Lehigh University
Lehigh Preserve

Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2013

You're a teacher because you say you are: Performance, Professionalization, and the Early Modern English Schoolmaster

Michael Andrew Albright
Lehigh University, maa206@lehigh.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd

Part of the English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation
Albright, Michael Andrew, "You're a teacher because you say you are: Performance, Professionalization, and the Early Modern English Schoolmaster" (2013). *Theses and Dissertations*. 4263.
https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd/4263

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

“You’re a teacher because you say you are”: Performance, Professionalization, and the Early Modern English Schoolmaster

by

Michael Andrew Albright

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Lehigh University

May 20, 2013

© 2013 Copyright
Michael A. Albright

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Michael A. Albright

"You're a teacher because you say you are": Performance, Professionalization, and the Early Modern English Schoolmaster

Dr. Barbara H. Traister
Dissertation Director

Approved Date

Committee Members:

Dr. Scott Paul Gordon

Dr. Jenna Lay

Dr. Edward Shapiro

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the unwavering support of my family, friends, and professors, this project would not have come to fruition. The past seven years at Lehigh University have been rewarding—personally and professionally. However, it would be remiss of me if I did not take the time to acknowledge those professors at Millersville University who encouraged me to continue with my education at the graduate level. In particular, I am indebted to Dr. Robert Carballo, who served as my advisor and staunchly supported every step of my career, and Dr. M.P.A. Sheaffer, whose wisdom and scholarly authority inspire me to this day. These individuals allowed me to see the value in my work, and, to them, I owe my gratitude.

I have profited immensely from my time at Lehigh as a graduate student in Drown Hall. The Department's generous support allowed me to pursue my master's and doctoral degrees, while being afforded with the opportunity to teach—one of the main reasons I found myself attracted to graduate school. I am thankful to have experienced stimulating seminars with a range of professors from within and outside my field of study, including Dr. Elizabeth Fifer, who encouraged me to attend my first conference, and Dr. Beth Dolan, whose grounded feedback and sound pedagogy serve as models in my own teaching.

However, I would not be at this point without the members of my committee who saw me through the dissertation stage. I am thankful for Dr. Edward Shapiro's expertise and willingness to serve as my outside reader. I wish to recognize Dr. Jenna D. Lay for her unflagging support, extensive feedback, and genuine compassion throughout the

process. Dr. Scott Paul Gordon's stimulating commentary and patient interaction with my project deserves due recognition. Lastly, I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Barbara H. Traister who has come to occupy a special place in my life. Dr. Traister offered a blend of support, guidance, and encouragement that allowed me to go from never having written a seminar paper to completing a dissertation. Without her patience and generosity as a scholar and individual, I would not have reached this pinnacle of my academic career.

It is important to note that this milestone would have been unreachable were it not for my family. My mom and dad have believed in me more than I have ever believed in myself. They have given me more in life than I could ever know. However, I do know that they deserve nothing but my utmost respect and enduring love.

Finally, I owe my eternal thanks to my fiancée, C. Bridget DuBrey, and our son, Luke. Bridget's excitement for my project and unconditional support throughout the process have been nothing short of inspirational. I will never forget or overlook the sacrifices she has made in order to see me through the project. But, I am especially thankful for her selfless, undying love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Introduction: The Schoolmaster's Office, "In reality it is very splendid."	3
Chapter 1: The Schoolmaster's Status in the Cultural Imagination	29
Chapter 2: Playing, Acting, and Teaching: The Nexus of Drama and Education	82
Chapter 3: University Drama and Drama About the University	120
Chapter 4: Leaving School for Society's Stage	178
Chapter 5: Performing, Teaching, and "performing teaching"	215
Conclusion: Creating a Profession	251
Works Cited	257
Vita	274

ABSTRACT

Tudor and Stuart England serves as the ideal sociological, historical, and literary landscape for confronting a turbulent legacy of professionalization among educators. During an era in which occupational groups began to professionalize, teachers—from domestic tutors, to grammar schoolmasters, to university dons—emerged as a vital core of an educationally-conscious and theatrical society. Many early modern educators incorporated drama in their classrooms, and some acted or wrote for the stage. Because of their placement within an inherently educational and dramatic culture, schoolmasters did not enjoy the status and recognition of the so-called traditional professions. Given the theatricality of the classroom, I argue that the early modern stage makes the precariousness of these professionals particularly visible via the dramatic representations of their work. Just as the actors who play schoolmasters on stage must perform their parts, those who practice as educators in daily discourse must act according to a set of rules and expectations set forth by members of the public and by other members of the profession. This common thread of performance binds dramatic and actual schoolmasters together, and their struggle for professional recognition plays out in the confines of the theater or in the classroom. Beyond reflecting the reality of many schoolmasters' situations, I suggest that on-stage performances of the profession informed or shaped their contemporary professionalization efforts.

With the proximity of performance and pedagogy serving as my critical foundation, my project seeks to understand professionalization through the lens of performance. To this end, I offer a series of close readings of key dramatic texts, starting with Gascoigine's *The Glasse of Government*, which prominently feature representations

of the figure of the schoolmaster. After providing a historical overview that establishes the schoolmaster's professional identity via the period's non-dramatic and pedagogical literature, I concentrate on both academic and nonacademic plays in which the schoolmaster (and, by extension, an entire profession) suffers an image crisis that replicates the contemporary professional climate. I highlight how these diversely qualified and positioned educators perform their professions on stage either to the benefit or detriment of a larger, shared professionalization movement. Whereas the period's vernacular academic drama (as seen in *Club Law* and *The Parnassus Plays*) or commercial plays set in the university (Marlow's *Doctor Faustus* and Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*) largely upholds the profession by demonstrating how central performance was to scholarly, social, and national advancement, the era's public drama generally depicts a less complimentary reality via performance. When schoolmasters find themselves on the world's stage beyond their classroom, such as Gerald in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost*, their professional status is emptied of meaning as made emblematic by their time on stage. In addition to considering representations of established schoolmasters, I devote space to investigating plays (Redford's *Wyt and Science*, Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, and Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho*) in which the role of the schoolmaster is freely assumed by non-educators thanks to the performance potentials inhered in the profession. Thus, in viewing the staged schoolmasters' acting as a display of a larger professional practice built on performance elements, I demonstrate how we might read dramatic representation as an active contributor to the historic professionalization crisis common to early modern schoolmasters.

Introduction: The Schoolmaster's Office, "In reality it is very splendid."

In a 1516 letter to Johann Witz, Desiderius Erasmus replies to one of Witz's poems written in tribute to Erasmus' virtues as a scholar and friend.[1] Erasmus modestly deflects any praise from himself, and, in the spirit of humanistic exchange, he calls attention to the learned society of experts who surround him. Insisting that Witz's absence from their company is merely physical, Erasmus reassures his friend of his value not only within his circle of friends but also as a contributing member of society. Addressed to Witz, "teacher of the liberal arts," the second half of the letter responds to his misgivings about his chosen career path. Erasmus acknowledges the labor-intensive qualities of the work to which his friend has dedicated himself, but he forcefully repudiates Witz's claims that the work lacks social value:

> In fact, your lot is, I agree, laborious; that it is tragic, as you call it, or pitiable, I absolutely deny. To be a schoolmaster is an office second in importance to a king. Do you think it a mean task to take your fellow-citizens in their earliest years, to instill in them from the beginning sound learning and Christ himself, and to return them to your country as so many honourable and upright men? Fools may think this a humble office; in reality it is very splendid. ("Letter to Witz" 244)

As a humanist scholar and teacher himself, it is unsurprising that Erasmus offers such unequivocal support for the work in which his friend, he, and others engage daily. In this regard, his elevation of the schoolmaster's office to a position of importance subordinate

[1] The date of this letter is a source of contention among scholars, some of whom assign the year 1515 to the correspondence. Other translations and editors refer to Johann Witz as Joannes Sapidus. I have quoted the letter from James K. McConica, ed., *The Correspondence of Erasmus*, trans. R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson, (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976), 243-45.

only to the king's reinforces the importance of the educator position in the commonweal as the chief producer of future generations of upright Christian scholars, citizens, and rulers.[2]

However, as this dissertation will demonstrate, not everyone joined with Erasmus in regarding schoolmasters as "second in importance to a king," or even in recognizing them as professionals worthy of esteem. Educators of the period fought to assert and maintain their professional status relative to other occupational groups, while encountering a range of challenges in the classroom and within the community. Even insiders like Witz, as implied in Erasmus' response to him, struggled to appreciate the worthiness of their positions while making a living in the process. Humanists and pedagogical practitioners worked together to manage these obstacles by elevating the office of the teacher to a seat of glory. Thomas Morrice, in his 1619 *An Apology for Schoolemasters*, echoes Erasmus when he longingly recalls, "Of what reputation Schoolemasters in all former ages have beene..." before he reminds readers how "Our Savior *CHRIST* graceth the office of teaching" (C5^{v}, C6^{r}). Spanish humanist and Erasmus' contemporary, Juan Luis Vives, insists on a similar level of respect for the office, arguing in *De Tradendis Disciplinis*: "Those who despise their masters are most impudent, more fit for the plough than for books, for working in the field and the woods than for the company of men" (86). What distinguishes Vives' pronouncement from the others referenced is his assignment of a fate of solitary manual labor to anyone who dares to "despise" or flout the office of the schoolmaster. As the antithesis of scholarship,

[2] Published in the same year as the cited letter to Witz in 1516, Erasmus' *The Education of a Christian Prince* is a courtesy book that prescribes the ideal education of a future ruler at the hands of a competent, dignified teacher whose character and skills are instrumental to the future ruler's success.

fieldwork does not require any sense of community or mental expenditure. Those who work the plough occupy a menial position relative to the master Vives protects. On the surface, Vives' statement appears as a call for respect between master and student. More significantly, the consequences he assigns to anyone who debases the schoolmaster's status implicitly support his status and professionalization.[3]

When considered against the backdrop of an era during which the professional status of educators was in process and in a state of precariousness, these examples of support for the schoolmaster's work provide an ideal starting point for appreciating the historical, sociological, and cultural vestiges of a professionalization movement forged on the continent and in England during the early modern period. Writing from different countries and centuries, Erasmus, Vives, and Morrice join together in their attempts to elevate the schoolmaster to a position of due respect and recognition from the public, as the humanist movement begun on the Continent crossed over to England and brought with it anxieties about the schoolmaster's social position. These authorities also convey—either implicitly or by logic—that educators enjoy an occupational position that is necessarily distinct from menial or manual laborers'. Yet, their collective support for the profession appealed to a limited early modern audience who not only had a similar stake in education but also who enjoyed access to the pedagogical literature they produced. Outsiders to the profession and people whose lesser means prevented them from obtaining copies of such tracts derived their impression of schoolmasters from

[3] Although this and other terms are fraught with ambiguity, as this introduction and project as a whole will demonstrate, I employ the term "professionalization" simply as a way to describe the ongoing legacy of professional growth and development faced by any occupational group who consciously endeavors to assert and claim "professional" status from a recognizing public. As distinguished from "professionalism," or the trappings of professional life, "professionalization" refers to active processes and still-unfolding history.

everyday interactions and a popularized cultural experience: the early modern theater. The office that Erasmus calls "splendid," the role that Morrice reminds his readers that Christ himself occupied, and the respect that Vives demands while menacing detractors with a life of manual labor, took on a decidedly different character when represented on stage. The theater's inherently didactic designs and its ability to cultivate a wide audience positioned it as a viable social medium for enacting, reflecting, and constructing the overall state of the profession whenever schoolmasters appeared on stage.

In this dissertation, I introduce dramatic representation as a cultural and literary site that shaped contemporary professionalization efforts, existing as something more than mere reflection. Henry Barnard, in the Introduction to a compendium entitled *Education, the School, and the Teacher*, attests to the generative powers of literary representation, explaining: "The character of the school and the teacher at any given period, is to some extent reflected in the popular writings of the day, and is to still a greater extent perpetuated by such representation" (403). I would like to invest the early modern stage with these same dual capacities of reflection and perpetuation. In this project, I will consider specifically how the drama of the early modern period represents the contemporary professionalization efforts of the schoolmaster in ways that the period's pedagogical literature or present-day historiography cannot. If literary representation and professionalization are treated as complementary, mutually dependent phenomena, it is possible to investigate how the performance elements of the theater might create a different and perhaps more widely disseminated professional picture than do other sources.

The period's drama receives my critical attention because it stages the precariousness common to many of the era's schoolmasters, while also introducing a dynamic of a real-time, collective public response absent from other sources. The audience members' potential response to the dramatic schoolmasters' performance on stage may recall their own schooling and the performance of their teachers, thus informing their overall evaluation of the profession. What sorts of responses could these plays have elicited from members of the public and the professional educators who found themselves as audience members? How might the staging of educators reinforce or produce their professional status in the surrounding culture? Could this contemporary status derive as much from the stage as it does from their real-world performance in schools and with students? What if the actor's performance of the schoolmaster's professional work taught the public to respond negatively to educators' bid for professional recognition? Could the early modern schoolmaster's difficulty in achieving professional recognition have stemmed from the theater's staging of the profession rather than schoolmasters' actual work ethic in the field?

To approach these essential questions, which undergird the entire project, I will track how dramatic representation of the schoolmaster appears to produce a professional reality—one that differs from other genres' portrayals of the profession. By establishing this generic disparity as a key complication in determining the schoolmaster's professional standing across literary forms and in early modern society, I will move to argue that ambiguities in professionalization efforts may be best understood by or, perhaps, even owe their existence to, literary representation—particularly the drama of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Citing examples of public and university

drama of the period in all but one of this project's five chapters, I suggest that the early modern theater emerges as an ideal site for locating and explaining the precarious position of the era's schoolmasters. The staged schoolmaster performs for an audience that already regards the schoolmaster's profession as a matter of performance, and it is this notion of performance that emerges as the key to appreciating an abiding legacy of professionalization. Just as these performances shaped early modern perceptions of the profession, they continue to effect our sense of what a teacher is into the modern era.

Serving as a counterpoint for subsequent chapters that interrogate the period's drama, Chapter 1 samples a range of early modern pedagogical and creative, non-dramatic literature to offer a conditional verdict on the professional standing of the era's schoolmasters. With this climate of contemporary professionalization established, Chapter 2 turns to the early modern stage to discover how theatrical representation intervenes in depicting the schoolmaster's status. George Gascoigne's play *The Glasse of Government* rounds out the second chapter, as its unclear performance history and antitheatricality render it an exception to other dramatic representations. Chapter 3 examines the career scholar and his situation within the protected enclave of the English university in both academic and commercial drama about the university. Whereas the university provides a place and function for the career scholar, the wider world proves more disruptive to the professional educator's identity as I demonstrate in Chapter 4 using Shakespeare's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Love's Labour's Lost*. Both these plays feature schoolmasters who exist in environments in which their learned and professional status appears to have little political, social, or cultural bearing. They become objects of mockery as they engage in and direct performances unrelated to their

job descriptions, which render them useless to the community. In my final chapter, the precariousness of the schoolmaster's status is amplified when I expose how outsiders to teaching exploit its inherent performativity by simply donning the robes of the schoolmaster to engage in the guise of the profession for non-pedagogical purposes. The work they perform as pretense is sometimes indistinguishable from that of already established, textually recognized schoolmasters, further destabilizing the profession through performance art—a trope that is to this day in some circles presented as a valid pedagogy.

Comparing and Assessing the Professions Over Time

To frame literary representation as another frontier for assessing the emergent professionalization efforts of the early modern English educator requires a firm grasp on the rudiments of professionalism and the process of professionalization. Appreciating the professional climate of the era as a discrete historical and cultural phenomenon becomes difficult when confronted with a set of terms and expectations that are decidedly modern. The designation of "professional" seems outwardly stable and commonplace when used in everyday discourse, yet when widely applied to everyone from physicians to plumbers to closet organizers, the concept of professionalism becomes ambiguous—regardless of the era. Given this flexibility and inherent ambiguity, which persist into the twenty-first century, it is instructive to preface any analysis of the early modern scene with a brief outline of modern approaches to the professions—generally and specific to teaching. The following overview of critical approaches and theories that postdate the era of this dissertation's focus by about four centuries will highlight the perpetual state of

precariousness faced not only by teachers as an occupational group but also by professionals from all sectors of the working world who strive to claim and protect their "professional" designations. Finally, by separating modern approaches from historical ones, it will become easier to appreciate early modern England on its own without indiscriminately importing inaccurate language from today to explain the situation.

Checklists and Comparisons

Perhaps the neatest, but also the most limited approach to determining professional status uses a checklist of criteria to evaluate one occupational group's fitness as professionals against another's. Kenneth Charlton, for example, adopts a modern frame of reference complete with current language to establish a list of seven determinants of professional status as part of his survey of sixteenth-century professional life. Achieving professional status rests upon satisfying each of the criteria Charlton enumerates, which range from possessing a "depth of knowledge," to having a training period, to demonstrating a social hierarchy within the group ("The Professions" 21-22). Shirley M. Hord and Edward F. Tobia establish a similar checklist that they use to evaluate teachers' specific claims to professional status. Their criteria stipulate that a professional of any ilk must have received "formal preparation" from an institution of higher learning (usually a university), affiliate with a "formal association," maintain a "regulated certification," hold a "unique set of skills," while providing a "service that is both unique and vital to society"—all while enjoying a "high degree of respect from the members of society served by the profession" (Hord and Tobia 9). The authors note that teachers satisfy many of these criteria; however, they fall short in one of the most crucial

domains: garnering the public's respect.[4] To secure this respect, which comes seems to come so naturally to established professionals who coincidentally meet the above criteria, teachers, internal policy makers, and educational advocates have sought to cast teaching in the image of other professions.

Both members of society and those within the field insist on deploying a logic of comparison to assess the professional standing of teachers. Comparisons between teaching and medicine dominate, and the present-day physician emerges as a positive exemplar to which teachers need to aspire in order to achieve like recognition as professionals. Henry A. Dawe explains how comparing teaching to practicing medicine aided in remaking teacher training programs into something more scientific: "Understandably, 20th-century educators looked to the medical model as they began to assemble, elaborate, and eventually to institutionalize a science of pedagogy in their graduate schools of education. Educators' hopes ran high when an analogy between medicine and teaching was formed" (548). Hord and Tobia acknowledge that a wide gulf exists between the professional identities of teachers and physicians, admitting "there is still much to do to match the preparation requirements of a teacher to those of a physician" (11). However, they still maintain the possibility for achieving parity and ultimately place the onus on teachers to close the gap in respect: "If teachers ever wish to gain the respect given to doctors, they must take on a professional orientation to their work, project an image of dedication and service, hold one another accountable for their own growth and improvement, and take on a shared responsibility for the learning of all students" (17). Whether to increase the respect accorded to educators or to improve their

[4] Jurgen Herbst in *And Sadly Teach* (Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1989) argues that, on the whole, people are loath to apply to teachers "the criteria of professionalism usually cited by sociologists" (7).

training, the critical effort to analogize teaching with medicine appears to advance the ongoing process of professionalization waged by teachers. However, enforcing the similarities of teachers to physicians—or to any of the other traditional professions—insists upon a degree of resemblance that also works to subordinate the teacher's profession to another seemingly more established field, only further reinforcing the precariousness of the teaching profession.

While most—if not all—of the considerations Charlton, Hord, and Tobia establish seem to be valid determinants of professional status, these sorts of lists and their attendant comparisons are not without complications. Some of the conditions are variable, such as the training regimens required from field to field and job to job. Other considerations are potentially inapplicable to particular professionals, including teachers whose line of work is incomparable in many respects to other more traditionally recognized occupations. For Raf Vanderstraeten, these sorts of comparisons are ultimately unsustainable, as "it is indeed difficult to fit teaching into the procrustean bed of the true profession" (621). Such functionalist approaches, which view professions homogenously, tend to disregard internal conflicts and disruptions that dynamically influence and shape a profession's overall organization—internally and externally (Bucher and Strauss 325). Furthermore, any impulse to rate a group's work and presence according to a preformed set of criteria privileges an outsider's perspective, removing any internal curiosities or exceptions from critical view.

Other Approaches to Professionalization

While checklists tend to assume the existence of discrete, standardized groups, other approaches to evaluating professional status rely upon more targeted and nuanced criteria. These narrowly defined approaches are not necessarily any more valid or successful than the wide-angle assessment experts like Charlton or Hord and Tobia assume, as they introduce their own sets of complications. Rue Bucher and Anselm Strauss conceive of the professions as multiple segments, which in themselves can be segmented, and they define professions "as loose amalgamations of segments pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less delicately held together under a common name at a particular period in history" (326). The above definition takes into account historical vagaries and argues for the impossibility of constructing a uniformly applicable professional reality from group to group. Andrew Abbott acknowledges the aspect of interconnectivity central to Bucher and Strauss' segmentation approach and offers an ecological reading of the modern workplace. In his study, aptly titled *The System of Professions*, he argues that professions exist alongside one another as part of an integrated system in which the forces of competition either create or destroy any profession's existence (Abbott 33).

The lynchpin of Abbott's system approach is his focus on jurisdictions, or privileged spaces, which professionals vie for and control, thus preventing other groups from claiming similar status and, as a result, dominance in the field.[5] The process of

---

[5] Edward Gieskes in *Representing the Professions*, (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2006) has a similar way of imagining professional spaces and the battles over control of them. Instead of jurisdictional boundaries, Gieskes describes a "field of power," which he explains as "the site of struggles over the legitimacy of various claims to exercise legitimate power in society" (58). For David F. Labaree in "Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching: A Genealogy of the Movement to Professionalize Teaching," *The Harvard Educational Review* 62.2 (1992), control is predicated on an expert's "mastery of a formal body of

professionalization is best described by this push and pull, as the professions are not inert but rather are organically developing in response to one another and to market forces.[6] As part of an elaborate network in which multiple professions exist in various states of maturity and visibility, each group develops and emerges only when jurisdictions become vacant as a result of inter- and intra-professional competition (Abbott 3, 86-87). The manner of claiming jurisdiction is a public one and, as Edward Gieskes argues: "Struggles for status and identity form as much a part of the process of 'professionalization' as do economic changes" (44). Whereas criteria-based lists might require the presence of a practitioner-client dynamic or allude to status as publicly sanctioned, Abbott's system approach best emphasizes just how instrumental the public is in terms of recognizing a profession's place in society. A jurisdictional claim made in public hinges on seeking "control of a particular kind of work" as well as asserting "both social and cultural authority in the process" of making that claim (Abbott 60). The public, therefore, plays a definitive role in the genesis or demise of any professional group, or its "professionalization." Not only must it require the "kind of work" offered by the practitioner, but also the public must willingly defer to a professional group's "authority." This deference results in the public's exclusive patronage of a particular

---

knowledge that is not accessible to the layperson and that gives it special competence in carrying out a particular form of work" (125).

[6] Labaree in "Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching" describes professionalization as "more a process than an outcome" (127). Referencing a varied critical tradition, Andrew Abbott in *The System of Professions* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988) notes a constant concerning approaches to professionalization: "Probably the most common theme of past work is that professions tend to develop in a common pattern called professionalization" (9). Wilfrid Prest in "Introduction: The Professions and Society in Early Modern England," *The Professions in Early Modern England*, ed. Wilfrid Prest (London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1987) however, emphasizes that these movements were not "necessarily a linear process" and that "what the professions *were* at given points in time is at least as interesting and important as what they were becoming" (18).

jurisdiction occupied by a professional group, thus ensuring the recognition of that group's "professional" status.

When viewed as part of an ecological system ruled by public interaction rather than as a convenient catch-all designation, the term "professional" (and its associated word "professionalization") seems anything but stable.[7] Even so, "the title of profession becomes the chief stake of the professional field" (Gieskes 67). A group cannot maintain its jurisdiction over a particular field or area of expertise without legitimating its claim to that status publicly. Abbott reads legitimation culturally, arguing that it "justifies both what professions do and how they do it," and this justification depends on whether the public approves of the results in line with its cultural values (184). Therefore, professionals must not only rule their jurisdictions, but also they must devote nearly as much to the pursuit of recognition. For the public, any group's legitimation culminates in its just claiming of "professional status."

The complexities of the professionalization process ultimately elevate the term "professional" to impressive, but ambiguous heights. Bucher and Strauss note such tension in terms of their segmentation approach, arguing that difficulties arise "when the whole profession is considered as a public for particular specialties or for segments of specialties" (334). Their argument highlights the interpretive difficulties of asserting and according professional status. Because members of the public—the same public charged with authorizing a profession's existence—often content themselves with recognizing professions using a macro scale, professionals invariably follow suit and establish their jurisdiction, dominance, or control according to the same ambiguous terminology. As a

---

[7] Abbott in *System* notes that, nevertheless, "[f]or whatever reason, public images of professions are fairly stable" (61).

result, it becomes difficult to ignore critical approaches that classify professional work using uniform criteria.

Many of the critical conversations concerning the professions also confront the issue of semantics, and these semantic debates know no temporal bounds, as the same issues existed in the early modern era. In today's professional landscape, "The concept of profession has to be as much of an object of inquiry as the groups who claim to be or are recognized to be professions" (Gieskes 57). For Charlton, solely analyzing a group's work overlooks the "conceptual or semantic problem that revolves around the simple question 'What is a profession?'" ("Teaching Profession" 24). While this overview sets out to interrogate the intricacies of professionalization, my project as a whole takes nothing for granted concerning the stability of any term.[8] Despite the assumed exclusivity of professional status, the "concept" of the professions has the potential to become devalued when indiscriminately or inappropriately applied to groups or jurisdictions that others, including members of the public and other professionals, find objectionable.

Institutional and organizational controls exist within many professions that regulate membership, yet no external governing body can successfully exclude every unauthorized or unqualified worker from claiming unearned professional status. Outsiders also can perpetuate potentially unauthorized claims, and: "The underlying problem is that for many writers, calling something a profession makes it one" (Abbott 8). Subsequent chapters will feature these sorts of willed claims to professional status as they occur on the early modern stage to reveal how non-educators could become teachers

[8] Rather than impasses, I read such ambiguities productively and acknowledge any uncertainties as legitimate, meaningful artifacts of an ongoing legacy of professionalization.

via a costume change, thus potentially destabilizing the professionalization efforts of the established group. This mode of self-fashioning is endemic to the professions, as they operate independently of "traditional hierarchies of rank or of birth" (Gieskes 14). For example, little prevents mechanical laborers from espousing a professional identity in an effort to elevate their own status relative to that of their more successful rivals. The plumber can easily affix the word "professional" to his work van, while physicians can only count themselves as a practicing members of the medical community and call themselves "doctors" after an extensive credentialing process.

Do both these positions share the same status? And does one deserve the "professional" designation more than the other? While no one answer will satisfactorily arbitrate this particular case, this hypothetical highlights the overall instability and flexibility built into professional life. When professionalization resembles less a deliberate process and more a capricious claim, professional communities worry for their own survival and band together in their attempts to uphold the sanctity of their collective status. Early modern educators found themselves implicated in many of the tensions described above, and their efforts to professionalize largely suffered as a result of the inherently ambiguous conditions of their jurisdiction and an often misunderstanding, unforgiving populace.

Setting the Early Modern Professional Scene

Foundations

The precariousness that typified the working lives of many educators of early modern England stemmed from a burgeoning professional scene that reconfigured the

significance of work for many occupational groups and the general public. Before addressing at length the particulars of early modern educators' push for professionalization, it is worth understanding the social and cultural landscape in which they lived and worked by surveying relevant historical and critical approaches to the professions in early modern England. While this project does assume the existence of the professions in early modern England, some authorities are reluctant to consider such historical developments before the Industrial Revolution, which occurred at least a century after the period under examination. For Gieskes, adopting the Industrial Revolution as a dividing and deciding line amounts to "bias" by "treat[ing] the modern professions as if they are born new" at the dawn of modern-day industry (45). Abbot proposes a more nuanced dating strategy, designating the nineteenth century as the "first development of the professions as we know them today" (3). Because what "we know today" concerning the professions may actually be less certain than popular opinion suggests, our sense of familiarity is really no more useful as a criterion than enforcing a chronological split for the sake of convenience. Furthermore, Abbott's method fails to account for many of the similarities that have persisted across period lines, while still allowing for the ongoing development of a public knowledge base.

Although some historians have implemented strict temporal bounds to pinpoint the birth of the professions, other experts have succeeded in considering professionalization in the early modern period on its own terms. Gieskes, for example, borrows from New Historicist and microhistorical traditions "to describe how institutional and individual histories construct early modern versions of professionalization" (17). His study, *Representing the Professions*, focuses

predominantly on London and tracks the contemporary professional development and dramatic representation of four fields, including law, government administration, theater, and playwrighting.[9] Gieskes emphasizes the proximity of these professions and their professionals to one another, and he constructs an early modern ecology reminiscent of Abbott's system approach. Rosemary O'Day's focus on the ethos of the early modern professions complements Gieskes' socio-historiographical methodology. For O'Day, "Professionals were important to society because there were so many of them, but also because the ethos which underpinned them was so pervasive of elite and middle-class society" (*The Professions* 256). The professional community's footprint upon the larger community was too large to ignore, as society dictated and demanded the work of these experts and specialists upon whom they relied daily.

By arguing for the existence of professions in early modern England according to contemporary conditions as opposed to modern-day standards, Gieskes and O'Day avoid becoming entangled in endless debates over chronology. Yet, just as easily as they work to establish the existence of the professions, other authorities—and perhaps even certain citizens of the period—argue to the contrary. Wilfrid Prest offers an ambivalent assessment of the professions in early modern England that encapsulates the challenges presented by competing critical apparatuses:

> If what distinguishes a profession from any other occupation is the ability of its membership to determine, directly or indirectly, who may pursue that particular

[9] Curiously, Gieskes overlooks teachers as a professional group entirely despite the fact that early modern London had a concentration of schools and educators that interacted closely with all of the fields he tracks as part of his study. My project, of course, focuses exclusively on the professionalization of the early modern schoolmaster and his interaction with fellow colleagues and the general populace as represented on the stage.

> vocation, then there were either very few or very many professions in early modern England. Few, if we are thinking of recognizable prototypes of modern professions, whether legal, medical or other; many, if we include all the craft guilds and trading companies whose members sought to maintain a monopoly on the practice of numerous callings and trades in particular localities. (14)

Prest's "few or many" assessment reveals the frustratingly uncertain and inevitably limiting results of interpreting history using solely modern critical frameworks. My interest lies not in endorsing or refuting any particular approach. Nor will I succeed entirely in abandoning my own twenty-first-century frame of reference in reading the professional climate of early modern England.[10] Instead, I will introduce another means of reading by locating the professionalization of the early modern schoolmaster in terms of the period's literary representations of this historical phenomenon. My intention is to maintain a separation between periods to avoid anachronisms, while building the case for a developing continuum of professionalization that does not respect arbitrary period designations. In doing so, I acknowledge and celebrate ambiguities as essential factors of a complex professional equation that remains unsolved today.

Terminology:

A confluence of terminology—much of which is still extant today—that describes work, professionalization movements, and the people who labored in early modern

---

[10] To pretend to the contrary would be disingenuous. In this spirit, O'Day in *The Professions in Early Modern England, 1450-1800* (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000) justly sounds the alarm when she states that "Sociologists have tended to divorce the professions from their historically specific context" (8). My analysis will respect historical specificity, while invariably acknowledging and drawing upon the available critical apparatuses—from modern and contemporary to the early modern era—that will most fully and appropriately provide needed context.

England creates many of the interpretive difficulties faced by today's historians, sociologists, and literary critics. Perhaps the best way to appreciate the semantic slipperiness of "profession" as a term is to note the evolving significations of "vocation" and "calling" in the context of the period's professionalization movements. William Perkins' *A Treatise on the Vocations, or, Callings of men, with the sorts and kinds of them, and the right use thereof*, provides an ideal foundation for tracking this semantic shift. Published in 1603, Perkins' treatise equates both terms, and he roots them both squarely in a religious context. Perkins draws from scripture to describe and prescribe a man's vocation or calling, offering: "A vocation or calling is a certaine kinde of life, ordained and imposed on man by God for the common good" (2). That one's work should benefit the common good of society quickly "became a lasting part of the professional ethic" during the period (O'Day, *The Professions* 28). In addition to stipulating that one serve God and the commonweal, Perkins details the logistics of entering a particular calling or vocation. A calling must be lawful and individually suited so that it "be fitted to the man, and every man be fitted to his calling" (Perkins 41). As long as one's selection of a particular vocation or calling conforms to God's and society's laws, Perkins allows for some element of personal choice.

When viewed in an early modern context, the potential for self-selection acquires great significance in an emergent climate of professionalization in which "vocation" and "calling" acquired new meanings. Gieskes, for example, notes that "the transition from premodern divinely ordained vocations to modern, at least apparently self-chosen professions involves the redefinition of vocations as professions" (54). This new equivalency may appear as haphazard or even as counterproductive to achieving any

stable notion of the professions in the early modern period. However, as described above, the term "profession" and its derivatives sometimes lack specificity even in today's popular lexicon.[11] In early modern England, the concept of the professions developed in concert with a changing cultural and social landscape. No longer exclusively carrying a religious significance, the term "profession" began to acquire various secular meanings, as did accompanying terms like "vocation" or "calling."[12] In the broadest sense, a profession translated into a job and was frequently synonymous with "known employment," but, at the same time, the designation of "professional" acquired a more dignified sense that contrasted with mechanical trades, while also being associated with university degree-holders (Prest 12). Gieskes describes the professions of early modern England as "occupations that develop as an internal structure whose structuring principles—the terms of distinction—become a stake in the internal struggles for status that translate, through a series of mediations, into claims for the status of the occupation in the broader society" (58). In this regard, the professions began to coalesce as cultural entities separate from the lay or mechanical trades, but they were still inextricably linked to the "broader society," which accorded them their status.

Even if the concept of the profession had broad applications during the period and did not necessarily distinguish every learned or specialized field from surrounding trades, occupational groups "began to claim expertise, learning and monopoly and to reflect openly about this claim" in response to its developing usage (O'Day, *The Professions*

---

[11] Kenneth Charlton in "The Teaching Profession in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," *History and Education: The Educational Uses of the Past*, ed. Paul Nash (New York: Random House, 1970) explains that the lack of a resolution in any period should surprise no one, as "various value judgments are built into our uses of the term" (25).

[12] O'Day in *The Professions* argues that "The use of the word in a wholly secular context cannot be established before the mid sixteenth century" (13), while Gieskes states that "our modern sense of professions as referring to one's chosen occupation is extant, if not prevalent, in the sixteenth century" (59).

14). Nevertheless, in everyday discourse and period literature, the terms "profession," "trade," "occupation," and "job" were often conflated and used arbitrarily. This apparent randomness should not prevent us from establishing the burgeoning existence of professional life in the early modern period—any more than the terminological confusion that persists into the twenty-first century should preclude us from maintaining such concepts today. Terms such as "professional," "professionalism," and "professionalize" did not even become standard in theoretical discourse until centuries after the period under examination, perhaps due to the holdover of religious associations with the professions. However, as O'Day aptly reminds us, "[T]he phenomena, which these words were later to describe certainly did exist or were in the process of development long before the words were coined" (*The Professions* 14). To appreciate and detect these "phenomena" in the literature and social history of the early modern period is to validate a still-developing legacy of the professions—even if that means appropriating terms from other eras to come to an understanding of how these professions, including teaching, existed on their own terms during the period.

The Social Landscape:

With the work of definition acknowledged, though by no means completed, we need to broaden our understanding of the professions during the period by discovering their cultural, social, and internal conditions. Understanding professional work in these lights will permit me to concentrate exclusively in Chapter 1 on the early modern educator's professional position and status as understood by his contemporary practitioners. Critics who locate a professional community in early modern England tend

to concentrate on contemporary social organization in order to offer the most comprehensive reconstruction of the era's professional sectors. In line with O'Day's ethos approach, Gieskes links professional growth with historical changes in everyday life. He argues, "Professions helped drive social and cultural change at the same time they were changed by those same developments" (Gieskes 43). This dialogic rapport between the professions and society also grounds Prest's analysis, in which he similarly describes the professions and their professionals as "cultural and intellectual artefacts" (7). In this project, I focus on the early modern stage and assign this period institution artifact-status by reading dramatic representations of schoolmasters against the backdrop of their contemporary professionalization movement and the social scene in which they performed their work on a daily basis.

Several historical developments, such as the English Reformation and the rise of the gentry, transformed social ranks, spurred educational growth, and remapped the professional landscape for many citizens, including teachers. Among other instrumental changes, the Reformation created new professional jurisdictions, while rendering others obsolete. For instance, after the break from the Catholic Church, Roman canon law no longer had a place in the English universities. Teaching and the awarding of degrees in this area were suspended, and "at a stroke…a whole profession was abolished—one that had for centuries furnished church and state with much of its administrative élite" (Lawson and Silver 95). At the same time, the Reformation was responsible for creating a "lay teaching profession," as the clergy no longer monopolized instruction (Charlton, *Education in Renaissance* 94). Early modern society became more secular, and

laypeople acquired more prominence in everyday affairs; they also capitalized on an increase in professional opportunities.

With the rise of the gentry, nobles sensed that a reconfiguration of honor was possible, and birthright, lineage, or military might was no longer the only cause for according social status.[13] New forms of work created opportunities for personal gain, and although not exactly democratized, education became central to achieving "advancement in most fields" (J. Simon 294). Nobles eagerly sought learning, while the gentry and members of the middling sort availed themselves of education in order to secure gentleman status. To satisfy this growing demand, educators found themselves in higher demand along with other professionals who similarly possessed a "growing awareness of the social theory of the profession, a theory which looked upon the social problems of the time and reckoned that they could be overcome by the educated professional" (Charlton, "The Professions" 41). Whether they served noble households, taught at the university, privately tutored, or manned the grammar or petty school classroom, a distinct corps of educators emerged against the backdrop of the period's other already established professions. And, in an effort to lend credibility to their own field, authors of pedagogical literature sometimes deliberately situated the educator among other fields.[14]

---

[13] See Caspari's *Humanism and the Social Order* for a particularly useful overview of the cultural, social, and ideological transformations brought upon by shifting perceptions concerning knowledge and learning.
[14] Charles Hoole, for example, in the Restoration-era *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School* (Syracuse, NY: C.W. Bardeen, 1912) insists that difficulties experienced along the way should not preclude teachers from enduring their present lots since other professions experience their own sets of challenges. Mariners "because of danger," husbandmen "because of toyle," soldiers "because of hardship," magistrates "because of interruption," and ministers "because of many men's disordered conversations" do not relent in their efforts (10). Morrice in *An Apology for Schoolemasters* (London: Bernard Alsop for Richard Flemming, 1619) includes the schoolmaster in the company of the divine, the lawyer, and the physician when arguing that "Every one is to be regarded, and esteemed, according to his vocation and degree, and the subject or object thereof about the which he is conversant" (B3^{r}). John Brinsley sets up his *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles* (London: Richard Field for Thomas Man, 1622) as a means to encourage "the shortest and fairest way of teaching" and argues that the schoolmaster should "expect much

Despite these efforts to contextualize the field, the relatively broad scope of the work of teaching contributed to the overall sense of precariousness shared by many educators of the era.

Who exactly, then, formed early modern England's professional class? Just as a range of terms used to describe work overlaps to create a host of interpretive ambiguities, professionals of the period occupied a range of social stations and served a broad-based clientele. The majority of the era's professionals found themselves situated among the growing middling sort, which also provided a large pool of potential and existing clients.[15] Many of the era's middle-class professionals did, however, enjoy an educational upbringing similar to many social elites (O'Day, *The Professions* 30, 261). Education thus emerged as a mark of distinction, becoming one of the chief criteria for seeking specialization and, in turn, for claiming professional status. As much as it united professionals across various fields, specialized knowledge also became a source of contention, sometimes creating "internal dissension" and other times leading to "conflict with those whom they aimed to exclude from practice" (C. Brooks 119). Oftentimes, what separated the expert from the amateur was a specialized body of knowledge. These phenomena of separation and exclusion are essential to constructing the professional identity of any individual or representative group.

Without exclusion, the professional-client dynamic would cease to exist, and so also would any need for or semblance of the professions. Without a sense of separation

---

comfortable fruit of his labours, as anie other man in all the world" (6), just like husbandmen who reap high returns and sailors who discover the best passages. All of these authors consciously elevate the office of the schoolmaster by comparison to already established and respectable occupations, thus contextualizing educators' work as really no different or any less valuable than other forms of essential labor.

[15] According to Prest, professionals of all types—past or present—tend to occupy a station above workers and peasants who don't rule, yet "below the elite whose livelihood is in no way dependent upon their personal exertions": "Introduction" (17).

enforced by qualifications or higher knowledge, demand for specialized services would vanish and laypeople would practice instead of professionals. The growth of the professions, therefore, depended on both parties maintaining their positions, while benefitting from one another in the process. The client could receive "expert advice" and "guidance and treatment for their souls, bodies, and estates," and the practitioner had the ability to "exclude the charlatan and enhance his own status" (Orpen 183).

Practitioners and clients drew from each other to cultivate the eminence of any given profession. Because the middling sort exercised the greatest demand for many professional services, they played an instrumental role in many groups' bids for professionalization by forming an "audience for many of their [the professionals'] public pronouncements about society and the State" (C. Brooks 116). It is this notion of "audience" that informs much of my analysis of the professionalization of early modern educators via the exchange between actor and spectator—an interaction that potentially extends beyond the scope of the theater and influences teachers' bid for recognition. This audience comprises an interpretive body that accords others professional status in any era—especially for teachers whose "personal service to clients [is] so attenuated and public" (Vanderstraeten 626). How teachers perform their profession for this public is what allows them to vie for what can seem like an elusive status. As Hord and Tobia put it, "Teachers who perform their work with a clear sense of identity as professionals and a strong personal standard of integrity are reflective about what they do and are committed to continuous learning as a way to hone their skills" (13). Yet, as I will demonstrate in this project using examples of early modern English drama, it is this expectation and

existence of acting in the profession that ultimately complicates and creates the status of the teacher whose livelihood is predicated on and defined by such performance tropes.

Chapter 1: The Schoolmaster's Status in the Cultural Imagination

The Professional and Literary Background of the Early Modern English Schoolmasters

Erasmus' letter to Witz, which appears above in the Introduction, not only encapsulates the great esteem in which humanists held knowledge, but it also reveals a fundamental divorce between perception and reality, theory and practice, ideals and facts. Although Erasmus openly celebrates the office of the schoolmaster, his response seems insufficient, no more than offering teachers friendly encouragement. The issues that occasion Witz's initial correspondence signal a much bleaker reality than the one Erasmus portrays in his encouraging reply. Witz and others in his position will continue to feel unworthy or demoralized no matter how often they are reminded that their office is nearly regal in importance. This idealization of the schoolmaster's position is but one form of representation that participates in constructing the status of the profession for early modern audiences.

As Rebecca Bushnell succinctly notes, "[H]umanists idealized the schoolroom" (30). However, this idealization often starkly contrasted a harsher reality chronicled by historians and depicted in contemporary literature. Charlton's description of the grammar schoolmaster and his usher as "gerund-grinding, birch-wielding pedants, narrowly confined in their method as much by their lack of learning as by their prescribed texts and prescribed statutes" is decidedly less flattering than the ways in which Erasmus and his fellow humanists would characterize the office ("Teaching Profession" 49). To appreciate this split between the sometimes-harsh reality and the ideal is central to understanding a legacy of professional precariousness that was forged in early modern England and that continues in many respects to this day.

Modern historians join together in heralding the importance of learning to early modern English culture, but few have included or treated the schoolmaster, the dispenser of this knowledge, as a professional worthy of the same recognition as lawyers, physicians, or clergymen.[16] This relative inattention creates its own set of challenges when it comes to assessing the professional status of the period's educators since we lack any sort of critical consensus or overwhelming historical evidence that fully supports the existence of a profession. When we turn to contemporary literary portrayals of the schoolmaster for assistance in determining this status, we are confronted with flattering literary and historical portrayals that bolster the profession alongside defamatory ones that deride it. Given these interpretive difficulties created by scant research and conflicting portrayals, providing the most comprehensive portrait of the office is only possible by drawing from both modern historiography and contemporary literary evidence, which serves as this chapter's focus. This combination of sources will do little to close the gap between perception and reality; however, this evidence will produce what I consider the fullest picture of an admittedly uncertain, but developing professionalization movement without hyperbolizing the office as an Erasmian ideal or rendering it as an abysmal lot in life.

In this chapter, I will cite creative literary (non-dramatic) representations of teachers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries along with a body of extant pedagogical literature to establish the profession in the cultural imagination of the period.

[16] Keith Thomas in *Rule and Misrule in the Schools of Early Modern England* (Reading, 1976) elevates the school as a social institution of prime importance, "By examining the internal life of the school it is possible to learn something about the workings of society as a whole" (5). For examples of histories that celebrate a culture of teaching and learning, see, for example, Lawrence Stone, "The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640," *Past and Present* 28 (1964): 41-80; Joan Simon *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967); Fritz Caspari, *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England* (New York: Teachers College P, 1968).

These literary representations are generally attributed to authors who are not practicing teachers, while the body of professional literature that exists almost always comes from the pen of an expert in the field.[17] The core of my project, of course, rests upon using dramatic representations of schoolmasters to make visible a larger phenomenon of professionalization, suggesting that performance may contribute in part to the collective sense of precariousness shared by educators of the period. While my dissertation mainly addresses drama, literary representations on the whole often emphasized teachers' "professional insecurity and social unpopularity" (Bushnell 39). The professional literature of the period, on the contrary, usually supports and upholds teachers' professional status. In particular, pedagogical treatises authored by practicing and experienced schoolmasters lent the greater profession a voice that communicated to the public its capabilities, while also responding both implicitly and directly to common concerns or criticisms.

Literary Representations of Education and Professionalization

Layers and Possibilities of Representation

Before considering dramatic representations of schoolmasters against the backdrop of a surrounding professionalization movement, it is necessary to establish how the period's literature treated more global issues such as teaching and learning. My immediate focus lies not in cataloguing any sort of exhaustive list of recorded representations of early modern education, as such work has already been compiled in a

[17] Of course, there are exceptions to this rule, as some schoolmasters penned plays, just as many university men incorporated drama as part of their pedagogy. My own analysis of literary representations comes in later chapters.

range of readers and compendiums.[18] Instead, I plan to consider representation as a polyvalent and powerful social phenomenon—one that has the ability to reflect and affect the reality of professionalization for early modern schoolmasters. The institutions of teaching and learning occupied places of central importance for many early modern citizens, readers, and writers. Newly regarded as a pathway to social advancement in the early modern era, education "was an issue that was rarely represented without some reference to social politics" (Grantley 200). The period's literature, which often had a didactic purpose, offered a prime vantage point for determining—or, at the very least, thinking about—the ambiguities of social position. And, the fact that the burgeoning professionalization movement of the period existed as part of these battles for social advancement, also remapped the conventions of social advancement and appeared as part of the period's literature.

Representation does not begin or end with literature. When referring to the institution of the school, Jeff Dolven argues for its representable and representative qualities: "School itself is constructed as a representation. It gives the young an account of what the world is going to be like" (29). Dolven's formulation emphasizes the shaping potentials of representation. Not only does the school reflect the outside world for students, but it also repackages that world to offer a condensed version of what the future reality may hold. These packaged representations in schools do not always faithfully reproduce reality, instead creating an ivory tower that separates academics from the rest

[18] See, for example, a group of nineteenth-century collections that feature literature in which the schoolmaster appears, including Henry Barnard, ed., *English Pedagogy: Education, the School, and the Teacher, in English Literature*. (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Company, 1862), Edward Eggleston, ed., *The Schoolmaster in Literature*. (New York: American Book Company, 1892), and Herbert M Skinner, ed., *The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire*. (New York: American Book Company, 1894).

of the population. In addition to representing certain experiences of the period's educational revolution, the era's dramatic and non-dramatic literature about education represented a rather wide swath of the population who participated either directly or indirectly within the system, including, of course, teachers and students.

Patricia Donahue's 2001 article, "Popular Representations of Teachers and Teaching," provides an optimal starting point for investigating how teachers have fared as a professional group in literature across the centuries. Writing her essay as an introduction to a journal issue devoted to the topic of literary representation of teachers, Donahue reasons that "[t]he work of teaching remains elusive, almost as if it were beyond representation, at least in the genres and conventions currently available" (15). Donahue's twenty-first-century assessment of literary representation could also have described the professional and literary landscapes of the early modern period. The precariousness, ambiguity, and inconsistency that typified the profession in Elizabethan and Stuart England not surprisingly appeared as part of the era's literature. It is important to note, though, that mere uncertainty did not and does not prevent literary representations. In fact, Donahue ultimately argues for the power of literary representation, claiming: "popular representations do not float in an undifferentiated social space but exert tangible material effect" (15). Though nonspecific and rather "elusive" on its own, Donahue's conclusion affirms the transformational and productive possibilities of literary representation.[19]

---

[19] Donahue mainly focuses on the students who read texts and view films depicting teachers in certain ways. The "tangible effect" she imagines deals with how these representations outfit students with "expectations which for them are commonsensical and which they deploy to shape the pedagogical project in various ways: though acquired ideas of what constitutes 'good' teaching, 'relevant' classroom work, 'fair' grading, and 'fun'" (15).

When it comes to the students, or scholars, of the period, they were often rendered as "stock types" who were many times noted for being "comically inept" (Grantley 187, 197). Although exceptions exist in which students take pride in their education, conventional dramatic representations featured students who were resistant to their education, such as the son in Thomas Ingelend's interlude *The Disobedient Child*, or those who fit into the second category of Grantley's assessment like Tim, the hapless son of a rich upstart in Thomas Middleton's city comedy, *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. For the sake of comedy, these students' parents, especially their mothers, often assumed meddling rather than supportive roles, although, again, exceptions exist throughout the period's dramatic and non-dramatic works.[20] If students and their parents often found themselves represented in less than flattering ways, then what literary fate did their teachers enjoy? In an era in which the teacher enjoyed an at best precarious professional standing, how did his livelihood fare in the hands of the period's authors? These are the questions that serve as the foundation of my project, and the answers that I derive from secondary and primary research in this chapter will allow me to begin to consider representation as a component of professionalization.[21]

---

[20] See, for example, Ursula Potter's "Pedagogy and Parenting in English Drama, 1560-1610: Flogging Schoolmasters and Cockering Mothers," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Sidney, 2001).

