“Play the Men”: A Study of Pedagogy in William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*

By

Wesley Boyko

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

MASTER’S DEGREE

In

English

December 14, 2019

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved by:

Lynn Enterline, Ph.D.

Vera Kutzinski, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

At the beginning of *The Tempest*, Alonso rushes on stage and commands, "Good Boatswain, have care. Where's the Master? [*To the* MARINERS] Play the men" (1.1.9-10). This last comment suggests several layers of meaning: on the surface, Alonso wants the Mariners to remain staunch in performing their duties during the storm. But Shakespeare also puns here on the word "play." The phrase can then be taken meta-theatrically—that is, one actor is actually telling his fellow actors on stage to play their designated roles. Between these two interpretations, though, we might even read a third meaning: the king demands conformity from the Mariners, prescribing a specified role to each of these nameless characters. In this sense, the statement that comes before, when Alonso asks to see "the Master," must be taken into consideration: in this moment, the audience becomes aware of the authority marking the king's tone. Alonso defers to a conventional hierarchy—namely, by asking, "Where's the Master?," he appeals to a specific social arrangement that establishes him at the top of a strict hierarchy. Alonso estimates himself far above the lowly Boatswain on the social ladder; in fact, the distance would be so great that Alonso thinks it would be improper to engage with the Boatswain directly. The king requires a mediator (the master of the ship) to buffer the difference between himself and the workers. Through each of his three remarks—telling the Boatswain to "have care," asking "Where's the Master," and yelling "Play the men!" to the Mariners—Alonso generates a rigid social order that requires every individual in the play to conform to his or her own conscripted role.

In reading this third meaning in the opening lines of *The Tempest*, my purpose is to reexamine the instances of social order throughout the play in order to confront the play's symptomatic manifestation of social relations and the pedagogical structures that uphold these

relations. What makes Shakespeare's work particularly fitting for the task is its extensive concern with hierarchy and the regulation of social scripts. The overarching plot presents Prospero's compulsion to reclaim his dukedom as an attempt to restore social order by implementing his magic and instructing his usurpers about the proper social order. Through this same process, however, Shakespeare introduces a component of resistance, in which the regulatory apparatus of education admits the possibility that a lesson might be misinterpreted. For example, characters like Antonio and Sebastian regularly engage in such moments of misprision. Their resistance challenges social arrangements of learning, and the more they transgress these conscripted roles, the more they reveal their complicated relationship with the sociopolitical hierarchy. By the same token, however, these moments of usurpation and resistance should not be entirely set at odds with the pedagogical system, since Antonio and Sebastian's dissention ultimately parallels Prospero's mission. Instead of restoring an older system, though, their acts attempt to rearrange the social ladder. Thus, the dueling antitheses of teaching and usurping social order in the play follow a specific student-teacher dynamic occurring within the sociopolitical organization of the early modern period, one that, on the one hand, categorizes, teaches, and governs the subject's role in society, while on the other, does not wholly efface the subject's own drives and desires.

Teachers and Pedagogy

Where the social system's organization most reveals itself in the play is in themes built around pedagogy. Characters like Alonso, Gonzalo, and Prospero serve as didactic moderators who reinforce a stratified hierarchy and reconstruct the scenes like an early modern classroom. The relationship between Prospero and his daughter, for example, consistently resembles the

relationship between instructor and student. Just following the tempest scene, when Prospero discloses his past to Miranda, he is quick to describe himself as her "schoolmaster":

> Here in this island we arrived, and here
> Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit
> Than other princes can, that have more time
> For vainer hours and tutors not so careful. (1.2. 205-208)

The apposition that identifies Prospero's "I" with the title "thy schoolmaster" interlocks the roles of schoolmaster and student with the immediate, biological roles of father and daughter; it defines their relationship according to the structure of the classroom. Moreover, the classroom exhibited here is one that is directly tied to European, humanist practices. The lines comparing Prospero's model of instruction to those provided to "other princes" relates his tutor position to a more conventional mode of early modern education: he fully conforms, in other words, to rubrics designed to "enfranchise [Miranda] in some of the most powerful ways an early modern woman could be enfranchised" (Lindsay 408). The profit conferred upon Miranda is one that will teach her how to prosper in her conscripted social role—that is, in court and alongside princes.

The title of "schoolmaster" is only a minor indication of the extent that Prospero and Miranda's relationship is pedagogical in nature. The structure of the dialogue in this scene purposefully recreates an instance of instruction. Before launching into his story, Prospero first bids Miranda to sit, "Obey, and be attentive" (1.2. 48). His concern with Miranda's obedience and attention initially appears in proportion to the gravity of the story being told, yet Prospero's seriousness is undercut as he continually proceeds to question, "Dost thou attend me?" (1.2.96), despite Miranda's repeated acknowledgement, "Sir, most heedfully" (1.2. 97). Prospero continues to question her, until the exchange concludes with a joke: Miranda proposes, "Your tale, sir, would cure deafness" (1.2.127). What began as a serious and austere telling of a tragic

history devolves into a jab at Prospero's pedantic officiousness. Shakespeare consequently adds another dimension to these characters' relationship by using Miranda's response to characterize and comment upon the overwhelming nature of Prospero's father-teacher role. Prospero does not speak to Miranda as just a father—his obsession with her attention and obedience places him in the role of a schoolmaster; his style, in the words of Jonathan Bate, "is that of the schoolmaster…a good humanist tutor, from whom the princess can profit" (131). Prospero's manner of speaking thus presumes both a patriarchal and pedagogical authority. The structure of this speech and the tone of his words may even be seen to foreshadow the self-identification with "thy schoolmaster" that Prospero will assume a few lines later.

