Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda

Hiewon Shin

SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, Volume 48, Number 2, Spring 2008, pp. 373-393 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/sel.0.0008*

SEL 48, 2 (Spring 2008): 373–393
ISSN 0039-3657

Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda

HIEWON SHIN

In *The Tempest*, Caliban describes Prospero as initially a caring schoolmaster:

> When thou cam'st first,
> Thou strok'st me, and made much of me, wouldst give me
> Water with berries in 't, and teach me how
> To name the bigger light, and how the less,
> That burn by day and night; and then I loved thee.[1]

Prospero instructed Caliban in academic knowledge of the sort a child would have acquired in petty school or later: he provided Caliban with language lessons and possibly taught him rudimentary astronomy, drawing attention to the sun and the moon. He was in fact a good teacher and a sort of loving surrogate father until Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda.

Critics once agreed that Prospero was a good humanist educator.[2] Later critics have viewed Prospero's education, however typical of that given to children in the English Renaissance, as oppressively patriarchal.[3] Jonathan Bate briefly discusses Caliban's education, calling Prospero a bad humanist and attributing his failure with Caliban's education to unsuccessful teaching methods.[4] But on the whole, critics have not done justice to Prospero's intricate role as a homeschooling single parent to *both* Caliban and Miranda. Prospero acts as schoolmaster to both; his unorthodox educational methods, although they fail with Caliban, work well with Miranda. This essay will explore why.

Hiewon Shin is an assistant professor of English at North Greenville University.

PROSPERO AND CALIBAN

Shakespeare evokes a number of relationships: Prospero and Caliban are alternately (and perhaps occasionally all at once) master and servant, tutor and pupil, master and slave, and father and adopted son. Prospero once appeared genuinely to care for the monstrously shaped Caliban, as Caliban recalls: "Thou [Prospero] strok'st me and made much of me" (I.ii.336). Prospero pitied Caliban when he first arrived on the remote island with Miranda and spotted the orphan. He became a kind of adoptive parent—he loved Caliban, cherished him, nourished him physically and mentally. Caliban, who must have yearned for parental affection and guidance, loved Prospero back: "then I loved thee" (I.ii.339). He became Prospero's de facto adopted son. In return for Prospero's parental affection/education, Caliban imparted to the newcomer all the information he had about the island. Not only did Caliban receive instruction from Prospero, but he also instructed his adoptive father by drawing on his own invaluable life experience: "[I] showed thee all the qualities o'th'isle, / The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile" (I.ii.340–1). On some level, Caliban attempted to establish a more reciprocal relationship with his adoptive father.

The first law on adoption in the United Kingdom was introduced in 1926; previously the act was unknown in common law.[5] As Jack Goody claims, one of the main reasons for the long legal absence of adoption was that the Church could profit from childless individuals' possessions since it could "benefit by excluding 'fictional' heirs": the childless were likely to give away their material possessions for "charitable" ends.[6] But despite the long absence of adoption from the English legal system, it continued to appear in literature. For instance, in *3 Henry VI*, the politically weak King Henry VI wonders if his grandfather, Henry IV, could be considered an adopted son to Richard II, not a usurper of Richard's royal power, since Henry IV's being an heir to the throne would legitimate his unstable royal power:

> I know not what to say—my title's weak.
> [*To YORK*] Tell me, may not a king adopt an heir?
> . . . . . .
> An if he may, then am I lawful king.
>
> (I.i.135–8)

While it does comprise wishful thinking, his speech establishes adoption at least as a hypothetical possibility, and it harks back to a scene in *Richard II* when Bolingbroke, forcing King Richard to resign and himself ascending the throne, creates the legal fiction that he has been adopted as heir by the resigning King Richard: as the Duke of York complicitly announces, King Richard

> Adopts thee heir, and his high scepter yields
> To the possession of thy royal hand.
> Ascend his throne, descending now from him.
> (IV.i.100–2)

The fiction of adoption softens Bolingbroke's usurpation and justifies the legitimacy of his new-found political authority.

In *As You Like It*, Orlando claims that he would not wish to be an "adopted heir" to the powerful and cruel Frederick, but would rather remain his banished father's son: "I am more proud to be Sir Rowland's son, / . . . [I] would not change that calling / To be adopted heir to Frederick" (I.ii.198–200). In *Othello*, when Brabanzio is enraged by the defiance of his only child Desdemona, he despairs, "I had rather to adopt a child than get it" (I.iii.190). He implies that if an adopted child betrayed him, at least he would not have to accept any personal blame in the behavior of his own flesh and blood, as Shylock must when his daughter Jessica betrays him: "My own flesh and blood to rebel!" (III.i.30). Adoption, then, remained available at least as an imaginative possibility in early modern England.