[21] Just as early moderns once did, present-day observers draw from a range of structural criteria, such as salary, training, membership in associations, to determine and assign professional status. I will treat literary representation as a viable, accessible determining factor of professional status and the process of professionalization. In considering literary representation as something more than a reflection of a professional's reality, representation becomes an active contributing factor in our efforts to recognize or accord status.

Non-Dramatic Representations of the Early Modern Teacher

Prose and the Question of Visibility

This section will provide a survey of non-dramatic literature in which the figure of the schoolmaster, or teacher, occupies a central place. As with the forthcoming analysis of dramatic representations that will form the bulk of this project, the following examples from prose and poetry will pay special attention to the representation of the teacher's professional identity. However, my primary purpose for engaging in this tour of non-dramatic literature is to consider the larger issues of representation and genre. How does the era's prose and poetry represent the figure of the schoolmaster? Are there any abiding trends from genre to genre? Does each genre offer something different in terms of representation? And, finally, how do these non-dramatic literary forms compare to the drama of the period in terms of representing the figure of the schoolmaster? These questions will inform my analytical efforts in presenting, organizing, and interpreting the texts I have selected for closer examination.[22]

The visibility of the schoolmaster as a professional and public figure in this discrete body of non-dramatic literature seems to differ from the rest of the era's prose writings written by non-schoolmasters, or non-career ones. Writing from a twenty-first-century perspective but equally applicable to the early modern literature, Donahue notes that "in historically popular media, teaching is most often depicted in its absence…" (14).

---

[22] In searching for representations of early modern schoolmasters in non-dramatic literature, I have had to choose representative examples. The prose essays, poems, and "characters" I have selected for analysis are not inclusive by any means. In order to provide the most compelling and efficient overview, I have included texts that are situated within the Elizabethan or Stuart periods and that feature the figure of the schoolmaster in such a way that allows for sustained and thoughtful inquiry. I located many of the poems, for example, by searching in indices and databases for variations of "schoolmaster" and "teacher" in the titles and bodies of early modern poems. Similar methods of searching in anthologies and collections allowed me to select the "characters" I have chosen as a means to introduce drama in Chapter 2.

This notion of absence applies not only to the work of teaching but also to the presence of the teacher as an individual and as a representative of a larger professional group. As the following pair of early modern prose tracts reveals, it is possible to address the broader subject of education without extensively treating or even acknowledging the principal agents of that institution.

Appearing in three editions during his lifetime, Francis Bacon's *Essays* follow in the tradition of Michel de Montaigne and offer readers reflective commentary on a range of familiar topics and experiences. In a collection that features essays entitled "Of Parents and Children," "Of Custom and Education," "Of Youth and Age," and "Of Studies," no essay deals with the office or role of the schoolmaster. Yet, all of these essays in some way address the institution of education. Bacon instructs parents in "Of Parents and Children" to "choose betimes the vocations and courses they mean their children should take," but there is no mention of the schoolmaster's role in teaching these programs (*Essays* 27). A similar note of absence punctuates other essays of the collection that center on education as a theme. Even in the essay "Of Studies," first written in 1597, Bacon de-emphasizes the schoolmaster or teacher to such a point that he is only present in his absence. Framing learning as self-directed in this essay, Bacon expounds on the uses, rewards, and users of studies, while also surveying a range of disciplines and tackling such issues as reading practices. He advises students to look to other examples in order to learn, such as "the schoolmen" who "are hair-splitters" or "lawyers' cases" (*Essays* 208-9). Although it would seem as though Bacon does give a nod to educators, the "schoolmen" to whom he refers are medieval scholastics—not typical schoolmasters in the field.

While it would be misleading to draw any conclusions about Bacon's views on the profession based on his omission of the schoolmaster from his essays regarding education, the absence of the teacher from the text does prevent the reader from having any sort of image of the schoolmaster. As a result, both his work and his position are invisible, and Bacon effectively removes the schoolmaster from the professional landscape by not featuring him as a key player in the learning process. Whereas Bacon's essays overlook the schoolmaster's position by excluding him from view, John Milton's 1644 pamphlet *Of Education* overlooks the complexities and specifics of that professional role, while still imagining a revolutionized institution of learning. Addressed to Puritan Samuel Hartlib, Milton's tract outlines a reformed curriculum and program for English students in which he considers current pedagogical practices in an effort to update them for a new generation of youth and public servants. Despite the brevity of the text, Milton manages to detail a range of curricular, practical, and pedagogical innovations. However, his limited commentary on the schoolmaster rests on assumptions or generalizations.

Milton describes the designs of his ideal academy with precise attention to detail down to the numbers, yet he leaves the governance of such an institution to one whose qualifications or capabilities are unclear. His academy is "big enough to lodge a hundred and fifty persons, whereof twenty or thereabout may be attendants, all under the government of one, who shall be thought of desert sufficient, and ability either to do all or wisely to direct and oversee it done" (Milton 633). The monumental task of administering such a large—and new—academy in which everything from the students' diet to their program of studies differs from current tradition rests on the shoulders of

“one” who either actively leads or efficiently delegates. Milton assumes an advanced, innate capacity for leadership without offering any further details.

In his concluding remarks about his plans for reform, Milton obliquely and ambivalently returns to the position of the educator:

> Only I believe that this is not a bow for every man to shoot in that counts himself a teacher, but will require sinews almost equal to those which Homer gave Ulysses; yet I am withal persuaded that it may prove much more easy in the assay than it now seems at a distance, and much more illustrious howbeit not more difficult than I imagine, and that imagination presents me with nothing but very happy and very possible according to best wishes; if God have so decreed, and this age have spirit and capacity enough to apprehend. (639)

In the above passage, Milton presents a frustratingly contradictory and optimistic vision of his plan for reform, placing the burden for success on an exceptional leader and teacher. Although he does seem to acknowledge a certain degree of privilege or prestige built within the profession in that not everyone has the capacity to lead, Milton undercuts this vision by insisting that practice will “prove much more easy in the assay” than in theory. The only specific quality that Milton assigns as a prerequisite for his teacher is an uncommon, mythical strength, which renders the ideal candidate an exception to the norm. This description does little to make visible any “real” teacher for the reader, as one must rely on imagination as Milton does to envision the reality of the teacher’s practice. When framed as an imaginary, mythical being, Milton’s teacher shares a common bond of absence with the nonexistent educator of Bacon’s essays on education.

Poetic Representations: Condemnation and Commendation

Like the era's drama, which followed a legacy of medieval morality and mystery plays, the poetry of the early modern period served entertaining and edifying ends. Poets recognized their roles as teachers, and "[a]ny poet of the age knew that he should be writing to teach" (Dolven 2). Aware of their responsibilities and mindful of their pasts as students, poets needed to balance their own learning with their potential to teach others through their art. Dolven frames the poet's vantage point in terms of visibility, arguing: "Such a poet had to make learning visible, as the schoolmaster has to make it visible in the classroom" (17-18). In a sense, poets occupied the role of a schoolmaster and wrote in the same vein that the schoolmaster taught. Just as the interplay between performance and pedagogy bridged the gap between classroom and stage, the era's poets once found themselves implicated in a system in which they learned and studied the sorts of poetical forms they emulate in their own work.[23] Yet, as the above prose tracts reveal, the existence of learning as a theme does not guarantee the presence of a teacher—much less the existence of a viable profession to facilitate that learning. In the examples of poetry that follow, each significantly focuses on a schoolmaster as a character. However, the poems' treatment of that schoolmaster's professional standing differs according to the type and occasion of the text.

In canvassing over a century's worth of poems that meet the criterion of prominently showcasing an educator, I have noticed that each broadly conforms to a model of either condemnation or commendation. Condemnations of schoolmasters tend

[23] However, as Dolven in *Scenes* argues throughout his study that focuses on instructional moments in romantic poetry, achieving such visibility posed a great challenge for poets who found it difficult to "endorse" their educational upbringing and the surrounding culture of teaching and learning in which they lived (18).

to approach the profession generally, not naming specific examples of schoolmasters, but serving as cautionary examples for concerned citizens, current students, and practicing professionals. Commendations, on the other hand, tend to focus on specific, historical schoolmasters who are often named in the title. These flattering representations sometimes speak to a larger professional corps, but oftentimes an individual's death occasions these expressions of praise. However, not every commendatory poem requires a death as its impetus. Sometimes poets choose to explore their own craft as writers and, in doing so, they attribute their standing and creative abilities to the schoolmasters who inspired them in the classrooms of their youth. No matter the occasion or category, each of these poems offers a distinct literary representation of schoolmasters both as individual figures and members of a profession recognizable to both the reader and to the poet who once occupied the role of a student. Whether written as a scathing indictment of poor teaching or as an encomium to a lifetime spent instructing young minds, these poems provide a clear vantage point for considering how this inherently didactic genre represents a professional group charged with instructing future generations.

Richard West's "Slothfull Teacher," from 1607's *The Court of Consciousness*, presents the antithesis of the ideal, loving, competent, and professional schoolmaster who appears as the exemplar in much of the period's pedagogical literature. The poem's speaker addresses the slothful teacher of the title directly throughout the poem, chastising him for his negligent practice. In the poem's first stanza, West describes the schoolmaster's appearance and relies on a familiar representation of a rod-wielding enforcer to accentuate his title character's unworthiness. Clad "in gowne" and "befurrd with rod in hand, / Like Dominator over silly boyes," the schoolmaster hides behind the

trappings of his office and lacks substance as an educator (R. West lines 1-2). Because he pawns off his responsibilities on children who serve as his monitors, the schoolmaster's classroom is marked by disorder, or "sport and play" (line 11). Beyond the walls of the schoolroom, the parents react angrily to their children's lack of knowledge at the hands of the schoolmaster. The poem ends with the speaker directly addressing the failed, hopeless educator with a plea that he exit the profession.

The final stanza resembles a lesson and trial, as the schoolmaster endures the scrutiny of the speaker who is now fully wise to the slothful pedagogue's wayward practice. Employing the first-person pronoun for the first time in the poem, West's speaker issues the schoolmaster his final judgment:

> Come, Come, untrusse, indeed y'ar in great fault,
>
> I cannot spare you' faith I pray dispatch:
>
> Are you a master now you shall be taught,
>
> How think you now sir have met your match,
>
> Heeres no commanding rod your chair or stoole,
>
> Y'had sped far better if y'had staid at schoole. (lines 19-24)

Reduced to the role of the student he once intimidated with his rod, the schoolmaster finds himself confronted by his "great fault." No longer in a position of authority, the schoolmaster loses his status as "a master" and meets his "match" in his accuser. The speaker's final suggestion that the slothful master should have remained at school reminds the audience of how a good number of schoolmasters simply traded one school for the next, leaving the university to become teachers as a last resort. As this poem suggests, the work of the schoolmaster requires more than maintaining appearances or

looking the part. In his representation of an anonymous character type, West acknowledges many of the anxieties educators encountered in their efforts to unite as a professional group. By indicting and eventually ejecting this schoolmaster from the profession, "Slothfull Teacher" preserves the worthiness of others who dutifully serve their communities by offering an essential service.

Whereas West's condemnatory poem ultimately supports the cause and purpose of competent professionals, Jordan Thomas' 1657 "On a School-Master" does little to inspire such encouragement. In this poem, a "Country Pedant of soul soft and silly" is upstaged by a "more learned Countryman," who deflates the *de facto* professional's ego and necessity (Thomas lines 1, 4). The "pedant" boasts to his neighbor that because he has removed a child from "*women-tutors*," he will be responsible for "mak[ing] him a *good Scholar*" (original emphasis, lines 6, 8). Unimpressed with the schoolmaster's claims, the countryman responds with the following: "*Come Doctor, come*, / You know that *Charity begins at home*" (original emphasis, lines 9-10). The countryman's calm, but pointed reply to the pedant ends the poem and establishes the home as an appropriate venue for instruction. Unlike West's poem, which chastises an ineffective schoolmaster in the ultimate service of the profession, Thomas' text discredits both the individual and the profession he represents. Not only are the schoolmaster's services unneeded, but the countryman who tells him as much possesses more learning and wisdom than the pedant.[24] The schoolmaster of this poem not only lacks credibility, but he also lacks a place in either the social or professional landscapes of the poem. Because the women

[24] For a discussion of the shifting significance of the term "pedant" throughout the early modern era, see Sidney L. Sondergard's "'To Scape the Rod': Resistance to Humanist Pedagogy and the Sign of the Pedant in Tudor England," *Studies in Philology* 91.3 (1994): 270-82.

operate successfully within the home, the pedant finds himself excluded from the business of education. In the end, Thomas represents a failed, obsolete schoolmaster who finds himself outsmarted by a humble member of the community.

Both West's and Thomas's poems feature ineffective individuals and represent them as negative exemplars of a larger profession. However, these individual representations of schoolmasters do not necessarily correlate with the poems' overall representation of the profession, as West's supports the office of the schoolmaster, while Thomas' poem renders it obsolete. The examples of poetry that fall under the commendatory category produce a similar split in terms of representation. Although these poems join together in praising their schoolmaster subjects, not every poem acknowledges or addresses the professional group to which these educators belong. Once again, the visibility of the schoolmaster and his profession will become the means for gauging how or if these poems represent the profession.

The first few commendatory poems that I will consider were all written upon the deaths of the schoolmasters featured in the titles. J.C. gent.'s "An Epitaph upon the death of P. Starling, Sometime Schoolemaister of Bury Schoole" is the earliest of the commendatory poems under examination, dating from 1579. This poem sets the tone for others in the group, as it contains expressions of intense grief followed by boundless praise for the departed. However, amid this sadness, the schoolmaster's position fades into the background as a result of the poem's elevated language. While the speaker refers to his subject's "sheeld of learned lore," (J.C. gent. line 13), the schoolmaster is made into a bird whose teaching resembled epic song: "Hee tought his young, most sweetly to recorde: / His pleasant tune, eche vacant place did fill, / His joyfull notes did please the

living Lorde" (lines 20-21). The "Starling lately died" (line 24) now calls heaven his home despite his "Untimely death" (line 27). The end of the poem leaves the reader with images of a celestial, otherworldly being whose earthly legacy as a professional schoolmaster is undefined at best. The poem offers no larger statement or representation of the profession beyond the immediate tribute to P. Starling, who according to the poem's title served only as a "sometime" schoolmaster.

If the absence of the schoolmaster's professional identity is noticeable in J.C. gent.'s elegy, it is palpable in Nicholas Billingsley's "*Monumentum Exequiale*, OR Lasting sorrow for the death of the Reverend, Pious, and Eminently-learned, Mr. Tho Horn, late School-master of Eaton Colledg." In this poem from 1658, Billingsly laments the passing of Thomas Horn by carefully relating the emotional turmoil that has besieged him. The speaker relies on seafaring imagery to describe his pain and channels his grief through his muse, Melpomene: "thy swoln eyes / Be Islands, circled with a Sea of tears" (Billingsly lines 20-21). Similar sorrowful plaints and references to tears dominate the poem's fifty-two lines until the its conclusion in which the speaker recognizes that the schoolmaster's soul has left the earth. Until this point of resolution, much of the poem hinges on the speaker's personal grief, and few details offer any sort of glimpse as to why the schoolmaster's passing has caused such anguish. In fact, the only mention of Mr. Horn's profession comes when the speaker includes himself as part of a group of the schoolmaster's students, "his Pupils, [who] run about / His Tombe, and weep until our eyes be out" (lines 43-44). Were it not for the lengthy title, the reader would have no idea that the poem's subject was an intelligent schoolmaster who presided over a preeminent early modern institution of learning. Similar to J.C. gent.'s poem,

Billingsly's elegy effectively renders the schoolmaster an object of the author's poetic exercise. Intense expressions of grief, metaphorical references, and otherworldly comparisons do very little to represent the professional identity of these fallen individuals who are so sorely missed.

Alexander Brome's 1661 poem, "LVIII. An Elegy on the death of his Schoolmaster. Mr. W. H.," strikes a balance in representing the schoolmaster's professional legacy while recounting his individual legacy. Marked by a conventional series of opening questions about the justness and timeliness of the schoolmaster's death, Billingsly's tribute to Mr. W. H. praises his high learning as well as his trade: "This was the schoolmaster that did derive / From *parts* and *piety's prerogative*, / The glory of that good, but *painful art*; / Who had high learning yet an humble heart" (A. Brome lines 13-16, original emphasis). In the following stanza, the speaker emphasizes Mr. W. H.'s art by contrasting him with "th'artless poedagogue" (line 19) who employs an outmoded methodology marked by violence. The schoolmaster of Brome's poem produced better results, and thanks to "his industrous labour now we see / Boyes coated *borne* to th' Universitie" (lines 35-36, original emphasis). The balance of the poem chronicles the schoolmaster's accomplishments in fashioning scholars for future endeavors and ends with an inscription that celebrates Mr. W. H.'s wisdom and learnedness, his piety and justness.

Although no requirement exists for a poet to pay tribute to an individual's profession upon his or her death, it is curious that both of the above poems identify the departed by name and occupation in their titles. While both J.C. gent. and Billingsly make the individual legacies of their subjects apparent for the reader, the dead's

professional legacies are undefined or even undisclosed. Brome's poem, on the contrary, treats the personal and professional identities of the dead schoolmaster as one and the same. His artfulness as an instructor led to him and his students leading accomplished lives. In terms of representation, Brome's schoolmaster distinguished himself from other less than successful educators and thus serves as a positive exemplar of his profession. The poem on his death not only chronicles a life well lived, but it also showcases a profession well practiced by a capable individual.

As the following pair of commendatory poems reveals, sometimes the capable individual that emerges as cause for celebration is not the professional schoolmaster of the title, but rather the poet himself, who uses his writing to demonstrate his worthiness. These poets tend to fixate on what they owe to their schoolmasters and use their poems as means to repay, or at least pay down, what they perceive as outstanding debt. The first stanza of George Wither's 1633 "To his School-Master, Mr. John Greaves" deals almost exclusively with the speaker's inability to settle the debt he owes for learning at the hands of his teacher. Lacking the appropriate financial means, the speaker intends to repay his schoolmaster "In willingness, in thanks, and gentle words" (Wither, "Mr. John Greaves" line 12). By the poem's end, the speaker resolves that although he might not be the most fit to offer such an expression of gratitude, he will forge ahead in his efforts and continue to write. In Wither's commendation, only the image of the poet remains for the reader, and the schoolmaster's presence is illusory at best since he completely drops out by the conclusion. Other than the claim that an effective schoolmaster occasioned the text, this poem offers little in the way of representing the profession beyond the scope of the poet himself.

Ben Jonson's "XIV. To William Camden" differs in that the intended subject of the poem, the schoolmaster, shares the spotlight with the poet. Dedicated to his teacher at Westminster, Jonson's poem celebrates William Camden as a national treasure—one to whom his "country owes/ The great renown…" (Jonson, "Camden" lines 3-4). Although he praises his teacher's "name" "skill" and "faith" (line 7), Jonson focuses on his position as a poet throughout, stating in the opening lines that Camden is the one "to whom I owe / All that I am in arts, all that I know," and concluding with the humble expression that "Many of thine this better could, than I,/ But for their powers, accept my piety" (lines 1-2, 13-14). Were it not for Camden, Jonson would presumably not have enjoyed the degree of success he did as a professional author. Yet, were it not for Jonson as the poet standing in for his "many" more capable schoolmasters, Camden's legacy as a schoolmaster would not have been represented poetically for the reading public. In perpetuating the professional legacy of William Camden, Jonson consciously refers to and acknowledges his own living legacy as a poet, allowing both himself and his intended subject to share the spotlight without obscuring the professional schoolmaster's visibility.

Perhaps it is only appropriate to conclude this survey of poetry with an example that serves as an exception to the broad categories outlined above. George Wither's 1641 "Hymn XLIII. For a School-master or Tutor" provides readers with the most comprehensive representation of the schoolmaster's profession. Structured as a personal meditation, this hymn speaks of an established body of schoolmasters who share similar goals and identities as professionals. The opening of the poem is reminiscent of Brome's elegy cited above in which the speaker distinguishes between the artlessness of the

pedant and the artfulness of a dedicated master. Directing his speech inward, Wither's speaker implores:

> Beware my heart,
>
> Lest thou too highly deem,
>
> of that small art,
>
> which may appear in me;
>
> And, proud become,
>
> As Pedants use to be, ("Hymn" lines 1-6).

The second stanza consists of a series of "if" clauses in which the speaker vows to himself to seek reward for due work and fulfill his responsibilities to his students. Failure to abide by these conditionals would result in one who is "guiltie of the worst untruth" ("Hymn" line 24). The poem concludes with the hope that his words may align with his deeds and that his labors result in his growth as an individual and professional. Wither's "Hymn" stands as an exception among the other cited examples because his poem explicitly supports the professional cause of a collective group of educators. In a footnote to his text, the poet declares: "By this Hymn therefore, they may be remembered to judge themselves, and to seek of God a due qualification, by prayer" ("Hymn" 442). In reading the poem, practicing schoolmasters are reminded of their roles and responsibilities, but they are also reminded of their membership within a discrete group.

Most poems containing schoolmasters as a subject do not offer such a neat representation of the profession. Perhaps catering to a wider audience, the other examples featured as part of this section vary according to occasion, purpose, and, most

significantly, their degrees of representation. Whether written upon the schoolmaster's death or as a general expression of praise, commendatory poems that feature specific, historical schoolmasters in their titles do not necessarily extol their professional legacies. The figure of the poet sometimes acquires just as much, if not more, of a professional presence than the named subject of the schoolmaster as evidenced in Jonson's and Wither's poems. Like the examples of condemnation analyzed above, commendations of schoolmasters variously represent the professional responsibilities of the schoolmaster. While some of these poems establish positive or negative exemplars to insist upon the execution of certain professional obligations, others represent schoolmasters abstractly or not at all for the reader.

Visibility thus becomes a crucial factor in assessing poetic representations of the schoolmaster. When a schoolmaster is represented as both an individual and as a professional, his standing has a bearing on a surrounding community of professionals—positive or negative. However, when the schoolmaster becomes an object of the poet's rhetorical exercises or inexplicably fades from the poem's dramatic situation, the educator's professional identity only lurks in the verses, sometimes crowded out by the poet's own professional standing and other times glossed over entirely as if the designation of "schoolmaster" provides a stable enough definition of his role and status in society. If anything was certain about the schoolmasters' collective professional standing in the early modern era, their stability was not, and by removing or overlooking their professional roles, such poems only succeed in reinforcing that sense of precariousness that typified their emergent organization as a body of professionals.

The Schoolmaster in Contemporary Pedagogical Literature

Just as some literary representations tended to invalidate teachers' professional standing by debasing or obscuring their work, pedagogical literature could gloss the office of the schoolmaster with a veneer of idealism. What is important to note, though, is that "it is clear that throughout the [professional] literature, the aim was to achieve a well-paid profession, carefully chosen, working in harmony with the parents of the pupil in accordance with humanist attitudes to corporal punishment and child psychology, and aware of its social responsibilities" (Charlton, "The Professions" 37). Charlton's synopsis of an entire body of literature captures the tall order that many everyday educators faced in winning the public's support and recognition—a battle that in many ways continues to the present day. While a particular author or renowned schoolmaster, such as Richard Mulcaster, could demonstrate a track record of excellence and satisfy many of the criteria listed above, others in the same field either struggled or shirked their responsibilities. As a whole, the profession faced an uphill battle in cultivating a positive reputation, and teachers found themselves caught between living up to the ideal extremes of a body of supportive professional literature and living down a popular body of largely unflattering representations.

Vives offers a particularly illustrative description of the dizzyingly broad range of possibilities for educators in his *De Tradendis Disciplinis*. Describing the process and virtues of studying the arts, he begs the reader to consider the content as well as the source of the knowledge, writing: "Then we are taught by means of schools, some to whom the duty was commanded; sometimes angels teach and heretics teach, devils teach—fathers, mothers, old men, young men, boys, women, skilled and unskilled

persons—even dumb animals teach us…" (Vives 27). Vives' lyrical survey of possibilities usefully highlights the multiple capacities of educators in early modern England. But, in doing so, he also calls attention to the inherent flexibility built within the profession which potentially grants access to anyone who can act as a teacher, thus nullifying the profession's exclusivity.

When it comes to sorting out the various capacities in which the era's teachers worked and how they were regarded, terminology emerges as a stumbling block. While all schoolmasters were educators, not every educator of the period was a schoolmaster, and not all schoolmasters enjoyed identical or even similar positions. These degrees of flexibility and overlap should not automatically prevent us from granting educators professional status. Members of the medical profession, for example, held different stations as well, with surgeons, apothecaries, and physicians practicing separately from one another, yet still under one professional umbrella (Charlton, "The Professions" 23-29). The era's educators similarly occupied related jurisdictions and thus comprised a professional body unto themselves worthy of public recognition.

On the whole, it is possible to categorize educators based on their particular capacities and levels of engagement. For the sake of order and organization, Patrick Orpen devises three distinct categories of masters: "professionals," or full-timers without clerical affiliation; "temporary professionals" also without cure; and "clericals" (185). Other than university dons, whom I will treat in Chapter 3, most educators operated outside the university setting in schoolrooms or in private households. More often than not, though, the public focused on the schoolmaster in the grammar school. A prototype of the grammar schoolmaster emerged in the sixteenth century as one who came from the

laity and generally had an acquaintance with pervading pedagogy and texts (Feyerharm 103). Beyond the prototypical grammar master, other types of schoolmasters existed, including the "technical" or "commercial" master, the foreign language master, the "mathematical practitioner," the writing master, and the private tutor (Charlton, "Teaching Profession" 38-40).[25] Private schoolmasters—especially in London and larger towns—could find ready employment in the great households and often competed with endowed schools (Lawson and Silver 120). Finally, most critical attention toward schoolmasters not only concentrates on the grammar school, but also assumes a male behind the desk. Women of the period did have a small presence in education and operated dame schools, exclusive girls' schools, as well as private schools of their own.[26]

The above rundown also assumes that each type of master possessed a certain level of skill—either inherently or by virtue of some educational training. However, as Vives' articulation of possible teachers notes, both "skilled and unskilled" persons could and still do practice as teachers. Coupled with the broad range of possibilities for educators of the period, the fact that potentially "unskilled" persons could serve as educators destabilized the professional status of the larger group. Yet, it is revealing that some self-styled experts actually dedicated portions or entire tracts of their professional literature to amateurs. John Brinsley, defines his audience as "the meaner sort" in *A Consolation for our Grammar Schools* (22), which he especially earmarks for "all ruder countries and places," such as Ireland, Wales, Virginia, and the Sommer Islands on the

[25] Sheila McIssac Cooper's "Servants as Educators in Early-Modern England" *Pedagogica Historica* 43.4 (2007): 547-63, offers a focused analysis of the pedagogical roles that short- and long-term servants assumed in the formal and informal education of children in households employing help.
[26] In Chapter 5, I examine John Redford's *The Moral Play of Wyt and Science* in which a feminine allegory of Idleness becomes a schoolmistress in an effort to corrupt the sensibilities of Wyt, the title character.

title page. In his much longer *Ludus Literarius*, Brinsley similarly notes that he writes for "even the meanest teachers" in his dedicatory prose, "To the loving Reader".

Edmund Coote is much more specific in his intentions when he envisions that his book, *The English Schoolmaster,* can be used by "teaching tradesmen," writing: "But to return to my teaching Trades-men; if thou desirest to be informed how to teach this Treatise, mark diligently the directions given in all places of the Book…" (A4[r]). Grammatically, the word "teaching" may be read as either a transitive verb or as a present participle. As a verb, "teaching" takes on the object of the tradesmen, a specific audience that Coote targets in his grammar book. However, when parsed as a participle, "teaching" describes the tradesmen who themselves have the capacity to instruct thanks to the book's contents. Coote explains this ambiguity earlier when describing the plain style of his text: "I am now therefore to direct my speech to the unskillful, which desire to make use of it for their own private benefit, and to such men and women of the trade, as Taylors, Weavers, Shop-keepers, Seamsters, and such others, as have undertaken the charge of teaching others" (A3[r]). Coote's intentions, though egalitarian, are potentially unsettling to the profession as a whole. If tradesmen can become teachers simply by following the advice and instructions contained within the book, then what becomes of the skilled teacher? Are teachers needed at all?

Coote seems to suggest a negative answer, as the frontispiece of his manual transparently endows the book itself with instructive capabilities: "So that he which hath this Book only, needeth to buy no other to make him fit from his Letters unto the Grammar-School, for an Apprentice, or any other's private use, so as concerneth English" (title page). Even though Coote sets his book up as a sufficient prerequisite for

later education that would require direct instruction, he essentially discounts the need for any teacher—tradesman or not—when it comes to establishing a base level of knowledge in the English language. Surprisingly, Erasmus also designates books as permissible substitutes for actual teachers: "Accordingly the rudiments of both languages [Latin and Greek] must be assimilated, and without delay, and from a really good teacher. If the teacher is not available, then (as the next best thing) the best authors must certainly be used" (*De Ratione* 667). Not only is the schoolmaster's office "second in importance to a king," but it would also seem that a well-written book can replace the teacher if necessary.

It is important to emphasize that Brinsley, Coote, and Erasmus unite in their shared concern and passion for proper, fruitful instruction. They believe in the power of learning, and they advocate sound teaching. Curiously, in the above examples they also do not bar the unskilled or even inanimate objects from assuming the role of teacher. If unskilled people have the ability to teach others or themselves using just a book, then why should skilled teachers deserve any more recognition or status? This question became complicated when members of the public demanded a certain level of skill that some educators neglected to offer, which reflected poorly on a larger profession whose reputation was often at the mercy of the community.[27] And, schoolmasters themselves had a hand in creating this reputation in their writings about their profession.

Much of the pedagogical literature of the period emphasizes the great stake that teachers have in shaping the future of both younger generations and the entire nation. In

---

[27] Charlton in "Teaching Profession" outlines the reflexivity of teachers' social interactions and their quest to acquire status, arguing that one must consider both "what individual teachers thought of their positions in society" and "what society thought of teachers" (28).

fact, many schoolmasters openly disclosed their profession when penning the era's literature—pedagogical or otherwise. As Helen Jewell argues, "Schoolmastering was not something to conceal, and for a writer putting forward educational theories, or publishing well-tried pedagogical practices, his long expertise of teaching was a good selling point" (83). Brinsley's words in *A Consolation* reveal how crucial a contribution the schoolmaster stood to make:

> We are they who helpe either to make or marre all; for that all the flower of our Nation, and those who become the leaders of all the rest, are committed to our education, and instruction: that if we bring them up aright, there is great hope, that they shall produce goodly lights, and marks to all the rest of the Land, especially, to the townes and countries where they are…. (45)

Brinsely places enormous stock in the schoolmaster's abilities to create or destroy knowledge, and those that rise to the challenge deserve plaudits for their social contributions. However, not all members of society joined Brinsley in his valuation of the profession. Status for any given profession is difficult to gauge, but for the period's teachers, they enjoyed an "uneven history" at best (Bushnell 37). Some views were decidedly more ambivalent, as "in the eyes of many townsmen the schoolmaster was regarded as a kind of teaching curate, somewhat transient but by no means in the professional cast of lawyers or rectors, he was still charged with the instruction of youth, in manners, morals and learning" (Feyerharm 112). Responding to their varied and precarious social status, experts in the field devoted space in their pedagogical treatises to acknowledging their perceived status, while also demonstrating how a schoolmaster had the ability to forge a positive or negative legacy for his students.

Roger Ascham, for instance, indirectly praises his own accomplishments as a schoolmaster by lauding his former student Queen Elizabeth's vast learning and scholarly dispositions in a famous section of *The Schoolmaster.* Calling her learning "a spectacle to all the world beside" (57), Ascham becomes a spectacle in his own right as her tutor and implicitly credits himself for the role he played in instructing her to greatness for all the nation and world to behold.[28] Sir Richard Sackville offers his own praise to both Ascham and Ascham's former schoolmaster when urging his friend to commit to writing the details of their dinner conversation concerning the teaching and rearing of children. Sackville references an enduring legacy of effective schoolmasters, explaining:

> And I know very well myself that you did teach the Queen. And, therefore, seeing God did so bless you to make you scholar of the best master, and also the schoolmaster of the best scholar that ever were in our time, surely you should please God, benefit your country and honest your own name if you would take the pains to impart to others what you learned of such a master and how ye taught such a scholar. (9)

Ascham's role in a positive chain of excellence starkly contrasts the mark of shame that other less qualified or scrupulous schoolmasters sometimes brought to the profession. Speaking of students who fled Eton as a result of a violent teacher, Sackville recalls from his own experience how a "fond," or foolish, schoolmaster "drave me so with fear of beating from all love of learning" (Ascham 7). Writing over sixty years after the publication of Ascham's treatise, Marchmont Nedham laments in *A Discourse*

[28] Sir Thomas Elyot in *The Book of the Governor* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1937) similarly credits schoolmasters for the greatness of rulers: "The incomparable benefite of maisters have been well remembered of dyvers princes" (34).

Concerning Schools and School-Masters "how much contempt, and how little incoragement is shewn to the Profession" (9).[29] Similar examples abound in other pedagogical literature spanning the period, as many of the era's experts necessarily confronted an image problem on their way to claiming status.

Without any society or central regulatory body governing the profession, some schoolmasters endeavored to boost their status from within by confronting issues that sullied their public image, such as corporal punishment, lax moral standards, and poor qualifications.[30] Elyot, for example, recognized that a negative public image of schoolmasters, which he considered pervasive, prevented qualified candidates from entering the field: "Undoubtedly ther be in this realme many well lerned, whiche if the name of a schole maister were nat so moche had in contempte, and also if theyr labours with abundant salaries mought be requited, were righte sufficient and able to induce their heres to excellent lenynge, so they be nat plucked away grene, and er they be in doctrine sufficiently rooted" (70). Elyot effectively diagnoses the foundations of schoolmasters' collective state of precariousness, signaling the seemingly impossible proposition of encouraging positive growth in a field with so many undesirable conditions in place which perhaps cause the "contempte" he notices. Although other authorities openly encouraged wholesome community and parental interactions in addition to issuing standard pleas for expertise and moral rectitude, the task of surmounting a debased social

---

[29] Nedham echoes these sentiments pages later in *A Discourse* (London: Printed for H.H., 1663) when he places the onus on masters themselves: "Indeed the great indiscretion and intemperance of Masters in that, hath brought a very great contempt upon the Profession itself…" (14).

[30] As Charlton explains in "Teaching Profession" when referring to grammar school teachers, "Academically, their qualifying institution was the university; professionally, their qualifying institution was the church in the person of the bishop of the diocese in which they taught" (31-32).

standing entailed far more than commonsense imperatives for good citizenship.[31] Schoolmasters faced a host of challenges in the field that disadvantaged them relative to other professions, while their own ambiguous self-awareness further complicated their bid for recognition.

A Profession in Practice, A Profession in Peril:

Despite their demonstrated importance and their potential to contribute to the strength of the nation, many schoolmasters of the era experienced an overburdened, unrewarding, and complicated existence. Many challenges compounded to demoralize the ranks from within and to bolster some outsiders' misgivings or misperceptions about the profession as a whole. Whether in the classroom or in the home, some teachers found themselves struggling to assert or maintain any sense of authority over their students. Popular lore and literature often rendered the schoolmaster as a "terrifying symbol of authority," but in actual practice any teacher's authority "was limited by his social situation and his personal qualities" (Thomas 9, 14). The teacher often wielded authority by also wielding the rod, and pedagogical violence became the subject of numerous contemporary debates.[32] The schoolmaster theoretically occupied a position of absolute authority, but as Bushnell argues, most teachers were "caught in a web of contradictions"

---

[31] Vives, Hoole, and Richard Mulcaster all weigh in on the issues of a teacher's interaction with a non-student population. Vives in *De Tradendis Disciplinis*, ed. Foster Watson (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1971) establishes that "Masters will easily gain love by their pleasantness of manner, reverence by their worth as teachers and by their upright life" (87). Mulcaster in *Positions,* ed. Robert Herbert Quick (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1888), states that "parents and maisters should be familiarly lynked in amitie" (156); while Hoole concerns himself with the master's "affability" toward his neighbors so that the community members will "vindicate the credit" of the schoolmaster (252).

[32] My project does not concern itself with inventorying the various perspectives and theories concerning the use of corporal punishment in the classroom; however, such accounts are plentiful in the era's pedagogical treatises, as humanists and pedagogues alike offer their points of view which range from Ascham's advocacy for gentleness to Mulcaster's anatomizing discipline techniques in his *Positions*.

(44).[33] Even in their classrooms, schoolmasters were ultimately subject to the will of the community, whereas in private households schoolmasters served as master and servant wrapped into one. Ascham's own history as tutor to Queen Elizabeth emblematizes this dynamic, as his student eventually became his superior and monarch.

Beyond the unclear bounds of authority, schoolmasters also experienced complications in the daily execution of their duties without any regard to their ability. Mulcaster, for example, uses his *Positions* to seek uniformity in instructional methods, crusading against what he views as "too much variety in teaching" (263) which compromised overall quality across the larger field. Charles Hoole refers to the "burden of schoolteaching" and calls attention to how "laborious it is both to minde and body" (9), while Nedham complains of instances in which "the Master takes too much upon him" (10). In *Ludus Literarius*, Brinsley frames teachers' burdens more specifically in terms of the curriculum when the beleaguered Spoudeus repeatedly rails against grammar schoolmasters who have to compensate for students' incomplete instruction in petty schools. To a supportive and successful Philoponos, Spoudeus complains, "it is an extreame vexation, that we must bee toyled amongst such little pettyes, and in teaching such matters, whereof we can get no profit, nor take any delight in our labours" (Brinsley *Ludus* 13). The above examples powerfully capture the displeasure faced by the overburdened schoolmaster by rendering professional work in terms of hard labor. As a "burden" that is "laborious," the art of teaching is reducible under certain conditions to mere "toyle," and as the grumbling Spoudeus argues, any sense of gratification eludes the teacher and his representative profession.

---

[33] For a more extensive reading of the schoolmaster's precarious authority, see Chapter 2, "The Sovereign Master and the Scholar Prince" in Bushnell's *A Culture of Teaching* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996) 23-72.

As in today's educational circles, teachers in early modern England possessed a range of abilities and skills sets with some truly remarkable examples.[34] However, exceptionality or excellence was not the guiding standard, as a distinct middle and lower range of teachers rounded out the field who "turned education into a grind of mechanical repetition" (Charlton, *Education in Renaissance* 127). Anything less than competence on the part of the schoolmaster won notice from the surrounding community, and the ignorance of even a few schoolmasters tended to compromise other members of the profession who attempted to conform to a standard of excellence. Elyot and Erasmus both weigh in on the damaging reality of less than capable schoolmasters. Elyot, for his turn, commiserates with the children who find themselves at the mercy of an ignorant master: "Lorde god, howe many good and clene wittes of children be nowe a days perished by ignorant schole maisters" (69). Erasmus, on the other hand, makes note of how distressingly common it could be for schoolmasters to know little to nothing about even the basic content they must teach, cautioning: "A similar care must be shown for the names of trees, plants, animals, tools, clothes, and precious stones, of which, incredible as it sounds, the common run of teachers knows absolutely nothing" (*De Ratione* 673-674). Both these examples expose an underbelly of the profession that humanists like Erasmus and Elyot as well as practicing and publishing schoolmasters did their best to counteract through supportive and, at times, idealistic accounts of the profession's practitioners.

[34] Those schoolmasters who authored pedagogical treatises are the most renowned and immediate positive exemplars available to critics today. In general, as Joan Simon argues in *Education and Society*, "Where masters achieved a reputation there gentlemen's sons were sent" (363).

It is possible to account for this spread in abilities by considering the qualifications and licensing requirements demanded of educators at the time. Critics and historians largely join together in depicting a reality in which loose or nonexistent standards regulated people's entry into the field, which created a climate of open access and rendered common any specialized jurisdiction carved out by a larger body of educators. David Cressy comments on this sense of openness, arguing: "Almost anyone could serve as a schoolteacher in Tudor and Stuart England provided they met the requirements of the church, their patrons and their clientele. Standards varied enormously in a loose free market of talent and incompetence" (133). Helen Jewell offers an even more alarming assessment of a teacher's qualifications that does no favors to the field's efforts to secure professional status: "The absolute minimum required, for any teacher, is to know just enough to remain ahead of the pupils" (79). While Jewell's pragmatic reading of teachers' abilities may draw the ire of today's practicing teachers, her comments do have merit when considered against the backdrop of the era's licensing requirements.

Unlike today's requirements for teacher certification, qualifying for the office of schoolmaster tended to hinge less on content knowledge and more on personal and religious standards of probity. Certainly, schoolmasters of the period, particularly those in the grammar schools, needed to have some sort of mastery over grammar, or else they would have been in all likelihood dismissed—license or not. But this level of knowledge was assumed since the typical schoolmaster shared a common background with his students, allowing him to function at the "level of his highest pupils" (Orme 219-20). When it comes to specifying qualifications, Vives demands a healthy balance of expertise

and virtue, ordering that "the masters have such learning that they may be able to educate well, but let them also have skill and aptness in teaching. Let their characters be pure" (55). Brinsley seeks a master of "a loving and gentle disposition with gravitie," who "ought to bee a godly man, of a good carriage in all his conversation, to gaine love and reverence thereby" (*Ludus* Mm2^{v}). Both Vives' and Brinsley's petitions demand excellence in character in the aim of improving teaching. Today's teachers at any level know full well that the art of teaching does not rest solely on expertise or book smarts.[35] Early modern educators were similarly aware of the impressionability of students and, therefore, sought qualified professionals whose pedagogies were guided by their positive dispositions and values.

In addition to measuring their qualifications in terms of knowledge and character, licensing requirements regulated schoolmasters' professional practice beyond church schools. The church may have begun to cede its monopoly over instruction to the lay population, but it still maintained the practice of requiring licenses for persons who made their livelihood in teaching school.[36] Even though many educators of the era held degrees or, at least, came from the university to teach in the grammar schools, a degree was not compulsory, and the "Episcopal license rather than the ability to teach became the criterion" for regulating many schoolmasters' entry to and performance in the field

---

[35] See, for example, Jefferey A. Kottler, Stanley J. Zehm, and Ellen I. Kottler, *On Being a Teacher: The Human Dimension* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin P, 2005). As the subtitle suggests, this book, which is directed to prospective educators, emphasizes the values of character and personality as means to educate those who will eventually educate others. Their book comes in response to what they feel is a scant body of twentieth- and twenty-first-century literature devoted to the same sorts of interpersonal issues that early modern English educators, such as the ones cited above, designated as indispensible to professional practice.

[36] W.E. Tate, in "The Episcopal Licensing of Schoolmasters in England," *Church Review* (1956): 426-32, explains that licensing was not a phenomenon unique to early modern England. In fact, for nine hundred years, schoolmasters had to be—at least in theory—licensed by the bishops of the schools in which the schoolmasters taught.

(Charlton, *Education in Renaissance* 129). The church maintained licensing requirements as a means to control what it perceived as "essentially a religious activity" (Lawson and Silver 101).[37] Ecclesiastical attempts for control were met with royal injunctions during Elizabeth's rule, which required schoolmasters to submit to royal supremacy and subscribe to the Thirty-nine articles. Yet, the mere existence of these and similar measures did not prevent unlicensed teachers from acquiring employment. Any forms of oversight or training were localized and certainly not uniform from town to town, or even school to school. No distinct training programs existed, and much of a teacher's own education was self-directed or experiential—a "baptism of fire" of sorts for the uninitiated (Cressy 141).[38] This lack of standardized training does not automatically disqualify schoolmasters of the era from achieving professional status.

Historians tend to portray an "anything goes," revolving-door educational frontier governed by airy licensing requirements. However, contemporary pedagogical literature introduces a different reality in which professionals held themselves accountable to a set of standards and responsibilities—even if certain members of the occupation were derelict in their duties or unqualified. Pedagogical debates and techniques were usually confined to the treatises and, in most cases, were not part of a more open, social discourse. As a result, "the conscientious teacher had to rely on this literature to provide a basis for his own professional education" (Charlton, "The Professions" 37). O'Day

---

[37] David Cressy compares teachers to midwives and preachers who fell under the oversight of the church since their "activities were similarly considered to impinge on things spiritual: "A Drudgery of Schoolmasters: the Teaching Profession in Elizabethan and Stuart England," *The Professions in Early Modern England*, ed. Wilfrid Prest (London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1987) 133.

[38] Ahead of his time, Richard Mulcaster in *Positions* advocates for the presence of a teacher's college, writing "I conclude therefore that this trade requireth a particular college" (249). Existing as one of seven university colleges, the teacher's college would produce graduates who would have a place to "continue their whole life" just as physicians, divines, and lawyers did in the world (248). For more of Mulcaster's vision, see Ch. 41 of *Positions.*

argues that most teacher-writers of the era "concerned themselves, above all, with perfecting teaching techniques" (*Education and Society* 75). Many of these same schoolmasters who worked to hold themselves and their colleagues to the highest standards also openly acknowledged their slighted status.

Nedham provides a particularly useful summation of the tenuous position in which the conscientious schoolmaster found himself. Acknowledging the challenges of the profession, Nedham emphasizes the impact that only professional teachers can make:

> What difficulties the Work hath in it, to encounter all kinds of Tempers, and improve all sorts of Wits, to be *ingeniorum & morum artifices*, to fashion Minds and Manners, to cultivate rude Soil, and dispose Youth to Virtuous behaviour against their Natural inclinations; what cares and pains, what great abilities of Prudence and skill and all Virtue, what a Cycle of Knowledge it requires to instruct others in the grounds of Literature, to raise their Parts, to heighten their Fancy, to fix their thoughts, and to crane their *Genius* to the pitch, and so prepare them for publick Service, is a thing more easily discoursed then considered, more talked of then taken notice of. (9)

Nedham prefaces the above statement on teachers' qualifications as his "last and chiefest Consideration" (9). His overview is emblematic in many ways of a collective profession's interest in preparing future generations by exacting the highest standards possible. The conclusion of the pronouncement neatly reveals just how difficult a proposition it is for schoolmasters to knowledgeably and effortlessly instruct a diverse, naturally resistant population of students. Nedham freely admits that his words will not automatically translate into practice and that his celebration of the schoolmaster's

capacity to cultivate the future of the nation on paper will not automatically garner public support. If Nedham's and others' words could only effect such change, then perhaps the profession as a whole would have enjoyed higher salaries across the board—a tangible indicator used by the public to measure a profession's value and social esteem, regardless of the era.

Janis N. Parham and Stephen P. Gordon identify teachers' salaries as the lynchpin of their ability to be recognized as professionals. Writing from a twenty-first-century perspective, they argue: "If we want teachers to act like professionals—and to remain in the profession—then we must pay them and treat them as professionals" (Parham and Gordon 51). Early modern educators also regard compensation as a key condition of their job performance and social standing as professionals. Historians generally agree that schoolmasters received low or even meager salaries.[39] Morrice captures the popular public sentiment of the era when he writes, "notwithstanding in this age it is thought by som that to Schoolemasters there can never be given too little" ($D1^r$-$D1^v$). Of course, salary was not the only determinant of professional status at the time, and schoolmasters could in theory still earn respect even if they earned too little monetarily (O'Day, 172). Some of the era's humanists and practicing educators nobly dismissed the importance of earning an income, instead insisting upon the intrinsic value of the job. In his response to Witz, Erasmus follows his elevation of the schoolmaster's office to near-regal status by arguing that no or low salary is ideal to preserving the profession's integrity: "A big

---

[39] Just as it is both impossible and counterproductive to attempt to tabulate the total population of early modern English schoolmasters during any given year or in any particular region of the country, it is equally daunting to quote a broad salary range. Charlton however offers some numerical values in *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965) 124-23: citing that teachers' "miserably small" pay could range from £10 per year in the beginning of the sixteenth century to as much as £20 at the tail of the century. For any more specific details, it is best to consult local records or anecdotal evidence.

salary and the prospect of high social standing might attract every criminal to the post" ("To Johann Witz" 244). As for Vives, he cautions schoolmasters against soliciting money from their pupils, questioning how any semblance of authority could be maintained: "How can a teacher rule his pupils when he looks to them for praise or money" (57). Finally, in the platonic dialogue staged as part of Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, the experienced and successful Philoponus overlooks worldly compensation, proclaiming: "We must look for thanks, and the rewards of our labours from God, where the world is unthankfull" (306). Philoponus' wisdom essentially closes Brinsley's text, concluding it on a note of hopeful resignation. However, even when viewed in the context of a body of literature prone to idealization, sentiments such as those cited above are rare.

Nedham, for example, vociferously refutes any notion of teaching for intrinsic gain alone, declaring: "'Tis the Salary which makes Schools and Learning flourish…The conscience of doing publick service, and satisfaction of discharging ones duty, is not sufficient recompence for the toil of teaching" (3). The fact remains that for many professionals and workers, regardless of the era, salaries are of primary importance to maintaining a healthy and fulfilling existence. Many professionals and members of the public interpret compensation as the tangible representation of one's status and prestige. Higher salaries often translate into higher public esteem. Instead of their being in want of an occupation during the early modern period, some teachers descended into poverty as a result of their occupation (Cressy 144). Relative to other professions, schoolmasters were unable to compete in terms of their earning power. Charlton notes that teachers could not count on the same entitlements, or "built-in practices of bribes and perquisites of all

kinds" that other men of the period did as part of their daily affairs ("Teaching Profession" 51). Most scrupulous teachers—idealistic or not—may have likely declined such means to pad their incomes, and, for many, underhanded schemes would only lead to their dismissal by members of the community in which they served.