In several other scenes, besides Prospero's discussion with Miranda, Shakespeare arranges his characters around the dynamics of the classroom, developing these relationships of tutors and students throughout the play. These relationships are, no doubt, marked by a difference in power, but more than this, the classroom represents a mechanism by which the social subject is constituted. Extensively implicated in the organization of society, the educational practices in the humanist schools were designed to reinforce social scripts through a "discipline [of] memory, voice, and tongue to [give a] more general instruction in the art of socially acceptable gesture and physical demeanor" (Enterline 39). The students' lessons went beyond training and apprenticeship; instead, they focused on the field of rhetoric and imitation, teaching boys to follow and conform to examples of appropriate behavior. Daniel Wakelin adds to this conception of pedagogy by describing the intentions of specific schoolmasters: "like many early founders of humanist schools, [Bishop William] Waynflete apparently did see his school as a way of disseminating and enforcing a particular standard of Latin," namely, a "reform of barbarous Latin" (133). Lorenzo Traversagni, another teacher cited by Wakelin, writes in praise

of Magdalen College not only "because they civilize the barbaric tongues of the boys, but because they cultivate the human arts alongside theological ones" (141), and again, the first master of John Colet's school at St. Paul's in London, William Lily, "urges the boys to 'flee barbarian words' ('barbara verba fuge')" (197). From these examples of early humanist theorizations about education, one ought to acknowledge a resolute determination to dispel and cure barbarism from the schoolboys' speech. The goal of the humanist schools, at least provisionally, was to civilize and cultivate, to divert a student from his barbaric ways and turn him toward strong Christian and social morals. But this goal must also be coupled with the schools' rubric of rhetoric and Latin literature. The humanist education system provided Latin readings for the students to imitate, and through this imitation, they would be groomed and raised to standards that teachers claimed would befit their respective social roles.

Caliban is one student who is often depicted as the barbarous subject, such as in Stephen Greenblatt's famous essay, "Learning to Curse," which thinks about Caliban from a colonial perspective, but it cannot be ignored that Caliban's barbarism is heavily inscribed with pedagogical overtones. As seen in the words of Wakelin's schoolmasters, barbarism was practically a synonym for speaking Latin poorly. So in speaking of Caliban's barbarism, one must also discuss how cultivation manifests as an inherent function of the educational apparatus. Miranda is the first to suggest the student role connected to Caliban; she explains how she "Took pains to make [him] speak, taught [him] each hour / One thing or other" (1.2.425-426). She even cites Caliban's savagery as the reason for her efforts: "When thou didst not, savage, / Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like / A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes / With words that made them known" (1.2.427-430). Caliban, in the view of the humanist technique, represents the type of student who would most benefit from instruction; in fact, if Wakelin's

teachers are to be believed, he must necessarily struggle in society until his meaner, barbarous character is resolved and until he acts with proper European behavior. Since "reality for each society," as Greenblatt states, "is constructed to a significant degree out of the *specific* qualities of its language and symbols" (44), Caliban's rejection of appropriate language places him on the fringes of society, or at least subjects him to Prospero's (his schoolmaster's) punishment and enslavement.

But Shakespeare does not merely depict Caliban as the figure of an uneducated student. Following this early exchange with Miranda, Shakespeare sends Caliban back to school and humorously recreates humanist lessons of imitation and rhetorical training. Stephano, who drunkenly encounters Caliban on the island, immediately recognizes Caliban's barbarity. Stephano asks, "Where the devil should he [Caliban] learn our language?" (2.2.67-68); then he further qualifies his remark: "He's in his fit now, and does not talk after the wisest" (2.2.75-76). Caliban may speak a common language with Stephano, but it is distinctly unwise and contaminated by these fits. Caliban's language remains, to a certain degree, as barbarous as Miranda described of his first days. Even though Caliban may now make his "purposes" known, he still speaks in a manner foreign to the standards of society.

Fortunately, however, Stephano intends to teach Caliban after his own ways and "recover him and keep him tame and get to Naples with him" (2.2.69-70). In place of the classics, though, Stephano, being a drunken teacher, offers his own drunkenness as the lesson plan:

> Come on your ways. Open your mouth.
> Here is that which will give language to you, cat.
> Open your mouth. This will shake your shaking, I
> Can tell you, and that soundly. [Caliban *drinks*.] You
> Cannot tell who's your friend. Open your chaps
> Again. (2.2.84-89)

Of course, the language Stephano describes here is not the same as what Miranda hoped to teach Caliban. The joke is more in reference to the effects of alcohol, which will calm Caliban out of his fits and loosen his tongue, yet one can also read these words from Stephano as a parallel to Miranda's lessons, generating another scene of instruction. For Stephano, the slurred speech of a drunkard best fits his own place in society, so to train Caliban after himself and contrive the necessary imitation, Stephano forces Caliban to drink. In fact, the sack of wine is eventually referred to as a book—"Come, swear to that. Kiss the book. I will furnish it anon with new contents. Swear. [Caliban *drinks*]" (2.2.148-149). The reference to swearing and kissing a book is certainly in mockery of Catholic popery, which still would have been at issue in Shakespeare's time, but this moment also presents an example of how the human arts were cultivated alongside the "theological ones" (Wakelin 141). Whether Stephano's "book" is religious or classic, either way, the model being implemented is clear: Caliban is encouraged to imitate Stephano and learn from the contents of his book (that is, to drink more liquor). Shakespeare might be devoting this interaction to making the whole educational system appear ridiculous in both its humanist and theological features, but the lessons conferred upon Caliban, nonetheless, follow the same logic that was advocated and implemented by the humanist schoolmasters. Caliban encounters another compulsion to imitate in Stephano, though this time the imitation is of drunken behavior and to acquire the appropriate language designated for the social script of a drunkard.

