

SHAKESPEARE AND RODÓ: RECURRING
THEMES AND CHARACTERS

by

WENDELL AYCOCK, B.A.

A THESIS

IN

ENGLISH

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Technological College
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

Accepted

15
1965
No. 18
copy 25

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor Joseph T. McCullen for his direction of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ARIEL AND THE TEMPEST: A SURVEY 5

 Rodó's Life and Reputation 5

Ariel 8

The Tempest 29

III. ARIEL AND THE TEMPEST: A COMPARISON 34

 Introduction 34

 The Societies of Shakespeare and Rodó 35

 The Conflict of Spiritual and Material
 Interests 40

 Ariel, Caliban, and Prospero 42

IV. CONCLUSION 54

BIBLIOGRAPHY 56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the important aspects of a study of literature is relativity. In trying to understand the universality of literature, scholars are continually discovering and relating recurring themes, literary techniques, and characters. By studying recurring themes, scholars can understand the ideas and problems which have interested authors of many eras. By studying recurring literary techniques, they can see the value of techniques which have been useful throughout history. And, by studying recurring characters (or types of characters), they can understand the qualities of human nature which are unchanging.

Possibly the most interesting consideration of this type of relativity is the comparison of recurring characters. Authors sometimes choose, as subjects for their own literary works, characters that have been created by another author. When such a choice is made, and when the recreated characters are not renamed, the student of literature becomes especially interested in trying to compare the two works and the characters that are used in both works.

William Shakespeare, in the early part of the seventeenth century, wrote The Tempest and created the

characters of Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban. Since then, various other authors have used these characters as a source from which they could begin their own literary creations.¹ One of the most interesting adaptations of these characters, however, was done by José Enrique Rodó in 1900. Rodó, a Uruguayan, chose to use the Shakespearean characters in his Ariel. Because Ariel is of major importance to South Americans, and because Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel serve an essential purpose in the work, the objective of this thesis is to illustrate that, despite differences reflective of the two periods from which The Tempest and Ariel sprang, philosophically Shakespeare and Rodó share an essential point of view.

In order to accomplish this objective, the first part of this thesis will be devoted to a study of Ariel and a separate study of The Tempest. These separate studies will provide the necessary background information for the final analysis of the works.

The explanation of Ariel requires a more complete discussion than does an explanation of The Tempest. Neither Rodó nor Ariel is so widely-known as Shakespeare or The Tempest. Therefore, it seems necessary to supply

¹ See Robert Browning's "Caliban upon Setebos," Sidney Lanier's "Marsh Song--At Sunset," and Ernest Renan's Caliban: A Philosophical Drama Continuing "The Tempest" of William Shakespeare.

more detailed information concerning Rodó and his Ariel. Also, Rodó's Ariel involves various major subjects. To understand the essential purpose of Rodó and his use of the Shakespearean characters, all of these subjects must be considered.

The explanation of The Tempest, however, can be somewhat limited. An understanding of Shakespeare's purpose in the play and his use of Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban to accomplish this purpose will be pointed out through an examination of these characters' adjustments to their positions in their society.

The final part of this thesis will deal with basic points of comparison and contrast. In order to compare the two works, the two authors' societies and views about society must be considered. The authors' treatment of the conflict of spiritual interests with material interests must also be considered. The consideration of these two points will lead into the final comparison of the characters.

The comparison of the characters, with the support of the earlier portion of the thesis, will show that Rodó uses Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel in a different manner than Shakespeare does. It will also show that, since the characters are used in a different manner, they are somewhat unlike the fully developed Shakespearean Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban.

In the final analysis, however, this thesis will reveal that, despite the different manners in which the two authors use these characters, Rodo' and Shakespeare are attempting to accomplish the same major purposes.

CHAPTER II

ARIEL AND THE TEMPEST: A SURVEY

Rodo's Life and Reputation

Before beginning a study of Ariel, it is fitting that a few facts about the life and reputation of Rodo serve as a prologue to the following discussion of Ariel.

José Enrique Rodo was born on July 15, 1871, in Montevideo, Uruguay. At the age of ten, he enrolled in the Elbio Fernández Lyceum, a non-parochial school. Though he never obtained a Bachelor's degree, he studied at the National University of Uruguay. After leaving the University, Rodo devoted himself to writing and politics. He was one of the publishers of the famous Uruguayan literary reviews, Revista Nacional de Literatura y Ciencias Sociales. In 1898, he accepted a position as Professor of Spanish Literature in the University. This position probably influenced Rodo's portrayal of Prospero as a teacher in Ariel.

Ariel was published in 1900. This same year Rodo was appointed Director of the National Library of Uruguay. In 1902, Rodo resigned his position at the University and was elected to Congress. Rodo's career in politics, however, was not so important as his career as an author. Among his famous works following his entrance

into politics are Liberalismo y Jacobinismo (1906), Motivos de Proteo (1909), and El Mirador de Prospero (1912).

In 1916, Rodó left for Europe. He was a correspondent for the Buenos Aires magazine, Caras y Caretas. Rodó died on May 1, 1917, in Palermo, Italy.

Rodó's influence has been, and is still, far-reaching. Rodó's works are being taught in almost every college course that deals with any advanced Spanish American literature. In explaining the importance of Rodó and the importance and purpose of Ariel, one of the most widely-known critics of Spanish American literature, Arturo Torres-Ríoaseco, points out that,

This final Americanist phase reached perhaps its highest expression in the work of the greatest modernist prose writer, and indeed the modernista who ranks second only to Darío: José Enrique Rodó (1871-1917), the Uruguayan essayist. His masterpiece, Ariel (1900), a slender volume of some hundred-odd pages, has had possibly more effect on the emergence of genuine Americanism than any other book ever written in Spanish America. . . . Ariel has none of the Americanism of local color or picturesque description; its Americanism is one of prophecy, of direct appeal to the ideals of an entire continent. Rodó's Ariel, indeed, ranks as the ethical gospel of the Spanish-speaking New World, much as Emerson's Self Reliance was the gospel of the Anglo-Saxon nation to the North.¹

¹ Arturo Torres-Ríoaseco, The Epic of Latin American Literature (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), p. 116. Hereafter cited as The Epic of Latin American Literature.

The effect of Ariel upon Latin America may even be seen in the names that the South Americans give to their children. In 1964, a Mexican graduate student, Ariel Barriendos, was attending Texas Technological College.² It is logical to assume (although the author of this thesis has no definite proof) that the parents of this student chose the name Ariel because they were influenced, directly or indirectly, by Rodó's Ariel.

Rodó's fame, however, is not limited only to South America. Within a few months after Rodó's death, Havelock Ellis, English psychologist, scientist, and author, sought to explain Rodó's importance. In his The Philosophy of Conflict, Ellis devotes an entire chapter to Rodó and Ariel. He explains,

South America we associate with various miscellaneous things, perhaps mostly unpleasant. We seldom think of it--even if we happen to have been there--as a land of poets and artists and critics. So it can scarcely be surprising that few among us know so much as the name of South America's best writer [Rodó], who was also the best writer anywhere in the Castilian speech, and one of the most distinguished spirits of our time.³

A more recent recognition of the importance of Rodó and Ariel has been made by Francis Hayes. In a 1959

² Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, November 22, 1964, F, 13.

