

Further Evidence for the Notion of "Resistance" in Literary Discourse

Prof. Mohammed Said Negm

Faculty of Arts, Tanta University

Abstract

This paper investigates the notion of ‘power resistance’ in one of Shakespeare’s plays, *The Tempest*. This study adopts the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model of Fairclough (1989) to reveal the aspects of power resistance [1]. The conflict between Caliban, the servant, and Prospero, his Master, produces a particular aspect of resistance against power domination. Caliban considers himself equal to Prospero since he has shown Prospero the ins and outs of the island. Caliban’s resistance takes different forms, such as rejection and a negative evaluation of Prospero. The analysis has proved that power is not only a source of domination but also a stimulator for resistance. **Keywords**—Critical Discourse Analysis, power, resistance, capitulation

Keywords: - CDA, Power, Resistance, Shakespeare, The Tempest.

Introduction

Studies established in the area of critical discourse analysis, (henceforth, referred to as CDA), have been almost entirely devoted to the language/power relations. An illustrating example in this context is Fairclough (1989). Fairclough uses doctors'/patients' interviews to show that the doctor uses devices of power such as Instructions / Evaluating the other participant's verbal behavior / Questions / Interruption / Explicitness / Controlling topics / Reformulation / Repetition to control the patient.

Similarly, Negm (1997) has broadened the language and power spectrum to include literary discourse. He has proved that literary discourse can be an instrument of power. However, discourse is not the only locus for power to be exercised but also a context for power to be questioned and resisted. An example is Negm (2015). Negm has indicated that literary discourse can be a context for power to be resisted and challenged, contested, and resisted in Arthur Miller's *"Death of a salesman"*. Both the employer and the employee have been proved to makes use of the strategies of power.

1. Theoretical Framework:

The notion of 'power' is elaborated by (Fairclough, 1989) who explores various dimensions of the relations of power and language focusing on two major aspects of the power/ language relation: power in discourse and power behind discourse. Power in discourse has to do with discourse as a place where relations of power are actually enacted and maintained. power behind discourse focuses on hoe certain types of discourse are shaped and constituted by relations of power.

Fairclough (1989) presents a model for the analysis of discourse which is the most elaborate and worked – out in this respect. This is why it has been selected in the context of the present study. It is capable of revealing strategies and devices of power in discourse. It is mainly concerned with discourse as a place where relations of power are realized and enacted, that is, where participants are unequal. In other words, language is not a neutral channel. On the contrary, it is a tool for manipulation. Thus, unless otherwise specified, reference is to the (1989) model. He offers the following features which are devices of manipulation and control: Instructions / Evaluating the other participant's verbal behavior / Questions / Interruption / Explicitness / Controlling topics / Reformulation / Repetition.

3. Linguistic Analysis

This study rejects the static views which manifest one interlocutor as the sole monopolize of power. This is in harmony with Foucault (1981), who regards discourse as a "locus for power to be resisted, contented and challenged. Foucault

rightly argues that discourse is not that which translates struggle or systems of domination but that for which and by which there is a struggle. Likewise, (Bavelas et al., 1992:22) remark in the same context that "whenever people interact, there is interpersonal discord to be observed." Thus, the exercise of power triggers the resistance of power. Power and resistance of power are inseparable. Moreover, (Said 1991:5) asserts that resistance, authorities, and orthodoxies are the realities that make texts possible.

This paper studies discourse as a dyadic interactive process between two interlocutors. It dismantles the idea that discourse can be pragmatically manipulated for the practice of power only. It treats discourse as a context for power struggle and conflict. It attempts to point out the strategies of other participants to question, challenge, and oppose the authority of the judge. Thus, discourse is a two-way process, an interactive phenomenon.

In order to achieve his goal, the researcher will base his analysis on specific linguistic models and apply them to selected literary texts that illustrate and validate his theoretical proposition most clearly. Literary texts are treated as some form of naturalistic discourse.

This section is devoted to analyzing the discourse of Prospero and Caliban in the play *The Tempest* by Shakespeare. Caliban is the only sole native character to appear in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. He is the slave and the follower of Prospero, but he claims sovereignty over the island, and therefore, he is in hostility and conflict with Prospero. Caliban claims that Prospero has stolen the island from him. He is in contrast with Ariel, an airy spirit who serves Prospero. He suggests that he has shown Prospero the ins and outs of the island. For this reason, Ariel participated in the act of rebellion.

Therefore, there is a context of power and, on the other hand, a different context, that of resistance. Ariel is the servant of Prospero, and thus he is dominated by Prospero. Caliban, on the other hand, feels oppressed and resists the domination of Prospero.

The rest of this section is devoted to analyzing the strategies of resistance exercised by Caliban as will be exhibited that Prospero is not the sole monopolized of power. Caliban shows resistance by employing the same strategies of power manipulated by Prospero.

