

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Dangerous Minds: A Perspective on Women's Education in Tudor/Stuart England.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9tw283zv>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 17(0)

Author

Lofting, Morgan

Publication Date

1997

Copyright Information

Copyright 1997 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Dangerous Minds: A Perspective on Women's Education in Tudor/Stuart England.

MORGAN LOFTING

Why should women be educated? Why should they not? This article looks at several early modern English writers who argue either for or against the education of women. They are Richard Hyrde, Juan Luis Vives, Thomas Elyot, Richard Mulcaster, Roger Ascham, Edward Gosynhill, Edward Hake and Mrs. Dorothy Leigh. Several strongly suggested educating women; others were vehemently opposed. Several approached the subject from a humanistic perspective and several from a religious. All tended to operate from a received opinion of womankind so inculcated in the society it had become opaque. Their arguments became entangled in this meaning of "woman" — a meaning at all times under deliberation and construction in relation to woman's in both the ideological and practical world. The drive to stabilize the meaning of "woman" pervaded these texts, yet the marking of her mind as potentially dangerous facilitated both the arguments for and the arguments against her education. I will argue that her dangerous mind was implicitly tied to the control of her dangerous womb, and that her mind/womb became not only an emblem for the period's religious, educational, and political anxiety but a focus for maintaining familial and authority-dependent relations as the bedrock of Order. Chastity was a key concept here and the selections reveal a constant struggle to define chastity, gender relations and the female mind in such a way as to obviate any threat to the social order and the newly emergent self coded as male.

Of the selected writings one is a translation, the others vernacular originals; all were written between the years 1524-1618 in England. Greater stress is placed on Richard Hyrde and his translation of Juan Luis Vives to provide a base line from which to discuss change and alternative viewpoints which

emerged over time. Hyrde was not only an optimistic educator of women, he found women themselves to be a joy. Do the other writers echo Hyrde's sentiments, or, if not, why do they not? Change is both contextualized within the dramatically altering political and religious climate, and change is localized according to each writer's own particular ethos. Hyrde (? -1528) was a secular optimist and mentor. Vives (1492-1540), was an eminent humanist cleric and son of conversos. Mothers were a vexed question for him; his mother in particular is discussed. Elyot (1499?-1546), a contemporary of Hyrde and Vives who also wrote prior to the Henrican Reformation, was a rhetorician and political writer. Ascham (1515-1568), was an instructor to the young Elizabeth and also Latin secretary to Queen Mary. Mulcaster (c. 1530-1611), bridged the Elizabethan period as a schoolmaster and as the most prominently published educational writer of his time. Hake (fl. 1574), most assuredly a pessimist and possibly a lawyer, had a negative effect on women's education in the early days of the English Renaissance as did Gosyhill (fl. 1560), a satirist. Mrs. Leigh (fl. 1616) a dying woman and widowed mother of four sons wrote during the reign of James. She was not emblematic of all women writers of her day, but a success story of sorts as she exemplified a politicized education for women far removed from Hyrde's optimism of ninety years before. It is the hows and whys of the commodifications to women's education which this piece follows.

The subject of education for both male and female in the early modern period was never divorced from a notion of the public good. The humanists' agenda for male education in the Renaissance turned on the problem of virtue for this very good. Was it possible to teach virtue, they asked, or if virtue could not be taught, was it possible to teach an eloquence which begat virtue? These questions complicated the subject of women's education because of the underlying assumption that women had no need of a public eloquence. Eloquence, education, the importance of the human will as a creative resource, and the superiority of the will to intellect were the keynotes of humanist educational theory, and all belonged to the male purview. This educational program was thoroughly implicated in England's religious reformation struggles and her political agenda. [1] The interactive recipe of education, religion and politics was the key to why some suggested teaching women and why others scoffed at her receiving any education at all.

Certain concerns were paramount: How best could a woman be controlled? Was there any good to be gained from educating her? Could her education serve to strengthen the family or would it destroy the family? In an age which conceived of society as a hierarchy of groups, women had no corporate identity other than the family, and yet the family was alternately

perceived as both a threat to and a constituent part of both the social order and the self.² That women had an anomalous power and an anomalous selfhood helped to explain certain themes which contended in both the pro- and anti- educational texts: (1) the construction of an alternative public good for woman through her literacy and education; (2) the overcoming of her inherent "lack" by privileging a guiding authority; (3) the addressing of all educational suggestions to the man in charge of her virtue and not the woman reader herself; (4) the salubrious effect of certain classical and religious readings in educating her to chastity as her crowning virtue; and (5) education's potentially hazardous effect in making her more capable of deception. The notions of woman's anomalous powers and its necessary containment were at the heart of the power/knowledge dilemma. To paraphrase Foucault: power and knowledge were mutually conditioning. Power deployed discourses on and over bodies, establishing the truth of bodies, their desires and their lack. Knowledge was extracted from the body and, in turn, helped to form bodies. The body was object and target, knowledge the major instrument and technique. Foucault never directly addressed the female body but it would appear that power/knowledge had not only produced what "woman" was, but constantly worked to secure that knowledge. One method of woman's containment was the family which in the mid-sixteenth century became not just the agent of social control but the object of control. Wiesner has proposed the family as the key to social organizations of power, seeing relations in all social and political organizations as linked ideologically and politically to those within the family.³ The family existed as both the containment point and the ideological locus of woman's anomaly. One could say that the anxiety over women's potency enjoined various propagandas where proprietary power and woman's body and mind were always tacitly connected. Educating her to the "proper" knowledge of herself might be a boon or it might backfire. Dangerous minds, dangerous wombs.

By the early sixteenth-century, not only women's education but the whole of education for either sex was tending towards a very authority driven model. Originally, the reemergence of an eloquence based in classical letters had absorbed both the Greek-trained Cicero's of the *bonae artae* for persuasion in a public, civic context, as well as Quintilian's precept that the *bonae artae* trained the moral faculties. That a "self-evident" connection existed between eloquence, a mature moral integrity and the virtuous state, pervaded Renaissance humanist thought, but there was a conflict. The Renaissance patron's practical needs, the humanists' educational agenda, and the existing clerical scholarship conflicted and congealed into a more rigid, less optimistic model of education constricted by both society and polity. Renaissance England was neither a democratic Athens nor a republican Rome and

English education was devolving into a conformity not openly receptive to freedom of thought or any vaunted republic's "new men."⁴

Nevertheless, the fact that an ideology of "civic use" still inhered to the curriculum exacerbated the problem of women's education. As Leonardo Bruni had written to the accomplished Batista Malatesta in the fifteenth century: "why exhaust a woman with...the thousand difficulties of rhetorical art, when she will never see the forum?"⁵ And if she would not what was a possible moral agenda for women's education? Erasmus, the premier Christian humanist who had united the classical ideal of *humanitas* (virtuous eloquence) and Christian *pietas* (duty to God, state and family), spoke not to woman's learning but to her occupation. He proposed that "the distaff and the spindle are in truth the true tools of women and suitable for avoiding idleness."⁶ Idleness in the female was not arbitrary; it was dangerous. Idleness equated with the female's uncontrolled imagination which needed to be channeled by some authority, and as the locus of the imagination was the body and not the mind in this period, imagination in a woman posed a threat to her womb fruit. With conception the natural state of the married women, the moral goal of womankind became a perfected state of enclosure, or matrimony, and pro-educationists came to see a potential if other civic use in her education. Matrimony "matured." Women would become functionally educated for their own betterment and for their children's. The "good mother" was being created: a woman educated to the value of her chastity who, thereby, enhanced the family as a locus of moral and social order.⁷

There should be a drum roll here as traditional ideology displayed its circular logic and woman's dangerous mind and wandering womb were conjoined in a tentative but contentious educational project. Knowledge would make her more moral and therefore of maternal civic use. Or knowledge might encourage her "natural" tendencies toward sin like her foremother Eve. Or she was highly educable and a joy because she had surmounted her bodily obstacles. Or because she was highly suggestible, some authority should be in charge of her education. In the political and religious dislocations of Reformation Europe a humanist optimism in regard to the mind and a religious pessimism in regard to the sinful body were often in odd conjunction, but even the pro-educationists could not get around the fact that certain "normative" constraints on women's sex had to explicitly circumscribe her education. And if she was to be educated at all, then the purpose of her education was not to be and, indeed, could not be the same as a man's.⁸

I.

The first English work on female education was a deportment guide orig-

inally written in French in 1371 with William Caxton setting the English version in 1484. [9] Just prior to the Henrican Reformation and the break with the Roman Church, the first original English comment on women's education appeared. Penned by Richard Hyrde, an educational radical in his own times, it was the introduction to Margaret More Roper's translation of Erasmus' "*Paternoster*," a Latin text first published in Basle in 1523. Roper's English version appeared the following year bearing Hyrde's dedication to the seven year old Frances Brandon, later the mother of Lady Jane Grey.¹⁰ Addressing Frances directly, and not anyone in charge of her education, Hyrde encouraged the young girl to pay no attention to the majority who railed against learning. Rather, Frances should heed Plato and learned doctors of the Church who recommended it to both men and women. Indeed, learning would last longer and be more steadfast than the body's beauty for "though ye had none otheer," he reminded Francis, learning "shall get you both greater love, more faithful and longer to continue of all good folks than shall the beauty of the body, be it never so excellent, whose love decayeth together with it that was the cause of it..."¹¹

Although Hyrde quite directly addressed the young Frances one can only ask if he would have concerned himself with the vagaries of earthly beauty if he had been addressing a young man. Indeed, we do not know if Hyrde ever had boy pupils. Little known of him: he lived with the Thomas Mores as Margaret's tutor; he may have taken an Oxford degree in 1519; he died on Lady Day in 1528.¹² Certainly he was present in a household that enthusiastically espoused learning for women albeit a learning not quite divorced from idea of womankind as the progenitors. In admonishing Frances to follow in the footsteps of her own dear mother who was even then taking up that learning that she had missed as a child, Hyrde wrote: "It would be great shame...born of such a mother and also nourished up with her own teat, for [you] to degenerate and go out of kind."¹³ Hyrde was rather an optimistic pro-educationist within certain constraints — women were not to be men. But he did not propose that women were by nature immoral as did some of his contemporaries. Rather he stressed that those men were mainly unlearned who said Latin and Greek would inflame women the more towards their natural inclination to vice.

Those men were in error, he wrote, for "women be not onely of no less constancy and discretion than men, but also more steadfast and sure to trust unto than they." Indeed, he continued, if all human vices were open and shown, a man would have much more to be ashamed of than a woman, and yet, men rail at her about her slighter faults. She was more often ashamed of her fault while he did not even acknowledge his own. Therefore, if reading were a cause of any faults, it would work much worse effect in the man than

in the woman.¹⁴ And like any dedicated mentor, Hyrde stressed the teacher's importance in guiding the female mind away from that idleness which had also concerned Erasmus.