As Caliban's caring adoptive father, Prospero was also a good teacher. His nurture of Caliban went considerably further than we would expect from a schoolmaster. For a duke to take on the role of a lowly schoolmaster—a very low-paid, low-status job, especially since this is very *elementary* level teaching—would have been extremely unusual, although the desert-island scenario makes unusual practices necessary to some extent, and the aura of fantasy and fairies should make us cautious about too literal minded a resort to social history. But the fact remains that nothing *required* Prospero to take Caliban in and teach him, to virtually adopt him. Early modern English households included servants living in close proximity to the children of the family, and as an orphaned child of ambiguous parentage, Caliban might have been taken in as either a servant or a child of the family. Initially placed as a child of the family, Caliban is demoted to servant and even to slave. England in the period was not unfamiliar with slavery

as a punishment for intransigent behavior. In 1547, vagrancy legislation specified a penalty of two years' enslavement for a first vagrancy offense and life enslavement if the slave ran away.[7]

Prospero recalls that his affection toward Caliban turned dramatically into hatred when he found Caliban attempting to rape Miranda. Prospero claims:

> I have used thee,
> Filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged thee
> In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate
> The honour of my child.
>
> (I.ii.348–51)

Caliban's sexual attraction to and the violence he seeks to inflict on Miranda are the immediate causes of Prospero's turning so dramatically against his adoptive son. But Prospero's anxiety may also be occasioned by the fact that a successful rape would threaten his two most valuable possessions—Miranda and the island. Caliban understands Prospero's anxiety: "O ho, O ho! Would't had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans" (I.ii.352–4). Caliban's speech indicates that his attempted rape signifies his desire to regain the ownership of the island by impregnating Miranda and populating the island with his offspring. Clearly, Caliban's sexual potency threatens Prospero's political stability.[8]

As postcolonial critics have noted, Caliban's resistance to Prospero includes his political desire to regain the island: "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak'st from me" (I.ii.334–5).[9] Indeed, Prospero's constant denigration of Sycorax as "foul witch," "damned witch," and "blue-eyed hag" and his accusation of Caliban as potential rapist seem designed to justify his usurpation of the island from Caliban (I.ii.259, 265, 271). But despite Prospero's ruthless efforts, Caliban defies his adoptive father, and the two men implicitly compete with each other for the island. The rivalry between Caliban and Prospero results in the breakdown of their initial loving father-son relationship. Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda is psychically and politically central, and it is arguably Prospero who is to blame for it.[10] During the Renaissance, humanists demanded the separation of male and female students. For instance, Sir Thomas Elyot warns of the sexual danger of mixed-gender education in *The Governor* (1531): when boys reach age seven, they need to be "taken frō the company of women," in particular "any young woman," because

of possible "sparkes of voluptuositie: whiche norished by any occasiõ or obiecte / encrease ofté tymes in to so terrible a fire / that there with all vertue and reason is consumed" and, instead, boys should be assigned a male tutor, whom "the childe by imitation folowynge may growe to be excellent."[11] Despite Renaissance humanists' arguments for gender exclusiveness, Prospero has not only instituted co-education but also has allowed Caliban and Miranda to share the same room (or cave).[12] Alan Stewart suggests that there was often an intimate pedagogical relationship between tutors and pupils.[13] If Miranda taught Caliban, they might have shared a sense of intimacy as tutor and student.

After the attempted rape, Prospero treats Caliban like a servant—in fact, worse than many Renaissance servants. Contemporary reports suggest that many apprentices found their apprenticeship quite challenging: they sometimes complained about being required to carry out household tasks rather than being trained in their discipline. But apprentices could seek a kind of compensation or at least a release when their masters violated their contract—masters had the legal obligation to provide for their apprentices' physical needs.[14] George Trosse remembered his troubled apprenticeship: "[D]uring my Stay, I had done him [his master] so much *Service*; had, in effect, been his *Steward*, his *Butler*, his *Chamberlain*, and his *Shoe-wiper* . . . and had run many *Hazards for* him, and endur'd severe *Dealing from* him."[15] Trosse expressed his frustration that "there is *no Piety*, usually there is but *little Equity*" and decided to "continue no more at such Uncertainties."[16] Likewise, Simon Forman recorded his painful apprenticeship; as a young apprentice, he was "put to all the worst" and was occasionally beaten by a kitchen maiden and his mistress.[17] But when he was unjustly beaten by his master, Forman demanded release from his apprenticeship: "Now because Simon's master had beaten him for his mistress' sake, herself being in fault, Simon told his said master flat that he had not performed his covenants according to promise, therefore he would give off the trade."[18] Prospero's cruel treatment of Caliban, who has no chance to lodge an official complaint or seek a release from his servanthood or apprenticeship, appears too severe even for the English public during this period.

Prospero's harsh attitude toward the adopted son stands in stark contrast to the loving manner in which he addresses his daughter. Prospero insults Caliban for his birth and natural parentage when they first encounter each other on stage: "Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself / Upon thy wicked dam,

come forth" (I.ii.322–3). His verbal abuse is countered by a viciously worded attack from Caliban:

> As wicked dew as e'er my mother brushed
> . . . . . .
> Drop on you both! A southwest blow on ye,
> And blister you all o'er!
>
> (I.ii.324–7)

Their conflict continues as Caliban resists Prospero's account of the past and strives for autonomy. Caliban challenges the veracity of Prospero's story about the past and his late mother and Prospero's claims for the ownership of the island:

> This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother,
> Which thou tak'st from me . . .
> . . . . . .
> Which first was mine own King.
>
> (I.ii.334–45)

Unlike Miranda, who has no accurate memory of the past and never questions the truth of her father's story, Caliban offers a very different story, which contradicts Prospero's, and Prospero counters, "Thou most lying slave" (I.ii.347). An emblem of disobedience and defiance, Caliban comes to represent the very opposite of the ideal child of the period. As a result, Prospero subjects him to a series of corporal punishments.