Roger Ascham addresses the issue of poor compensation by comparing the schoolmaster's earnings to the horse-courser's. In doing so, he skillfully addresses the parents of children to frame his argument for higher salaries as a matter of investing for the children's future, writing: "And it is a pity that commonly more care is had, yea, and that amongst very wise men, to find out rather a cunning man for their horse than a cunning man for their children. They say nay in word, but they do so in deed. For to the one they will gladly give two hundred crowns by year and loathe to offer the other two hundred shillings" (Ascham 26-7). Ascham bluntly exposes the illogical disparity in earning power between schoolmasters and caretakers to horses, and he also notes the hypocrisy of parents declaring their concern for their children only to pay more for the sake of their animals. What makes this passage even more remarkable is the fact that Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* mainly imagines instruction occurring in a well-to-do household between tutor and student.

If Ascham from his privileged social enclave cries foul over low wages, then conditions would surely have been no better for everyday schoolmasters who served in local villages. Earning less than those charged with grooming horses adversely impacted the *esprit de corps* of the schoolmaster's profession and tarnished his public image. In his *Positions*, Mulcaster claims that nothing "so weakeneth the profession as the very nakednesse of allowance doth" (228). Poor salaries also served as a disincentive for

attracting newcomers to the profession. As a deterrent, the schoolmaster's salary prevented an increase in the talent pool and, conceivably, deadened the talent already practicing, as there was little incentive to maintain high standards of practice. If better compensation were in place, more scholars would have entered the classroom from the universities willingly instead of treating teaching as a default option: "Were that [elevating salaries] done, young scholars at the *Universitie* would prepare themselves for School, as for a handsome Preferment; whereas now nothing but pure necessity can put them upon that way" (Nedham 10). Perhaps most importantly, higher salaries would have reconfigured public perception. Many community members became accustomed to their poor, local schoolmasters and freely associated low salary with low quality—even if no such correlation existed. In this sense, the profession became tainted, as poor earnings handicapped a profession already in search of status and recognition.

Proving Professionalization, Assessing Ambiguity

Having examined the everyday challenges and realities of the schoolmasters' practice and their overall situation among a wider professional field, what remains is to establish on more definitive terms the status of early modern English educators as a professional group. The fact that any question of whether schoolmasters were professionals existed when similar questions did not for other professions reinforces the inherent precariousness of teaching as a profession. Despite the neatness of awarding or denying the group professional status with a simple affirmation or denial, such convenient verdicts, to which some scholars incline, tend to overlook the crowded field of challenges and ambiguities that complicated the group's makeup. In this section, I

intend to sort through these ambiguities while examining them as valuable elements of the schoolmasters' collective experience. Rather than view these ambiguities as stumbling blocks that make the decision-making process appear hopeless, I will consider them as essential ingredients for reconstructing an accurate, and perhaps even clear, picture of the schoolmaster's status over the broad swath of the early modern period under investigation.

One of the first means to determine a profession's status would be to assess its strength from within its ranks. Early modern schoolmasters lived in an era during which professionals as a whole possessed a noticeable degree of self-awareness "as bodies of like-minded men who had a special expertise, and who had to see that the level of expertise was maintained amongst their members" (Charlton, "The Professions" 41). Gauging the self-awareness of any body of professionals in any period of time proves a daunting task. Critical opinion regarding educators' self-awareness and solidarity during the early modern period ranges from measured doubt to near dismissal.[40] Based on examples contained within the period's pedagogical literature, it is not unreasonable to conclude that pockets of educators banded together to form a united, professional front. If nothing else, the ideal of solidarity existed within some of the era's treatises.

The authors of this body of literature often directly addressed their colleagues in the field and dispensed their advice accordingly in this limited context. Hoole, for

---

[40] O'Day in *Education in Society: 1500-1800* (London: Longman, 1982), lauds the "self-conscious approach of early modern educators" in terms of their commitment to practice over theory (76), but she doubts their level of consciousness as "a distinct group" who "saw themselves as committed to teaching as their vocation" (168). Cressy in "Drudgery" claims that "Professional solidarity among schoolteachers was virtually impossible since their incomes, circumstances, quality and expectations varied so much" (129). Charlton in *Education in Renaissance* notes that schoolmasters had access to a range of advice concerning their practice in the classroom (123), but one cannot determine how many everyday schoolmasters availed themselves of the latest methodological tracts.

example, encourages collaboration when offering his treatise to his colleagues, imploring them to “use it freely” or to “censure it with impartial mildeness” in the case of error (12). Other experts of the era use their treatises to communicate the value of professional exchange. In *Positions*, Mulcaster not only encourages teachers to interact with parents and neighbors, but he also calls for “conference” among practicing teachers as a way to bolster the group’s standing (285). Perhaps the most revealing testament to the era’s collaborative spirit appears as part of the framing dialogue in Brinsley’s *Ludus Literarius* in which Philoponus attributes his success in the field to his proactive approach in seeking out his colleagues: “I set my selfe more conscionably and earnestly to seeke out the best waies of teaching, by acquiring, conferring and practicing constantly all the most likely courses, which I could heare or devise…” (3). Whether every practicing teacher across the country subscribed to the same notions of professionalism remains forever uncertain and cannot be determined based on the extant evidence available to us today. Not only does the lack of evidence make such a conclusion impossible, but also the fact that some practicing teachers of the era made careers out of drifting in and out of the profession or even moonlighted in other fields during brief stints of their working lives, further complicating the status of the profession at large.[41]

The layers of accessibility and flexibility that existed within the profession worked to destabilize the core foundations, which allowed it to stand on its own as a viable field separate from others. For many years, teaching operated as a subsidiary of the church, and members of the clergy often served as schoolmasters until laypeople entered the field in greater numbers. Before the church ceded its monopoly on education,

[41] As I will describe Chapter 5, the potential also existed for the directionality of moonlighting to be reversed with people from other fields moonlighting as teachers.

some clergymen viewed teaching as an "apprenticeship," and teaching only became regarded as an "alternative" to the ministry when early modern England began to professionalize on a greater scale (O'Day, *Education and Society* 166). These historical developments did not necessarily lead to a complete shift in popular perception, as many still regarded teaching as a subordinate or associated practice under clergy control. For many, teaching served as a stepping-stone for launching an ecclesiastical career and "was clearly regarded as a transitory phase in one's career, not a profession" (Feyerharm 106).[42] Dual employment—as minister and teacher—did not necessarily translate into undesirable pedagogical results for the student.[43] But when it came to professionalization, the educator's close proximity to and association with the clergy did little to legitimize teaching as a viable profession on its own.

Were they only associated with the clergy, then schoolmasters might not have endured as many hurdles in their bid for professional recognition.[44] However, the reality of the era was that a number of educators found it advantageous to acquire outside work, or, as Mulcaster puts it, many were compelled to "meddle with some trade quite different from the schoole" (228). Insufficient salaries mostly drove schoolmasters to find other work—some of which might have been manual labor in farming or other crafts that have

[42] O'Day in *The Professions* offers a similar analysis of teaching in the shadow of the church: "For as long as teaching was regarded as a suitable by-employment by the clergy of the Church of England, the professionalisation of teaching itself could only be restricted" (269).
[43] Because ministers shared many parallels with schoolmasters "there is evidence that 'pluralism' was often compatible with successful schoolmastering": Patrick K. Orpen, "Schoolmastering as a Profession in the Seventeenth Century: The Career Patterns of the Grammar Schoolmaster," *History of Education* 6.3 (1977): 185, 190-91.
[44] Bushnell offers a fascinating commentary on how early modern schoolmasters paralleled the early modern gardener also in a search for a professional identity. By examining contemporary tracts on gardening, Bushnell establishes that gardeners of the era shared many of the same obstacles to achieving professional status, as they possessed similar complications in authority or standing depending on who regarded them. Despite their indispensability to cultivating future generations of plants and children, gardeners and teachers, respectively, crusaded against their ultimately low social standing. For more of Bushnell's research, see Ch. 4, "Harvesting Books," in *A Culture*, 117-143.

no professional trappings (Feyerharm 106). Most of this supplementary work took place outside the schoolroom and after hours on the schoolmaster's own time. However, sometimes teachers doubled up on the job, converting their classroom to a mobile atelier: "So precarious was the livelihood afforded by teaching that it was frequently combined with some other sedentary occupation that could be carried on as children stood or sat around" (Lawson and Silver 113). There is little doubt that situations such as the one Lawson and Silver describe in which people effectively moonlighted as schoolmasters damaged the profession's overall status and public image.

For a teacher to acquire a second job was not uncommon, nor was it unheard of for professionals in other sectors, as more informal institutional structures in place centuries ago did not demand full-time commitments from every worker (Prest 15). In his *Treatise*, Perkins offers three criteria of appropriateness for having two callings or entering both at once. First, God must join both callings together according to His will. Both callings must not be "against the word, and for the common good," and neither calling should "hinder" the other nor the common good (Perkins 60-61). As long as teachers maintained high standards within the classroom, their having a second occupation likely weakened their morale more than it hurt the common good. However, if we invert our perspective to consider not the schoolmasters' second position, but rather the outsiders who capriciously entered the profession or moonlighted as teachers, it becomes evident that this built-in accessibility contributed to an uncertain professional reality and cheapened status relative to other groups.

As amenable as he is to people having two concurrent callings, Perkins offers no grace for anyone who encroaches on another man's calling: "Againe, here is condemned

the curiositie of those, that enter upon the duties of other men's callings. It is a dangerous sinne…" (66). Contemporary schoolmasters similarly condemned drifters who entered their profession without regard for maintaining standards or solidarity with their established career counterparts. Nedham directs his ire toward failed churchman who became teachers as a last resort: "those who were unfit for Church-work, ought to be judged much less fit for the work of the School…" (8). Mulcaster expresses his discontent for people who treat an institution of learning as a way station for their own ascent up the career ladder: "Whereas now, the schoole being used but for a shift, afterward to passé thence to the other professions, though it send out very sufficient men to them, it selfe remaneth too too naked, considering the necessitie of the thing" (249). What further destabilized the profession during the period —and still destabilizes it to this day—was its high turnover and poor retention rates, which was due in part to the existence of the culture of moonlighting and transiency within the profession. Poor salaries also did little to encourage long-term employment, but with a steady and rising demand in place for teachers, schools sometimes had little choice in the matter when staffing their classrooms.

Multiple forces participated in exacerbating and interpreting educators' precarious professional status in early modern England. Schoolmasters who made teaching their livelihood sometimes had no other recourse but to acquire additional employment, potentially compromising their devotion to their careers. These same teachers, some of whom conceivably self-styled as professionals, faced crippling challenges on the job, and/or they found themselves working alongside unqualified or uncaring outsiders who passed through on their way to more lucrative employment. As for members of the

public, they formed a crucial group as outside observers capable of granting recognition. Whether witnessing fluctuations in quality that depended on the schoolmaster *du jour*, or watching an established schoolmaster moonlight as the town weaver to earn extra cash, the community could notice what the contemporary authors of treatises cited above did.[45] However, unlike these pedagogical experts, who had a stake in safeguarding their professional interests, outsiders to the profession—neighbors or drifters—did not have the same level of investment. To many of them, teaching was just another trade, a line of work occupied by whomever, sometimes without stability or tenure. These sorts of informal perceptions did little to support an already struggling occupational group searching for what they perceived as due recognition among more established professions. As long as poor salaries, widely differing qualifications, and open access pervaded, dedicated educators had difficulties standing on their own as a professional group to be recognized by the general public and the surrounding professional community.

Professional Pronouncements: The (Conditional) Verdict

At this point, what seems clearest and most certain is the fact that educators of the early modern era lived an ambiguous, precarious, and challenging existence. Situated in a developing professional landscape, schoolmasters struggled to secure their own distinct status relative to other more established and acclaimed fields. Determining their position

[45] Morrice, in *An Apology*, goes to extraordinary lengths to convince his readers through appeals to logic and fact that teachers are not servile and that those who engage in liberal arts are not subservient. Beyond reminding readers that receiving a salary is not a sign of servility and that schoolmasters wear no livery, Morrice refers to the virtues of language instruction in Latin and Greek, writing "These Offices are liberall, not servile, appertaining to the soule" ($C1^r$).

in society during such an expansive and rapidly changing period presents its own set of challenges based on the evidence available to today's scholars. Any verdict on the schoolmaster's professional status thus becomes a matter of interpretation that depends on the reader. Modern critics consider the evidence differently, depending on the approach each employs. Members of early modern society held their own opinions that often depended on their local schoolmaster's comportment or performance. And, finally, period schoolmasters possessed degrees of self-awareness that have been transmitted across the generations in the form of pedagogical treatises. This concluding section will attempt to sort through these multiple perspectives to provide a conditional verdict that includes all available evidence.

Once again, it is most productive to separate modern historiography from contemporary evidence. A brief tour of today's scholarship reveals that critics run the gamut from denying the profession's emergence and existence in the period, to qualifying it as ambiguous, to supporting fully its reality. Few critics seem to rule out the presence of a body of schoolteachers, but some do not endow that occupational group with "professional" status. Referring to late medieval schoolmasters, Nicholas Orme checks off a list of criteria that prevents, in his view, professional recognition: "Their lack of numbers, their geographical isolation, and their modest economic importance were all against them. They never managed to develop a national organization, and they cannot be regarded as a profession" (238). Most of the factors Orme cites as characterizing medieval schoolmasters, also described early modern schoolmasters, and it is conceivable that his opinion would not change based purely on period nomenclature. Helen Jewell does not issue the same categorical dismissal as Orme, but she does point to the

heterogeneity and the disparate skill sets of schoolmasters as detractors to their assuming collective professional status (79).

As part of his assessment, Charlton actually uses the same criteria that prevent others from declaring schoolmasters as professionals to offer an affirmative reading of their situation. He refutes other critics who insist that a lack of a professional association somehow implies a lack of professional identity, establishing this criterion as "insufficient grounds for dismissing the professional status of teachers since no such (one) association exists today" (Charlton, "The Professions" 56). Orpen adopts a similar, but more guarded approach when he argues that teaching's historical "subordination to the church" is not "a mark of its non-professional status" (193). Sometimes affirming the status of the profession is simply a matter of declaration, as Brian Simon demonstrates in his introduction to the teachers of the seventeenth century: "Teaching was now beginning to become a profession in its own right" (46). Regardless of the particular point of view critics assume, the either-or mentality of deciding an entire body of work's status risks being too simplistic and misrepresentative of an admittedly ambiguous reality.

It is this admittedly ambiguous reality that the majority of historians and critics openly acknowledge when faced with the task of offering a verdict on whether schoolmasters belonged to the professional class. Their assessments are largely conditional, reflecting the overall precariousness that the majority of schoolmasters had in common with one another. Cressy calls schoolteaching an "incipient" profession that struggled to come into its own bounded by a number of educators in the field who "were utterly undeserving of 'professional' esteem" (149). Even if teachers never achieved

complete recognition, their efforts to professionalize did not go unnoticed, as many conscientious teachers celebrated in the pedagogical literature referenced throughout this chapter "developed a sense of commitment and profession" (O'Day, *Education and Society* 178). These tentative verdicts seem to do the profession more justice than categorically positive or negative judgments. The precariousness that early modern educators experienced does not nullify their existence as a professional group, yet the ambiguity of their position in any given location or moment in time makes it difficult to insist upon the sort of uniform social standing that characterized more established groups.

Because of this compromised, tenuous position, contemporary educators of the era did not fall silent, but rather advanced their cause and claimed status alongside other professions. Nedham and Morrice both use their treatises to incite a public response in the hope of reconfiguring popular perception and improving conditions for educators. Nedham appeals to those in power and begs that "they give publick Schools a publick Countenance" (15), while Morrice works to "stirre up some, which in this age are exorbitant herein, to a due consideration, to a more requisite usage, and to a more gratefull remembrance of schoolmasters" (A6^{v}). The success of these public appeals depended, of course, on the readership of the treatises. If mostly teachers and those already invested in learning consulted such manuals, then these appeals for change could at most succeed rhetorically, and they likely reverberated within an already supportive chamber of practitioners.

The most compelling examples of support for the professional status of schoolmaster came from practitioners themselves who attested to the worthiness of their own work by comparing it to the expertise of other masters who dedicate themselves to

their work. Hoole effectively compares the schoolmaster's challenge to "bend to the child's capacity" to the precise craftsmanship of the watchmaker:

> How I have delighted to see an artist (I mean a watchmaker or the like) spend an hour or two sometimes in finding a defect in a piece of work, which he hath afterwards remedied in the turning of a hand; where, as a more hasty workman hath been ready to throw the thing aside and to neglect it as good for no use. Let the Master ever mind where a childe sticks, and remove the impediments out of his way, and his scholar will take pleasure, that he can go on in learning. (83)

Although Hoole's comments address methodology, his diction does support his recognition of the schoolmaster as a professional. In contrast to the "hasty workman," the precision watchmaker, or "artist," dedicatedly completes his objective just as the "Master" spends ample time cultivating the child. The accomplishment—or lack thereof—of the task at hand depends on the caliber of the practitioner, and there is a discernable difference in the status of the workman and the master.

In line with the title of his treatise, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*, Hoole argues that teaching is an art best reserved to a contingent of qualified, specialized artists, or masters. Elyot makes a similar point in *The Book of the Governor* when he reminds his audience that unqualified schoolmasters are no more suitable to a child's instruction than a father's binding his son "firste prentise to a tynkar" instead of a "connyng goldsmith" (71). Both Elyot and Hoole make it a point to distinguish amateurs or other stand-ins from the authentic masters. Just as quacks occupied the margins of medicine and hacks meddled in legal affairs, so also did pretenders lurk within the schoolmaster's profession. These inferior "workmen" may have existed alongside the

professional schoolmaster, but a distinct field of experts practiced independently of such outsiders, and this group deserved recognition in its time despite its ambiguous, challenged position.

Conclusion:

In Vives' *De Tradendis Disciplinis*, the author imagines a healthy student-teacher interaction that inspires the student's reverence and emulation of his teacher. Referring to the student, Vives writes, "Whatsoever he has received from his teacher, let the scholar regard as if pure oracle, and since he will think him to be perfect and full of the highest excellence he will keenly wish that he himself should be like his teacher as far as possible" (Vives 107). The sentiments contained within this passage echo the soaring rhetoric of Erasmus' letter to Witz that prefaces this chapter. When examined as a literary artifact, Vives' admiration for the schoolmaster's work is just as inspiring and uplifting as Erasmus' letter. However, when viewed against the backdrop of a complicated historical and contemporary reality, these same expressions of laud and admiration ring hollow. If the student only knew that some teachers barely subsisted, then he probably would not have desired to emulate his schoolmaster. If the student realized that many members of the public regarded schoolmasters as "inferior tradesmen" (Cressy 149), then, surely, he would have sought an alternate path in life. If the student knew that his "perfect" oracle of a schoolmaster practiced alongside ignorant, unqualified outsiders who drifted in and out of the classroom on a whim, then, most definitely, would that same student have qualified his admiration of the profession, if not of "his" teacher.

To similarly qualify our perspective on the status of the era's educators is not to deny the presence of an existing profession. Teachers of the period fulfilled a need and had the potential to offer a body of knowledge to which their students and outsiders did not have immediate access. This reason, along with the fact that many of these same educators participated in a developing professionalization movement to achieve recognition, allows me to offer a conditional appraisal of the profession's status that hinges on a range of temporal and theoretical perspectives. From this conditional premise I will explore in subsequent chapters how performance—on stage as a cultural phenomenon and incorporated as part of pedagogical practice—might have influenced the schoolmaster's professionalization efforts and attendant identity crisis.

As this chapter demonstrates, to determine an entire profession's status without relying on inaccurate, limited, or anachronistic criteria imported from the modern era presents a major challenge to today's scholars and historians of education. Contemporary literature in the form of creative representations and pedagogical treatises offers competing perspectives that complicate the rendering of any definitive verdict. Finally, when the pedagogical ideals of the period collide with the harsh realities of the educator's lot, it becomes difficult to give credence to lofty humanist endorsements that situate the schoolmaster's office as one step removed from the king's. The precise location of the schoolmaster's step on a professional gradient that is still in process today largely depends on how one acknowledges and interprets the ambiguities of the era. To remove entirely the English schoolmaster from the early modern era's professional landscape, though, ignores a legacy of advocacy, a history of advancements, and a sense of

precariousness that once defined the profession and, in fact, still characterize it to this day.

Chapter 2: Playing , Acting, and Teaching: The Nexus of Drama and Education

The "Character" Genre: A Bridge to Drama

Marked by epigrammatic prose representations of common persons, places, and even behaviors, the "character" genre serves as a literary threshold that separates non-dramatic literary representations of early modern teachers from the era's drama. Reworking a generic tradition originated by the ancient Greek philosopher Theophrastus, these brief sketches popular in the early decades of the seventeenth century offered sometimes-satirical social commentary and appealed to a wide readership that could readily identify with the familiar subject matter. "Character" writers of the early modern era faced a unique challenge in reducing the broad scope of their generalized subjects to relatively limited confines. As Alfred S. West in the Introduction of the 1897 issue of John Earle's compendium of "characters," *Microscosmography*, explains: "The writer of Character-sketches presents us with a *genre* picture in a small frame" (xxiii). Despite the inherent compactness of the "genre picture," "characters" offer us a panoramic frame of traits, dispositions, and commonplaces, which are presented as stable, absolute givens. As literary representations, these sketches are invaluable in offering modern audiences a crash course of sorts in some of the most common personality types and customs of early modern culture.

To appreciate the intricacies and designs of this literary form, it is useful to examine Sir Thomas Overbury's meta-"character" entitled "What a Character Is" in which he delineates the bounds and purposes of this form of literary representation. Prefaced by a declarative title that promises precise definition, this "character" about a "character" is revealing in that Overbury references the schoolmaster. He opens with the

line: “If I must speak the schoolmaster’s language, I will confess that character comes from this infinite mood χαράξω that signifyeth to engrave, or make a deep impression. And for that cause, a letter (as A.B.) is called a character” (Overbury “Character” 167). In offering his preliminary definition of the genre, Overbury channels the essence of a schoolmaster by depicting him as someone whose language differs from that of the masses. This representation is brief, but powerful, and the author manages to embed another character within his “character” about a “character.” After further comparing the form to Egyptian hieroglyphics, Overbury attests to the layered complexity of the genre when he translates the schoolmaster’s language into English, writing: “To square out a character by our English level, it is a picture (real or personal) quaintly drawn, in various colours, all of them heightened by one shadowing” (167). Like Alfred West’s photographic definition of the genre, Overbury’s artistic analogy emphasizes the mode’s capacity to offer readers a composite image from a diverse landscape of particularities. This composite obscures individual exceptions to focus on a larger group’s identity. For this reason, the genre is amenable to gauging how professional groups, such as schoolmasters, were represented and later regarded by readers at the time.

Richard S. Christen’s article from 2001, “‘An absolute monarch in his school’: Images of Teacher Authority in the Seventeenth-Century English Character literature,” will serve as the critical foundation of my own analysis of the genre. In his examination of “characters,” Christen considers eighteen different sketches of the schoolmaster that span the century to consider how these writers portrayed teachers’ authority and professional status at the time. In his research, he uncovers “two contrasting archetypes” in which the incompetent schoolmaster’s weakness foils the “superlative instructor

wielding unchallenged command" (323).[46] These extremes in portrayal are not surprising in a genre that relied on broad brushstrokes to create stereotypes of diverse individuals. Most interesting about Christen's work, however, are his thoughts on the "character" genre's negative representations and his invocation of performance as a descriptor of status. He argues that "these incompetent instructors are performers for whom pleasing the audience means everything" (325). Within the confines of the "character" genre, performance is related through the details of the representation instead of by live action. For this reason, the genre serves as an appropriate bridge for considering how the dynamics of the stage might have altered representation.

In line with Christen's approach, I will analyze both a positive and negative "character" of an educator as part of my literary survey, beginning with Overbury's "A Pedant." In doing so, I will determine how each literary representation portrays professional identity and whether any performance tropes surface as part of the overall description. In "A Pedant," Overbury depicts a self-indulgent, ineffectual educator who privileges linguistic minutiae to the exclusion of anything or anyone else. Before chronicling the pedant's grammatical fixations throughout the "character," Overbury first outfits his educator with telltale signs of his office. The pedant "treads in a rule, and one hand scans verses, and the other holds his scepter" ("Pedant" 108). Similar to a rod or a ferrule, the pedant's scepter readily signifies his position to the reader. On stage, this visual detail would have resulted in a similar degree of recognition from the audience. As a "character," the pedant lacks a live audience, and he performs his role, or

[46] Christen in "'An absolute monarch in his school': Images of Teacher Authority in the Seventeenth-Century English Character literature," *History of Education* 30.4 (2001), surmises that in reality "one would more likely find teachers resembling the Character literature's despotic, inept performers than the genre's caring autocrats" (337).

occupation, for himself. Nowhere in the text does Overbury include an animate object of the pedant's work, and "only the eight parts of speech are his servants" ("Pedant" 108). His lifelessness separates him as an ineffectual educator from capable ones. Overbury's "character" of the pedant self-servingly represents his practice as one to be avoided by conscientious educators.

Whereas Overbury's "A Pedant" offers an unequivocally negative representation of a certain type of educator, Thomas Fuller's "The Good Schoolmaster" describes the ideal teacher and consummate professional. Longer than the typical "character," Fuller's is as much a portrayal of an ideal pedagogue as it is a model representation of the entire profession. "The Good Schoolmaster" opens with a blanket statement on the contemporary state of the early modern profession: "There is scarce any profession in the commonwealth more necessary, which is so slightly performed" (Fuller 99). Although one may read the verb "perform" strictly as a synonym for "practice" or "execute," Fuller's word choice is significant if we regard the profession as a performance art. Some professionals, such as the subject of Fuller's "character," are excellent performers in their roles and responsibilities, while others tarnish the image of their profession as a result of their poor individual performances. Fuller enumerates four causes of the "slight" performance he decries, ranging from teachers who leave the university without a degree to teach as a last resort, to transients who drift in and out of schools for want of a better position, to teachers who find their salaries insupportable, and those who defer their classroom responsibilities to an usher.

Concerning the schoolmasters who prematurely exit the university, Fuller offers an all too familiar visual representation of a schoolmaster who only succeeds in looking

the part rather than playing it well. These individuals manage to secure positions in the profession, but they act "as if nothing else were required to set up this profession, but only a rod and ferula" (99). Similar to the pedant's scepter of Overbury's "character," these accoutrements of the profession do not make the professional, and they signal to the audience a certain level of emptiness that one cannot help but read back onto the profession. That is, so many teachers found it sufficient to perform their obligations by wielding a rod or ferula that many associated these symbols with a bankrupt profession. In order to combat such negative associations, Fuller shifts the tenor of his "character" to focus on the positive traits that distinguish his schoolmaster as an upstanding individual and prototypical ambassador of the profession. Eight maxims follow in which the reader learns that, among other desirable qualities, the "good" schoolmaster possesses intelligence, diligence, and good morals. He does not resort to violence in his classroom and is "moderate in inflicting deserved correction," and "[o]ut of his school, he is no whit pedantical in carriage or discourse" (101, 102). Fuller concludes his list of virtuous dispositions by petitioning all schoolmasters to remember that their students are ultimately responsible for maintaining their schoolmasters' legacies as teachers "who, otherwise in obscurity, had altogether been forgotten" (102).

Like some of the era's poems offered to specific, accomplished schoolmasters, Fuller's "character" emphasizes just how central secondhand, literary representations are to constructing an individual or professional's lasting and pervading image. Although practicing schoolmasters can produce their own treatises in an effort to further their professional cause as demonstrated in Chapter 1, their audience is decidedly more limited and partial than the more generalized audience of the era's popular literature and drama.

The “character” genre differs from other prose and poetic representations of schoolmasters in that the profession of the “character” under examination is the generalized and principal focus of the sketch—not an afterthought or latent understanding. As a composite image, the subjects of this particular form of literary representation embody the traits, behaviors, and qualities of a collective group, including but not limited to professional organizations.

Negative “characters,” such as Overbury’s “A Pedant,” do no favors to individuals who resemble or conform to the unflattering, literary stereotype. Positive representations, on the other hand, as Christen argues, work differently: “The Character writers aimed to unveil the extremes of human folly and virtue, not reality, however, and toward this end, they depicted exemplars to counteract shoddy practice” (337). Christen’s view of the “character” genre and, by extension, literary representation as a means to sway public perception is central to the purposes of my project. I argue that representation as it is performed on stage also serves as a factor in determining a profession’s status and the overall process of professionalization in which performance played a crucial role.

Drama and Society: A Medium for Education

Before we can explore the relationship between dramatic representation and surrounding professionalization movements, it is useful to confine our focus to the early modern classroom and its wider culture of education to establish the primacy of drama as a medium and subject of instruction. Once we uncover the proximal relationship of play, performance, and instruction, it will become possible to introduce representation as an

additional factor in determining how professional displays on stage could contribute to a surrounding climate of professionalization efforts. Just as the humanist spirit of the era gave rise to "a culture of teaching," as Rebecca Bushnell argues in her study of the same name, the period also was marked by a widespread dramatic culture, which supported the educational initiatives of the classroom. The increased secularization of the era's schools and the decline of religious drama changed the ways in which citizens learned from and interacted with the theater. These shifts, which occurred in concert with the robust humanist revolution, elevated "themes such as the importance of knowledge and the cultivation of rhetorical skills" to new levels of importance previously unseen in society (Potter, "Performing" 145). However, the theater's treatment of knowledge as a theme also changed with time. By the end of the sixteenth century, plays that unequivocally supported education became increasingly rare, and the institution of education often became a subject of satire (Potter, "To School" 118). With the surging popularity of the theater, a wider audience also constituted itself and stood to learn from the stage lessons that transcended religious doctrine.

Darryll Grantley, in his 2000 study entitled *Wit's Pilgrimage*, examines how the early modern stage was instrumental in communicating and teaching social mores and skills. Although he primarily focuses on social behaviors taught and learned from drama, Grantley's methodology and findings are illuminating in the scope of my own project in that he accentuates the seamless interplay between both the institutions of the theater and the school. After acknowledging the pedagogical place of drama within the period's schools, Grantley enlarges his focus to consider how the stage could reinforce—if not directly teach—the same sorts of social values, skills, and behaviors introduced in the

classroom. Likening drama to courtesy literature, Grantley notes how plays not only could "present argument, but also indeed demonstrate stress, behavior, speech, and manners, and so models of social identity could be actualized on stage" (59). Writing on London's early modern theatrical tradition, Steven Mullaney attributes the stage's productive, generative capacities to its "vantage point" as an institution at once associated with the city and "dislocated" from it, which "gave the stage an uncanny ability to tease out and represent the contradictions of a culture it both belonged to and was, to a certain extent, alienated from" (30, 31). Appreciating the stage as a "kind of material institution" allows us to understand the full import of its productive and instructive potentials, which create "new ideological positions and new modes of subjectivity" (Howard 12, 13).[47] Integral to this project, of course, is the professional subjectivity the stage produces via schoolmasters' performances of their pedagogical work.

In their 2011 collection of essays entitled *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England*, Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson extend the work of Grantley, Mullaney, and Howard to focus on the stage as an active agent of social pedagogy by emphasizing the pedagogical potentials of performance. Not only is pedagogy "performed" on stage, but it is "deeply performative…helping create a social (and gendered) world in which desired behaviors were initiated and repeated via lessons designed for a specific purpose" (Moncrief and McPherson 7). These senses of actualization and creation lie at the heart of my project in that I will seek to explain not only how dramatic representations of the schoolmaster reflected a particular professional

[47] Louis Montrose in *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996) similarly establishes the theater in materialist and ideological lights to interrogate its place in producing cultural claims.

status or character type, but also how these plays could similarly "demonstrate," "actualize," or even "initiate" the precariousness experienced by practicing professional schoolmasters off stage. By regarding pedagogy actively as something that performance (on or off stage) generates, I intend to consider representation as something more than a reflection and instead as its own performance of professionalization. This potential of drama to contribute or lend meaning to professional status owes its existence, in part, to the seamless integration of play and performance in the classroom and as part of the schoolmaster's professional discourse.

Teaching and Learning: Pleasurable Recreations

When it comes to school drama, or those exercises in the classroom that incorporated rehearsed performances or recitations, Ursula Potter describes it as "one of the few pleasures both for the master and the boys in the otherwise tedious and rigorous Tudor school system" ("Performing" 161). While schoolroom drama may have elicited "one of the few pleasures" within an environment not traditionally associated with such amusements, certain schoolmasters looked beyond drama to imagine their classrooms and practices in terms of play. By briefly returning to some of the same early modern schoolmasters whose pedagogical treatises illuminated their professional stake and position in Chapter 1, I will demonstrate how a cross-section of educators understood and manipulated the broader concept of "play" as part of their pedagogy and in the performance of their everyday roles. Following this sampling, I will shift my attention to a particular kind of play that Potter and others identify as central to the era's pedagogy—drama—and its place within the nation's schools. To have an appreciation of how

schoolroom drama may have actually fit within a larger paradigm of pedagogical pleasure and play is to understand just how integral performance was to the culture as a whole.

Philoponus, the successful schoolmaster of John Brinsley's framing dialogue in *Ludus Literarius*, provides an optimal starting point for investigating how pleasure and play intersected within the early modern classroom. As part of his efforts to encourage his downtrodden colleague, Spoudeus, Philoponus celebrates the inherent source of pleasure he attributes to his calling: the students whom he instructs. The accomplished schoolmaster explains: "I can take ordinarily more true delight and pleasure in following my children…then any one can take in following hawkes and hounds, or in any other the pleasantest recreation, as I verily perswade my selfe" (Brinsley *Ludus* B2^{r}). Brinsley's explanation using Philoponus as his mouthpiece introduces both "delight" and "pleasure" as key conditions of a schoolmaster's happiness and success. The professional schoolmaster has the opportunity to contribute to his students' successes via his instruction or influence, thus producing positive results. Furthermore, schoolmasters like Philoponus who succeed in their office have the ability to derive a level of satisfaction, or pleasure, that surpasses other more recreational activities.[48] Charles Hoole in his treatise, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*, similarly equates the schoolmaster's occupation to recreation when he asks: "What more pleasing variety can there be, then that of children's dispositions and fancies? What better Recreation, then to read and discourse of so many sundry subjects, as we meet with in ordinary authours?" (8). In both these examples, Brinsley and Hoole justify their calling by highlighting the

---

[48] The marginal notes that accompany the principal text of Brinsley's dialogue *Ludus* also inform the reader that "More true contentment may be found in this calling rightly followed, then in any recreation whatsoever" (B2^{r}).

profession's pleasurable potential. The schoolmaster's everyday work thus becomes transformed into something greater than the most enjoyable forms of recreation, which traditionally occur outside the workplace.

Not only do the schoolmasters who "follow" their students stand to benefit from the pleasure of their position, but also the students have the ability to derive similar recreational joys from their instruction. Later in his treatise, Hoole proposes a similar model of equivalency, but this time addresses the students: "And could the Master have the discretion to make their lessons familiar to them, children would as much delight in being busied about them, as in any other sport, if too long continuance at them might not make them tedious" (42). In this particular example, the students' work can easily resemble the pleasurable sports played outside the classroom. In order to receive "much delight," the students must have the benefit of learning from a competent schoolmaster whose pedagogy allows for the pleasures of the sports field to insinuate themselves within the space of the classroom. The above examples make it clear that for both teacher and student, the possibility of pleasure emerged as both a lofty ideal and as somewhat of a priority for certain educators who use their treatises to justify their professional status to society.

Just as these educators redefined the trappings of the profession in terms of pleasure and delight, so also did they seek to transform the space of the classroom from strictly an environment of learning to a new recreational venue. Philoponus, in Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, proclaims to his counterpart and to the reader, "Let the schoole be unto them [the students] a place of play: and the children drawne on by that pleasant delight which ought to be, it can then no more hinder their growth then their play

doth, but rather further it…" (C1v). In response to the climate of pedagogical violence that occasions the writing of *The Schoolmaster*, Ascham includes the following commentary from Doctor Wotton, who corroborates his company's general feelings of dismay for beaten schoolchildren: "'In mine opinion, the schoolhouse should be indeed, as it is called by name, the house of play and pleasure, and not of fear and bondage'" (6). The similarities between these works are striking, as both Brinsley and Ascham borrow from what has emerged as a common lexicon of play, pleasure, and delight to describe their ideal educational institutions and professional experiences.

Brinsley, Hoole, and Ascham, though writing for different purposes and possessing distinct philosophies, achieve common ground in their efforts to reconfigure the public's and their own colleagues' perceptions regarding early modern education. Each author seeks to introduce pleasure, delight, and play as distinct possibilities and results of the processes of teaching and learning. With the schoolhouse as a "place of play," the schoolmaster's work can resemble recreation, or become even more enjoyable than such pastimes, thus creating an interesting inversion that at the very least serves as an idealization. Yet, what if such efforts to bolster the profession and the educational process by elevating the work to a state of transcendent pleasure might actually complicate schoolmasters' standings—especially when one introduces the element of performance that often induces, supports, or grounds such pleasure within the classroom?

The Theater of the Classroom and the Classroom of the Theater

The same classroom, or "place of play," in which teaching and learning had the potential to bring forth pleasure, delight, and recreation also hosted another sort of

"play," or the dramatic activities that occurred as part of the schoolmaster's pedagogy. Dramatic performance was a form of play, and this particular iteration also could have produced instructive pleasures for both master and students—in the confines of the classroom or on stage.[49] As an "instructional site," the stage made learning available to a wider audience, whether through specific scenes of teaching and learning or via more subtly demonstrated cultural behaviors and practices (Moncrief and McPherson 6, 12). Yet, these potentially edifying lessons would cease to exist were it not for the existence of a receptive, interpretive body of spectators who shared more similarities than differences with the era's students. The composition of the theatergoing audiences paralleled the student population of the early modern classrooms of the time, as both venues resembled sites of "social juxtapositions" (Grantley 18). Spectators were likely onetime students who had possibly derived parts of their own education from performance-based activities and lessons in the classroom. While it is impossible to determine any collective audience's response, the fact remains that theatergoers at times resembled students as a result of the pedagogical potentials of performance and/or the performance of pedagogy on stage.

When implemented in the classroom, drama supported a range of pedagogical ends, such as developing rhetorical training and sharpening memory.[50] Referencing the

---

[49] Ursula Potter in "Performing Arts in the Tudor Classroom," *Tudor Drama Before Shakespeare: 1485-1590, New Directions for Research, Criticism, and Pedagogy*, ed. Lloyd E. Kermode, Jason Scott-Warren, and Martine van Elk (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) notes the intersection between the early modern classroom and the theater by focusing on the trope of role-playing, which she designates as "the founding tenet of Elizabethan drama" whose "groundwork was firmly laid in Tudor schools" (150).

[50] Drama for drama's sake also produced its own set of instructional rewards as the editors of *A Cylcopedia of Education*, ed. Paul Monroe et al. (New York: Macmillan, 1911) note in their entry "Drama and Education" when they claim that drama allowed one "to throw himself into another person's position, and in imagination see the 'other person's' point of view. For this reason the dramatic, in some form or other, must be recognized as a necessary basis for the teaching of history, literature, and social relations" (366).

Westminster School's program of Latin instruction, Lynn Enterline likens it to "a kind of *daily theater for Latin Learning*" (original emphasis 179). Potter extends Enterline's particular example and calls the Tudor classroom "for all intents and purposes a performance space, both for the master and for the boys" ("Performing" 147). The trappings of the theater became integrated within many of the nation's schools. Schoolmasters incorporated aspects of performance into their daily practice, and their students displayed their acquisition of that instruction for the schoolmaster and any outsiders who assembled as an audience via their performance.[51] Whether it resembled a traditional stage play or merely facilitated the rehearsal of grammar lessons, the drama of the early modern classroom became "an avowed educational instrument in the school" (Monroe 363). Although it could serve practical ends in the confines of the classroom, the theatricalization of the schoolroom may have resembled something different in theory than it did in practice. In a culture in which certain authorities and interest groups either distrusted or disapproved of the public theater, drama in the classroom raised suspicions and created anxieties for those who felt that the schoolroom should exist independently from the commercial stage.

Potter addresses the proximity of both the classroom and the theater by insisting on an ultimate separation of academic and popular performances: "Audiences and performers could rest secure in the knowledge that they were participating in an academic display of talent and a sanctioned pedagogical exercise" ("Performing" 155). This

---

[51] When it comes to the audience's ability to perceive instruction via performance, Jeff Dolven in *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance* (U of Chicago P, 2007) considers everything from the students' range of motion to their rhetorical delivery: "Fluency of physical movement and dramatic affect would have signaled to the audience something about which students got it and which didn't, and some of the same criteria must have been applied on an even more regular basis in the evaluation of *ponuntiatio*, the actual declaiming of orations" (50).

reading confronts the anxieties about the public theater overlapping and overtaking the classroom by upholding the academic nature of the schoolboys' performance. However, some contemporary authorities of the period, such as Sir Francis Bacon, point to the erosion of the era's public theater as cause for concern. In his 1623 *De Augmentis Scientiarium*, Bacon questions if the era's drama retains any didacticism. He acknowledges a wide gulf that separates the worlds of the public theater and the classroom, while recalling former generations' more responsible uses of drama. With one keen eye focused on his contemporary landscape and the other nostalgically regarding the past, Bacon writes: "Dramatic Poesy, which has the theatre for its world would be of excellent use if well directed…but the discipline has in our times been plainly neglected. And though in modern states play-acting is esteemed but as a toy, except when it is too satirical and biting; yet among the ancients it was used as a means of educating men's minds to virtue" (*De Augmentis* 441).

Bacon's commentary on drama acknowledges a shifting tide in which dramatic poetry no longer inspires the same virtues as it once did. In his view, it has become less a practical, didactic instrument, and instead it has been "neglected" and transformed into a "toy." When play or performance is regarded as little more than a trifle, any pleasures that ensue are equally empty, producing little in the way of edification or instruction. For Bacon, drama's heyday as an instructive form has long passed. If his assessment of the theater held true, schoolmasters would have experienced a certain level of difficulty when implementing performance as part of their pedagogies—"sanctioned" or not as academic exercises. For the early modern classroom, a venue that shares such close proximity to the theater, the implications of such emptiness are far-reaching, affecting everything from

the quality of instruction to the schoolmaster's professional standing as someone who negotiates and participates in the "daily theater" that is his classroom.

If we look beyond the idealization of the classroom as "the place of play," the fact that such play might occur there under the purview of a professional schoolmaster—not a stage player—creates an additional level of tension. Juan Luis Vives in *De Tradendis Disciplinis* offers two sharp critiques of "play" and performance within the classroom that introduce some key complications for the schoolmaster's professional status. In discussing a practice known as "concurrentes" in which two professors lecture on the same subject before an audience who decides the victor, Vives argues that teaching, when executed as a theatrical performance, can tarnish the profession as a whole. He describes the process with an eye for how the audience responds:

> There is a pandering to the audience, as it were to the public in the theatre, who are pleased not with the best man, but with the best actor. For the hearers cannot pass an opinion on what they are ignorant of. Hence strife is received by the audience with great applause, for the spectacle of a fight is most pleasing to them. All respect and reverence for the teacher vanishes, and with it disappear the tranquility of philosophical thought and the progress of studies. (Vives 61)

Vives' criticism of the "concurrentes" stems from his objection to the dramatization of the educational exchange that occurs between teachers and students. The educator become "actors," while the students—now rendered as audience members—take in a "spectacle" instead of instruction. The sort of transformations that Vives describes do not resemble the ideal, mutually satisfying results that both schoolmaster and students stand to gain in the commentaries of Brinsley, Hoole, and Ascham. Instead, the elements of

performance—the sense of play that all three of the above authorities celebrate—weaken the teacher's credibility. For Vives, it is impossible for "the tranquility of philosophical thought" to stem from overlaying elements of performance, play, or recreation on either the institution of the school or, most importantly, on the schoolmaster's profession.

Vives follows his discourse on the "concurrentes" by encouraging schoolmasters to avoid viewing their profession as recreational. In a rhetorical move that starkly opposes other professionals who justify their occupations by asserting their leisurely, pleasurable constructs, Vives implores: "Wherefore masters will take all the precautions in their power, that the schools shall not be allowed to become worthless through play or to be contaminated by disgrace" (87). In both of these examples, the Spanish humanist differs from his English counterparts cited above in that he considers performance as a detriment to both the schoolmaster's status and the institution of the school itself. When no longer regarded as ideal forms for pedagogy, play and performance have the potential to undermine the integrity of the profession. The issue becomes even more complex when we acknowledge just how integral performance was (and still is) to the educator's pedagogy and professional identity. Already in a precarious position because of their status and inconsistent recognition, schoolmasters found themselves unavoidably living and participating in a performance culture. They received encouragement from some of their contemporaries to transform elements of their practice so that they could elevate their lot to one that elicited the pleasures of recreation. Yet, these same experiences of play and pleasure to which they aspired might have hindered their efforts to succeed as a distinct professional group—especially if their appetite for performance blurred the line between their standing as educator and player or playwright.

Some schoolmasters of the period, such as Nicholas Udall, enjoyed successful careers both as playwrights and educators.[52] However, others found themselves regarded as "incompetent amateurs," and "the type became a common figure of fun" (Potter, "Performing" 159).[53] As previously noted, a schoolmaster's standing most often hinged on another's perspective. The public's opinion of their local schoolmaster most surely differed from a more generalized or official view. Potter claims, "Most pedagogical authors of the period make a clear distinction between the sanctioned actor in an academic environment and the 'degenerate' player of the public stage" ("Performing" 159). But what happens if the public refuses or fails to make such a "clear distinction"? What if the reality of the situation beyond the pages of pedagogical treatises painted another picture in which the schoolmaster resembled less a professional educator and more a stage player or hapless playwright whose interests did not lie with his students? What if a schoolmaster's involvement with drama compromised his professional image for audiences beyond the stage? While it is impossible to answer any of these questions with any degree of convincing proof, it is possible to detect a certain level of public anxiety represented in Ben Jonson's 1625 comedy, *The Staple of News*.

In this play, Jonson features four theatergoing "Gossips" who take their places on the stage to provide a running critical and social commentary on the plot. Gossips Mirth,

---

[52] Tellingly, schoolmasters enjoyed an occupational status similar to playwrights—regardless of their direct involvement with the public theater. As Grantley notes in *Wit's Pilgrimage: Drama and the Social Impact of Early Modern Education in Early Modern England* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000), the period's playwrights occupied a social position that was "at best ill-defined" (28). For anyone but the most successful schoolmaster-playwrights, the only given of branching out from the classroom to the stage seemed to be trading one precarious professional status for another.

[53] The fact that many schoolmasters who attempted to break into the ranks of professional playwrights became known as "figure[s] of fun" in society is exacerbated when we consider that many dramatic representations of schoolmasters on stage similarly rendered them as comical figures, thus creating a stereotype for the audience who could detect this kind of schoolmaster on and off the stage.

Tattle, Censure, and Expectation appear in only the framing scenes of the play, which include the Induction and the Intermeans that follow the first four acts. Although their stage presence is rather minimal, these women lend a lively, realistic counterbalance to the play's allegorical and diffuse main plot, which features the Staple of the title. In Act III's Intermean, Mistress Censure rails against schoolmasters who incorporate performance in their classrooms to the point that the schoolroom and the playhouse become inseparable entities. Calling the schoolmaster "a cunning man" and a "conjurer," Censure voices her intense displeasure with a practice she deems as all too common:

> They make all their scholars playboys! Is't not a fine sight to see all our children made interluders? Do we pay our money for this? We send them to learn their grammar and their Terrence, and they learn their play-books…[S]ee we shall have painful good ministers to keep school and catechize our youth, and not teach 'em to speak plays and act fables of false news in this manner, to the super-vexation of town and country, with a wanion. (Jonson, *Staple* 189-90)

Mistress Censure's objections run the gamut from financial concerns to curricular issues. She staunchly opposes the transformations that occur within the classroom when schoolmasters "make all their scholars playboys" or when for the sake of performance, these students are "made interluders." For Censure, the ways to prevent such transformations rest in hiring "painful good ministers," who would conceivably maintain the separation between the worlds of the theater and the school. These ministers, who already enjoy stable professional identities, are better suited to take control of the schoolmasters' duties since the schoolmasters, as far as Censure is concerned, have abandoned their professional responsibilities as educators for another field altogether.

Despite the apparent logic of her critique, Mistress Censure, or, for that matter, any of the Gossips, is by no means the play's voice of reason. Jonson, who himself was one of the period's first professional playwrights, tinges Censure's placement within the play and her objections to performance with irony: "The audience is invited to enjoy the irony of the boy player directing criticism toward himself as parent, schoolboy, and player and to consider the hypocrisy of parents who condemn the grammar schools yet willingly attend schoolboy performances" (Potter, "Performing" 160). Though bombastic in her delivery, Censure's words aptly reveal just how complicated the relationship was between performance, instruction, and professionalization.[54] Her words also serve as "strong testimony to the success of schoolmasters as drama coaches as well as to the place of dramatic performance in the curriculum" (Rogerson 321). Perhaps, most importantly, in terms of this project, Mistress Censure's criticisms demonstrate how the early modern stage serves as a vehicle for both reflecting and representing cultures of teaching and learning. When staged before a diverse audience whose members have at least passing familiarity with the educational institutions that surround them, this character has the opportunity to corroborate, counter, or even shape popular sentiments regarding the stage and schoolhouse's interactions with regard to performance, pedagogy, and professionalization.

As Vives' critiques demonstrate and Jonson's character of Mistress Censure reveals in her diatribe, the sometimes-borderless distinction between the early modern classroom and the theatrical stage encourages a certain degree of ambiguity that could

[54] Grantley in *Wit's* reads this particular episode as a way to stress the commonness of drama in the classroom, while swinging out to consider the cultural and social effects of performance: "The place of drama in the educational process, at least in the more important institutions, has implications for its place in the general culture as well" (49-50).

either support or frustrate a schoolmaster's efforts—pedagogically and professionally. Much of this sense of confusion rests on the issue of separation. For certain insiders like Brinsley and Hoole, their desire to render the classroom pleasurable accompanied their efforts to buoy the profession as a whole. Those schoolmasters who incorporated performance (a form of play) within their classrooms openly borrowed from the theater that surrounded them and their schools. These rhetorical and pedagogical strategies emphasized fluidity over separation, which afforded the schoolmasters and their students the potential to experience the sorts of didactic pleasures that the public stage offered, creating a rewarding educational experience for students, parents, and the community.