Reading and studying so occupieth the mind, that it can have no leisure to muse or delight in other fantasies, where in all handiworks that men say be more meet for a woman, the body may be busy in one place, and the mind walking in another: and while they sit sewing and spinning with their fingers, may cast and compass many peevish fancies in their minds, which must needs be occupied either with good or bad, so long as they are waking.¹⁵

Hyrde did not elaborate on what women should be taught but presumably he approved the classics as he would have had no occasion to write the introduction if Margaret were not highly competent in Latin. Moreover, he sang the praises of the humanist ideology: learning "sheweth the image and ways of good living, even right as a mirror sheweth the similtude and proportion of the body."¹⁶ About Margaret his pupil he wrote: "This gentlewoman, which translated this little book...undoubted it is to the increase of her virtue, [that] she hath taken and taketh no little occasion of her learning."¹⁷ A skeptic could say that he sang his pupil's praises as her scholarship redounded to him, but the paramount impression one takes from Hyrde's essay was encouragement for women to learn and praise for their ability to achieve high standards. Perhaps, because he lived and worked among the elite, his concept of woman had a more salubrious caste — a humanist education drawing its value in moral profit. Yet integral to his understanding of woman was not that she was a "lacking" male. Rather she was of a different "kind."

The polarization of male/female into "kinds" was not a new idea but an unclearly enunciated one. Of what gender was an educated woman? Angelo Poliziano in writing to the distinguished humanist Cassandra Fedele, a learned latinist in 1580s Venice, remarked that as a learned woman she was "not-woman." Although Poliziano praised Fedele as "his laudatio of female scholarly accomplishment," and acknowledged her learning as a "manly" virtue in a female body, he made it clear that she was also not a man which squarely removed her from any notion of active political involvement. Equating her with classical figures, he shifted in his letters from addressing her as Camilla, the warrior or manly-maid, to calling her virgin Muse and herald of the poetic cult. In these letters, at least, Fedele was effectively metamorphosed from a talented and learned individual into a genus representing female worth.¹⁸ Because of her learning Fedele had become a paradigm; because of her female body her personal virginity was problematic. By

remaining unmarried, she had refused the traditionally privileged role of woman. Implicit in the notion of two "kinds" was the notion that scholarship was in itself de-flowering ñ the learned woman might never bear her fruit, a child. And this was a problem which writers on Queen Elizabeth's reign would later take up.

Woman's proper fruit was central to Juan Luis Vives' text on women's education; he was a man not quite as sanguine about women as his translator, Richard Hyrde. In the vanguard of the humanist educational movement, Vives (1492-1540) was a Valencian whose parents were suspect conversos amid the rumblings of Inquisition and Reformation. On the continent, Luther's writings would suggest a non-medieval answer to Church reform and divide Christendom.¹⁹ In England, despite the Roman Church's opposition, some were urging a vernacular bible. Vives wrote, as they say, in interesting times. And it is the time disparity between the appearance of the Latin and English texts which may say a good deal about England's engagement with the times and its heightened interest in women's education. Vives' *"De Institutione Foeminae Christiane"* (*"Instruction of a Christian Woman"*) was published in 1523 while he was a resident at Corpus Christi, Oxford and in the king's good favor.²⁰ Hyrde's translation had to be completed before 1528, the year of his death. Between 1528 and the publication of the English translation in 1541, severe political and religious changes occurred in England. Between 1531-34, Henry VIII legitimated his divorce from Catherine of Aragon and established himself as head of the Church of England. In 1532 Cromwell used Parliament to amend the statutes regarding Church and conformity. Henceforth, to call the king a heretic was treason. In 1535, Hyrde's benefactor, the humanist Thomas More was beheaded. In 1536 Henry proclaimed his religious writ throughout the realm, and in opposition, Cardinal Pole wrote the *"Defense of the Unity of the Church."* In 1538, the pope excommunicated Henry; in 1540 the king abolished the monasteries and convents; and also executed Cromwell. Vives himself, having opposed Henry's divorce, was jailed for six weeks, then left for the Netherlands to die in Bruges in 1540.

One could argue that in more settled times Hyrde's own work would have had a positive effect on the preceding formlessness of women's education while Vives even in '23 had a more programmatic agenda; one could also argue that with the loss of the convents in '40, women lost a more personal space for learning. Home was the only educational venue open for them when, following the break with the Roman Church and amid the Henrican Reformation of the polity, moral regulation became co-extensive with State formation.²¹ Was there a political purpose at work as control of women's education shifted firmly to father, then to husband? Was the reorganization of

patriarchal control a reason for the translation of Vives to appear in 1541? The point is not to definitively answer these questions but to contextualize women's education by noting the lag time in Vives' English publication. The dates are important. As Hyrde died in '28, the translation sat on the shelf for at least thirteen years until its publication in '41, one year after Vives' death, and well on into the Henrican Reformation.

That the translation of Vives was published at all, as well as going through four editions until 1592, suggests a possible for it to appear in English.²² Of what use could Vives' text be? Was women's education being used as a strategy for reconstituting the family as a stable counterweight to the political and religious upheavals? Margaret Spufford has equated any attempts to control the more private aspects of people's behavior with such a spontaneous "higher status" reaction to demographic and economic stress. Muchembled has also cited the sixteenth century's acculturation of thoughts and behaviors as an elite agenda. Law was not only one of power's mechanisms for repressing popular culture, it also spoke for a unifying, centralizing authority which set out to discredit women and their magical mentality. Law and the state as Providential institutions of Order stepped over the family threshold to write a new ritual of social conformity. Such power agendas were not new but an intensification according to Martin Ingram. With the Marriage Act of 1563, the English Church tightened safeguards against clandestine marriage, yet unwilling to countenance any changes regarding the freedom to marry, the Church maintained the apprenticeship system as an unofficial means restricting the poor from marriage. As ambivalence surrounded both prenuptial sex and bastard bearers, the Marriage Act became a new tool in the campaign for moral discipline and Christianization by naming spousals (prenuptial contracts) invalid and requiring that valid marriages be performed in public. However, Ingram has stressed that Law and Church/State made no sustained effort to reform personal conduct other than sexual behavior.²³

Anthony Fletcher has named male fear of sexual impotency, the prime sexual issue confronting the period. Visible genital difference only located one's place on a one-sex continuum. There was always the danger of overlap and reversal. Positioning women at the lower end of the continuum were God's direction regarding Eve's sin and women's natural physical inferiority, but metamorphosis was a dreaded possibility. With sexual potency was a male marker, impotence highlighted the difficulties in forever stabilizing the male as male and his initiative, control and dominance. Could men alleviate this fear and securely determine the truth of two "kinds" by drawing sharper lines between the sexes? The first "scientific" confirmation, according to Fletcher, was Fallopio's discovery of the clitoris in 1561. This knowledge allowed the Galenic notion of uterus as inverted penis to gradually be

replaced by a clitoris/penis analogy. Now one could admire the uterus for its reproductive functions, without de-stabilizing penile power. Other stabilizing factors of two "kinds" included: the gentry's prescriptive honor code which grounded social roles in the physical body with dress and bearing proclaiming for class and gender rule; the gentry's desire for absolute property in women which encouraged marriage as the lynchpin of social order; the gentry's view of class as implicitly gendered which included an elaborate scheme of gender construction marking gentry from the masses through a proscriptive literature aimed at gentry women; and Thomas Willis' sensational psychology of the 1660's whose combination of biological, psychological and social attitudes created a powerful ideology of gender difference. Phyllis Rankin has confounded the Renaissance body image of visible sexual difference by insisting that the body served as a map, not of gender difference but of social and political hierarchy. The head not the penis justified male dominance.²⁴ Whether head or penis, however, each was intrinsically coded male.

Even prior to the Henrican Reformation in '23 Vives had a rhetorical agenda of two "kinds" which took no joy in women as had Hyrde in his Introduction to Roper' "*Erasmus*." He addressed not the woman reader herself but the male reader in charge of her virtue: the purpose was for "thyneformation & brynyng up of a christian woman: a matter never yet entreated of any man...." He preached the of her learning with chapter headings covering the three virtuous stages of womankind: virgin, wife and widow while citing Aristotle, Plato, Ambrose, Xenophon, Cyprian, Augustine who had exhorted women to goodness but not taught them the "lower things."²⁵ The only textual change in the '41 publication was in the dedication. The Latin "Instruction" of '23 had been dedicated to his pupil, the same Queen Katherine who was divorced by the time of Hyrde's translation; the translation was re-dedicated to her daughter, the future Queen Mary. The following overview may speak for itself, and Vives' difficulties with his own mother will help make his positions clear. With elite and gentry controls stressing Order and Privilege through ideology and culture, the appearance of the English Vives and its continued republication was another tool used to construct a normative ritual for women.

II.

Vives wrote in his preface a maid should read all the books pertaining to her honesty and chastity. While men were at home and abroad, these were her charges of which she must be informed. Honesty and chastity were women's jewels and those were the more cursed and detestable, who "go aboute to perysshe that one treasure of women: as though a man had but one

eye, and an owalde go about to put it out." Writing to his young student, the princess Mary, daughter of dedicatee, Queen Katherine, he promised the queen "you shall see the resemblaunce of your mynde and goodnes" much as the portrait displays the bodily similitude.²⁶ Vives did not concern himself with the mind's essence but with its actions — how the mind was put to use. "What soul is, is of no concern for us to know," he wrote. "What its manifestations are, is of great importance."²⁷ Although mothers were a vexed question for Vives, in this instance he promoted the ideal of mothers and nurses, often called mothers. Mothers should be with the girl to "reckon her daughter her owne" for the daughter is of the same blood, borne in her womb and takes her milk. The mother had kissed the first laughs, heard joyfully the early stammering, held her to her breast, and all these things generate love. And because she loved, "she shall be far more loved and sette by of her daughter." As he held the contemporary belief that a child could get its dispositions from the teat, Vives recommended using the best nurses, and the wisest also because the first speech a child heard was so important. Despite Quintilian's disagreement he urged diligence in comportment in choosing a boy's nurse too.²⁸ But girls needed special attendance from both mother and father "lest any spot of vyce or unclenlynes shulde stycke to her." Indeed, he asked, how much more diligence ought to be given in a Christian virgin than in the boy child who had naught to lose?²⁹

In his "*Book of Maids*," Vives drew on classical scholarship to sing the praises of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, who had taught her children herself; of Portia wife of Brutus, who took her father's wisdom; and of Cleobula so given to learning she "dispided al pleasure of the body." Other women and prophets cited were all virgins with Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, and Tecla, a mete scholar for her noble master Paul among them. That learning kept a girl chaste was the essential Vives: "for the study of learning is such a thing, that it occupieth ones mind holly, and lifteth it up unto the knowledge of most goodly matters, and plucketh it from the remembrance of such thinges as foul." Women should study wisdom as woman learned on good books never turned to villainy. A public eloquence, however, they did not need as it "is no shame for a woman to holde her peace, but it is a shame for her and abomynable to lack discretion, and to lyve yl."³⁰ Specifically separating the duties of each sex, he accepted the traditionally privileged norm — a norm apparent in the foundational logic of the two primary rhetoricians of this period, Agricola and Erasmus. Moreover, Vives' humanist ideology included women as integral to civic integrity, but only in their maternal capacity:

And in lernynge, as I poynte on one ende to the manne, no more I doo to the woman: saving it is mete that the man have knowledge of many

and divers thinges, that may both profit hym selfe and the common welthe, bothe with the use and increasinge of lernyng. But I wold the woman shuld ve al to gether in that parte of philosophy, that takethe upon it to enfourme, and teche, and amen the conditions. Finally let her lerne for her slefe alone and her yonge children, or her systers in our lorde. For it neyther becometh a woman to rule a schole, nor to lyve amonge men, or soeke abrode, and shake of her demurenes and honesty, eyhter all together or els a great parte: which if she be good, it were better to be at whome within and unknowne to other folkes.³¹

In fact, as it was better for a woman to go blind that to use her learning to read books of war and romance, Vives could not understand why fathers and husbands would allow their charges to become infected with such poison; the law should take heed of the filthiness in some songs, he wrote. There were dangers inherent in the act of unsupervised reading which Vives' addressed reader, the male authority, should not "allow." Rather he should pay close attention to Vives' "suggested" reading list which focused on Latin as a medium of both conversation and active writing. It not only included grammar and pronunciation, but set a high moral standard stressing content as well as style and form for the maid or future wife.³² In imitating Latin lines, the maid's purpose was to exercise her memory in holding opinions of only those good things which were true. He did not mention Greek; perhaps it was considered either too difficult or not a fit subject for young ladies.³³

Believing that from proper memory and religion together, a foreknowledge could almost be obtained, Vives recommended Cato, Publius Syrius, and Erasmus' Seven Wise Men. For cultivating right language and right living, he suggested Cicero, Seneca, the Latinized Plutarch, certain passages on government in Plato, the epistles of Jerome, certain works of Augustine and Ambrose, and especially More's "Utopia," Erasmus' "Institutiones Principis," "Enchiridon," and "Paraphrasis." Such heathen poets as Lucan, Seneca the dramatist and Horace might be added when she had mastered an extensive Latin vocabulary. He also recommended that Princess Mary, only eight years of age, read the New Testament morning and evening. The idea being that as with her classics, Mary would question herself each morning about the previous day's reading.³⁴ Mary herself went on from these studies to translate Erasmus' "Paraphrase for St. John's Gospel" which was published in a whole work by Nicholas Udall in 1547, and the fact that both Mary and Margaret Roper translated works of a religious bent may be a telling point as to what "individuality" could be permitted.³⁵ Both women translated neither the classical nor the patristic writers directly but a mediator, Erasmus. Certainly Mary, praised for her learning in relation to moral integrity, was denied access

to certain "ill-conceived" writers who had no wit or ingenium — no innate moral integrity. Proscribed works had but "a few wordes of wanton lust whiche be spoken to move her mynde...And I miselfe some time have red in them, but I never found in them one step either of goodnes or wit." People read them because they saw themselves as in a glass. I want no pleasure, Vives wrote, infected with poison nor any woman "quickened unto vyce."³⁶

Vives offered the maid a select reading list which would not tax her as some women, as well as men, were inept at learning. He further believed that while the precepts for men might be innumerable, women might be informed with just a few words.³⁷ To counter any suspicions that learned women could use their learning for deceit, he stressed educating her correctly through both eye and ear, and educated correctly she would know the value of her own treasure, and the mischief she could do. Without guidance, she would not know "what a font of ungratiousness she letteth in, what tyme she shutteth forthe chastytte." Proper learning would her from dwelling on bodily pleasure "because a woman is a frayle thing, and of weake discretion, and...may lightly be disceyved, which thing our fyrste mother Eve sheweth, whome the dyvell caught with a lyght argument." Further Vives cited Paul and Timothy as to woman's proper place within the home: "Let youre women holde thier tonges in congregations, nor they be allowed to speake but to be subjecte as the lawe biddeth. If they wolde lerne any thing, lette them aske their husbandes at home."³⁸

"Be not proude mayde," Vives wrote, "that thou arte hole of body, if thou be broken in mynde: nor bicause no man hath touched thy body, if many men have persed [pierced] thy mynde. What avayleth it thy body to be clene whan thou beareste thy mynde and thought infected with a foule and an horrible blotte?" The sin of pride in learning or a swelled mind equated with a belly swelled not by man's seed but by devils.³⁹ To embellish this idea that a future husband would not approve of ideas, or seed, inimical to his own, Vives turned to St. Augustine: "The holy virgin our lady conceyved fyrst in her mynde our lorde Christe, and after in her body." As the whole question of women's education was problematic even in its "usefulness," it was constantly constricted by citing some authority. By stressing the mental conception, Vives could not only guilelessly salvage the problem of the Immaculate Conception but he could also adhere to the Aristotelian version of male or mental essence and female materiality. In allowing woman a mind at all, control could be kept by analogizing that mind into womb or fertile field. The monopoly or authority over the mind by the male thinker was also salvaged; it was "a more honorable noble, and excellent thing to conceive in mynde than in body, wherfore thou art the partener of the more excellent conception."⁴⁰ The idea that learning could penetrate woman's mind and create a chaste or

unchaste condition was a commonplace.⁴¹

While not questioning women's abilities to learn, Vives did question their native wit or ingenium. The whole subject of a learner's abilities, whether man or woman, was much discussed in the Renaissance. Some said ability was natural; others that it could be learned. In women, however, the penetration of the mind, lent itself immediately to an analogy with the penetration of the vagina — the spark igniting knowledge and the sperm igniting conception became co-terminus. In one sense, this analogy of mind and womb was a metaphor, a figure of speech for rhetorical use. However, it was also a figure of thought, a logic which supported a "normative" foundation for women's education.⁴² What women seemed to lack in this schema where she acted as receptacle was discernment. Therefore, just as her conceptual ability would be properly enclosed in marriage, her mental conditioning would be overseen by an authority. The goal of her education became irredeemably tied to her chastity.

Essentially, women were more in thrall to their bodies than men as our "fyrst mother for meate was cast out of paradise." So while women's minds received a diet of proper reading in their maidenhood, Vives cited Galen in suggesting that until marriage they should also fast. A diet of cold food, of mean meat and water, would bridle the body; meat induced heat and young men and women were already naturally hot. Further, as "some thynges that be in the mynde come of the reason and complection of the body" a maid growing from the child's state should be kept from men's company as her body would be full of lust.⁴³ Virginal conditioning prepared the way for Vives' second book and his discourse on wedlock — a state ordained not so much for generation as for certain company of life and continual fellowship. God led the woman to the man, Vives wrote, not only for procreation but because "god hym selfe was chiefe author and maker of wedlocke." Indeed, the name of "husband" did not signify bodily pleasure but unity and affinity. "Where it is sayde in one fleshe (Gen. 2), it is to be understanden one fleshe, and fleshe after the propriety of the Hebrew spech sygnifieth mankynde both man and woman." With these ideas Vives completed the circular figure of thought on woman's purpose.⁴⁴

In the book of wedlock, Vives built on the value of chastity in promoting the state's good. While at first claiming he would not dispute the old questions concerning marriage, he proceeded to demonstrate how the state of a nation rested on womankind. Citing the cases of the Manicheans and various other heretics and pagans, he reminded his reader that the Carthaginians were known for false promise, the Cilicians as robbers, the Romans for their covetousness, and the Greeks as inconstant and variable because a minority of common evil women gave the name to the whole nation. Indeed, "honeste

wyves ought to hate and blame the noughty sylves: as a shame and slander unto al the kynd." A woman who fulfilled her two virtues of chastity and love for her husband cemented the virtuous state. Through study, she came to understand the law that "reckoneth her selfe and her husbände all one person" in service to that state.⁴⁵

Vives' psychology of women was centered around her being a non-self. She had a mind but it required an enclosure in order to function properly. In a similar manner, should her body and womb be enclosed by chastity. Chastity was like a veil without which the woman was naked; it was the maintenance of her integrity through submission to authority; and it was a condition that she could carry throughout her life. Chastity was not virginity but her entity first enclosed by her father, and then by her husband. As she moved from her father's house to her husband's, she was never exposed, never naked, never without proper enclosure. In becoming one in her husband's flesh, she was in a sense never penetrated because her flesh was not hers. Enclosed in the husband's flesh she remained forever chaste as if the husband were penetrating himself. That this ideology tended to breakdown on the practical front, was very apparent in Vives' own difficulties regarding the nature of motherhood.

"No mother loved her childe better than myne did me," he wrote. "Neither any childe did ever lesse perceyve hym selfe loved of his mother than I." As a child I fled from her but when I reached manhood I loved to see her. I now have her memory in reverence. "I embrace her within my mynde and thoughte, whan I can nat with my bodye."⁴⁶ Vives' tortuous relation to his own mother followed a trail which seemed to replicate the period's history. As he examined the potential relationships between women, language and culture, the figure of the mother became polarized as the uneducated speaker of the "mother" tongue. How could he transform her into an ideal in this time of rampant female illiteracy — a time in which mothers almost disappeared in literary depictions? As responsible adult women became invisible, "comic" mothers actively rejected their children in picaresque novels. As print and humanism actively separated real women from social and political roles, the ideal woman had become exiled to a chastity defined by its absence of autonomous activity. It was in this space that authority determined women needed education.⁴⁷

Vives own life was a microcosm of these contradictory messages. As he was working on the Latin "*Instruction*," his father was on trial in Spain for heresy and his mother had reconverted to Judaism. He seemed not to have believed in his father's defection but was seriously concerned about his mother's. How could this child of conversos save his mother's soul and salvage her as a still devout Christian woman? And how could he love her now when he

did not as a child? His writings suggest that the best mother may be a dead one like a blank tablet awaiting inscription, for on the one hand Vives' remembered his mother as cold and unfeeling. On the other hand he considered himself blessed for having escaped her influence in his formative stages, for not having imbibed the mother tongue along with her milk. Emilie Bergman suggests that: "Paradoxically, it is the renunciation of speech and of any demonstration of maternal feeling that give Blanca Vives her authority as an exemplary mother." The absence of her presence gave Vives the scope to become the distinguished humanist who could apotheosize her as exemplary Christian woman and as an "ideal" mother while burying the contradictory images. Blanca's exemplarity, Bergman suggests, "is created by the humanist as an autobiographical basis for his authority on the topic of motherhood."⁴⁸

In essence I would agree, but Bergman's thesis does not quite answer why Vives wished to be an authority on motherhood. Vives' stress on woman's submission to her husband throughout his "Instruction" may be a crucial key. Focusing on the woman's union in the "one flesh" of her husband, was a strategy to save his mother from damnation. If his mother had reembraced Judaism, she was dead to the Church and, consequently dead to both herself and him. But if his father's authority prevailed, his mother's choices were immaterial. To accomplish this maneuver, Vives had to assume that his father was not a heretic despite any consequent judgment. His mother, simply rudderless without the father's authority, had made choices which did not count. If we accept womankind as incapable of any determinate judgment, three of Vives' choices become clearer. First, Vives' renounced the alternative concept of matrimony proposed by Fray Luis de Leñon and seconded by Erasmus. This more positive idea of women not only allowed them free will in choosing matrimony but saw marriage as reciprocal economically. While a hierarchical framework still prevailed, such a conjoint union would have acknowledged woman's contribution of duties and favors in exchange for her husband's economic security. Second, by utilizing St. Paul's teachings that a woman's body must be subject to her husband, Vives firmly anchored her moral development under her husband's authority and moved her freedom of will into his care. It followed, then, that Blanca could not "choose" to leave the church if her husband was still a member.

