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"Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery."
Ever since William Shakespeare's time, other artists have been honoring him with recounts, rearrangements, and visual and musical representations of his work. Shakespeare's characters have become by-words, and his quotations, proverbs. This paper is a selective look at the literary life and times of one Shakespearean character, Caliban, the monster from The Tempest.

Shakespeare's characters are so pervasive in our culture that they have developed the disconcerting habit of taking different forms and functions as they waft across the metaphorical landscape of our language and thought. Much of this nebulousness is due to the effects of competing literary interpretations. Hamlet, for instance, can be anything from an ineffective nebbish to a philosopher of immense profundity, depending on the interpretation you follow of the play and his role in it. About Caliban, however, there is general critical agreement. In appearance and behavior, he is a monster, a "bestial man", an object of horror and pity. This is the role he takes in critical discussions of The Tempest, and it is the starting point from which post-Shakespearean creative writers treating of Caliban have begun.

One striking fact about Caliban that should be made clear immediately is that he is an original creation of Shakespeare's. Though Shakespeare was one of the most derivative authors of all time, borrowing plots and characters from a variety of sources, to the point where searching for his sources is a major scholarly pastime, his genius showed original creativity even in his most derivative plays. The Tempest is the least derivative of his plays. It has its possible plot sources, which are beyond the scope of this paper, but a critic can say wistfully of The Tempest that "no really convincing general source for the play has yet been discovered."[1] Though the phrasing may suggest that he expects to find one, perhaps, just for once, Shakespeare was being truly original. Caliban stands out as the most distinctive character of this distinctive play.

There is no specific physical description of Caliban in The Tempest, but it is not difficult to determine what some of the other characters think of him. The wizard Prospero describes him as "a freckled whelp, has-born, not honored with a human shape" (I.i.283-4)[2] and refers to him as a "beast", a "monster", and lastly as "this thing of darkness" (V.i.275). Despite the vitriol in these remarks, they are at least in part merely typical Prosperan invective. The wizard is capricious at best, even towards Ariel, whom he calls "malignant thing" when in a bad mood and "fine spirit" the moment he is pleased with his activities. In the course of The Tempest Prospero expresses perhaps as much dislike towards Caliban, Ariel, and the spirits as he does towards Antonio, the play's villain. As Caliban replies of Prospero, the spirits "all do hate him as rootedly as I." (III.ii.91-2) There are also different rhetorical connotations: the term "monster" was in Shakespeare's day still in the process of changing meaning from a word of simple physical description, meaning an abnormal creature, to a pejorative.

A less pre-judged physical description of Caliban comes from Trinculo the jester. He comes across Caliban, who is pretending to be a rock in hopes of being ignored, and is not at first sure what to make of him at all:

What have we here? a man or a fish? dead or alive? A fish; he smells like a fish; a very ancient and fishlike smell.

(II.ii.24-26)

Then he looks a little closer:

Legged like a man! and his fins like arms! Warm, o' my troth! I do now let loose my opinion, hold it no longer: this is no fish, but an islander, that hath lately suffered by a thunderbolt. (II.ii.32-35)

So Caliban is not a fish; he just smells like one. But the overall impression of him as semihuman at best is clearly conveyed. His ancestry adds to the image: his mother, Sycora, was a witch from the exotic Barbary coast; his father unknown, possibly an incubus or, as Prospero says in anger, "the devil himself" (I.ii.319). The Restoration playwright John Dryden asserted that such a parentage was "not wholly beyond the bounds of credibility", which says more than enough about seventeenth-century popular science.[3]

Caliban's behavior confirms this impression even more strongly. When he first appears on stage, in Act 1, Scene 2, he is a fugure of menace and terror. Prospero keeps him locked up, because though a useful slave he is dangerous and entirely untrustworthy, having once tried to rape the wizard's daughter Miranda. For Caliban's part, he isn't sorry he did it; he has been cheated of his freedom, and curses Prospero soundly for it. His intent in assaulting Miranda was to impregnate her, to people "this isle with Calibans". One can see his reasoning: the more Calibans, the less likely that one unemployed wizard could displace them.