However, for detractors such as Vives, lack of separation between theater and classroom, or between professor and performer, created more problems than rewards. By their logic, the integrity of the schoolroom and the profession suffered when "play" began to define the schoolmaster's role and practice. While it is not in the interests of this project to declare one perspective as the cultural reality of the period, the precariousness of the schoolmaster's professional status acquires more significance when it is situated within an already ambiguous culture of performance, teaching, and learning. If performance and play, standard parts of the era's pedagogical and professional practices, could create such tensions for schoolmasters in the confines of the classroom, what happened when the stage featured performances depicting the schoolmaster's profession? Did audiences maintain a sense of separation between representation and reality, or did they accept the schoolmaster's on-stage character as a valid display of professional status or merit? These are the sorts of questions that emerge when we consider the performance of professionalization—as it occurs on stage—as a potential lesson for audiences.

Dramatic Representations: Performing Professionalization

Beyond "figures of fun"?

While non-dramatic literature may obscure the schoolmaster's professional identity beneath that individual's character, it is difficult for the audiences of stage plays to disassociate a character's personhood from his or her profession because both are openly performed in front of an interpreting body of spectators. Schoolmasters, tutors, pedants, and other pedagogical characters tend to look the part they play by donning particular garments and carrying visual accessories that signify their roles. Although a range of characters and dramatic situations can have a didactic purpose, explicit scenes in which educators appear on stage in an official, instructional capacity carry significant weight for a culture already accustomed to drama's incorporation within the classroom. Moncrief and McPherson probe this dynamic and consider "the extent to which education itself, an activity rooted in study and pursued in the home, classroom, and the church, led to, mirrored, and was perhaps even transformed by moments of instruction on the stage" (1). I would like to refine Moncrief and McPherson's argument by focusing on how stage performances and dramatic representations of the schoolmaster's occupation might have similar transformative effects on contemporary professionalization movements.

As previously discussed, much of the early modern schoolmaster's pedagogy and position were steeped in performance. Sometimes doubling as playwrights or players themselves, many early modern schoolmasters freely borrowed from and participated in a culture of performance as part of their everyday practice. Regardless of their involvement with any organized theatrical activity or the extent to which they incorporate drama in their lessons, the schoolmaster's profession is performative by nature, as

students and teacher have each other as their audience. Schoolmasters' success, therefore, depended on their daily performance as well as the performance of their students, since parents and members of the greater community read these performances as signs of learning.[55] In this culture of performance, I propose that people also performed their professions. These performances occurred in the workplace, in public, and on stage. Schoolmasters performed their profession within an already theatricalized classroom. Therefore, when represented on stage, the schoolmaster's character similarly performs that profession to a more diverse audience. Certain schoolmasters who were particularly active in the theater culture of their classrooms and society were also savvy about how performance affected their standings: "They saw public performance as a way of promoting themselves and their schools and also…saw the power of the theatre in the political arena" (Rogerson 326). In either venue, these performances not only were instructional but, as I will argue, they also displayed for an audience—students, parents, community and audience members—the schoolmaster's profession. In reading these performances on the stage as performances of the profession, we see how dramatic representation might do more than reflect or mirror the teacher's individual reality and instead contribute to his profession's reality by virtue of its display on stage.

This possibility for dramatic representation to produce a "real" teacher can only be fulfilled if we as audience members and critics regard schoolmasters on stage as more than stock characters, such as those that populated the "character" genre of the era. For

---

[55] Moncrief and McPherson in "'Shall I teach you to know?': Intersections of Pedagogy, Performance, and Gender," *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction, and Performance*, ed. Katherine M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson (Burlington, VT: Ashate, 2011) view learning and gender as performable social constructions: "Students, actors, teachers, and writers themselves performed their learning, just as surely as they performed aspects of their gender" (2).

her part, Rogerson offers a positive, innocuous reading of the stage schoolmaster, arguing: "When schoolmasters appeared as characters on the stage, they were likewise figures of fun," later adding that they "provided audiences with harmless amusement," (326, 325). Her interpretation focuses primarily on the audience's emotional response to the plot and action on stage. Although Rogerson accurately and helpfully generalizes that the vast majority of dramatic representations of schoolmasters were unflattering and made them objects of amusement, she stops short of accounting for the consequences of the laughter or any other audience response. What if these negative representations were not as harmless and as inconsequential as Rogerson imagines? What if the audience considered the actor's portrayal of the schoolmaster as somehow representative of the larger occupational group and used the stage to corroborate or formulate its perceptions of the profession?

What becomes of established, dedicated educators who do not engage in such behaviors? What are we to do with representations of incompetent schoolmasters on stage who offer no educational value in the world of the play or for the audience? Might these representations produce more than empty laughter? The answers to these questions depend on how we view the stage of that time. Did it reflect the audience's reality back on itself, or did it resemble a two-way mirror through which the audience observed a new reality in the making? Determining one's vantage point as a reader, audience member, or modern critic gives greater understanding of the affinities and differences between staged and actual schoolmasters.

In Rogerson's view, practicing provincial schoolmasters of the period "fulfilled an important function in the shaping of the theatrical culture of their time" (327). I will

argue in the following analysis and throughout the subsequent chapters of this project that the staged schoolmasters of the era played an equally important role in "shaping" a surrounding professional culture from their position in the theater. As much as these characters displayed for the audience in the performance of their roles their knowledge, or perhaps their ribald ignorance, they also displayed their professional identities in the same performance. The early modern stage and the dramatic representations of the schoolmaster on that stage make these professional displays visible to an interpreting audience composed of people variously familiar with their local schoolmaster, his standing in the community, and the profession of which he is a part. Whether enacted in the classroom or on stage, these dramatic performances are central for understanding, interpreting, and perhaps even explaining the complexities of the professionalization efforts waged by the era's schoolmasters who lived and worked in an already theatricalized culture of education.

The Glasse of Government*: Exceptions in Representation*

George Gascoigne's 1575 "tragicall Comedie," *The Glasse of Government*, defies neat, generic categorization and features a well-qualified and highly respected schoolmaster named Gnomaticus as part of its cast of characters. Unlike other dramatic texts that tend to exploit the comedic potentials of the schoolmaster, Gascoigne's play resists portraying the schoolmaster and his profession unflatteringly. Instead, Gnomaticus' stellar reputation remains intact throughout the play—despite his mitigated success in inspiring only half of his students to greatness. His character affirms the profession he represents, and he comes across as an ideal. However, considering the

play's disputed performance history and its relative lack of critical attention, it is difficult to regard *The Glasse of Government*'s sympathetic portrayal of the schoolmaster as typical of the period's drama. Nevertheless, its unclear literary heritage and anti-theatricality make Gascoigne's play a good starting point for beginning a more extended inquiry of how we can regard the performance of other staged schoolmasters in the period of as part of the contemporary professionalization movement.

"The Argument" of the play encapsulates its conventional plot in which "[t]wo riche Citizens of Andwerpe (being nighe neigboures, & having eche of them two sonnes of like age) do place them together with one godly teacher" (Gascoigne 5). The older students, Phylautus and Phylosarchus, sons of Phylopaes and Phylocalus, respectively, squander their educations under Gnomaticus and find themselves convicted of various crimes against society. Phylautus is executed for robbery, while his counterpart Phylosarchus is whipped and banished after being charged with fornication. The younger sons, Phylomusus, brother of Phylautus, and Phylotimus, brother of Phylosarchus, study hard to become a secretary and preacher, respectively. Their older brothers meet their demises after coming in contact with the play's unsavory characters, including the harlot, Lamia, her aunt, Pandarina, and Eccho and Dick Drumme, a parasite and roister. Most of the play follows the education of the four sons and the ideological split that divides the younger pair from the older, philandering ones.

Given the play's focus on the contrasting behaviors of the sons, most critics associate it with the prodigal son tradition; however, this classification presents challenges when it comes to tracing Gascoigne's inspirations and when interpreting the

play's ending.[56] Felix E. Schelling is one of the critics who classifies *The Glasse* as an example of the prodigal son tradition, while still acknowledging the play's novelty as "a unique example of a distinct species of the drama and the earliest specimen of its class" (129). Linda B. Salamon, however, disputes the accuracy of the prodigal formula altogether by arguing, "the errant sons do not return, repentant, to the welcoming arms of their families" (51). Unlike her critical predecessors, Salamon does not look to sixteenth-century models of Dutch prodigal son plays to contextualize Gascoigne's work. Instead, she spotlights the play's similarities to Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* and Elyot's *The Book of the Governor*, arguing that these contemporaneous prose tracts "appear to be the sources for the ideas Gascoigne chose to dramatize" (69).[57] The debate does not end with the play's source materials and generic classification, however, as questions regarding *The Glasse*'s performance history also produce divided critical opinion.

Whether Gascoigne's play ever appeared on stage for a public audience is uncertain, and critics have addressed the lack of any authoritative evidence by instead assessing the play's potentials for performance, the main apparatus I use to gauge the period's professionalization of schoolmasters. Potter, for example, argues that the play was best suited as a "school exercise and not for public performance" ("To School" 111). Although Potter still allows for the possibility of performance, just not on the public stage, Christopher Gaggero cites the play's textuality as the ultimate impediment to

[56] For some of the earliest critical assessments of the play as a form of the prodigal son model, see the nineteenth-century studies by C. H. Herford, "Gascoigne's *Glasse of Government*," *Englische Studien*, 9 (1886), 201-09 and Felix E. Schelling, "Three Unique Elizabethan Dramas," *Modern Language Notes* 7.5 (1892): 129-33.

[57] Despite her efforts to reclassify Gascoigne's play, Linda B. Salamon in "A Face in *The Glasse*: Gascoigne's *Glasse of Government* Re-examined," *Studies in Philology* 71.1 (1974), also openly acknowledges the play's shortcomings, stating: "Although it has found mild admirers in Gascoigne's biographers, the sermonizing, mechanical *Glasse* undeniably has its longuers" (48).

performance—public or private. Gaggero argues that the text's rigid moralizing: "discourages the reader from taking pleasure in it as an entertainment" (183). Reading the same text that Gaggero cites as impossible to perform, Richard Hillman recovers some dramatic value from the play. He claims that *The Glasse* has "at least isolated moments of stage-worthiness" (405). When it comes to the play's inclusion of stage directions and the presence of physical movement of the actors, Gaggero and Hillman adamantly disagree with one another, offering diametrically opposed interpretations that further complicate the issues surrounding the play's performance history and viability as a stage play.

Gaggero categorically dismisses the text as ever having a life on the stage since it "rarely invokes the space" of the stage, and short of its "massed entries," "there are no other stage directions" (172, 183). Hillman, however, detects a host of stage directions, stating: "There is no lack of stage directions, some of them quite particular, both internal…and external" (395). How is it that there exists such a critical impasse regarding the performance history of Gascoigne's 1575 play? And, how does the play's performance history or potential have any bearing on this project? If we regard the play as purely textual, then we deny the existence of an audience and essentially retrofit what was originally printed as a play into some sort of moral prose tract, which might have still found a reading audience.[58] Without accounting for the potential presence of an interpreting body of spectators, we limit our own interpretation to textual and rhetorical

[58] Christopher Gaggero in "Pleasure Unreconciled to Virtue: George Gascoigne and Didactic Drama," *Tudor Drama Before Shakespeare*, forwards this very logic when he argues that the text's publication history proves its destiny as a non-performance piece: "Working with a new printer, he [Gascoigne] employed a number of key editorial devices in an effort to constrain how the play could be read. *The Glasse* was never performed and, as I see it, was never intended to be" (172).

concerns, while also narrowing the cultural landscape—and the audience—in which the play existed. If viewed solely as a textual artifact, the play's admittedly less than dynamic characters exist as mere abstractions instead of as live beings who display their virtues and vices to the public.

As a staged schoolmaster, Gnomaticus differs from the Gnomaticus in the printed text who would be just another literary representation of the early modern schoolmaster. For the purposes of this analysis, I join Potter and Hillman in at least allowing for the potential of *The Glasse* as a performance piece. I will treat Gnomaticus' character as a dramatic representation of a schoolmaster whose stage presence displayed his personal and professional identities for an audience. It will become clear by the conclusion of this analysis and chapter that Gnomaticus differs from many dramatic examples in that he supports and bolsters the profession he represents by virtue of his performance. In a play that is itself a study of exceptions, Gnomaticus' portrayal as an ideal seems appropriate, as his character is not specifically cast as an amusing or delightful figure for the audience, but instead he offers a rare performance of the positive exemplar that so many practicing schoolmasters and other authors attempt to establish as reality in their professional and non-dramatic literature.

Gnomaticus: *Exemplary Educator or Pretend Professional?*

The themes that dominate *The Glasse*, a humanist drama, primarily revolve around civic responsibility, parental obligation, and the interplay between learning and social mobility. Gnomaticus, as the schoolmaster, plays a key role in supporting his students' growth in all of these areas. Regarded as a renowned educator in the world of

the play, Gnomaticus' dignified representation of his profession offers audiences that may have been accustomed to less flattering portrayals of schoolmasters on stage a different model. By examining Gnomaticus' role and responsibilities as schoolmaster, I will consider how we might appreciate Gascoigne's dramatic representation of the profession in a culture in which everyday schoolmasters struggled in their professionalization efforts. How does *The Glasse* represent professional status via the staging and characterization of Gnomaticus' reputation, responsibilities, practice, and results? Does Gnomaticus' performance of the schoolmaster's role prove an exception to the rule, or might his character reshape or sway the audience's perception of the occupation by virtue of his on-stage performance of the schoolmaster's office?

Both fathers, Phylopaes and Phylocalus, desire a better future for their children, and they place that future in the hands of a schoolmaster who can ready the boys for their imminent university education at Dowaye. "Unlearned" themselves, the fathers anticipate that education will allow their children to "aspire unto greater promotion, and builde greater matters upon a better foundation" (Gascoigne 9). The success of the fathers' plans hinges on their finding a well-qualified schoolmaster to instruct their sons. Phylopaes insists that their children's teacher be skillful while also an "honest and carefull schoolmaister…because the conjunction of two such qualities, may both cause the accomplishment of his dutie, & the contentions of our desires" (10). While skills, honesty, and carefulness seem reasonable criteria, Phylopaes' expectations signal to the audience that the selection of a schoolmaster is not a matter of chance. Their ideal candidate is one with a specific "dutie" as a professional and a sense of responsibility to his students and their parents.

The parents of the two sets of younger and older brothers search for a schoolmaster to work exclusively with their children. Despite this private arrangement, Gascoigne “customarily names the teacher ‘schoolmaster,’ or ‘instructor’ and never ‘tutor,’ although the latter term would follow humanist tradition” (Salamon 57 n. 18). In addition to being named as schoolmaster, Gnomaticus enjoys a public reputation as a teacher and is a product of the community. Fidus, Phylopaes’ servant, recommends Gnomaticus personally as “a man famous for his learning, of woonderfull temperance, and highly esteemed for the diligence and carefull payne he taketh with his Schollers” (Gascoigne 10). Reacting to Fidus’ high praise for Gnomaticus, Phylopaes remarks on the larger state of the profession. According to him, “more parents there are that lacke such Schoolmaisters for their children, then there are to be founde such Schoolemaysters which seeke and lacke entertainment” (10). Gnomaticus apparently represents a type of schoolmaster that is in short supply.

Phylopaes recognizes the need for well-rounded, accomplished educators, such as Gnomaticus, while also recognizing a collective professional group. However, as far as Phylopaes is aware, few schoolmasters are able to conform to the same standards as Gnomaticus, and *The Glasse* seems more evidence of a familiar sense of precariousness that typified the profession beyond the theater. Before Gnomaticus even appears on stage, his reputation precedes him to the point that he already seems an outlier when compared to his counterparts in the profession. On stage, Gnomaticus’ physical appearance and upright carriage further distinguish him from the other characters—particularly, the band of scammers headed by Eccho that corrupt the two older sons. Despite the play’s lack of textual information regarding costuming, internal cues

embedded within the dialogue facilitate interpretations of Gnomaticus' character based on his physical characteristics. Depending on the character speaking, references to the schoolmaster's appearance either work to reinforce his dignified standing within the community or dismiss him as a useless figure. For example, Phylopaes verbally heralds Gnomaticus' initial representation on stage by announcing that his servant, Fidus, "bringeth with him a grave personage" (11). Seen from afar and unknown by either father, Gnomaticus' gravitas registers visually. In hearing Phylopaes' complimentary observation of the schoolmaster's grave personage, the audience finds itself in a better position to confirm both fathers' expectations regarding the Gnomaticus' reputation based on first impressions alone.

Eccho's perceptions of the same public figure on the same stage differ in tone and meaning. However, his standing as a parasite does not lend him the same credibility in speech as have the fathers who seek a better future for their sons. Whereas Phylopaes flatteringly and honestly describes the schoolmaster from afar, on two separate occasions Eccho refers to Gnomaticus' appearance without regard for his character, emphasizing his advanced age relative to his students, his compatriots, and Eccho himself. Eccho refers to Gnomaticus as "a frosty bearded scholemaster instructing of four lusty men" (25) and later simply as "the old scholemaster" (38). Unlike Phylopaes' use of the term "grave," which reinforces Gnomaticus' reputation as an accomplished, established educator and community figure, Eccho's superficial language slights Gnomaticus by overlooking his talents and instead fixating on his age compared to the students he teaches and the younger generation with whom Eccho associates. Both ways of perceiving Gnomaticus are important for the sake of performance, as the audience has the

ability to corroborate either perspective based on its own observations of the character's movements on stage and his representation of his role and profession. Furthermore, these friendly and unflattering perceptions work in tandem to render Gnomaticus as the distinct, exceptional person he is in the world of the play. The question is whether his exceptionalness as an individual ultimately distances him from the profession to which he belongs, or if his practice and performance allow him to represent the worthiness and strength of his calling. His dignified views on salary provide audiences with an early indication of his professional identity.

When the "grave" Gnomaticus first meets the two fathers, their enthusiastic greetings soon give way to discussions about salary. Before explaining the program of studies that includes a blend of religious and civic instruction, Phylopaes acknowledges the value of the schoolmaster's profession by stating, "there is no money so well spent as that which is given to a good Schoolmaister" (12). Gnomaticus graciously accepts the praise directed toward him and his profession, taking solace in the fact that his efforts have been recognized and appreciated throughout the community. Once he accepts his new engagement, Gnomaticus refuses to name a specific or, for that matter, any sum for his compensation. He shies away from thinking of his work as an economic venture, and he explains: "I would be lothe to make bargaines in this respect, as men do at the market or in other places, for grasing of Oxen or feeding of Cattle, especially since I have to deale with such worthy personages as you seeme and are reported to be" (14). In response, Phylocalus defers the discussion to a later time and offers twenty angels to the newly hired schoolmaster. Gnomaticus' seeming disinterest in his compensation is curious but not inexplicable. To modern and early modern audiences, a working

professional's refusal of payment would seem odd and implausible. Since much of Gnomaticus' renown rests on how he upholds himself and his office to exacting standards, his deliberate separation of his line of work from other more common, pecuniary trades seems only natural. By not shifting his focus from the students under his care to his salary, Gnomaticus demonstrates the value of his labor without cheapening it, and he still receives payment despite his protest.

Gnomaticus' awareness of his professional obligations extends to his pedagogy. On stage, however, Gnomaticus' lack of performance of his profession sets him apart from the play's other characters. In teaching his students the virtues of obedience to one's God, prince, parents, country, and magistrates, the schoolmaster lectures incessantly with speeches that span pages of uninterrupted discourse. Schelling cites Gnomaticus' speeches as one of the play's "rarely inartistic" elements (265-66). These speeches feature no movement on stage, and there is little interaction with the four students or the play's spectators, who are essentially captive audiences. The pattern of entrances, exits, and escapes that typify the movements of Echho and his gang contrasts Gnomaticus' appeal as a stationary instructor, and the older sons find themselves attracted to the more dynamic and mobile life of the streets.

Despite the apparent drawbacks in his approach, Gnomaticus' practice, as Gaggero notes, "probably resembles actual teaching practices of the period more closely than do the idealized masters of Ascham and Elyot" (190 n. 11). And although he relies primarily on direct instruction and lectures to teach, Gnomaticus first takes care to question his students in order to "determine what trade or Methode shalbe most convenient to use…" (Gascoigne 16). If translated to modern educational theory,

Gnomaticus engages in a form of differentiated instruction in that he acknowledges his students' varied backgrounds and capabilities.[59] Despite his due diligence in instructing his students, a difference of opinion splits the older sons from their younger brothers. Phylautus and Phylosarchus object to their schoolmaster's "order of teaching," on the grounds that "it hath in it neither head nor foote" (34). The older boys claim that they already possess the knowledge Gnomaticus offers them, and they react by turning their attentions to the unsavory characters who roam about their town, while dreaming of the university as a place where they would enjoy an "other maner of teaching" along with a range of other pleasurable pursuits (35). The younger sons, Phylomusus and Phylotimus, profit from Gnomaticus' teaching and dutifully complete their assignments, while possessing great admiration and reverence for their teacher.

In his attempts to save his two older students from a life of corruption, Gnomaticus unwittingly perpetuates their demise during the play's middle acts. He continues to trust their integrity and is duped in the process by Eccho who misrepresents himself as Servus the Markgrave's messenger. Gnomaticus makes his final misstep when he suggests to the students' concerned fathers that they send the boys to the university in Dowaye as a refuge—the same institution to which Phylosarchus and Phylautus have intended to flee all along. In his words, "you could devise no greater punishment which would so much greeve them as to departe from this Citie…" (60-61). Gnomaticus' ignorance and his misplaced belief that sending the boys the university would constitute punishment may complicate his reputation a bit for the audience. How could such a

[59] Gaggero in "Pleasure," reads Gnomaticus' pedagogy as inconsistent, claiming it resembles a "homiletic tradition of instruction" in the first two acts to become more "humanist" in appearance by the third act (178, 179).

renowned, successful schoolmaster misread his students so seriously that he ends up contributing to their failures? How could this same schoolmaster achieve such unmitigated success with his other two students who thrive by the play's end? Do the fates of his students have any bearing on Gnomaticus' standing as a professional? Is his success in educating only half his students to virtue a Pyrrhic victory for him and his profession?

While Gnomaticus certainly errs in his judgment, he never neglects his roles and responsibilities, and he enjoys the unwavering support of Phylomusus, Phylotimus, their fathers, and Servus the Markgrave throughout his tenure. By the play's end, Gnomaticus resigns himself to his inability to control the destinies and decisions of his students, but he still acknowledges his stake in shaping their moral and intellectual character. At the beginning of Act IV, Gnomaticus delivers one of his and the play's most important speeches regarding a schoolmaster's professional obligations and standing:

> If none other thing were required in a faythfull enstructor but onely that he should teach his schollers grammer or such other sciences, then with lesser travaile might wee attayne unto perfection, sythens Grammer and all the liberal Sciences are by traditions left unto us in such sort, that without any greate difficultie the doubt thereof may be resolved: but the Schoole Master which careth for none other thing but onely to make his schollers lerned, may in some respect be compared to the horsecourser which onelie careth to feede his horse fat, and never delighteth to ryde him, manage him, or make him handsome: and when such palfryes come to jorneyng, they are comonly so provander proude, that they praunce at the fyrst

> exceedingly, but being put to a long journey or service, they melt their owne greace and are not able to endure travaile. (68)

Gnomaticus' soliloquy addresses the profession as a whole. While he registers his own grief, he uses the opportunity to affirm the comprehensiveness and importance of the profession. Skills alone, as Phylopaes acknowledges during his search for the ideal candidate, do not guarantee the schoolmaster's success or define his professional obligations. Recalling Ascham's comparison of the schoolmaster to the horse courser in *The Schoolmaster*, Gascoigne evokes the manual occupation as a point of comparison to demonstrate that schoolmasters who limit their focus to learning alone slight their students and compromise their own integrity as professionals.

By Act V, the audience and the fathers learn of the older sons' misdeeds and combined failure. Gnomaticus can only look on at this point and comfort the fathers who hired him, knowing that his efforts did not inspire Phylosarchus or Phylautus to practice the lessons he taught them. However, he can also rest in knowing that the two younger sons flourished under his care to enjoy great success and social advancement. It seems appropriate that by the play's end, Gnomaticus fades from public view, leaving the opposite fates of the sons as the object of the audience's consideration. In this sense, the play ultimately supports the earnestness of Gnomaticus' efforts, placing the burden of the responsibility on the students. Despite his exceptional standing among those in his profession, Gnomaticus emerges as something more human than an idealized stage representation of Fuller's "The Good Schoolmaster." Instead, Gascoigne's schoolmaster is represented as a thinking and feeling individual who regards his work as having a social significance, but who is not always successful with every student. His reputation

throughout the community, his own understanding of his role and responsibility, and his awareness of his membership in a larger occupational group allow the play's audience to witness a dignified performance of the schoolmaster's profession on stage.

As Christen argues of the "character genre," "[t]he ways in which seventeenth-century pedagogical images depict authority should reveal much about the status of the era's teachers, both inside and outside the classroom" (322). *The Glasse of Government* offers the sorts of revelation Christen describes relative to the professionalization efforts of the era's schoolmasters. As a dramatic representation, Gnomaticus is not a comedic figure who somehow still manages to edify the audience. A serious figure who success ultimately depends on his pupils' performance, his upstanding stature in the community and his unconventional disinterest in financial gain do separate him from other members of the profession—just as his appearance and lack of movement separate him from the rest of the play's characters on stage. But, despite his exceptionalness, he does not stand alone. Instead, he considers himself as a practicing member of a larger professional group and fights for that group's recognition in the careful execution of his duties. In this play, the audience has a rare opportunity to view a competent and compassionate representation of a self-aware schoolmaster whose presence on stage makes visible both the precariousness of the profession and its merits, importance, and worthiness. Whether *The Glasse* actually provided such visibility in performance is a matter of critical debate.

Chapter 3: University Drama and Drama About the University

"Are these men not fools?": Career Scholars and Their Status

Robert Burton, who resided in Oxford University's Christ's Church College from his election in 1599 to his death in 1640, draws from a lifetime of study, reading, and clerkship to contend in a subsection of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* that career scholars such as himself are particularly prone to the overarching subject of his treatise. First published in 1625 and released in multiple editions thereafter, Burton's sprawling compendium reads as much as a medical textbook as it does as a philosophical tome or social commentary on the human condition. Buried in the First Partition's third membrane of the second section is Burton's pointed commentary on learning, those who study, and the concomitant misery associated with such scholarship. The author breaks from his customarily ambling prose to pose the question that titles this introduction: "Are these men not fools?" (Burton 262). As Burton establishes throughout the fifteenth subsection, entitled "Love of Learning, or over-much Study. With a Digression of the Misery of Scholars, and why the Muses are Melancholy," scholars' foolishness stems not only from their apparent lack of practical knowhow, but also from their conscious decision to stake their livelihoods on scholarship to the exclusion of other more lucrative, viable, or socially respected fields.

A "sedentary, solitary life" combined with "overmuch study; too much learning" mark students as more susceptible to melancholy than the masses, according to Burton (261). He elaborates upon the plight of scholars by examining their position in a modern world populated by a range of intellectual capacities and professional types. Because of their intense pursuit of knowledge, scholars lack many of the practical skills esteemed by

polite society, such as horseback riding, courtship, and the ability to carve meat at the dinner table. Compared to other occupations—learned or manual—career scholars fare far worse in Burton's view:

> Most other Trades and Professions, after some seven years' Prenticeship, are enabled by their Craft to live of themselves. A Merchant adventures his goods at sea, and though his hazard be great, yet, if one Ship return of four, he likely makes a saving voyage. An husbandman's gains are almost certain; which Jupiter himself cannot diminish, ('tis Cato's hyperbole, a great husband himself;) only scholars, methinks, are most uncertain, unrespected, subject to all casualties, and hazard. (263)

Burton's assessment certainly echoes these longstanding debates, but it also significantly identifies "scholars" as an aggrieved, vulnerable population. Referring to what has already been established as a relative commonplace of early modern society, Burton in frames becoming a schoolmaster as one of the few prospects available to those scholars exiting the university, explaining that whether becoming a lecturer or curate, schoolmasters stand to "have Flaconer's wages, ten pounds a year, and his diet, or some small stipend, as long as he can please his Patron or the Parish" (264). Despite their collective misery, these scholars who sometimes become teachers outside the university happen to represent their own career group—albeit one that cannot compete with others in terms of status or salary.

Burton's concentration on scholars' bleak career prospects allows us to widen our focus from early modern schoolmasters to include those individuals who, like Burton, devoted their lives to the pursuit of knowledge both within and outside the university.

With this widened field, it becomes worthwhile to discover how the dramatic literature of the period might portray their lot and situation within the university environment. While matriculates to Oxford and Cambridge varied in their social position and professional aspirations, a number of students repaired to the university to pursue years—if not careers—of scholarship. This chapter will focus on what I will refer to as the early modern era's "career scholars" and the drama that stages their work and status via performance.[60] Like the figure of the schoolmaster, upon which previous chapters have focused, the career scholar attempted to make his living from educational work. Both populations enjoyed ambiguous professional status. University dons, or the highest-ranking academic authorities of the institutions, such as fellows or professors, did not begin to assert their professional identity until the mid nineteenth century.[61] Unlike the schoolmaster, whose territory consisted of grammar schools or domestic environments, the career scholar's domain was the university. As intellectual and national landmarks, early modern England's two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, not only cultivated generations of English scholars, but these institutions also produced a body of drama unique to them, referred to broadly as "university drama."

Despite historians' efforts to chronicle the legacy of England's universities, cultural evidence pertaining to the everyday instructional and professional realities of the university and its students is lacking. As Lawrence Stone notes: "Very little is known

---

[60] While all career scholars are scholars, not every scholar or university student exactly qualifies as a "career scholar." I base my classification on those university scholars who staked their livelihoods on making a career out of their scholarship. Grammar schoolmasters and private tutors are specific iterations of this category that I cover in other chapters. The present chapter concerns itself with the early modern English university, drama produced within and about it, and those who resided within or passed through who made their livings as scholars.

[61] For an in-depth history of professional movements within Oxford, see Arthur Engel, "Emerging Concepts of the Academic Profession at Oxford 1800-1854," *The University in Society: Volume 1*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975) 305-51.

about either the contents and significance of the curriculum or the quality of teaching provided; equally little is known about the background or the future careers of the students" ("Size" 3). Because there is little historical evidence concerning the curriculum and instruction of the university, we are free to consider how dramatic representation can effect the professional status and professionalization efforts of educators. Concerning career scholars, I will use this chapter to ask how the university (and the commercial) stage represents them, especially when their fictive roles are played in the university by actual scholars. If they are not officially recognized or thought of as professional academics until the mid-nineteenth century, how do we acknowledge or treat this undeniably extant body of career scholars in the early modern period? Is it rhetorically viable to account for and insist upon this group's presence via literary evidence when they were historically unrecognized? These questions serve as the critical cornerstone of this chapter in which I will consider how the university, its drama, and public drama about the university coalesce to represent the status of the career scholar. In the case of university drama, I will seek to answer how the real-time performance of and by scholars succeeded in portraying their standing in early modern society. Did plays that prominently feature career scholars echo the bleak, damning assessment put forward by one of the period's most renowned scholars, Robert Burton, in his prose masterpiece *The Anatomy of Melancholy*? Or, are there other fates imagined by and inspired via performance?

Focusing exclusively on drama, I will sustain the lines of inquiry developed in the previous chapter's culminating analysis of *The Glasse of Government*, as it straddles the generic threshold between popular and university drama. The play's ultimately flattering

and affirming professional representation of Gnomaticus seems out of the ordinary, considering that popular drama of the period tended to deride schoolmasters or, at the very least, not recognize them as serious professionals. These exceptions in the *Glasse*'s form and in Gnomaticus' character, therefore, invite further inquiry regarding how performance represents and configures professionalization. To consider the professional status of career scholars and their places within the nation's universities, I will divide my analysis between university plays written in the vernacular, *The Parnassus* trilogy and *Club Law*, and two commercial dramas set in the university, *Doctor Faustus* and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. All these works significantly feature individuals—students and learned doctors—who make their careers as scholars. The career scholars that populate these plays share a collective, professional identity regardless of theatrical venue or audience.

Pairing examples from the commercial and academic stages will allow me to trace how aspects of performance inherent to the dramatic enterprise as well as those moments of performance built within the dramatic situation of the plays themselves work to reflect, represent, and construct for spectators the collective status of career scholars. Depending on the locale of the stage, in university colleges or as part of the public theaters, these plays reached different audiences—the one made of a closed academic community and the other comprised of the broader public. The performance of the plays featured in this chapter, like the schoolroom and commercial productions discussed previously, showcased for audiences the learning of the actors on stage and/or any didactic, social, or cultural messages embedded within the action.[62] I will argue that the professional status

[62] One might also argue that these plays showcase the dramatists' learning.

or identity of the career scholar was also on display as part of these performances, and it is my contention that the aspects of performance that unite the plays under examination both reinforce and confer a certain professional status upon the career scholars—even if this designation did not formally exist as a professional designation. After taking some time to establish the historical, social, and pedagogical climates of early modern Oxford and Cambridge, I will turn my attention first to university drama and then conclude with commercial plays about the university to establish how performance of and by career scholars ultimately works to construct and/or uphold their status as a recognizable occupational group existing amid a larger early modern professional landscape.

The Early Modern English University: Scholars and Their Scholarship

Foundations and Functions

To begin to understand the ambiguous social, cultural, and professional status of career scholars we need to appreciate the foundations of the early modern English university. For the purpose of this chapter, I will refer to Oxford and Cambridge collectively as "the university," surveying common practices of both in a general sense unless it is worth mentioning a specific university or college. While multiple volumes of university histories exist, my immediate concern does not lie in chronicling the legacy of individual colleges or students, but rather in examining the university as a center of education, nationalism, and dramatic performance. The position of the career scholar in the emergent professional landscape of early modern England is linked to the complex position of the university in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, periods in which both Oxford and Cambridge experienced statutory reforms and organizational

changes that transformed them from their medieval religious roots into the modern universities they are today.

By the time the Tudor dynasty took hold in England in 1485, Oxford and Cambridge had existed as institutions of higher learning for the better part of two centuries. Derived from the Latin “universitas,” meaning world or corporate whole, the term “university” simply refers to an association of scholars under the government of degree-granting authorities. Situated in continental centers such as Padua, Paris, and Bologna, many organizational aspects of the medieval European university would have been “quite recognizable” to us today (Scott 7). The English universities throughout the medieval era served an essentially ecclesiastical function, educating members of the clergy and housing a contingent of masters who were religious authorities. After the dissolution of the monasteries, the universities did not abandon their ecclesiastical heritage, but they necessarily came under closer supervision and interaction with the crown (O’Day, *Education and Society* 78). The Reformation also ushered in a period of significant changes in the universities’ size, student population, and overall purposes.

Although England’s universities were far from democratic in their admissions practices, both did host a cross-section of society over the course of the early modern period, admitting everyone from poor clerical students to elites. Not every student who studied or resided at the university pursued or took a degree. In particular, wealthy sons of aristocrats or gentry often found themselves sent to the university for a more generalized education (Stone “Size” 28). For some, their time in residence allowed them to pursue careers in law or other administrative employment, but others simply took advantage of their time away from home without much educational ambition, like the

elder children in Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*. Because not every student matriculated or took a degree, Oxford and Cambridge provided resources for multiple populations, "fulfill[ing] a dual or even a triple function in society—providing general education for no paper qualification; a basic curriculum for the BA; and preparation for the MA at one and the same time…" (O'Day, *Education and Society* 110). Despite these various functions, a grammar school education was one of the most common pathways to the university, which some students entered as young as fourteen or fifteen years old (Charlton *Education in Renaissance* 131). Given the multiple avenues pursued by a range of students, one might imagine that matters of the curriculum were just as diffuse, but statutes officially governed the content and sequence of instruction within the university as well as its associated colleges and faculties.

In order to have a sense of the kinds of teaching and learning that occurred in the university, we need to distinguish university-wide activities and practices from those that occurred within individual colleges. Although the various colleges of each university essentially came to dominate university life throughout the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, both Oxford and Cambridge operated administratively and curricularly at the university level. Therefore, it is useful to address the broad statutes that informed the university curriculum before addressing the sorts of instruction that occurred within the colleges. Theoretically the "rule and foundation of the university's scholastic programme," these statutes were "in many ways a very hypothetical concept" in practice (McConica 151-52). O'Day suggests that our modern perspective might actually distort the levels of "irregularity and flexibility of the university system in the Tudor-Stuart period" (*Education and Society* 107). While internal records from the era

certainly provide a much more comprehensive overview of the university curriculum than does the following account, the statutes and program of instruction in place were steeped in tradition.

Perhaps Kenneth Charlton best assesses the English university's curriculum, arguing: "If the university is to be regarded as a market of ideas it could hardly be said that either Oxford or Cambridge traded in new ideas" (*Education in Renaissance* 152). In fact, two of the mainstays of instruction, lectures and disputations, were medieval holdovers that continued to be mandated by university statutes throughout the early modern period. Minor changes to these curricular statutes over the course of the sixteenth century mainly addressed matters of "religious policy" and came in the form of the endowment of separate professorships, readerships, or lectureships (Charlton *Education in Renaissance* 141). University-wide lectures generally entailed the reading of a text by a professor or Regent Master who would offer his own comments afterward before an audience of undergraduates.

Beyond lectures, the university required its students to take part in oral disputations, or exercises, the "ordinary means of scholarly communication in the Elizabethan and Early Stuart period" (O'Day, *Education and Society* 112). Trading their seats as auditors of lectures for roles as public speakers, students who participated in these oral exercises had the opportunity to perform their learning in front of their fellow students and faculty members. Disputations allowed undergraduates in their last two years to apply their rhetorical training and skills gained from study as well as university and college lectures to "the practical business of speaking and debate" (143). Despite the designs of the university lecture and disputation, both of these events suffered from

notoriously poor attendance from the university community, in part because the colleges already housed similar activities and provided instructional opportunities of their own. In fact, it is at the college level that the most changes to university life and methods of instruction occurred.

Changes and Transformations

In his landmark 1959 book, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition: 1558-1642*, Mark H. Curtis investigates the changing social and cultural position of the English universities in Elizabethan and early Stuart society. He identifies two key phases of change beginning with "a period of crisis and adjustment" from the 1505 founding of Christ's College, Cambridge to the passage of the 1571 Act of Parliament and ending with "a period of settlement and steady development" that lasted from Elizabeth's taking the throne in 1558 to the beginning of the Civil War in 1642 (Curtis 5-6). These separate, but overlapping phases brought with them changes in the universities' curricula, instructional methods, student populations, and overall visibility within English society.[63] Perhaps one of the most significant transformations to affect university life occurred within its colleges. Changes to courses in the arts brought on by the rise in humanism and a new generation of students led to universities becoming "undergraduate institutions primarily dedicated to the 'virtuous education of youth'" (85). By examining these changes at the college level, the intersections between career scholars, their opportunities

[63] Charlton in *Education in Renaissance England* is careful to argue that none of the changes to the universities during this period was as "revolutionary" as Curtis and other critics like Lawrence Stone contend. Charlton argues that instead of being "cultural," the changes were "political and social" (168). For the purposes of this project, my citation of these changes—however revolutionary they may have been in terms of redefining social, political, and cultural landscapes—is meant to establish the professional environment in which the career scholars of the era worked, studied, and even performed.

for professional training, and the in-house drama that sometimes portrayed these realities will become readily visible. This visibility structures the forthcoming analysis on how the performance of university drama and drama about the university represented and contributed to this occupational group's status.

Prior to the fifteenth century, the university primarily existed as a corporate body of masters, fellows and other dons, or figures of authority. The undergraduate student population did not occupy a place of importance in university life until the shuttering of the medieval halls and new residency requirements concentrated these students in associations of their own. Their physical presence at the universities necessitated the rise of the colleges throughout the fifteenth century, transforming the universities into "collegiate universities" (McConica 64). Charlton identifies two principal changes to university life as a result of the rise of the college. With new student populations seeking university educations, including wealthy sons and poor fellow-commoners, universities "no longer remained the preserve of graduate fellows," and the colleges, therefore, "became teaching institutions, with the fellows taking on the teaching duties hitherto the responsibility of the university and carried out in the main by the Regent Masters" (Charlton *Education in Renaissance* 132). The Elizabethan Statutes of Cambridge in the 1570s had the further effect of shifting power from a society of masters to the heads of colleges (Curtis 42). Amid these changes, the university retained the sole responsibility of conferring degrees, and instruction at the university level persisted, despite the fact that actual attendance records would have seemed to indicate otherwise.[64]

---

[64] O'Day in *Education and Society* acknowledges the weakened state of university-wide instruction along with the rise of the college, but she explains that records and evidence do not support that the university curriculum lessened in importance. In her words, "The colleges took over and mediated the university

The college effectively became the locus of university life and teaching as the sixteenth century progressed.[65] The new focus on undergraduate instruction led to "a rival teaching system" taking hold in the college (O'Day, *Education and Society* 83). As a "self-contained unit," the college "provid[ed] for its own students, often in conflict with and powerful enough to resist the parent body whenever the interests of the two did not coincide" (Charlton *Education in Renaissance* 132). One of the ways in which the college "provided for its own" was via the college lecture. With non-attendance becoming an issue for university lectures, lectures at the college "catered for smaller groups," while facilitating more opportunities for direct interaction with lecturers who already worked with the students in attendance on a regular basis (O'Day, *Education and Society* 111). Because the colleges could provide their own lectures, those at the university became redundant and at best served as a supplementary resource for the knowledge and instruction obtained within the colleges.

In addition to its own lectures, the college also provided students with another uniquely collegiate experience: the individual tutor. Becoming a university requirement in the late sixteenth century for every undergraduate student, tutors were upper-division fellows who relied on their tutoring engagements to support their time within the university. As Curtis argues, "the college tutors rather than the readings of the college lecturers was probably in the sixteenth century and was definitely in the seventeenth century the most important influence on a scholar's education" (107). Tutors supported a

syllabus to students" (130). Mark H. Curtis in *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition: 1558-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1959) echoes O'Day's assessment, arguing that when it came to the "whole burden of instruction," the universities, "despite their statuses, had little to do but to grant degrees" (104).

[65] God's House at Cambridge was founded in 1439 by William Bygham and later became Christ's College in 1505; it was established as the first "teachers' training college" according to Charlton in *Education in Renaissance* (132). See also O'Day's *Education and Society* in which she briefly references this particular institution that served arts students (86).

range of experiences for undergraduate students at the university, from delivering personalized instruction to offering supervision in social and financial contexts. When it comes to instruction, tutors assisted students with their readings and prepared them for their exercises.

Beyond academics, tutors also supervised their students' interpersonal and financial lives—often at the behest of parents. Possessing an important "socializing function," tutors were expected to "produce young gentlemen as well as scholars" (O'Day, *Education and Society* 130). In addition to influencing the instructional and social lives of students, the tutorial system also redefined the office of the fellow. The institutionalization of the tutor "transform[ed] the young fellows from sinecure placemen into working teachers and watchful moral guardians" (Stone, "Size" 25). When regarded as a "working teacher," the college tutor, who as a fellow balanced his own studies with the needs of his undergraduate charge, emerges as a key example of the body of career and university scholars who serve as the focus of this chapter.[66] The occupational transformation of the fellow into college tutor not only responded to the evolution of the university's composition and purpose, but it also created its own transformation of the statutory curriculum, as tutors found themselves working in a "two-track system of undergraduate education" in which lay students—some of whom never intended to take a degree—demanded a different program of reading than traditional clerical students (Looney 16). The college tutor played a key role in facilitating the education of a new

[66] In the space of this chapter, I have chosen to address the tutor's instructional role and his position relative to and as an agent of the transformations that occurred within the English university in the early modern era. Because the tutor occupied a dual role as student and educator, while also having social and pedagogical duties, his status was more nuanced than that of the career scholars and university dons that serve as the chapter's focal point.

undergraduate student population called fellow-commoners, or gentlemen students distinguished from poor scholars, who entered the university with a different set of career and professional expectations. It is this rising population of gentlemen students that constituted one of the university's greatest changes in the period.

New Populations and Professional Possibilities

The career scholar's place in the university and his status in the surrounding professional landscape cannot be understood without considering a pronounced student demographic that came to populate and reshape Oxford and Cambridge. According to O'Day, the colleges consisted of "two main groups of undergraduates": the plebian, destined for careers in the church, and the sons of the gentry (*Education and Society* 130).[67] While not every undergraduate student fit precisely in one of these groups, significant numbers of sons of gentlemen descended upon the universities in order to round out their educations and/or to prepare for a career in one of the professions. Based on available records, which admittedly only tell a limited story, a number of historians argue that a surge of new, gentle-born students entered the universities beginning in the mid sixteenth century.[68] Curtis attributes the uptick in enrollment to the increasing

---

[67] For more on this two-group split, see Lawrence Stone's essay "Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body: 1580-1910," which appears in his own edited collection *The University in Society* and traces enrollment patterns over three centuries. Like O'Day, Stone refers to "two fairly distinct groups of students, with quite different aspirations and goals," the first of which consisted of degree-seeking clerical students who sought careers in the church or teaching. The other group was more diffuse and consisted of those who "planned a career in one of the professions, or as secretary, accountant, etc., and those who came to Oxford for a year or two as a kind of finishing school before embarking on a public career in politics or a private career as a country gentleman" (9). Taking a degree was less of a guarantee for members who belonged to the second category.

[68] Charlton in *Education in Renaissance* cites an "increasing number of gentle-born youth" who entered Oxford and Cambridge as fellow-commoners or pensioners, while acknowledging that the colleges were "still recruiting from a fairly wide social range" (135, 136).

importance of humanism, which took hold in both the universities in concert with the rise of the gentry and its focus on learning as a means for social empowerment (20). O'Day, however, perceives what others cite as hard evidence of increased numbers as "an optical illusion," arguing that "the numbers of commoners in the universities had always been sizeable and that the dramatic nature of the increase in their numbers in the later sixteenth century is indeed more apparent than real" (*Education and Society* 86, 87).

What is most important for the purposes of this chapter is to recognize that the career scholar, the student population of which he was a member, and his career prospects all depended on the composition and changing purposes of the university, which gentlemen fellow-commoners influenced as a result of their presence. Within and outside the university, "Gentlemen, professionals and academics spoke the same language" (O'Day, "University and Professions" 81). Not only did the rise in young gentlemen at the university alter the enrollment statistics, this population also affected curricular and policy matters as well as the early modern professional landscape. Joan Simon notes that colleges within the universities often became "recast in the gentlemen's image" as a result of this rising group's social status (368). Wealthier students—despite their subordinate status in the overall organizational hierarchy of the university's leadership—enjoyed a certain sway in the internal and external affairs of the university. Colleges, and their tutors, often had to "cater for gentlemen's sons, at the expense of scholarship and church," knowing full well that as elites, the young gentles and their fathers occupied prime positions to affect university governance, which sometimes allowed them to make personnel decisions (361). Although as a peer group they enjoyed

a certain level of clout by virtue of their elevated social status, fellow-commoners had various reasons for entering—and being sent—to the university.

While most plebian students of the universities sought degrees in divinity with the explicit aim to establish careers in the Church of England, fellow-commoners and their parents had other uses for a university education.[69] Some young gentles simply viewed their time in the university as a way station in their overall grooming to become a gentleman, sometimes leaving Oxford or Cambridge without a degree. Other elites considered the university as a site for acquiring training in one of the professions or learning the art of statecraft (O'Day, *Education and Society* 106). In Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*, for example, both sets of wealthy fathers look toward the university as a safe harbor to which they send their sons to escape the temptations of the world in order to pursue a future built on learning, virtue, and state service. For the two younger sons, this plan comes to fruition as they achieve well-respected professional positions; however, the older sons squander their time at the university and treat it as another recreational ground. Although the university in *The Glasse* is not an English one, Gascoigne's treatment of it as both a site that promises opportunity for professional development and potentially as nothing more than a playground for the wealthy corroborates the possibilities that awaited many young gentlemen who enrolled in England's universities.

[69] Stone in "Size and Composition" explains that a "serious excess of qualified" churchmen led to an "overproduction" of religious graduates in the second and third decades of the seventeenth century, leading to young divines having to subsist on a "marginal existence as an ill-paid curate or schoolmaster with few prospects for advancement" (23). Those who did not pursue an ecclesiastical education enjoyed—at least in theory—more professional prospects upon taking a degree or simply exiting the university, but this possibility was strengthened by oftentimes an elevated social status that already worked in the gentlemen's favor prior to entering the university.

Given the two distinct populations that filled its undergraduate ranks, the university promised a range of professional and scholarly opportunities for transient students, degree-seekers, and career scholars. Early modern Oxford and Cambridge no longer served exclusively as the training ground of future members of the church. Gentlemen discovered that a university education allowed them to enter many of the established professions, such as law, medicine, and administrative service, upon taking their degrees. While certain "entirely new professions" and specializations developed on their own beyond the institutional borders of the university, Oxford and Cambridge still maintained a particular degree of influence by, for example, tightening their control over the higher faculty members' training in the "ancient professions" (O'Day, "University and Professions" 81). It is important to realize that even amid the growth of new professions and specializations not under the university's purview, those who made up the professions often came from the university.[70] As O'Day concludes, "Leadership of the new professions often rested in university-educated men who revered learning" ("University and Professions" 99). This relationship between the university and university-educated gentlemen explains why this institutional and national site deserves such attention in this chapter, which seeks to understand how career scholars situated within the university understood and acquired their own status. In my following examination of university drama and commercial drama set within the university, I will suggest that the real-time performance of these plays along with the performance tropes

[70] O'Day in "Universities and Professions" cites "attorneys (ancestors of the solicitors), scriveners and civil servants" and those in "specialisms such as surgery and pharmacy" as examples of emergent, non-traditional professionials not educated in the university (81).

incorporated within them represent, reinforce, and confer professional status on this grouping of early modern educators.