³ Havelock Ellis, The Philosophy of Conflict (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1919), p. 235.

article, Hayes stated that, "Rodó as much as any writer of the Indo-Hispanic world created the distorted image now pretty generally held of Uncle Sam there."⁴ Hayes further asserted that, "it may be that we may place Ariel on our book shelf alongside of Common Sense, Das Kapital and other upheaval-inducing literature."⁵

Ariel

Francis Hayes' description of Ariel is partially accurate. Ariel did influence South Americans' concepts of the United States. Rodó's main purpose in Ariel, however, was not simply to condemn Yankee imperialism. He was a South American who was trying to guide his people from a world which he thought was overly concerned with materialism to a world which would concern itself with man's spirit and soul.

Hence, Rodó's Ariel is primarily an appeal to the youth of Latin America for their acceptance of spiritual and intellectual values. Miguel de Unamuno has described Ariel as "an ode to youth."⁶ In order to understand Ariel, and thereby be able to compare and contrast it

⁴ Francis Hayes, "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," South Atlantic Bulletin, XXIV (March, 1959), 8. Hereafter cited as "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon."

⁵ "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," p. 9.

⁶ Miguel de Unamuno, "Ariel," Rodó y Sus Críticos (Paris: Agencia General de Librería, 1920), p. 50.

with Shakespeare's The Tempest, one must carefully examine the six major discussions of the work.

The first part of Ariel is important because it introduces the form of the work, reveals Rodó's main purpose in using the characters of The Tempest, and explains Rodó's ideas concerning youth.

Rodó chooses a rather practical form for his essay. The work is presented as a final lecture of an old professor to his young class. Such a lecture provides Rodó with the opportunity to state his philosophy in the disguise of a learned man.

The learned man that Rodó chooses as his professor is nicknamed Prospero by his students. Prospero, as he begins his final lecture, sits in his usual position near a bronze statue of Ariel. In the fourth paragraph of the essay, Rodó explains the reason for the nickname and the essential qualities (as he chooses to see them) of Ariel and Caliban:

But perhaps, as well in the manner of his teaching, or in his character, there were [sic] a reason for the nickname, in profounder sense. Ariel, genius of the Air, represents, in the symbolism of Shakespeare, the noble part--the spirit with wings. . . . For Ariel embodies the mastery of reason and of sentiment over the baser impulses of unreason. He is the generous zeal, the lofty disinterested motive in action, the spirituality of civilization, and the vivacity and grace of the intelligence;--the ideal end to which human selection aspires; and that superman in whom has disappeared, under the persistent chisel

of life, the last stubborn trace of the Caliban, symbol of sensuality and stupidity.⁷

Thus, in introducing the characters of The Tempest, Rodó introduces Ariel as a proper model for humanity. He depicts Caliban as the depraved opponent of Ariel. Prospero later expresses his devotion for Ariel by saying, "So I invoke Ariel as my divinity. . . ."⁸

After Rodó thus clarifies the qualities which Shakespeare's characters are to assume in Ariel, Prospero begins his lecture by explaining one of the responsibilities of a young person:

The youth which you love is a power whose application you must work yourselves, and a treasury for the use of which yourselves are responsible. Prize that treasure and that power; see that the lofty consciousness of its possession stay radiant and effective in yourselves.⁹

Prospero points out that humanity must renew itself from generation to generation by a rebirth of human hopes. "And to provoke this renewal, . . ." he says, "has been in all times the function and work of youth."¹⁰

⁷ José Enrique Rodó, Ariel, trans. F. J. Stimson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922), p. 4. Hereafter cited as Ariel.

⁸ Ariel, p. 6.

⁹ Ariel, p. 8.

¹⁰ Ariel, p. 10.

Prospero then explains that a stage of youth may be seen in the evolutionary processes of societies. He compares the youth of Greece to the age of Egypt. According to Prospero, "Greece did mighty things because it had of youth the gaiety which is the atmosphere of action, and the enthusiasm which is the omnipotent lever."¹¹

In explaining the youthfulness of Christianity at its birth, Prospero points out that the gifts of the youthful spirit are enthusiasm and hope.¹² As an illustration of the youth's possession of enthusiasm, he later says:

Your first pages as I read them, your confessions in them of your private life so far, speak often of indecision, of astonishment, but never of enervation or of definite loss of will. I am sure that enthusiasm is still a living force with you.¹³

Though Prospero praises youth's enthusiasm and hope, he warns youth that it should face reality. He says, "No firm training of the intelligence can be based on simple-minded isolation or on voluntary ignorance."¹⁴ However, he also states that problems or "bitterness of

¹¹ Ariel, p. 10.

¹² Ariel, pp. 14-16.

¹³ Ariel, p. 19.

¹⁴ Ariel, p. 21.

thought" may provide proper stimulation for youthful spirits.¹⁵ In one of the most important passages in the discussion of youth, Prospero explains,

That which humanity needs, to be saved from all pessimistic negation, is not so much a belief that all is well at present, as the faith that it is possible through life's growth to arrive at a better state, hastened and discovered by the actions of men.¹⁶

Such faith, according to Prospero, is inherent in youth.

Prospero ends the discussion of youth by saying:

. . . and I hold that America stands much in need of her youth. . . . I hold with Michelet that the right idea of education does not include only the teaching of the minds of the sons the experience of the fathers, but as well, and often more, the informing of the fathers' experience with the innovating inspiration of the sons.¹⁷

Rodo' chooses as his second general topic Prospero's advice to the individual. This discussion begins with the statement: "Let us then discuss how you shall consider the life that is awaiting you."¹⁸

To begin the advice to the individual, Prospero says that the individual has to be a complete human:

¹⁵ Ariel, p. 21.

¹⁶ Ariel, p. 22.

¹⁷ Ariel, p. 24.

¹⁸ Ariel, p. 25.

But over all the inclinations which may bind you severally to different tasks and ways of life, you should guard in your inner soul the consciousness of the fundamental unity of our nature, which demands that every human being be, above and before all, the unspoiled pattern of a man in whom no noble faculty of the mind be obliterated, and no lofty interest for all men have lost its communicative virtue.¹⁹

The failure to be a complete human being comes mainly, says Prospero, from specialization:

And though it be a necessary condition of progress, this development of the notion of specialization brings with it visible evils which not only lower the horizon of the eye of thoughts, thus distorting its image of human solidarity by the particularization of individual habits and affections, but come to injure also the spirit of human solidarity by the particularization of individual habits and affections.²⁰

Prospero further points out that such specialization injures both the beauty and strength of an institution or nation. He explains that the beauty and strength of Greece was due mainly to the fact that the Greeks sought to develop "all human faculties, in the free and chartered liberty of all energies capable of contributing to the glory or the power of mankind!"²¹

At this point in his essay, Rodó skillfully creates

¹⁹ Ariel, p. 25.

²⁰ Ariel, p. 29.

²¹ Ariel, p. 30.

a parable with which he is able to demonstrate the way in which one may maintain his identity. The parable describes an ancient orient king. The king was a hospitable ruler that was loved by all his people. His palace was never guarded, and anyone was welcomed there. There was, however, one hall reserved for only the king. In this hall, the king went to dream. There, he freed himself from the reality of life and "turned his vision inward, smoothed and refined his thought in meditation."²² After giving the parable, Rodo's Prospero explains its importance:

To this story I liken your inmost kingdom. Open with healthy generosity to all the currents of the world, there exists at the same time, like the secret chamber of that king, an inner forum hidden from all, closed to the common guests, ruled by serene reason alone. Only when you enter within this inviolable sanctuary may you call yourselves free men. They are not free who give up their self-dominion to inordinate affection or selfish interest, forgetting Montaigne's wise precept that our souls may indeed be lent, but never surrendered.²³

Prospero ends the discussion of the advice to the individual by restating the necessity for the individual to maintain his integrity as a human and warning against the mutilation of the "inner life."²⁴

²² Ariel, p. 37.