Caliban's argument in his own defense is that he was his own master until Prospero arrived. At first he was pleased to have the wizard's praise, and especially his learning — he was eager to know things and to become articulate. But then he realized that Prospero intended to be master with himself to be the servant, and rebelled. For his part Prospero had intended nothing more than a benign dictatorship until Caliban attacked his daughter, and then he in his turn felt betrayed.[4] This situation is, to my mind, a more starkly believable misfortune than some of Shakespeare's tragedies. Caliban's reasoning is particularly important to keep in mind when comparing Shakespeare's use of the character with that of later authors.

Critical interpretation of Caliban has frequently focused on his role as a savage man and as the island's token native. Symbolically, this is valid, although, as we have seen, he barely qualifies as human and by ancestry is not even a native of the island. For symbolic purposes, he functions as a generic primitive human, or what used to be called "the missing link"[5], and can be viewed as a deliberate satire on the concept of the "noble savage", the idealized inhabitant.
Caliban's name has been the subject of some particularly revealing and ingenious suggestions. That the name is a metathesis of "cannibal" seems to be generally accepted, although cannibalism is not one of Caliban's sins (and even if it were, Shakespeare's Dickensian coinages are not so contorted: a name like Sir Toby Belch is at least straightforward). Other writers have postulated a similarity to an Arabic slang word meaning "vile dog", or suggested a relationship to Kali, the Hindu goddess of destruction.[8] These ideas would seem to tell more about what the scholars in question have been reading lately than anything about what Shakespeare may have read.

Certainly there is more to Caliban than bestiality, but it is this aspect that travels with the name in our culture. The ways in which intellectual writers—not just Shakespearean critics and indeed not even just literary scholars—have evoked the name of Caliban are both colorful and revealing, because in their casualness they show how we as a society think of him. Ursula K. Le Guin placed Caliban in company of the right hue in her essay "The Child and the Shadow":

The shadow is on the other side of our psyche, the dark brother of the conscious mind. It is Cain, Caliban, Frankenstein's monster, Mr. Hyde. It is Vergil who guided Dante through hell, Gilgamesh's friend Enkidu, Prodo's enemy Calum. It is the Doppelganger. It is Mowgli's Grey Brother; the werewolf; the wolf, the bear, the tiger of a thousand folktales; it is the serpent, Lucifer.[9]

(And, of course, it is God's shadow in Le Guin's A Wizard of Earthsea.)

Le Guin's point in making this list is that the shadow is a necessary key to the exploration of the unconscious. It is our friend in some senses, especially by the sheer necessity of its presence, but it is also our enemy. My point in quoting the list is, however, merely to illustrate, as graphically as possible, the perception of Caliban in our culture. Le Guin is not writing about Caliban, but it is interesting that she should use him as a figure in the broader canvas she is painting. Consider his neighbors: Mr. Hyde, literally the evil side of man; Cain, the first murderer; Frankenstein's monster. The last of these is a particularly interesting choice. In Mary Shelley's novel the monster is a tragic figure, not evil but misunderstood. The connotations he has acquired since then, though, could have been handed down by the monster that chased him. Caliban too has been misunderstood by posterity in a way.

Our perception of Caliban can be seen most clearly in the use of his name as a metaphor. Consider these resonant titles:

A book on miscegenation and the resultant offspring was imaginatively called Children of Caliban on its first appearance, in England. It was blandly retitled Children of Conflict for American republication.

Music critic Wilfrid Mellers called one of his books Caliban Reborn, in reference to the rise of deliberate primitivism in the music of Stravinsky and other twentieth-century composers.

Robert Silverberg used the name "Caliban" as the title for a science fiction story.[10] It's a very stark little tale, and begins simply:

They have all changed their faces to a standard model. It is the latest thing... I have no idea how it is done but I think it is genetic, with the RNA, the DNA. Only retroactive. They all come out with blond wavy hair and sparkling blue eyes. And long straight faces with sharp cheekbones. And notched chins and thin lips curling in ironic smiles. Even the black ones: thin lips, blue eyes, blond wavy hair. And pink skins. They all look alike now. The sweet Aryанизed world. Our entire planet. Except me. Mee. (p. 63)

Despite their deliberately chosen standardization, the women of this world find the narrator's very strangeness to be sexually attractive. At first he enjoys his popularity, but later finds it uncomfortable, and finally has himself changed to their standard model just as they are all beginning to change—to his.