Drama at and About the University: Performance of Professionalism

University Drama: Place and Performance

In the previous chapter, I introduced the inherent theatricality of the early modern classroom by describing the dramatic activities that schoolmasters included as part of their pedagogy. Drama supported instruction in the classroom and, on the stage, it had the potential to display the students' learning to the audience or schoolmaster. When it comes to the dramatic representation of the schoolmaster on stage, I argue that the character's professional status and identity also were put on display for the audience via performance. Depending on the portrayal of such characters, the staging of the educator has the potential to make visible the ambiguous and burgeoning status of the professional group via performance, while contributing to that status as a function of the performance. In the space that follows, I will investigate how drama of and about the university worked to represent and construct the professional status of career scholars, a population of educators located at the university.

New enrollment patterns as a result of an influx of fellow-commoners, the rise of the college, and curricular developments that responded to the humanist movement—all changes and transformations touching the early modern English university—gave life to the university stage.[71] Although university drama had "tentative beginnings" in the

---

[71] Because the universities were organized into various colleges, which as I have explained above acquired great importance throughout the early modern period, university drama, as Frederick S. Boas reminds us, is "strictly speaking, College drama," in *University in the Tudor Age* (New York: Benjamin Bloom 1966) 13.

medieval age, it was "essentially a creation of the Renaissance" and experienced its "golden period" when Elizabeth visited both universities not long after taking the throne (Boas, *University Drama* 1, 335). As a specimen of academic drama, university drama deserves its own generic category. Distinct from commercial or popular examples, university plays are broadly related, but they possess enough particular characteristics in the realms of performance practices, content, and audience to render them distinct entities.[72] In terms of dramatic output, Oxford and Cambridge "rivaled the professional companies" (A. Nelson, "The Universities" 142). Specifically, Nelson cites Cambridge as holding more recorded performances "through the 1560s than any other town or city in England, including London" (*Early Cambridge* 3). Despite this statistical dominance and the fact that they existed concurrently for a time with the performance of commercial drama, the university plays maintained a relatively low dramatic profile, since performances were contained within the colleges, preventing much, if any, exchange with the commercial and public theatrical landscape.

The men of the university produced and acted in their own plays (often in Latin), which were frequently performed on special occasions or festival days.[73] Unlike the more diverse audience pool of the commercial theater, university productions were

[72] Jonathan Walker in "Introduction: Learning to Play," *Early Modern Academic Drama*, ed. Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008) has a wider, less generically precise definition of academic drama. He argues that this body "certainly consists of plays that originate from within educational environments or that offer representations of scholars and the academy. But the field also concerns the cultural place, social perceptions, and the political uses of the academy" (2). In focusing on university drama and commercial drama about the university, I share a similar approach to Walker in examining how the site of the university and its associated performances represent the status of a particular social population: the career scholar.

[73] Writing on the non-professional, amateur nature of the university performers and playwrights, Alan H. Nelson logically connects this status to the inherently "pedagogical nature of the dramatic enterprise" in "The Universities," *Contexts for Early English Drama*, ed. Marianne G. Briscoe and John C. Coldewey (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1989), 144.

generally closed to the general public. When it comes to Oxford, "No plays written for the commercial London stage were ever performed by Oxford students; no plays written by Oxford academics were ever performed by professional actors and no professional companies ever performed within university precincts" (Elliott 69). These rigid boundaries between the two theatrical worlds reinforce for modern observers just how distinct and, even obscure, examples of university drama seem relative to their commercial counterparts during the period. Yet, a certain degree of exchange between the worlds existed; Cambridge, for example, enjoyed what Nelson explains as a "vital connection with London drama, having supplied Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, and Robert Greene (among many others) to the London stage" (*Early Cambridge* 2). Incidentally, the two commercial plays about the university featured later in this chapter are products of Marlowe and Greene.

What did university drama offer its in-house audience and performers? What discoveries do we as modern critics and audiences stand to make in treating this seemingly obscure dramatic form that was dwarfed by the commercial theater's popularity? For university men—undergraduates, fellows, and dons alike—drama served recreational and pedagogical ends. As Robert Knapp explains, "the educational, ceremonial, and the festive all intermingled" with the production and performance of these university plays (258). Similar to the schoolroom drama that occurred within the grammar schools, university drama supported rhetorical work already begun in lectures and private study, displaying that knowledge via performance to an audience of scholars. These plays also "articulate humanistic ideals within the unpredictable circumstances of concrete social relations, which students can inhabit and observe through the simulacrum

of dramatic performance" (J. Walker 2). Walker's formulation of university drama's cultural and social utility highlights the relevance of this body of drama to the cultural milieu of the period—despite its narrow field and limited exposure.

Not surprisingly, the exclusivity that defined university drama has resulted in rather limited critical attention. Despite its significant footprint in the corpus of early modern English theatrical works, this brand of academic drama has become a "niche topic" for many scholars, resulting in its rarely being taught or studied (Knapp 257). However, to interpret Oxford's and Cambridge's plays as peripheral cultural artifacts is to overlook their contributions to and place within early modern culture, particularly the educational and professional sectors. In order to survive and maintain their national profile, universities worked to demonstrate via performance for their audience and the queen who sometimes visited that there indeed existed a "connection between the world of the university and the world of action" (Marlow, "Performance" 4). As Walker argues, university plays "record important cultural moments in which the realm of ideas becomes actualized through dramatic performance as it is embodied by students, who both teach and are taught by their experiences on stage" (5). Of the many "cultural moments" performed on university stages, the one to which I will devote my attention concerns the professionalization and status of career scholars. As national and educational institutions, early modern Oxford and Cambridge emerge as ideal cultural and theatrical sites for sustaining this project's ongoing inquiry into how performance represents and shapes professional status.

University Drama: Status Staged

As part of his commentary that opens this chapter, Robert Burton arrives at what would appear to be a rather simple conclusion, which also serves as a warning to anyone who seeks to lead the life of the scholar: "The scholar is not a happy man" (264). A lack of professional prospects and marketable social skills at the time serve as sufficient causes for Burton to reach this verdict. Why then would anyone want to subject himself to the melancholic, unhappy life that Burton outlines in his *Anatomy*? This question becomes far more complicated to answer when we consider the increasing prominence of the early modern English universities and the men who attended them. As sites of national importance, educational superiority, and dramatic innovation, Oxford and Cambridge housed generations of career scholars who laid claim to livelihoods based on their learning, whether they remained comfortably ensconced within the university as dons or exited to return to public life. This section will consider how two examples of vernacular university drama, both anonymous, capture the essence of the career scholar's status via the actual performance of the plays themselves and the various elements of performance incorporated within each play.

Club Law, the anonymous comedy sometimes attributed to George Ruggle and acted between 1599-1600 in Clare Hall, Cambridge, stages the perennial conflict of town versus gown to validate the superior status of the university scholar and gentleman.[74] Transplanting the scene of the action from Cambridge to Athens, the farcically driven plot features the escalating feud between the so-called "gentle Athenians," or scholars,

[74] For more on the textual history, contemporary background, and the mystery of authorship surrounding this play, see the "Introduction" to the edition of the play used in my analysis: George Charles More Smith, ed., *Club Law: A Comedy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009) xi-lvi.

and the townspeople referred to variously by the scholars as "hoydens" or "mechanicals." The historical source of the animosity between the university men and the townspeople concerned the "peculiar privileges" that stemmed from the medieval period and granted the university liberties, such as regulating local trade and enforcing and adjudicating laws in their own courts (Boas, "University Plays" 347). In the scope of the play, the feud reignites when Niphle wins the election to replace Mr. Brecknocke as the outgoing Burgomaster and vows to restore the balance of power to the townspeople's favor. They swiftly declare war on the students by carting off their corn and invoking their own "club law." The scholars, headed by Philenius and Musonius, fellows and tutors to the wily undergraduate Cricket, thwart the townspeople's efforts by discommoning them, or legally barring them from commerce with the university community. Niphle and his fellow townsmen are forced by the university men to submit to their authority, thus ending the play with the gentle Athenians resuming control.

Whereas the townspeople derive power from their physicality—in keeping with the play's title—the gentle Athenians stake their authority on their learned status, which they define in opposition to the townspeople. Philenius expresses his amazement that the locals attempt to rise above their ignorance to assume control over the town: "I thought it unpossible that ignorance should have nestled where knowledg is so powerfull…instead of our servants they seem to be our masters, and their power is too absolute, they muddy slaves [think themselves] to good to be our servants" (*Club Law* 9). For Philenius, a scholar who derives power from his knowledge, the townspeople's claims are illegitimate based on their subordinate intellectual status. For their part, however, the townspeople deny knowledge as a condition of power and instead draw upon their physical superiority.

As part of his bid to become Burgomaster, Niphle calls for the gentle Athenians' demise: "I will rout out the whole generacion of them, and make the vagabonds seeke their dwellings, they shall not nestle with us in our streets, nor out brave us in our owne dunghills, they shall trudg, they shall trudge, if Nicholas Niphle be head of this Citie, they shall packe with bag and baggage" (20). Compared to Philenius' objections to the townspeople, Niphle's speech against his opponents differs in tenor and fervor. The physicality that rules the townspeople permeates the language of Niphle's rally cry, marking them off from the intellectualism that defines their adversaries, the gentle Athenians.

The gentle Athenians' intellectual prowess is what ultimately allows them to triumph in their battle with the townspeople for supremacy. As a play, *Club Law* represents the laborers and merchants of the town as inferior opposites of the university men, with their learning and refinement. When it comes to staging, "the overall effect is to construct the townsmen in terms of farce and to contain them within a defined comic space" (Grantley 87). Because Niphle and his supporters lack the intellectualism of their sworn enemies, they can only resort to violence and harebrained schemes, such as carting off the gentle Athenians' corn. The university men meet these machinations and physical assaults with measured violence and the legal recourse of discommoning, which ends up crippling the townsfolk who happen to rely on commercial trade with the university to make their living. Realizing their dependence on the university and its men, Niphle as leader is forced to relent in his campaign to overthrow the gentle Athenians, and he humiliatingly must subscribe to the scholars' assertion of their superiority.

For the gentle Athenians, “The lack of learning of the townsmen is presented as invalidating their claims of authority” (Grantley 88). Musonius rises to the occasion to excoriate Niphle and his backers for their attempts to overreach their status on these grounds, while articulating the innate superiority of scholars, which stems from their learning:

> Know thy selfe what thoug art, thinke thy selfe no kinge because thou hast almost witt enough to be Mr Burgomaster. this arrogant humor ill befitts thy deserts, and learne to measure students, not by thy puffie apprehension, but according to their owne excellency, and know that learning and the Arts are divine, they fetch their pedigree from the high heavens. Jove himselfe had three of his ofspringe Schollers, and great Monarchs have triumphed more in their knowldeg, then in their empire, and have them selves happy in philosophers familiarity, And will you base drudges springing from dunghills contend for superiority? (*Club Law* 100-101)

In the above passage, Musonius asserts his scholarly kinship with ancient deities and historical monarchs who similarly wielded power as a result of their knowledge. His victory speech, which ends the town-gown feud in the gentle Athenians’ favor, encapsulates the play’s endorsement and validation of the career scholar’s status in the world of the university. When delivered in the select company of an audience of fellow university men, Musonius’ words acquire added significance and confer the same status claimed by the gentle Athenians in the play upon the actual scholars who appear on the

university stage and in the audience.[75] As a prime example of a topical university drama, *Club Law* stages a conflict between town and gown to represent and uphold the career scholar's status as superior to those in lower stations. The performance of the play, therefore, reflects this status back on the audience, while reinforcing for the spectators their own positions and learning via the victory enacted on stage against the opposition.

Whereas *Club Law* asserts the relative superiority of the career scholar by distinguishing him from an unlearned, adjacent population, the *Parnassus* plays chronicle the scholar's journey to and from the university in a bid to acquire this status. Performed at St. John's College, Cambridge, the *Parnassus* plays comprise a trilogy that Boas refers to as "loosely-hung" (*University Drama* 332). *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, which was acted as a Christmastime play in 1597, was later followed by a two-part sequel: The first part of *The Returne from Parnassus*, acted sometime between 1599-1601, and the second part of *The Returne from Parnassus*, *or the Scourge of Simony* from 1601.[76] All three plays are once again topical examples of university comedy in which the lives of scholars and university politics serve as prime focal points. Boas describes the trilogy as belonging to "a group of comedies which are academic in a more special and intimate sense" ("University Plays" 344). The intimacy to which Boas refers manifests itself in the *Parnassus* plays with their candid chronicling of the educational and professional

---

[75] When it comes to the performance history of *Club Law*, Charles Cathcart reminds us in "*Club Law*, *The Family of Love*, and the Familist Sect," *Notes and Queries* 50.1 (2003) that "There is little sign…that *Club Law*, either as text or performance, gained any sort of prominence outside Cambridge" (65). The localized nature of university performances, which exclude outside audiences and other venues, is essential to understanding how their staging of professional status would immediately and only touch a homogeneous audience who would readily identify with the performance of their positions on the university stage.

[76] I have derived these dates from the "Preface" of W.D. Macray, ed., *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with the Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus*. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1886) v-xi, which is the edition from which I will cite in my analysis. For more critical debate concerning such matters as authorship and dating, see J.B. Leishman, ed., *The Three Parnassus Plays (1598-1601)*. (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson Ltd., 1949) 7-34.

journeys of Philomusus and Studioso, cousins and scholars who appear in each of the trilogy's installments and throughout represent the position of the career scholar. Although their journey is fraught with professional setbacks, the plays ultimately support the scholars and their learned status—even as the pair discover that the rest of society has no place for them in the workaday world. The actual performance of the *Parnassus* plays as well as meta-theatrical elements appearing in the plays succeed in preserving the scholars' worth and the university's prominence—even while corroborating some of the miseries detailed in Burton's *The Anatomy*. My look at these plays will focus primarily on Studioso and Philomusus, who jointly represent the figure of the career scholar and whose roles were, of course, performed by members of St. John's academic community.

The Pilgrimage to Parnassus stages the beginnings of Philomusus and Studioso's scholarly journey, while also establishing the scholar's position relative to a larger social, cultural, and professional landscape. As the first installment in the trilogy, it differs from both parts of *The Returne* in its allegorical structure, lack of subplots, and limited number of characters. Consiliodorus, Philomusus' father and uncle to Studioso, opens the play after a brief prologue by giving the boys advice before they set upon their journey to Parnassus, which is figured as a mountain that represents the university. In a speech that lasts for a half hour, Consiliodorus draws upon his age and own experiences to prime the boys for their imminent climb. Detailing the splendors that await the uninitiated, the elderly counselor tempers his speech with pragmatic advice, which he frames as indispensible to the young scholars' present and future success. Consiliodorus encourages his son and nephew to exercise a certain level of caution along the way so as not to become ensnared in flattery or profligacy. He also warns his two protégés of the

financial sacrifices associated with leading a scholar's life, noting: "Learning and povertie will ever kiss" (*The Pilgrimage* I.76). Consiliodorus' pointed advice apparently steels Philomusus and Studioso for the obstacles that they will soon face on their journey since they begin their ascent of Parnassus without hesitation.

Darryll Grantley describes the pilgrimage of the young scholars-in-training as one that is "presented as a process of gaining a social identity through learning" (90). I would like to add to Grantley's formulation by suggesting that Philomusus and Studioso's journey also enacts the process of acquiring a professional identity through learning. Over the course of the trilogy, Philomusus and Studioso struggle to establish themselves once they leave the university because their scholarly identity separates them intellectually, culturally, and, most importantly, professionally from their fellow citizens. In *The Pilgrimage*, however, neither of the scholars is fully aware of the challenges that will greet them as a result of the status they have yet to claim. Therefore, they faithfully act on their wise counselor's advice when traversing the various lands of Parnassus and confronting the naysayers along the way who encourage them to stray from their course. Much of the negativity they encounter concerns their future earning potential as scholars—a key component of an occupation and a central construction of professional identity. Because the idyllic promise of Hellicon, Parnassus' summit, nevertheless awaits them, the students dismiss these warnings and persist in their climb.

Even though Philomusus and Studioso commit to reaching the top of the mount (the completion of their undergraduate studies), the obstacles that stand in their way do give them pause. Passing through the land of Logique, the uninitiated scholars encounter Madido who is reading Horace, particularly his commentary on drinking. When he

learns of Philomusus and Studioso's destination, Madido declines their invitation to join them, claiming that the lack of a tavern along the way will prevent his progress. Madido takes the opportunity to deny the existence of Parnassus and Hellicon from his vantage point at the base of the summit, claiming that both "are but the fables of the poets" (*Pilgrimage* II.201-02). He identifies drinking as the source of creative inspiration and the tavern as the seat of scholarly production. Encouraging the young scholars to curtail their journey to make a living with him, Madido proposes that they come with him to "hire our studies in a taverne, and ere longe not a poste in Paul's churchyarde but shall be acquainted with our writings" (*Pilgrimage* II.222-24). Madido dispenses with the need for a university education and instead identifies St. Paul's, a London cathedral that also served as ground zero for gossip, commerce, and the book trade, as the ideal site for launching a career as a popular writer.

Madido appears to ground much of his doubt about Parnassus in his own educational experiences as a youth at the hands of a violent schoolmaster. In relating his misfortune to Philomusus and Studioso, Madido evokes a familiar image of the rod-wielding schoolmaster: "[T]here are certain people in this cuntrie called schoolmaisters, that take passingers and sit all day whippinge pence out of there tayls; these men tooke mee prisoner, and put to death at leaste three hundred rodes upon my backe" (*Pilgrimage* II.234-38). Madido seems to debase an entire group, a "certain people" who make up a larger occupational landscape, in the process of trying to dissuade Philomusus and Studioso from entering into university life. As unfair as his sweeping assessment may be to actual practicing, non-violent schoolmasters, Madido's comments accurately acknowledge a common fate for many university men who were unable to find any other

work—a fate that Studioso incidentally experiences in the first part of *The Returne* after he and his cousin take their degrees and leave Parnassus.

Undeterred by Madido's objections to their journey, Philomusus and Studioso continue their climb and enter the land of Rhetorique where they meet Stupido, a Puritan known to the pair who began the same journey ten years earlier. Stupido refuses to travel ahead and proceeds to rail against the vanities of rhetoric, poetry, and philosophy, concluding that they "will have learning enoughe" without forging ahead (*Pilgrimage* III.354-55). Yet, the pair does just that and continues their journey to meet Amoretto in the land of Poetrie. Amoretto temporarily pleases Studioso and Philomusus with his poetic joy, but Studioso fears delay and insists that they continue their trek, which leads them to the play's fifth and final act in the land of Philosophie, home to Ingenioso. An old schoolmate of theirs, Ingenioso expresses his fatigue with the realm of philosophy and implores Philomusus and Studioso to suspend their journey at once. Of all the figures who have intervened in their journey to this point, Ingenioso appears to offer the scholars the most practically-grounded and pressing advice concerning the earning potential of scholars.

Just as Philomusus and Studioso are about to reach to top of Parnassus, thus completing their university educations, Ingenioso exclaims that "Parnassus is out of silver pitifullie, pitifullie" (*Pilgrimage* V.583-83). He follows up his claim with a tale of professional woe that he heard secondhand from a friend at the base of the mountain. Regarding a group of graduates who took their degrees to re-enter the real world, Ingenioso claims that his friend reported:

> [A] companie of ragged vicars and forlorne schoolemaisters, who as they walked scrached there unthriftie elbowes, and often putt there handes into there unpeopled pockets, that had not beene possessed with faces this manie a day. There, one stoode digginge for golde in a standishe; another looking for cockpence in the bottome of a pue; the third towling for silver in a belfree… (*Pilgrimage* V.588-95)

Ingenioso's anecdote singles out two possible career paths upon graduation, the vicar and the schoolmaster, while imagining a penurious professional future for anyone who expects to make a seamless transition from the university to the wider world. Despite the pair's resolve to complete their journey, Ingenioso relentlessly badgers Philomusus and Studioso with his claims that their chosen career path will lead to nothing but financial misery.

Recalling the comparisons of schoolmasters to horse coursers that appear in both Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* and Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*, Ingenioso inquires: "Why, woulde it not greeve a man of a good spirit to see Hobson finde more money in the tayles of 12 jades than a scholler in 200 bookes?" (*Pilgrimage* V.637-39). Without allowing them the opportunity to answer, Ingenioso references another manual trade, that of the cobbler, to argue that scholars' learning will serve them poorly in work and the marketplace. In a parting imperative, Ingenioso bids the young scholars to "Turne home againe, unless youe meane to be *vacui viatores*, and to curse youre witless heades in youre oulde age for takinge themselves to no better trades in theire youthe" (*Pilgrimage* V.643-45). Studioso responds to his old school chum's plea by acknowledging the truth in his statements, and pursuant to Consiliodorus' advice at the

outset of the journey, Studioso asserts his awareness that poverty and scholarship go hand in hand. Ingenioso replies in turn with a menacing farewell in which he says: "take heede I take youe not napping twentie years henc in a viccar's seate, asking for the white cowe with the blacke foote, or els interpretinge *pueriles confabulationes* to a companie of seven-yeare-old apes" (*Pilgrimage* V.659-63). With these parting words, Ingenioso assigns Philomusus and Studioso future places in the narrative of depressed scholars he just finished rehearsing.

Leaving Ingenioso behind them, Philomusus and Studioso prepare to complete their ascent unencumbered—but not before a character called Dromo comes on stage leading a clown by a rope. Dromo breaks the allegory to refocus the audience's attention on the performance at hand and the conventions of comedy. As Dromo explains to the Clowne, figures like him "have been thrust into playes by head and shoulders ever since Kempe could make a scurvey face;" (*Pilgrimage* V.675-77). Referring to the famous Elizabethan actor and Shakespeare contemporary, Dromo's invocation of William Kempe attempts to unite *The Pilgrimage* and comedies of the commercial theater by ending the allegorical play on a light, farcical note. However, as a university play, this convention is misplaced and superfluous, and it results in the Clowne resorting to putting a love letter he has written to song. The learned Cambridge audience's expectations for comic conventions were likely not as pronounced as their counterparts of the public theaters, and perhaps for this reason Philomusus and Studioso retake the stage to signal the end of their journey and to close the play. They—not the Clowne—solicit the audience's applause.

Although the play ends with Philomusus and Studioso obtaining their degrees, Ingenioso's adamant denunciation of their scholarly and career ambitions seems to deflate their accomplishment—especially since he foretells the position in which they find themselves in the latter two installments of the trilogy. Can we, therefore, consider their reaching the summit an actual victory? Why do Studioso and Philomusus so fiercely maintain their faith in Parnassus throughout their four-year allegorical journey? And, amid all of the negativity that surrounds their chosen vocation staged as part of the play, does the audience have reason to applaud? Answers to none of these questions is certain; however, they do hinge on the performance context of the play. Sealed off from the rest of the early modern world, including that of the commercial theater, the hallowed grounds of the university and its stage support scholars and their careers as part of their institutional mission. *The Pilgrimage* stages an experience common to those both performing in and watching the action. By ending with the duo's receipt of their B.A., this first installment ultimately affirms the scholar's value and fortitude via performance. The latter parts of the trilogy similarly rely on performance to preserve the scholar's status—in spite of the admittedly undesirable fate that awaits both Philomusus and Studioso upon their descent from Parnassus.

Wider in scope than its predecessor, the first and second parts of *The Returne from Parnassus* abandon allegory to stage the realities of Philomusus and Studioso's foray into the world beyond the university. According to Boas, in these installments of the trilogy, "the playwright is in more somber mood, and his satire is more incisive" ("University Plays" 350). The warnings of financial woe and professional misfortune directed their way in *The Pilgrimage* become the everyday reality of Philomusus and

Studioso once they leave the university. Their struggle to earn a decent living in society is compounded by the fact that baser tradesmen and social inferiors wield more social capital than they do as learned scholars. The majority of both parts of *The Returne* focus on Philomusus and Studioso's efforts to parley their learning into sound, lucrative professional careers. Whereas *The Pilgrimage* stages the processes of acquiring social and professional identities, the latter parts of the trilogy dramatize the arduous process of professionalization that occurs away from the university in the farther reaches of early modern society. My interest not only lies in tracking how these plays stage that process, but in considering how elements of performance—that is, the production of the plays themselves and meta-theatrical references to performance appearing in the second part of *The Returne*—ultimately work to fashion Philomusus and Studioso as career scholars.

The heartened, undeterred scholars of *The Pilgrimage* who once seemed to embrace the poverty that awaited them after their journey to Parnassus, find themselves ill-equipped to deal with the reality they find at the base of the mountain. Ingenioso's dire warnings from *The Pilgrimage* appear to have come true, as Philomusus and Studioso painfully realize that their status as learned scholars does not entitle them to commensurate earnings. Philomusus objects to his misfortune on the grounds that he must associate with baser individuals, bemoaning: "Where I am learninge's outcast, fortun's scorne. / Nowe, wandring, I muste seeke my destinie, / And spende the remnante of my wretched life / 'Mongst russet coates and mossy idiots" (*I Returne* I.i.107-110). Wrested from the protective enclave of Parnassus, the scholars experience "the difficulty of reconciling their status as educated men with poverty and a need to sell themselves and their services" (Grantley 89). Philomusus and Studioso, however, find themselves at a

loss to compete with the "russet coates and mossy idiots" of the world who ably "sell themselves," even though they lack the learned status which the scholars have devoted the last four years of their life to acquire.

The gulf in understanding cuts both ways, as the local tradesmen express their own shock about how such learned individuals as Philomusus and Studioso could skip town without paying their debts. After the dejected scholars agree to flee to London with Ingenioso and Luxurioso, an aspiring poet who has spent seven years at Parnassus, the Draper and Tayler take the stage at the beginning of Act II to curse their debtors, the scholars. For his part, the Draper cannot understand why people with such learning would default on their debts, asking: "Why, who would think that men in such grave gownes and capps, and that can say soe bravlye, woulde use honest men soe badlie?" (*I Returne* II.i.485-88). Despite the fact that their dress marks them as "grave," which is the same term used to describe Gnomaticus' prestige in *The Glasse*, the recent university graduates comport themselves in a manner unbecoming to their projected status. The Tayler, however, refutes the young men's gravity. He follows his counterpart's complaint with a note of dismissal, saying that "if they had our wisdome joined to theire learninge they woulde prove grave men" (*I Returne* II.i.495-96). For the Tayler, wisdom is independent of learning, and the scholars' knowledge does not confer on them the "grave" status to which they consider themselves entitled. As both Philomusus and Studioso soon realize, their learning is not their meal ticket, and they must seek work beneath their perceived station to survive.

Philomusus is "double benefisde" (*I Returne* II.i.671) as a sexton and clerk, while his cousin becomes a private tutor, or schoolmaster, for a young boy more interested in

wreaking havoc and gambling than doing his studies. Studioso's insipid, unsatisfying interaction with the boy reinforces for him that his learning has failed to supply him with suitable work. Instead of learning his Latin, the boy wants his schoolmaster to bet four counters on a pile or cross in a game of chance. When the coin lands on pile, Studioso responds with self-pity: "Well may it pile in suche a pilled age, / When schollers serve in such base vassalage" (*I Returne* II.i.772-73). As a private schoolmaster to an incorrigible, uninterested student, Studioso finds himself underemployed and debased in status. He lacks all authority, as he finds himself serving the younger student who hides behind his parents' authority. Short of his learning, little separates Studioso from the family's serving men, and the audience learns of his dismissal in Act IV because of his refusal to allow one of the blue-coated servants to sit at a higher place at dinner. His stint in this wealthy family not only demonstrates to the audience the misappropriation of his talents, but it also reinforces the ambiguity and fragility of the schoolmaster's professional status. Whether it is a lack of authority, social recognition, or salary—all deficits that Philomusus and Studioso experience firsthand upon their entry into the workplace—this play reveals that the career scholar and schoolmaster struggle to translate their learned status into professional gain. Similarly ousted from his position as sexton, Philomusus joins an unemployed Studioso at the play's end, and both resolve to fly to Rome or Rheims in pursuit of the professional life that has up until this point eluded them.

Like *The Pilgrimage*, the first part of *The Returne* ends with a bid for applause from the audience. However, Philomusus and Studioso seek recognition from only fellow discontented scholars. Until they find contentment in their careers, they declare

that they "banish from our stage all mirth and glee" (*1 Returne* V.iii.1593). The audience presumably obliges their request for "plaudite" based on the stage direction that closes the play, supporting the characters and actors that represent their own position as career scholars and uniting the audience and performers as one body. Even amid an air of discontent, the end of the play allows the audience to assert their collective status, while sending their staged representations off to the next phase of their professional lives, which the final installment of the trilogy depicts. The second part of *The Returne from Parnassus, or The Scourge of Simony* sustains Philomusus and Studioso's collective misery, while rendering the final leg of their professional journey as a performance.

Containing the most diffuse and expansive plot of the trilogy, the second part of *The Returne* has Philomusus and Studioso returning to England after an abortive stint abroad. With every act, the pair find themselves more estranged from capitalizing on their scholarship, as they are forced to dabble in what they regard as the basest of careers. As Philomusus declares, they have been left with no other prospects: "[L]et us run through all the lewd formes of lime-twig purloining villaynes: let us prove Cony-catchers, Baudes, or any thing, so that we may rub out; and first my plot for playing the French Doctor, that shall hold" (*II Returne* I.iv.427-30). When the French doctor plot results in failure, the pair declare their professional lives a tragedy—one that's compounded by the fact that those in lower stations seem to garner all the financial and social esteem. Studioso and Philomusus recapitulate their tragic lot to one another and the audience:

STUD. O how it greeves my vexed soule to see,

Each painted asse in a chayre of digniye:

And yet we grovell on the ground alone,

Running through every trade, yet thrive by none.

More we must act in this lives Tragedy.

PHIL. Sad is the plot, sad the Catastrophe.

STUD. Sighs are the Chorus in our Tragedy.

PHIL. And rented thoughts continuall actors be.

STUD. Woe is the subject:

PHIL. earth the loathed stage,

Whereon we act this fained personage.

Mossy barbarians the spectators be,

That sit and laugh at our calamity. (*II Returne* II.i.564-75)

The above meta-theatrical dialogue remaps the scholars' journey of professionalization in terms of performance, creating an important link between both processes that supports the aim of this project. In addition to establishing the proximity of performance and professionalization, the scholars' exchange also succeeds in refocusing the audience's attention on the immediate performance they are witnessing. While Studioso and Philomusus enact their hopeless professional search on the world's stage before a barbarous body of spectators, the actors who play these parts do so on the university stage in front of a supportive, refined audience of university men who would certainly not laugh at the staged scholars'—or, for that matter, their own—plight.

In the world of the play, Philomusus and Studioso's professional tragedy leads them to the commercial stage where they audition for roles in front of two of Shakespeare's contemporaries, Richard Burbage and William Kempe. Kempe, whose

legacy as a clown was first referenced in *The Pilgrimage*, welcomes the starving scholars to the world of public theater by proclaiming that their fortunes have changed for the better: "But be merry my lads, you have happened upon the most excellent vocation in the world for money…" (*II Returne* IV.iii.1828-29). However, the university scholars do not share Kempe's enthusiasm for the commercial stage. After Philomusus tests his acting skills by reading from *Richard III*, he channels his own discontent with their latest career gambit by asking: "And must the basest trade yeeld us relief?" (*II Returne* IV.iii.1886). The pair answer this question by quitting the public stage and taking on one more base occupation by becoming fiddlers in Act V. Quickly realizing that this life is no better than subsisting as professional actors, Philomusus and Studioso decide to abandon the professional and social worlds altogether by becoming shepherds.

Studioso celebrates their new career choice and declares: "True mirth we may enjoy in thacked stall, / Nor hoping higher rise, nor fearing lower fall" (*II Returne* V.ii.2091-92). Philomusus shares Studioso's sentiments regarding their new career path, noting that nothing else has allowed them to survive without sacrificing their learned status. In leading a pastoral life, the scholars will extricate themselves from an ultimately hostile world in which "base vassalage" serves as their only viable career path. As the final installment of the trilogy suggests, the career scholar has no place in a world ruled by inversions of authority and a general disdain for knowledge. They "see themselves as forced into roles which are inappropriate for their status, so that the world is turned upside down" (Grantley 97). When they become professional actors and fiddlers, Philomusus and Studioso reach a tipping point, as they find themselves so alienated from their learning that they determine their only recourse is to leave the world behind them to

become shepherds. Their flight to the pastoral world replicates their climb up Parnassus in that they are able to seek a sheltered environment immune to pecuniary pressures and unjust power dynamics.

Fearing that their story will end on the note of discontent that pervaded the close of the first part of *The Returne*, Philomusus begs for a happy conclusion: "Perhaps some happy wit with feeling hand, / Hereafter may recorde the pastorall / Of the two schollers of *Parnassus* hill, / And then our scene may end and have content" (*II Returne* V.iv.2246-49). He entrusts his and Studioso's story to the hand and mind of a similarly learned individual, insisting that the tragic arc of their professional lives did not lead to personal tragedy. Although the St. John's playwright showcases the scholars' failures to achieve a professional position commensurate with their learning, he ultimately upholds their status. As literary critic Christopher Marlow puts it: "In bringing the hostility of the world to college drama, then, the *Parnassus* plays warn scholars of what might await them, whilst also validating the subject position into which their education and their expectations have placed them" ("Interiority" 284). Their uncompromising efforts and refusal to debase themselves as manual laborers, tradesmen, or servants ultimately draws support from an audience of likeminded individuals who applaud in solidarity.

The trilogy's performance context and the elements of performance incorporated within the second part of *The Returne* validate the status of the staged scholars as well as the positions of the audience members. Similar to *Club Law*'s celebration of the scholar's innate superiority, the *Parnassus* plays draw on the conventions of the university stage to preserve the status of learning and scholarship. When represented as a performance, Philomusus and Studioso's professional journey resembles tragedy when

exposed to the vagaries of the marketplace, which includes the commercial theater. However, when left in the hands of capable university wits, their story can be transformed from tragedy to pastoral interlude, as they end their journey in peace and protection, supported by the applause of a house full of likeminded scholars who comprise the audience. As vernacular, topical university comedies, *Club Law* and the *Parnassus* plays join together in upholding and supporting the status of the career scholar by virtue of their performance. As Marlow argues, university plays possess a "strong coterie element" since they were "produced in and by a community that shared learning and living experiences, and that spoke about those experiences by using a familiar language that encompassed everything from Aristotelian logic to slang and in-jokes" ("Interiority" 276). The university gave rise to this occupational group, and the drama of the university staged its support of this group's status—even if that status was jeopardized by an unforgiving early modern professional and social landscape.

Commercial Drama About the University: *Popularizing Professionalization*

Whereas *Club Law* and the *Parnassus plays* ultimately uphold the career scholar's place in the world—even if that world is hostile—via performance, the following duo of public theater plays offers a more ambiguous representation of this particular occupational group to a wider audience. Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus* and Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* each feature university men who must straddle both the academic and public worlds in their daily dealings. Doctor Faustus and Friar Bacon, the two principal academics in their eponymous plays, enjoy a certain elevated status by virtue of their learning; however, their livelihoods rely on

outside sources for recognition instead of the innate sense of superiority and audience backing that the university stage produces through its performances. Like early modern schoolmasters, academic men did not enjoy the same status and privileges as those in the traditional professions. In fact, not until the latter part of the nineteenth century did this subset of educators make strides to assert their professional unity. My particular analysis of these commercial plays about the university considers this historical reality, while gauging how the commercial stage performed and constructed this group's status.

One of the ways in which Faustus and Bacon must achieve and maintain their status in the worlds of their respective plays depends on the appropriation of their scholarship for the good of the nation. Unlike the *Club Law* and the *Parnassus* plays, which tend to hermetically seal off the university and preserve its scholars from the outside world, Marlowe's and Greene's plays treat the university and its men as national resources. As a result, individual status and public recognition in these plays depend on how each scholar's work benefits the nation, and that work in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Bacon and Bungay* is often figured in terms of public displays of their scholarship, or performances built within the bodies of the plays themselves. Faustus and Bacon call upon their knowledge of magic to display their learning, yet the men's pursuits lead to opposite fates. Although Bacon struggles to balance his individual goals with his obligations to the crown, he eventually renounces his personal magical aims and vows to support his country, using his learning to prophesy national greatness. As a result, his status is affirmed by the play's end. Faustus, on the other hand, succumbs to the evils of his art, and his career ends in tragedy when he performs his learning for self-reward. His

tragic fate and disgraced status serve as a negative exemplar for career scholars everywhere.

Written between 1588-1589, Marlowe's play borrows from popular Faustian legend to bring to the stage a university man's professional demise brought on by "the problem of knowledge" (Heilman 317). The Prologue, performed by the character of the Chorus, localizes the play in Wittenberg, Germany and pits Faustus' humble origins against his eventual fall. Quickly rising to become a doctor of divinity, Faustus soon became "swoll'n with cunning of self-conceit, / His waxen wings did mount above his reach,/ And, melting, heavens conspired his overthrow" (Marlowe "Prologue" 19-21). In exchange for his soul, the scholar enters into a twenty-four year contract with Satan in return for nearly unrestrained power. *Doctor Faustus* is a play that explores man's desire to overreach his natural capacity. As much a personal tragedy as a professional one, Faustus' selfish displays of knowledge and learning, which stem from his own misappropriation of his responsibilities as a career scholar, precipitate his downfall.

At the beginning of the play, the audience joins Faustus in his study where he maddeningly struggles to reconcile his boundless intellect with the limitations of his chosen vocation. Faustus has purportedly satiated his worldly ambitions and has accomplished significant feats as a scholar, including doing work that has saved "whole cities" from the plague and cured "thousand desperate maladies" (I.i.19-20). Upon cycling through the disciplines he has thus far studied, such as analytics and divinity, and considering new career paths, such as becoming a physician, Faustus feels that he has come to an impasse in his career. It is important to note that from the outset of the play, the audience sees that "Faustus is, significantly a professional—an academic, a divine, a

physician, and a lawyer" (Gieskes 19). Believing himself to have reached a plateau in the work available to him as a university man, the Doctor dismisses his studies one-by-one until he comes upon a book of magic, seen by some in the period as a legitimate form of scholarly inquiry. As he holds the book in his hands, Faustus imagines new possibilities otherwise unavailable to the typical scholar: "Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires./ O what a world of profit and delight,/ Of power, of honour, and omnipotence/ Is promised to the studious artisan" (I.i.53-55). In turning his scholarly attention to magic, Faustus imagines a world in which spirits will do his bidding, securing for him Indian gold, walling off Germany in brass, decking out schoolchildren with silk. As grandiose as these ambitions are, none of them is practically beneficial to anyone but Faustus and his ego.

Conventional modes of scholarship do not afford the rewards Faustus covets, and his present career excludes him from these materialist desires. His "mélange of aspirations is the work of an indiscriminate mind, reaching for everything, evaluating nothing" (Heilman 320). To wall his country with brass and redirect the current of the Rhine serve no greater purpose than glorifying his own vanity. Rather than establish additional public schools or lend his services as a schoolmaster, Faustus reasons that silk adornments will suffice in bettering the young scholars' lives. Instead of studying to benefit his university or the nation beyond, Faustus imagines a world in which applying his knowledge will lead to personal gain at the expense of social harmony. He feels that his worth as an individual transcends that of his peers because of his vast knowledge, and he "fails to understand himself as an ordinary man" (McCullen 10). By turning to magic, Faustus no longer regards himself an ordinary scholar and declares of himself: "A sound

magician is a demigod" (Marlowe I.i.61). Aspiring to demigod status, Faustus progressively alienates himself from his profession, including his colleagues and his responsibilities to the university and nation.

With his self-centered ambitions in place, Faustus sequesters himself from any community of consequence and finds himself estranged from his fellow scholars. After he has articulated his grandiose vision, two unnamed scholars arrive on stage and soon discover their master's new career interest. They learn from Wagner that Faustus has been consulting with Valdes and Cornelius, two skilled magicians who seek Faustus' genius. The First Scholar laments Faustus' descent "into that damnèd art" (I.ii.30), while the Second Scholar reacts by intending to save him from the error of his ways: "Were he a stranger, not allied to me, / The danger of his soul would make me mourn. / But come, let us go and inform the Rector. / It may be his grave counsel may reclaim him" (I.iii.32-35). At this point in the play, the students maintain hope that they can "reclaim" Faustus from his sins and reincorporate him within the fold of their scholarly community. However, Faustus refuses to alter his course and indulges his worldly ambitions even further by making a pact with Lucifer to trade his soul for the capacity to conjure.

With his signing of the pact, Faustus' scholarly inquiry into magic becomes indefensible on intellectual grounds. In allying with the devil, Faustus makes himself a witch—not an intellectual. As a result, the learned Doctor undergoes a program of reeducation in which he becomes acquainted with the bounds of his newly acquired powers. Mephistopheles, who becomes Faustus' envoy, ably demonstrates for Faustus what his magic can deliver by calling upon devils to dance and bestow crowns and luxury garments to their newest convert. Responding to Faustus' inquiry about the purpose of

the show, Mephistopheles explains it as: "Nothing, Faustus, but to delight thy mind / And let thee see what magic can perform" (II.i.84-85). Later treated to a pageant of the Seven Deadly Sins, which Beelzebub calls "a pastime," (II.iii.99), Faustus exclaims: "O, how this sight doth delight my soul!" (II.iii.154). In both these moments, Faustus becomes a spectator whose delight hinges not on his edification but rather on pure spectacle. When it comes to the parade of the Seven Deadly Sins, "this is knowledge-for-entertainment, not knowledge for virtue" (Heilman 325). Far from virtuous, Faustus' practice of necromancy resembles more a "pastime" than virtuous act, and his work transforms from serious scholarship into a series of fantastical performances that ultimately lead to his demise at the termination of his twenty-four-year contract with Lucifer. These performances, which occur as part of the play's overall plot, reinforce for the audience the triviality of Faustus' work and the inutility of his newfound status as magician.

With Mephistopheles and other lesser devils at his disposal, Faustus engages in a variety of stunts, ranging from disrupting the papal court, to dispatching grapes from the southern hemisphere, to raising Helen of Troy from the dead. However, none of these miracles achieves any demonstrable social end beyond indulging his own fancy. In performing these feats, Faustus overlooks his potential as a scholar to inspire greater changes beyond his sphere of influence. He instead couches his work as performance art, and in formulating his plan to disrupt the papal proceedings, he identifies himself as a player, announcing: "Then in this show let me an actor be, / That this proud pope may Faustus' coming see" (Marlowe III.i.75-76). Similar to the delight he witnessed as a spectator in the shows put on for him by the devils, Faustus' impressive plan to liberate

Pope Bruno from the rival Pope Adrian's court in Act III stems from his self-proclaimed desire to "delight his mind / And by their folly make some merriment," (III.ii.9-10). Succeeding in achieving his "merriment," Faustus finds himself before a grateful Charles the German Emperor who lauds him for his deeds. He responds to the accolades by wryly declaring his love for his country:

> These gracious words, most royal Carolus,
> Shall make poor Faustus to his utmost power
> Both love and serve the German emperor.
> And lay his life at holy Bruno's feet.
> For proof whereof, if so your grace be pleased,
> The doctor stands prepared by power of art
> To cast his magic charms, that shall pierce through
> The ebon gates of ever-burning hell
> And hale the stubborn Furies from their caves
> To compass whatsoe'er your grace commands. (IV.i.61-70)

Despite the nationalistic sentiments that structure Faustus' speech, it is difficult to read his words as a sincere expression of love for country. Instead, Faustus rejoices in "his magic charms," which enable him to disrupt the order of the cosmos. Throughout the play, he repeatedly ascribes his motives to nothing more than seeking "merriment" or "delight." To interpret the above passage as Faustus' declaration of his nationalism or responsibility as a scholar is to imagine the same Faustus who hopes to wall Germany in brass as national hero. Marlowe's character not only is less than heroic in his ambition, but he also represents those in his field in a negative light.

As his contract with Lucifer expires, Faustus becomes desperate to stay his descent to hell, yet he remains too proud to repent. Act V returns us to Faustus' study at the university where he mourns his own self-inflicted loss and erroneously attributes his downfall to learning: "Though my / heart pant and quiver to remember that I have been a student here / these thirty years, O, would I had never seen Wittenberg, never read book!" (V.ii.45-48). His standing as a scholar does not precipitate his demise. What Faustus refuses to acknowledge is his misappropriation of knowledge: "Like other knowledge which he has gathered piecemeal, his awareness that he is, after all essentially human comes too late to benefit him" (McCullen 16). His failure to recognize his place in a defined social or professional order results in his fatal removal from the company of his earthbound peers—the very community from which he sought to extricate himself early in the play.

Painfully separated from the human race, Faustus meets his tragic end as individual and professional. The scholars discover his dismembered body and remark on their fallen colleague at the play's conclusion: "Yet, for he was a scholar, once admired / For wondrous knowledge in our German schools, / We'll give his mangled limbs due burial; / And all the students, clothed in mourning black, / Shall wait upon his heavy funeral" (Marlowe V.iii.15-19). The academic community collectively mourns the passing of a scholar whose "wondrous knowledge" inspired others to emulate his learning. The Chorus returns to the stage to deliver the Epilogue, warning the audience to take heed of Faustus' fall from grace: "Faustus is gone. Regard his hellish fall, / Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise / Only to wonder at unlawful things, / Whose deepness doth entice such forward wits / To practise more than heavenly power permits"

(Epilogue 5-8). Established as the negative exemplum of scholarship, Faustus did more than "wonder at unlawful things." His insatiable lust for knowledge—a brand of knowledge inaccessible to the layman—led to his demise and ultimate separation from his fellow man. In the end, "his limited and defective knowledge" led to his demise (McCullen 6).

Faustus' tragedy is a personal and professional one. He wishes to know without bothering to engage in the process that is learning and hurriedly engages in magic to satisfy his whims. Moreover, he claims exclusive rights to knowledge, and his displays of that knowledge result in an empty set of performances that serves nothing and no one. His search for recognition, therefore, is misdirected, as "he seeks only short-cuts and instant reinforcement" via his performances (Matelene 519). While away from the university community, Faustus' appropriation of his knowledge for entertainment's sake is useless and leads to self-centered pursuits. Even when giving his fellow scholars a banquet in which he conjures Helen of Troy, Faustus is marked as different because of the pact that subordinates him to the devil and the black arts. His preoccupation with amassing knowledge thus prevents him from learning anything new and engaging in the legitimate forms of inquiry available to his kind. His status as a career scholar is neither upheld nor preserved, but instead he is reduced to nothing more than a necromancing entertainer.

Likely written between the years of 1589-1590, but certainly before the playwright's death in 1592, Robert Greene's comedy *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* also includes a scholar-magician, but unlike Faustus, Friar Bacon succeeds in using his learning to the benefit of the nation. Similar to Marlowe's tragedy, Greene's firmly

places the university, this time Oxford, in the national landscape. Although Bacon struggles to manage his magic—eventually renouncing it by the play's end—his knowledge and intellectual superiority ultimately support England's political interests. Whereas *Doctor Faustus* stages the personal and professional tragedy of a career scholar, *Bacon and Bungay* upholds the university man's place in academia, government, and beyond—outcomes not experienced by Doctor Faustus or available in the hostile world of *Parnassus*'s Philomusus and Studioso. Performances of intellectual power once again structure the play, but in this example of commercial drama, these displays represent not the egotism of career scholars, but rather they testify to the whole group's necessity and worthiness in a wider professional landscape. Perhaps owing to its multi-plot structure, the play emerges as an exercise in glorification, celebrating the nation, its universities, and the professional scholars who work within and serve beyond it.

Greene's play divides itself among the landscapes of country, court, and university, while featuring a series of interconnected love plots that cuts across all venues. Frank Ardolino calls this example of commercial drama about the university "a tour de force of topicality" ("History" 20). In particular, *Bacon and Bungay*'s focus on the university and its national profile emerge as one of the play's principal thematic concerns. As Ardolino writes, "Greene uses the history of Oxford University, its traditions, buildings, celebrated events, and famous people to create an encomium of this educational, cultural, and political institution which helped to shape English national life" ("Setting" 227-28). In heralding the institution of Oxford as a national center of culture, politics, and educational might, Greene also recognizes the career scholar, or university man, as a binding thread of the overall institutional fabric. As such, my examination of

this play will focus predominantly on the character of Friar Bacon, a scholar and necromancer who, in association with Friar Bungay, works to balance his own scholarly ambitions with his service to the nation. By the play's end, Friar Bacon not only emerges as a competent individual scholar, but he also comes to represent others in his field in a positive, productive light.

In contrast to Faustus' restlessness with his scholarly pursuits, Friar Bacon is comfortably established and well respected as a necromancer within the university. He first takes the stage in the play's second scene when he meets three doctors of the university, Mason, Clement, and Burden, who have installed themselves in his private cell. The three doctors have gathered to learn more about Friar Bacon's magic, particularly his fabrication of a brazen head that will wall England in brass. Clement extols Friar Bacon's skills and frames him as the pride of Oxford:

> Bacon, we come not grieving at thy skill,
> But joying that our academy yields
> A man supposed the wonder of the world;
> For if thy cunning work these miracles,
> England and Europe shall admire thy fame,
> And Oxford shall in characters of brass
> And statues such as were built up in Rome
> Eternize Friar Bacon for his art. (Greene ii.36-43)

Friar Bacon responds to Clement's prognostication by affirming that his work—the magic he performs—is in the service of England. Burden, on the other hand, doubts Friar Bacon's intentions and accuses him of overreaching his potential as a man and scholar,

causing Friar Bacon to use his magic to expose Burden's illicit encounter with a tapstress. After this admittedly humorous dressing down, Friar Bacon addresses the doctors and the audience by proclaiming, "Thus, rulers of our academic state, / You have seen the friar frame his art by proof" (ii.167). In his efforts to prove his art to the "academic state," Friar Bacon also seeks recognition from the national state that supports the universities and the professional community of scholars of which he is part.