²³ Ariel, p. 38.

²⁴ Ariel, p. 41.

The third general discussion of Ariel is concerned with the value of beauty. Prospero points out that a recognition of beauty is an essential part of education:

And yet of all the elements of education that go to make up a full and noble view of life, surely none more than Art [art is used here with reference to beauty] can justify our interest.²⁵

Prospero then explains one of the major values of beauty by saying,

I hold it certain that he who has learned to distinguish the delicate from the common, the ugly from the beautiful, has gone half the way to knowing the evil from the good.²⁶

He also sees the importance of beauty to human progress:

In the measure that humanity progresses it sees that the moral law is but beauty of conduct; it shows evil and error like a discord; and will seek for the good as a restored harmony.²⁷

In explaining the effect of beauty upon Christianity, Prospero praises Renan for making the statement that "the originality of the work of Jesus lies . . . in having, by his preaching, made felt the poetry of his

²⁵ Ariel, p. 43.

²⁶ Ariel, p. 46.

²⁷ Ariel, pp. 46-47.

precept, that is, its inner beauty.'"²⁸ Prospero then severely criticizes the Puritans for their desire to divorce virtue from beauty.

Perhaps the best summary of the discussion of beauty is given by Prospero when he says,

In the characters of peoples, the gifts derived from fine taste, the mastery of gracious form, the delicate power to interest, the virtue of making ideas likeable, go with the genius of propaganda--that is to say, the mighty gift of universality.²⁹

The fourth main topic of discussion in the essay is democracy. This section of the essay is possibly the most important; for, in it, Prospero explains the danger of democracy, the possible way to avoid democracy's pitfall, and the potential good of democracy. This section also serves as a necessary introduction to the fifth section: Prospero's analysis of the United States.

Prospero begins the fourth section by saying,

Often you will have heard attributed to two main causes that torrent of the spirit of utility which gives its note to the moral physiognomy of the present century, with its neglect of the aesthetic and disinterested view of life. The revelations of natural science, . . . are one; the other is the universal diffusion and triumph of democratic ideas. I propose to speak to you exclusively of this latter cause; . . . Upon democracy

²⁸ Ariel, p. 48.

²⁹ Ariel, p. 55.

weighs the accusation of guiding humanity, by making it mediocre, to a Holy Empire of Utilitarianism.³⁰

Prospero continues by saying that Renan is one of the most active critics of democracy. It is at this point in the essay that one of the few references to Caliban is made. It is important to read this reference carefully; for, from it, some critics have accused Rodó of equating democracy with Caliban.³¹ The following excerpt, however, proves that Rodó's Prospero is simply explaining Renan's opinion:

This master [Renan] holds, then, that high preoccupation with the ideal interest of our race is irreconcilable with the spirit of democracy. He believes that the conception of life in a society where that spirit dominates will gradually come to seek only material welfare, as the good most attainable for the greatest number. According to him, democracy is the enthronement of Caliban. Ariel can but be vanquished by its triumph.³²

Prospero accepts the fact that democracy can be a great danger. He says that democracy must "uplift its spirit by a strong ideal interest which it shares with its preoccupation by material interest" or it will lead to a "favoring of mediocrity" which will finally cause it

³⁰ Ariel, pp. 60-61.

³¹ "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," p. 8.

³² Ariel, pp. 62-63

to "extinguish the idea of any superiority which may not be turned into a more efficient training for the war of interests."³³

Therefore, the danger of democracy is, according to Prospero, simply the failure of the society to recognize any merit other than material or economic success.

Prospero does not, however, condemn democracy because he finds danger in it. He points out that science and democracy are two necessary props for modern civilization, and he urges that democracy should be educated:

We must seek how gradually to inculcate in popular feeling and custom the idea of that necessary subordination, the sense of true superiorities, the instinctive yet conscious cultivation of all that multiplies the cipher of human worth in the eye of reason.³⁴

Prospero's idea of necessary subordination is aimed at creating an aristocracy in democracy. This aristocracy, however, is one of merit in which every member of society has an equal opportunity to receive recognition for his excellence (one must remember that Prospero refers to excellence of aesthetical achievements as well as economic achievements).

In the final paragraph of the discussion of democracy, Prospero describes the potentially good democracy:

³³ Ariel, p. 64.

³⁴ Ariel, p. 78.

. . . we need only insist on our conception of a democracy that is just and noble, impelled only by the knowledge and sense of true superiorities, in which the supremacy of intelligence and virtue, the only limits to the just equality of men, receives its authority and prestige from liberty and sheds over all multitudes the beneficent aura of love.³⁵

In the fifth section of the essay, Prospero chooses to speak about the United States. Clemente Pereda calls this section the most important part of Ariel.³⁶ In discussing the United States, Prospero speaks of Latin America's desire to imitate the United States, the good attributes of the United States, and the defects of the United States.

As an introduction to his discourse on the United States, Prospero explains the tendency of Latin Americans to admire and try to imitate the United States:

The mighty confederation the United States is realizing over us a sort of moral conquest. Admiration for its greatness, its strength, is a sentiment that is growing rapidly in the minds of our governing classes, and even more, perhaps, among the multitude, easily impressed with victory or success. And from admiring it is easy to pass to imitating. Admiration and belief are already for the psychologist but the passive mood of imitation.³⁷

³⁵ Ariel, p. 87.

³⁶ Clemente Pereda, Rodó's Main Sources (San Juan, Puerto Rico: Imprenta Venezuela, Inc., 1948), p. 40. Hereafter cited as Rodó's Main Sources.

³⁷ Ariel, p. 90.

Even before beginning to praise or condemn the United States, Prospero opposes such imitation. He offers two reasons for his opposition. First, he resists imitation because ". . . blind imitation gives but an inferior copy of the model."³⁸ He says that Thackeray points out that ". . . those without rank or fortune ineffectually imitate only the foibles of the mighty."³⁹

The words "those without rank and fortune" give the clue to Prospero's second objection to Latin American imitation of the United States. Directly after the sentence in which they are used, Prospero says that "care for one's own independence, personality, judgment, is a chief form of self-respect."⁴⁰ Hence, the second objection to imitation may be seen in Prospero's appeal to the Latin Americans to maintain their heritage (this appeal for self-identity is consistent with Prospero's earlier parable of the orient king);

. . . we Latin-Americans have an inheritance of Race, a great ethnic tradition to maintain, a sacred bond which unites us to immortal pages of history and puts us on our honour to preserve this for the future.⁴¹

³⁸ Ariel, p. 92.

³⁹ Ariel, p. 92.

⁴⁰ Ariel, pp. 92-93.

⁴¹ Ariel, p. 92.

Although Prospero rejects Latin American imitation of the United States, he accepts the possibility of both Americas existing harmoniously as "distinct but coexisting forces."⁴²

This difference in genius does not exclude honourable emulation, nor discourage in very many relations agreement or even solidarity. And if one can dimly foresee even a higher concord in the future, that will be due not to a one-sided imitation of one race by the other, but to a reciprocity of influences and a skilful harmonizing of those attributes which make the peculiar glory of either race.⁴³

Prospero, however, feels that the influence of the United States requires not only a warning against imitation and a suggestion for coexistence, but also an examination of the attributes and faults of the North American country.