Prospero's physical punishment of Caliban would to some degree have been acceptable to a Renaissance audience. In Renaissance England, the discipline of children was always an issue for the public. The biblical adage "Spare the rod and spoil the child" was often voiced, and old sayings such as "Better is a child unborn than unbeaten" and "He that spares the Yard (rod) hates his child" were quite popular.[19] Corporal punishment was generally accepted, especially when all other methods had failed. Lady Jane Grey recorded her parents' physical and verbal punishment: "he [God] sent me so sharp and severe parents . . . I am so sharply taunted, so cruelly threatened, yea, presently sometimes, with pinches, nips, and bobs, and other ways which I will not name for the honour I bear them . . . that I think myself in hell."[20] Most of the advice literature written during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century in England supported

the use of physical punishment, but only if verbal instruction failed. William Gouge suggests that "[c]orrection by word must goe before correction by the rod."[21] Robert Cleaver indicates that "the wise parent in curing his sonnes vices, must not strike before he hath reprehended or preadmonished."[22] Prospero's corporal punishment of Caliban appears to be perfectly "appropriate" since his kindness and verbal rebuke did not achieve the correction of Caliban's rebellious behavior: "Whom stripes may move, not kindness!" (I.ii.348). However, contrary to these writers' advice that "[c]orrection must be giuen in loue. *All things must be done in loue*," Prospero punishes Caliban not with love, but with hatred and anger, which was strongly condemned.[23]

Prospero's unusually harsh treatment of Caliban would have been frowned upon even in a master-servant relationship, let alone in an adoptive father-son relationship. Henry Smith disapproves of masters' unreasonable punishment of their servants and warns of possible retaliation against violent masters by their angry servants: "Masters prouoke not your seruants to wrath . . . when he [here, a servant] seeth that he is rebuked with curses and beaten with staues, as though hee were hated like a dogge, his heart is hardened against the man which correcteth him, and the fault for which he is corrected, & after he becommeth desperate, like a horse which turneth vppon the striker."[24] Gouge concurs: "It is beyond a masters power by any correction to impaire life, health, or strength of his seruant, or any way in his body to disable him from doing that which otherwise he might haue beene able to doe."[25]

Caliban's fear of his adoptive father's relentless punishment is obvious: "Do not torment me! O!"; "The spirit torments me. O!"; "Do not torment me, prithee! I'll bring my wood home faster" (II.ii.54, 61, 68–9). Caliban cries out for mercy to avoid physical pain when he believes his adoptive father to be threatening him. But despite Prospero's physical and verbal chastisement, Caliban continues to challenge Prospero's authority until the last scene of the play. Caliban's enslavement is a condition completely acceptable to Prospero, regardless of Caliban's real motives for his resistance. Prospero calls him "this demi-devil," because Caliban "[has] plotted with them / To take my life" (V.i.275, 276–7).

Prospero not only inflicts verbal and physical abuse, but also feminizes Caliban by assigning him domestic tasks unsuitable either to a son or to a male servant. Caliban clearly celebrates his freedom from all the household work when he schemes a rebellion against Prospero:

Nor fetch in firing
. . . . . .
Nor scrape trenchering, nor wash dish.
. . . . . .
Freedom, high-day! High-day, freedom! Freedom, high-day.
(II.ii.172–7)

The division of labor by gender was quite obvious in this period. Few women servants did outdoor services: they were more often hired as domestic servants than men. Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos observes that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, most women migrants in London "entered domestic service" and "[b]y the late seventeenth century the employment of domestic female servants among London's middling classes was virtually universal, and many provincial towns and smaller urban settlements also had a large sector of female servants."[26] Caliban appears to do most of the housework—or cavework—from making fires to washing dishes, and is tired of doing inappropriate chores. Prospero's parenting liberates Miranda from the domestic duties and instead restricts Caliban to them.

Caliban's excitement about his liberation from domestic work is clear when he swears to serve the poor drunkard Stephano as a new master: Caliban makes sure never to pledge to do any kind of domestic service: "I'll show thee the best springs, I'll pluck thee berries; / I'll fish for thee, and get thee wood enough" (II.ii.152–3). His promised services to Stephano include only outdoor activities, which were traditionally seen as men's work. He indeed seeks to redeem his former masculinity, which has been lost by his adoptive father's punishment.

Caliban's education—limited after his estrangement from Prospero—is mainly focused on performing domestic duties. Clearly, he is not being groomed for any kind of masculine role outside the domestic realm. His education lies primarily in the hands of Prospero—though Miranda was initially also in charge of his language skills—but it is obvious that Caliban is not being taught the values of masculinity. Rather, his instruction revolves around skills associated with women and femininity. Caliban is unwilling to accept the imposition of Prospero's domestic demands and consequently faces the brutality of his adoptive father's physical punishment:

If thou neglect'st or dost unwillingly
What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,

Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar,
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.

(I.ii.371–4)

However, the worst thing Prospero does to Caliban is to withdraw his access to education. Caliban understands the exact source of his adoptive father's enormous power and determines to seize Prospero's books: "Remember / First to possess his books, for without them / He's but a sot, as I am" (III.ii.86–8). The destruction of Prospero would mean more than Caliban's personal liberation: it would also allow him to continue his disrupted education and to recoup his masculinity.

PROSPERO AND MIRANDA

When Prospero first appears in *The Tempest*, he identifies himself as Miranda's "schoolmaster":

Prospero. . . . I thy schoolmaster [have] made thee more profit
Than other princes can, that have more time
For vainer hours and tutors not so careful.
Miranda. Heavens thank you for't.

(I.ii.173–6)

As a schoolmaster, Prospero claims to make Miranda more "profit" than other noble ladies, who waste their time on vainer thoughts, and attributes their failure to be productive to the carelessness of their tutors. Miranda's expression of gratitude supports his claim.