The story is as much a satire on fashion as anything else, but the title must have been chosen for a different reason. Shakespeare's Caliban is not fashionable, and though he's unique, uniqueness per se is not his most emphasized characteristic. Silverberg's character is a metaphorical Caliban partly because he's ugly, and secondly because he feels divorced from society.

Caliban is also seen in our culture, because of his barbarity, as being inarticulate. (This is a rather odd impression, since in his scenes with Stephano and Trinculo he speaks in verse, though rather prose-like verse, while they use completely unversed prose.) In any case, this conception was proven in the most back-handed way possible by W.H. Auden in his work, The Gen and the Mirror. This was intended as an epilogue to The Owl at the Window and contained his final section a speech in prose titled "Caliban to the Audience". It's not directly about Caliban, but serves as an oration on the role of the artist in society, and is written as a deliberately outlandish pastiche. Auden explained it thus: "The whole point about the verbal style is that, since Caliban is inarticulate, he has to borrow, from Ariel, the most artificial style possible, i.e. that of Hermes."[11] Auden used in this work the idea of Caliban as representing animal nature in contrast to Ariel's spiritual nature. As servants of Prospero they reflect the two sides of the wizard's humanity.[12]

A more working-class, casual reference to Caliban is to be found in a story by John Wain, C.S. Lewis'
student who ignored his tutor's example and became a
picaronesque novelist instead of a fantasy writer. The
story's narrator and another man are choosing the stage
name for a new exhibition wrestler:

"I've got a name for him", he said. "Did
you see that look that came over his face?
Sort of ape-like? That's worth a fortune in
the ring."

"What's the name?" I said, a bit short.
"King Caliban," he said.
"King Who?" I asked. It sounded a bit
funny to me.

"Caliban. He was some kind of monster on
a desert island, as far as I know. That's the
angle to stress — the barbaric."

"Why not call him the Missing Link and
done with?" I asked.[13]

In a sense, this is the bottom line. These men
certainly have not read Shakespeare; they're not even
sure who Caliban is. Though they are fictional
characters and not real working-class men, they are
what Wain imagines such men to be like — a writer and
critics' perception of what a lower-class view of
Caliban would be. As a perception, then, its importance
is comparable to the other perceptions already
discussed. It is also worth noting that the whole
reference in Wain's story is casual — the wrestler's
name, though it is the story's title as well, does not
necessarily bear on the story's real point, which is an
ironic look at the way a gentle man can be driven into
violence against his will. Perhaps it is relevant,
though, because the name could be said of the original
Caliban. (Which is not to say that Wain intended his
character to resemble Shakespeare's on that point.)

The most appropriate use of Caliban's name as a
symbol is to explore the idea that Caliban was intended
by Shakespeare to resemble the American Indians. These
people were just becoming known to Europe in
Shakespeare's time, and the Europeans were intensely
curious about them. Their origins were obscure — they
might well have sprung from the union of a devil and a
witch for all anyone knew. They worshipped their own
gods, not the Christian God. Caliban mentions that
his mother Sycorax worshipped a god named Setebos
(I.iv.373; V.i.261), a name which Shakespeare
apparently picked up from travellers' reports of the
Patagonians, who lived in what is now southern
Argentina.[14]

Extending the name of Caliban beyond the American
Indians to cover all the unfortunate natives in lands
subject to European colonization, a sociologist named
Oscar Mannoni found some disconcerting parallels. Using
the French in Madagascar as a case study of the
psychology of colonization, he drew his parallels
between their opinion and treatment of the Malagasy
natives and Prospero's of Caliban. The natives are
dispossessed of their land, and their capacity to work
is exploited by their masters. As Prospero justifies
his strictness by Caliban's sexual offense, so do the
colonizers fear the sexuality of the natives and
attempt to keep it controlled. Mannoni goes on to
postulate a shared inferiority complex in Prospero and
the colonizers, but his point concerning Caliban has
been made. Those who encroach the natives consider
them sub-human, and treat them accordingly. The
relevance to the tragedy between the original Prospero
and Caliban could not be closer. The white man, out of
a sense of nobleman oblige, creates a benevolent
dictatorship, and the native resents it.[15]