The first two attributes which Prospero praises are concerned with the organization of a free state. He first points out that:

Born--to employ Beaudelaire's paradox--with the innate experience of liberty, they have kept themselves faithful to the law of their birth; and have developed . . . the fundamental principles of their organization. This gives to their history a unity which . . . has at least the intellectual beauty of being logical.⁴⁴

⁴² Ariel, p. 94.

⁴³ Ariel, p. 95.

⁴⁴ Ariel, p. 96.

Prospero then explains that the citizens of the United States were the first to convert the modern idea of liberty into actuality.⁴⁵

In recognition of another attribute of his North American neighbors, Prospero says,

. . . they have got from the sum of their energies, as devoted to research, industry, philanthropy, results that are the more marvellous in that they were secured with the most absolute integrity of their personal liberty.⁴⁶

Another aspect of the North American culture which Prospero praises is public education. He says that the United States' citizens,

. . . have made the common school the surest prop of their prosperity, believing that the mind of the child should be the most cherished of their precious things.⁴⁷

Prospero also credits the democracy to the North with having preserved religion.⁴⁸

As a final summary of the laudable qualities of the United States, Prospero says,

Their characteristic points are manifestations of the will-power, originality, and audacity.

⁴⁵ Ariel, p. 96.

⁴⁶ Ariel, pp. 98-99.

⁴⁷ Ariel, p. 99.

⁴⁸ Ariel, p. 100.

Their history is above all a very paroxysm of virile activity.⁴⁹

Prospero begins his criticism of the faults of the United States by pointing to its utilitarianism:

Later he [Herbert Spencer] said that so exclusive a preoccupation with those activities which make for immediate utility revealed a notion of life, . . . which already needed rectifying as [sic] it tended to make 'useful' labor the end and object of all living. . . . And he added that it behooved them now to teach their people the gospel of rest or recreation; and we, identifying these words with the otium of the ancients, will include in this gospel to be taught those restless toilers any ideal concern, any disinterested employment of one's time, any object of meditation or study divorced from all relation to immediate utilitarian interest.⁵⁰

Prospero further asserts the materialism of the United States by saying that a citizen of that country "subordinates all of his activities in the egoism of material well-being, albeit both individual and collective."⁵¹

For Prospero, however, probably the most striking defect which he observes is "a radical unaptness for selection."⁵² As he couples this defect with materialism,

⁴⁹ Ariel, p. 102.

⁵⁰ Ariel, p. 105.

⁵¹ Ariel, p. 107.

⁵² Ariel, p. 109.

he finds the result "makes a chaos of all that pertains to the realm of the idea."⁵³

After observing North Americans' lack of selectivity and their materialism, Prospero says that, through education which underemphasizes excellence, "the levelling by the middle classes tends ever, pressing with its desolating task, to plane down what little remains of intelligentsia."⁵⁴

Although Prospero earlier commended the United States for having preserved religion, he also finds fault in the religion of the North American:

American religiosity, derived from the English and exaggerated, is merely an auxiliary force for the penal law, and would disappear on the day it was found possible without it to give to utilitarian morality that religious sanction which Mill desired for it.⁵⁵

In his discussion of the United States, Prospero also speaks of propaganda. He says that the United States is trying to propagandize its "utilitarian genius" and "aspire to the primacy of the world's civilization."⁵⁶ He notes, however, that "nature has not granted them the genius for

53 Ariel, p. 109.

54 Ariel, p. 113.

55 Ariel, p. 114.

56 Ariel, p. 120.

propaganda, the vocation of the apostle."⁵⁷

As a conclusion to the fifth section of the essay, Prospero attempts to explain to his students the possible value of North American utilitarianism. He speaks of the relation of the satisfaction of material needs to spiritual growth. Although he sees no such relationship in the immediate future, Prospero says,

Let us hope, then, that the spirit of that Titanic organism [the United States], which has so far been utility and will-power only, may some day also be intelligence, sentiment, ideality; that from that mighty forge may arise, in last result, the noble human figure,⁵⁸

Upon finishing his discussion of the United States, Prospero begins the final phase of his lecture. In this last part of Rodó's Ariel, Prospero explains the most valuable attribute of a great civilization and expresses the need for that attribute in Latin America. He also makes an appeal to the youth of Latin America for their dedication to the creation of such a civilization, and he tells of the meaning of the Ariel that has inspired him.

The valuable attribute of a great civilization, according to Prospero, is simply that worthwhile idea or

⁵⁷ Ariel, p. 122.

⁵⁸ Ariel, p. 129.

"legacy" which a civilization, "after its time has passed," leaves to humanity.⁵⁹ Prospero explains that large cities, though they are usually necessary for a creation of high culture, do not alone contribute to the enlightenment of humanity. As examples, he points to Carthage and Babylon:

Of the stones of Carthage not one remains to bear any message of light, and all the immensity of Babylon or Nineveh does not fill in human memory the hollow of man's hand as compared with the few furlongs that lie between the Acropolis and Piraeus.⁶⁰

Prospero describes as a worthy civilization, or city, one which stimulates "thoughts whence germinate ideas which are to come to the sunlight of the coming day with a cry to humanity, a force that shall compel man's souls."⁶¹ He then expresses fear that the grand cities of Latin America will fail to contribute such ideas to humanity, and he warns that the cities of Latin America "may end like Tyre or Sidon, or as Carthage ended."⁶²

After this warning, Prospero reminds his students that it is their responsibility to build a great Latin

⁵⁹ Ariel, p. 130.

⁶⁰ Ariel, pp. 131-132.

⁶¹ Ariel, p. 133.

⁶² Ariel, p. 134.

American civilization.⁶³ He then attempts to inspire them for their task in the future by saying,

Every one who devotes himself to propagate and preserve in contemporary America a disinterested ideal of the soul--art, science, ethics, religious belief, a political policy of ideals--should educate his belief in the persevering preparation for the future . . . a future that seems all the nearer as the thinking and willing of those who look forward to it grow more earnest--shall offer the stability, the scenario, the right atmosphere, to make possible the higher evolution of man's soul.⁶⁴

He further inspires them by describing the America of his dreams:

Can you not picture to yourselves the America we others dream of? Hospitable to things of the spirit, and not only to the immigrant throngs; thoughtful, without sacrificing its energy of action; serene and strong and withal full of generous enthusiasm; resplendent with the charm of morning calm like the smile of a waking infant, yet with the light of awakening thought.⁶⁵

Prospero believes, however, that the building of such an America will be an evolutionary process, and he warns his students not "to expect that the span of your own generation will suffice to bring in America the conditions of intellectual life."⁶⁶ As a proper attitude

⁶³ Ariel, p. 135.

⁶⁴ Ariel, pp. 136-137.

⁶⁵ Ariel, p. 137.

⁶⁶ Ariel, p. 139.

to adopt towards one's daily work, Prospero offers the suggestion that,

We are only capable of progress in so far as we can adapt our actions every day to the conditions of a more distant future, to countries farther and farther away. Assurance of our part in bringing about a work which shall survive us, fruitful in times to come, exalts our human dignity and gives us triumph even over the limitations of our nature.⁶⁷

The work which will progress and be fruitful for future generations, according to Prospero, is spiritual and intellectual. He proposes a culture from whence comes ideas which will enrich man's spirit. In explaining these ideas, Prospero depicts Ariel as a symbol for man's spiritual, idealistic, and intellectual endeavors.