From Miranda to Caliban, the education system being staged in *The Tempest* operates as a mechanism within the sociopolitical spectrum, preparing individuals for their roles as subjects in an historically specific social order. Moreover, the description of scholastic training as imitation and as a form of control, where one is relegated to a strict hierarchical structure, hints at the possibility of a Foucauldian analysis—in fact, many such analyses are dedicated to this

topic and apply a "Foucauldian analysis to education [to] unmask the politics that underlie some of the apparent neutrality of educational reform" (Ball 7)—but one ought to be careful when approaching Shakespeare's representation of pedagogy with only Foucault in mind. While there exists, among the rubrics of imitation, a degree of punishment and control, there is also, most significantly, an element of theatricality, which appears to escape the knowledge-power formula of Foucault. When Foucault writes about the distribution of surveillance throughout institutions of pedagogy, he notes:

> By means of such surveillance, disciplinary power became an 'integrated' system, linked from the inside to the economy and to the aims of the mechanism in which it was practiced. It was also organized as a multiple, automatic and anonymous power; for although surveillance rests on the individuals, its functioning is that of a network of relations. (176)

Discipline of the students is maintained primarily through the stratification of authority, since the older students, having already been inducted into the disciplinary procedure, could be relied upon to observe and guide the younger students. The formation of a student's role in the institution, then, depends upon a constellation of particular relationships that develop around a particular student. So far, Foucault's examination of the school system accords with the socialization promoted by the teachers in *The Tempest*. However, Foucault also wants to isolate coercion as the primary mode of discipline; that is, he wants to present social institutions as a force that continuously acts upon the individual to produce the subject. The corrective measures of the schoolroom are "forms of coercion, schemata of constraint, applied and repeated. Exercises, not signs: time-tables, compulsory movements, regular activities, solitary meditation, work in common, silence, application, respect, good habits" (128). Training, in Foucault's model, impresses upon the students and transforms them into obedient subjects, but this model

must be distinguished from Shakespeare's representations of pedagogy because Foucault presumes an individual who exists as an ontological priority for coercion, a body that enters into the domain of knowledge-power relations and emerges as the subject of the educational institution. "What was then being formed," Foucault goes on to say, "was a policy of coercions that act upon the body, a calculated manipulation of its elements, its gestures, its behaviour. The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it" (138). The insistence upon the body in Foucault is indicative of its ontological priority in coercion. For Foucault, each part and gesture of the body is a valid episteme as far as it is traced upon an ontological body, even if all knowledge of that body has been shaped by a political anatomy. In other words, a gesture, no matter how politically infused, is only possible as long as there is a body to allow its occurrence. I am tempted, however, to suggest that this body is completely unknowable to us, since it is always already approached and understood through a political anatomy. Thus in discussing pedagogy and discipline, Foucault's coercion becomes troublesome, limiting the possibility of parts, gestures, and behaviors to a presumed ontological body. Going forward, one's analysis of pedagogy—and indeed, *The Tempest* itself—should focus solely on the function and operation of these social institutions, which (as will be seen later in certain acts of misprision) are not totalizing even at the level of an ontological priority.

The first step, then, in changing the thrust of the analysis is to recognize that despite the occurrence of surveillance and other "compulsory movements" throughout the play, Shakespeare primarily depicts integration into the social order as a performance, as the act of playing of a part. To return to the opening scene, when Alonso speaks to the Mariners, it is important not to forget that Alonso has already been identified as the king by the *dramatis personae* and the Mariners, on account of their very name, are solely equated with their occupation. This means

that the signifying roles of king and mariner are distributed to each character before any dialogue is spoken. Before any coercion appears, before even the charge to "Play the men," Alonso and the Mariners are already entangled in a particular social order. In fact, the very possibility of identifying coercion becomes indeterminable at this point, since no ontologically-prior individual can be located outside of the characters' performance—the performance encapsulates the entirety of their actions. For this reason, we may read Alonso's command as the result of an overdetermined social script (that is, his role as king), whereas the Mariners' compulsion to obey it is less the result of a command than the result of their occupation, their sole identifier. To put this in other terms, coercion proves less involved in the organization of the play than the performativity of social relations inflected by the structures of contemporary pedagogy. The play is structured around a pre-given network of differentiated social roles which make the institutions of contemporary education fundamental to the possibility of these characters' interactions.