And third, and perhaps most important to his psychology of women and a goal towards which his whole treatise was driving, Vives recovered the "good" mother by premising that if she had been educated correctly, she would have known her worth. She would have understood not only her moral responsibilities but how to demonstrate her love. "Let her embrace and kiss [her child]," he wrote, "when it does good things. "Let [mothers] love their

children well...for who wolde either adnull or dispreise the lawe of nature. Oh what a crueltie is it, nat to love them that thou hast borne." And "when she embraceth her chylde and kysseth it" let her pray that Christ give the child grace to be good and continent, despising the world's riches. Let her be virtuous and follow in the footsteps of St. Paul, who was more just than Cato, more holy than Socrates and Seneca, more cunning than Plato and Aristotle, and more eloquent than Demosthenes or Tullius. But such was Vives' plea for a mother's love that he could not resist castigating a mother's "natural" inclinations to not discourage vices in the child. Such children would stop loving their mother, he added, once they perceived they were unloved by others because of this indulgent mother love. "O mothers, what an occasion be you unto your children, to make them whether you wyll, good or badde."⁴⁹ As Vives must consider himself good, it naturally followed it must be due to Blanca. So Blanca always loved him, she just did not know it. That her "faults" were to due to an erring, unsupervising husband, also created a foundation for male authority. Hyrde's delight in women's learning has been replaced by Vives' angst. It was an angst that saw five reprints between 1541 and 1592.

III.

Among the modern comments on the period of Henrican Reform, Geoffrey Elton has argued that an educational program for men and women succeeded but with a twist. It was essentially concerned with man as sinful and with maintaining the hierarchical status quo. Faith in education's ability to instill proper duty survived but the politically practical, optimistic *vita activa* of a Thomas Starkey failed because it ran counter to Henry's monarchical aims.⁵⁰ Seminal Tudor figures, contemporaries of Hyrde, Vives and Elyot such as John Colet, John Fisher and Thomas More, had felt a complex sense of religious urgency in the face of continental Reformation, yet concern with law and education for government ultimately prevailed over religious concerns. By the later Queen Elizabeth's time patronage and service to the government would play the major role in the growth and direction of English education, with Christian Humanism absorbed to the state's agenda in the education of the Tudor aristocracy. Young men's training was no longer for the church or clerkships; they were to be trained as governors of society while upper class women were to study the classics to acquire a delight in learning. Absorbing their duty as good wives and mothers along with their books, they would consequently serve their families for the good of the state. Ironically, with more education more women began to write, not it must be noted to challenge the values of chastity, but their status as subordinate beings. Well-

versed in the classics, certain women developed a facility with rhetoric which by the time of King James would be marked as an impediment to the husband's control. Literacy and education spawned a freedom of thought beyond the educators' intention. This was a problem which would never cease to bedevil the status quo as the educational agenda contained an implicit tension between the behavioral and civic indoctrination to duty, and the literate, thinking individual who crossed gender and class lines. Literacy transformed the imagination.⁵¹

Edward VII's protestant conversion, and then Mary's return to Catholicism, followed the dissolution of the Roman Church and Henry's assumption of both secular and religious mantles. Protestantism with its unmediated God created a vacuum which the husband in the family stepped in to fill. A combination of salvation as predestination, education, and political routinization served patriarchy further by cutting upper class women off from their family and kin in the interests of state. Thomas Elyot, the watershed educational figure spanning this Henrican-Marian period, had the markings of a pro-educationist but with qualifications. Primarily a rhetorician and political writer he recuperated "woman" in her idealized, passive form in "*The Defense of Good Women*." Written in English, it first appeared in 1534 with a reprint in '45, and was not so much an educational tract as a paean to the virtuous woman as embodied in Queen Zenobia, the same virginal queen of Palmyra that Vives had cited.

Elyot (1499?-1546) had had a classical if not a university background, and had translated not only Isocrates' "*The Doctrine of Princes*" and Eucolpius' "*The Image of Gouvernance*", but also various Platonic dialogues, Plutarch, and several patristic writers. He also popularized the classics in England and his "*Dictionarie*" in Latin and English was the first book so-called in the kingdom. A friend of Thomas More, he attracted the attention of both Wolsey and Cromwell who appointed him to various offices. Dismissed in 1530, he turned full time to writing and he and his wife lived off the Woodstock estate which he had inherited in 1522. Familiarity with the assize circuit from accompanying his father, a justice, no doubt played a part in the genesis of his most noteworthy book, "*The Boke named the Governour*." Published in '31, it espoused the importance of learning especially for the sons of the nobility, and was a marriage of education and politics which revealed a classical influence as well as illustrating the evolution of English prose.⁵² But in his "*Defense of Good Women*" he exuded the full force of Renaissance humanist ideology incorporating Quintilian's primary precept that the *bonae artae* train the moral faculties. However, as the civic goal for the *vir bonum* still remained problematic for women, notice Elyot's construction of the good woman as one made and not born.

Did the "*Defense*" even promote women's education? Was the preface an add on to a rhetorical exercise? Foster Watson's gloss on the "*Defense*" stressed Zenobia's education in view of matrimony. A woman was to study moral philosophy, Watson wrote, between the ages of sixteen and twenty in preparation for marriage, and to demonstrate the use of her studies both in her marriage and as a widow in choosing tutors and bringing up children. [53] Have I been reading a different book, or was Watson, writing in the early twentieth century, reading in his own time's received opinion? The gist of the essay was the dialogue between two male protagonists discussing Zenobia; Elyot referred often to Zenobia's virtue but not specifically to marriage. It was only in the preface that he suggested women reading Queen Zenobia would "be provoked to imbrae vertue more gladly, and to be circumspecte in the bryngynge up of theyr children." Also in the preface, he recalled how men rebuked women even though they never received displeasure. In fact some men praised women for serving their wanton appetites. Honest men, he wrote, should rather reverence the virtue and gentle strength of women. The preface was an instruction on women should read the essay. This was the only point in which not marriage, but motherhood was mentioned.

Keeping in mind that Elyot's addressed reader in the essay might not be female, there are two points which should be stressed in reading. First, the dismissed Elyot dedicated his work to the virtuous Queen Anne Boleyn (now chaste in marriage) while praising the virginal Zenobia. This was a very politic move perhaps meant to sing Henry's praises more than good women's. Second, form as an explanatory and shaping significance was a primary feature of humanist rhetoric. In the copiousness of words, verbal play interconnected on many levels. There was an enfolding of reason and irony most prominent in the open-ended dialogue of the homo ludens; it was a dialogic device which both Erasmus in "*Praise of Folly*" and Thomas More in "*Utopia*" had used.⁵⁴ Viewed in this light, the dialogue of the "*Defense*," may not be pro-educationist at all, but rather a rhetorical exercise using a "historical" Zenobia metamorphosed into the "genus" of the ideal woman. She was not a woman but a topos, a figure of thought, a trope, a metaphor. To paraphrase Aristotle, poetry or verisimilitude was of higher value than any strict attendance to history. Elyot's Queen Anne was more a device; she was not Hyrde's exuberantly addressed Frances Brandon. Living women were in the main confined to the dedication; imaginary women were better to think with.⁵⁵

Was "*The Defense*" pro-educationist or a rhetorical/political exercise? Elyot's previous attitude to women may shed some light as here lies the gender/class problem. All Elyot's other educational/political works addressed the necessity of proper education for the nobility's sons in serving the commonweal. One could argue that a woman would also be born into her class, but

for Elyot, gender carried more weight. His distrust of women had been apparent three years earlier in his "*Boke called the Governour*" in which he stressed that at "seven years of age, the [boy] child should be taken from 'the company of women.'"⁵⁶ But if Elyot had such an inherent mistrust of womankind, who was he addressing in his "*Defense*" but the fathers and husbands as the chosen overseers of women's influence on their children. These men would select his text as appropriate for their daughters and wives while reveling in its ironic tone themselves. The question of two "kinds" was resolved in Elyot's recommendation for raising women to virtue. Educated women would not only participate with men in reason but in fidelity and constancy be equal unto them. The education/chastity paradigm was operating as women's mental acumen was not in question, but her discernment. But was Elyot a man-at-play making good use of the Ciceronian in *utramque partem*, or was he serious?

The "*Defense*" itself was a very amusing battle of the citations between Caninius, a cur who was always barking after women, and Candidus, a benign and gentle man who used Zenobia's life to prove his argument for women's education. When Caninius offered Helen as an example of the false woman, Candidus countered with the more apt and wifely Penelope. Whenever Plato, Plutarch, Plotinus or Xenophon had written about false women and made them inferior to men, Candidus noted, they only wrote about some women and not most women. Caninius countered this with Aristotle but to no avail. Aristotle, Candidus insisted, reproached women in treating of matters weighty and serious but he himself was a crank. In fact, he reproached everyone in his works. In women's favor, Candidus cited Aristotle's more disciplined work, the "*Oeconomice*:" "The company moste accordynge to nature, is that whiche is ordeyned of man and woman." This companionship was not only for propagation of the species but for love and mutual assistance. Further Aristotole had written: "This company is not because that eche of them hath in every thyng and the same al their vertues lyke profitable," but because their virtues seemed to be contrary one to another and "yet in conclusion they agree to one purpose."⁵⁷

Zenobia herself did not join Elyot's dialogue until close to the end. She was more than ready to continue carrying on this defense of good women herself but Caninius, the skeptic, assured her that he was already satisfied. "He is wise that with reason is shortely contented," declaimed Caninius. "And where Reason serveth not, silence is praysed." And Zenobia agreed: "a good mynde in sylence, is ever well occupied."⁵⁸ There would be no detrimental "imaginings" in the good woman's mind as Zenobia spun her wool. Women's proper education, and proper must be stressed, focused on her understanding the value of her chastity — her voice was not required. In fact, a proper edu-

cation would teach her the value of her silence. And any woman “reader” would see that Zenobia, the virginal queen, also concurred.