Ariel is reason, and the higher truth. Ariel is that sublime sentiment of the perfectibility of man through whose virtue human clay is magnified and transformed in the realm of things for each one who lives by his light-- . . . Ariel is, to nature, that crowning of its work which ends the ascending process of organic life with the call of the spirit. Ariel triumphant signifies ideality and order in life, noble inspiration in thought, unselfishness in conduct, high taste in art, heroism in action,⁶⁸ delicacy and refinement in manners and usages.

After this description of Ariel, Prospero expresses his faith in his students' strength, and he says that he

⁶⁷ Ariel, p. 141.

⁶⁸ Ariel, p. 144.

dreams of the day when the world will recognize " . . . that the Cordillera which soars above the continent of the Americas has been carved to be the pedestal of this statue, the altar of the cult of Ariel."⁶⁹

The cult of Ariel, Prospero's students, is therefore to endeavor to make achievements in the realm of man's spirit. This group is to concern itself with the creation of ideas that will enrich Latin American culture and enlighten man's spirit. It is to realize that its most important work is not materialistic accomplishment, but rather intellectual accomplishment.

The Tempest

Although there are various interpretations of Shakespeare's The Tempest, the author of this thesis sees the play as simply an adjustment of the protagonists to their proper positions in society. The essential conflict is based upon a failure of the characters to recognize their places in society. In order to understand this conflict and its resolution, one must understand the Elizabethan theory of the natural order of society, the characters' failure to observe this order, and their ultimate resumption of their duties in societies.

Before examining the conflict of the characters of

⁶⁹ Ariel, pp. 147-148.

The Tempest with their society, one must first understand the Elizabethan theory of the natural order of society. This order is based principally upon the theory of the chain of being. This theory, simply stated, is that every being is assigned a sphere (a link in the chain) of action in which he has duties to fulfill. Any attempt to neglect one's duties in his sphere of action leads to a break in the chain and thus causes discord in society.

The first violator of the natural order of society in The Tempest is Prospero. Prospero fails to fulfill his duty to society by neglecting his office as a ruler. He admits his failure by saying,

The government I cast upon my brother,
And to my state grew stranger, being transported
and rapt in secret studies.⁷⁰

This neglect of duty leads to the usurpation of Prospero by his brother and to Prospero's exile. Therefore, Prospero is responsible for the original infraction of order.

Prospero also commits a similar error in his dealings with Caliban. He refuses to recognize Caliban as a subhuman (a lower link in the chain of being) and

⁷⁰ William Shakespeare, "The Tempest," The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951), I, ii, 75-77. Hereafter cited as The Tempest. All subsequent references to The Tempest correspond to this edition.

tries to elevate him to the level of Miranda. The result is that Caliban disregards human moral standards and attempts to seduce Miranda. Prospero explains this incident:

I have used thee,
 Filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged
 thee
 In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate
 The honour of my child.⁷¹

After this incident, Prospero recognizes his error and restores natural order by overruling the subhuman creature.

Caliban is another example of a violator of the natural order of society. Throughout most of the play, he is in rebellion against his natural superior, Prospero. He also attempts to upset order by trying to elevate Stephano (a drunken butler) to an unnatural position as a ruler.

A similar infraction upon order is committed by Sebastian and Antonio. Lawrence Bowling explains their error by saying,

These younger brothers do not heed their natural duty to respect 'the primogenitive and due of birth, prerogative of age, crowns sceptres, . . . office and custom.'⁷²

⁷¹ The Tempest, I, ii, 345-349.

⁷² Lawrence E. Bowling, "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" College English, XII (January, 1951), 206. Hereafter cited as "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest.'"

Ariel is another representation of violation of natural order (though not of his own choice). Because Prospero frees him from bondage in a pine tree, Ariel is forced to repay the kindness by becoming a servant for Prospero. Therefore, Ariel is not observing the natural order of society; for he leaves his place in natural society (the spiritual world) to become involved in human affairs.

— Although there are other examples of violations of natural order (Gonzalo's failure to support Prospero completely at the time of his exile and Alonso's aid in conspiring to overthrow Prospero), the above examples adequately illustrate the conflict of the protagonists with natural order. Even the storm (in scene one) and the title of the play are symbolic of this conflict:

The tempest in the natural sphere symbolizes the basic discord and confusion in the moral and political spheres. The title of the play refers not merely to the brief storm in the first scene but also to the greater tempest which is dealt with throughout the play.⁷³

Therefore, the resolution of the play comes about only after the protagonists accept their proper spheres in society. Prospero abjures his study of the spiritual and intellectual world and returns to govern his state. Caliban submits to Prospero's rule. Ariel is freed by

⁷³ "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 207.

Prospero and quits his servant's duties in the realm of humanity. Antonio and Sebastián return to their subordinate positions under their rulers, and Alonso entreats pardon for his crime against Prospero.

CHAPTER III

ARIEL AND THE TEMPEST: A COMPARISON

Introduction

When attempting a comparison of two literary works, one often embroils himself in details which are not integral parts of either work. To avoid such a pitfall, one must examine the main points of consideration of both works. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to compare two of the main topics which are considered in Ariel and The Tempest, along with the characters that are used by both authors to show the importance of these topics.

In comparing The Tempest with Ariel, the first topic which will be considered is society. This topic is important because both authors are concerned with the responsibility of individuals to their societies (chapter one explains the authors' treatment of this responsibility). This topic is also important because the authors lived in, and wrote about, two distinctly different types of societies. Despite these differences, however, both authors are attempting to explain the same point about society. An examination of the societies of both authors will explain the reason for their different approaches to the same conclusion.

The second topic which will be considered is the attitudes of the authors about the spiritual and material aspects of life. This topic is important because both authors are concerned with the conflict of spiritual and intellectual interests with material interests. There is an apparent contrast in the authors' attitudes concerning this topic, but there is also an essential, and important, comparison.

The final comparison which will be made in this chapter deals with characters that are used by both authors. This part of the chapter will explain that Rodo' uses Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban in a different manner than Shakespeare does. It will also explain the reason for the use of, and changes in, the Shakespearean characters.

The Societies of Shakespeare and Rodo'

The society of Shakespeare's era was based upon an inherent order. The effect of this order was so strong that E. M. W. Tillyard explains it by saying that Shakespeare's Histories "had no meaning apart from a background of order to judge them by," and that the order "applied to Shakespeare's Histories no more than to the rest of Shakespeare."¹

¹ E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (New York: Random House, Inc., 1943-1944), p. vii. Hereafter cited as The Elizabethan World Picture.

He points out the acceptance of this order by explaining:

. . . the conception of order is so taken for granted, so much a part of the collective mind of the people, that it is hardly mentioned except in explicit didactic passages.²

The order of Shakespeare's time is most commonly described as a chain of being. Tillyard explains this chain by saying that it

. . . served to express the unimaginable plentitude of God's creation, its unfaltering order, and its ultimate unity. The chain stretched from the foot of God's throne to the meanest of inanimate objects. Every speck of creation was a link in the chain, and every link except those at the two extremities was simultaneously bigger and smaller than another: there could be no gap.³

The seriousness of causing a gap in the chain or failing to respect one degree in the chain over another degree is explained by Shakespeare in Troilus and Cressida:

Oh, when degree is shak'd,
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
The enterprise is sick. How could communities,
Degrees in schools and brotherhoods in cities,
Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
The primogenitive and due of birth,
Prerogative of age, crowns sceptres laurels,
But by degree stand in authentic place?
Take but degree away, untune that string,
And hark, what discord follows. Each thing meets

² The Elizabethan World Picture, p. 9.