Few readers take up the educational issue that figures so prominently in the play. Paul Brown remarks upon Miranda's education but quickly brushes it off as a strategy of Prospero's political ambition: "to engineer another courtship, between Miranda and the son of his old enemy—his daughter having been duly educated for such a role."[27] Ania Loomba discusses "Miranda's schooling," but her focus is modern—she writes of her own experience in "Miranda House" in India and how Indian girls were taught English Renaissance plays such as *Othello*.[28] She also dismisses such education as both a tool of obedience and a way to "*participate* actively in the colonial venture."[29] Elaine Showalter explores Miranda and her education, but suggests that it is American women writers who themselves have constructed this

"metaphorical account" as they try to re-create *The Tempest* as an inspiration for American woman writers.[30] While these readers do take up the educational issue, they do not contextualize it fully within Renaissance writings on education, especially education for women. I suggest that Prospero's instruction of Miranda diverges crucially and interestingly from the Renaissance humanists' prescriptions of proper education for women.

As a Renaissance scholar, Prospero reinforces some of the humanist ideas about women's education in the period. He clearly accepts the Christian notion of women's virtues, such as obedience, silence, and virginity. When Prospero and Miranda first appear on stage together, he abruptly commands her silence, after finishing the story of their past: "Here cease more questions. / Thou art inclined to sleep" (I.ii.185–6). When Miranda first sees Ferdinand and instantly falls in love with him, Prospero reminds her of her womanly duties: "What, I say, / My foot my tutor?"; "Silence! One word more / Shall make me chide thee, if not hate thee" (I.ii.472–3, 479–80). Later, when he approves of their marriage, Prospero emphasizes the importance of virginity and commands that Ferdinand and Miranda not break "her virgin-knot before / All sanctimonious ceremonies" (IV.i.15–6). However, most of Prospero's instruction is unorthodox.

Although he does silence her on occasion, Prospero appears to have taught Miranda to speak up, rather than being silent. Early in the play, he objects to Miranda's silence, which could be taken for an indication of indifference; he asks the silent Miranda three times if she is attentive to him as he relates the story of their past: "Dost thou attend me?" (I.ii.78); "Thou attend'st not?" (I.ii.87); "Dost thou hear?" (I.ii.106). Prospero has taught his daughter what a young Renaissance woman was not supposed to be taught.

The idea of educating a girl at all was not universally accepted; Renaissance theorists of women's education were very suspicious of the idea of women's learning. Women's education was clearly advocated by a number of Renaissance humanists, yet as Valerie Wayne shows, most of their advocacy focused on "the religious, philosophical, and moral instruction of their [female] students . . . The emphasis was not so much on acquiring knowledge as putting it into practice in an ethical and pious life."[31] Unlike men's education, women's education was more geared toward encouraging "moral action."[32] Women's education and knowledge were particularly threatening because of their traditional association with female sexuality and transgression. A woman's attempt to

learn from her father's books during this period could be construed as a sign of her wish for mastery over men, threatening to English social and gender hierarchies. Conservative humanist writers such as Juan Luis Vives stipulated that women should study religious rather than secular works: "Let her lerne to here nothing nor speke but it that perteyneth unto the feare of god . . . it were better for them to go blynd & deffe into lyfe than with. ii. eies to be caste into helle."[33] Comparing secular books to "serpents or snakes," Vives urges fathers to keep their daughters from "all [secular] redyinge."[34] He instead encourages women to read "the gospelles and the actes & the epistoles of the apostles and y olde Testament saynt Dteronyme."[35]

Lisa Jardine in "Cultural Confusion and Shakespeare's Learned Heroines: 'These are old Paradoxes'" historically situates Shakespeare's educated heroines, Helena in *All's Well That Ends Well* and Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*. Jardine argues that both are "women of intellect capable of employing specialist knowledge customarily restricted to men," and that such learned women aroused fears of "sexual unruliness and ungovernability."[36] However, Jardine unfairly disempowers Shakespeare's educated heroines: although learned women evoked a certain amount of social anxiety and were viewed as a threat to male dominance, it seems shortsighted to assume that Shakespeare ignored the value of women's liberal education. Other Shakespearean fathers also take pains to educate their daughters, such as Baptista in *The Taming of the Shrew* and Helena's father in *All's Well*. These single fathers support their daughters' reading of nonreligious texts, and their secular education.

The Tempest reveals some of the humanists' anxieties and paranoia about women's knowledge. Anxiety is reflected in Prospero's sole possession of his books and library. There is little indication that Miranda, Caliban, or anyone else in the play is able to get access to his library full of secret books. But the view of this play as a mere reflection of contemporary humanists' restriction of women's knowledge is complicated by the results of Miranda's education. Prospero's single parenting has hardly produced a daughter of passive Christian virtue. In *The Tempest*, the contemporary dichotomy between women's and men's education dissolves, through Prospero's androgynous role as a schoolmaster and single parent. I use the term androgynous in order to highlight Prospero's combining of fatherly and motherly roles for Miranda's balanced upbringing. For instance, he is in charge of the household food and even gives Caliban rudimentary

cooking lessons, particularly in juice making: "Thou [Prospero] . . . wouldst give me / Water with berries in 't" (I.ii.336–7). And Miranda acquires not only "feminine" virtues, but also "masculine" attributes from her father.

