlightened the movement from a male-centred narrative to a female-centred one which has brought under prominence women's and Friday's marginalised voices in Defoe's masterpiece. Coetzee has also openly attacked the latter's utopian setting, Crusoe figure, absence of sexual desire, colonialism and slavery. The character of Friday has been remodelled and freed from cannibalism; as for Defoe, he has been vilified. In the fourth and last section, Williams' notions have surfaced residual elements such as slavery and Eurocentrism. Apartheid and capitalism, just like in Gordimer's "*Friday's Footprint*," have had the status of the dominant in the South African society. The continuum has been closed with neocolonialism, multiculturalism and feminist aspirations which have occupied the position of the emergent.

Finally, it might be argued, that each African/Caribbean author, this thesis is concerned with, has made use of his/her source text, either *The Tempest* or *Robinson Crusoe*, to suit his/her own purposes fitting their narratives into new environments. The resulting six adaptations, whether apparent or subtle, have reproduced, from their 'originals,' some features faithfully, despite different eras and backgrounds, while reworking, adjusting and even altering other elements. Each author has revived and perpetuated, in a way or another, the literary and artistic legacy of Shakespeare and Defoe towards whom divergent stances have been fostered. Because the subsequent adaptations, selected herein, have been written in quite different backgrounds and audiences, from their sources, every single resulting work has addressed and reckoned with the questions prevalent in its epoch. To end up with, there is a pressing necessity to affirm that while Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* have had a strong appeal to 20th century African/Caribbean writers, for a wide range of reasons, it would be quite interesting, to put it no less stronger, to examine the resonance of these two works in the 21st century within the same spatial confines.

Bibliography

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

Césaire, Aimé (1969). *A Tempest*. trans. Richard Miller. New York: Seuil, 1985.

Coetzee, J. M. *Foe*. London: Penguin Books, 1986.

Defoe, Daniel (1719). *Robinson Crusoe*. San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005.

Gordimer, Nadine (1960). "Friday's Footprint," in *Life Times Stories*. London: Penguin Books, 2010.

Kincaid, Jamaica. *Annie John*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1985.

Shakespeare, William (1611). *The Tempest*. San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005.

Walcott, Derek (1978). *Pantomime*. Bloomington: Alexander Street Press, 2005.

Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. *A Grain of Wheat*. New York: Penguin Group, 1967.

Secondary Sources:

a- Theory Books:

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, 2000.

_____. *Roland Barthes*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Ashcroft, Bill. Griffiths, Gareth and Tiffin, Helen. eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.

_____. *The Empire Writes Back Theory and Practice in Post Colonial Literature*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. in Carl Emerson, ed. trans. Carl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

_____. *The Dialogic Imagination*. in Michael Holquist ed. trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Edgar, Andrew and Sedgwick, Peter. *Cultural Theory: The Key Thinkers*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Masks*. trans. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 2008.

_____. *The Wretched of the Earth*. trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests Literature in the Second Degree*. trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Kristeva, Julia. in Roudiez, Leon S. ed. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. trans. Gora, Thomas. Jardine, Alice and Roudiez, Leon S. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

- Said, W. Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- _____. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1987.
- _____. *Homecoming*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972.
- _____. *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedom*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 1993.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Materialism*. London: Bookmarque, 1980.
- _____. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

b- Novels, Memoires, Theses, Philosophy, History and Civilisation Books:

- Auerbach, Jeffrey A. *Imperial Boredom Monotony and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Alam S. M, Shamsul. *Rethinking the Mau Mau in Colonial Kenya*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Armitage, David. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Baker, Christopher. ed. *Absolutism and the Scientific Revolution, 1600-1720: A Biographical Dictionary*. London: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Ball, Philip. *The Modern Myths: Adventures in the Machinery of the Popular Imagination*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2021.
- Bannet, Tavor Eve. *Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading 1720-1810*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Beal, Collette Michelle. *Jamaica Kincaid and the Rewriting of Other as Self*. Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1998.
- Beck, Roger B. *The History of South Africa*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Berleant-Schiller, Riva. Lowes, Susan and Benjamin, Milton. *Antigua and Barbuda World Bibliographical Series*. Oxford: Abc-Clio, 1995.
- Betts, Raymond F. *Decolonization*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Boyce, Charlotte and Fitzpatrick, Joan. *A History of Food in Literature: From the Fourteenth Century to the Present*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Burnett, Paula. *Derek Walcott: Politics and Poetics*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.
- Byatt, Antonia Susan. *On Histories and Stories*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2000.