So far we have seen Caliban as semi-human monster,
rapist, fishy smelling, dangerous slave, missing link,
cannibal, dog, servant of destruction, shadow,
miccagnosy, symbol of the primitives, ugly and divorced
from society, barbaric monster, and a dispossessed native.
This is the accumulated popular image of Caliban. But
there is another side to this unfortunate. No trace of
redemption can be found in the popular image, but in
the original character it's definitely there. The
Shakespearean critics of the Romantic period were
careful to point this out. Samuel Taylor Coleridge,
after comparing Caliban's moral character to that of
animals, writes, "Still, Caliban is in some respects a
noble being: the poet has raised him far above
contempt; he is a man in the sense of the imagination."
August Wilhelm von Schlegel describes Caliban as "rude,
but not vulgar; he never falls into the prosaic and low
familiarity of his drunken associates, for he is a
poetical being in his way." And William Hazlitt writes
that though Caliban "is the essence of grossness", he
is without "a particle of vulgarity." ("Vulgarity", he
explains, "is not natural coarseness, but conventional
coarseness, learned from others.")[16]

Caliban shows in his delight in nature the
"imagination" that Coleridge mentions, and proves
Schlegel's description of him as "a poetical being". He
repays Prospero's initial kindness by showing him "all
the qualities of the wild, the savage, the springs,
brine-pits, barren place and fertile" (I.i.i.337-8), and
later describes the night-sounds of the place in a
truly comedy fashion (III.ii.132-140) [17]

Schlegel also makes an interesting point by
mentioning those "drunken associates", Stephano and
Trinculo. Caliban's background of savagery as the
monster of the story — the part of his so firmly
established in popular mythology — come almost
entirely from his first appearance in Act 1, Scene 2,
with Prospero and Miranda. The entire remainder of his
part in the play is spent in the company of his drunken
associates: three scenes forming the low comedy
relief, and once again briefly at the denouement.

Trinculo and Stephano come across Caliban at the
beginning of Act 2, Scene 2. Being a primitive savage,
knowing nothing save what Sycorax, Prospero and
Miranda have taught him, and never having met anyone else,
he believes the two to be gods, "If", as he adds, "they be
not sprites." (Undoubtedly he is accustomed to the
appearances of Ariel and the spirits in odd forms.) He
is especially desirous of worshipping Stephano after
the butler gives him some of that "celestial liquor" he
has in a bottle.

Throughout the scenes, Caliban keeps to the deadly
purposes which he spelled out in Act One. His love of
the liquor creates gratitude to Stephano equal in kind
to the gratitude he originally felt toward Prospero for
feeding him and teaching him speech. Now he wishes
Prospero destroyed, and is willing to serve Stephano
to do it. He hatches a murderous plot, and the others
are bemused enough to agree to it. But the entire context
of this grim purpose has changed. Caliban's horror
suddenly deflates, and it is due entirely to his
company. He does not know how a man should behave,
and has no way of knowing that his new friends are fools
until their plans come to nought. When they show a
greater interest in wearing Prospero's gown than in
murdering the wizard and seizing his books, he calls
this his "principle" (IV.i.221-233), and realizes in taking
them for wisecracks that he has become a fool himself
(V.i.295-298). When they invade Prospero's cave, Ariel
and the spirits frighten them off, and they are
captured. From a terrifying monster, Caliban has become
a minor oddity. Nobody can remain faithful to a drunken butler for very long and continue to be regarded as terrifying. The entire episode, and Stephano’s foolish ambition to be king of the island, form a sort of comic counterpoint to the more sinister ambitions of Sebastian to become King of Naples.

But though there is some humor in Caliban’s extravagantly respectful behavior, he is for the most part the “straight man” in this silly company. His thoughts are full of revenge, not pratfalls, and his nature contains the poetic, not the prosaic.