In act I, scene ii, Miranda is first introduced as a compassionate young woman, who pleads with her father for the lives of strangers suffering from shipwreck:

> O, I have suffered
> With those that I saw suffer!
> . . . . . .
> O, the cry did knock
> Against my very heart!
>
> (I.ii.5–9)[37]

In reply, Prospero assures his sympathetic daughter that no one was hurt by the shipwreck and that he caused the accident for her: "No harm. / I have done nothing but in care of thee, / Of thee, my dear one; thee, my daughter" (I.ii.15–7). Here, Prospero appears as a loving single father, who does not chide Miranda for her naiveté, but rather appreciates his daughter's loving and "piteous heart" (I.ii.14). Miranda's compassion, the very virtue that is commended by Prospero, indicates part of the nature of her education: "Wipe thou thine eyes; have comfort. / The direful spectacle of the wrack, which touch'd / The *very virtue of compassion* in thee" (I.ii.25–7, emphasis added). The positive reinforcement he gives to her expression of compassion is a sample of his educational methods.

It was assumed that mothers were loving and nurturing and that fathers were strict and disciplinarian. For example, Cleaver suggests that "so long as thou art a father, so long thou must carry a fatherly authoritie and power ouer" children, whereas mothers "loue their children more dearly then that they can suffer them to be an houre out of their sight."[38] Gouge observes that "Mothers are most tender ouer them [children], and cannot indure to let them lie crying out, without taking them vp and stilling them," while fathers "forbid their wives to nurse their children, or are a griefe to them [their wives] . . . because husbands for the most part are the cause that their wiues nurse not their owne children: and that partly by suffering, and partly by egging them [wives] on to put out their children."[39] However, this traditional binary opposition fades when Miranda's very feminine virtue, compassion, is taken into consideration. In fact, Miranda's compassion was

most likely inculcated by Prospero's paternal instruction, since she has no women around her, and no mother: "I do not know / One of my sex, no woman's face remember / Save from my glass mine own" (III.i.48–50). The essentialism of so many Renaissance beliefs about woman's compassionate nature is undercut by the way Prospero has fostered Miranda's "piteous heart" rather than adopting the stern and pitiless paternal rule that Cleaver sees as typical. Prospero's androgynous parenting and instruction of Miranda destabilize the traditional dichotomy between paternal and maternal styles of parental guidance.

Exactly what Prospero taught Miranda must be teased out of the text: except for her language ability—she taught Caliban how to speak properly—and her skill in chess, there are few details on the nature of her education. Even whether she taught Caliban speech has been controversial. Scholars have disagreed over whether Miranda speaks the lines "Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour / One thing or other" (I.ii.357–8); many editors give the lines to Prospero, seemingly on the assumption that Prospero would not have enlisted Miranda's aid in his educational projects, or that Miranda could not have taught her step-sibling on her own initiative.[40] Such assumptions foreclose the possibilities opened up by Miranda's unconventional home-schooling. But one thing is clear: even the meager clues about Prospero's instruction of Miranda point to a *departure* from the humanist notion of a proper education for a female child.

Prospero employs some contemporary educational ideas but in a manner that is not consistent with the customary arguments for feminine virtue advocated by Renaissance humanists. He personally performs the traditionally female supervision of Caliban's domestic chores, unwilling or unable to instruct Miranda in domestic activities suitable for a woman's destined role as "the lady of the house." Unlike Vives's suggestion that women's education should be restricted to either religious or pragmatic work that is suitable for domestic life, throughout the play Miranda is never shown to do or supervise such domestic chores. Instead, Prospero micromanages the household: "Fetch us in fuel. And be quick, thou'rt best, / To answer other business" (I.ii.369–70).

Miranda appears not to understand the gendered dichotomy of labor. When Ferdinand complains of the laborious work assigned by Prospero, she is willing to perform the masculine role of log carrying: "If you'll sit down, / I will bear your logs the while. Pray give me that; / I'll carry it to the pile" (III.i.23–5). In offering to carry the logs, Miranda is adopting a male role. Ferdinand,

however, clearly shows his discomfort about women's physical labor: "I had rather crack my sinews, break my back, / Than you should such dishonour undergo, / While I sit lazy by" (III.i.26–8). Considering Miranda's performance of this physically demanding task unbearably shameful, he reminds Miranda of traditional gender roles, and refuses her offer. However, Miranda, who apparently has not been taught the gendered division of labor, insists that she carry the logs: "It would become me / As well as it does you; and I should do it / With much more ease, for my good will is to it" (III.i.28–30). Naples may be in for some startling social moments, once she is queen.

To complicate further the gender issues at work in the play, Miranda takes an aggressive role traditionally assigned to men and makes a marriage proposal to Ferdinand: "I am your wife, if you will marry me. / If not, I'll die your maid" (III.i.83–4). As Jessica Slights argues, Miranda adopts "the role of courtly lover"; Slights discusses and demonstrates "the social inversion of this unconventional courtship."[41] Prospero, who oversees their mutual attraction in secret, does not despair over his daughter's demonstration of masculine qualities. Rather, he is overjoyed at the prospect of their future marriage: "So glad of this as they I cannot be, / Who are surprised with all; but my rejoicing / At nothing can be more" (III.i.93–5)—further evidence of the way he has brought her up.

Miranda's assertiveness and willingness to stand up to Prospero are also untraditional. When she sees her father's harsh treatment of Ferdinand, she is eager to speak up for the handsome stranger:

> There's nothing ill can dwell in such a temple.
> If the ill spirit have so fair a house,
> Good things will strive to dwell with't.
>
> (I.ii.461–3)

She refuses to be silent and continues to plead for Ferdinand despite Prospero's stern warning of "silence!" and denunciation of the young man as "a traitor" (I.ii.464): Miranda implores "Make not too rash a trial of him, for / He's gentle, and not fearful"; "Beseech you, father!"; "Sir, have pity. / I'll be his surety" (I.ii.471–2, 477, 478–9).