- Chakrabarti, Pratik. *Medicine and Empire 1600-1960*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Cherifi, Ahcene. *Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe in Cinematographic Adaptations: A Postcolonial and Intertextual Study*. UMMTO, 2013-2014.
- Chidester, David. Dexter, Phillip and James, Godfrey Wilmot. eds. *What Holds Us Together: Social Cohesion in South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council, 2003.
- Chima J. Korieh and Raphael Chijioke Njoku, eds., *Missions, States, and European Expansion in Africa*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Collins, Wilkie. *The Moonstone*. San Diego: Icon Group International, 2005.
- DeWolf, Rebecca. *Gendered Citizenship: The Original Conflict over the Equal Rights Amendment, 1920–1963*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021.
- Dueck, Alvin. ed. *Indigenous Psychology of Spirituality in my Beginning is my End*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, 2021.
- Eward-Mangione, Angela. *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Tree Adaptations of Tree Plays by William Shakespeare*. Florida: University of South Florida, 2014.
- Fried, Johannes. *The Middle Ages*. trans. Peter Lewis, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Grove, Richard H. *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hamilton, Neil A. *Eyewitness History: The 1970s*. New York: Facts on File, 2006.
- Iddir, Meriem and Hallalel Melissa. *Survival Narratives in Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, Jules Verne's The Mysterious Island and Yann Martel's Life of Pie: An Intertextual Dialogic and Cultural Materialist Study*. UMMTO, 2019.
- John, Murrin M. Johnson, Paul E. McPherson, James M. Fahs, Alice. Gerstle, Gary. Rosenberg, Emily S. Rosenberg, Norman L. *Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of the American People Vol., 01*. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth, 2008.
- Jörn, Rösen and Mihai, Spariosu. eds. *Exploring Humanity: Intercultural Perspectives on Humanism*. Taiwan: National Taiwan University Press, 2012.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. London: Penguin Group, 2000.
- Kayange, Muchineripi Grivas. *Capitalism and Freedom in African Political Philosophy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Klein, Herbert S. *African Slavery in Latin America and the Caribbean*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Levy, Jacob T. and Young, Marion Iris. eds. *Colonialism and Its Legacies*. New York: Lexington Books, 2011.
- Magnusson, Lars ed. *The Political Economy of Mercantilism*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

- Matheron, François and Corpet, Oliver. Ed. trans. G. M. Goshgarian. *Philosophy of Encounter: Later Writings, 1978-87*. Baskerville: Andrea Stimpson, 2006.
- Mühleisen, Susanne and Migge, Bettina. eds. *Politeness and Face in Caribbean Creoles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
- Mwakikagile, Godfrey. *Africa and the West*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2000. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=iKVCGuSzNhcC&pg=PA90&dq=kikuyu+central+association+ignored+demands&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwitg66b5tHIAhWnyoUKHUFqAm4Q6AEINTAB#v=onepage&q=kikuyu%20central%20association%20ignored%20demands&f=false>.
- Nancy L. Clark and William H. Worger, 2nd ed. *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Niro, Brian. *Race*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Odhiambo, Atieno E. S. and Lonsdale, John. eds. *Mau Mau and Nationhood: Arms, Authority and Narration*. Oxford: James Curry Ltd, 2003. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=mbKOXGsytcIC&pg=PA121&dq=east+africa+protectorate+kenya+colony&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwix_LTA5sflAhWDoXEKHabJCN44HhDoAQiIATAJ#v=onepage&q=east%20africa%20protectorate%20kenya%20colony&f=false.
- Page, Williams Yolanda. ed. *Encyclopedia of African American Women Writers*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2007.
- Parker, John and Reid, Richard. eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern African History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Park, Robert E. and Burgess, Ernest W. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Permenter, Paris and Bigley, John. *Antigua and Barbuda*. Edison: Hunter Publishing, 2001.
- Pocock, Anne Judith. *Genesis of a Discourse: The Tempest and the Emergence of Postcoloniality*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010.
- Poole, Kristen. *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England: Spaces of Demonism, Divinity, and Drama*. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1762). *Emile or on Education*. trans. Allan Bloom. Toronto: Basic Books, 1979.
- Secomb, Linnell. *Philosophy and Love: From Plato to Popular Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
- Sherman, J. Howard. Hunt, E.K. Reynold, F. Phillip, Nesiba. O'Hara, A and Wiens-Tuers, Barbara. eds. *Economics: An Introduction to Traditional and Progressive Views*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Smith, Verity. ed. *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Streissguth, Tom. *The Greenhaven Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2008.

Thomas, Lynn M. *Politics of the Womb: Women, Reproduction and the State in Kenya*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Viala, Fabienne. *The Post-Columbus Syndrome: Identities, Cultural Nationalism, and Commemorations in the Caribbean*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Volkmann, Laurenz. Grimm, Nancy. Detmers, Ines and Thomson, Katrin. eds. *Local Natures, Global Responsibilities: Ecocritical Perspectives on the New English Literatures*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

Walton, Jonathan L. *Watch This! The Ethics and Aesthetics of Black Televangelism*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.

Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. *Secret Lives and Other Stories*. London: Vintage, 1975.

Whisenhunt, Donald W. *Reading the Twentieth Century: Documents in American History*. Lanham: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, 2009.

Williams, Basil. *The Whig Supremacy 1714-1760*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

Zantop, Susanne. *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*. London: Duke University Press, 1997.

c- Criticism and Literature Books:

Arnold, James A. Kutzinski, Vera M. and Phaf-Rheinberger, Ineke. eds. *A History of Literature in the Caribbean English-and Dutch –Speaking Regions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

Attar, Samar. *The Vital Roots of European Enlightenment Ibn Tufayl's Influence on Modern Western Thought*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007.

Attwell, David. ed. *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

_____. *J. M. Coetzee and the Life of Writing: Face-to-Face with Time*. New York: Penguin Books, 2015.

Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of Age: A Bibliography of the Mind of William Shakespeare*. New York: Random House, 2009.

Battiste, Marie. ed. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000.