Grafton and Jardine suggest that this silencing method for celebrating women’s learned virtue was “essentially an evasion of the humanist tactic of identifying the virtue of humanism with morality in the marketplace,” or the male place.⁵⁹ But not only women were excluded from political participation. Politics was the realm of the propertied. The organization of appropriate texts devolved on the teacher who also supplied a disciplined method for their interpretation. Neither boys or girls could be set loose on readings of their own choice if the ultimate moral value of the *bonae artae* was to be achieved.⁶⁰ Consequently, while discernment was not an attribute connected naturally with student’s young minds, there was always a special connection made regarding women’s minds. Woman’s mind could not escape analogy with her womb. It was a place of voluntary motion outside of the woman’s control as was her mind, and proper education would either teach her the value of her chastity or make her more capable of deception. Elyot’s “*Defense*” fell in that middle space between eloquence and regimentation. It recuperated Politan’s distrust of the learned woman while recovering her as an emblem; it effectively silenced the real woman. It employed Vives’ strategies for motherhood; it ignored Hyrde’s delight in the female mind.

IV.

By the mid-Elizabethan period academic distinction offered real access to positions of power in the queen’s court. Previously subservient to religion by the 1550’s humanism as an identifiable movement had become the more secular “humanities” curriculum with its own methods of its teaching.⁶¹ It was also in this period of the royal-female court that more women came to their own defense through writing and that two differing views on womankind emerged in the literature.⁶² The anti-educationists, the pessimists, and the writers of scurrilous literature stressed woman as a creature “lacking” maleness. The pro-educationists promoted woman as not “lacking” but of another “kind” assimilating Fallopio’s discovery of the clitoris to their argument. Two notable points: it was a period of increased attendance at university for the sons of the elite and middle-classes, as well as a time of vocational school growth in England; it was a period of queenship.⁶³ The constant redefinition of education for both sexes, and of humanism itself cannot escape the social and political contingencies — although one could argue that “language” itself perpetuated these contingencies as its grammar and syntax is always self-referential. This inherently gendered nature of language was put to the test as Mary and then Elizabeth ascended the throne. Did women have a

Renaissance as Joan Kelly so cogently asked? Perhaps, only if they were queen. Ambiguities abounded in regard to the one-sex body which allowed the "lacking" peeress to transmit inheritance through her blood but not to wield power over her inheritance. Old arguments were resurrected: would power render a woman barren, would her power set a subversive model? Was a queen God's will or Nature's mistake?⁶⁴

For the subjects of both Mary and Elizabeth the problems of succession and of "the authority of a married queen regnant" were particularly urgent. In "*The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*," Knox using history proposed that if God chose one woman as the vessel of queenship, He in no way intended all women for power. However, Knox using Scripture said that when God reprov'd a woman, he reprov'd all women. Elizabeth must be cut from the herd. John Aylmer, further determined that it was God's will that Elizabeth have no male heirs as her virile capacities had enfeebled her as a woman. It was fortunate, he continued, that Parliament was the final authority and not the monarch. John Leslie drew attention to the fact that although language repressed the feminine, ex fratribus comprehended women. If any woman were excluded, it must necessarily follow that she had been excluded from salvation.⁶⁵ The difficulty was in acknowledging the queen as authority and female while maintaining order in the realm but not liberating all females. It was a tortuous path to maneuver which no doubt exacerbated the Jamesian backlash. Elizabeth herself stepped into the breach when she exhorted her troops at Tilbury Camp. Employing her rhetorical training she appeared on the battlefield as king. Claiming a king's heart in her weak woman's body she deployed discourse over her body to strategize woman as genus and king as species.⁶⁶

Amid the brouhaha the most prominently published writer on education was Richard Mulcaster, an attendee of both Eton and King's College, Cambridge, and a graduate of Christ Church, Oxford. His "*Positions*" first appearing in 1561 with probable reprints in '81, '87, and '91, had a profound effect on English education. A schoolmaster and later headmaster at Merchant Taylor's School and St. Paul's, Mulcaster had an insider's view of the essentials necessary for a good education, and while he addressed his "*Positions*" of 1561 primarily to educators of boys, he did include one chapter in favor of women's education. Moreover, he dedicated the work to Queen Elizabeth as the centerpiece of the constellation of learned women. Even if no state allowed women's education, he wrote, the queen commended women's education to our reason.⁶⁷ That education for women must be "reasonable" accorded with the humanists' self-fashioning notions of inculcating manners and values with control as the epitome of reason. Such reasonableness was the foundation for Mulcaster's four points in promoting the training

of women. The first point was the manner and custom of the country which allowed them to learn — a custom it would be loathe to contradict. The second was the duty which owe unto them — a duty that has charged us not to leave them lame in carrying out their own particular duty. The third was their own ability to learn. God by nature would never have given them this ability if he wished them to remain idle or to small purpose. The fourth point was the excellent effects in that sex which were fostered by a good bringing up. All this “commendeth the cause of such excellency, and wisheth us to cherish that tree, whose fruit is both so pleasant in taste and so profitable in trial.” What more can be said, Mulcaster asked. “Our country doth allow it, our duty doth enforce it, their aptness calls for it, their excellency commands it.” And do we dare some private conceit, he wrote, when such excellent points and such “rare circumstances do so earnestly commend” her education?⁶⁸

Although women themselves were not addressed here, Mulcaster echoed Hyrde's joy in the educated woman. Yet his arguments also called up visions of a state in the midst of social and economic upheaval which, nevertheless, understood society as a static reality. His final thrust yielded to the “custom of the country.”

I set not young maidens to public grammar schools, a thing not used in my country, I send them not to the Universities, having no precedent thereof in my country. I allow them learning with distinction in degrees, with difference of their calling, with respect to their ends, wherefore they learn, wherein my country commendeth my opinion.⁶⁹

In the queen's case, however, Mulcaster had overridden the custom of the country — a custom which was his main foundation for structuring women's education in a private milieu according to her and . Mulcaster set the tone which Ascham would follow in '70. In specifically addressing the problem of a monarch who was not-male but held the highest authority, he noted that God did not deny women the right to rule in those governments devised by men. And aware that many other women would also need learning according to the degree of their need or use in the commonwealth, he also proposed their education for a trade. The use value of education for the majority, however, could not be divorced from the good woman who aspired to be a good housewife.⁷⁰ In promoting learning for young maids as future wives, Mulcaster called them not only “the seminary of our succession” but “the naturall frye, from which we are to chuse our naturall, next, and most necessarie friends.” Women were the very selfe same creatures, he continued, which were made for our comfort. They were the “only good to garnish our aloneness; our nearest companions in weale or woe and the peculiar and priviest partak-

ers in all our fortunes. They are borne for us to life and bound to us till death."⁷¹ They were not only our warm companions but the mothers of our progeny. Drawing on the macrocosmic/microcosmic analogy, he promoted the education of both sexes in a communion of their "kind" of natural body: "For the bodie of a common weale in proportion is like unto a natural bodie...and in a bodie politike if the like proportion be not kept in all partes, the like disturbance will crepe thorough out all partes."⁷² Citing the degeneration of the Roman Empire under foreign men in service, he wished England to train her own men, and made connections between the well-educated and the commonweal's good.⁷³ Essentially, Mulcaster was appealing to those in authority to do their duty in advancing an education for both girls and boys in which each should learn as much as should be needful in their proper positions.

Women especially, Mulcaster wrote, were committed and commended to us, as pupils to tutors, as bodies to heads, and moreover as bodies to souls. If we did not tender their education dutifully, or "if at any time wither by their owne right, or by our default, they winne the upper roome and make us stand bare head, or be bolder with us to," they may fault us for it. We would do well then to see that "by natural men, and Philosophicall reasons, ...young maidens deserve the traine: because they have that treasure, which belongeth unto it, bestowed on them by nature, to be bettered in them by nurture. " It was the Lord of Nature who had given men the duty to continue the education of all creatures to the limits of their own particular duty and for their utmost good. Because of the goal which the Lord had assigned them and the ways that he had willed them "we have it in commandement not onely to traine up our owne sex, but also our female, seeing he hath to require an account for naturall talentes of both parties, us for directing them: them for perfourmaunce of our direction."⁷⁴

Specifically for a young gentlewoman Mulcaster suggested she be able to read plainly and distinctly, write fair and swiftly, sing clear and sweetly, play well and finely, understand and speak the learned languages, and also learn those tongues "which time embraceth, with some logical help to chop, and some rhetoric to brave." Logic and rhetoric gave seats to words just as bodies furnished a ground for apparel. A well-furnished maid should further be able to "draw clean in good proportion, and with good symmetry."⁷⁵ Mulcaster was aware, however, that the end of their education was different: for women "are to be the principall pillers in the upholding of households."⁷⁶ While he added that men's education was without restraint in its employment, women's was "within limit, and so must their traine be.." If she was to be trained "in respect to marriage, obedience to her head, & qualities which look that way, must neede be her best way."⁷⁷

While Mulcaster wished women joy in learning, he feared they had no innate wit to assimilate geometry or the other sciences. He denied them ability in math but encouraged math's sister, music. As they would not plead at the bar, he wrote, they would not need to learn the law. And although countless stories commended their skill in herbals, they need not concern themselves with physics. As they had no use for public speech in the pulpit or as leaders, what good speech they learned was for honest performing and virtuous living. Philosophy, if they were able, was not prohibited as it would furnish their general discourse and allow them some tongues which, as Pliny had recommended: would help them beautify their needle work with good examples of their own kind. For all this learning, Mulsacter continued, they were best taught either at home or in elementary schools by their own sex although "ours frame them best, & with good regard to some circumstances will bring them up exceedingly well."⁷⁸

The essential values in Mulcaster, were in certain instances a recapitulation of Vives. Woman's discernment was still in question while her education to virtue was promoted. The communion of education and politics was essential to Mulcaster. Virtue was the ground for all English women and men — "by whether so ever name ye call it, wisdom in pollicie, valiance in execution, iustice in deciding, modestie in demeanor."⁷⁹ However, the quintessential question as to whether virtue could be taught directly or whether teaching eloquence could lead to virtue was as problematic as always. The incorporation of Ramus' and Taleus' methods for teaching the classics in the universities had promoted the humanities as a way to learning, but certainly not to a public or democratic eloquence. The problem which bedeviled Cicero in grafting an Athenian discourse and educational goal on to a different political structure still surfaced around the notion of rhetoric in the Elizabethan period. Learning for men, however, did lead to a career in law, writing or court politics while the humanities had a basic education appeal to the mercantile class not so much for moral improvement as for information and skill.