Miranda's "I'll be his surety" even suggests that Prospero has instructed Miranda in the rudiments of legal practice. The OED defines "surety" as a person who "makes himself liable for the

default or miscarriage of another, or for the performance of some act on his part (e.g. payment of a debt, appearance in court for trial, etc.)" and "a bail."[42] Prospero's teaching Miranda about legal practice would be unusual, first since she is a girl and second since they are on an island with no apparent legal system. Shakespeare endows her with a language that suggests that Prospero has instructed her in the ways of the wider world, beyond the island, and the ways of a masculine world.

Miranda's public display of her knowledge of chess also contradicts conservative humanists' idea of women's "proper" education. For instance, Thomas Salter warns young women of the danger of recreational activities: "touchyng recreation by learnyng[,] that cannot be graunted her, without greate daunger and offence to the beautie and brightenesse of her mynde."[43] Salter argues that recreational activities will eventually corrupt and ruin the beauty of women's minds and advises young maidens to be trained in activities such as "the Distaffe, and Spindle, Nedle and Thimble," suitable for domestic affairs.[44] At the end of the play, however, Miranda and Ferdinand are discovered playing chess—and Miranda boldly (if playfully) accuses Ferdinand of cheating: "Sweet lord, you play me false" (V.i.174). Renaissance humanists disapproved of young women's playing chess, first because of its association with amorous courtship and "romantic love," and second because of its use for intellectual training, which was regarded as more suitable for the opposite sex.[45] Bryan Loughrey and Neil Taylor argue that chess symbolizes "self-control, the exercise of intellect and the practice of art."[46] Sir Thomas Elyot in *The Booke Named the Governour (1531)* advocates chess as a good educational tool for the aristocratic youth: a chess game is a "right subtile engine: wherby the wytte is made more sharpe / and remembrāce quickened."[47] The text attributed to da Odenara Damiano further elevates chess to "a kingly game" or "kingly pastime": chess "breadeth in playes a certaine studye, pollicie, wit, forcast, memorie, with other properties, to make men circumspect not only in playing this game, but also comparinge it to a publicke gouernement."[48] Yet recreation and games were condemned and considered particularly dangerous for women by conservative Renaissance humanists and Puritans, who objected most strongly to games such as cards and chess: Vives equates women's playing "cardes" with their lascivious activities, such as dancing and "drink[ing] in a feast or a banket."[49] Despite such conservative humanist disapproval of young women's participation in any recreational activities, Prospero has taught his daughter to play chess, perhaps the same way he would train a son.

Prospero's educational methods are also unorthodox in that opposite-sex tutors were frowned upon and fathers, in particular, were not considered good teachers for their daughters. In *The Mirrhor of Modestie* (1579), one of the most popular conduct books for women, Salter, like many contemporary Renaissance humanists, defends women's education, although in a way limited by his conventional Christian commitment to female virtues such as virginity, chastity, modesty, and silence. His main argument is that the education of daughters and young maidens should be entrusted to virtuous mothers and matrons, not fathers—at least not unwise fathers. His work is appropriate "for Matrones and Maidens, for Matrones to knowe how to traine up suche young Maidens as are committed to their charge and tuission, and for Maidens how to behaue them selues to attaine to the seate of good fame."[50] *The Mirrhor of Modestie* proposes the same-sex role model or mentor system as the best way of addressing women's education, to inculcate Christian values. Salter is apprehensive about a father's role as his daughter's teacher: "I will staye too shew the use of many unwise Fathers, who being more daintye, and effeminate in followyng their pleasures, then wise and diligent in seekyng the profite of their Daughters, doe giue them, so sone, as they haue any understanding in readyng, or spellyng, to cone and learne by hart bookes, ballades, Songes, sonettes, and Ditties of daliance."[51] By implying that many fathers have careless natures (ironically stigmatized as "effeminate"), Salter emphasizes mothers' roles as prime educators of their daughters. Unlike these "unwise" fathers, virtuous mothers and matrons are able to instruct young maidens to read "the examples and liues of godly and vertuous Ladies . . . out of the holy Scripture, and other histories," if they must read.[52] Salter rejects women's reading of books such as those associated with fathers' nonreligious reading materials.

As Loomba notes, Miranda is "the most solitary of Renaissance woman protagonists, and moves on an exclusively male stage."[53] Miranda's isolation from other women, including the early loss of her mother, has imposed a deviation from the ideal women's education advocated in Salter's *Mirrhor of Modestie* and Vives's *Instruction of a Christen Woman*. Like Salter, Vives claims that a maiden should be taught in "the presence either of her mother or her nurce or some other honest woman of sad sage" who is able to "rule and measure the playes and pastimes of her mynde and set them to honestie and vertu."[54] Vives further indicates that young maidens should be kept away from all men, including their

fathers, since fathers "wyl nat haue theyr children unexpert and ignorant of yuel . . . [so that] they [female children] lerned to do yuel by theyr fathers mynd and wyl."[55] Miranda barely remembers having been around "four or five women once that tended me," and has virtually no memory of her mother (I.ii.47). Her lack of female role models is a breach of the Renaissance notion of women's education. Instead, Miranda has her single father as her sole role model to follow on the island. Prospero, as an opposite-sex role model and a schoolmaster to Miranda, provides an ambiguous example of the benefits of education.