Baugh, Edward. *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Derek Walcott*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Bigliuzzi, Silvia and Calvi, Lisanna. eds. *Revisiting The Tempest: The Capacity to Signify*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Bloom, Harold. ed. *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jamaica Kincaid*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008.

_____. *Bloom's Shakespeare through Ages: The Tempest*. New York: Bloom's Library Criticism, 1994.

_____. ed. *Derek Walcott*. Broomall: Chelsea House Publishers, 2003.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bongie, Chris. *Islands and Exiles: The Creole Identities of Post/colonial Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=juC7vaxM80C&pg=PA430&dq=shakespeare+defoe&hl=fr&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=shakespeare%20defoe&f=false.

Borsing, Christopher. *Daniel Defoe and the Representation of Personal Identity*. London: Routledge, 2017.

Braziel, Jana Evans. *Caribbean Genesis: Jamaica Kincaid and the Writing of New Worlds*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2009.

Breslin, Paul. *No Body's Nation: Reading Derek Walcott*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Brevik, Frank W. *The Tempest and New World-Utopian Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Burrows, Victoria. *Whiteness and Trauma: The Mother–Daughter Knot in the Fiction of Jean Rhys, Jamaica Kincaid and Toni Morrison*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Canepari-Labib, Michela. *Old Myths – Modern Empires Power, Language and Identity in J.M. Coetzee's Work*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2005.

Cartelli, Thomas. *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*. Routledge: London, 1999.

Cartmell, Deborah. Hunter, I. Q. Kaye, Heidi and Whelehan, Imelda. eds. *Classics in Film and Fiction*. London: Pluto Press, 2000.

Cefalu, Paul. *Revisionist Shakespeare: Transitional Ideologies in Texts and Contexts*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Childs, Peter. ed. *Post-Colonial Theory and English Literature: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.

Cowart, David. *Literary Symbiosis: The Reconfigured Text in Twentieth-Century Writing*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993.

Craiu, Aurelian and Isaac, Jeffrey C. eds. *America Through European Eyes: British and French Reflections on the New World from Eighteenth Century to Present*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=RgjSY1DouwUC&pg=PA104&dq=France+Victor+Schoelcher+his+first+trip+to+america&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjNvc76oIX7AhUR_rsIHXjGAkYQ6AF6BAGKEAI#v=onepage&q=France%20Victor%20Schoelcher%20his%20first%20trip%20to%20america&f=false.

- Crosman, Robert. *The World is a Stage: Shakespeare and the Dramatic View of Life*. Washington: Academica Press, 2005.
- CZigányik, Zsolt. ed. *Utopian Horizons: Ideology, Politics, Literature*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2017.
- Danta, Chris. Kossew, Sue and Murphet, Julian. eds. *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.
- Davis, Gregson. *Aimé Césaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Dionne, Craig and Kapadia, Parmita. eds. *Native Shakespeares Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Drabble, Margaret. ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. New York: Oxford, 2000.
- Effe, Alexandra. *J. M. Coetzee and the Ethics of Narrative Transgression: A Reconsideration of Metalepsis*. Gewerbestrasse: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Fallon, Ann Marie. *Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=F-4GDAAAQBAJ&pg=PA77&lpg=PA77&dq=south+african+revisions:+J.+M.+Coetzee,+Nadine+Gordimer+and+Bessie+Head&source=bl&ots=EaI754_7O&sig=ACfU3U0whGju9TJBs3FH_ON8cpA7aISs8w&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiDrbqOzaX4AhVsyoUKHexZD9oQ6AF6BAgTEAM#v=onepage&q=south%20african%20revisions%3A%20J.%20M.%20Coetzee%20and%20Bessie%20Head&f=false
- Frank, Katherine. *Crusoe Daniel Defoe, Robert Knox and the Creation of a Myth*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2012.
- Ferretter, Luke. *Routledge Critical Thinkers: Louis Althusser*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Fetzer Anita and Oishi, Etsuko. eds. *Context and Contexts: Parts Meet Whole?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.
- Fortier, Mark. *Theory/Theatre: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Gale de Saxe, Jennifer. *Critical Feminism and Critical Education: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Gikandi, Simon. *Cambridge Studies in African Caribbean Literature: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Gill, Richard. *Mastering Shakespeare*. London: Macmillan Press, 1998.