By staging these relationships along the intersecting elements of performance, imitation, and pedagogy, Shakespeare replicates the same logic which constitutes the early modern educational system. Like the students of Bishop Waynflete or Lorenzo Traversagni, Caliban, Miranda, and the Mariners are encouraged to imitate models of appropriate behavior, but this is also much more than mere imitation: the act of imitation is itself a performance. And it is in this way that the play brings to our attention the theatricality of pedagogy. Yet, if the schoolroom can be said to adhere to the rules of the stage, it is also important to investigate how Shakespeare handles theatricality throughout the play. In particular, illusion, which constantly converges with the idea of the theater. For instance, when it is claimed, as it has many times, that "Prospero's magic is, on one level, a metaphor for theatrical artistry" (Mebane 33), the play becomes both a

commentary on its own production and a representation of pedagogical authority—that is, Prospero's power to create illusions becomes simultaneously a representation of theatricality, educational instruction, and socialization. *Magic*, the source of Prospero's abilities, is thus the power to instruct, standing at the point of contact where the educational system and the formation of social order unite.

The type of magic and illusion practiced in the play is also of a peculiar nature: on the one hand, it is not simply witchcraft, especially since "references to his 'book' and Caliban's allusions to Prospero as a 'magician' and a 'sorcerer' would, by placing Prospero in the category of 'magician' or 'white witch,' have constructed him as a natural enemy of Sycorax" (Mowat 26). Prospero, who may dabble in magic, is even careful to differentiate himself from the witch Sycorax: "This damned witch Sycorax / For mischiefs manifold, and sorceries terrible / To enter human hearing, from Argier, / Though know'st, was banished" (1.2. 316-319). Prospero takes up a tone of reproach in speaking about the deeds of Sycorax, and more importantly, this scene follows just after Prospero conjures the tempest, a similarly mischievous deed. The condemnation of Sycorax therefore suggests that Prospero's magic is far less malicious and terrible than Sycorax's and that he is a magician of a different sort. Prospero primarily implements his magic to summon spirits and illusions in order to restore his dukedom and to reestablish the social order lost during his exile.

On the other hand, Prospero's magic explicitly depends upon the use of books. As Caliban resolutely warns Stephano, "First to possess his [Prospero's] books, for without them / He's but a sot, as I am, nor hath not / One spirit to command. They all do hate him / As rootedly as I. Burn but his books" (3.2. 101-104). The access to literature is not uncommon in the representation of magicians, but at the same time, "as reflected in his language and actions,

[Prospero's book] must be imagined as departing in significant ways from extant grimoires," or magic texts (Mowat 27). Of course, any discussion of the contents of the books used by Prospero will be nothing but speculation, since Shakespeare does not make it known what kind of book is drowned at the end of the play; however, it is clear that his books are associated with the appropriate humanist education that Prospero had undoubtedly received. The most apparent proof of this is in Prospero's abjuration of magic. Shakespeare, borrowing from Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, drafts Prospero's monologue in the form of an imitation exercise:

> You elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves,
> …by whose aid,
> Weak masters though you be, I have bedimmed
> The noontide sun, called forth the mutinous winds,
> And 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault
> Set roaring war; to the dread rattling thunder
> Have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak
> With his own bolt; the strong-based promontory
> Have I made shake, and by the spurs plucked up
> The pine and cedar; graves at my command
> Have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em forth
> By my so potent art. (5.1. 42-59)

In this speech, Prospero delineates the accomplishments of his magical abilities according to the model set out by Ovid's Medea. It might further be said that Prospero is more concerned here with mimicking Ovid than actually describing his own achievements. The graves opened by Prospero, for instance, seem less possible if one recalls that prior to Prospero's arrival, the "island / (Save for the son that [Sycorax] did litter here, / A freckled whelp, hag-born) [was] not honored with / A human shape" (1.2. 334-337). Shakespeare blurs the line between magic and humanist education, since Prospero learns to speak of his magic only through an imitation of Ovid. As such, the speech is a perfect example of the type of classical imitation that defined a

student's education. It also reveals an endless chain of imitation where the teacher/student hierarchy, normally defined by a dichotomy of one who educates and one who learns, is confounded: Prospero has learned, just as a student would, to play the preset roles of teacher and magician—his authority and magical abilities are an effect of imitating his social script.

Furthermore, it ought to be stated that after Prospero's magic becomes associated with Latin literature, his entire speech removes itself from the world of witchcraft and moves into a distinctly Ovidian world. Shakespeare creates Prospero's magic as an extension of his humanist education, and it is his education and knowledge of books, then, whether magical texts specifically or just Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, that become the possibility and condition for generating magical illusion in *The Tempest*.

Both of these characteristics—illusion and the knowledge of books—combine to establish a very particular representation of magic. Prospero is capable of conjuring illusions because he received a proper education. Again, it might be said that this form of learned magic resembles more closely stagecraft and theatrical creativity than pedagogical models, that his illusions are really the illusions of the theater. But the point to remember is that theatricality, as far as it is exhibited in *The Tempest,* is inseparable from pedagogy. One instance which may be specifically pointed to is the masque scene, the play within the play. This scene occurs when Prospero puts on a performance of spirits for Ferdinand and Miranda to both celebrate their relationship and warn against premarital sex—as Prospero tells Ferdinand just before, "Look thou be true. Do not give dalliance / Too much rein. The strongest oaths are straw / To th'fire i'th'blood. Be more abstemious / Or else good night your vow! (4.1. 51-54). These lines come as a sort of prelude to the masque, suggesting that the sole purpose of the production, its *raison d'être*, is instruction. Even as a form of courtly entertainment, "appearing trivial, lavish,

extravagant and ephemeral, often designed to celebrate special occasions (particularly nuptials), [masques] carry coded meanings usually of a political-ethical nature" (Linley 201), and Prospero's masque is no different. First, Prospero's masque is an illusion, a display of magic in the form of theatrical creativity; it is performed by "Spirits, which by mine art / I have from their confines called to enact / My present fancies" (4.1. 134-136). And his "art," explicitly tied to his "fancies," delineates the process by which one's creativity finds expression through artistic expression. Shakespeare thus positions Prospero as a playwright in this scene, and his spirits become the players who "enact" the drama.