Prospero's co-education of Miranda and Caliban is unorthodox too, in that co-educating males and females was frowned on during the period not only because it might awake lascivious thoughts in the boys, as we have seen, but also because it might accustom the girls to living in a man's world. Vives, warning of mixed-gender education, urges parents to "Auoyde all manes kyn away from [a girl]: nor let her nat lerne to delite among men." A girl should play only "with maydes of her own age," as soon as she is "weaned and begynneth to speke."[56] Despite such admonition, Prospero taught them together as if they were of the same gender.

Prospero's instruction, highly unorthodox for the Renaissance, has the unexpected effect of making Miranda seem rather modern, more assertive and less stereotypically feminine than most Renaissance girls. Prospero does deny Miranda access to his library filled with magic books, perhaps to protect her from his dangerous magic practice and the accusation of witchcraft.[57] But overall, Miranda's well-balanced personality, which encompasses traditionally feminine and masculine virtues at once, reflects her single father's successful instruction.

Prospero's single parenting and homeschooling are a noble experiment that is only partly successful. He departs from Renaissance practice in tutoring children himself, in co-education for males and females, in teaching "masculine" assertiveness to his daughter and "feminine" housework skill to his adoptive son. Such gender-equal education seems quite modern and appears to be a good idea to us, but although it works well with Miranda, it does not work with Caliban. Prospero successfully inculcates both feminine and masculine ideas in Miranda, but fails to teach Caliban the values of masculinity.

Prospero was once a loving adoptive father *and* teacher. He provided an ideal example of surrogate parenthood, and his affection toward Caliban appeared to be no different from his care for his biological daughter until Caliban's attempted rape of Mi-

randa. In a sense, it is understandable for Prospero to turn into a harsh master toward Caliban, who tried to violate Miranda's innocence, despite Prospero's parental nurturance. But insofar as the attempted rape reveals a deficiency in Caliban's education—he has not learned to respect the rights of others—the failure may reflect upon the teacher as well as upon the student. It is as if Prospero-the-radical-educator is gradually overwhelmed by Prospero-the-western-colonizer-master. As Shakespeare ended his career during the dawn of English colonialism, he seemed to glimpse starkly divergent paths for the New World: would it become a land of brutally oppressed servants or a land of hopeful youngsters empowered by radical parenting?

NOTES

I am grateful to the following for their thoughtful comments and advice: Linda Woodbridge, Patrick Cheney, Garrett Sullivan, Christine Clark-Evans, and Laura Knoppers. I dedicate this essay to Professor Woodbridge, who first gave me an idea of studying single parenting in Shakespeare, provided immensely insightful advice at every stage of this project, and directed me to Thomas Salter.

[1] Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), pp. 3047–3107, I.ii.335–9. All future quotations from Shakespeare will be from this edition and will be cited parenthetically by act, scene, and line numbers within the text.

[2] For instance, Frank Kermode claimed in 1963 that Miranda becomes "the cultivated plant" by Prospero's "'nurture' or education . . . [and she] benefits by nurture" (*Shakespeare: The Final Plays* [London: Longmans Green, 1963], p. 44); in 1964, E. M. W. Tillyard saw Prospero not only as a scholar, but also as a "tutor of Miranda," who becomes "the complete embodiment of sympathy" and is able to "mend the work of destruction," due to Prospero's instruction (*Shakespeare's Last Plays* [London: Chatto and Windus, 1964], pp. 49, 50, 56).

[3] For example, Lorie Jerrell Leininger argues that Miranda's obedience and submission to Prospero demonstrate the patriarchal nature of Prospero's education of his daughter ("The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's *Tempest*," in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely [Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1980], pp. 285–94, 287–8).

[4] Jonathan Bate, "The Humanist *Tempest*," in *Shakespeare "La Tempête": Etudes Critiques*, ed. Claude Peltrault (Bescançon France: Univ. de Franche-Comté, 1993), pp. 5–20, 12–3.

[5] Jack Goody, "Cousins and Widows, Adoptees and Concubines," in *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983), pp. 48–82, 73.

[6] Goody, p. 75. Goody explains how the Church could profit from childless people: "The way that the Church could profit is clear from the nature of an

Anglo-Saxon settlement in which a husband and wife leave their land and property to each other and to their future children (Thorpe 1865: 462; Robertson 1939: 45). If there is no child, the land is to go to Archbishop Wulfred 'for their souls.' A man could not adopt a son and heir when he had none of his own. He was therefore more likely to leave his possessions for charitable purposes, as is the case with childless individuals today" (p. 75).

[7] Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature* (Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 2001).

[8] The fact that Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda and his dangerous sexuality are the main cause of Prospero's hatred toward Caliban is rightly observed by Stephen Orgel in the introduction to his edition of *The Tempest*. However, instead of developing further his claim about Caliban's sexuality and his political ambition, Orgel shifts his focus onto Prospero's disruptive inner qualities, which, he claims, are exactly embodied in Caliban: "rage, passion, vindictiveness; perhaps deepest and most disruptive, sexuality . . . the most troublesome aspects of the magician's character have been those relating to libidinous energy" (Introduction to *The Tempest*, Oxford Shakespeare [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987], pp. 1–87, 28).