We have now considered Caliban in his various aspects as a Shakespearian character, and as a metaphor — that is, the name of Caliban used to apply to something else. A third angle worthy of consideration is the subject of how Caliban, himself, the individual, has been recreated by subsequent authors: people making, in one way or another, homage to Shakespeare’s work. Homage to The Tempest frequently takes the form of a sequel. The play’s ending is in some ways ambiguous. Prospero has been restored to his rightful place as Duke of Milan, Miranda is betrothed to Ferdinand, and they and the shipwrecked venturers are to return to Italy. Prospero has promised to free Ariel, but what of Caliban? After the failure of the plot, Stephano and Trinculo were remanded to Antonio’s custody, and Caliban to Prospero’s. “As you look to have my pardon, trim it handsomely,” says the wizard (V.i.293-294). Has Caliban learned anything from the experience of his fancied rebellion? E.M.W. Tillyard, one of the most distinguished modern Shakespearian critics, thinks not, and writes, “Caliban may hover between man and beast, yet in the end he shows himself incapable of the human power of education.”[18] Caliban himself, however, hopes otherwise. “I’ll be wise hereafter,” he says, “and seek for grace” (V.i.295-296). Whether he finds it, and where he finds it (on the island or in Italy) is not to be discovered from The Tempest. Questions like these are the rightful province of the sequels, whose authors have generally disagreed with Mr. Tillyard, hoping for the best from Caliban.

About two hundred years after Shakespeare the ghosts of Caliban and his dam’s god Setebos were summoned up by the poet Robert Browning, in a poem titled “Caliban upon Setebos, or, Natural Theology in the Island.”[19] It is not, strictly speaking, a sequel, being set sometime during the twelve years that Prospero resides in the island, Caliban has been sent off to do some task but instead prefers to sprawl in the mud and muse about God — the only god he knows, Setebos.

As the title indicates, the poem is a study in natural theology; that is, the deductions that mortal humans can make about God from the evidence of the world around them, without the aid of revealed Scripture. Browning use Caliban as the man and Setebos as the god to make this description; this provides him with a context. Browning’s audience, unlike John Wain’s wrestling entrepreneurs, were people educated in literature. They would know who Caliban was, and what made him such an excellent potential philosopher of natural theology. Perhaps he made too much of an assumption about Setebos; the local god is mentioned only twice in The Tempest, and Browning may have sent many readers scuttling back to their copies of the play to look for him.

As a piece of theological commentary, “Caliban upon Setebos” is an oblique satire, specifically on Calvinistic philosophy, which Browning is known to have disliked. A man sees those aspects of the infinite God that are closest to his own limited self, and thus creates a personal God in his own image. Caliban in the poem is nasty, brutish, and short, and so is his Setebos. Browning in this way indirectly attacks Calvinists for being cruel and unforgiving. Setebos is also arbitrary, a more direct censure of Calvinistic predestination.[20]

Caliban’s musings are almost entirely in the third person. He makes no assumptions about Setebos’ divinity, but calls him by his right name or as “He” with a capital H; only Sycorax, Caliban’s mother, calls Setebos “God”. According to the poem, he thought of Setebos as having various properties of the Christian God, including the creation of an afterlife. Caliban, the non-Christian, doubts it:

‘Believeth with the life, the pain shall stop. His dam held different than that after death He both plagued enemies and feasted friends! Idly! He dothe His work with this one life! Giving just repose lest we die through pain, Saving last pain for worst, —with which, and end. [lines 250-255]

Caliban begins with the assumption that Setebos created the world and everything in it. He then questions the purpose behind this, and decides that Setebos...

...would not make what he dislikes or slights, An eyesore to Him, or not worth His pains: But did, in envy, listlessness or sport, Make what Himself would fain, in a manner, be — Weaker in most points, stronger in a few, Worthy, and yet mere playthings all the while, Things He admires and mocks too, — that is it. [lines 59-63]

In other words, for the same reasons that Caliban himself would create something if he had the power. And therefore, if God is of the same nature as man, merely more powerful, then he is as willfully capricious as man.