- Goldberg, Jonathan. *Tempest in the Caribbean*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- Grapard, Ulla and Hewitson, Gillian. eds. *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Griffith, Paul A. *Afro-Caribbean Poetry and Ritual*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Griffiths, Trevor R. and Woddis, Carole. *The Theatre Guide*. 3rd ed. London: A and C Black Publishers, 2003.
- Hackler, M. B. and Adipurwawidjana, Ari J. *On and Off the Page: Mapping place in Text and Culture*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=xwQZBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA71&dq=island+important+to+Coetzee+Foe+Daniel+Defoe+Crusoe&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiG4KzrYP7AhWaSfEDHfxpBwkQ6AF6BAgGEAI#v=onepage&q=island%20important%20to%20Coetzee%20Foe%20Daniel%20Defoe%20Crusoe&f=false>.
- Handley, George B. *New World Poetics: Nature and the Adamic Imagination of Whitman, Neruda, and Walcott*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007.
- Hartley, James. *The Shakespearean Dramaturg: A Theoretical and Practical Guide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Hayes, Patrick and Wilm, Jan. eds. *Beyond the Ancient Quarrel Literature, Philosophy, and J. M. Coetzee*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017
- Head, Dominic. *The Cambridge Introduction to J. M. Coetzee*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Hicks, Heather J. *The Post-Apocalyptic Novel in the Twenty-First Century: Modernity beyond Salvage*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Hollander, Rachel. *Narrative Hospitality in Late Victorian Fiction: Novel Ethics*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Hoppenstand, Gary. *Perilous Escapades: Dimensions of Popular Adventure Fiction*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, 2018.
- Horlacher, Stefan. ed. *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2011.
- Howard, E. Jean and O'Connor, F. Marion. *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=neXcAAAQBAJ&pg=PA7&dq=Shakespeare+Reproduce d:+The+Text+in+History+and+Ideology&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj5xrqWgdH7AhXNV6QEhfDQAJ8Q6AF6BAgCEAI#v=onepage&q=Shakespeare%20Reproduced%3A%20The%20Text%20in%20History%20and%20Ideology&f=false>.
- Huber, Werner. Mettinger, Elke and Zettelmann, Eva. eds. *Dramatic Minds Performance, Cognition, and the Representation of Interiority*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2015.
- Hulme, Peter. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean 1492–1797*. London: Methuen, 1986.

- Hulme, Peter and Sherman, William H. eds. *'The Tempest' and its Travels*. London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- Huggan, Graham and Watson, Stephen. eds. *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996.
- Kannemeyer, J. C. trans. Michiel Heyns. *J. M. Coetzee: A Life in Writing*. Victoria: Scribe, 2012.
- Kaul, Suvir. *Eighteenth-Century British Literature and postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
- Kenney, Arthur F. and Hooper, Warren Thomas. eds. *A New Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2017.
- Killeen, Jarlath. *The Fairy Tales of Oscar Wilde*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- King, Bruce. ed. *Post-Colonial English Drama: Commonwealth Drama since 1960*. Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press, 1992.
- King, Bruce. ed. *The Later Fictions of Nadine Gordimer*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.
- Kinney, Arthur F. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kossew, Sue and Harvey, Melinda. eds. *Reading Coetzee's Women*. Gewerbestrasse: The Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Kott, Jan. *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. trans. Boleslaw Taborski. Warsaw: Doubleday and Company, 1964.
- Kumar, Krishan and Bann, Stephen. eds. *Utopias and the Millennium*. London: Reaktion Books, 1993.
- Lie, Nadia and Haen, d'. Theo. *Constellation Caliban: Figurations of a Character*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=JMPhRK1Ms94C&pg=PA272&dq=has+logically+been+re+read+and+rewritten+as+a+manifesto+of+decolonisation+and+a+myth+of+transatlantic&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiHxvmcp4X7AhWj_7sIHQK4DqkQ6AF6BAgBEAI#v=onepage&q=has%20logically%20been%20reread%20and%20rewritten%20as%20a%20manifesto%20of%20decolonisation%20and%20a%20myth%20of%20transatlantic&f=false.
- Loomba, Ania. *Cultural Politics: Gender, Race Renaissance Drama*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Lunch, Stephen J. *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Sources and Plays*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998.
- MacDonald, Joyce Green. *Shakespearean Adaptation, Race and Memory in the New World*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Majumdar, Margaret A. *Postcoloniality: The French Dimension*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.

- Mckeeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- McLeod, John. ed. *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Mehigan, Tim. ed. *A Companion to the Works of J. M. Coetzee*. New York: Camden House, 2011.
- Mooneeram, Roshni. *From Creole to Standard Shakespeare, Language, and Literature in a Postcolonial Context*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Morrison, V. James. *Shipwrecked: Disaster and Transformation in Homer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and the Modern World*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2014.
- Morris, Pam. *Realism*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Mueller, K. E. Andreas and Ridley, Glynis. eds. *Robinson Crusoe after 300 Years*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2021.
- Mullan, John. *How Novels Work*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Nasta, Susheila. ed. *Writing Across Worlds Contemporary Writers Talk*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Nayar, Pramod K. *The Postcolonial Studies Dictionary*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Nelson, Emmanuel S. ed. *Contemporary African American Novelists: A Bio-Bibliographical Critical Sourcebook*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Nicholls, Brendon. *Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Gender, and the Ethics of Postcolonial Reading*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010.
- Nichols, Ian. *The Pocket Essential William Shakespeare*. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2002.
- Nnolim, Charles E. *Issues in African Literature*. Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2010.
- Ogude, James. *Ngugi's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*. London: Pluto Press, 1999.
- Olson, Paul A. *Beyond a Common Joy: An Introduction to Shakespearean Comedy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.
- O'Malley, Andrew. *Children's Literature, Popular Culture, and Robinson Crusoe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- O'Sullivan, Emer. *Historical Dictionary of Children's Literature*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2010.
- Peter Melville Logan, ed. *The Encyclopedia of the Novel*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2011.
- Poddar, Prem. Patke, S. Rajeev and Lars Jensen. eds. *A Historical Companion to Postcolonial Literatures –Continental Europe and its Empires*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.