⁸⁰ Chastity and good mothering remained the primary goals of women's education but, ironically, the learning Mulcaster espoused for women as a purely private function would encourage lettered women to begin to write. And although these women would write in opposition to the male notion of their inherent "lack," they acknowledged their "place" as a different "kind."⁸¹

Mulcaster's opinion that maids were commonly more weak by nature recapitulated the idea of woman as a more material substance and the imagination as a bodily stratum. Women were "of a moonish influence," he wrote, "and all our kinde is weake of the mother side, which when the first was made, even then weakened the mans side." The biblical stories of woman created from man supported woman's intrinsic "nature." "Though the girles seeme

commonly to have a quicker ripening in witte, then boyes have, for all that seeming, yet it is not so. Their naturall weaknesse," he continues, "which cannot holde long, delivers very soone, and yet there be as prating boys, as there be prating wenches." Besides their brains were not so much charged, with weight or with multitude of matters as boys heads were, "and therefore like empty caskes they make the greater noise."⁸²

V.

With a debt to Mulcaster Roger Ascham's masterwork, "*The Scholemaster*," appeared early in Elizabeth's reign in 1570; it dealt, but only in passing, with the new phenomenon of female scholarship. A graduate of Cambridge, a Greek reader there, and public orator at the University after Cheke, Ascham went on to instruct the Princess Elizabeth in '48. His hatred of Rome demanded he maintain a self-imposed silence when he was appointed Latin secretary to Queen Mary in 1553, but with Elizabeth's ascension to the throne in '58, he himself played a role of "educational" power at the court. "*The Scholemaster*," sent to the publisher by his widow two years after his death, addressed the male teachers of youth and focused on the means for generating good leaders and the method for teaching Latin. All were in aid of a better commonwealth. In fact, Ascham blamed nobles for not educating their children correctly so that "meaner men's children come to be the wisest counsellors and greatest doers, in the weighty affairs of this realm."⁸³ But Ascham's approach to education also blended the religious with the humanist. "But now, master Cicero," Ascham wrote, "blessed be God and his Son Jesus Christ, whom you never knew, except it were as it pleased Him to enlighten you by some shadow, as covertly in one place you confess." Like your master Plato before you, you have said: "*Veritatis tantum umbram consecutamur*." (Nevertheless, we pursue the shadow of truth.)⁸⁴

Ascham's text focused on men's education and on their public role. he underscored both as essentially male prerogatives by suggesting that wise men send their sons to Italy "under the keep and guard" of example and authority.⁸⁵ For the male student he lauded the rule of three discrete persons: the schoolmaster who taught with gentleness, the governor who corrected manners with sharpness, and the father who maintained a stern watch on the child's whole obedience.⁸⁶ Despite being faced with the first formidable rumblings of the learned woman, Ascham enthusiastically promoted a "Quintilian" approach to education for men, and mentioned women only twice in passing. He praised Elizabeth obliquely by noting that "It is to your shame (I speak to you all, young gentlemen of England) that one maid should go beyond you all, in excellency of learning, and knowledge of divers

tongues."⁸⁷ He also lauded the executed Lady Jane Grey's accomplishments but said nothing further about a need for women's education or its possible use.⁸⁸ His love for education in and of itself seemed to be intrinsically bound up with the public role of men although certainly he would agree with Erasmus that "Studies, if they have begun to please, spur the mind to wilder enthusiasm than any other of the arts."⁸⁹

Notably in his essay on matrimony, Erasmus had stressed the teaching duties of the husband in educating the woman's eye and ear lest amorous fables cause violent passions in young maids.⁹⁰ While Ascham made no mention of such specifics, nor of the education/chastity analogy, he did after all have that problem discussed above: unmarried and female monarch which bedeviled the Elizabethan period. As Ascham was, however, for a short time in charge of Elizabeth's education, we might infer that her syllabus included only those classical and religious readings which educated both men and women to their proper virtue. The question of a gentle authority in education itself and a concomitant attack on the license shown to impressionable young men at court was the essential Ascham. While offering Elizabeth and Lady Jane as examples for the court to follow, he was perhaps turning Elyot upside down by suggesting that royal blood surmounted the inherent complications of womankind.

Some might have considered anything more specific on Elizabethan womankind as a subject too hot to handle. Such thinking did not, however, deter Edward Hake in his "*Touchstone*" of 1574 as he took the educational authorities to task. A translator of one dialogue from Erasmus' "*Colloquia*" and of Thomas a Kempis' "*Imitation of Christ*," Hake may have been a lawyer, would serve as a bailiff in '76, a court recorder in '78, and as a member of Parliament in '88-'89.⁹¹ He claimed to write to counteract the evils of poor education and despaired of the grievous injuries done the country by ill-educated men, yet so little is known of him there are no personal clues to his unmitigated pessimism in the "*Touchstone*." The essential Hake believed all children "by nature are evyll and being evyll, they are by the example of parents made worse." They had no love for God, nor any honor or fear of their Parents. On the subject of the "educated" women he despaired again over parents' who wanted learning for their daughters just "to make them companions of carpet knights, and giglots for amorous lovers."⁹² He could only cite pagans, heathens and disbelieving people who had any women and virgins who were so well-learned and virtuous that even the worst of them could govern a whole country in their prudence. Of the majority of contemporary women he wrote: "I cannot tell whether through sorrow I should cry out and bewail them, or for shame commit them to silence: so immoderate in apparel, so lascivious in talk, so bold in behaviour, and so unseemly in gesture is the

universal state, almost as well of wives as of damosels." Provident care of parents over their daughters was so neglected that in their young and tender years they straightaway learned "the high path to whoredom, and the principles of vanity and lewdness." The daughter was either kept from exercises of good learning and a knowledge of good letters, or "else she is so nouseled in amorous books, vain stories and fond trifling fantasies, that she smelleth of naughtiness even all her life after."⁹³

Another book, appended and bound with the "*Touchstone*," offered further enlightenment on Hake's attitude toward women and to girls' education. While these were poems and of a gentler, kinder nature, the gist was to counteract a mother's negative influence on her son's learning while stressing education solely for boys. In the prologue Hake incidentally made his attitude to women clear. There, he mentioned that his wife was about the house somewhere, and that he was going crazy without "accustomed conference." Having just reread a handy "*De Pueris Statim ac Liberaliter Instituendis*," by Quintillian to keep his mind occupied he decided to write on education handled wisely. The "missing" wife, the poems' dialogic debate as to whether young minds can learn anything, and their stress on the shortness of earthly time would seem to suggest a preoccupation with the corruptibility of humanity and the condemnation of women to a more sinful, and inept material kind. [94] Some small number of women, he wrote, "who have any knowledge at all, do so greatly abuse it, that much better were it that they should unlearn..."⁹⁵ Because of the rarity of texts on girls' education, aside from Vives' who had stressed the education/chastity analogy and Mulcaster's one chapter, Hake's negative influence became difficult to undo.⁹⁶

In popular print, there were also scurrilous attacks on the literate female. The idea, that any education at all might make a woman more capable of deception by augmenting her "natural" talents, had been Edward Gosynhill's theme in his 1541 "*Scholehouse of Women*." A poem in seven line stanzas it attacked women satirically mocking their pretensions to be "on top." Such unruly women embodied ambiguity. They were mundus inversus, the world turned upside down — both shameful and outrageous, vigorous and in command, and emblematic of the analogy: dangerous minds, dangerous wombs. It was a multivalent image encompassing the female grotesque, the female limiting male tyranny, and Folly.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, several writers came to women's defense in print, and Gosynhill was believed to have recanted his lack of chivalry and published "*The Mulierum Pean*." The little "*Scholehouse*," however, still went through three subsequent printings — the last in '72, and by its popularity may have confirmed the beliefs of many. Using mockery, Gosynhill warded off the alien "female" by positioning her agonistically to the male. Then he absorbed and displaced her through the use of language struc-

tured as a male prerogative, the polar opposite of women's unlearned and unlettered mother tongue. Women were gossips, liars and talkers who used language any way they could.⁹⁸

Although Gosynhill assured the reader that women themselves would acknowledge his sayings as true, it was the knowing men who were addressed in these poems. In gist: Women had no shame. Whatever men said or reasoned, women would always have the last word for after they had used their wiles to get you to sleep with them, they would then say you had made a promise to them just in case their belly swelled. If it did not, they were well pleased but if you were going to continue using them you would have to dress them and if their belly did rise, then they would swear it was yours. "Make sure," Gosynhill cautioned his reader, "that the childe looks like you." Woman's preposterous behavior was God's mistake: the rib he had taken to make her got chewed by a dog, and God had taken one of the dog's bones instead. So here she was, our woman, made of a bone which chattered and clattered around the empty hollow of her womb like bones in a bag.⁹⁹

Gosynhill's female psychology drew a connection between women's two orifices: both her "lips" were loose. The labial analogy fitted a womb/brain analogy. With the womb an organ outside of the woman's will, her education was specious as it naturally followed, if the womb had a will of its own, so too did woman's brain. Both were two empty kettles which beset the poor man. He was condemned to a life of this immortal truth: "That whosoever weddeth a wyfe, Is sure of sorowe/ all his lyfe."¹⁰⁰ Interestingly, Gosynhill did not lambaste the male for his interest in "kettles." Instead he encouraged man's natural wit to get the best of female nature. Language was the device for surmounting woman's empty speech. And language, in this guise, created a reality. Both "natural" wit and learning became male prerogatives by demonstrating the transparency or emptiness of the woman's mother tongue. Both wit and learning were set aside as "commonplaces" which created a persona, a self-hood for the male by privileging him with the true language. The psychology of the period was not ours; the self was not an internal structure. The self was a created constellation of things, goods, and properties given communal credence which had a mask-like quality of exteriority. Agency, or the action of a self, equated with the proper and property. Gosynhill's denial of "language" to women was not just a problem of her educational lack. Language was an extrinsic component of self-hood, and its denial to women further substantiated her as property, as lacking agency and as requiring a guiding authority to promote the public good. Which ever orifice was referenced, mouth or labia, both needed supervision. In this sense Gosynhill's poems reinforced a pessimism like Hake's. Both the scurrilous and the pessimistic literature on education stressed woman as a creature "lacking" male-

ness.¹⁰¹

Mulcaster's "custom of the country," Hake's social pessimism, religious proscriptions, male domination in language and education, and Gosynhill's mockery created an odd stew. Together they made the propriety of women's writing directly for the public sphere, other than as a translator, rather difficult. Perhaps, agency was a strong factor here. The translators, such as Margaret Roper or the Princess Mary were not creating original works; they were merely performing a copying of sorts. Agency and authority were naturally synonymous with the "proper" of which propriety was a derivative term: what was suitable to one. Dying was one tactic a woman could employ to write; dying allowed her to maintain a woman's proper virtue while writing yet at the same time cope with the problem of proprietary or male selfhood. Dorothy Leigh (fl. 1616), writing on her deathbed, fit this category. Certainly other women were writing both in manuscript and in print but Mrs. Leigh might be considered a success story of sorts. She fit the paradigm towards which the educationalist's agenda had been driving. Mrs. Leigh was emblematic of a potentially dangerous mind converted to the public good through her devotion to her family. She had overcome her inherent "lack" by properly producing children. She accepted herself also as a different "kind": a good mother with great affection for her children. Citing religious and not classical readings as having had a salubrious effect upon her chastity, she was strongly aware that her writings might be discredited as she was only a woman. Bereft without her husband's authority to write, she turned to Lady Elizabeth daughter of King James and to her Church for approval. Yet yearnings for those vocations which only a man could attain surface in her book. Limited to weapons of the weak, she fulfilled a promise made to her dead husband, and wrote on her deathbed. She conformed even as she rebelled.¹⁰²