Prospero's masque can also be said to tend toward a coded meaning—explicitly, it is intended to teach Ferdinand and Miranda about the values of abstinence. The masque depicts an encounter between Juno and Ceres, two mythological goddesses who are allegorical figures for marriage and fertility, respectively. A promise of children ("Honour, riches, marriage-blessing, / Long continuance and increasing" [4.1. 119-120]) and wellbeing ("Earth's increase, foison plenty, / Barns and garners never empty" [4.1. 123-124]) is sung to the young couple, but the benediction comes only once Ceres discovers that Venus and Cupid had not done "Some wanton charm upon this man and maid [Ferdinand and Miranda], / Whose vows are that no bed-right shall be paid / Till Hymen's torch be lighted" (4.1. 106-108). The goddesses are worried about the vices committed in passion, when one is inflamed by lust, and they promote, instead, chastity—in fact, Ceres and Juno are an ideal of marriage. They represent the correct behavior that one ought to pursue in his or her relationship, and hence serve as classical models for Ferdinand and Miranda to imitate. Prospero's masque, then, both as a magical illusion and as a theatrical production, is structured around the agenda and logic of a humanist educational system. Through the broader staging of magic, Shakespeare manifests the collaborative

relationship between pedagogy and theatricality. These two social elements are, in fact, activated precisely because Prospero's illusions are at the core his instruction.

This combination of pedagogy and theatricality reoccurs as a pattern that formats the entire play, even in the scenes where Prospero is absent. Gonzalo is clearly another of the play's instructors. He does not conjure illusions to convey his lessons, but Shakespeare, notwithstanding, finds a way to associate the old advisor with magical properties, most explicitly when the royal company is first met on the island. Alonso is in despair for his lost son, and Gonzalo approaches to consolidate him. The conversation, at one point, turns to the marriage of the king's daughter Claribel, whom Gonzalo claims to be the best queen Tunis has ever seen "since widow Dido's time" (2.1. 79). This mention of Dido then derails the entire dialogue, and Shakespeare allows it to dissolve into a pedantic argument over whether or not "This Tunis, sir, was Carthage" (2.1. 87). The characters split into the familiar roles of teacher and students, and Gonzalo takes up a tone of authority in his voice to instruct his disruptive pupils about the true location of Carthage. However, in response to Gonzalo's firm opinion on the matter, Sebastian and Antonio act like two students snickering at the back of the classroom, saying,

> ANTONIO His [Gonzalo's] word is more than the miraculous harp.
> SEBASTIAN He hath raised the wall, and houses too.
> ANONIO What impossible matter will he make easy
> Next?
> SEBASTIAN I think he will carry this island home in his
> pocket and give it his son for an apple.
> ANTONIO And sowing the kernels of it in the sea, bring forth more islands.
>
> (2.1. 90-97)

The walls and houses that Gonzalo raises with his words are those of Carthage, which Sebastian and Antonio assume to be somewhere other than Tunis (in reality, Gonzalo is correct in this instance, but for Sebastian and Antonio, he is creating an imaginary city, an illusion of Carthage

in Tunis). Like Prospero, Gonzalo's teaching is based upon illusion—that is, Sebastian and Antonio believe Gonzalo has contrived a whole new city of Carthage in an attempt to convince them of its whereabouts. The following lines are even more obscure in their description, but still, the imagery of an island transformed into an apple and sowing its seeds into the sea to produce more islands paints Gonzalo as a type of magician. Unlike Prospero who employs the aid of spirits, Gonzalo does not conjure any illusions proper; rather, Gonzalo's position as a schoolmaster carries magical overtones within.

In this play, magic is the power to instruct; it is a sort of theatrical prop, a resource that allows the teachers of *The Tempest* to assume authority and maintain the structure of the classroom. More than this, though, the illusions being created out of these magical acts contrive power relations, both in the classroom and in the social order. Illusion recreates the script that each character must play—in other words, magic and illusion are the nodal point that sprouts the theatricality of pedagogy. A defining moment for this, where pedagogy, illusion, and social power intersect, occurs just before the masque of Ferdinand and Miranda. In fact, the scene is almost an anti-masque: Ariel and his spirits show up not in the form of goddesses and nymphs but as a harpy and other mocking figures to strike fear into the hearts of the royal company and evoke their repentance. After the harpy leaves the stage, Prospero praises Ariel's performance; he remarks:

> Bravely the figure of this Harpy hast thou
> Performed, my Ariel. A grace it had, devouring.
> Of *my instruction* hast thou nothing bated
> In what thou hadst to say. So, with good life
> And observation strange, my meaner ministers
> Their several kinds have done. My high charms work
> And these mine enemies are all knit up
> In their distractions. *They now are in my power*. (3.3. 102-110, emphasis mine)

Once again, Shakespeare combines illusion and education to contrive the primary mechanism of instructional power. Prospero's lesson, his purported "instruction," is translated through a magical medium—Ariel and his other "meaner ministers"—to charm his enemies and compel them to conform to his will. This capacity to teach, moreover, allows Prospero to reclaim the old social order; it reinstates his former power as the Duke of Milan. Prospero's magic is not just an instance of instructional power but also a representation of social power. But this reinstatement of power should not be read as a type of moral or social commentary, since Prospero's own vision of the correct social order is relative to the concepts engineered by his social position. It is, therefore, the social roles that determine how the pedagogical apparatus is organized and operated, and by the same token, it is through its unique organization that the educational system can support social hierarchies. Each side of the structure thus upholds the other, becoming a mutually reinforcing system. The formation of social order, to put it another way, is bound up in a theatricality in which the schoolmaster deploys a prerequisite imitation of social scripts.