The first strategy deployed in the discourse of both participants is evaluation. Both Prospero and Caliban, in their first appearance in the play, exchange negative evaluation of each other as manifest in the following exchanges in act (1) scene 2:

Cal.: *As wicked dew as e'er my mother brush'd, With raven's feather from unwholesome fen, Drop on you both! A south-west blow on ye And blister you all o'er!*

Pro. *For this, be sure to-night thou shalt have cramps, side- stitches that shall pen thy breath up; urchins shall, for that vast of night that they may work All exercise on thee; thou shalt be pinche'd as thick as honeycomb, each pinch more stinging than bees that made 'em.*

Cal. *I must eat my dinner this island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, which thou tak'st from me. When thou cam'st first, thou strok'st me and made much of me, wouldst give me water with berries in't, and teach me how to name the bigger light, and how the lessthat burn day and night, and then Ilov'd thee, and show'd thee all the qualities o' the isle, the fresh springs, brine-pits, barren palce and fertile. Cursed be I that did so! All the charms of Sycorax, toads, beetles, bats, light on you! For I am all the subjects that you have, which first was mine own king; and here you sty me the rest o' th' island.*

Pro. *Thou most lying slave, whome stripes may move, not kindness! I have us'd thee, filth as thou art, with human care, and lodg'd thee in mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate the honour my child.*

Cal. *Oho, Oho! Would 't had been done, thou didst prevent me; I had people 'd else this isle with Calibans.*

Caliban declares bluntly that he has been utilizing the language that Prospero has taught him to curse Prospero and express his negative the evaluation of his master:

Cal.: *“You taught me language, and my profit on't is, I know how to curse. The red plague rid you for learning me your language.”*

The second strategy of power is directive when Prospero gives orders to Caliban, the latter does not conform.

Pro.: *Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices that profit us. What ho! Slave I Caliban! Thou carth, thou! Speak*

Cal.: *[Within] ther's wood enough within.*

Pro.: *Come forth, I say; there's other business! when?*

Another strategy used by both is that each participant tries to control the situation by making more utterances. They compete to talk more. This is evident also in act II scene; both Participants are eager to make as many utterances as possible.

4. Conclusion: Summary and Implications.

4.1 Summary:

What this paper has attempted to do is to prove that discourse is not only a context of power but also a context of power to be questioned, resisted, and challenged. This research tackles one of Shakespeare's plays, *The Tempest*, in which Caliban has challenged the domination of his master Prospero and exchanged negative evaluations of him. Both of them have criticized and abused the other. Caliban has shown power resistance throughout the rebellion against his master, Prospero. No participant monopolized power strategies. They both got in competition to abuse each other. Prospero always has shown high stakes for such acts of rebellion to keep his power control on the servants. In other words, his strategy succeeded with Miranda and Ariel, but it fails with Caliban. Another focal point of the conflict between Prospero and Caliban is that Caliban considers himself the owner or the king of the island since he inherited it from his mother, as he said. He accused Prospero of stealing the island from him. Caliban used the language he learned from Prospero to curse him as a form of rejection to the authorities of Prospero.

4.2 Implications

4.2.1 Linguistic Implications

The first linguistic implication of the study is that power is only one perspective from which discourse can be studied. Resistance is another dimension of discourse. Power triggers resistance in the sense that whenever there is power, there is resistance. They exist side by side in discourse.

The second implication of this paper is that literary discourse exhibits the deployment of the strategy of power and resistance like other genres. This is in accordance with Said (1983), who urges us to study words of fiction not only as products of imagination but also in terms of hegemony. Similarly, Negm (1999) has argued that forensic discourse not only a locus for power to be enacted but also a context. In other words, discourse is a dyadic interactive process in which participants react and reciprocate.

4.2.2 Pedagogic Implications

The first such implication is that the teacher should not monopolize the floor in the classroom. Students should be given a chance to take part in classroom interaction. This situation will result in interaction in the classroom and mutual understanding. Moreover, the students will be partners in the teaching-learning process.

References

- [1] Fairclough, N. (1989) Language and Power, London: Longman.
- [2] Negm, M.S. (1997) An Analysis of the Notion of Discourse as " Power" in Selected literary Texts published in the journal of the Faculty of Arts, Tanta Univ., January.
- [3] Negm, M. S. (2015). Resisting power in discourse. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192, 284-289.
- [4] Foucault, M. (1981) the Order of Discourse," in R. Young (ed.) Untying the Text, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- [5] Bavelas, J. B. L. E. Rogers and Frank E. Millar (1992) Handbook of Discourse Analysis, New York: Academic Press.
- [6] Said, E. (1991) "Foucault and the Imagination of Power," in D. Couzens (ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader. Basil: Blackwell.
- [7] Said, E. (1983) The World, The Text and The Critic, Oxford: H.U.P.
- [8] Negm, M. S. (1999) Forensic Discourse and the Conflictual Strategies of Power. Journal of Tanta Faculty of Arts