In her "*Mother's Blessing*" of 1618, which was reputedly in its fourteenth edition by 1629, Mrs. Leigh entreated her four sons to educate all their children that they might learn virtue through reading and thus serve God, King and country. Marrying the notion of godliness with learning, she charged her sons "that al your children be they males or females may in their youth learn to read the Bible in their own mother-tongue, for I know it is a great help to true godliness."¹⁰³ The reading of religious texts was foremost in her mind; such an ability was a means to reach God who "sent his own Son to wash this filthy creature man."¹⁰⁴ Apologizing for writing in such a bold manner to her very young sons, she offered seven reasons why she must, and foremost was a mother's affection. The well-learned lessons of womankind permeated her text as she pleaded: it was because her children were boys that she must write for "the great mercy of God toward you, in making you men, and placing you

amongst the wise.¹⁰⁵ Hoping her women readers would not blush too much at her boldness, and giving men the first and chief place, she wrote, "yet let us labour to come in the second." Because we women must confess, "that sin entered by us into our posterity, and how fearefull we are that our sinne should sinke any of them to the lowest part of the earth..." do not be ashamed to show your infirmities.¹⁰⁶

Parents, give your children names they can strive to emulate, she wrote, leaving names for her children's children: Philip, Elizabeth, James, Anna, John and the chaste Susanna. Mary she said she could not include because Mary was the savior's mother, the mother and comforter for all women, and "because many hae made a God of the Virgin Mary, the Scripture warrenting no such thing, and have prayed to her." Yet it was Mary, she reminded her readers, who "hath taken away the reproach which of right belonged to us, and it is further by her seed that we are all saved."¹⁰⁷ For Mrs. Leigh woman was rightfully less than man because of the original sin, and a woman had to be wary of this essential materiality. Chastity was key to woman's overcoming this natural state. Learning to read gave her access to this higher state of virtue. Indeed, Mrs. Leigh found a certain justice in women's subservience: for as Eve once beguiled Adam now we women may say "that men lye in waite every where to deceive us, as the elders did to deceive Susanna. Wherefore let us be, as she was, chaste, watchful, and wary." Addressing the more numerous women readers of the early 1600s, she asked them to be on guard as "an unchaste woman destroyeth both the body and the soule of him shee seemeth most to love."¹⁰⁸

Why should women be educated? Why should they not? Was there an alternative public good to be gained from educating women? Could her education serve to strengthen the family or would it destroy the family? In an age which conceived of society as a hierarchy of groups and women were deprived of any corporate identity outside the family, the family was alternately perceived as both a threat to and a constituent part of both the social order and the self. Hyrde, Vives, Elyot, Mulcaster, Ascham, Hake, Gosynhill, Mrs. Leigh. All their arguments became entangled in the meaning of "woman." Her dangerous mind was implicitly and explicitly tied to her sexualized body and the control of her womb. The anomalous nature of her power and selfhood help to explain certain themes which contended in both the pro- and anti- educational texts. "Woman" was a meaning at all times under deliberation and construction in relation to woman's in the world. Her mind/womb was not only an emblem but a focus for religious, educational and political anxiety.

We have come full circle. From Dorothy Leigh back to Blanca Vives.

Mother was love; woman was virtue; learning begat chastity; ignorance and lewdness went together. The conscious and unconscious commonplaces of these writers inscribed the learned women with a civic use while denying her a public voice. Hyrde's enthusiasm became lost in an educational agenda which prescribed male authority and authenticated male proprietary rights and selfhood. In reading these treatises on education today, however, they seemed to do something else, perhaps unintentionally. They structured a hierarchy of learning which in conjunction with the emerging capitalist system, drove a further wedge into the feudal structure of hierarchy and blood supremacy. Learning for both women and men promoted a new class structure based on mental acumen, albeit one that could not quite erase its debt to first principles. Aristotle's "causes" still emerged as women's lack of discernment. The equation of her womb with mental capacity always entailed some guiding authority whether pastor, tutor, husband or father. The unruly, unmarried or unseemly woman remained a prime suspect. The arguments became entangled in the meaning of "woman" but it was a meaning which the writing women would begin to undermine and challenge simply by writing. Their challenge might have altered not only the foundations of learning but the very meaning of "woman" herself if science had not recuperated chastity's essentiality in a language whose grammar and syntax remained self-referential. Chastity continued as the hobgoblin and Hyrde's joyfulness was redirected. Why should women be educated? Why should they not? Dangerous minds, dangerous wombs.

NOTES

- 1 The humanist argument for an education of practical use was in contrast to the scholastic which recuperated knowledge through an abstraction of the mind, a formally valid logic. Ronald Witt, "The Humanist Movement," in Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, eds. *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1994).
- 2 For the deconstructed family as a constituent part of, as well as a threat to, both social order and the self see Jean Bethke Elshtain, ed., *The Family in Political Thought* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1982).
- 3 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1979). For a cogent overview of Foucault see Elizabeth Grosz, ed., *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), esp. pp. 145-148. See also Ralph Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450-1700* (New York: Longman, 1984);

- Merry Wiesner, "Family, Household and Community," in Brady et al., *European History*.
- 4 Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), chapters 1 and 2. For an explication of the ongoing commodifications within humanism itself and between humanism and religion, there is no better source than the three volumes of essay in Albert Rabil Jr. ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989). For a discussion of humanists in opposition to King Henry's monarchical agenda see A.G. Dickens and Dorothy Carr, eds., *The Reformation in England; to the Accession of Elizabeth I* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968); and Thomas F. Mayer, *Thomas Starkey and the Commonwealth: Humanist Politics and Religion in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
 - 5 *Leonardo Bruni Aretino Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe*, ed. by H. Baron (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 11-12, as quoted in Grafton/Jardine, p. 33 n11. For arguments for and against Baron's dissection of Bruni's civic humanism see Albert Rabil Jr., "Significance of Renaissance Humanism in the Interpretation of the Italian Renaissance," ; and "AHR Forum," (Feb. 1996): 107-144.
 - 6 *Christiani matrimonii institutio* (Basle, 1526), chapter 17, unpaginated as cited in Grafton/Jardine, p. 32 n 10. For Erasmus' optimistic humanist agenda see Albert Rabil Jr., "Desiderius Erasmus,"
 - 7 There is extensive literature in anthropology, philosophy and history on the contradictions in the female body which are often read as "pre-existing signs." For a particular instance of how society's creation of the "good mother" occludes its complicity in manipulating woman and her wealth while reinforcing her image as insensitive and dangerous when not under male control see Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).
 - 8 In the period education (or even the ability to read) was implicitly tied to notions of hierarchy and to discovering the best obedience to Authority. What Authority was was highly contentious. That society did exist and was maintained by religion and law which were both structured on the Great Chain of Being is discussed in Conrad Russell. For the period's notion that a settled doctrine of sovereignty implemented by an extrinsic, pragmatic potency of centralization would lead to peace see Denis Hay, (London and New York: Longman, 1966, 1989); in Hay women are hidden behind the pervasive notion of family. For a discussion of how the age not only conquered the world by force but laid foundations for political, economic and social changes essential to the evolution of the modern age (women again are hidden) see H.G. Koenigsberger, George L. Mosse, and G.Q. Bowler, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (London and New York: Longman,

1989). For an understanding of how the Reformation created unprecedented opportunities for secular power and how "man as sinful" fed elites' moral and educational agenda see Gerald Strauss, *Pre-Reformation Germany*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1993). For confessional orthodoxy's attempt to resolve the crisis of Authority see both Francis Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979); and Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984). For moral regulation as co-extensive with state formation and the manner in which state formations animate, legitimize and routinize a particular moral ethos of citizenship and subjectivity in which difference equates with moral fault see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985). For the interactions of state formation and self-mastery through manners which implicitly conveyed a gendered component in regard to power, and located the body as a site of cultural production see both Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process* (Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell, 1994); and Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992).

- 9 Cited in Suzanne W. Hull, *Chaste, Silent, and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982), p. 181.
- 10 Richard Hyrde, Introduction to "A devout treatise upon the Paternoster made fyrst in latyn by the moost famous doctour mayster Erasmus..." 1524, as reproduced in, Foster Watson, ed., *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), p. 160.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 169.
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 159.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 172.
- 14 Cited and quoted, *ibid.*, p. 163.
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 167.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 168. He also reminded Frances of Erasmus' tale of "The Abbot and the Learned Woman" which took an oblique shot more at priestly incompetence than womanly scholarship. When Erasmus' abbot remarked that women were more secure from priests if they did not know Latin, his Magdalia replied: "Nay, there is the least danger from that quarter...because you [monks] take all the pains you can not to know anything of Latin." *Ibid.*, p.166n1.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 167.
- 18 Cited in Grafton and Jardine, *Humanism*, pp. 45-53.
- 19 For the Reformation from a political perspective see Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); and De Lamar Jensen, *Reformation European: Age of Reform and Revolution* (Lexington, MA: D.G. Heath and Co., 1981). For the Reformation from a religious perspective see Francis Oakley, *Western Church* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979); and Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation 1300-1700*, Vol. IV (Chicago: University of

Chicago Press, 1984).

- 20 Richard Hyrde, "A very fruitful and pleasant boke called the Instruction of a Christian woman, made fyrst in Latyne by the right famous clerke maister Lewes Vives... Thome Berthelet, 1541, "Privelegio ad imorimendum solum," preface. STC: 24856 HUNT: 60706. (The reprint dates for the Hyrde/Vives text are 1547, 1557, 1585 and 1592. 1531 is listed as a questionable date in Pollard and Redgrave; 1540 is listed as well.) The reference HUNT throughout the footnotes refers to the book's call number at the Huntington Library, San Marino, Ca. Notes on Vives' background are cited from (Chicago, etc.: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1969), pp. 91-92.
- 21 Corrigan and Sayer, *Great Arch*.
- 22 George Buchanan published a Latin edition of Vives' treatise at Lyons in 1536 which was intended to follow Thomas Linacre's "Rudimenta Grammatica." Buchanan included the following admonition to the reader: "for he who looks in all things for a reason, as if for a goal, knows moreover what things are of most value, and which things have been furnished him to no use or purpose." He added further that in this text of Vives "you have the judgment of a most learned man [eruditissimi viri]."
- 23 Margaret Spufford, "Puritanism and Social Control," in ; Robert Muchembled, *Popular Cultural and Elite Cultural in France, 1400-1750*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1985). Spufford noted that women's regimentation was not specifically a Puritan response as similar controls on sexuality had surfaced in the thirteenth century. Martin Ingram, "Sex and Marriage," *Popular Cultural in Seventeenth-Century England*, Barry Reay, ed. *Popular Cultural in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985).
- 24 Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995). For discussions of the one-sex body see Phyllis Rankin, "Historical Difference, Sexual Difference," Jean Brink, ed., *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England* (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1993); and Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990).
- 25 Vives/Hyrde preface.
- 26 Idem.
- 27 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, op. cit.
- 28 Vives to the contrary, Quintilian believed a nurse's morals were important for boys as well. Moreover, Quintilian stressed early language for both boys and girls. Cited in Quintilian, *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing*, ed. by James J. Murphy (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987), pp. 11-12.
- 29 Cited and quoted in Vives/Hyrde, pp. 1-2.