³ The Elizabethan World Picture, pp. 25-26.

(37) *OMA*

In mere oppugnancy. The bounded waters
Should lift their bosoms higher than the shores
And make a sop of all this solid globe.
Strength should be lord to imbecility,
And the rude son should strike his father dead.⁴

The quotation from Troilus and Cressida, as is explained by Hardin Craig, serves to illustrate that Shakespeare's view ". . . is not the blind obedience taught by modern totalitarianism but a rational order for which all citizens from top to bottom are responsible."⁵

Probably the importance of the structure of order in Shakespeare's society influences him to show the flaws of disorder in The Tempest. It does enable him to present a solution to these flaws (see chapter one). The solution is simply a restoration of order--the order which is inherent to the Shakespearean society.

The order of Shakespeare's society greatly contrasts with the disorder of Rodó's society. During Rodó's life, South America was plagued with an unstable order of society. Rodó's homeland, Uruguay, was so torn by civil strife that a citizen could be loyal to a government for only a short period of time:

Uruguay's subsequent instability as a

⁴ William Shakespeare, "Troilus and Cressida," The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951), I, iii, 101-115.

⁵ Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951), p. 9. Hereafter cited as The Complete Works of Shakespeare.

nation led to further intervention by both rivals, while Montevideo quarreled with its own backland for the next 50 years. There were at least 40 revolutions before the end of the century [19th] century . Of the 25 different governments in power till the turn for the better in 1903, nine were forced out by military power, two were 'liquidated by assassination' and one by 'grave injury,' while ten resisted successfully one or more revolutions during their periods in office, and only three were free of serious disturbances. Lawless frontiersmen, rival caudillos, a psychology of endless fighting, and continued foreign influence and intervention combined to make chaos in Uruguay.⁶

Clemente Pereda explains the effect which this civil disorder had upon Rodó and his works:

From 1871 to 1904, that is, from Rodó's birth to the publication of his Proteus, the struggle between the two parties political parties: [the Colorado Party and the Blanco party] often caused serious blood shed. It would not be possible to understand the author's life without considering the constant excesses and violence of which he was witness. It would not be possible, either, to understand his work. What was his desire for tolerance and peace--that tolerance he preaches in his works, that peace for which he sighed when he visited Horace's garden near Tivoli--but a strong reaction against violence and turmoil?

The desire for order and unity in Latin America is one of the major themes in Ariel. Torres-Ríoaseco explains that Ariel "has had possibly more effect on the

⁶ Helen Miller Bailey and Abraham P. Nasatir, Latin America: The Development of Its Civilization (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960-1962), p. 417.

⁷ Rodó's Main Sources, pp. 27-28.

emergence of genuine Americanism than any other book ever written in Spanish America."⁸ Rodo' seeks to give order to society through his appeal, in Ariel, for a spiritual unity of Latin American youth which will create a greater South America.⁹

When comparing the stable order of Shakespeare's society with the unstable order of Rodo's society, one may see the differing vantage point from which the authors present their works. Shakespeare, because his society accepted the chain of being theory, was able to give an acceptable remedy for revolution and disorder. Shakespeare did not have to create an acceptable philosophy or order. Rodo', however, was not so fortunate. The people of his society had many different ideas about the proper way to create a philosophy. Because of the difference in the stability of order in the societies of Shakespeare and Rodo', Shakespeare (in The Tempest) writes of the restoration of an already established order, and Rodo' (in Ariel) writes to try to unite the youth of Latin America and thus create order.

This difference in the two authors' societies, and in the order of the societies about which the two authors write, does not, however, blot out the fact that both are

⁸ The Epic of Latin American Literature, p. 116.

⁹ See p. 28.

attempting to present the same major point about society. They are both trying to explain that society needs an accepted order. Shakespeare, in The Tempest, shows that the conflict which results when order is upset is resolved only when the violators of natural order resume their proper positions in society. And Rodo', in Ariel, tries to unify Latin American order by giving the youth of that continent a purpose.

The Conflict of Spiritual and Material Interests

The second topic of comparison in The Tempest and Ariel is the attitudes of the authors about the conflict of the spiritual and material aspects of life.

In The Tempest, Prospero is troubled with this conflict. The temptation, for Prospero, is to neglect the material pursuits of life and become involved only in spiritual and intellectual matters. Shakespeare proves that such an action is dangerous. In one instance, Prospero yields to this temptation and thus embroils himself in trouble. In another instance, he almost makes the same error.

✓ The first example of Prospero's neglect of his material life and involvement in his spiritual life is mentioned by Prospero in the first act of The Tempest. He explains to his daughter that he neglected his duty to his state (the material duty of a ruler is to rule) and

concerned himself only with his "secret studies" (the study of magic and the spirit).¹⁰ Prospero's neglect of his duty enables his brother to usurp his dutchy and thus leads to Prospero's exile.

Although Prospero finally accepts his material duty as a ruler (he rules the island on which he is exiled), he almost makes the same error again. The second instance of Prospero's temptation to pursue the spiritual and neglect the material occurs in act four of the play. In this instance, Prospero becomes so engrossed in his spiritual efforts of staging a masque that he almost forgets Caliban's conspiracy against his life. Lawrence Bowling explains this instance and summarizes Prospero's problem of spiritual involvement:

The masque illustrates, therefore, not merely Prospero's ability in the superhuman realm but also the great danger involved in such vanity, for he becomes so completely fascinated with his magic that he temporarily forgets matters of more immediate and more practical importance. Thus, the masque serves as a parallel to, or a re-enactment of, Prospero's original error, when he had become interested in secret studies of the spirit world to such an extent that he neglected his practical duties as ruler and allowed matters of state to get out of hand.¹¹

With Prospero's vow, in the last act, to leave his study of the spiritual world, he realizes that "the

¹⁰ See p. 30.

¹¹ "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 207.

proper study of mankind is man' and not the spirit world."¹²

Rodó, however, regards the conflict of spiritual interests with material interests in a different manner. Rodó's Prospero does not abjure spiritual pursuits. He abjures material pursuits and tries to lead the youth of Latin America to a concern for spiritual matters:

He [Rodó's Prospero] exhorts these youths to recall the traditional idealism of their culture, to think optimistically and freely and in terms of classic values, and to avoid seduction by the material progress of the positivistic-thinking example of the North.¹³

Hence, Shakespeare and Rodó deal with the same conflict. They do, however, differ in their approach to it. Shakespeare points out the danger of forsaking one's duty in the material realm to become involved in the spiritual realm. Rodó points out the danger of embracing material pursuits to the exclusion of spiritual pursuits. Despite their apparently different approaches, both Shakespeare and Rodó are concerned with spiritual and material pursuits and recognize the danger of extreme involvement in these pursuits.

Ariel, Caliban, and Prospero

¹² "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 208.

¹³ C. C. Bacheller, "An Introduction for Studies on Rodó," Hispania, Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (December, 1963), 764.

One of the most important factors to consider when comparing Ariel with The Tempest is the characters that both authors choose for their works. Critics agree that Rodó uses Ariel, Prospero, and Caliban as symbols. It is therefore important to understand why Rodó uses them as symbols and how Rodó's symbolic characters compare and differ from the original Shakespearean characters.