- Poyner, Jane. *J. M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Puri, Shalini. *The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post/Nationalism, and Cultural Hybridity*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- Purkiss, Diane. *The Witch in History Early Modern and Twentieth-century Representations*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Reimer, Mavis. ed. *Home Words: Discourses of Children's Literature in Canada*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008.
- Retamar, Fernández Roberto. *Caliban and Other Essays* trans. Edward Baker. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971.
- Richetti, John. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- _____. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to "Robinson Crusoe"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- _____. *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography*. London: Blackwell publishing, 2005.
- Rivier, Estelle and Brown, C. Eric. eds. *Shakespeare in Performance*. Newcastle: Cambridge Schooling Publishers, 2013. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=DTYyBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA185&lpg=PA185&dq=shakespeare+influence+ngugi&source=bl&ots=W18mdW0sGX&sig=2KOH7Y10cPLPoicGBRFjO23VSDQ&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0CBsQ6AEwAGoVChMI7PaMmcHjyAIViloUCh0jzwEw#v=onepage&q=shakespeare%20influence%20ngugi&f=false>.
- Roberts, Neil. ed. *A Companion to Twentieth-Century Poetry*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- Rogers, Pat. *Robinson Crusoe*. London: Unwin Critical Library, 1979.
- Rollyson, Carl. ed. *Critical Survey of Long Fiction*. New Jersey: Salem Press, 2010.
- Scott, Helen C. *Shakespeare's Tempest and Capitalism: The Storm of History*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2020.
- Shapiro, James S. *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* London: Faber and Faber, 2010.
- Skinner, John. *The Stepmother Tongue: An Introduction to New Anglophone Fiction*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Slater, Niall W. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 2000.
- Sorensen, Park Eli. *Postcolonial Studies and the Literary Theory, Interpretation and the Novel*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

- Spaas, Lieve and Stimpson, Brian. eds. *Robinson Crusoe Myths and Metamorphoses*. London: MacMillan, 1996.
- Speake, Jennifer. ed. *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Spivak, Chakravorty Gayatri. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. London: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Stam, Robert. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Starks-Estes, Lisa S. *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Play: Transforming Ovid*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
- Stone, David. *The Tempest*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thrones Ltd, 2003. in https://books.google.dz/books?id=2q-Gv7FSyp8C&pg=PA1&dq=There+are+many+cross-references+between+Strachey%E2%80%99s+account+and&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi085qqo4X7AhWli_0HHe_JDCsQ6AF6BAgGEAI#v=onepage&q=There%20are%20many%20cross-references%20between%20Strachey%E2%80%99s%20account%20and&f=false.
- Tigner, Amy L. *Literature and the Renaissance: From Elizabeth I to Charles II*. Farnham, Ashgate: 2012.
- Todd, Dennis. *Defoe's America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Turner, Frederick. *Beyond Geography: The Western Spirit against Wilderness*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- Vásquez, Sam. *Humor in the Caribbean Literary Canon*. New York, Palgrave McMillan: 2012.
- Vaughan T. Alden and Vaughan, Mason Virginia. eds. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- _____. eds. *The Tempest: A Critical Reader*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014.
- Vetter, Lara. *By Avon River H. D.* Gainesville: The University Press of Florida, 2014.
- Vitkus, Daniel. *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean 1570-1630*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1957.
- _____. *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Weaver-Hightower, Rebecca. *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare on Masculinity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- West-Pavlov, Russell. *Transcultural Graffiti: Diasporic Writing and the Teaching of Literary Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Widdowson, H. G. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Williams, Patrick. *Ngugi Wa Thiong'o*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=owRz6pGiRKOc&pg=PA2&dq=british+misinterpreted+land+kenya&hl=fr&sed=0ahUKEwiXu5WL88flAhUqyoUKHfAxAYoQ6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=british%20misinterpreted%20land%20kenya&f=false>.

Wilson, Richard. *The Man Who Was Robinson Crusoe: A Personal View of Alexander Selkirk*. Glasgow: Neil Wilson Publishing Ltd, 2011.

Wisker, Gina. *Post-colonial and African American Women's Writing: A Critical Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Zabus, Chantal. *Tempests after Shakespeare*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Zander, Horst. *Fact - Fiction – "faction": A Study of Black South African Literature in English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1999. in <https://books.google.dz/books?id=Thw5n9IZLowC&pg=PA108&dq=if+I+had+lived+elsewhere,+my+writing+would+%5Bnot%5D+have+reflected+politics+much,+if+at+all+%5B...%5D+I+didn%E2%80%99t+know+what+politics+was+about+until+I+saw+it+all+happening+to+people&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwin1dD9nIX7AhVchP0HHaz9De8Q6AF6BAgIEAI#v=onepage&q=if%20I%20had%20lived%20elsewhere%2C%20my%20writing%20would%20%5Bnot%5D%20have%20reflected%20politics%20much%2C%20if%20at%20all%20%5B...%5D%20I%20didn%E2%80%99t%20know%20what%20politics%20was%20about%20until%20I%20saw%20it%20all%20happening%20to%20people&f=false>.

d- Articles and Journals:

Arnold, A. James. "Césaire and Shakespeare: Two Tempests," in *Comparative Literature*, Vol 30: N° 03, 1978, Duke University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1770825>.