- 30 Ibid., pp. 5r-9r.
- 31 Ibid., p. 9.
- 32 Cited in *ibid.*, p. 9r.
- 33 Ibid., chapter 5, *passim*.
- 34 *Idem*. There is no specific mention that Plato also would have been in Latin.
- 35 Watson, , p. 148.
- 36 Vives/Hyrde, p. 11.
- 37 Ibid., cited in the Preface.
- 38 Cited and quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 5r-10.
- 39 Ibid., p. 13.
- 40 Ibid., p. 14.
- 41 For the skopophilic gaze and the analogy between testicles and the male eye which penetrate the secrets of nature see Steve Brown, "The Boyhood of Shakespeare's Heroines: Notes on Gender Ambiguity in the Sixteenth Century," *Studies in English Literature*, 30, 2 (Spring 1990): 243-263; Paula Findlen, "Humanism, Politics and Pornography in Renaissance Italy," *The Invention of Pornography*, ed. Lynn Hunt (New York: Zone Books, 1996); David O. Frantz, *Festum Voluptatis* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1989).
- 42 For a discussion of the differences between figures of speech and figures of thought and Agrippa's influence on English rhetoric see Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), esp. chapter 5.
- 43 Vives/Hyrde, pp. 18-18r.
- 44 Ibid., p. 63.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 61-64r.
- 46 Ibid., p. 116.
- 47 The basis for these ideas appear in Emilie Bergman, "The Exclusion of the Feminine in the Cultural Discourse of the Golden Age: Juan Luis Vives and Fray Luis de León," *Sex and Love in Golden Age Spain*, ed. by Alain Saint-Saens (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edward Mellon Press, 1991), *passim*.
- 48 Cited and quoted, *Ibid.*, pp. 129-133.
- 49 Vives/Hyrde, pp. 113r-115r.
- 50 Geoffrey Elton, "Humanism in England," *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe*, eds. Anthony Goodman and Angus MacKay (London and New York: Longman, 1989).
- 51 Richard J. Schoek, "Humanism in England," ; Retha M. Warnike, Women and Humanism in England," ; Gerald Strauss, "State of Pedagogical Theory c. 1530: What Protestant Reformers Knew about Education," various articles in *The Rise of Puritanism*; William Haller, (New York: Harper & Row, 1957, orig. pub. 1938).
- 52 All cited in *English Writers on Education, 1480-1603*, compiled by Foster Watson (Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1967, original printing in four

parts between 1902-06), pp. 14-15, and *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, compiled and edited by Sir Paul Harvey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 268.

53 Cited in Watson, p. 18.

54 Cited and quoted in Thomas Elyot, (London: 1534, reprinted 1545), p. 4. STC: 7657.5; HUNT: 88302. The page references are to the Huntington's photo reproduction: R212242. References to the homo ludens may be found in Richard Schoek."

55 Zenobia may indeed have lived during the reign of Aurelian in 273 C.E.

56 Cited in Watson, pp. 15-19.

57 Cited and quoted in Elyot, p. 20.

58 Ibid., p. 35.

59 Grafton/Jardine, p. 35.

60 Cited in Ibid., pp. 147-49.

61 Today, historians debate whether humanism had by this time merely devolved into rote drills stifling creativity; whether it had only ever been just a broad cultural and literary movement with a strong belief in both recuperating the classics and valuing man; whether the movement came to a grinding halt amid the Reformation and Counter-Reformation; whether Puritan propaganda through the public and the press built on the humanistic model to transform the English imagination; or whether, indeed, humanism was a revolutionary cognitive turn. (That is a meaning-making taking place through dialogic encounters which refashioned reality through the use of words in a particular way, creating a new vision of the world in which the humanists' educational program helped shape state-building by promoting self-mastery and control as the epitome of reason.) This is a short list for pursuing these various arguments: Grafton and Jardine, ; James Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991); Dermot Fenlon, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); Elizabeth Gleason, "Catholic Reformation, Counterreformation and Papal Reformation in the Sixteenth Century," ; Haller, ; Jerome Bruner, *The Culture of Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996); Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization* (Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell, 1994). For an excellent overview and further bibliography on the subject see *American Historical Review* (Feb. '98) especially, Kenneth Gouwens "Perceiving the Past: Renaissance Humanism after the 'Cognitive Turn.'"

62 For an overview on literacy and learning among women, and a secondary source bibliography see Merry E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 117-145. For the primary texts themselves see , eds. Catherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus, *Half Humankind* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); and for a facsimile library of essential works, (10 volumes when completed), gen. eds.

- Betty S. Travitsky and Patrick Cullen, *The Early Modern Englishwoman* (Brookfield, VT: The Scholar Press).
- 63 Lawrence Stone, "The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640," no. 28 (July '64): 41-80.
- 64 Joan Kelly, "Did Women Have a Renaissance," *Women, History, and Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Judith Richards, "To promote a woman to beare rule: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* (Spring '97): 101-122.
- 65 John Knox in (Edinburgh, 1895), p. 373; John Aylmer, "Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subjects" (1559); John Leslie, "A Defense of the Honor of Marie Quene of Scotlande" (London, 1569). All cited in Constance Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," (Aug. '87): 421-451; Jordan quoted.
- 66 Janet Green, " 'I My Self': Queen Elizabeth I's Oration at Tilbury Camp," *Sixteenth Century Journal* (Summer '97): 421-446.
- 67 Richard Mulcaster, "Positions: Wherein those primitive circumstances be examined, which are necessarie for the training of children, either for skill in their booke, or health in their bodie" (Thomas Vautollier at London, 1561), p. 167. Probable reprints, 1581, 1587, 1591. STC: 18250; HUNT: 62700. Biographical material cited in Watson, , p. 99.
- 68 Mulcaster, p. 167.
- 69 Idem.
- 70 Cited in Ibid., p. 174, 180.
- 71 Cited and quoted in Ibid., p. 168.
- 72 Ibid., pp. 133-34.
- 73 Cited in Ibid., p. 159.
- 74 Cited and quoted in Ibid., p. 168.
- 75 Ibid., p. 180.
- 76 Ibid., p. 177.
- 77 Ibid., p. 174.
- 78 Cited and quoted in Ibid., pp. 181-83. Mulcaster cites the Pliny reference on needlework from Pliny, book 35, cap ii.
- 79 Ibid., p. 200.
- 80 Cited in Grafton/Jardine, Chapter 7 and Conclusion, passim.
- 81 See fn. 62.
- 82 Cited and quoted in Mulcaster, p. 177.
- 83 Roger Ascham, "The Scholemaster Or plaine and perfeite way of teachyng children, to onderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong, but specially purposed for the private bryngyng up of youth in gentlemen and Noble mens houses..." B.L.J. Daye, London, 1570 in , collected and revised by Rev. Dr. Gilles (London: John Russel Smith, 1864), p. 123. Background on Ascham cited from Watson, , p. 43 and , p. 44.

- 84 Ibid., p. 256.
- 85 Ibid., p. 151.
- 86 Cited Ibid., pp. 119-120.
- 87 Quoted in Ibid., p. 142.
- 88 Cited Ibid., p. 118.
- 89 Erasmus, "Christiani matrimonii institutio" (Basle, 1526), no page citations, as quoted in Dorothy Gardiner, (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 167.
- 90 Ibid., as cited in Gardiner, p. 164.
- 91 Cited in Watson, , p. 78.
- 92 Edward Hake, "A Touchstone for this time present, expressly declaring such ruines, enormities and abuses as trouble the Church of God and our Christian commonwealth at this daye. Whereunto is annexed a perfect rule to be observed of all Parents and Scholemasters in the traying of their scholars and children in Learning." (Newly set forth by E. H. Imprinted at London by Thomas Hackett..., 1574), p. 26. STC: 12609; HUNT: 59531.
- 93 Cited and quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 22-24.
- 94 E. H. in his Epistle to "A Compendius fourme of education to be diligently observed of all Parentes and Scholemaisters in trayning up of their children and schollers in learning." Gathered into Englishe meeter, by Edward Hake — and bound with the "Touchstone."
- 95 Hake, "A Touchstone," p. 22.
- 96 Watson, , p. 78. While there were numerous books on the method and value of a boy's education in this period, the only text specifically for girls was the reprinted Hyrde translation of Vives.
- 97 Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Cultural in Early Modern France* "Women on Top," (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975).
- 98 Edward Gosynhill, "Here begynneth a lytle boke named the Scholehouse of women: wherein every man may rede a goodly prayse of the condicyons of women." Tomas Petyt, 1561. (Pollard and Redgrave notes a possible error in date) Published 1541, 1560, 1572. STC: 12104.5 HUNT: repro of 16965. Biographical information on Gosynhill is cited from *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (London: Oxford University Press, 1949-50), pp. 266-7.
- 99 Ibid., pp. 1r-4.
- 100 Ibid., p. 3v.
- 101 I am indebted to both Stephen Greenblatt and Francis Dolan for my thoughts in this passage. Stephen Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990); Frances E. Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550-1700* (Ithaca and London:, Cornell University Press, 1994).
- 102 Further ideas on "the weak" may be found in James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

103 Mrs. Dorothy Leigh, "The Mother's Blessing: Or The godly Counsaile of a Gentle-woman, not long since deceased, left behind her for her Children..." (John Budge, 1618), Preface. (Reprinted in nineteen editions through 1718 and dedicated to the Lady Elizabeth, daughter to the high and mighty king of Great Britain. STC: 154039, HUNT: 20955. The manuscript was sent to the Princess Elizabeth after Leigh's death on her instructions. In her dedication, she asks the Princess "to preserve this for my children who are now too young, while I am too old." The Huntington copy contains an inscription on the flyleaf to another Elizabeth. It reads: "to Elisa. Frances Park, October 9, 1811 from her father." Leigh's ideas were still very much of the moment.

The few particulars on Mrs. Leigh are cited in , eds. Anne Crawford et al. (Detroit MI: Gale Research Co., 1983). There are no birth or death dates given.

104 Ibid., p. 251.

105 Ibid. , p. 14.

106 Ibid., pp. 16-17.

107 Ibid., pp. 43-44.

108 Ibid., pp. 32-34.