Unruly Students and Pedagogy

The question of social order is not complete as merely a factor of theatricality, however. How a subject performs his or her assigned role assigned also becomes a problem throughout the play. While Shakespeare's teachers try to reproduce a hierarchy that defines their own position as a teacher, this attempt begs the question as to why an educational system is necessary in the first place. If one's social position becomes the sole determinant of his or her behavior, then what need is there for an educational system in the first place? In this respect, the play appears to eschew what we might call behaviorism; instead, the characters who usurp seem to do so against the conditioning of their education. It might be better, then, to read the mechanism of educational

control as a response to a phenomenon of misprision: that is, a performance is always in danger of the possibility of misinterpretation. And the precise details of any given subject's assigned social role become subject to misreading. Shakespeare's own bibliography can be cited as a testament to this rebellious feature in pedagogy: his works "exploit the slippage between the august ideals of humanist education and its practical shortcomings, between its ambitions and its unintended consequences. Misremembering and mishearing the classical tongues can be as much a response to 'the classics' as careful imitations and artful echoes" (Burrow 15). This unaccounted-for resistance to humanist education manifests in the capacity to translate an imitation into one's own style—namely, one does not escape from the boundaries of classical imitation, but one can reintegrate the classics in a way that permits the subject to peek out from behind the curtain of the pedagogical performance. For example, when Sebastian and Anthony make jokes about widow Dido, "which appear partly to depend on a mistake over the syllabic quantities of Dido's name" (Martindale 99), their active misremembering and mishearing of the classical details opens up the possibility of questioning Gonzalo's instructional authority. The two students do not acquire a newfound authority in this moment, but the potential to resist becomes a part of their educational performance: Sebastian and Anthony become unruly students.

The potential for resistance, furthermore, increases in this scene after Gonzalo begins to speculate on how to make the perfect society on the island:

> I'th'commonwealth I would by contraries
> Execute all things. For no kind of traffic
> Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
> Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
> And use of service, none…
> No occupation, all men idle, all;
> And women too, but innocent and pure;

No sovereignty—… . (2.1.162-171)

Even though the promise to abolish every malady and abuse in society is applicable to their immediate situation (that is, as far as the island seems to provide a certain freedom to renegotiate social policies), it is also intimately connected to specific philosophical ideals. More than just a promise of radical change, the speech relies on Montaigne's famous essay, "Of Cannibals," an essay which manipulates the image of native peoples in order to criticize Montaigne's own European society. The essay, in this regard, is less a picture of how native people live than a commentary on how Europeans ought to live. Likewise, the potential that Gonzalo sees in the island—its supposed lack of social structure—urges him to reflect back upon the institutions and values of his own society. It is not the freedom from social structure, in other words, that drives Gonzalo's new perspective; rather, it is a predetermined social and philosophical ideal that re-inscribes itself on the blank face of the island. His vision of a perfect society does not do away with hierarchy; Gonzalo has merely reinstated and emphasized the aspects of European society that he values most.

Even Sebastian makes note of this contradiction, as he responds, "Yet he would be king on't" (2.1. 172). This short remark calls into question the extent to which Gonzalo has truly remedied the hierarchies that plague society. In his attempt to dissolve class and authority, Gonzalo must also employ sovereign, instructional power, and one might raise further suspicions about this contradictory claim to "No sovereignty" by examining Shakespeare's use of meter. At the end of the speech, Gonzalo stops the short and truncates the last words of the line, making an incomplete pentameter, but Sebastian jumps at the opportunity to complete the line. With the exclamation, "Yet he would be king on't," Sebastian fills in the last three iambs. Both statements, then, comprise two parts of the same line and become contingent upon one another,

despite Gonzalo's own self-censorship. What initially appears to be an interruption in the dialogue turns out to be the concealed reality of Gonzalo's fantasy. Sebastian bears to the audience the appropriate questions about the plausibility of this Montaignian society and the continuance of hierarchy.

This response from Sebastian may be especially read as a prime example of how a student might mishear or misremember an exercise in imitation. Gonzalo, taking his cues from Montaigne and extensively quoting from his essay, perfectly conforms to the imitation model; Sebastian, however, resists the exercise by tagging his own commentary at the end of the speech. And whereas Gonzalo hears in the passage an ideal and peaceful society, Sebastian hears a reinstatement of the rigid social order, a reinstatement in which those currently in power remain in power. Sebastian's words demonstrate by these means how resistance becomes a part of the pedagogical system, and how "in early modern English thinking about students such individuation was unstable rather than airtight: the process of differentiation was based on the acknowledgement of a lack of control as much as it was exercised in the name of control" (Bushnell 116). *The Tempest* similarly represents its students with the potential to mishear the lessons of their schoolmasters, even while remaining firmly within the pedagogical system.