Auga, Ulrike. "Intellectuals between Resistance and Legitimation: The Cases of Nadine Gordimer and Christa Wolf," in *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa*, Vol 15: N° 01, 2003, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2003.9678139>.

Boehmer, Elleke. "'The Master's Dance to the Master's Voice': Revolutionary Nationalism and Women's Representation in Ngugi wa Thiong'o," in *Stories of Women*, Vol. 26, N° 01, 2005, Manchester University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt155j4ws.6>.

Bongie, Chris. "'Lost in the Maze of Doubting': J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* and the Politics of (Un)Likeness," in *Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol 39: N° 2, 1993.

Breslin, Paul and Hamner, Robert. "Derek Walcott," in *Callaloo*, Vol 28: N° 01, 2005.

Caminero-Santangelo, Byron. "Neocolonialism and the Betrayal Plot in "A Grain of Wheat": Ngugi wa Thiong'o's Re-Vision of "Under Western Eyes," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 29: N° 1, 1998, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3820536>.

Clowes, W. Edith. "The Robinson Myth Reread in Postcolonial and Postcommunist Modes," in *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol 36: N° 2, 1995.

- Cox, D. John. "Recovering Something Christian about *The Tempest*," in *Christianity and literature*, Vol 50: N° 01, 2000.
- Fasselt, Rebecca "(Post)Colonial We-Narratives and the "Writing Back" Paradigm: Joseph Conrad's *The Nigger of the "Narcissus"* and Ngugi wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in *Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics*, Vol 37: N° 01, 2016.
- Ferris, R. William. "A Multiplicity of Voices: A Conversation with Derek Walcott," in *Humanities*, Vol 22: N° 01, 2001, The National Endowment for Humanities.
- Fishelov, David. "Dialogues with/and Great Books: With Some Serious Reflections on "Robinson Crusoe,"" in *New Literary Source*, Vol 39: N° 02, 2008.
- Glenn, Ian. "Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and the Dilemmas of the Intellectual Elite in Africa: A Sociological Perspective," in *English in Africa*, Vol 08: N° 02, 1981, Rhodes University, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40399035>.
- Greenfield, Matthew. "Coetzee's "Foe" and Wittgenstein's "Philosophical Investigations": Confession, Authority, and Private Languages," in *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, Vol 25, N° 03, 1995.
- Hale, A. Thomas. "Aimé Césaire: A Bio-Bibliographical Note," in *Callaloo*, Vol 01: N° 17, 1983, The John Hopkins University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3044019>.
- Hannabuss, Stuart. "Castaway Themes in Children's Books," in *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2009, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614540009510625>.
- Hoffmann, David. "Saint Lucia Guide," in *DHB Guides*, Vol 43: N° 01, 2013.
- Hemphill, Ailsa. "Voicing Freedom: The Meaning of Uhuru in Ngugi wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*," in *Grounding*, Vol 06: N° 01, 2013, Glasgow University Dialectic Society, Glasgow.
- Janes, Regina. "'Writing Without Authority': J.M. Coetzee and His Fictions," in *Salmagundi*, Vol 01: N° 114/115, 1997, Skidmore College, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40548964>.
- Knott, Jan. "The Aeneid and the Tempest," in *A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Vol 03: N° 04, 1976, Trustees of Boston University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20163431>.
- Koot, Stasja. "Articulations of Inferiority: From Pre-colonial to Post-colonial Paternalism in Tourism and Development among the Indigenous Bushmen of Southern Africa," in *History and Anthropology*, Vol 1: N° 1, 2020, Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2020.1830387>.
- Kraft, Elizabeth. "The Revaluation of Literary Character: The Case of *Crusoe*," in *South Atlantic Review*, Vol 72: N° 04, 2007, South Atlantic Modern Language Association, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27784739>.
- Krause, Delia. "A Grain of Wheat: Ngugi's Tribute to the Armed Rebellion," in *Wasafiri*, Vol 4: N° 9, 1988, Routledge, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02690058808574172>.

Lindsay, Tom. “Which First was Mine Own King”: Caliban and the Politics of Service and Education in “The Tempest”, in *Studies in Philology*, Vol 113: N° 02, 2016, University of North Carolina Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43921892>.

Mahdi, Saleh Ghaith. “Derek Wolcott’s *Pantomime as a Postcolonial Critique*,” in *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, Vol 04: N° 09, 2020.

Marrouchi, Mustapha. “Fear of the “Other”, Loathing the Similar,” in *The Profession of Literature at the End of the Millennium*, Vol 26: N° 3, 1999, *College Literature*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25112474>.

Mayer, Robert. “Global Crusoe: Comparative Literature, Postcolonial Theory and Transnational Aesthetics by Ann Marie Fallon (Review),” in, *Project Muse*, Vol: 47, N° 02, 2015, The Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/scb/summary/v048/48.1.mayer.html>.

Mbungang, J. Derick. “Intertextuality in Jamaica Kincaid’s *Annie John*,” in *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, Vol 02: N° 01, 2017, *International Open Access Journal*, www.ijtsrd.com.

McInelly, C. Brett. “Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and *Robinson Crusoe*,” in *Studies in the Novel*, Vol 35: N° 1, 2003.

Micó, Giménez Antonio José. “Occupying the Isle; or, Which Monster—and Which Island—Are We Talking About?,” in *Hispanic Issues Online*, Vol 15: N° 1, 2014.