As Bryan Reynolds and Henry Turner argue, "In the play, recognition is indeed the primary currency of the 'academic state'" ("Transversations" 249). Dr. Faustus sells his soul to achieve the recognition he desires, yet his bought status as a renowned magician leads to his demise and disgrace as a scholar. Unlike Faustus, whose self-centered pursuit of magic culminates in empty performances of his skills, Friar Bacon's work serves greater ends for a greater population. These displays, which the play stages as a series of performances that comprise the overall plot, emerge as key staging grounds for trading in the "primary currency" of recognition that is so vital to Friar Bacon's livelihood as an individual scholar and the reputation of the nation as a whole. One of the central moments of academic performance occurs during a royal expedition to Oxford of visiting dignitaries from other European countries led by King Henry III of England. The Emperor of Germany, the King of Castile, his daughter Eleanor, and Jacques Vandermast, a German scientist, tour England in preparation for Eleanor's marriage to Prince Edward, the King's son. The entourage makes a detour to Oxford partly in pursuit of Edward and also as a way for the Emperor to discover the might of the English universities and their learned scholars.

The Emperor proposes that Vandermast enter into a disputation with one of the university's orators, and King Henry promptly assigns the task to Friar Bacon, whom he dubs "England's only flower" (Greene iv.60). Before this disputation occurs, the "flower" of King Henry's boast finds himself using his magic to spy on Margaret, a country maid and love interest of Prince Edward who promises to compensate the friar with "Living and lands to strength thy college state" in exchange for his services (v.98). Despite the insular and private nature of this particular display of Friar Bacon's skills, his individual work does end up benefitting the university he represents—just as Bacon's disputation with Vandermast works to glorify Oxford and the nation *it* represents. Occurring in the ninth scene of the play, the disputation between Vandermast and Bacon, who steps in for a faltering Bungay, "becomes its own delightful theater, staging the becomings and comings-to-be of *homo academicus* in relation to the communities he needs to both engender and defy in order to survive and replicate" (Reynolds and Turner, "Transverasations" 247). Reynolds and Turner's reading is essential for understanding how the element of performance not only works to reflect but also participates in creating the status of the career scholar or, for that matter, any educational professional discussed as part of this project. As its own form of "theater," the disputation stages the professional status and subjectivity of the *homo academicus*, a term that Reynolds and Turner borrow from Pierre Bordieu that describes the subject position of the academic man—or career scholar—in the early modern period.

With the foreign dignitaries arrived at Oxford, the Emperor opens the scene with his assessment of the colleges and the scholars. His speech is filtered by an aesthetic survey of his surroundings, as he comments on the land's natural features, the colleges'

structural integrity, and the scholars' "grave attire" (Greene ix.6). Vandermast responds to the Emperor's impressions by acceding to the visual appeals of the university, but he expresses his doubt about the scholarly reputation of the university men. The German scientist seems satisfied with his appraisal when Bungay fails to restrain the conjured Hercules from destroying the branches of a conjured tree, an exercise that stemmed from the men's initial disputation concerning the prominence of pyromantic or geomantric spirits. Vandermast gloats in his victory: "Bungay is learned enough to be a friar, / But to compare with Jacques Vandermast, / Oxford and Cambridge must go seek their cells / To find a man to match him in his art" (xi.106-110). However, with Bacon's arrival on the scene, Vandermast finds his confidence disrupted, and he must reevaluate his views on Oxford's scholars when face to face with the learned friar.

After Bacon introduces himself, Vandermast responds by reading his counterpart's appearance. The German comments: "Lordly thou lookest, as if thou wert learned; / Thy countenance, as if science held her seat / Between the circled arches of thy brows" (ix.122-24). As someone who looks the part of a learned scholar, Bacon plays his role perfectly when it comes to the ensuing performance of his magic. His presence before the conjured Hercules is enough to arrest the spirit and prevent him from following Vandermast's commands. Dismissing Vandermast's skills as amateurish, Bacon dispatches Vandermast to his native Germany on the back of Hercules. Bacon's victory over his continental rival prompts King Henry to praise him for his skills and for making the university proud: "Bacon, thou hast honored England with thy skill, / And made fair Oxford famous by thine art;" (ix.165-66). Henry's words attest to the power of Bacon's performance within both the world of the play and beyond.

The disputation between Vandermast and Bacon serves as a fulcrum of the play's diffuse plot structures. As academic performance, the disputation between the German scientist and the English friar "is best understood as a hyperbolic representation of actual university practice, in which a contemporary interest in all aspects of mathematics and magic, natural and otherwise, have been accentuated and submitted to scrutiny" (Reynolds and Turner, "Celebrity" 87). In terms of the plot, this duel of wits allows for representatives from multiple nations and of multiple social stations to assemble on the grounds of an important national institution, the university. Bacon's defeat of Vandermast validates Bacon's skills as a scholar-magician, while also supporting the nation and its interests. Beyond the stage, this embedded performance displays for the audience the national and social implications of an individual's scholarship.

Whereas Faustus performs his magic for self-gain, thus rendering him ineffectual as an individual scholar and member of the scholarly community, Bacon intends for his magic to serve greater causes. The brazen head, which he has constructed over the course of seven years, will serve as his crowning achievement, as his knowledge will result in his surrounding England with a protective wall of brass, which is, of course, similar to Faustus' plan for Germany. However, when Bacon's lackluster assistant, Miles, fails to alert his master of the brazen head's prophetic animation, Bacon's work implodes and he assumes the melancholic pose immortalized in Burton's *Anatomy*. Holed up in his cell, Bacon exclaims: "My glory gone, my seven years' study lost. / The fame of Bacon bruited through the world, / shall end and perish with this deep disgrace" (Greene xiii.4-7). In one of his displays of his magical skills, Bacon comes to realize his limits as an individual man and scholar. As a party to the deaths of two fathers and their

sons thanks to his magic glass, he discovers that knowledge (as revealed in the two boys' use of the glass) can be dangerous as well as productive. He regrets his actions and abilities—not in a last-ditch effort of self-preservation à la Dr. Faustus—in a move to protect the people and his country from future harm.

After breaking his glass and freeing himself from the potentially dangerous effects of his necromancy, Bacon ends the play with a prophecy on England's future. He draws upon the "deep prescience of [his] art" (xvi.42) to portend the flourishing of the nation after Edward and Eleanor's nuptials. His prophecy essentially achieves the same effect as his brazen head scheme, in that he plays an instrumental role in his capacity as university man in glorifying the nation. Instead of walling off England, he welcomes the outsiders who will strengthen—by marriage—England's future. As Ardolino argues, in delivering his final speech, Bacon "Emerges as the good sage foretelling the greatness of England and joining with the Court and Country as representative of the University in an image of the rightfully balanced nation" ("Setting" 222). His "representative" status is central in understanding how his scholarship sets him apart professionally from someone like Dr. Faustus who misappropriated his knowledge for selfish ends. Unlike Faustus, whose performances resulted in empty delights, Bacon's displays of learning solidify his reputation as a scholar, while bolstering the reputation of the university he represents and its national profile.

Bacon's work satisfies individual and national interests, and his victory over Vandermast demonstrates that England's universities occupy a central place in the national, political, and professional landscapes of society. As much as Greene's play glorifies the nation and its universities, it also succeeds in staging for the audience the

prominence of the university man as part of an occupational group. In fact, all of the plays examined as part of this chapter—university dramas and commercial examples—somehow interrogate the university man's professional identity within the university itself, its community of scholars, and beyond. Because historical evidence does not account for any formalized professional development of the university man until the mid nineteenth century, these dramatic works offer early modern audiences and modern critics an alternate means of assessing the overall status and professionalization efforts of a larger group.[77] By virtue of their performance and the elements of performance incorporated within them, these plays stage for the audience the battles for recognition waged by career scholars to achieve a foothold in an early modern professional world dominated by more established professions and trades.

As examples of university comedy, *Club Law* and the *Parnassus* plays exploit the insularity of their performance context and the homogeneity of the audience to preserve and protect the university man and his work. *Club Law* achieves this preservation by staging the topical conflict between town and gown in which the gentle Athenians emerge victorious over the townspeople as a result of their innate superiority as scholars. While the *Parnassus* plays seem to borrow a page out of Burton's *Anatomy* in staging the perilous journey scholars face when confronting the outside world, the St. John's poet ultimately supports Philomusus and Studioso's dignity as scholars, entrusting their story to one of the university wits gathered in the audience. On the commercial stage, the scholar-magicians that populate Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Greene's *Friar Bacon*

[77] O'Day reminds us in *Education and Society* that "[t]his development was gradual but it was real" and did not occur until the universities "had thrown off all external control other than the ultimate control of the crown," 79.

and Friar Bungay enjoy opposite fates as a consequence of the uses of their knowledge, which they display as a series of performances. The self-serving, overreaching designs of Faustus' work lead to his demise and the debasement of his reputation as a scholar, while Bacon's ultimately responsible ethics and exemplary abilities catapult him to national and international renown. Regardless of the theatrical venue, all of the above plays set at the university join together to represent the precarious social and professional positions of the career scholar. The actual staging of these plays combined with the metatheatrical elements contained within them construct for the audience this educational group's status via performance in a period in which that status was not fully recognized.

Chapter 4: Leaving School for Society's Stage

"A self-wise seeming schoolmaster": Behind the Laughter

Sir Philip Sidney, in "The Defence of Poesy" (1579), argues that his vocation as poet and his chosen medium of poetry, which encompasses a range of generic forms to including drama, most appropriately teach virtue in contrast to other disciplines, such as history and philosophy. Often regarded as the English language's first work of literary criticism, Sidney's essay is steeped in the humanist tradition of the early modern period, as it argues for poetry's rightful place in a national and cultural landscape in which intellectualism can lead to social advancement. As part of his prolonged justification, Sidney acknowledges how certain creative practices among poets and dramatists have compromised the integrity of the genre as a didactic medium, perhaps contributing to a developing counterculture of anti-theatricality. Among such practices, Sidney observes how some of the era's writers of comedy indiscriminately conflate the audience's experiences of delight and laughter, thus creating an atmosphere in which crucial opportunities for teaching and learning go by the wayside.

For Sidney, laughter can exist independently of delight, and it is delight which ultimately inspires the brand of didacticism that grounds Sidney's argument. Equating laughter on its own with "a scornful tickling," Sidney inveighs against comedic scenes in which the audience derives humor—and often mistaken delight—from "sinful things," such as ridiculing pathetic stage characters like impoverished transients, country clowns, or non-native English speakers (244). However, "The Defence of Poesy" does imagine the possibility of unity between delight and laughter, which encourages didacticism. Sidney supports non-scornful laughter, which creates "that delightful teaching which is

the end of poesy" (244). In contrast to the pathetic characters that stir the empty sort of laughter against which he argues, Sidney proposes a more acceptable cast of laugh-worthy personages, which includes "a self-wise-seeming schoolmaster" (244).

Sidney includes this pedagogical figure among a band of bumbling but otherwise non-destitute characters, referring to them generally by explaining: "These, if we saw walk in stage names, which we play naturally, therein were delightful laughter, and teaching delightfulness—as in the other, the tragedies of Buchanan do justly bring forth a divine admiration" (245-46). Like the courtier, braggart, and traveler Sidney places alongside him, the schoolmaster's comedic behavior and value are associated with and derived from his role or occupation—one that happens to corner the market of instruction. It is important to acknowledge that Sidney's invention of "a self-wise-seeming schoolmaster" serves a strictly rhetorical purpose in his essay. He does not reference a particular play in which such a character exists but instead creates the comedic schoolmaster as an ideal representation for accomplishing the sort of pleasurable instruction that comedy, and by extension, poetry can achieve. In his one-act pastoral drama, *The Lady of May*, Sidney features a schoolmaster named Rombus who largely conforms to the model the author creates as part of his prose apology. The non-specific, illustrative quality of Sidney's example in "The Defence of Poesy" makes it possible for us to confront such issues as representation, professionalization, and performance as they pertain to actual dramatic representations across the period. Sidney's archetypical representation of a comedic schoolmaster who succeeds in instruction invites audiences and critics of plays in which such representations occur to consider the implications of dramatic representation for professionalization. When considered in terms of his

comportment and profession, this comedic, yet ultimately didactic, schoolmaster becomes more complex if one views his dramatic representation in light of the precariousness and the expectations of performance built into the profession of actual schoolmasters.[78]

On stage, the professional identity of the dramatic schoolmaster achieves great visibility in the performance of his role. The character of the schoolmaster who induces healthy, "delightful laughter" is one whom Sidney and, by extension, the comedic playwright render absurd as part of the didactic enterprise at stake. Ironically, this same "self-wise-seeming" schoolmaster can support the delightful instruction upon which Sidney bases his apology for poetry—despite the character's overtly ridiculous standing as an educator. Does a flawed, laughable representation of an educator on stage effectively produce more instructive, salutary delight than do more pitiable characters? Might not the representation of the "self-wise-seeming" schoolmaster appear just as pitiful for practicing professionals confronted with an undesirable portrayal of their trade on stage? What does it mean that the audience still might learn from a flawed schoolmaster on stage? Does the audience ably separate the "self-wise-seeming" distinction, or similarly unflattering labels, from the character's office as "schoolmaster," or does the character become inextricably linked to his professional position? Finally, what implications might such a character have in terms of performance, representation, and professionalism? Do literary—specifically, dramatic—representations have any bearing on the movement to professionalize schoolmasters, which was developing in the early modern period?

[78] For a close analysis on how modern educational theory on performance pedagogy might serve to illuminate the professional precariousness of early modern schoolmasters who lived and worked in a society heavily influenced by theatrical production, see Chapter 5 of this project.

These questions serve as the foundation of this chapter, in which I will begin to consider how comical representations of schoolmasters on the commercial stage register in terms of the characters' professional status, thus possibly informing or influencing the professionalization movements waged by the period's schoolmasters. While laughable schoolmasters such as Sidney's occupied a reality in which teaching and learning, laughter and delight, performance and didacticism existed in harmony, these same figures would not have enjoyed success in real life off stage. The dramatic representation of the schoolmaster from whom the audience stands to learn and laugh thus contradicts the dignified professional image sought and projected by many everyday schoolmasters whose audience extended beyond the scope of the theater.

Fun and Foolery: The Schoolmaster on the Public Stage

The "self-wise-seeming" schoolmaster of Sidney's *Defence* came to populate the early modern stage with a degree of regularity, closing the gap between the classroom of the theater and the theater of the classroom. Richard Brome's Caroline-era city comedy, *The City Wit, or the Woman Wears the Breeches*, enacts this fluid exchange by rendering the schoolmaster as professional nearly indistinct from the schoolmaster as stage character, making this play an ideal starting point for examining the schoolmaster's representation on the public stage. Delivering the Prologue, Sarpego, the pedant, seems less concerned with framing the play's content for the audience and more invested in articulating his status.[79] A relatively minor character in the play, Sarpego assumes a

[79] First published in 1653 and thought to be staged some twenty years earlier, Brome's *The City Wit* borrows from the city comedy genre and anticipates future examples of Restoration comedy. The multi-layered plot fraught with disguises, mistaken identities, and last-minute reveals features the Pedant in a

major presence in the opening, directly addressing the audience with the bombast and self-importance he thinks appropriate to his position. In speaking to the "Gentlemen," the pedant declares: "You see, I come unarm'd among you, *sine Virga aut Ferula*, without Rod or Ferular, which are the Pedants weapons. *Id est*, that is to say, I come not hither to be an Instructor to any of you…" (R. Brome 275). Sarpego attempts to disarm the audience by defining himself in the negative; however, he remains ultimately recognizable despite laying down his "weapons" and disclaiming any pedagogical intent. In fact, Brome's pedant, who readily identifies himself as a schoolmaster, appears to desire nothing more than to uphold and lay claim to his status. It soon becomes clear to the audience that in the world of the play, Sarpego is not playing a role but rather guest-starring as himself.

The pedant explains that he has given his students a holiday to allow him to act in the same play he introduces. He boasts that no one else could fulfill his role because, as he puts it, "A Pedant is not easily imitated. Therefore in person, I for your delight have left my Schoole to tread the Stage" (275). Sarpego's pronouncement not only reveals his self-satisfaction, but it also calls attention to his actual ridiculousness as a character. The purported mimetic difficulties associated with the pedant's office have essentially ruled out the possibility for anyone to act the part, necessitating the pedant's appearance as himself. The joke is on Sarpego, however. Within the world of the play, Sarpego insists that he must play himself. Yet, the play has proved that pedants can be acted by anyone since the audience is ultimately witnessing a non-pedant—an actor—playing a role Sarpego claims is inimitable. Brome's staging of Sarpego in the Prologue as a practicing

---

minor capacity—unlike the Prologue in which Sarpego takes center stage to ruminate on his participation, while explaining to the assembled audience the implications of his status as an educator.

schoolmaster who has relocated from his classroom to the theater nevertheless draws notice from the audience because it creates the impression that the actor on stage is indeed no actor at all.

As a direct import from his school, which he has "left," Sarpego carries himself to and on the stage as the Pedant he already is. However, having left his school, Brome's pedant must adjust to his new landscape. As Sarpego implicitly acknowledges in his attempts to downplay his status, the pedant's role inevitably changes because he has traded his school for the stage. Without rod in hand, Brome's pedant lacks the clout he wields as an instructor of those younger than he. Removed from his scholarly domain and having freed his captive audience of students, Sarpego must win over the theater's audience by exchanging his daily performance of authority for his performance of another's "delight." The Pedant takes the opportunity to remind the gentlemen he addresses that he comes in peace, urging them: "But let feare passe, nothing but mirth's intended" (276). These comedic intentions become reality for the audience when the schoolmaster is robbed at the point of a sword for a ten pound debt owed to the play's central character, Crasy, a broken gentleman who dons a series of disguises and makes his way through London to restore his fortune.

Although Brome's pedant, as he admits, plays a bit part in *The City Wit* that "[i]s but a Page, compar'd to the whole volume," (277), Sarpego occupies a substantial place in the Prologue that is difficult to ignore and that has significant implications for this project. By claiming in the world of the play to cast the pedant's part with a practicing schoolmaster, the playwright represents his character (who, of course, is played by an actor) as a product of the cultural, social, and professional landscape that lies beyond the

stage. But, the seemingly fluid transition from school to stage, from pedant to player, is complicated when Sarpego must make the shift from instructive figure to a maker of mirth and bringer of delight after coming on stage—much like Sidney's "self-wise seeming" comic schoolmaster. When situated within the confines of the commercial theater and framed as a transplant from the community, Sarpego's professional representation takes on a new light: he must disclaim part of his status to assume the position of a comic figure. However, the visibility of the schoolmaster and his office remains perceptibly intact for the audience, and the audience associates the character's comic rendering with his professional status.

"'Brought upon the Stage'": The Comedy of Professional Failures

What happens when other dramatic representations of schoolmasters leave the protective space of their schools, studies, or universities to "tread" the stage? How do schoolmasters perform their profession in the wider world, and what if they engage in performances that stray beyond their roles? How does non-academic, commercial drama not set at the university represent the professional status of the schoolmaster? And, what happens to the schoolmaster's status on and off stage when his work is interpolated into a comic landscape? To approach these questions, this chapter will broaden the generic and temporal boundaries of the previous chapters to consider how the commercial theater regulates the performance of the schoolmaster's professional status before an audience. Two of William Shakespeare's plays, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, a collaboration with William Fletcher, and *Love's Labour's Lost* will serve as the foundation of this chapter's textual examples, as they capture the precariousness of what was an emergent profession,

while portraying the follies of seemingly incidental characters who happen to "tread" the stage as schoolmasters. Before delving into these plays, which temporally bookend Shakespeare's prolific career, it is necessary to consider how present-day critics and contemporary authorities have interpreted the comedic schoolmaster's stage presence.

Unlike the texts featured in the previous chapter, which maintain a divide between town and gown, while seeking to preserve, uphold, and celebrate the status of the career scholar, plays destined for the public stage tend to handle schoolmasters with less generosity. Pedants like Sarpego of Brome's *The City Wit* became stock figures on the early modern stage and were easily recognizable to early modern audiences as sources of comic relief or amusement, depending on the genre. Potter notes that representations of educators during the period became so predictable that "[t]he image of schoolmasters projected by dramatists towards the end of the sixteenth century is, with rare exceptions, one of satire and scorn" ("Flogging" 36).[80] Henry Peacham corroborates Potter's present-day assessment of the period's treatment of schoolmasters on stage in his seventeenth-century courtesy book, *The Compleat Gentleman*. First published in 1622, Peacham's text catalogues a suite of skills and refinements appropriate to nobility, including the humanist pursuit of learning in which he takes an opportunity to enumerate the errors committed by schoolmasters in their education of young gentlemen.[81]

[80] As discussed above in Chapter 2, the village schoolmaster, Gnomaticus, in George Gascoigne's 1575 *The Glasse of Government*, not only occupies a significant place on the stage, but he also stands as an exception to the rule, soliciting sympathy from the audience and retiring from the stage with his image—personal and professional—intact. Gnomaticus' anti-theatrical carriage on stage, however, contributes to his idealized representation, ultimately forestalling performance and disrupting the interplay between performance and professionalization that occurs with more dramatic representations of schoolmasters considered in this chapter and elsewhere.

[81] The edition cited in this chapter is from 1634.

Citing various deficiencies that handicap the profession as whole, such as irateness and ineptitude, Peacham identifies "Humour" and "Folly" as "the diseases whereunto" schoolmasters "are very subject…whereby they become ridiculous and contemptible both in the school and abroad" (26). When placed in dialogue with the Pedant's Prologue in Brome's *The City Wit* in which Sarpego disavows his role as an instructor and instead insists on his capacity to delight the audience, Peacham's assessment acquires an even greater significance—especially when we consider the public stage's placement as part of the "abroad." For Peacham, the stage acutely magnifies the unattractiveness of certain schoolmasters, creating a familiar image of the profession for spectators:

> Hence it comes to passe that in many places, especially in Italy, of all professions, that of *Pedanteria* is held in basest repute: the Schoole-master almost in every Comedy being brought upon the stage, to parallel the *Zani*, or *Pantaloun*. He made us good sport in that excellent Comedy of *Pedantius*, acted in our Trinity Colledge in *Cambridge*, and if I be not deceived, in *Priscianus vapulans*, and many of our English Playes. (26-27)

Citing the pedant figure common to Italy's *comedia dell'arte*, an early form of professional theater in which stock characters dominated the cast lists, Peacham establishes the stage as a site where professional image is not only depicted, but also "held." When the schoolmaster is "brought upon the stage," laughter ensues—in part—because of such frequent exposure. Specifically named among the plays is *Pedantius*, an example of Latinate academic drama acted in Cambridge. But, as Peacham nebulously concludes, such comedic portrayals extend to non-academic, English examples.

Peacham's appraisal of the schoolmaster's portrayal on stage is noteworthy for its candor as well as the nexus of causality he establishes between the schoolhouse, dramatic representation, and the theater. Signaled with the brief transition, "[h]ence," Peacham indicates in his explanation that the schoolmaster is "brought" on stage as a direct cause of the negative behaviors sometimes displayed in the field, or "abroad." If the stage receives and represents these professionals comically, does it also contribute to the audience's perception of the profession at large? Does the stage equally participate in "holding" the schoolmaster in a state of negative "repute" as a result of its portrayal? Beyond observing trends in staging, how do critics make sense of the comedic portrayals of this socially vital occupational group?

Herbert M. Skinner in *The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire*, a companion collection to Edward Eggleston's *The Schoolmaster in Literature*, surmises that such comedic portrayals work to benefit teachers and their practice. He claims in his overview of dramatic and non-dramatic forms of literature: "There is a potent moral force in humor and satire; and there are few stronger influences than these that can be brought to bear on the training of teachers and the improvement of systems of education" (3). As far as Skinner is concerned, humor and satire serve productive ends and are paramount in shaping the future of the profession via training and system-wide reforms. Yet, how do these "influences" extend beyond the closed circle of internal stakeholders, teachers and policymakers? How might these stage portrayals that Peacham references in his time have affected popular opinion of the profession, a central construction of the group's path toward wider recognition?

For her part, Margaret Rogerson offers a positive, innocuous reading of comedic

representations of the schoolmaster, seemingly downplaying the effects on the audience. She argues: "When schoolmasters appeared as characters on the stage, they were likewise figures of fun," later adding that they "provided audiences with harmless amusement" (326, 325). Her interpretation renders the prospect of the audience's delight as immaterial to anything beyond their enjoyment of the play. However, as Potter notes, this same "amusement" provided early modern "scholars and schoolmasters" with "good reason to complain of their dramatic treatment" ("Flogging" 82). Although Rogerson accurately and helpfully generalizes that the vast majority of dramatic representations of schoolmasters were unflattering and made them objects of amusement, she stops short of accounting for the consequences of the laughter or any other audience response.

What if these negative representations were not as harmless and as inconsequential as Rogerson imagines? What if the audience considered the actor's portrayal of the schoolmaster as somehow representative of the larger occupational group and used the stage to corroborate or formulate its perceptions of the profession? Although textual and historical evidence will not furnish the degree of proof needed to establish any sort of audience reaction, it is possible to consider the implications of the comedy produced on stage at his expense and by virtue of his representation. Unlike the homogeneity associated with the audiences of university drama, early modern spectators of the commercial theater occupied different social strata and held a wider range of opinions.[82] With less incentive to support or preserve the professional image of scholars and educators than the university wits who acted and performed in their own, closed

[82] Ursula A. Potter in *Pedagogy and Parenting in English Drama, 1560-1610: Flogging Schoolmasters and Cockering Mothers*, diss., U of Sydney, 2001, frames the appeal of Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* as a specimen of public drama, arguing: "Presented as it is through the medium of public rather than private entertainment, Shakespeare's play takes on additional significance for Elizabethan society" (38).

plays, audiences of the era's public theater brought to the theater their own experiences in the realm of education, including their perception of schoolmasters.

In this chapter I will consider how two of Shakespeare's schoolmasters, Holofernes of *Love's Labour's Lost* and Gerald of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, fare when "brought" on stage not only as "figures of fun" but also as representations of a wider profession, immediately recognizable to an early modern audience which might associate them with the schoolmasters in their communities. Away from the institutional protections of the schoolhouse or the sheltering enclave of the university, Holofernes and Gerald exist in environments in which their learned and professional status appears to have little political, social, or cultural weight. As objects of mockery, neither Holofernes nor Gerald performs socially fulfilling educational work. Instead, each engages in and directs performances not immediately related to his job description; Gerald leads a morris dance, and Holofernes participates in and directs the play of the nine worthies. I will seek to understand how the secondary performances by Holofernes and Gerald affect and ultimately represent the professions they represent (and already perform) on stage as schoolmasters.

The Two Performing Schoolmasters: *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*

Shakespeare's Schoolmasters

Shakespeare has become synonymous, for modern audiences, with early modern drama and its commercial theater. Although much is known about Shakespeare's body of work, less is known about the extent of his own formal education. What is worth keeping

in sight, however, is Shakespeare's commitment to didacticism as a playwright. When it comes to his comedies, "Shakespeare was more, and not less, didactic than the Latin writers of comedy," and his comedic characters, which include his staged schoolmasters, conform to three representative didactic "modes," ranging from positive and negative exemplars to those "characters with whom we are invited to sympathize but who nevertheless behave in a foolish way" (Muir 40, 51).[83] In the world of comedy, this sympathy registers didactically, as the audience is conditioned to model its behavior and recalibrate its morality in response to the negative display on stage. In general terms, Muir's formulation speaks to the utility of comedy and the ever-present didactic potentials of the dramatic form. What happens, though, when didacticism itself and those professionals devoted to didactic pursuits come under fire and become the stuff of comedy? What kinds of lessons do bumbling schoolmasters teach the audience? How does Shakespeare stage his professional pedagogues?

Of all the characters and stories for which Shakespeare is renowned, the schoolmaster did not enjoy a particularly prominent position in the playwright's canon. Depending on who and how one counts, the number of schoolmasters varies across Shakespeare's works, ranging from as few as two to as many as six.[84] While the total itself is irrelevant, the critical uncertainty surrounding it is not without significance—especially if we consider it in terms of how we establish professional recognition on and

---

[83] Kenneth Muir in "Didacticism in Shakespearean Comedy: Renaissance Theory and Practice," *Review of National Literatures* 3.2 (1972) argues that the third "mode" of didacticism in which characters draw sympathy as a result of their foolishness is "likely to be the most efficacious" in benefiting the audience.

[84] Edward Dowden in "William Shakespeare," *The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire*, ed. Edward Eggleston (New York: American Book Company, 1894) counts "but two schoolmasters" appearing "in all the multitude of Shakespeare's characters" (47). Writing over a century later, Patricia Winson in "'A Double Spirit of Teaching': What Shakespeare's Teachers Teach Us," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 1 (1997) arrives at a total of six "actual teachers, only four of whom are solely schoolmasters" (par. 4).

off the stage, then and now.[85] The fact that the same characters recognized as schoolmasters by one critic go uncounted by another critic reinforces the inherent subjectivity that sometimes informs professional recognition. If critics are at odds over how they determine a character's occupational status for purely academic purposes, then audiences of the time could not have been expected to endow these same characters with any sort of automatic, universal recognition as professionals.[86]

Schoolmasters who appeared on Shakespeare's stage represented more than stock characters, even if their professional roles were still easily recognized by audiences and critics. As Winson puts it, "The teacher in Shakespeare's plays is certainly a wolf in sheep's clothing" (par. 9). Deceptive or mistaken identities notwithstanding, Shakespeare's schoolmasters tend to derive their renown from their flaws or follies. Winson echoes Rogerson in her assessment of Shakespeare's teachers, calling them "caricatures or figures of fun," who "are objects of mirth" (par. 6). In the execution of their duties, the schoolmasters of Shakespeare's plays "seem to have difficulty mastering anything or anyone" (Bushnell 39).[87] Both Holofernes and Gerald have "difficulty" in the mastery of their crafts, while comporting themselves in a way that elicits the audience's mockery when they perform in capacities beyond their everyday roles.

---

[85] Questions over authorship, for example, would lower the count by at least one if *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is not included among Shakespeare's plays, causing Gerald to be out of the running.

[86] Holofernes and Gerald do not pose many interpretative challenges since, as will become clear in the forthcoming analysis, both characters at the very least are recognized within the world of the play as schoolmasters—oftentimes supplementing this external validation of status with forms of self-identification, including their costuming and comportment.

[87] When it comes to the failures of Shakespeare's educators, Winson argues in "A Double Spirit" that "Shakespeare does not totally denigrate educators; rather he will invite us to reconsider the blind faith we place in them" (par. 31). In Chapter 5, I will examine the faith the community places in its professional educators by considering what happens when those who masquerade as schoolmasters attempt to command the same sort of recognition as their established counterparts.

Holofernes and Gerald are "mocked because of the way they talk," since "[w]here one would expect wisdom from these learned figures, one paradoxically finds the opposite" (Winson par. 6). Winson bases her conclusion about this pair's failings on their use of language. She reads these schoolmasters as part of the contemporary debates concerning Latin and the vernacular. While it is clear that both Holofernes and Gerald conform to both models of failure proposed by Bushnell and Winson, I propose that their failure as professionals also becomes a subject of mockery. In both plays, Shakespeare thrusts his schoolmaster into a world in which his expected professional skills appear to lack purpose or utility beyond the schoolhouse. Still recognized as schoolmasters on stage even while "abroad," Holofernes and Gerald engage in extraneous festive performances that only succeed in reinforcing their lack of necessity as professionals. On stage, Holofernes and Gerald not only become individual subjects of mockery, but the profession they represent emerges as an object of the audience's humor. It is my intention in this chapter to argue how *Love's Labour's Lost*, a comedy from the mid 1590s, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, a collaboration with John Fletcher classified as a romance from the early seventeenth century, manage to leave us with significant impressions of the schoolmaster's consolidation as a profession. These impressions extend beyond harmless entertainment despite the plays' comedic constructions and the rather limited stage presence of each play's schoolmaster.

Gerald, a Professional "Nullity" of The Two Noble Kinsmen

Staged sometime between 1613-1614, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* will serve as the starting point for this chapter—despite its postdating *Love's Labour's Lost* by two

decades. Ostensibly an adaptation of Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Knight's Tale*, the first story told in *The Canterbury Tales*, Shakespeare and Fletcher's collaboration dramatizes the emotional and physical battles waged by Palamon and Arcite, the eponymous kinsmen of the title, who vie for Emilia's hand in marriage while they are prisoners of the Duke of Theseus. Much of the play revolves around the internal struggles faced by Palamon and Arcite, as they seek to reconcile their nobility with their imprisonment, and their loyalty to one another with their individual desires toward Emilia, the sister of Theseus' new Amazonian bride, Hippolyta. Immediately preceding the duel between the cousins that will decide who lives and marries Emilia is a morris dance organized in honor of Theseus and Hippolyta to coincide with May Day festivities. The morris scene, which appears at the play's midpoint in Act III, is orchestrated by Gerald, a village schoolmaster whose profession, I will argue, becomes the subject of performance as much as the dance itself.

Physically present in just one act, Gerald (alternatively spelled as "Gerrold") has all but escaped critical attention, which is perhaps not surprising for a play that has only received renewed performance and scholarly interest in the closing decades of the twentieth century. In previous centuries, critics have mainly attended to the collaborative history of the play, its proximity to Chaucer's tale, and its status as one of Shakespeare's so-called "problem plays." However, in recent years, scholars have focused on a broader range of thematic and literary concerns, including expanded discussions on authorship, inquiries into same-sex friendships and the nature of homosocial relationships, and work that involves historicizing the play as a product of the Jacobean court (Turner and Tatspaugh 17-23). Absent from the public stage during the eighteenth and nineteenth

centuries, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* has since reappeared with some degree of frequency to coincide with the play's renewed critical interest. However, persistent questions regarding the play's authorship have generated enough "critical suspicions that have discouraged interest and performance" as a rule (Richmond 179). While interest levels and performances of the play have fluctuated with time, what has remained constant since the play's debut is the lack of critical attention paid to Gerald beyond brief procedural mentions of him as the morris dance's leader.

As part of my analysis of this play, I will attempt to bring meaning to what ultimately seems like a throwaway scene dominated by a relatively minor character. By conceiving the significance of the morris dance as a performance of its leader's professional status, I will seek to push against viewing Gerald as an incidental plot device and consider him a representative of a larger profession. In his performance of the morris dance, Gerald visibly maintains his station as schoolmaster and performs in that professional capacity throughout his time on stage. His language and actions as the dance's leader propel the plot as much as they construct his professional status for both the play's audience and its cast. Gerald's dual performances overlap to endow the schoolmaster with a more significant stage presence than previously imagined—despite his direct involvement in a single scene that does not even contain the play's title characters. Before reimaging the morris dance for its performance of professionalism, it is necessary to establish how it was conventionally practiced during the period and how it is typically interpreted by critics as a dramatic device within the play.

As a diminutive of "Moorish," the morris dance had its origins in the north of England as a folk dance set to music, which featured costumed characters with ribbons

and bells attached to their person. By the seventeenth-century debut of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, this tradition had been in place for well over two centuries, emerging as "at once a quintessentially English tradition and a sharp encounter with the foreign" (Iyengar 87). Katrina Bachinger in her analysis of the dance within the play frames this abiding folk tradition as "both a ritual and pageant, and yet a rout" (36). Not only does the performance of the dance resemble a play within a play, but also the morris dance in Shakespeare and Fletcher's collaboration is an adaptation within an adaptation, as most critics cite Francis Beaumont's *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn* as the source material for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*'s morris dance.[88] Depending on their respective interpretive lenses, scholars have read variously the function of the morris dance in the play, either endowing it with distinct organizational, thematic purposes or dismissing it as a superfluous element with "no narrative function" (Turner and Tatspaugh 4).[89] Although seemingly out of place as a festive interlude within a play that has at its core themes of love, death, honor, and battle, the performance of the dance holds significance for the overall performance of the dramatic enterprise into which it is interpolated.

Sujuta Iyengar, for example, classifies the dance as "an organizing trope for the frustrations of desire and of heterosexual marriage" (85). When it comes to the dance's participants, including its leader Gerald, Iyengar further inscribes the morris with social

---

[88] For more on the sourcing of the play's morris dance, see Katrina Bachinger's "Maidenheads and Mayhem: A Morris-Dance Reading of William Shakespeare's and John Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," *English Language and Literature: Positions and Dispositions* 16 (1990): 23-38 and Sujata Iyengar's "Moorish Dancing in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 20 (2007): 85-107.

[89] Regarding the stage history of the morris dance, Hugh Richmond in "Performance as Criticism: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and* The Two Noble Kinsmen, ed. Charles H. Frey (Columbia, MO: U of Missouri P, 1989) notes that "recent performances often skimp this aspect or cut it entirely" (166).

significance for the audience and the characters within the world of the play. As "[t]he dance carefully reinforces the social hierarchies of its audience," she argues that it also accentuates how each participant of the troupe is "less associated with civilization and more strongly with the wilderness than the one before" (93). In his role, I argue that Gerald becomes "less associated" with his professional identity as he performs in the capacity of the morris' leader. When Gerald takes center stage in leading the dance, the audience's attention should be directed to him as an individual rather than to the profession he actively represents. This focus is significant considering the fact that Gerald seems to materialize on stage in the fifth scene of the play's third act with little in the way of exposition. Nevertheless, his status as schoolmaster is never obscured from the audience's attention, and much like Sarpego from Brome's *The City Wit*, Gerald's stage presence away from his school only serves to accentuate his professional status as a schoolmaster. In the space that follows, I will track Gerald's movements as part of the morris scene in terms of his articulation of his professional status as well as how those within the world of the play and beyond interpret that status based on his multiple performances.

Before he makes his appearance on stage, Gerald's dual positions as schoolmaster and dance leader become the subject of conversation among four countrymen who prepare for May Day. Unnamed by any of the Countrymen, Gerald's standing as a schoolmaster is emphasized. In an exchange between two of the assembled Countrymen, the Second Countryman asks: "But will the dainty dominie, the schoolmaster, keep touch, do you think? For he does all, ye know," to which the Third Countryman responds with hyperbolic certainty: "He'll eat a hornbook ere he fail

(Shakespeare, *Kinsmen* II.iii.41-42, 43). From just three lines of seemingly mundane dialogue, the audience is able to glean pertinent information regarding the schoolmaster's temperament and job description without ever having lain eyes on him. Described as a "dainty dominie," Gerald's fastidious nature is emphasized to the exclusion of his actual skills as a schoolmaster, one who perhaps deals with petties of the lower schools if we take the Third Countryman's reference to the hornbook at face value. What is especially revealing about the above exchange, however, is the claim that Gerald "does all" when in reality, he ends up doing little more than revealing his uselessness.

Although the Second Countryman's claim specifically refers to Gerald's position in arranging the imminent festivities, we can read this same pronouncement in terms of the schoolmaster's professional placement within the world of the play. I argue that Gerald's temporary involvement with the morris dance actually obfuscates his professional status—despite his best efforts to invoke and call upon his learning. In his performance of the morris dance, Gerald's performance of his profession suffers in the eyes of the community and those gathered in the audience. He marks his limited time on stage as the dance's leader by struggling to uphold his authority and maintain his image. Gerald appears on stage at the beginning of Act III, Scene 5 pedantically castigating his performers for not heeding his lessons:

> Fie, fie,
>
> What tediosity and disinsanity
>
> Is here among ye! Have my rudiments
>
> Been laboured so long with ye, milked unto ye,
>
> And, by a figure, even the very plum-broth

And marrow of my understanding laid upon ye?

And do you still cry 'where?' and 'how?' and 'wherefore?' (*Kinsmen* III.v.1-7)

The schoolmaster trots out the inflated diction of a pedant to address his inferiors, the rustics who make up his morris dance troupe. Gerald deliberately sets himself apart from his dancers, or students, referring to them as "dunces," while imagining himself to be on equal footing with the Duke to whom he will "utter learned things / And many figures" (*Kinsmen* III.v.11, 14-15). As Madelon Lief and Nicholas F. Radel argue, "The schoolmaster's irritation points to his inability to train properly his students and to their inability to perceive what he teaches" (422). Gerald's pretensions to knowledge offer him no traction as the dance's leader, as he misperceives his students' abilities and only succeeds in calling attention to the vanity of his labor.

Throughout his stint as the dance's leader, Gerald couches his attempts at instruction in terms of intense "labour," a theme to which he returns throughout his abortive efforts to organize the morris. Once it becomes evident that one of the women slated to participate is unaccounted for, Gerald bemoans his expended efforts, announcing, "We have been *fatuus*, and laboured vainly" (*Kinsmen* III.v.42). In emphasizing his efforts as the leader, in accentuating his intellectual superiority over his students, and all the while leading with his status as a schoolmaster, Gerald's labors as the morris' leader are progressively rendered as inconsequential and ineffective—associations that may equally apply to the profession he represents. Faced with the prospect of a missing dancer, Gerald panics and begins to mourn the loss of his efforts: "Nothing; / Our business is become a nullity, / Yea, and a woeful and a piteous nullity"

(*Kinsmen* III.v.54-56). As much as his words refer to his perceptions of his dance, so also do they speak to his professional status.

Framing the morris dance as a "business" reduced to nothing, Gerald also betrays his ineffectualness as a schoolmaster. Before the dance even commences on stage, Gerald has become the "nullity" of which he speaks, since his learning fails to inspire his students. His standing as the one that "does all" has reverted to a state of nothingness when out in the community. Despite his pedantic guise and status as the dance's leader, Gerald is unrecognized as a schoolmaster by the Jailer's Daughter who madly wanders on the scene and ends up taking the open role vacated by the missing woman. In their exchange, the Jailer's Daughter begins by telling Gerald's fortune and in the process tests (and fails) him for idiocy:

DAUGHTER. You are a fool. Tell ten—I have pos'd him. Buzz!
Friend, you must eat no white bread; if you do,
Your teeth will bleed extremely. Shall we dance ho?
I know you, y' are a tinker. Sirrah tinker,
Stop no more holes but what you should.
SCHOOL. Dii boni!
A tinker, damsel?
DAUGH. Or a conjurer.
Raise me a devil now, and let him play
Qui passa o' th' bells and bones. (*Kinsmen* III.v.80-87)

Mistaken for a tinker, or maker of kettles, Gerald's status as a learned intellectual who will seek the approval of the Duke with his "many figures" is reduced to that of a laborer.

In his brief exchange with the Jailer's Daughter, Gerald slips from one who is all knowing and doing to one who is unknown and undone—personally and professionally.

Having been mistaken for a cross between a tinker or conjurer, Gerald initiates the morris dance for his distinguished guests by accentuating his identity as a schoolmaster, while framing the display as an educational experience managed by him. He greets his guests with the imperative: "Stay and edify" (*Kinsmen* III.v.97). However, Gerald's attempts to seek recognition as one who will provide edification are met with skeptical amusement from Theseus and his noble retinue who take their places for what becomes an extended, self-promoting lecture from Gerald who proclaims:

> And I, that am the rectifier of all,
> By title *pedagogus*, that let fall
> The birch upon the breeches of the small ones,
> And humble with a ferula the tall ones,
> Do here present this machine, or this frame; (*Kinsmen* III.v.111-15)

Gerald uses the platform of the dance to articulate his greatness as a function of the professional status he claims. In describing himself as "rectifier," or director "of all," the schoolmaster embraces the reputation accorded to him by one of the Countrymen appearing in Act II. But, what comes through in his speech is the totality of the violence Gerald wields as *pedagogus*. As Lief and Radel argue, Gerald "defines his task as a schoolmaster by the whippings he gives, with the clear implication that the rod keeps the boy in line" (423). Away from his classroom, however, Gerald's birch and ferula have little sway—other than to render him more out of place than his bombastic, empty language already does.

The dancing of the morris indicated by a simple stage direction in the text of the play follows Gerald's introduction. Upon the conclusion of the dance, the schoolmaster returns to address his audience—this time imploring them for the recognition he has up until this point presumptuously claimed. Gerald seeks the approval of Theseus and company and encourages them—if they liked what they have witnessed before them—to "Say the schoolmaster's no clown" (*Kinsmen* III.v.142). Theseus responds by directly addressing Gerald as "Schoolmaster" and giving him some money so that his troupe can be "all rewarded" (*Kinsmen* III.v.152). Although the Duke appears to recognize Gerald from a place of authority, it is important to note that he does not exactly heed the schoolmaster's closing petition, not saying one way or another if the schoolmaster is a clown. At this point in the play, Gerald's status is inconsequential, and it would require much more of an argument to uphold his professional status than it would to call him a clown.

Gerald departs the stage at the end of Act III, Scene 5 praising his band for having "danced rarely" (*Kinsmen* III.v.160) never to return again.[90] Not exactly disgraced, but certainly not valorized, Gerald's character is an enigma, occupying an ultimately precarious position on the margins of professionalism and performance. His status as a schoolmaster is never far from his comportment as an individual or his position as the morris' leader. In fact, Gerald leads with his profession to demonstrate his value and authority before his multiple audiences: his students (dancers), the nobles, and the assembled spectators of the wider play. However, in his efforts to cultivate a presence on

[90] The Jailer's Daughter refers to Gerald as Emilia's schoolmaster in the following act, calling him "Giraldo" (*Kinsmen* IV.iii.11). It is possible to attribute the misnaming of Gerald to a textual irregularity as a result of the collaboration, or we can ascribe the naming to the Jailer's Daughter altered mental state.

stage, Gerald descends into nothingness—misrecognized and unrecognized by anyone but himself. On stage and away from his schoolroom, Gerald occupies a position in which his pretensions to knowledge and his proclivity toward violence are revealed although he constantly relies on these models of language and authority to distinguish himself and the profession he claims from his peers. His status as schoolmaster, therefore, becomes inconsequential—or even negative—in the community in which he attempts to insinuate himself.

In *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Gerald the individual and Gerald the professional are simultaneously reduced to states of nothingness in which they lack authority. In what appears to be an otherwise disposable scene, the morris dance acquires greater significance in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* if we read it as a professional display of the schoolmaster's interactions with his community beyond the protective surroundings of the classroom. Gerald fails to achieve the level of recognition to which he feels entitled as schoolmaster when stepping outside his role. Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost* experiences a similar, but ultimately more devastating reality when his attempt to perform his profession for an adult, non-academic audience similarly fails to generate desirable professional results.

"Imitari is nothing": Holofernes as Performer and Pedagogue in Love's Labour's Lost

Regarded as one of Shakespeare's most ostensibly intellectual plays for both its focus on scholarship and its witty, allusive language, *Love's Labour's Lost* creates a world in which a schoolmaster's presence would seem fitting—if not requisite. The principal plot of the play focuses on the King of Navarre's men as they, under his

direction, reconfigure their court as a "little academe" (Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's* I.i.13) in which they vow to forswear women in order to engage in three years of study. Navarre and his men, however, plan to study without the aid of an outside teacher. Instead, the King himself "will serve as their schoolmaster" to form a "single-sex enclave" devoted to learning (Moncrief, "'Teach us'" 118). The integrity of their masculine "enclave" and the vow upon which it was founded, however, is almost immediately disrupted by the Princess of France's arrival with her own retinue of ladies who instruct the men in various ways.[91] The scholarly activities that have come to newly define Navarre in the play's opening scenes are closed to a wider world, not only making it difficult for outsiders to enter, but also making it that much more conspicuous when they do come on scene.

One of the outsiders to this self-contained, scholarly "enclave" is ironically the play's only character who is a career scholar, Holofernes, the village schoolmaster. But like Gerald of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Holofernes' time on stage is dominated by pretentiousness and pedantry. On stage for parts of only two acts, Holofernes enters the play as a "forceful dramatic figure" who is meant to "set the preceding amateur displays of knowledge and skill within a culture of pedagogy, and to draw an analogy with the king and his scholar companions" (Potter, "Flogging" 66). Reduced to a "figure of fun"

[91] Critics have noted that the arrival of the women to the court also results in the overturning of instructional authority, as the Princess' ladies teach the men how to court them. Kathryn M. Moncrief, for example, in "'Teach, us sweet madam': Masculinity, Femininity, and Gendered Instruction in *Love's Labour's Lost*," *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncreif and Kathryn R. McPherson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011) argues that "the seemingly fixed gender hierarchies and gender roles are disrupted in the rehearsal and display of a different model: the female schoolmaster and male pupil" (114). Trevor Lennam in "'The Ventricle of Memory': Wit and Wisdom in *Love's Labour's Lost*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24.1 (1973) anticipates Moncreif's assessment in his reading of *Love's Labour's Lost* according to wit and morality, calling the women "beautiful, celestial creatures" who are "the teachers and the light-givers" (55).

and openly ridiculed by those with whom he comes in contact, Holofernes acts more as an amateur than a professional during his time on stage. He becomes the clown Gerald so desperately sought to repress and disavow in his role as the morris' leader by similarly attempting to maintain his schoolmaster status while directing and performing in a play of the Nine Worthies put on for the nobles' entertainment. His efforts to translate his professional status into success, authority, and recognition beyond the walls of his schoolhouse fail, as his performances as actor and professional cause him to be laughed off stage by his audience.

Much of the play's enduring popularity as a comedy lies in its satirical treatment of learning, its place in the world, and those who are charged with its practice or preservation. As Daryll Grantley argues: "The satire here is not on education itself, but rather its social misuse by those who are propelled, through their own eccentricity or the uncertainty of their social background, into an overly zealous embrace of it" (188). Edward Dowden explains that modern educators would be interested in the play because "[i]t exhibits and satirizes the pedantry, puerility, affectation, and conceit of teachers" (47). As a teacher, Holofernes is guilty of all charges levied by Grantley and Dowden, as his eccentricity and verbosity mark him as a zealous pedant. In my analysis of the play, I will expose the professional implications of the schoolmaster's dramatic representation by tracking Holofernes' time on stage in terms of his status as a performer who acts in his professional role as a schoolmaster and in his triple-casting in and directorship of the play of the Nine Worthies. Holofernes' stage presence is marked by empty performances of knowledge that ultimately render him an ineffectual nonentity—personally and professionally—when "abroad" in his community.