The act of mishearing, misinterpreting, and misprision all counter the educational model that purports to teach students the "kind of competence which will make an individual a responsible, moral and active member of the civic community" (Grafton and Jardine 163-164). No doubt, at their surface Shakespeare's characters act out a distinct student-teacher dynamic, which accords with the theoretical strategies and categories of the humanist project. But Shakespeare also complicates this dynamic by including the intermittent displays of student resistance. The unruly student (such as Sebastian, Antonio, and Caliban) are capable of

manifesting a fragility within the educational system. Yet these acts do not necessarily allow the unruly student to escape from the social structure—to consciously resist the performance, in other words. Instead, the unruly student becomes another possible role to be played. It is another aspect of the imitative performance. However, the choice to play an unruly student, or even the precise manner in which a student mishears a lesson, must then become the mode through which the play reveals something beyond the classroom structure, beyond the student-teacher relationship, and beyond the prescribed social scripts. The unruly student reveals, first, the instability of the educational model and, second, the complicated relationship a subject has with the social order. Since the student (or teacher) can never quit the performance, though, it is more valuable for the audience to examine the ways in which the characters mishear their lessons, rather than focus on the efficacy of that resistance.

In this regard, psychoanalysis can help explain how resistance enters into the representation of the unruly student role. The psychoanalytic principle of condensation, which would later be tied to the linguistic process of metaphor, demonstrates how a symbol can acquire and absorb various meanings even when that symbols appear stuck in a seemingly totalizing social structure. Jacques Lacan, for example, formulates metaphor (i.e. condensation) as an explanation for symptoms that arise out of the misprisions of the subject: "Between the enigmatic signifier of sexual trauma and the term it comes to replace in the current signifying chain, a spark flies that fixes in a symptom—a metaphor in which flesh or function is taken as a signifying element" (*Écrits* 431). The spark that flies is itself a metaphor to portray signification as though it were an electrical current that flies between two objects (in this case, the signifiers) that come too close to each other. This spark then produces another link in the signifying chain, and it is precisely in this new realm of potentiality where resistance lies. The possibility for new

pathways to emerge along the signifying chain explains how one can misread and create unforeseen metaphors and condensations throughout society.

Lacan elsewhere describes this metaphoric process in terms of a break—"there comes a moment, with the sexual initiation of the mechanism, when the moorings are broken. Paradoxical as it may seem, the break occurs all the later as the function of the signifier is more implicit, less mapped in this mechanism" (*Seminar* 152). The lack of mapping presents the potential for a break in the signifier, which forces a readjustment in the formation of the signifying chain, opening up new possible connections. The process of this break, or breach, is then further illustrated in an examination of astronomy and the attaining of new knowledge about the stars:

> "[Comte believed] that we shall never know anything about the chemical composition of the stars, that the stars will continue to be stuck to their places, that is to say—if we can see it from another perspective—purely as signifiers. Tough luck! At almost that very moment, the analysis of light enabled us to see in the stars many things at once, including their chemical composition. The break was then consummated between astronomy and astrology—which does not mean that astrology is not alive for a great many people." (*Seminar* 152)

The passage does not appear much less obscure in its description than the flying spark, but when the whole image of the star is read as another metaphor, as the star standing in for the function of the signifier, Lacan's words become an indispensable tool for analyzing the process in which new meaning is generated dialectically while remaining firmly within the signifying chain. Comte assumed that the star was complete in its meaning, that the signifying network surrounding the star was a closed unit. The star, in other words, could not produce meaning outside of its symbolic function in astrology, since it was not yet able to be examined by science. However, once science became capable of analyzing light and testing the chemical composition of stars, a breach was made in the signifying chain surrounding the star. The star, as a signifier,

now had the possibility of entering every structure and network of meaning that is associated with science. This is the break "consummated between astronomy and astrology." It might be better, therefore, to think of meaning, especially new meaning, as the transference of a signifier from one set structure to another, as breaching into a separate line or structure along the signifying chain that makes meaning possible.

Accordingly, in *The Tempest*, the act of mishearing can be read as a form of breach. The characters are able to open up new meanings by transferring the signifiers of their lessons into new symbolic networks. To return to Sebastian's remark, "Yet he would be king on't," the island poses itself as a signifier. It is not empty of meaning; rather, the absence of any trace of human society allows for Gonzalo to approach the island with a pre-given meaning: the signifier immediately reenters into the chain of meaning that specifically defines the most valuable aspects of European society. However, Sebastian takes this signifier another way. The island breaches a whole other set of significations that, conversely, define what are the least enjoyable and advantageous aspects European society. He sees Gonzalo's vision as a rebuilding of hierarchy and a return to subjugation. Again, the breach can never lead outside of the network of signifiers, since the characters are continually stuck within their conscripted performance. But, as Lacan points out, the metaphoric function of the signifier is symptomatic in nature and tied to the desires of the subject—that is, the gap that is left after the break from one set structure to the other reveals at its core a desire. And for this reason, the pathway breached by the metaphoric spark or break, a pathway marked by desire, becomes the formulation of the subject. To better connect this logic to the play, we might say that a characters' subjectivity is constituted by their desire precisely at the point of misinterpretation and resistance that occurs in their performance of pedagogical roles.