Mugesera, Léon. “Guilt and Redemption in Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s “A Grain of Wheat,” in *Présence Africaine*, Vol 01: N° 125, 1983, *Présence Africaine Editions*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24350692>.

Nixon, Rob. “Caribbean and African Appropriations of “The Tempest”,” in, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 13: N° 03, 1987, University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343513>.

Nosworthy, J. M. “The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*,” in *The Review of English Studies*, Vol 24: N° 96, 1948, Oxford University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/510670>.

Pare, Granite. ““Burn But His Books”: Education and Colonization in *The Tempest* and *Annie John*,” in *The Ashen Egg*, Vol 07: N° 01, 2019, Western Kentucky University, Kentucky.

Pinto, Pacheco Marta. “Postcolonial Language: Rejection and Subversion,” in *Babilónia*, Vol 09: N° 08, 2010.

Plath, Mullan Zarina. “Issues of Identity in the Politics of Race: Jamaica Kincaid and the Post-Colonial Fiction of Invention,” in *Journal of West Indian Literature*, Vol 07: N° 02, 1998, *Journal of West Indian Literature*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23019708>.

Porter, M. Laurence. “Aimé Césaire’s Reworking of Shakespeare: Anticolonialist Discourse in “*Une Tempête*”,” in *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol 32: N° 03, 1995, Penn State University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247009>.

Probyn-Rapsey, Fiona. “J M Coetzee: Writing with/out authority,” in *Jouvert: a Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, Vol 07: N° 01, 2002.

Rampaul, A. Giselle. "Black Crusoe, White Friday: Carnavalesque Reversals in Samuel Selvon's *Muses Ascending* and Derek Walcott's *Pantomime*," in *Culture, Language and Representation*, Vol 01: N° 01, 2004.

Rich, Paul. "Liberal Realism in South African Fiction, 1948-1966," in *English in Africa*, Vol 12: N° 01, 1985, Rhodes University, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238565>.

Sarnecki, Holland Judith. "Mastering the Masters: Aimé Césaire's Creolization of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*," in *The American Review*, Vol: 74, N° 02, 2000, American Association of Teachers of French, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/398722>.

Skura, Anne Meredith. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*," in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol 40: N° 01, 1989, Folger Shakespeare Library, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2870753>.

Solomon, Robin Julie. "Going Places: Absolutism and Movement in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*," in *Renaissance Drama, Essays on Epistemological Transformations and Theater History*, Vol 22: N° 1, 1991, The University of Chicago Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41917271>.

Trump, Martin. "The Short Fiction of Nadine Gordimer," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 17: N° 03, 1986, Indiana University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3819220>.

Turk, Tisha. "Intertextuality and the Collaborative Construction of Narrative: J. M. Coetzee's *Foe*," in *Narrative*, Vol 19: N° 03, 2011.

Valens, Keja. "Obvious and Ordinary: Desire between Girls in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol 25: N° 02, 2004, University of Nebraska Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3347307>.

Watson, Mathew. "Competing Models of Socially Constructed Economic Man: Differentiating Defoe's *Crusoe* from the *Robinson* of Neoclassical Economics," in *New Political Economy*, Vol 16: N° 5, 2011.

Woltmann, Suzy. "Annie John, the Postcolonial Palimpsest, and the Limits of Adaptation," in *Postcolonial Interventions*, Vol 04: N° 01, 2020.

Yeoh, Gilbert. "From Caliban to Sycorax: Revisions of *The Tempest* in Jamaica Kincaid's *Annie John*," in *World Literature Written in English*, Vol 33: N° 02, 1993, New York University, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449859308589210>.

e- Web Sites:

Silver, Cathy. "Umbrellas: Drenched in History," in <https://www.nytimes.com/1981/05/06/garden/umbrellas-drenched-in-history.html>, Accessed on 23/02/ 2020.