...He is strong and Lord. ‘Am strong myself compared to yonder crabs That march now from the mountain to the sea; ‘Let twenty pass, and stone the twenty-first. Loving not, hating not, just choosing so ... As it likes me each time, I do: so He. [lines 99-103, 108]

Caliban’s own misery and Prospero’s happiness, the continued existence of the world itself, are all the result of Setebos’ momentary whim. There is no rule for consistently pleasing a God of whim, so, Caliban decides, “the best way to escape His ire is, not to seem to happy.” (lines 256-257)

Browning made one significant assumption in this outline of his work; it is an important consequence of his choosing Caliban for the character. Caliban becomes a man. This stupid monster, who learned everything he knew from Sycorax and Prospero, now makes significant philosophical judgments on his own. He thinks about what Sycorax taught him, and disagrees with it. (What, one wonders, did Prospero teach Caliban about God?) He is still an uncouth native — he is depicted as sprawling in the mud, and the poem ends with his comical fear that a summer thunderstorm is Setebos’ direct wrath at his musings — but despite that, and
the primitiveness of his opinions, he has become a thinking character. Browning's Caliban is, as he should be, a different person from Shakespeare's; he is now Browning's character. Despite the Browning Caliban's lack of theological knowledge, he has native intelligence equal to any modern human's. In this way Caliban becomes something else: the force of life if by a subhuman could concoct this natural theology, it would not be worth writing this poem in response to it. Shakespeare's Caliban is a sapient monster; Browning's Caliban is Everyman.

Caliban shows up again in *A Midsummer Tempest*, a novel by Poul Anderson.[21] This book is an entirely non-theological study in What If: assume that Shakespeare was not an inventive playwright, but an utterly truthful historian, and describe the world that would result. *A Midsummer Tempest* takes place during the English Civil War, not long after Shakespeare's death. Anderson makes one other change from historical reality to get the plot going: the hero, Prince Rupert of the Rhine, King Charles I's nephew and Royalist general, is captured by the Parliamentary Roundheads after the disastrous battle of Marston Moor, instead of narrowly escaping as he did in our history.

The differences between the world of "the great Historian," as the characters call Shakespeare, and our own world of the great Playwright, are readily apparent. The characters speak in blank verse. Technology is much advanced over that of our own world at the time, for Shakespeare had put clocks that strike in *Julius Caesar*. Elves and fairies are found in the English countryside, for Shakespeare had put them there in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. As a result, Rupert and his allies call upon the magic forces as needed for railroads and King Oberon. Oberon offers his help to the Royalists because, he says, the Puritans are "a creed which bears no love for Mother Earth" and nature spirits such as himself, whereas "the Royal cause defends the Old Ways, knowing it or not."[22] He sends Rupert and two companions to Prospero's long-missing island to recover the book of magic that the wizard threw to the briny deep; at the end of the book, if Rupert is successful, uses the magic to win the war that in history was lost, and all live happily. What concerns us here is that on the island Rupert meets Ariel and Caliban, still living there through the years since the close of *The Tempest*.

Anderson's use of Caliban is a reflection of the moral tone which infuses the book. On one level, *A Midsummer Tempest* is, as one critic called it, "a thinly disguised anti-pollution tract."[23] The Puritans remind one strongly of nineteenth-century industrialists, and they have overtones of hypocrisy. Like most fantasy writers, Anderson prefers a love of nature to the slash-and-burn mentality so prevalent in the world today; he is also obviously fond of the Cavaliers for, with the help of Rupert's magic, they best the Puritans in the battle fought at the end of the book, quite contrary to primary-world history. There has to be a love interest in a good novel, so Rupert falls in love with Jennifer Alayne, niece of one of the important Puritans, and a person distinctly unsympathetic to her uncle's cause. The historical Rupert, though he lived a long and full life (and had two illegitimate children), never married. Anderson has no definite reason to suspect that Rupert would have turned out otherwise in a Shakespearean world, but he makes the assumption anyway. Heroes in a Shakespeare comedy usually get married at the end. In short, *A Midsummer Tempest* is not meant to be profound or philosophical. It is simply an escapade by a writer who loves history, Shakespeare, and happy endings.