We might also turn to Caliban's famous rejection of Miranda's lessons to recognize Lacan's formula and take note of the desire emitted in the breach. Miranda says she took pains to teach Caliban language and proper European behavior. The point of these lessons, as shown above, are to train the barbarous traits out of Caliban's character. But by the time the play is set, Caliban has already refuted her instruction, stating, "You taught me language, and my profit on 't / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / For learning me your language!" (1.2. 437-439). The language lesson itself, then, acts as the prime signifier for their interaction. For Miranda, her teachings were offered out of the kindness: "I pitied thee" (1.2. 424). She sees the lesson as a generosity that was meant to profit Caliban and ameliorate his base nature. Caliban, however, realizes how Miranda and Prospero's language only became a way to further integrate and assimilate him into a social hierarchy. He even contends that the purpose of the lessons was not to benefit him; on the contrary, for Caliban, the only benefit that can be retrieved from Miranda's work is to curse and resist his overbearing masters. Thus, the breach occurs as soon as it is asked how the language lesson could be profitable for Caliban. The choice to speak and use language is no longer in question for Caliban; however, he still does have the choice to interpret, or misinterpret, the effects of this language. He chooses to be "An emblem of disobedience and defiance [and] represent the very opposite of the ideal child of the period" (Shin 378). This choice is thus to be an unruly student, and in this choice the gap in his performance emerges. Caliban's desire manifests to the audience as desire to resist the social arrangement implemented by Prospero and simultaneously return to his "brutish" manners.

The effects of the metaphoric breach may, lastly, be observed in an interaction that occurs in the first act. One of the Boatswains, hard at work in his labor, is interrupted by Gonzalo, who becomes indignant at the brusque demeaner of the Boatswain and demands, "remember whom

thou hast aboard" (1.1.19-20), to which the Boatswain answers, "None that I more love than myself" (1.1.21). On the one hand, the threat of the tempest explains why the exchange has become so heated, but on the other, the high tension and brusque rebuttal from the Boatswain also exhibits a certain dialectic procedure, one that is hidden in his performance. The Boatswain is urged to continue imitating his subservient role on the ship, but the crisis of the tempest, as a signifier, causes a spark; it permits another rationality to be produced, which, though still contained in the social order, redefines the criteria for evaluating one's life. One should also remark that the primal, or material, objective does not change from one perspective to the next—both Gonzalo and the Boatswain equally desire the safety of the ship and all its passengers. The debate, then, occurs at the symbolic, or interpretive, register, where Gonzalo and social convention require the well-being of the ship to be affected with respect to a particular hierarchy: the king's life should be considered first and so on all the way down to the Boatswain. The exigency of the tempest, though, permits a potential outlet for the Boatswain's desire, allowing him to recognize, notwithstanding Gonzalo's demands, that in the face of death he esteems his own life far more valuable than the king's. This final denial of the self, insisting on the king's superiority, consequently unlocks the potential to mishear Gonzalo's words. His command to "remember whom thou hast aboard" is not taken as an idiomatic demand for obedience but an actual exhortation to think about the people on the ship. This leads the Boatswain to remember not the king but himself, reevaluating and reaffirming his own worth in the very organization of society.

The importance of the mariners and the Boatswain in this scene, and even all the other secondary characters throughout the play, is their ability to amplify the issues at the heart of *The Tempest*. The entire first act, in fact, which seems so far removed from the action of the rest of

the play, actually serves as a microcosm for the complex scholastic themes that continually reemerge. And in each case, it becomes clear how the educational apparatus operates as both a result of and a bolster for the social order. It is important, then, to read Shakespeare's play as an effective study of hierarchical relations; it carries over humanist logic from the schools to the stage. And finally, when Shakespeare is read along these lines, *The Tempest* begins to transform into a further expression of misprision. The play itself becomes the product of a schoolboy who has misheard his lessons and now reinterprets the pedagogical structures of the classroom into his own imitative work.

WORKS CITED

Ball, Stephen. Introduction. *Foucault and Education: Discipline and Knowledge*, edited by Stephen Ball, Routledge, 1991, pp. 1-10.

Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*. Viking, 2008.

Burrow, Colin. "Shakespeare and Humanistic Culture," *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 9-27.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Cornell University Press, 1996.

Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1977.

Grafton, Anthony, and Lisa Jardine. *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Harvard University Press, 1986.

Greenblatt, Stephen J. "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century." *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*, Routledge, 2007, pp. 22-51.

Lacan, Jacques. “The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason Since Freud.” *Écrits*, Translated by Bruce Fink, W.W. Norton, 2006, pp. 412-441.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Book XI, translated by Alan Sheridan, edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, W.W. Norton, 1978.

Lindsay, Tom. “‘Which first was mine own king’: Caliban and the Politics of Service and Education in *The Tempest*,” *Studies in Philology*. Vol. 113, No. 2 (Spring, 2016), pp. 397-423.

Linley, Keith. *The Tempest in Context: Sin, Repentance and Forgiveness*. Anthem Press, 2015.

Martindale, Charles. “Shakespeare and Virgil,” *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 89-106.

Mebane, John S., “Metadrama and the Visionary Imagination in *Dr. Faustus* and *The Tempest*.” *South Atlantic Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (May 1988), pp. 25-45.

Mowat, Barbara A. “Prospero’s Book,” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 52, No.1 (Spring, 2001), pp. 1-33.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine, Folger Shakespeare Library, 2015.

Shin, Hiewon. “Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda.” *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Spring, 2008), pp. 373-393.

Wakelin, Daniel. *Humanism, Reading, and English Literature 1430-1530*. Oxford University Press, 2007.