There are three probable reasons for Rodó's choice of Ariel, Prospero, and Caliban as symbolic characters for his Ariel. First, because Rodó is interested in leading the youth of Latin America away from materialism and toward spiritual awareness, he sees Ariel as a worthy symbol of spiritual helpfulness and Caliban as a worthy symbol of the ugliness of materialism. He sees Prospero as a director and controller of the activities in The Tempest, and therefore sees him as worthy teacher, or director of the youth of Latin America. Second, because Ariel is a spirit and Caliban a subhuman, it is easy to praise and condemn them. By using non-human creatures as symbols, Rodó can characterize extreme good and evil without harming humanity by placing it in an unfair position (chapter one points out that Rodó, though he regards them as materialists, still has hope for the citizens of the United States). The third reason, though perhaps obvious and minor, for Rodó's choice is Shakespeare's reputation. Rodó often uses references from great

writers to add information and support to his works. Therefore, it is logical to assume that he happily accepts symbols from such a great literary figure as Shakespeare.

In order to understand how Rodo's symbolic characters compare and differ from the original Shakespearean characters, it is necessary to examine each character separately. After briefly describing the creation of Shakespeare and Rodo, one may then examine the similarities and differences which occur in the creation.

Shakespeare's Ariel, an obedient servant to Prospero, is simply a spirit. In the chain of being, he represents the order, or link, above man.¹⁴ He is, however, a servant to Prospero. Prospero has released him from his pine prison and demanded his service for a year. Ariel has little or no interest in the affairs of man, however, and he even quarrels with Prospero and demands his freedom.¹⁵ Hardin Craig points out Ariel's spiritual unconcern with humanity:

Ariel, as a spirit, longs for freedom; as a spirit, he is also incapable of affection or gratitude as entertained by human beings.¹⁶

¹⁴ "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 207.

¹⁵ The Tempest, I, ii, 242-250.

¹⁶ The Complete Works of Shakespeare, p. 1253.

Ariel, however, recognizes his responsibility (after Prospero threatens to imprison him again) and fulfills it.

Rodó's Ariel is also a spirit, or rather he symbolizes spirituality. Rodó's Prospero, however, recognizes Ariel as a god. He says, "I invoke Ariel as my divinity."¹⁷ Prospero also uses him as a model for human action and says that Ariel is "the ideal end to which human selection aspires."¹⁸ Near the end of Ariel, Rodó entreats his students to accept Ariel as a symbol:

Ariel is reason, and the higher truth. Ariel is that sublime sentiment of the perfectibility of man through whose virtue human clay is magnified and transformed in the realm of things for each one who lives by his light-- Ariel is, to nature, that crowning of its work which ends the ascending process of organic life with the call of the spirit. Ariel triumphant signifies ideality and order in conduct, high taste in art, heroism in action, delicacy and refinement in manners and usages Ariel runs nimbly as at the call of Prospero to all¹⁹ who really care for him and seek to find him.

Prospero continues his praise of Ariel and finally calls his power "invincible."²⁰

Upon comparing Shakespeare's Ariel with Rodó's Ariel, one may say that they are generally comparable. Neither

¹⁷ Ariel, p. 6.

¹⁸ Ariel, p. 6.

¹⁹ Ariel, p. 144.

²⁰ Ariel, p. 145.

Ariel is human, and both are regarded as a higher order than humanity. Both are servants of humanity, and they are both praised by Prospero for their work. Both struggle with the forces of Caliban and are regarded as contrasting figures with the Calibans.

Although the two authors' Ariels may be generally comparable, a close examination of both Ariels reveals that they are separate creations. Though both characters are regarded as a higher order than humanity, there is a difference in their positions. Shakespeare's creation is simply a spirit. Rodo's creation is a god with invincible power. Rodo's Ariel is never beaten, but Shakespeare's Ariel is conquered and imprisoned by the witch Sycorax. He is also in Prospero's power and obeys Prospero's command, for he yields to Prospero's threat.²¹ Therefore, the powerful Ariel of Rodo's Ariel is quite different from the imprisoned Ariel and servant Ariel of The Tempest. Ariel's attitude toward Prospero is also different in both works. In Rodo's Ariel, "Ariel runs nimbly as at the call of Prospero to all who really care for him and seek to find him."²² Rodo symbolizes Ariel as helpful spiritualism. Shakespeare's Ariel, however, is rather unconcerned with human affairs.²³

²¹ The Tempest, I, ii, 295-297.

²² Ariel, p. 146.

²³ See p. 44.

Hence, the comparison and contrast of the two Ariels show that they are generally comparable, but they are indeed separate creations. One is omnipotent, but the other has limited power. One is a willing servant of mankind, but the other is a servant working only to gain his freedom.

✓ Another non-human character of Ariel and The Tempest is Caliban. Shakespeare's Caliban is a subhuman that is of an order in the chain of being lower than humanity.²⁴ Though he is ruled by Prospero, he is disobedient and constantly rebels. At the end of the play, however, Caliban pledges to reform. Lawrence Bowling points out that

. . . Caliban is able to see things in their proper perspective and is willing to accept his natural position and support the other links in the chain.²⁵

Of the main references made to Caliban in Ariel, none are complimentary. Rodo' calls him a "symbol of sensuality and stupidity."²⁶ He also refers to "the untamable rebellion of Caliban."²⁷ Therefore, Rodo', in trying to persuade the youth of Latin America to pursue

²⁴ "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 207.

²⁵ "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 208.

²⁶ Ariel, p. 4.

²⁷ Ariel, p. 145.

spiritualism and accept Ariel as their symbol, sets Caliban up as an opposite symbol. In warning his students against materialistic democracy and quoting Renan as saying that democracy is the "enthronement of Caliban," Rodo' is, in effect, making a warning against materialism (with Caliban as its symbol).²⁸ Because the spiritualistic philosophy is not existent, the symbol of Caliban as an evil force remains at the end of the essay.

Of the three characters that are described in both works, Caliban is probably the most comparable. In both works, he is essentially a subhuman beast that is trying to do an evil deed (in The Tempest, he is trying to upset the chain of being, and, in Ariel, he is a symbol of an evil which would damage spiritualism).

The similarities of the two Calibans, however, do not overshadow their essential difference. This difference is simply that the Caliban of Shakespeare reforms, and Rodo's symbolic Caliban does not reform. Shakespeare's Caliban is a character that develops from the ignorance of rebellion to the enlightenment of acceptance of his place in society. Rodo's Caliban is simply a symbolic character who retains his rebellious nature throughout Ariel.

The third character who appears in both The Tempest

²⁸ Ariel, p. 63.

and Ariel is Prospero. Shakespeare's Prospero is a human who sees his basic error and corrects it. He commits an infraction upon natural order by failing to fulfill his duty as a ruler. He becomes so involved in his studies of the spiritual and intellectual realm that he fails to rule. After giving most of his responsibilities as a ruler to his brother, his brother usurps his dutchy and exiles Prospero. Prospero then realizes that he has caused his own suffering by neglecting his human duty. Throughout The Tempest, Prospero is the director of the action (he controls Ariel and Caliban, directs the love affair of Miranda and Ferdinand, causes his brother to restore his dutchy, and generally brings about order). After regaining his position as a ruler in the world of humans, Prospero

. . . gladly gives up his superhuman powers in order to return to the strictly human sphere:

This rough magic

I here abjure
 I'll break my staff,
 Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
 And, deeper than did ever plummet sound,
 I'll drown my book.

Now my charms are all o'erthrown,
And what strength I have's mine own.

At last, after much suffering for his original error Prospero fully realizes that 'the proper study of mankind is man' and not the spirit world. 29

29 "The Theme of Order in 'The Tempest,'" p. 208.