Holofernes' first appearance occurs in the second scene of Act IV where he and his loyal companion and personal cheerleader, the curate Nathaniel from whom he is never apart, discuss the hunt conducted by the Princess and her ladies. Dull, a constable whose name reflects his intellect, appears to be unable to keep pace with the schoolmaster and curate's Latin-infused dialogue, and he becomes the unwitting auditor of Holofernes' immodest claims to knowledge and Nathaniel's unwavering corroboration. After having delivered an epitaph for the deer slain by the Princess, Holofernes immodestly expounds on his talent, and Nathaniel responds by celebrating his friend's purported stature in the community:

> HOLOFERNES. This is a gift that I have, simple, simple—a foolish extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures, shapes, objects, ideas; apprehensions, motions, revolutions. These are begot in the ventricle of memory, nourished in the womb of *pia mater*, and delivered upon the mellowing of occasion. But the gift is good in those in whom it is acute, and I am thankful for it.
>
> NATHANIEL. Sir, I praise the Lord for you, and so may my parish-ioners; for their sons are well tutored by you, and their daughters profit very greatly under you. You are a good member of the commonwealth. (Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's* IV.ii.61-70)

The above exchange between the schoolmaster and curate establishes for the audience Holofernes' individual reputation—morally, socially, and professionally. Furthermore,

the dialogue also embodies the multiple layers of representation inherent to Holofernes' character.

Most immediately apparent in his speech is Holofernes' inflated self-confidence—a disposition that Nathaniel actively encourages in his obsequious follow-up. The "gift" that Holofernes touts is ultimately lost on Dull and others in the community that sometimes neither understand nor have any use for the flowery, Latinate rhetoric. In fact, the use value of Holofernes' "gift" becomes one of the play's objects of satire and, as I argue, another of the title's lost labors. Like Gerald of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Holofernes' function beyond the classroom comes into question based on his performance of his profession. Although Nathaniel praises his friend as "a good member of the commonwealth," the curate's admiration is undercut by a certain moral ambiguity depending on how one reads Holofernes' character.

Several critics have concentrated on the implications of the schoolmaster's name, citing its biblical significance as an indication of the character's ethical standing as a vice character. For many members of Elizabethan audiences, the name "Holofernes" was synonymous with "tyrant," as a personage by the same name appears in the apocryphal Book of Judith. The associations with tyranny evoked by Holofernes' name correlate to his profession as schoolmaster: many people regarded schoolmasters as violent tyrants who lorded over the children of their classrooms (Potter, "Naming" 11). If regarded as a vice character based on his name, Holofernes' purported interactions with the village's sons and daughters as recounted by Nathaniel acquire a less than scholarly and decidedly salacious tenor. Potter does not limit Holofernes' vices to sexual misconduct, arguing: "[T]here are other characteristics which he shares with his biblical namesake, namely

drunkenness and poor judgement, particularly when it comes to women" ("Naming" 19). Winson adds gluttony to the list of vices of which Holofernes is guilty and represents by virtue of his name, citing his tendency to broadcast "self-important truths," or the "gift" he touts in the above speech (par. 15). Although some of his on- and offstage dealings may cause Holofernes to conform to his biblical namesake, his professional representation is more interpretatively complex.

Vice figure or not, most critics and audience members unite in recognizing Holofernes as the stock pedant figure.[92] However, Shakespeare's schoolmaster "proves *so much more* than a mere pedant…" (Flanigan 21, emphasis in original). His character emblematizes the precarious position of the early modern schoolmaster within his community in the world of the play and as a dramatic representation on the public stage. When removed from the confines of his classroom, Holofernes' status becomes a matter of inquiry when Armado, a foreigner, asks if the schoolmaster is "lettered" to which Mote, Armado's page, responds, "Yes, yes, he teaches boys the horn-book" (Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's* V.i.41-42). Like Gerald, Holofernes is most likely a teacher in a lower school based on his use of the hornbook.[93] The audience learns that Holofernes indeed educates "youth on the charge-house on the top of the mountain," or "*mons*," as Holofernes pedantically interjects in response to Armado's follow-up inquiry (*Love's Labour's* V.i.69-71). When his actual position as a teacher of the petties is disclosed, Holofernes' pretensions to knowledge and his "gift" for language are rendered

[92] Winson in "'A Double Spirit of Teaching,' attests to the absoluteness of this association and notes: "The epitome of the foolish teacher is Holofernes. In 1594 Shakespeare coined the word 'pedant' to describe him" (par. 7).

[93] Potter in "The Naming of Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost*," *English Language Notes* 38.2 (2000) also suggest that Holofernes may serve as an usher. She offers other textual evidence to support his interaction with lower school students, including his teaching of girls and his "affectation for Mantuan" (14).

all the more absurd and useless. The profession he represents also suffers when he attempts to stake his claim in the greater community.

Potter sees Holofernes as "grounded in the disjuncture between his inflated self-perception and the more jaundiced opinion the local community has of him" ("Flogging" 39). Flanigan, on the contrary, interprets Holofernes' difficulties as a matter of assimilation, claiming: "The sad (or rather comic) truth of the matter is that he is intellectually incapable of assimilating and/or synthesizing the enormous system of codified rhetoric that he aspires to practice and teach" (20). When away from his school and "treading" the stage, Holofernes does not fit within the world in which he lives and works, as his skills seem to hold little attraction for an audience not comprised of boys and girls learning their alphabet. His profession, therefore, goes either unrecognized or unneeded by the people with whom he comes in contact beyond, of course, Nathaniel, his most ardent supporter who provides a narrative of the schoolmaster's utility and value that contradicts his actual standing in the community.

Holofernes' efforts to insinuate himself as an active member of society precipitate his personal and professional downfall. When offered the chance to direct and perform in a play of the Nine Worthies presented before the royals, Holofernes eagerly agrees and boldly claims a third of the roles for himself. However, this chosen form of community involvement reveals uselessness in the world outside his school. When it comes to this notion of involvement, Winson argues that Holofernes "is not a doer, underlining his lack of involvement with real life" (par. 12). Ironically, the schoolmaster's decision to undertake the production of the play contradicts his own philosophy on imitation and acting that he articulates earlier in the play after having intercepted a love letter intended

for one of the Princess' ladies. On this previous occasion, Holofernes criticizes the letter's poetics, proclaiming: "*Imitari* is nothing" (Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's* IV.ii.117). In striving to achieve visibility by becoming an actor, Holofernes pursues an experience predicated on actions he once regarded as nothing. And, like Gerald of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Holofernes becomes another professional nullity by virtue of his participation in the pageant, which he calls "sport" (V.i.132).

Holofernes' classification of the dramatic enterprise in which he participates as "sport" anticipates the trajectory of the performance, as it descends into chaos—eventually leading to Holofernes' embarrassing ouster from the stage. Yet, up to and throughout the pageant, the schoolmaster openly represents his profession. As Potter notes regarding his participation in the pageant, "Holofernes' sense of himself as a public performer pervades his role" ("Flogging" 70). I would add that pervasive in his performance in the play of the Nine Worthies is his professional identity, which is just as visible to his audience as his assumed roles and inextricably linked to his character and everyday movements. However, what the gathered spectators expect from the schoolmaster differs from his self-concept as the purportedly gifted "good member of the commonwealth." Instead of edification or dignified pageantry, the King fears that Holofernes and his troupe will bring opprobrium to the court. Biron, however, dismisses such possibility, calling Navarre "shame-proof," while the Princess desires the performance of the play for its comedic potential as the "sport" it will become (Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's* V.ii.509, 512). The face of the play, of course, is the schoolmaster who becomes the subject of Armado's criticism.

Directly addressing the King, Armado apologizes in advance for their

performance of the play, targeting Holofernes' role in the play: "I protest, the schoolmaster is exceeding fantastical, too-too vain, too-too vain" (*Love's Labour's* V.ii.525-26). As it turns out, Armado's assessment is accurate, and Holofernes is forced to quit the stage almost as soon as he enters it after being humiliated by the carping noble audience. Playing the role of Judas Maccabeus, one of the Jewish Worthies, Holofernes finds himself in the unfamiliar positions of deference and relative silence as an actor. Bound by the strictures of the dialogue he must deliver and sensitive to his subordinate status to his noble audience, Holofernes struggles to keep from breaking from character, while not succumbing to the audience's jeers. The King's men deliberately mistake Holofernes for Judas Iscariot and repeatedly forestall his attempts at clarification with rapid punning on his every word. After a lull in the mockery, one of the king's men, Biron, encourages Holofernes to continue with the words: "And now for- / ward, for we have put thee in countenance" to which the schoolmaster sullenly replies, "You have put me out of countenance" (*Love's Labour's* V.ii.607-09). In the above exchange, Biron's use of the term "countenance" differs from Holofernes'.

Earlier in the scene, Holofernes vows that he "will not be put out of countenance," by which he means that he will not become upset by the taunting to which he had been subjected (*Love's Labour's* V.ii.596). When Biron appropriates the same word, he signifies that he and his cronies have justly represented Holofernes' character, thus putting him "in countenance." The schoolmaster's response, however, cuts two ways, as he not only confirms being upset by their treatment of him, but also he reveals his vulnerability in having been undone by their words to the point that he loses his identity—dramatically, personally, and, I would argue, professionally. Unable to

withstand the barrage of taunts hurled in his direction, Holofernes prematurely exits the play of the Nine Worthies after making the following pronouncement: "This is not generous, not gentle, not humble" (*Love's Labour's* V.ii.617). The schoolmaster's uncharacteristically terse words speak to his treatment at the hands of the nobles as well as their comportment during the play. Importantly, these words are also Holofernes' last ones in the play, although he remains on stage in a nonspeaking capacity at the play's end.

Most critics use this line as a means to gauge Holofernes' sympathetic qualities as a character. Winson, for example, cites the schoolmaster's parting words as "a commentary as much upon his inglorious demise as it is upon those who exalt in it," evenly spreading the blame from performer to audience (par. 17). For his part, Flanigan identifies Holofernes as one of the play's "moral victors," because of his "justly rebuking [his] persecutors for their lack of courtesy, humility, and reverence…" (28). Potter, however, reads Holofernes' statement as self-referential. In fact, she argues that the text does not support a sympathetic reading of his character even though "[t]he validity of his words is beyond doubt" (Potter, "Naming" 21). While it is clear that Holofernes' audience behaved badly in their unrestrained jeering during the performance, Potter's view that the schoolmaster's words serve as a reflection of his own behavior offers more analytical traction if we regard them on a grander scale that transcends the immediate performance of the pageant.

Beyond referring to his pedantry, I would like to suggest that Holofernes' claim also accurately constructs his professional standing by the play's end. Added to the list of negatives he enumerates should be a lack of professional accomplishment on the part

of Holofernes throughout the play. The schoolmaster's performance in the play of the Nine Worthies encapsulates the overall performance of his profession, as he maintains his occupational identity for his two audiences. Although schoolmasters did act and produce theatrical entertainments, "[w]hat is significant to Shakespeare's audience is Holofernes' mean status as a country, elementary teacher set against his inordinate confidence in his dramatic abilities, the painfully amateur level of the entertainment presented, and his desire not just to direct but also to take centre stage" (Potter, "Flogging" 52). Holofernes' time spent on the stages of the Worthies' pageant and of Shakespeare's play as a whole combine to comprise a performance in which his amateurishness as a director and lack of purpose as a professional dominate. As a whole, *Love's Labour's Lost* "is a dramatic plea on behalf of nature and of common sense against all that is unreal and affected" (Dowden 48). One of these affectations spotlighted within the play is the profession Holofernes represents.

Conclusion:

Whereas Gerald is shooed off his stage with a perfunctory toss of some coins to recompense him for his labor, Holofernes' exit as an individual and professional is much less ceremonious and far more devastating to his reputation. He all but disappears from the play's action after his participation in the pageant and remains on stage only to witness a dialogue written in praise of the owl and cuckoo that occurs before the final curtain. Although he succeeds as a comic character by generating laughter at his lofty pedantry, Holofernes joins Gerald in leaving audiences a professional legacy built on failure by delivering empty promises and laboring in vain. As much as they both fail as

representatives of their profession, each of Shakespeare's schoolmasters also fails to represent a profession that is either meaningful or useful in a larger social landscape. Despite his pretensions to knowledge and action, Gerald struggles to corral a band of inferiors to dance in a May Day entertainment. Holofernes, on the other hand, is legitimately recognized as a schoolmaster in a play in which the pursuit of scholarship structures much of the plot; however, he has no place within his community—much less the commonwealth of which he is purportedly such a "good member."

When we consider their representations as professionals, Holofernes and Gerald are far more than individual "figures of fun." Together, their seemingly incidental stage presence makes visible for the audience the profession they represent by virtue of their performances as pedagogues and as actors. When they leave their schools to "tread" upon stage, they each represent their profession as failures. Like Sarpego of Brome's *The City Wit*, who cannot separate himself from his professional identity, neither Gerald of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* nor Holofernes of *Love's Labour's Lost* abandons his self-concept as a professional. Instead, when installed within their larger communities and away from their traditional students, both Gerald and Holofernes involve themselves in dramatic performances to which they attempt to bring their knowledge and position as professionals.

However, both schoolmasters fail to achieve the levels of recognition to which they feel entitled based on their professional status. Gerald is misrecognized as a day laborer and conjurer, while Holofernes must convince his hostile noble audience that he plays the role of Judas Maccabeus—not Iscariot—without breaching the decorum of the plot or the court. In their respective performances, both of Shakespeare's comic

schoolmasters reveal themselves as nonentities, as they serve no real social purpose in their respective communities. Outside the classroom, they simply refuse or are unable to speak the same language as the members of everyday society. No longer safe on the academic stage, which protects career scholars from the injustice and unpredictability of the wider world, schoolmasters like Gerald and Holofernes operate outside their power base and fail to adapt to life beyond the sheltering enclave of the university. The public stage on which these schoolmasters perform reveals this professional precariousness to a heterogeneous audience, which is markedly different in composition from the audiences of academic drama discussed above in Chapter 3. Unlike the automatically supportive spectators of university drama, audience members of the public theater had less of a stake in upholding respect for the career scholar in performances that staged his profession. They did, however, each have a hand in associating these staged schoolmasters with the schoolmasters of their own communities by potentially "holding," as Peacham argues above, the entire profession in "base repute" as a result of their dramatic representation on the public stage.

Chapter 5: Performing, Teaching, and "performing teaching"

"You're a teacher because you say you are": Self-fashioned Professionalization

Based on the true story of first-year teacher Erin Gruwell's efforts to reform a depressed, racially-divided school in Long Beach, California, the 2007 Hollywood film *Freedom Writers* offers audiences a positive exemplar of a professional educator. Unafraid to confront the bureaucratic tangles and the institutionalized racism that beset Woodrow Wilson High School in 1994, Ms. Gruwell succeeds in uniting her students using an expressivist pedagogy built on community-building. However, as the film reveals, Erin's victory in the classroom comes at the expense of her personal and professional relationships with colleagues and family. Erin's fellow educators, including her department head, resent her efforts to reform the system by willfully circumventing longstanding protocol. The novice teacher's established father, who forged his professional legacy as a civil rights advocate, remains incredulous about his daughter's chosen career path when he attempts to calculate her net salary against her intellectual potential. At home, Erin's husband, Scott, feels increasingly unimportant in comparison to his wife's students, which eventually leads to the couple's divorce. None of these obstacles or detractors prevents Erin from doing her job, which she holds while also moonlighting as a hotel desk clerk and a lingerie salesperson in order to finance the extracurricular activities she arranges for her students. Erin's uncompromising stance as an individual and her unrelenting efforts as an educator lead to her emerging as a hero of her profession by the film's end.

Although much of Erin's motivation comes from her innate desire to break through to her students, she does occasionally draw support from outsiders to her

profession, including Scott, who comes to his wife's aid after a rocky dinner meeting with Erin's father. Gruwell's usually misunderstanding and unsympathetic husband in this scene offers her a rare moment of encouragement that references her professional status. In what I consider one of the film's most significant lines, which also happens to lend this project part of its title, Scott explains to Erin: "You're a teacher because you say you are" (*Freedom Writers*). Without leaving room for any response on Erin's part, the domestic interaction between husband and wife immediately cuts to Ms. Gruwell, the teacher, standing at the front of her classroom attempting to reach her students using rap music. Erin appears to have embraced her husband's pep talk by claiming a new presence as a professional. Employing a pedagogy that relies on grand gestures and elaborate projects, she effectively becomes the teacher she always envisioned herself being—gaining self-esteem as well as the viewers' approval. But does the process of her becoming (or identifying as) a teacher derive from anything more than her own say-so?

Scott's tautology suggests Erin's professional identity hinges solely on her own powers of convincing—not on social recognition, on specialized knowledge, or on any other objective measure typically used to confer professional status in the modern or the early modern eras. Whereas the film seems to depict Erin's implicit endorsement of Scott's words, her husband's logic introduces a set of interpretative complexities surrounding the conferral and claiming of a teacher's professional status that is overshadowed by the film's singular focus on Erin's eventual success. However, it is this single line of dialogue that I argue emblematizes an abiding sense of precariousness faced by educators who struggle to negotiate their place within a larger professional landscape. The fact that an outsider to the teaching field casually frames another's professional

status as a matter of personal assertion raises certain complications for those already established as teachers who might struggle to maintain their own claims to this same status. This line from a twenty-first century film acquires additional interpretive significance when applied to the scope of this project: the drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in which the performance element of disguise facilitated a brand of identity formation analogous to Scott's formulation in *Freedom Writers*. It is via this extension of performance that I will consider how the dramatic representation of men disguised as schoolmasters both reflects and affects the period's professionalization movement.

If a practicing educator like Erin has the potential to will her performance as a teacher because she "says so," what prevents those outside the field from harnessing the same generative abilities? If established schoolmasters who are textually and publicly recognized by their work, such as Gerald and Holofernes of the Shakespeare plays featured in the previous chapter, fail in the performance of profession to which they lay claim as educators, what happens when outsiders to the field don the robes of the schoolmaster to "tread" the stage? What if the experiences of performance and teaching become interchangeable to the point that the process of professionalization becomes accessible to anyone capable of deploying the self-convincing logic advanced by Scott in *Freedom Writers*? To approach these questions, I will consider how early modern dramatic representations of characters masquerading as schoolmasters stage a brand of professionalization predicated on self-fashioning, a politics of identity formation coined

by Stephen Greenblatt, which he locates in sixteenth-century England.[94] In my examination of three plays that feature characters who disguise themselves as schoolmasters, including John Redford's early Tudor morality play entitled *The Play of Wyt and Science*, Shakespeare's comedy *The Taming of the Shrew*, and Thomas Dekker and John Webster's collaboration *Westward Ho,* I will propose that the pedagogical nexus of performance and teaching integral to the emergent educational profession in the early modern period also participates in shaping the contemporary process of professionalization. I ultimately intend to demonstrate that the actors who play characters who themselves play schoolmasters destabilize the foundations of the profession they purport to represent via their staged representation.

Teaching as Performance, Teaching is Performance

Before we confine our focus to the early modern stage, it is helpful to contextualize the literary implications of performing the profession in disguise by exploring how twentieth- and twenty-first-century pedagogical literature intervenes in a similar discourse. A range of handbooks, guides, and critical articles instructs today's prospective and practicing educators on the best ways to incorporate elements of theatrical performance into their practice—in essence, theorizing the very sorts of professional performances staged in an era during which such pedagogical literature was

[94] See Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980). In his study, Greenblatt pinpoints the sixteenth century as a cultural and historical epoch in which a heightened sense of self existed, leading to the possibility for subjects to fashion their identity in response to and in accordance with surrounding institutions and antithetical, alien others. There was in the period, what the author calls, an "increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process " (2). In my analysis of plays in which characters masquerade as schoolmasters, I will deploy the terminology of Greenblatt's theory to reference a particular manifestation of self-fashioning that entails performing another's profession.

nonexistent. Although none of these sources directly advocates disguise, each does support a brand of theatricality that works in the service of creating and upholding a professional identity.[95] It is also worth noting that all of the current pedagogical literature cited below assumes the existence of the teaching profession—even if it is still in process or not fully recognized by society as a whole. For my part, I intend to expose the potential for outsiders to appropriate the same techniques to impersonate, or perform as, teachers—essentially becoming educators themselves.

When viewed as a performative profession, the office of the educator is theoretically open and accessible to anyone who can act as a teacher, regardless of that person's formal qualifications or legitimacy. This sort of accessibility, which is represented in the examples of early modern drama I will cite below by non-educators disguising themselves as schoolmasters, is at once empowering and disempowering to the state of the teaching profession as a whole. As much as the work of a teacher in any era corresponds to a set of established expectations, classroom practice or performance has the potential to be dynamic or improvisational. The potential and expectation for role-playing in the classroom and on stage would seem to complicate any fixed guarantee of professional status; however, these same theatrical tropes are considered valid pedagogical strategies by a certain number of today's educational theorists. There are some practitioners—like professor, lawyer, and playwright Jyl Lynn Felman—who conceive of their professional identity as educators squarely in terms of performance.

---

[95] Robert T. Tauber and Cathy Sargent Mester in *Acting Lessons for Teachers: Using Performance Skills in the Classroom* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006) explain the ubiquity of acting in everyday life, and while acknowledging the potential for deception, they ultimately dismiss it as a key use of performance: "Acting, then, for most of us, is not used to deceive, but to stimulate, convince, and instruct" (25). In my look at the plays featured in this chapter, I will consider the disguises employed as means of deception, but I will also acknowledge the stimulating, convincing, and instructive potentials of these disguised schoolmasters in an effort to gauge how this sort of dramatic representation of the profession might affect professionalization.

In her 2001 study *Never a Dull Moment: Teaching and the Art of Performance*, Felman attributes the success of her feminist pedagogy to her seamless embrace and implementation of performance art in the classroom. She chronicles her evolution as an educator and roots her identities as a scholar and feminist in her conscious decision to become a performer in the classroom. In the preface to her academic memoir, Felman explains how she cast herself as a performer in order to foster her growth as a learner and teacher: "To understand myself as a woman playing the *role* of a professor became the basis of my intellectual inquiry" (xvii, emphasis in original).[96] Because she infused her pedagogy with performance, Felman explains that her role as a professor and her performance of that role became indistinguishable trappings of her pedagogy.[97] For this reason, she makes no distinction between performance and teaching in her later reflections on her professional identity, musing: "This is performing. No, this is teaching. Actually, it is performing teaching. But the form is unrecognizable" (11). Felman teaches to perform and performs to teach. Refusing to separate form from content, she purports to reach a level of professional authenticity that is steeped in the tradition of performance.

Margaret Edson, author of the 1999 Pulitzer Prize-winning play *Wit*, echoes Felman by citing the lack of distinction she finds in the pursuits of teaching and playwrighting—two occupations she has held at separate times in her life. Formerly a successful playwright, Edson now makes her living as a sixth-grade teacher, while still

---

[96] Felman in *Never a Dull Moment: Teaching and the Art of Performance: Feminism Takes Center Stage* (New York: Routledge, 2001) also notes how she she transformed her classroom into a "permanent stage" on which, as she explains, her daily performances had "become the praxis and axis on which the turn of my feminist pedagogy revolv[ed]" (xvii).

[97] Contrasting performing with professing, Felman in *Never a Dull Moment* embraces the attendant precariousness of the former, while citing the predictability of the latter: "Performing is always precarious. Professing, on the other hand, is much more reliable and far less controversial" (33).

managing to conceive of her craft in theatrical terms. She equates her previous occupation of playwright with her current station as a teacher, explaining in an interview with the *New York Times*: "The difference between teaching and play-writing is not incomprehensible to me, they're not so different. They both create a public event that leads to understanding" (McGrath 4). This lack of distinction between performance and teaching common to both Felman's pedagogy and Edson's practice represents a synthesis among performance, pedagogy, and professionalism. The fusion of theater to teaching allows both practitioners to cultivate their identities as performing teachers, while achieving success in their classrooms.

A number of experts and practicing teachers argue that the link between performance and teaching is a pedagogical necessity—one that must be openly recognized for the sake of success in the classroom. In their handbook entitled *Acting Lessons for Teachers: Using Performance Skills in the Classroom*, Robert T. Tauber and Cathy Sargent Mester insist that actively acknowledging the existence and potentials of this link will lead to improvements in teachers' practice.[98] The authors announce their intentions to "convince readers that there is an acting-teaching parallel that once recognized…and adopted, will improve their effectiveness as classroom teachers" (Tauber and Mester 4). In their view, these experiences of recognition and adoption are predicated on a model of application. When teachers "recognize the lessons to be learned from the world of actors and actresses and the stage and cinema environment that make

[98] Elyse Pineau in "Teaching is Performance: Reconceptualizing a Problematic Metaphor," *American Educational Research Journal* 31.1 (1994) offers a more limited—if not cynical—appraisal of the potential classroom benefits of incorporating performance as part of one's teaching, arguing that "the claim that teaching is performance will evoke nothing beyond the facile acknowledgement that a certain theatricality can help hold the attention of drowsy undergraduates in early morning or late afternoon classes" (5).

up their world," they have the ability to draw "from the actor's world" in order to apply these lessons to their own world as teachers (4). What is significant about a guide like Tauber and Mester's in the context of this project is not so much its content, but the professional implications of its content. They argue that the key to any teacher's success is the accompanying knowledge as to why he or she is successful. Lack of this understanding causes teachers to "stop being professionals, and teaching stops being a profession" (25). Yet, how can teaching persist in being its own profession and teachers be regarded as professionals when the potential for success of one profession is located in another profession? Whether the analogy between teaching and performance ultimately supports the integrity of the profession or destabilizes it is a matter of critical debate, as will be revealed below.

Harry A. Dawe in his essay "Teaching: A Performing Art" argues in support of upholding the analogy, contending that redefining teaching as a performing art will improve teachers' standings in the long run. Whereas Felman and Edson detail their personal stories of naturally blending teaching and performance in their careers, Dawe adopts a wider, more social stance. He argues that "teaching is, in reality, a performing art—and that the selection, training, career guidance, working conditions, and mode of compensation should be patterned on the practices that characterize other performing arts" (549). In essence, Dawe deconstructs the profession of teaching as we know it and seeks to incorporate it within an already established profession: the performing arts. When regarded as an offshoot of performance, aspects once particular to the teaching profession become integrated and reclassified according to the structures that already govern the world of the performing arts. As a result, Dawe imagines a "teaching studio"

to replace traditional schools of education, which would be modeled after the theatrical stage. He argues that prospective teachers "should be auditioned, not tested" as part of their training (Dawe 549). For Dawe, reform is ultimately at stake: "Without a radical shift in our view of teaching, even the best reform measures will accomplish little" (552). Felman argues from her position as a feminist scholar performing teaching and claims: "The integrity of the classroom is at stake" (14). But, what about the integrity of the profession? How might the analogy between performance and teaching be a disservice to the profession and its membership?

As much as this intersection between performance and teaching holds potential benefits for personal growth, pedagogical success, or radical reform, enforcing this link also threatens to destabilize—or even obfuscate—the profession as we have come to know it. Even Felman, a staunch advocate of performance pedagogy, acknowledges the difficulties associated with this combination of teaching and performance, explaining that "turn[ing] the classroom from lecture hall to center stage is to risk being misunderstood by both colleagues and students" (8). Elyse Lamm Pineau cites more than the potential for misunderstanding when establishing the equivalency of teaching and performance. In her article, "Teaching is Performance: Reconceptualizing a Problematic Metaphor," Pineau argues against critics like Felman who frame teaching and performance as inextricably and axiomatically linked. In Pineau's view, the experiences of teaching and performance are necessarily separate, and equating them is unsound: "Educational and theatrical stages are not identical, and the aesthetic responsibilities and conversations of the educational performer are not the same as those that govern stage performers" (9).

She also objects to critics like Dawe who advocate the link between performance and teaching as a means to overhaul the designs of teaching as a profession.[99]

Associating the work of performance and teaching advances what Pineau calls a "theoretical claim" that is "highly problematic, if not overtly polemical to institutionalized assumptions about the purpose of education and one's function as an educator" (4). She bases her argument on the popular associations held by the general populace regarding the nature of performance. Noting that performance "still holds a largely pejorative meaning for the cultural psyche" since it is "associated with pretense, artifice, deception, affectation, and entertainment," Pineau attempts to expose the analogy as ultimately dangerous for the integrity of the profession since it threatens to deconstruct it, or at the very least render it something it is not (4). Felman, on the other hand, actually encourages such deconstruction brought on by the analogy:

> To view the professor in terms of performance is to break the professorial mold, which then turns the classroom into a 'spectacle' in the dramatic sense, *not* in a Disney-cartooned but predictable sensibility. And when the entire production is viewed as such, the explosion, disruption, and/or departure becomes a spectacular, pedagogic fireworks display—an event to watch, appreciate, and applaud in all its colorful insightful splendor but not to take too personally (that response would be basic Freudian narcissism and not credible behavior in the classroom). (27, emphasis in original)

[99] Pineau in "Teaching is Performance" responds to articles like Dawe's, "which might be loosely categorized around the 'teacher-as-actor' and 'teacher-as-artist' metaphors," which "rely on a reductive, actor-centered model that impoverishes both educational and performative experience" (6).

Based on Felman's experiences and theories, to "break the professorial mold" is to achieve pedagogical results that are impossible without performance. Although she ultimately cites the benefits of adopting performance pedagogies, it is imperative we consider that enforcing the analogy between teaching and performance nevertheless involves the destruction of an established mold—whether professorial or professional in nature.

Supporters of the performance analogy tend to assume that only those teachers already included in the profession will have access to this brand of pedagogy. However, if we allow for the possibility that non-educators may perform in positions now held by established teachers, our appraisal of the profession's integrity must change. When applied to the early modern stage, Felman's notion of "performing teaching" acquires an entirely new level of significance if we consider the disruptive potential of non-educators willfully assuming the roles claimed by already practicing and recognized schoolmasters because they essentially "say so" through disguise. In the three plays that I examine in this chapter, several characters variously abandon their everyday personas and professions to masquerade as schoolmasters.[100] Unlike the moonlighting schoolmasters of the previous chapter who engage in extraneous performances outside their classrooms,

[100] Moonlighting in the teaching profession is a well-documented occurrence, and a body of research exists explaining its ramifications on the profession as a whole. See, for example, Jeffrey A. Raffel and Lance R. Groff, "Shedding Light on the Dark Side of Teacher Moonlighting," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 12.4 (1990) and Janis N. Parham and Stephan P. Gordon "Moonlighting: A Harsh Reality for Many Teachers," *The Phi Delta Kappan* 92.5 (2011). Raffel and Groff in "Shedding Light" attribute high incidence of moonlighting as "an indicator of teacher dissatisfaction and the low status of this career," which in their esteem, "harm[s] the education of children and lead[s] to the exit of many teachers" (404). In my use of the term "moonlighting," I consider the entrance of people into the profession who irrespective of the era, fall into teaching from other positions which they continue to maintain. In my analysis that follows, I will consider how the performance of teaching via disguise enacts a brand of moonlighting that holds similarly destructive consequences for the status of the profession.

the schoolmasters staged in this chapter operate in the reverse: they enter the profession from the outside to perform in professional capacities to which they hold no prior claim.

By disguising themselves as teachers, these on-stage characters engage in what I will describe as a modification of Greenblatt's theory of Renaissance self-fashioning in which they harness the tropes of improvisation and roleplaying to achieve their own agendas. Greenblatt defines improvisation as "the ability both to capitalize on the unforeseen and to transform given materials into one's own scenario" (227), while role-playing, according to him, is "the transformation of another's reality into a manipulable fiction" (228). In disguising themselves as schoolmasters, these characters render the schoolmaster's professional status, or reality, a "manipulable fiction," as a result of their improvisation, or performance of that profession. This performance is already built into teachers' work and to this day is encouraged as a valid pedagogical and professional strategy as demonstrated above by the body of pedagogical literature, which encourages this analogy. When we consider self-fashioning as a means of achieving professionalization, the performances of the schoolmaster's profession more important than characters simply donning disguises. The staging of these masquerading schoolmasters who freely act in the capacity of textually established and tacitly recognized professionals makes visible the overall precariousness of the profession, representing for the audience how claiming professional status is perhaps also a matter of performance in the wider world just as it is on stage.

Masquerading Schoolmasters: Manipulating Professions on the Early Modern Stage

Playing the Schoolmaster, "if need be," in John Redford's The Play of Wyt and Science

Probably written sometime between 1530-1550, John Redford's *The Play of Wyt and Science* serves as an appropriate starting place for locating the masquerading schoolmaster in early modern drama, as it features the vice character, Idleness, effortlessly making this occupational shift based on the power of her own say-so. Featuring a series of disguises and mistaken identities as part of its plot, Redford's Tudor morality play, which borrows from the medieval tradition, stages the allegorical journey of Wyt who pursues Science, the daughter of Reason and Experience. Aided by the virtuous companions Instruction, Diligence, and Study, Wyt must choose the best route to Science, which is paved by various distractions and obstacles along the way. However, his decision to ignore the wisdom of Instruction causes him to be felled by the monster Tediousness. Revived by Honest Recreation, Wyt soon falls into the arms of Idleness who lulls him to sleep and renders him temporarily unrecognizable by swapping his clothes with Ignorance's, her charge. It is at this point that Idleness steps into the role of schoolmistress to (mis)educate Ignorance in an extended comic interlude. With blackened face and wearing Ignorance's coat, Wyt spends the second half of the play attempting to recover his former identity and atoning for his missteps; his success leads to his betrothal to Science by the play's end.

Wyt's identity shift occurs as a consequence of his refusal to listen to his companions, whose moral identities collectively support a virtuous education. Instruction, Diligence, and Study maintain their virtuous forms and social stations

throughout the play, yet they initially fail in guiding Wyt on his journey—despite their claims to authority. Idleness, on the other hand, freely assumes the professional identity of a schoolmistress and instructs Ignorance in a mock schoolroom scene. Although Idleness's work as an educator is ultimately corruptive, she does manage to subvert the integrity of the profession she performs to serve her own purposes. When regarded as part of the play's performance history as a school play acted by child choristers, Idleness' masquerade as a schoolmistress acquires a greater significance than her character's rather short stage presence might suggest.[101]

Therefore, it is important to situate the play generically as an example of the morality tradition, which also carries a rich educational and professional subtext. As a morality play, *Wyt and Science* allegorizes the virtues and vices of human behavior on stage, while at the same time serving a distinct civic purpose in "strengthen[ing] ideas about social hierarchy and the healthy body politic" (Sikorska 21). The content of Redford's play is also informed by the playwright's occupational background as an educator and choirmaster. Victor I. Scherb reminds audiences that this morality play is also at its base "a school play," which "provided Redford with an opportunity to reflect upon the obstacles facing an early sixteenth-century educator and his pupils, as well as the potential rewards of successfully overcoming them" (272). One of the play's chief "obstacles" in this regard, I argue, is Idleness whose interference in and appropriation of key tenets of Redford's profession are staged as part of his play's plot.

---

[101] Victor I. Scherb in "Playing at Maturity in John Redford's *Wit and Science*," *SEL* 45.2 (2005) conjectures that these child performers "were probably drawn from two sources: the humanist school founded by John Colet, and a singing school whose existence dated back to at least the late fourteenth century" (271). As Scherb further explains, this singing school, "the much smaller St. Paul's choir school" was headed by the playwright himself (271).

How does a vice character like Idleness manage to commandeer a profession from its established practitioners? How is her occupation of the schoolmaster's office similar to Instruction's or Study's? How does Redford's staging of Idleness as a schoolmistress represent the profession of which he is part? Much of Idleness' success stems from Wyt's misrecognition of himself and others—particularly those who virtuously represent the learned professions. As Wyt consults his entourage in the initial stages of his journey, he blatantly ignores Instruction's advice and dismisses the utility of Study—the character, pursuit, and career. Responding to Instruction's open solicitation of Study's input, Wyt explains: "No, syr, ye know Studyes ofyce is / Meete for the chamber, not for the feeld; / But tell me, Studye, wylt thow now yeld?" (Redford 6). Wyt regards Study as an ineffectual presence on his journey and relegates him to the closed quarters of his chamber. Study heeds Wyt's banishment and retreats from the field along with Instruction. By removing themselves from the journey, Instruction and Study essentially erase their presence from the audience's frame of reference, allowing a character like Idleness to insinuate herself in their place as an instructor.

Another instance of misrecognition on Wyt's part allows Idleness to overtake him and exert her power as a schoolmistress. When Honest Recreation comes on the scene to revive Wyt from his fall at the hands of Tediousness, Wyt has difficulty distinguishing virtue from vice. He orders Idleness and Honest Recreation to "Declare yourselves both now as ye be" (18). Idleness responds to Wyt's petition by projecting her character onto Honest Recreation's, causing Wyt added difficulties in distinguishing between the pair. Scherb reads Wyt's misrecognition as a function of the play's structural pattern of

"doubling," which he argues causes the characters and their allegorical representations to fold into one another:

> The paradox—which Redford's play illustrates—is that these social practices could be identical, that the difference between healthful recreation and harmful idleness was often a matter of degree rather than of kind, and that distinguishing between the two calls for a complex combination of self-examination and worldly experience that we would now identify with maturity. (273)

Lacking such perspective and experience, Wyt fails to distinguish vice from virtue, causing the abstractions of Idleness and Honest Recreation to dissolve into one another. As Scherb puts it, "the two women are indistinguishable, free-floating signifiers unattached to any meaningful semiotic system" (278). One such "system" from which these characters become detached is the system of professions, which allows Idleness to assume with ease the pedagogical positions vacated by Wyt's former companions. She does so through what amounts to a simple, uncontested declaration of her status.

With Wyt asleep across her lap, Idleness occupies the stage uncontested. She capitalizes on her singular presence by touting for the audience her ability to work—despite her name. Idleness explains her capabilities in the third person by confronting her detractors:

> Sum say that Idlenes can not warke,
>
> But those that so say now let them marke.
>
> I trowe they shall see that Idlenes
>
> Can set herselfe abowt sum busyness.
>
> Or at the lest, ye shall see her tryde,

Nother idle nor well occupyde. (Redford 19-20).

Idleness cultivates an audience and essentially forces that audience into recognizing, or "marking" her refashioned identity that takes shape before them. The "busyness" she undertakes is that which Instruction and Study previously held, as she becomes a schoolmistress by the powers of self-fashioning.

Idleness summons Ignorance to the stage to serve in the capacity of her student, and she offers another bold declaration to the audience in which she announces her new role, saying that "men shall know / That Idlenes can do sumwhat, ye, / And play the schoolmiytress to, yf neede bee" (20). Idleness' pronouncement is remarkable for both its nonchalance and rhetoric of performance. For Idleness, becoming a schoolmistress is a matter of say-so that evokes the same sort of logic used by Scott in his affirmation of Erin's status in the line from *Freedom Writers* that opens this chapter. The vice character of Redford's play couches her "warke" in terms of playing a part—one that she can assume extemporaneously "yf neede bee." With the need having arisen, Idleness sets out to school Ignorance by teaching him to recite his own name. Through a series of fits and starts, the newly minted schoolmistress appears to achieve the impossible by teaching someone who exhibits the profound lack of knowledge indicated by his name. Using a suite of mnemonic devices and relying on rote drills, Idleness coerces Ignorance to string together a series of syllables that form the word "ignoramus."

Satisfied with Ignorance's accomplishment of the task at hand, Idleness checks her work by asking her student what he has learned, to which he responds: "Ich can not tell" (28). In a world governed by Science, Wyt's ultimate destination in the play, Ignorance's admission of uncertainty would be out of place. However, under Idleness'

rule, her student's maintenance of his identity goes according to plan, as she offers the following rejoinder: "Ich can not tell, thow sayst evyn very well. / For yf thow cowldst tell, then had not I well / Towght the thy lesson, which must be tawghte / To tell all, when thow canst tell ryghte noght" (28). In masquerading as a schoolmistress, Idleness' education produces negative results, which she heralds as a success. Although she performs educational work, her teaching produces emptiness and perpetuates further instances of misrecognition, as she exchanges Wyt's coat of Science for Ignorance's costume. Appareled in Wyt's garments, Ignorance announces to the audience "He is I now" (30). His new clothes apparel him with a new identity, and he proudly lays claim to the same self-fashioning logic that allowed his schoolmistress to establish her "busyness" as an educator.

Wyt experiences the same fate as Ignorance when he awakens from his slumber and resumes his journey unaware that his clothes cause him to resemble Ignorance. As Liliana Sikorska explains Wyt's transformation, "The change in his inner disposition is stressed by his outer appearance" (35). Wyt's altered appearance leads to his *de facto* performance of Ignorance's role.[102] He is duly recognized by Science as a product of Idleness' school upon their reunion:

> I take ye for no naturall foole,
>
> Browght up among the inocentes schoole,
>
> But for a nawgty vicious foole
>
> Browght up with Idellnes in her scoole!
>
> Of all arrogant fooles thow art one! (Redford 41).

[102] Scherb in "Playing at Maturity" casts Ignorance as a "powerful symbol of Wit's own lack of self-knowledge," who "presents, in extreme form, his apparent inability to learn from others" (285).

Until Shame arrives on the scene to scourge Wyt for his missteps and rampant misrecognition, Idleness and her work reign supreme. The educational work that she performs in her school achieves results—however debilitating or corruptive they may be.

As a professional representation, she secures the uncontested recognition that seems to elude other claimants to the office, like Instruction and Study, who have been banished from the field entirely. Although Instruction returns to the play and rehabilitates Wyt after he suffers at the hands of Shame, the damage Idleness does to the emergent profession is not as easily erased from memory. By allegorizing the character of Idleness in his morality play, Redford not only depicts the conventional vices associated with such a disposition, but he also reveals a potential vulnerability in the profession that he himself represents in his daily life. Idleness' ability to capitalize on potentials for misrecognition that surround already established schoolmasters allows her to carve out a space in which she arbitrarily claims professional status in ways that her more upright counterparts do not. Her manipulation of Honest Recreation's virtues and her appropriation of common pedagogical structures result in her rendering her "warke" through performance. Her success as a performer leads to her qualified success as a professional—despite her having no prior claim to the status of a schoolmistress before she decided the "neede" existed.

"You will be schoolmaster": Professionalization as Expediency in The Taming of the Shrew

In Redford's morality play, Idleness achieves recognition as a schoolmistress only when the play's other educators are misrecognized. Wyt's confusion makes visible for

audiences both the tenuousness of recognition when it is used as a criterion of professional status and the arbitrariness associated with the conferral of that status. As Idleness proves, her becoming a teacher is as simple as her deciding to perform the part. In Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* (1592), two wealthy suitors similarly regard professionalization as a means to an end, and they disguise themselves as schoolmasters to gain access to the object of their mutual affection, Bianca whose father, Baptista, prevents her from marrying until he finds someone to wed his other daughter, Katherine, the shrew of the title. Until they can find someone willing to marry Katherine, Hortensio and Lucentio devise parallel strategies to pursue Bianca by gaining entry to her household as schoolmasters. For the two men, laying claim to their new professional identities is as simple as changing their names and clothes. Hortensio transforms into Licio, the music master, while Lucentio assumes the alias of Cambio, the Latin master. Like Idleness whose manipulations of the profession expose its precariousness, Shakespeare's masquerading schoolmasters exploit their new offices to accomplish their own ends, while pretending to perform educational work. However, their work is an elaborate front for their attempts to seduce Bianca, which I will argue trivializes the work of established professionals who regard their status as educators as something beyond expediency.

While much of the scholarly conversation surrounding Shakespeare's early comedy centers on the playwright's staging of the interaction between Kate and Petruccio, the tamer of the shrew, a body of criticism establishes the play as a pedagogical artifact, which "puts education—a humanist education in the liberal arts—into the foreground immediately" (K. Walker 192). Dennis S. Brooks argues that the

play's "disparate themes, anomalies…coalesce into a dramatic unity when framed by the broader Renaissance debate over education" (7).[103] The play also depicts a number of pedagogies staged as part of the action and enforced for the audience. Katherine A. Sirluck, for example, classifies the play's pedagogy as one built around learning the structures "of dominance and submission" in a patriarchal society (420). Alyssa Herzog, on the other hand, argues that the play "propose[s] a pedagogy of observation," which extends beyond the world of the play to reach the audience (192). In my analysis of the play, I would like to invert Herzog's formulation to suggest that *The Taming of the Shrew* also allows for the audience's observation of pedagogy in action. When regarded as an educational play, therefore, the scenes featuring the wooing schoolmasters take on a greater meaning, as the profession they represent is highly conspicuous when we consider how they manipulate it to serve their own amorous designs. Yet, in the process, Lucentio and Hortensio appear to conduct educational work, which offers a competing—if not destabilizing—challenge to others' claim to the same work.

Whether we consider Petruccio's efforts to wrangle Kate into submission or the masquerading Latin and music masters' designs to woo Bianca, Shakespeare's play is "bound up with the education of a woman" (K. Walker 193). Lucentio and Hortensio are two of "several pedagogues in this play," including Kate herself who "becomes a mock-pedagogue when she ties her sister's hands behind her back and beats her, both for planning to marry and for being more loved" (Sirluck 422). For Lucentio and Hortensio,

---

[103] Dennis S. Brooks in "'To Show Scorn Her Own Image': The Varieties of Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 48.1 (1994) borrows a concept from Sir Philip Sidney to suggest that Shakespeare's comedy enacts "an eikastic education" in which the theater and classroom fold into one educational venue (8). Brooks elaborates on his comparison, stating: "Throughout *The Shrew*'s various plots, the eikastic function of mimetic art is contrasted with the contintental theories of rote learning and tutorials in quadrivium and trivium subjects" (13).

becoming a "mock-pedagogue" provides the surest and most convenient access to Baptista's house and daughter. The Paduan gentleman, however, is under the impression that the schoolmasters he seeks for his daughter will come from within the profession. As a result, he puts out a call for recommendations of two individuals "[f]it to instruct her youth" who are also "cunning," or skillful men (Shakespeare, *Shrew* I.i.95, 97). Upon learning of Baptista's needs, Lucentio and Hortensio set plans in motion to remake themselves to achieve the "fit" Bianca's father desires—despite their lack of any previous claim to the office of schoolmaster.

Having arrived from Pisa to undertake in Padua "[a] course of learning and ingenious studies" (*Shrew* I.i.9), Lucentio rapidly changes plans and forgoes his identity as a student to assume that of the schoolmaster once Bianca becomes the elusive object of his affections. Lucentio's transformation to the writing master Cambio, whose name in Italian translates as "change," hinges on an elaborate role-playing scheme involving the support of his servant, Tranio. Anticipating the path his master will take to win Bianca's love, Trainio confidently surmises: "You will be schoolmaster / And undertake the teaching of the maid. / That's your device" (*Shrew* I.i.185-87). Lucentio answers in the affirmative and orders Tranio to occupy his station, while he plays the role of the schoolmaster. Like Lucentio, Hortensio will also become something he is not in order to "be the schoolmaster," and he seeks Petruccio's aid in recommending him to Baptista in this capacity.

Hortensio—soon to become Licio—explains to his servant Grumio that his tenure as schoolmaster will be nothing more than the expedient required to gain access to the Minola household and Bianca:

Now shall my friend Petruccio do me grace,

And offer me disguised in sober robes

To old Baptista as a schoolmaster

Well seen in music, to instruct Bianca,

That so I may by this device at least

Have leave and leisure to make love to her,

And unsuspected court her by herself. (*Shrew* I.ii.125-31)

Hortensio makes no pretense about how he regards the position that he will occupy, framing it as a "device." Becoming a schoolmaster will grant him "leave and leisure" rather than any sort of professional or intellectual fulfillment. Entering Baptista's house—and by extension the internal structure of the profession—requires Hortensio to be outfitted in "sober robes." This visual marker of his status coupled with his alleged skills prove enough in the world of the play to allow him and his counterpart Lucentio to perform a profession in which neither of them has a place and to which neither of them has any claim. Nevertheless, as their respective encounters with Bianca demonstrate, both disguised schoolmasters offer a convincing enough presence that they are recognized as schoolmasters whom Baptista receives into his home without reservation.[104]

---

[104] Several critics seek to understand the play's portrayal of Bianca's education against the backdrop of its historical context. Alyssa Herzog in "Modeling Gender Education in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Tamer Tamed*," *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncreif and Kathryn R. McPherson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011) argues that the curriculum proposed by Lucentio and Hortensio, which contains music, philosophy, Latin, and Greek, "remains something of an anomaly" when applied to female students (194). When it comes to the age of Bianca's instructors, Kim Walker in "Wrangling Pedantry: Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance*, ed. Lloyd Davis (Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 2003) notes that the tutors' youth "also works against the strictures of the humanist pedagogues who argued, with a similar anxiety in mind, that daughters should be educated by either women or by grave old men" (196). The only "grave" man in the

Act II begins with Baptista opening his home to the two masquerading schoolmasters who come to him with the recommendations of Petruccio and Gremio, speaking on behalf of Hortensio and Lucentio, respectively. Attired in "the habit of a mean man" (*Shrew* II.i), Lucentio arrives on scene looking the part he is about to play in an effort to woo Bianca. Petruccio offers Hortensio as an entrance fee of sorts so that he may gain access to Baptista's other daughter, Kate: "And for an entrance to my entertainment / I do present you with a man of mine / Cunning in music and the mathematics / To instruct her fully in those sciences" (*Shrew* II.i.54-57). Whereas Petruccio's recommendation of Hortensio as Licio is both self-serving and manufactured for the sake of his friend, Gremio genuinely believes he is doing himself a favor by introducing Baptista to Cambio, whose actual identity remains unknown to Gremio. Not to be outdone by Petruccio and his presentation of Licio, Gremio similarly offers Cambio as a gift to the wealthy father:

> To express the like kindness, myself, that have been more
> kindly beholden to you than any, freely give unto you this
> young scholar that hath been long
> studying at Rheims, as cunning in Greek, Latin, and other
> languages as the other in music and mathematics. His name
> is Cambio. Pray accept his service. (*Shrew* II.i.77-82).