سعى البحث الحالي إلى دراسة مسرحية ويليام شكسبير "العاصفة" (1611) (*The Tempest*) في علاقة وثيقة مع رواية "حبة قمح" للكاتب الكيني نفوقى واثيرونفو (1967) (*Ngũgĩ Wa Thion'o's A Grain of Wheat*) و مسرحية "عاصفة" من تأليف إيمي سيزار (1969) (*Aimé Césaire's A Tempest*) بالإضافة إلى رواية جامايكا كينسيد المسماة "آني جون" (*Jamica Kincaid's Annie John*) (1985) ؛ وقد استهدف أيضًا هذا البحث استكشاف العلاقة التي قد تربط "روبينسون كروزو" للروائي الإنجليزي دانيال ديفو (1719) بالقصة المعروفة بـ "بصمة الجمعة" لنادين جورديمر (1960) (*Nadine Gordimer's "Friday's Footprint"*) ، ومسرحية بانتومايم للكاتب الأنتيغوي ديريك والكوت (1978) (*Derek Walcott's Pantomime*) ورواية "فو" للمؤلف الجنوب إفريقي جي إم كويتزي (1986) (*J. M. Coetzee's Foe*). من حيث المحامل النظرية، إرتكز هذا البحث على نموذج تم تشكيله حول حوار النصوص التاريخي لميخائيل باختين، ومفاهيم الباحث الفرنسي جيرارد جينيت والإستمارة الأيديولوجية والثقافية لريموند ويليامز. أثناء إجراء هذه الدراسة، توصلت إلى مجموعة واسعة من النتائج. أولاً، استندت كل واحدة من التعديلات الإفريقية/الكاريبية الستة، قيد الفحص، إلى نصها الأصلي، المؤلف من طرف شكسبير أو ديفو، لإعادة إنتاج أسلوب، وبالتالي يُنظر إليها على أنها إعادة صياغة "لأصولها" أو نصها الأصلي؛ ومع ذلك، وفقاً لهذا الطرح، يجب تسليط الضوء على أن كل عمل أدبي إفريقي/كاريبي كان بعيداً كل البعد عن كونه نسخة كربونية للعمل الأصلي. تقودنا هذه الحجة إلى الإستنتاج الرئيسي الثاني الذي يتعلق بحقيقة أن كل مؤلف استخدم على نطاق واسع مصدر إلهامه/مصدر إلهامها ليناسب أغراضه/أغراضها؛ كانت النتيجة النهائية سنة نصوص، في بعض الأحيان، سخرت أو شاركت في جدال، مخفي أو علني، مع مسرحية الشاعر الإنجليزي أو رواية ديفو؛ وفقاً لاستنتاجي الثالث، في أوقات أخرى، عالجت بعض التعديلات العمل المصدر نصياً إما بالتعليق عليه وانتقاده، أو حذف، وتقليل، وتضخيم، ومراجعة مجموعة متنوعة من جوانبه. النتيجة الرابعة التي إستخلصتها مرتبطة بالطيف الإيديولوجي والثقافي لويليامز والذي كشف، بالنسبة لي، التالي: الأهمية الحاسمة للخلفية الكاملة لكل محاولة أدبية إفريقية/كاريبية تعاملت معها هذه الدراسة. نتج عن ذلك ستة نصوص إستكشفت وعبرت عن قدر كبير من الاهتمامات والقضايا والشكوك والمفاهيم والحقائق المتعلقة بلحظة إنتاجها التاريخية الدقيقة مقارنة بعصر شكسبير أو زمان ديفو. تم تقسيم هذا البحث إلى سبعة فصول. تم تخصيص الفصل الأول للنصوص "المصدر" المزعومة التي تم وضعها بكل دقة في سياقها و بيئتها التاريخية. تم تنظيم الفصول الستة التالية في جزأين، ثلاثة فصول لكل منهما، كل واحد منها معني بدراسة التكيف الإفريقي/الكاريبي لـ "العاصفة" و "روبينسون كروزو" في كل مرة.

Résumé:

La présente recherche à étudier *The Tempest* (1611) de William Shakespeare dans une relation étroite avec *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) de Ngũgĩ Wa Thion'o, *A Tempest* (1969) d'Aimé Césaire et *Annie John* (1985) de Jamaica Kincaid; il a également pour objectif d'explorer le lien possible qui pourrait lier *Robinson Crusoe* de Daniel Defoe (1719) à "*Friday's Footprint*" de Nadine Gordimer (1960), *Pantomime* de Derek Walcott (1978) et *Foe* de J. M. Coetzee (1986). Cette recherche, en termes de repères théoriques, s'est appuyée sur un paradigme constitué autour du dialogisme intertextuel historiciste de Mikhail Bakhtine, des notions de Gérard Genette et du continuum matérialiste culturel de Raymond Williams. En menant cette étude, j'ai atteint un large éventail de conclusions. Premièrement, chacune des six adaptations Africaines/Caribéennes examinées s'est appuyée sur son texte source, celui de Shakespeare ou de Defoe, reproduisant et stylisant, donc vu comme stylisation de, plusieurs éléments de leurs «originaux» ; il faut cependant souligner, à la suite de ce fil d'arguments, qu'ils [les six adaptations] sont loin d'être des copies conformes. Cela concernerait ma deuxième découverte majeure, qui est le fait que chaque auteur a fait abondamment usage de sa source d'inspiration pour le répondre à ses propres objectifs; le résultat final a été six textes qui ont parfois parodié ou engagé une polémique, cachée ou ouverte, avec la dernière pièce du barde anglais ou le premier roman de Defoe; conformément à ma troisième constatation, certaines adaptations ont, à d'autres moments, traité l'œuvre source de manière métatextuelle soit en la commentant et en la critiquant, soit en supprimant, réduisant, amplifiant et révisant une variété d'aspects du texte originale. La quatrième découverte pourrait être associée au spectre idéologique et culturel de Williams qui a révélé, pour moi, l'importance cruciale de l'ensemble du contexte de chaque tentative littéraire Africaine/Caribéennes dont cette étude a traité. Cela a abouti à six textes qui ont dû explorer et exprimer beaucoup sur les préoccupations, les problèmes, les certitudes, les incertitudes, les perceptions et les réalités de leur moment de production historique précis que de l'époque et la vie de Shakespeare ou Defoe. Cette recherche a été divisée en sept chapitres; le premier a été consacré aux présumés textes sources qui ont été examinés dans leur environnement exact. Les six chapitres suivants ont été organisés en deux parties de trois chapitres chacune, chacun d'entre elles étant concerné à la fois par l'étude d'une adaptation Africaine/Caribéenne avec sa source.