Rodó's Prospero is an old professor. He is nicknamed Prospero by his students because he lectures beside a bronze statue of Ariel. Rodó's Prospero exalts and glorifies the spiritual aspects of life (as symbolized by Ariel). Francis Hayes points out the importance which Rodó's Prospero gives to Ariel:

. . . he [Prospero] declared that Ariel, for him symbolized the noble and winged part of the spirit, the empire of reason and sentiment, of generous enthusiasm, of all high and disinterested motives, culture, the vivacity and grace of the intelligence, the ultimate ideal to which human beings aspire.³⁰

Therefore, throughout Ariel, Prospero emphasizes the importance of spiritual pursuits.

There are several similarities in the Prosperos of Shakespeare and Rodó. In both The Tempest and Ariel, Prospero acts as director of the central action. Shakespeare's Prospero controls the characters in The Tempest. Rodó's Prospero, as a teacher, is the controller of a classroom. Both are concerned with the effects of spiritualism. And both show a concern for humanity. Shakespeare's Prospero does not condemn his fellow human beings for their wrongs. Instead, he pardons them and says, "'the rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance.'"³¹ Rodó's Prospero shows his concern for humanity

³⁰ "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," p. 8.

³¹ The Tempest, V, i, 27-28.

by trying to inspire his students to create a greater Latin America.

The two Prosperos are different, however. One embraces and exalts the spiritual and intellectual world, and the other experiences this world and rejects it. Shakespeare's Prospero abjures magic and drowns his book. He sets Ariel free and thus cuts his connection with the spiritual realm. Rodo's Prospero, however, emphasizes the importance of the spirit by accepting Ariel as a symbol and by trying to persuade his students to accept "'genuine Arielian aristocracy,' that of the mind and spirit."³² Therefore, the Prosperos are also simply separate creations.

When one considers the Prosperos, Calibans, and Ariels of The Tempest and Ariel, there are two important points to remember. First, these characters in The Tempest are used as characters. As characters, they undergo a certain development. Prospero develops from a state of involvement in studies of the spiritual world and magic to an acceptance of his duty in the real world of human beings. Caliban develops from a rebellious character to a character who accepts his proper place in society. And Ariel works to free himself from human servitude and thus is able to leave the realm of human affairs and return to his separate spiritual world. In

³² "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," p. 8.

Ariel, however, these characters are used mainly as symbols. As symbols, they retain their symbolic meanings throughout the essay. Therefore, because they are stable characters and do not develop, they differ somewhat from the developed Shakespearean characters.

This difference in the characters of Shakespeare and Rodó probably causes the second important point of contrast. This point of contrast is simply that Rodó's symbolic characters are unlike the developed Shakespearean Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel. Rodó's Ariel symbolizes the spirit that will aid humanity. Though Shakespeare's Ariel helps Prospero in The Tempest, he does so with the intention of freeing himself from his work for humans. He is, at the end of the play, free from his duties in the world of humans. Rodó's rebellious, materialistic Caliban is unlike Shakespeare's Caliban who learns to "accept his natural position."³³ Rodó's Prospero is also different from the matured Prospero of The Tempest. Rodó's Prospero is advocating a philosophy of spiritual and intellectual pursuits. But Shakespeare's Prospero leaves such pursuits and vows to concern himself only with his worldly duties of state.

The changes which Rodó makes in Shakespeare's original characters in no way lessen the importance of Ariel. Rodó, as a creative author, creates the characters of

³³ See p. 47.

Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban that are most effective in helping him to accomplish his purpose in Ariel. The changes are necessary, for Rodo's purpose is to inspire Latin American youth to accept spiritual and intellectual values. Shakespeare's purpose, however, is to show the chaos which results when natural order is upset. Therefore, the characters are used in the manner which will help the authors to achieve their purposes.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters, this study has been concerned with trying to discover the comparable point of view of Shakespeare's The Tempest and Rodo's Ariel. When comparing two such works, one must expect to find certain differences in the authors' attitudes and manners of presentation. Shakespeare and Rodo use different approaches to the three topics which are compared in this thesis. Shakespeare approaches the topic of society with the knowledge that his society has an accepted order. Thus, in The Tempest, he can write of a restoration of the accepted order of society. Rodo, however, cannot assume that his society has an accepted order. Therefore, in Ariel, he tries to instill in the youth of Latin America a philosophy which he thinks will unify Latin America and thus create order in it. In approaching the conflict of spiritual interests with material interests, Shakespeare shows the danger of neglecting the material pursuits of life to become involved in spiritual and intellectual matters. Dealing with the same topic, Rodo warns against neglecting spiritual and intellectual interests and becoming involved in completely materialistic pursuits. There is also a difference in the way in which these authors deal with the third topic which is

compared in this thesis (the comparison of the Prosperos, Ariels, and Calibans). Whereas Shakespeare uses Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban as characters that develop, Rodo' uses these same characters as stable characters that do not develop.

Despite the differences evident in these three topics, Shakespeare and Rodo' do share an essential point of view. The author of The Tempest and the author of Ariel both emphasize the need for an order in society. In The Tempest, Shakespeare dramatizes the strife which results when there is disorder in society, and he shows the harmony which prevails when order is restored to society. Rodo', in Ariel, tries to give order to society by attempting to inspire Latin American youth with a common purpose. Rodo' and Shakespeare also share a common fear of extremes. Shakespeare shows the danger of extreme involvement in spiritual matters, and Rodo' warns against extreme pursuit of material interests. The fact that these authors use the same characters in different ways does not change the fact that both sets of characters are used to point out a philosophy that advocates order in society and moderation in spiritual and material matters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bacheller, C. C. "An Introduction for Studies on Rodó," Hispania, XLVI, No. 4 (December, 1963). 764-769.
- Bailey, Helen Miller, and Nasatir, Abraham P. Latin America The Development of Its Civilization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Bowling, Lawrence E. "The Theme of Natural Order in 'The Tempest,'" College English, XLVI (January, 1951). 203-209.
- Craig, Hardin. (ed.). The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951.
- Ellis, Havelock. The Philosophy of Conflict. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919.
- Hayes, Francis. "Essays, Upheavals, and Mr. Nixon," South Atlantic Bulletin, XXIV (March, 1959). 8-9.
- Kittredge, George Lyman. Shakespeare: An Address. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Lubbock Avalanche-Journal. November 22, 1964. F, 13.
- Pereda, Clemente. Rodó's Main Sources. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Imprenta Venezuela, Inc., 1948.
- Rodó, José Enrique. "Ariel," Obras Completas de José Enrique Rodó. ed. Alberto Vaccaro. Buenos Aires: Ediciones A. Zamora, 1959. 162-210.
- _____. Ariel. trans. F. J. Stimson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922.
- Shakespeare, William. "The Tempest," The Complete Works of Shakespeare. ed. Hardin Craig. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951. 1249-1271.
- _____. "Troilus and Cressida," The Complete Works of Shakespeare. ed. Hardin Craig. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951. 862-898.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Random House, Inc., 1943.
- Torres-Rioseco, Arturo. The Epic of Latin American Literature. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

Unamuno, Miguel de. "Ariel," Rodó y Sus Críticos.
Paris: Agencia General de Librería, 1920. 50-51.

Ureña, Max Henríquez. Rodó y Rubén Darío. La Habana,
Cuba: Sociedad Editorial Cuba Contemporánea, 1918.