Baptista gladly obliges by receiving the gifts presented to him in the form of the two schoolmasters. He officially welcomes them both into his household and bids a servant who greets them at the door to tell his daughters to "use them well" (*Shrew* II.i.108).

---

play who happens to be a schoolmaster does not actually serve in an educational capacity and is instead roped into standing in for Lucentio's father, in a scene which will be detailed below.

Taking little more into account than Petruccio's and Germio's word, Baptista's "cursory acceptance" of the schoolmasters highlights his "cavalier attitude" toward the education of his daughters (D. Brooks 15). His attitude toward the schoolmasters also extends to his view of their assumed profession. Baptista commodifies the schoolmasters as objects to be used, which conforms to the play's overall representation of the profession as a means to an end.

While Petruccio and Gremio "use" the Latin and music masters as bargaining chips to ingratiate themselves with Baptista, Lucentio and Hortensio "use" the profession they (mis)represent to gain access to Bianca. Both disguised schoolmasters engage in a "struggle over priority" in which they perform various gambits, under the auspices of educating Bianca, to win her love (K. Walker 196). Representing the quadrivium and trivium subjects, respectively, Hortensio and Lucentio appear to provide "Baptista's daughters a complete curriculum" (D. Brooks 15).[105] However, when it comes to their actual modes of instruction, both Licio and Cambio deviate from convention to plead their cases to Bianca, using the professions they represent as "mere pretense for seduction" (D. Brooks 17). In delivering his Latin instruction to Bianca, Lucentio as Cambio reveals his true identity and the reason for his disguise "that we might beguile the old / pantaloon" via a manufactured exercise in translation (Shakespeare, *Shrew* III.i.35-36). Hortensio follows Lucentio's lead and presents Bianca with a musical scale, which he personalizes with a plea for her love.

[105] Brooks in "Varieties" associates the schoolmasters' collective pedagogy—its pretense notwithstanding—to the "regimented rote-learning favored by Continental theorists and the English grammar school tradition" (18).

The posturing music master explains to his student the reasons for beginning with the gamut, or scale by saying:

> Madam, before you touch the instrument
> To learn the order of my fingering,
> I must begin with rudiments of my art,
> To teach you gamut in a briefer sort,
> More pleasant, pithy, and effectual
> Than hath been taught by any of my trade;
> And there it is in writing, fairly drawn. (*Shrew* III.i.62-68)

In his attempts to identify with the profession he pretends to have joined, Hortensio emphasizes his ultimate separation from the role he plays. He claims personal ownership when referring to his discipline, or "art," and his profession, or "trade." Yet, he further underscores the pretense of his character in his attempts to distinguish himself as one who can teach the gamut more quickly and more effectively than others in a profession to which he has no prior claim.

Despite the undeniable illegitimacy that unifies Hortensio and his counterpart in their status as schoolmasters, they come to perform more educational work than the lone schoolmaster in the play who arrives in Act IV. In order to approve Lucentio's marriage to Bianca, Baptista requires that Vincentio, Lucentio's father, corroborate the large sum promised to her. Because Vincentio is away from the action, Tranio, who is impersonating his master, must find a stand-in to play the part. He finds this actor in an aged pedant, or schoolmaster, who makes his way into town and is recognized by his apparel and grave visage. Convinced by Tranio that his life depends on his playing

Vincentio, the Pedant is instructed to abandon his personal identity to become someone he is not. The schoolmaster also sheds his profession, as he goes from the instructor to the instructed when heeding Tranio's directives: "In all these circumstances I'll instruct you. / Go with me to clothe you as becomes you" (*Shrew* IV.ii.121-22). The Pedant's transformation from pedagogue to Vincentio's double is predicated on an outfit change and some coaching from Tranio who has accumulated experience as a performer in playing the role of his master.

In the character of the Pedant, "we are presented with a man who is positioned as a master and servant, a substitute father and at the same time a rather foolish nonentity" (K. Walker 199). Walker's description of the Pedant, the play's only authentic representation of a schoolmaster, as a "nonentity" parallels the portrayals of Gerald and Holofernes (discussed in Chapter 4) who similarly find themselves performing outside their profession in their interactions with the world that lies beyond their schools. With a change of clothes, the Pedant is stripped of his station and forced to "become" something other than what he represents on a daily basis, leaving his work by the wayside. For the play's schoolmasters—established or not—not only does their work become guise, but so also does the profession they represent.[106] Lucentio and Hortensio exploit "the trappings of pedagogy in a twisted way" in their efforts to gain access to Bianca (Sirluck 422). In the process, they also empty the profession of its still developing significance by demonstrating how easy it is for them to lay claim to its status. The Pedant's professional status and his claim to that status are erased just as expediently as Lucentio and Hortensio

[106] Brooks in "Varieties" offers the following on the various guises at work in the play: "While Bianca's suitors court her under the guise of education, Petruchio educates Kate under the guise of courtship" (20). In my analysis of the play, I consider what happens to the status of the schoolmaster's office when his profession is manipulated as a guise for other work.

create it for themselves when his only work in the play is to perform as Vincentio. In *The Taming of the Shrew*, the schoolmaster's professional status is represented as a means to an end that is freely manipulated (and occupied) via costuming and performance to allow for the pursuit of other, seemingly more important work.

"A rare Scholemaister, for all kind of handes": The Business of Manipulation in Westward Ho

Of all the masquerading schoolmasters examined thus far, Justiniano from Dekker and Webster's city comedy *Westward Ho* (1607) represents the pinnacle of disguise and performance. The Italian merchant based in London essentially stakes his financial livelihood and masculine identity on his ability to manipulate both his appearance and professional station. Justiniano's anxiety over being cuckolded leads him to hatch a plan to monitor his wife and her fellow citizen wives by remaking himself as a schoolmaster. Actually remaining in London after publicly announcing that his debts have occasioned a trip abroad to Stade in Germany, Justiniano in Dekker and Webster's play occupies a more central and exclusive position than the masquerading schoolmasters featured above in Redford's morality play and Shakespeare's comedy.

In *Westward Ho*, Justiniano operates in a world in which no dramatic counter to his disguised identity exists. Unlike Idleness, who usurps her power from the virtuous offices of Instruction, Study, and Honest Recreation, or Lucentio and Hortensio, who offer instruction instead of the play's only actual Pedant, Justiniano is a free radical who drives the plot. Even as a poseur to the profession, Justiniano emerges as the play's sole representation of the schoolmaster based on his appearance and work, allowing him to

enjoy instant, uncontested recognition in his adopted role. His singular existence in the play's educational landscape thus exacerbates the precariousness of established educators whose hard fought claims to professional status are rooted in something beyond superficiality and self-fashioning.

In describing Justiniano's character, critics unite in classifying him according to a lexicon of management, control, and manipulation. Simon Morgan-Russell accentuates Justiniano's managerial tendencies in stating that the play's "intrigue is managed principally" by him (71). Charles R. Forker offers a less neutral explanation of the masquerading merchant's role, framing him as a "clever manipulator" and later dubbing him the "master-intriguer" and "chief-controller" of the play's overarching and overlapping plots (3, 8, 9). Situating Justiniano's manipulative tendencies as a function of the play's genre, Larry S. Champion variously calls him a "comic controller" and a "comic manipulator" (253, 256). In the first of several soliloquies in which he outlines his plans and reflects on his image, Justiniano openly references the comical designs of his planned manipulation.[107] Following his wife's exit from the stage after his disclosure of his intention to travel abroad, Justiniano provides the audience with the intricate details of his scheme, while anticipating its overall levity. He begins with the declaration: "I resolve to take some shape upon me, and to live disguised heere in the Citty" and ends with the words: "and so to my comicall businesse" (Dekker and Webster 325). The "comicall business" Justiniano undertakes involves him donning a series of disguises,

[107] Forker in "*Westward Ho* and *Northward Ho*: A Revaluation," *Publications of the Arkansas Philological Association* 6.2 (1980) discusses Justiniano's casting as an vehicle for comedy in terms of awareness: "Thus he combines almost antithetical functions: he is at once an embodiment of folly and, as his name implies, the play's chief agent of exposing folly in others. Moreover, he seems aware of the distinction" (19).

which allow him to assume the identities of a writing master, a collier, and even his own wife.

Borrowing a page from Lucentio and Hortensio's playbook, Justiniano remakes himself as a schoolmaster named Parenthesis in order to gain access to the city wives' inner social sanctum from which vantage point from which he can observe and regulate their movements. Costumed "*like a wryting Mecanicall Pedant*," Justiniano looks the part and gives no reason for anyone to doubt his intentions or legitimacy as a schoolmaster (330, emphasis in original). One of the women, Mistress Honeysuckle, who learns to write under Master Parenthesis' hand, lauds Justiniano for his talent and reliability. She labels him as "the finest Schoole maister, a kind of Precision, and yet an honest knave to" (329). Little does Mistress Honeysuckle know that her words hold no objective truth beyond her own observations. Not only is the man whom she praises not a schoolmaster by day, but also he is not honest by any stretch of the imagination. Yet, Justiniano expertly manipulates his students' misconceptions as much as he controls their movements. He excels in playing his adopted role convincingly by both looking the part and by acting in an instructional capacity throughout the play—regardless of the particular identity he assumes. Whether serving as a writing master for the citizen wives, or exposing the other husbands to their wives' potential infidelity as a collier, or later instructing these same men, when dressed as himself, on how to maintain their civility while still preventing themselves from becoming cuckolded, Justiniano resembles a pedagogue, even though he has no prior affiliation with the office.

Justiniano's constancy as an educational figure distinguishes him from Idleness or the masquerading schoolmasters in Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* who

temporarily perform educational work, slipping in and out of the schoolmasters' robes at their leisure. Dekker and Webster's masquerading schoolmaster, however, deserves attention for the extent to which he appears to identify with his manufactured identity. As Parenthesis, Justiniano openly identifies with the profession he performs when he introduces himself to Mistress Honeysuckle's husband, saying:

> Sir, your vulgar and foure-peny-pen-men, that like your *London* Sempsters keepe open shop, and sell learning by retaile, may keepe their beds, and lie at their pleasure: But we that edifie in private, and traffick by whole sale, must be up with the lark, because like Country Atturnies, wee are to shuffle up many matters in a fore-noone. Certes maister *Honeysuckle*, I would sing *Laus Deo*, so I may but please al those that come under my fingers: for it is my duty and function, *Perdy*, to be fervent in my vocation. (331, emphasis in original)

In addition to expressing his personal dedication to his assumed occupation, or rather his "vocation," Justiniano manages to situate himself within a larger professional landscape through his use of the plural possessive. Parenthesis sets himself apart from less than skilled "foure-peny-pen-men" who resemble urban seamsters. Whereas the group of private instructors in which he includes himself, the "we that edifie" of his speech, rivals the more prestigious professional group of "Country Atturnies." As far as Mr. Honeysuckle is concerned, Parenthesis fills a void in the city where there is a dearth of "painfull and expert pen-men" (331-32). Recognized and approved by both the women and the men of the play, Parenthesis enjoys the unfettered access and control he desires from the outset of his manipulative scheme. He maintains this occupational privilege by carefully regulating how others regard him and his representation of his profession.

If it were somehow overlooked that Parenthesis was actually Justiniano in disguise, the above speech to Mr. Honeysuckle would seem to have come from an established, conscientious schoolmaster who takes pride in his work and the profession he represents. When taken out of context, Justiniano's remarks appear supportive of the profession's emergent status. Not only does he demonstrate his value as a private writing master, but also he associates the profession he represents with an equally commendable social station. He even goes so far as to identify those whose work ethic causes them to resemble tradesmen other than professionals. In context, however, Justiniano's rhetoric rings hollow. What seems to be an empowering speech on the behalf of the profession does very little to lend credence to practicing schoolmasters when its source is considered. Justiniano ultimately lacks a valid claim beyond his own manufactured understandings of the profession and its membership. Yet, within the world of the play, Justiniano's claim to the field is solid, and his educational fraud garners him the respect, results, and social mobility that elude many of his contemporaries off stage.

As a result of his singular, uncontested professional status in *Westward Ho*, Justiniano cultivates a certain mystique, and he comes to enjoy a reputation of exceptionality not unlike the stellar one that accompanies Gnomaticus of Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*. Both gentlemen, from different dramatic eras and genres, pose complications for how we regard the representation of the profession, but Justiniano's representation is far more troubling since his seeming authenticity as a professional is baseless once he exposes himself as a masquerader. The jealous husband and master of disguise acknowledges his own novelty when he proclaims himself "A rare Scholemaister, for all kinds of hands, I" (336). The fact of the matter is that Justiniano's

rarity as a schoolmaster derives from the fact that Parenthesis and, by some extension, the profession he purports to represent would cease to exist without the exigencies that are in place at the play's opening. He is also "rare" in that he performs well within the profession he has adopted as a disguise, and his pretensions to dedication and distinction in the speech quoted above actually hold merit.

In fact, Justiniano performs so well in his fake profession that his efforts to control the situation as the citizen wives' writing master actually assist them in gaining power. Not only does he aid them in fleeing London for Brainford, a location at which an assignation with the play's gallants can best occur, but he also teaches them how to write. As Morgan-Russell argues, "the women in the text see writing as a means of attaining agency, even if that agency is achieved through the arrangements of the writing master" (80). Specifically, women's writing allows them to acquire "purchasing power," which ultimately "allows them to buy sex more directly through the act of writing" (Dowd 228). Although his progress report to Mistress Honeysuckle's husband is rife with sexual innuendo, Justiniano as Parenthesis appears to have delivered authentic results because of his instruction. Unlike Idleness' miseducation or the seductive guises of instruction offered by Lucentio and Hortensio, Justiniano as schoolmaster performs his work without resorting to pedagogical corruption.

However, his work as Parenthesis lasts only as long as the need for his disguise. By the end of the play, Justiniano concludes his "comicall business" just as easily as he started it, once he realizes that his suspicions of his wife's infidelity have been unfounded all along. He restores order by reverting to his former self, explaining to the assembled citizen wives and their husbands:

> Looke youe, your Schoole-maister has bin in *France*, and lost his hayre, no more *Parenthesis* now, but *Justiniano*, I will now play the Merchant with you. Looke not strange at her, nor at mee, the story of us both, shall bee as good, as an olde wives tale, to cut off our way to *London*. (Dekker and Webster 392, emphasis in original)

Although it is no longer necessary for him to don disguises or to play a part, Justiniano persists in using the language of performance when reclaiming his given identity and actual profession. He announces that he will "play" the role of the merchant even though he has always laid claim to that position. In discovering himself as Justiniano the merchant, the role of Parenthesis is "no more." The schoolmaster's office, therefore, appears to lack a place in the play's closing scene since it only came into existence as part of Justiniano's quest for control. With no established schoolmaster in the world of the play to counter Justiniano's appropriation of the office, his representation provides the audience with a complicated view of education's professionalization.

As Parenthesis, Justiniano looks the part and manages to perform the sort of pedagogical work expected of someone in the field even though he enters the profession under false pretenses. He achieves instant recognition as a schoolmaster and identifies himself as part of a larger professional landscape even though he ultimately manufactures these associations. For all intents and purposes, Justiniano is *Westward Ho*'s resident schoolmaster. Only when he says Parenthesis is "no more" do the audience members and the play's other characters fully perceive the illegitimacy of the schoolmaster's professional status. Like Idleness of Redford's Tudor morality play, who capitalizes on Wyt's misrecognition of authentic instructional figures, and the masquerading suitors of

The Taming of the Shrew, who adopt the profession merely as a means to an end, Justiniano claims professional status rather unceremoniously and without any credentials. Yet, the pedagogical work he does and the professional identity he assumes while in that role would seem to overturn the very notion of legitimacy since he performs just as well—if not better—than actual schoolmasters.[108]

Conclusion:

All three of the plays featured in this chapter unite in their staging of professionalization as a matter of performance. Each dramatically represents the precariousness that typifies the conferral, recognition, and maintenance of the schoolmaster's professional status by highlighting the destabilizing realities of performance, an inherent professional issue present in both the early modern and current eras. When framed as a pedagogical strategy, the analogy of actor and teacher has the potential, according to some experts, to increase classroom success, while creating the most natural of academic environments. Others, such as Dawe, go so far as to argue that reclassifying teaching as a performance art protects the integrity of the profession. However, for critics like Pineau, enforcing this analogy transforms the profession into something it is not, since performance ultimately hinges on artifice.

In my study of early modern examples of drama in which outsiders to the profession perform as schoolmasters, I reveal the vulnerability of the schoolmaster's office, which I argue exists because of outsiders' ability to perform the profession with apparent ease and skill without a stronger claim to it. These performances, at the very

[108] But, of course, we have no one with whom to compare him since he is the play's only representation of a schoolmaster.

least, complicate how we regard the status of the schoolmaster's profession. At most, these performances destabilize the foundations of the profession by rendering it an arbitrary experience accessible to whomever can look and act the part of the schoolmaster. In the above analysis we have seen how the vice figure of Idleness, a competing duo of suitors, and an Italian merchant all become schoolteachers by virtue of their respective performances and collective will. Their joint claims to the profession echo the self-fashioning mantra uttered by Scott to his teacher-wife in Hollywood's 2007 film *Freedom Writers*: They are teachers because they say they are. If we regard the dramatic representation of these characters' professionalization efforts as reflective of a contemporary reality, it would seem that they have the ability to claim the same status in the world beyond as they do on stage—if and when the profession they represent is left to a matter of self-fashioning and performance.

Conclusion: Creating a Profession

Presently circulating in multiple online venues and presented in a range of aesthetics is an allegedly anonymous adage that touts the greatness of the teaching profession. This maxim, which contains the words, "Teaching creates all other professions," has made its way across the Internet, gracing such social media outlets as Facebook and Pinterest. Variously attributed to "Anonymous" or "Author Unknown," this message is often posted and reposted by teachers and their supporters to highlight the indispensability of the teaching profession.[109] Essentially, without teachers, people would lack the essential skills and knowledge needed to advance their own educational and professional careers. Beyond accentuating the necessity of teachers, the above saying also serves as a pointed affirmation of teachers' professional status—one that is often in jeopardy or arbitrarily obscured by members of society, including those who identify as professionals. In creating "other professions," teaching is framed as the genesis of the professions. The word "other" implies that teaching is not only necessarily included in a broader professional system, but also that it is the nucleus of that system. Despite its profundity and popularity as an Internet meme or quotable quote for an office bulletin board, this maxim can only do so much to penetrate a pervasive public discourse

[109] This maxim is actually a modified version of comments made by David Haselkorn, the president of Recruiting New Teachers Inc., a nonprofit group created with the aim to advance the profession of teaching. Responding to The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's report that assessed the competence of educators, Haselkorn explained, "Teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible." See "Upgrading teachers," *Boston Globe* 16 Sep 1996: A14 and Tamara Henry, "Teaching Seen as vital, but not touted as a job," *USA Today* 8 Oct 1996: 1D, two newspapers that feature the entirety of Haselkorn's statement.

that seeks to deprofessionalize teachers by stripping them of or refusing to accord them such professional status.[110]

Unable to remain secure in their own profession by merely insisting on its status as the creative origin of other professions, educators have found themselves needing to *re*create their work as professional for the public. The National Education Association, for example, considers the status of its members as one of its key battlegrounds, and it devotes a section on its website entitled "Myths and Facts about Educator Pay" to combat the widely held belief that "Teaching is easy—anyone can do it." The NEA responds to this myth by situating teaching in a professional landscape through familiar comparisons to other professions. The organization states, in response to the "anyone can do it myth": "Teachers, like many professionals, including accountants, engineers, and registered nurses, are trained, certified professionals. They have college degrees in education or in the subject that they teach plus a teaching credential" ("Myths and Facts"). Stressing teachers' training, schooling, and credentialing, the NEA attempts to distinguish their stakeholders as skilled professionals whose work cannot be easily recreated or appropriated by laymen. However, the opportunity for "anyone" to "do" the work of teachers is already built within the profession as a result of its inherent performance structures.

What sets teachers apart from the other professions listed by the NEA is the fact that their work is decidedly more exposed to the general public than other lines of work. Whereas surrounding professions, such as medicine or law, "seem inscrutable to most,"

---

[110] Thomas Nelson in "Editor's Introduction: Challenging Contemporary Politics—(Re)Imagining the Professionalization of Teaching and Learning," *Teacher Education Quarterly* 36.3 (2009), locates this impulse to deprofessionalize teachers in recent reform initiatives, arguing that "Contemporary school reform is rooted in a politics and language of deprofessionalization" (3).

teachers must make their work accessible to a wider population of students and parents if any sort of learning is to occur (Hord and Tobia 9). The common cultural experience of schooling is, therefore, an extended performance in which the teacher is the actor and the students are the audience members. As part of what becomes a daily performance, a veritable apprenticeship is forged between teacher and student in which the audience "learns to 'take the role' of the classroom teacher" by virtue of their spectatorship—an interaction that spans 13,000 hours for the typical student who graduates from high school (Lortie 61-62). The apprenticeship Lortie describes is essentially accidental, as educators almost certainly do not teach with the explicit aim to instruct others how to do their work. Yet, teachers' daily performances become naturalized for the students whose consistent observation positions them well to play a similar role—regardless of their "occupational intentions" (62). Even when students cease being students, they carry with them beyond the classroom an intimate familiarity with their teachers' work, which makes them "feel that they know what teaching is all about" (Hord and Tobia 9). As demonstrated above, the NEA attempts to invalidate these pretensions to knowledge by rarifying the work of teachers and insisting on their rightful inclusion in a professional cadre. Yet, as far as some members of society are concerned, the work of teachers is easily replicable—a performance art learned secondhand as part of the daily experience of schooling.

As much as teaching may create other professions, it is a profession that itself can be both created and destroyed by virtue of performance. When regarded as a key condition and expectation of the profession, performance emerges as a significant factor of professionalization—one that can bolster professional practice or ultimately destabilize

it, depending on the context. My study of the drama of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, has given me an ideal critical context from which to assess an abiding legacy of professional precariousness. The performance potentials that prompted the NEA's response to assertions that anyone can teach are staged in the masquerades of Idleness in *Wyt and Science*, the suitors in *The Taming of the Shrew*, and Justiniano of *Westward Ho*. Their self-fashioning claims to the profession are voiced in the 2007 film *Freedom Writers* by Scott who assures his teacher-wife that she is a professional because she says so. As compelling as these correspondences are, my project goes beyond locating today's professional precariousness in the drama of the early modern period. Instead, I have sought to endow literary representation—namely drama—with the dual capacities of reflecting and enacting a contemporary process of professionalization.

When literary representation and professionalization movements are treated as complementary, mutually dependent phenomena, it is possible to investigate how the performance elements of the theater might create a different and perhaps more realistic professional picture than do other sources of the present or past that attempt to sketch what is an admittedly ambiguous legacy of professionalization. The era's theaters were as much classrooms in function as the period's classrooms themselves were reminiscent of theaters, and schoolmasters who appeared on the stage performed a part just as those who taught to make their living performed a part of their own. This common thread of performance unites dramatic and actual schoolmasters, and I have located their struggle for professional recognition as playing out in both the confines of the theater and in the classroom.

Given the associations of classroom and theater, the early modern stage makes the precariousness of these teaching professionals particularly visible via dramatic representations, or performance, of their work. Only Gnomaticus of Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government* stands as an exception. His anti-performance as a character on stage idealizes him and the profession he represents, but he seems more an abstraction than a reality. For others, however, it is their presence on stage that undoes their status. Gerald from *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and Holofernes from *Love's Labour's Lost*, for example, become professional nonentities when they take to the stage and find themselves engaging in and directing performances unrelated to their job descriptions. Existing in environments in which their learned status appears to have little political, social, or cultural bearing, their performances away from their schoolrooms divest them of their professional and social utility—despite their attempts to uphold that status. Only the protective enclave of the university, represented in the academic and commercial drama set in the university, seems to uphold the professional status of the career scholar. In university plays, this sense of preservation derived mostly from the audience—a homogeneous body of individuals whose own livelihoods were acted before them by members of their own kind represented by their identifying gowns. When audiences were members of the town, however, representations of the gowned profession not only tended to draw attention to the profession's precariousness, but also participated in constructing it.

As an inherently didactic enterprise, the theater transmitted lessons to its audience members. No matter the theatrical genre, the stage introduces a dynamic of a real-time, collective public response absent from other sources. My look at the theater of this

period has emphasized the presence of this interpretative body. While it is impossible to determine with any degree of certainty how audiences reacted to a particular schoolmaster's performance on stage, it is likely that this staging recalled in some ways their own schoolmasters who engaged in performances of their own as part of their pedagogy. The proximity of performance that binds practicing and staged schoolmasters has led me to contend that the audience stood to regard staged schoolmasters as more than easily dismissed "figures of fun." Beyond their entertainment value, these representations of early modern English educators performed their profession in ways that allowed the audience to witness an enactment of professionalization that was contemporaneous with the emergent efforts of a group of schoolmasters to seek professional recognition and status off stage. When regarded as a site of professionalization, the stage does more than reflect or represent the schoolmaster's status. The theater creates that status via performance, while performance ultimately influences the profession being performed.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster*. Ed. Lawrence V. Ryan. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1967. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *De Augmentis Scientiarium*. *The Works of Francis Bacon*. Ed. James Spedding, Robert L. Ellis, and Douglas D. Heath. Vol. VIII. Boston: Taggard and Thompson, 1863. 439-44. Print.

---. *Essays and New Atlantis*. Ed. Gordon S. Haight. New York: W.J. Black, 1942. Print.

Billingsley, Nicholas. "*Monumentum Exequiale*, or Lasting Sorrow for the Death of the Reverend, Pious, and Eminently-learned, Mr. Tho. Horn, Late School-master of Eaton Colledg." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Brinsley, John. *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schools*. Ed. Thomas C. Pollock. New York: Scholar's Facsimiles and Reprints, 1943. Print.

---. *Ludus Literarius: Or, the Grammar Schoole: Shewing How to Proceede from the First Entrance into Learning to the Highest Perfection Required in the Grammar Schooles*. EEBO Editions, ProQuest, 1612. Print.

Brome, Alexander. "An Elegy on the Death of His Schoolmaster. Mr. W. H." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Brome, Richard. *The City Wit, Or, The Woman Wears the Breeches*. *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome Containing Fifteen Comedies Now First Collected in Three Volumes*. Vol. 1. London: John Pearson, 1873. 273-374. Print.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Ed. Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan-Smith. New

York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1955. Print.

Coote, Edward. *The English School-Master, Teaching All His Scholars, of What Age Soever, the Most Easie, Short, and Perfect Order of Distinct Reading, and True Writing Our English Tongue, That Hath Ever Yet Been Known or Published by Any*. London, 1656. Print.

Dekker, Thomas, and John Webster. *West-ward Hoe*. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1953. 312-93. Print.

Elyot, Sir Thomas. *The Gouernour*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1937. Print.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *On the Method of Study: De Ratione Studii Ac Legendi Interpretandique Auctores*. Trans. Brian McGregor. *Collected Works of Erasmus*. Ed. Craig R. Thompson. Vol. 24. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1978. 661-91. Print.

---. *The Education of a Christian Prince*. Ed. Lisa Jardine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

---. "To Johann Witz." *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 298 to 445, 1514 to 1516*. Trans. R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson. Comp. James K. McConica. Vol. 3. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1976. 243-45. Print.

Fuller, Thomas. *The Holy State, and The Profane State*. Ed. James Nichols. London: Printed for Thomas Tegg, 1841. Print.

Gascoigne, George. *The Glasse of Government*. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1910. Print.

Gent., J.C. "An Epitaph upon the Death of P. Starling, Sometime Schoolemaister of Bury

Schoole." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Greene, Robert. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. Ed. Norman Rabkin. *Drama of the English Renaissance: The Tudor Period*. Ed. Russell A. Fraser. Vol. 1. New York: MacMillan, 1976. 357-82. Print.

Jonson, Ben. *The Staple of News*. Ed. Anthony Parr. Manchester, UK: Manchester UP, 1988.

---. "To William Camden." *The Complete Poems*. Ed. George Parfitt. London: Penguin, 1996. 39. Print.

Hoole, Charles. *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*. Ed. Thiselton Mark. Syracuse, NY: C.W. Bardeen, 1912. Print.

Macray, W. D., ed. *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with The Two Parts of The Return from Parnassus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1886. Print.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus (B-Text)*. Doctor Faustus *and Other Plays*. Ed. David Bevington and Joseph Rasmussen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 185-246. Print.

Milton, John. "Of Education." *Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003. 630-39. Print.

Morrice, Thomas. *An Apology for Schoole-Masters, Tending to the Advancement of Learning, and to the Vertuous Education of Children*. London: Bernard Alsop, 1619. Print.

Mulcaster, Richard. *Positions*. Ed. Richard L. DeMolen. New York: Teachers College, 1971. Print. Ser. 44.

Nedham, Marchamont. *A Discourse Concerning Schools and School-Masters*. London:

H.H., 1663. Print.

Overbury, Thomas. “A Pedant.” *A Book of Characters*. Ed. Richard Aldington. London: Routledge, 1924. 108. Print.

---. “What a Character Is.” *A Book of Characters*. Ed. Richard Aldington. London: Routledge, 1924. 167. Print.

Peacham, Henry. *Peacham's Compleat Gentleman*. Ed. G. S. Gordon. London: Clarendon, 1906. Print.

Perkins, William. *A Treatise of the Vocations, Or, Callings of Men, with the Sorts and Kinds of Them and the Right Use Thereof*. Cambridge: John Legat, 1603. Print.

Redford, John. *The Moral Play of Wyt and Science*. Ed. James O. Halliwell. London: Shakespeare Society, 1848. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. Ed. Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine E. Maus. *The Norton Shakespeare: Comedies*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton and, 2008. 295-364. Print.

---. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Ed. Walter Cohen, Jean H. Howard, and Katherine E. Maus. *The Norton Shakespeare: Comedies*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton and, 2008. 175-244. Print.

---, and John Fletcher. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Ed. Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine E. Maus. *The Norton Shakespeare: Romances and Poems*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton and, 2008. 429-512. Print.

Sidney, Philip. “The Defence of Poesy.” *The Major Works*. Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 212-50. Print.

Smith, G. C. M., ed. *Club Law: A Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Thomas, Jordan. "On a School-Master." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Vives, Juan Luis. *Vives: On Education; A Translation of the De Tradendis Disciplinis of Juan Luis Vives*. Ed. Foster Watson. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1971. Print.

West, Richard. "Slothfull Teacher." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Wither, George. "Hymn XLIII. For a School-master or Tutor." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

---. "To His School-Master, Mr. John Greaves. Epigram 16." *Literature Online*. ProQuest. Web. 7 Oct. 2011.

Secondary Sources

Abbott, Andrew Delano. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988. Print.

Ardolino, Frank. "'The Glories England Over All the West': Setting as National Encomium in Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 9.3-4 (1988): 218-29. Print.

---. "Greene's Use of the History of Oxford in *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*." *ANQ* 18.2 (2005): 20-25. Print.

Bachinger, Katrina. "Maidenheads and Mayhem: A Morris-Dance Reading of William Shakespeare's and John Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen*." *Salzburger Studien zur Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 16 (1990): 23-38. Print.

Barnard, Henry. "The Popular School and the Teacher in English Literature." *English Pedagogy: Education, the School, and the Teacher, in English Literature*. Ed.

Henry Barnard. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Company, 1862. 403. Print.

Bentley, Gerald Eades. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971. Print.

Boas, Frederick S. *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966. Print.

---. "University Plays." *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. VI. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1910. 330-69. Print.

Brooks, Christopher. "Professions, Ideology and the Middling Sort in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries." *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society, and Politics in England, 1550-1800*. Ed. Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 113-41. Print.

Brooks, Dennis S. "'To Show Scorn Her Own Image': The Varieties of Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association* 48.1 (1994): 7-32. Print.

Bucher, Rue, and Anselm Strauss. "Professions in Process." *American Journal of Sociology* 66.4 (1961): 325-34. Print.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1996. Print.

Caspari, Fritz. *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England*. New York: Teachers College P, 1968. Print.

Cathcart, Charles. "*Club Law*, *The Family of Love*, and the Familist Sect." *Notes and Queries* 50.1 (2003): 65-68. Print.

Champion, Larry S. "Westward-Northward: Structural Development in Dekker's *Ho*

Plays." *Comparative Drama* 16.3 (1982): 251-66. Print.

Charlton, Kenneth. *Education in Renaissance England*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965. Print.

---. "The Professions in Sixteenth-Century England." *The University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1969/70): 20-43. Print.

---. "The Teaching Profession in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England." *History and Education: The Educational Uses of the Past*. By Paul Nash. New York: Random House, 1970. 24-61. Print.

Christen, Richard S. "'An Absolute Monarch in His School': Images of Teacher Authority in the Seventeenth-Century English Character Literature." *History of Education* 30.4 (2001): 321-38. Print.

Cooper, Sheila M. "Servants as Educators in Early-Modern England." *Paedagogica Historica* 43.4 (2007): 547-63. Print.

Cressy, David. "A Drudgery of Schoolmasters: The Teaching Profession in Elizabethan and Stuart England." *The Professions in Early Modern England*. Ed. Wilfrid Prest. London: Croom Helm, 1987. Print.

Dawe, Harry A. "Teaching: A Performing Art." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 65.8 (1984): 548-52. Print.

DeMolen, Richard L. "Richard Mulcaster and the Elizabethan Theatre." *Theatre Survey* 13.01 (1972): 28-41. Print.

Dolven, Jeffrey Andrew. *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2007. Print.

Donahue, Patricia. "Popular Representations of Teachers and Teaching." *Reader* 45

(2001): 10-17. Print.

Dowd, Michelle M. "'Leaning Too Hard Upon the Pen': Suburb Wenches and City Wives in Westward Ho." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 15 (2002): 224-42. Print.

Dowden, Edward. "William Shakespeare." *The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire*. Ed. Herbert M. Skinner. New York: American Book, 1894. 42-73. Print.

Eggleston, Edward. "Introduction." *The Schoolmaster in Literature*. Ed. Edward Eggleston. New York: American Book Company, 1892. 5-12. Print.

Elliott, John R., Jr. "Early Staging in Oxford." *A New History of Early English Drama*. Ed. John D. Cox and David S. Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. 68-76. Print.

Engel, Arthur. "The Emerging Concept of the Academic Profession." *The University in Society*. Vol. 1. Ed. Lawrence Stone. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974. 305-51. Print.

Enterline, Lynn. "Rhetoric, Discipline, and the Theatricality of Everyday Life in Elizabethan Grammar Schools." *From Performance to Print in Shakespeare's England*. Ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 173-90. Print.

Felman, Jyl Lynn. *Never a Dull Moment: Teaching and the Art of Performance: Feminism Takes Center Stage*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Feyerharm, William F. "The Status of the Schoolmaster and the Continuity of Elizabethan Education in East Anglia." *History of Education* 5.2 (1876): 103-15. Print.

Flanigan, Tom. "On Fashionable Education and the Art of Rhetoric: Reflections of a Not-Indifferent Student in *Love's Labour's Lost*." *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium* 5 (2005): 13-33.

Forker, Charles R. "*Westward Ho* and *Northward Ho*: A Revaluation." *Publications of the Arkansas Philological Association* 6.2 (1980): 1-42. Print.

Freedom Writers. Dir. Richard LaGravenese. Paramount Home Entertainment, 2007. DVD.

Gaggero, Christopher. "Pleasure Unreconciled to Virtue: George Gascoigne and Didactic Drama." *Tudor Drama Before Shakespeare, 1485-1590: New Directions for Research, Criticism, and Pedagogy*. Ed. Lloyd Kermode, Jason Scott-Warren, and Martine Van Elk. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 167-93. Print.

Gieskes, Edward. *Representing the Professions: Administration, Law, and Theater in Early Modern England*. Newark: University of Delaware, 2006. Print.

Grantley, Darryll. *Wit's Pilgrimage: Drama and the Social Impact of Education in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005. Print.

Heilman, Robert. "The Tragedy of Knowledge: Marlowe's Treatment of Faustus." *Quarterly Review of Literature* 2 (1946): 316-332. Print.

Herbst, Jurgen. *And Sadly Teach: Teacher Education and Professionalization in American Culture*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1989. Print.

Herford, C. H. "Gascoigne's *Glasse of Government*." *Englische Studien* 9 (1886): 201-09. Print.

Herzog, Alyssa. "Modeling Gender Education in *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Tamer Tamed*." *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*. Ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 1-17. Print.

Hillman, Richard. "*Measure for Measure* and the (Anti-)Theatricality of Gascoigne's *The Glasse of Government*." *Comparative Drama* 42.4 (2008): 391-408. Print.

Hord, Shirley M., and Edward F. Tobia. *Reclaiming Our Teaching Profession: The Power of Educators Learning in Community*. New York: Teachers College, 2012. Print.

Iyengar, Sujata. "Moorish Dancing in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 20 (2007): 85-107. Print.

Jewell, Helen M. *Education in Early Modern England*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998. Print.

Henry, Tamara. "Teaching Seen as Vital, but Not Touted as a Job." *USA Today* 8 Oct. 1996: 1D. Print.

Howard, Jean E. *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Knapp, Robert S. "The Academic Drama." *A Companion to English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. 257-65. Print.

Kottler, Jeffrey A., Stanley J. Zehm, and Ellen I. Kottler. *On Being a Teacher: The Human Dimension*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2000. Print.

Labaree, David F. "Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching: A Genealogy of the Movement to Professionalize Teaching." *Harvard Educational*

Review 62.2 (1992): 123-54. Print.

Lawson, John, and Harold Silver. *A Social History of Education in England*. London: Methuen & Co., 1978. Print.

Lennam, Trevor. "'The Ventricle of Memory': Wit and Wisdom in *Love's Labour's Lost*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 24.1 (1973): 54-60. Print.

Lief, Madelon, and Nicholas F. Radel. "Linguistic Subversion and the Artifice of Rhetoric in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 38.4 (1987): 405-25. Print.

Looney, Jefferson. "Undergraduate Education at Early Stuart Cambridge." *History of Education* 10.1 (1981): 9-19. Print.

Lortie, Dan C. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1975. Print.

Marlow, Christopher. "Scholarly Interiority in the *Parnassus* Trilogy." *Dalhousie Review* 85.2 (2005): 275-84. Print.

---. "The Performance of Learning: University Drama at Oxford in 1566." *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 73 (2008): 1-7. Print.

McConica, James. "Scholars and Commoners in Renaissance Oxford." *The University in Society*. Vol. 1. Ed. Lawrence Stone. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974. 151-82. Print.

McCullen, Joseph T. "Dr Faustus and Renaissance Learning." *The Modern Language Review* 51.1 (1956): 6-16.

McGrath, Charles. "Changing Gears but Retaining Dramatic Effect." *The New York Times* 16 Feb. 2012: 1-4. Print.

Moncrief, Kathryn M. "'Teach us, sweet madam': Masculinity, Femininity, and Gendered Instruction in *Love's Labor's Lost*." *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*. Ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 113-27. Print.

---, and Kathryn R. McPherson. "'Shall I Teach You to Know?': Intersections of Pedagogy, Performance, and Gender." *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*. Ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 1-17. Print.

Monroe, Paul, ed. "Drama and Education." *A Cyclopedia of Education*. Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1911. 361-66. Print.

Morgan-Russell, Simon. "'No Good Thing Ever Comes Out of It': Male Expectation and Female Alliance in Dekker and Webster's Westward Ho." *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 70-84. Print.

Muir, Kenneth. "Didacticism in Shakespearean Comedy: Renaissance Theory and Practice." *Review of National Literatures* 3.2 (1972): 39-53. Print.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988. Print.

"Myths and Facts about Educator Pay." *Issues and Actions*. NEA, n.d. Web. 24 Mar. 2013.

Nelson, Alan H. *Early Cambridge Theatres: College, University, and Town Stages, 1464-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.

---. “The Universities.” *Contexts for Early English Drama*. Ed. Marianne G. Briscoe and John C. Coldewey. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989. 137-49. Print.

Nelson, Thomas. “Editor’s Introduction: Challenging Contemporary Politics—(Re)Imagining the Professionalization of Teaching and Learning.” *Teacher Education Quarterly* 36.3 (2009): 3-6. Print.

O’Day, Rosemary. *Education and Society, 1500-1800*. Essex: Longman, 1982. Print.

---. *The Professions in Early Modern England, 1450-1800*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000. Print.

---. “Universities and Professions in the Early Modern Period.” *Beyond the Lecture Hall: Universities and Community Engagement from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*. Ed. Peter Cunningham, Susan Oosthuizen, and Richard Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 79-102. Print.

Orme, Nicholas. “Schoolmasters, 1307-1509.” *Profession, Vocation, and Culture in Later Medieval England: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of A.R. Myers*. Ed. A. R. Myers and Cecil H. Clough. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1982. 218-41. Print.

Orpen, Patrick. “Schoolmastering As a Profession in the Seventeenth Century: The Career Patterns of the Grammar Schoolmaster.” *History of Education* 6.3 (1977): 183-94. Print.

Parham, Janis N., and Stephen P. Gordon. “Moonlighting: A Harsh Reality for Many Teachers.” *The Phi Delta Kappan* 92.5 (2011): 47-51. Print.

Pineau, Elyse L. “Teaching Is Performance: Reconceptualizing a Problematic Metaphor.” *American Educational Research Journal* 31.1 (1994): 3-25. Print.

Potter, Ursula A. *Pedagogy and Parenting in English Drama, 1560-1610: Flogging*

Schoolmasters and Cockering Mothers. Diss. University of Sydney, 2001.

---. "Performing Arts in the Tudor Classroom." *Tudor Drama Before Shakespeare, 1485-1590: New Directions for Research, Criticism, and Pedagogy*. Ed. Lloyd Kermode, Jason Scott-Warren, and Martine Van Elk. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 167-93. Print.

---. "The Naming of Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost*." *English Language Notes* 38.2 (2000): 11-24. Print.

---. "To School or Not to School: Tudor Views on Education in Drama and Literature." *Parergon* 25.1 (2008): 103-21. Print.

Prest, Wilfrid. "Introduction: The Professions and Society in Early Modern England." *The Professions in Early Modern England*. Ed. Wilfrid Prest. London: Croom Helm, 1987. Print.

Raffel, Jeffrey A., and Lance R. Groff. "Shedding Light on the Dark Side of Teacher Moonlighting." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 12.4 (1990): 403-14. Print.

Reynolds, Bryan, and Henry S. Turner. "From *Homo Academicus* to *Poeta Publicus*: Celebrity and Transversal Knowledge in Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (c. 1589)." *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer*. Ed. Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008. 73-93. Print.

---. "Performative Transversations: Collaborations Through and Beyond Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*." *Transversal Enterprises in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Fugitive Explorations*. Ed. Bryan Reynolds. New York:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 240-50. Print.

Richmond, Hugh. “Performance as Criticism: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.” *Shakespeare, Fletcher, and the Two Noble Kinsmen*. Ed. Charles H. Frey. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 1989. 163-85. Print.

Rogerson, Margaret. “Provincial Schoolmasters and Early English Drama.” *Leeds Studies in English* 29 (1998): 315-32. Print.

Salamon, Linda B. “A Face in ‘The Glasse’: Gascoigne’s *Glasse of Government* Re-Examined.” *Studies in Philology* 71.1 (1974): 47-71. Print.

Schelling, Felix E. “Three Unique Elizabethan Dramas.” *Modern Language Notes* 7.5 (1892): 129-33. Print.

Scherb, Victor I. “Playing at Maturity in John Redford’s *Wit and Science*.” *SEL* 45.2 (2005): 271-97. Print.

Scott, John C. “The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations.” *The Journal of Higher Education* 77.1 (2006): 1-39. Print.

Sikorska, Liliana. “Writing a New Morality Play: The Court as the World in John Skelton’s *Magnyfycence* and John Redford’s *Wit and Science*.” *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature, Language, and Culture*. Ed. Noel H. Kaylor and Richard S. Nokes. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007. 21-40. Print.

Sirluck, Katherine A. “Patriarchy, Pedagogy, and the Divided Self in The Taming of the Shrew.” *University of Toronto Quarterly* 60.4 (1991): 417-34. Print.

Simon, Brian. “Leicestershire Schools 1625–40.” *British Journal of Educational Studies* 3.1 (1954): 42-58. Print.

Simon, Joan. *Education and Society in Tudor England.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967. Print.

Skinner, Herbert M., ed. *The Schoolmaster in Comedy and Satire*. New York: American Book Company, 1894. Print.

Sondergard, Sidney L. "'To Scape the Rod': Resistance to Humanist Pedagogy and the Sign of the Pedant in Tudor England." *Studies in Philology* 91.3 (1994): 270-82. Print.

Stone, Lawrence. "The Educational Revolution In England, 1560–1640." *Past and Present* 28 (1964): 41-80. Print.

---. "The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body 1580-1910." *The University in Society*. Vol. 1. Ed. Lawrence Stone. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974. 3-110. Print.

Tate, W.E. "The Episcopal Licensing of Schoolmasters in England." *The Church Quarterly Review* CLVII (1956): 426-32. Print.

Tauber, Robert T. and Cathy S. Mester. *Acting Lessons for Teachers: Using Performance Skills in the Classroom*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007. Print.

Thomas, Keith. *Rule and Misrule in the Schools of Early Modern England*. Reading, England: University of Reading, 1976. Print.

"Upgrading Teachers." Boston Globe 16 Sept. 1996, Editorial sec.: A14. Print.

Vanderstraeten, Raf. "Professions in Organizations, Professional Work in Education." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 28.5 (2007): 621-35. Print.

Walker, Jonathan. "Introduction: Learning to Play." *Early Modern Academic Drama*. Ed. Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert. Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate,

2008. 1-18. Print.

Walker, Kim. “Wrangling Pedantry: Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*.” *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance*. Ed. Lloyd Davis. Newark, DE: University of Delaware, 2003. 191-208. Print.

Watson, Foster. *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice*. New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1970. Print.

West, Alfred S. “The Characters.” Introduction. *Earle’s Microcosmography*. By John Earle. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1897. ix-xl.

Winson, Patricia. “‘A Double Spirit of Teaching’: What Shakespeare's Teachers Teach Us.” *Early Modern Literary Studies* Special Issue.1 (1997): n. pag. Web. 26 July 2010.

Michael A. Albright
maa206@lehigh.edu
560 Hillside Avenue: 1st Fl. Bethlehem, PA 18015 (610) 737-5632
35 Sayre Dr. Lehigh University Bethlehem, PA 18015 (610) 758-3310

Education:

Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA
Ph.D. English, May 20, 2013
Dissertation: "'You're a teacher because you say you are': Performance, Professionalization, and the Early Modern English Schoolmaster"
Committee: Barbara H. Traister (chair), Scott Paul Gordon, Jenna Lay, Edward Shapiro
M.A. English, May 19, 2008

Millersville University of Pennsylvania, Millersville, PA
B.A. English, May 13, 2006 (*summa cum laude)*
B.S.E. English, May 13, 2006 (*summa cum laude)*
Minor in French

Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Paris (CCIP), Paris, France
Certificat de français professionnel, July 7, 2004

Teaching and Research Interests:

Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature
British Literature Survey
Drama: Early Modern English, Restoration, and Twentieth-century American
Literature and Film About Education
Pedagogy

Professional and Teaching Experience:

Lehigh University, Department of English
Senior Teaching Fellow (2012-2013)
Courses: Composition and Literature: ENGL 001
Composition and Literature: ENGL 002
The Heroic and the Hopeless: ENGL 191
Teaching Fellow (2006-2012)
Courses: Composition and Literature: ENGL 001
Composition and Literature: ENGL 002
Writing Center Tutor (2009-Present)

Pennsylvania School for Global Entrepreneurship, Lehigh University
Residence Life Coordinator (Summer 2011, 2012)
Assistant Residence Life Coordinator (Summer 2010)

The Institute of Reading Development
Instructor (Summers 2007-2009)
Courses: Stepping Stones to Fluency: Kindergarten to Fifth Grade
Reading and Study Skills: Sixth Grade to Adults
Marticville Middle School, Pequea, PA
Student Teacher (January-May 2006)
Courses: Seventh and Eighth Grade American Literature

Presentations:

"The Two Performing Schoolmasters: Performing Professionalization in Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*." The 41st Annual Meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America. Toronto, March 28, 2013.

"What Happens in First-Year Writing at Lehigh?" Writing to Improve Learning at Lehigh Colloquium. Lehigh University, April 19, 2011.

"Imagining Positive School-Community Relations: Teachers and Texts *in loco parentis*." Annual Meeting of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies. Lehigh University, October 10, 2009.

"Remapping the World: Joy Harjo's Poetics of Creation, Community, and Survival." II Crossing Over Symposium. Cleveland State University, October 6, 2007.

Department and University Service:

Writing Program Self-Study Committee Member (2012)
Assistant to the Writing Program Director (2010-2011, 2011-2012)
Department Representative for Dean's Graduate Student Advisory Council (2009-2011)
Library and Technology Services Liaison, Lehigh University (2007-2008)
Unit Representative: Graduate Student Senate, Lehigh University (2006 – 2008)

Community Service:

S.T.A.R. Academy, Bethlehem, PA
Tutor-Mentor (2010-2012)

Professional Memberships:

Member of Kappa Delta Pi, International Honor Society in Education (2006 – Present)
Member of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi (2005 – Present)

Awards and Honors:

Department of English Dissertation Fellowship (Spring 2012)
Dean's List (Consecutive semesters 2002-2006)
Class of 1910 English Award (2005, 2006)
Student of Academic Distinction (2005, 2006)

Millersville University Search for Excellence Scholarship

Languages:

French

References:

Barbara H. Traister, Professor, Lehigh University
bht0@lehigh.edu, 610-758-3330

Scott Paul Gordon, Professor, Lehigh University
spg4@lehigh.edu, 610-758-3307

Jenna D. Lay, Assistant Professor, Lehigh University
jdl210@lehigh.edu, 610-758-3308

Edward E. Lotto, Associate Professor and Director Writing Program, Lehigh University
eel2@lehigh.edu, 610-758-3097