A major feature of the novel is the rehabilitation of some things often downgraded in the past. Traditionally, the Puritans have been considered "Right but Repulsive" and the Cavaliers "Wrong but Wromatic".[24] Anderson summarily declares the Cavaliers to be Right as well as Romantic, and the few who appear in the novel are as attractive as possible. Another rehabilitation deals with that traditionally noxious monster, Caliban. Ever since Prospero and party left the island, some few years before, Ariel has been keeping the now elderly Caliban amused with "mirages for his entertainment." Ariel, however, has never dared to show images of Miranda to Caliban, for part of his rehabilitation, Caliban turns out to have been in love with her. Here is a sharp change in Caliban's personality, wrought for Anderson's literary purposes. The contrast with the attempted rape described in *The Tempest* and discusses earlier in this article is quite strong. In the play, the closest to loving Miranda Caliban comes is in a speech to Stephano about Prospero, where he says:

> And that most deeply to consider is<br>  The beauty of his daughter. He himself<br>  Calls her a nonpareil. I never saw a woman<br>  But only Sycorax my dam and she;<br>  But she as far surpasseth Sycorax<br>  As great'at does least. (III.i.95-100)

Even this contains more aesthetic appreciation of Miranda's beauty, as well as simple lust, than it does love. Caliban does feel desire for Miranda, but he is willing to surrender her to Stephano.

In *A Midsummer Tempest*, this desire is transformed into a touching affection. When Jennifer first lands on the island, alone, Caliban thinks she is Miranda and begins to worship her. Eventually he notices that she is somewhat different in appearance from Miranda, but he can never bring himself to call her anything but "the Miranda". His behavior throughout is quite gentle, despite his monstrous appearance, which Anderson describes graphically. Caliban is presented, physically, as something like the hunchback of Notre Dams in a loincloth. At the end of the Royalist party's stay on the island, Jennifer overcomes her disgust at the sight and smell of Caliban, and kisses him on the cheek. The unfortunate creature can hardly restrain his joy. Part of the change in his personality is explained by his failure to win the affection of the first Miranda. "Be not afraid," he says to Jennifer.

> When I was young, and with the first<br>  Miranda, I own I terrorized her tenderness, but none had taught me better how to be. The thoughts do drop and trickle very slow through this thick bone that sits atop my chine. None else I've had a deal of years to brood on how 'tis best Mirandas be adored.[25]

As Anderson has the Cavaliers winning the Civil War, as he puts elves in England, as he arranges the marriage of Prince Rupert, so he makes Caliban a sympathetic character. All of these changes are made to improve the charm of the Shakespeare-historical world.

Ernest Renan, a nineteenth-century French writer, also continued the story of Caliban beyond the end of *The Tempest*. In his play, *Caliban*, Prospero brings Caliban back with him to Milan. Soon, the wizard's unworldliness once again gets the better of his ducal responsibilities, with the surprising result that Caliban himself is able to supplant him. Caliban has, however, learned better than to follow Antonio's example. Rather than exiling Prospero, Caliban employs
him in his professional capacity as wizard and philosopher. [25]

To the reader familiar only with the characters as portrayed in The Tempest, this scenario may seem even less plausible than Anderson's. Renan, however, is no more really interested in strict ideas of plausibility than Anderson is. Both authors are using these familiar characters to carry ideas beyond the simple plots: Anderson is writing a romance, and Renan is attempting to express in dramatic form philosophical ideas about the relation between science and abstract thought (represented by Prospero) and the uneducated masses (represented by Caliban).

Caliban seems to have taken on a life of his own. Unbeknownst to his original creator, he has become a byword of literary allusion, and he has appeared in other fictions from that day to this. This article could not even begin to be comprehensive about the allusions. As for Caliban as a character, Browning, Anderson, and Renan are certainly not the only authors to include Caliban as a character in their own works. Percy MacKay, an American playwright of the 1910s, wrote a masque, Caliban by the Yellow Sands, in which Caliban also, as in A Midsummer Tempest, feels a genuine love for Miranda which helps to redeem him.

What makes Caliban so interesting as a continuing personage is that he has grown. He is a monster in popular mythology, both monster and rebel in Shakespeare, Everyman in Browning, a sympathetic old savage in Anderson, and the unexpected ruler of Milan in Renan. The characters in The Tempest and the coiner of casual reference don't have a good word for Caliban, but his literary authors have thought of him more kindly, and in that thought there may be hope for us all.
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