[9] Paul Brown, for example, pays a great deal of attention to Caliban and sees him as a victim of colonizers' oppression and as a politically conscious dissident ("'This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield [Manchester UK: Manchester Univ. Press, 1985], pp. 48–71). Likewise, Francis Barker and Peter Hulme see Caliban sympathetically, shedding new light on Prospero's domination and Caliban's resistance. They explain the way Caliban's violence is used as a showcase for the "final and irrevocable confirmation of the natural treachery of savages" ("'Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish': The Discursive Con-texts of *The Tempest*," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis [London and New York: Methuen, 1985], pp. 191–205, 201).

[10] For example, George Lamming writes forcefully about how the western colonizer like Prospero uses the attempted rape as an excuse to seize the land and enslave the indigenous people (*The Pleasures of Exile* [London: Michael Joseph, 1960], p. 111). Frantz Fanon also notes that the charge of rape upon the black colonized by the white colonizer has long been used as a good excuse to legitimate colonialism and that the attempted rape is often not real, but "imaginary" (*Black Skin, White Masks: The Experiences of a Black Man in a White World* [New York: Grove Press, 1967], p. 107).

[11] Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Book Named the Governor (1531)* (Menston UK: Scholar Press Limited, 1970), fol. 20v.

[12] David I. Kertzer and Marzio Barbagli observe that at an early age, "a strict sexual division [of children] was enforced" (*Family Life in Early Modern Times, 1500–1789*, vol. 1 of *The History of the European Family*, 3 vols. [New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2001], p. 205).

[13] Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997), chaps. 3, 4.

[14] Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and Youth in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 84–132.

[15] George Trosse, *The Life of the Reverend Mr. George Trosse: Written by Himself, and Published Posthumously according to His Order in 1714*, ed. A. W. Brink (Montreal: Queen's Univ. Press, 1974), p. 64.

[16] Ibid.

[17] A. L. Rowse, *Simon Forman: Sex and Society in Shakespeare's Age* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), p. 271.

[18] Rowse, p. 276.

[19] *Proverbs, Sentences, Proverbial Phrases from English Writings Mainly before 1500*, ed. Bartlett Jere Whiting and Helen Wescott Whiting (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1968), pp. 81, 678.

[20] Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster (1570)*, ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 1974), p. 36.

[21] William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Dvties: Eight Treatises* (London: John Haviland, 1622), p. 556.

[22] Robert Cleaver, *A Godly Forme of Hovshold Government: For the Ordering of Private Family according to the Direction of Gods Word* (London, 1621), S4.

[23] Gouge, p. 556.

[24] Henry Smith, *A Preparative to Mariage: The Summe Whereof Was Spoken at a Contract, and Inlarged After* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1591), pp. 95–6.

[25] Gouge, p. 660.

[26] Ben-Amos, p. 151.

[27] Brown, p. 60. Brown's view has been widely shared by postcolonial readers of the play, such as Barker and Hulme, and still influences recent political criticism of the play such as that of Geraldo U. de Sousa. De Sousa, for instance, maintains that Prospero has provided Miranda "a European education and courtly manners, raising her to assume her dynastic destiny" and become "Ferdinand's bride and future queen of Naples" (*Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters* [New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999], p. 175). See Barker and Hulme, pp. 191–205.

[28] Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama* (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 1989), p. 154.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Elaine Showalter, *Sister's Choice: Tradition and Change in American Women's Writing* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 27.

[31] Valerie Wayne, "Some Sad Sentence: Vives' *Instruction of a Christian Woman*," in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent OH: Kent State Univ. Press, 1985), pp. 15–29, 16.

[32] Wayne, p. 17.

[33] Juan Luis Vives, *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Boke Called the Instruction of a Christen Woman* (London, 1637), Eiii.

[34] Vives, F.

[35] Vives, Fii.

[36] Lisa Jardine, "Cultural Confusion and Shakespeare's Learned Heroines: 'These Are Old Paradoxes,'" *SQ* 38, 1 (Spring 1987): 1–18, 4, 16.

[37] Tom McAlindon points out the compassionate side of Miranda, who pleads with Prospero on behalf of voyagers ("The Discourse of Prayer in *The Tempest*," *SEL* 41, 2 [Spring 2001]: 335–55, 340).

[38] Cleaver, pp. S4, T2.

[39] Gouge, pp. 512, 518. Patricia Crawford argues that preachers in the sixteenth and seventeenth century frequently taught their congregations

that "the ideal good woman was the good mother," since the bond between a mother and a child was considered as "natural," and thus a mother was often encouraged to breastfeed her baby ("The Construction and Experience of Maternity in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Women as Mothers in Pre-Industrial England: Essays in Memory of Dorothy Mclaren*, ed. Valeri Fildes [London and New York: Routledge, 1990], p. 8). Gouge similarly suggests that "mothers ought to nurse their owne children" and that "[if] women giue not sucke to their Children . . . they are more cruell then those sea monsters" (pp. 510, 512). Likewise, John Dod observes in *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments* that "this [breastfeeding] is so natural a thing that euen the beasts will not omit it: for both the strongest and weakest, the wildest and tamest, will giue suck to their yong ones" ([London, 1610], p. 200).

[40] For instance, Frank Kermode argues that "Theobald followed Dryden's guess, and gave these lines to Prospero . . . [since] it is Prospero who is berating Caliban, and Miranda would not interfere; the language is at once too indelicate and too philosophical for Miranda . . . [who] could not have had much to do with Caliban's education" (Kermode, ed., *The Tempest*, Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare [London: Routledge, 1954], p. 32n353).

[41] Jessica Slights, "Rape and the Romanticization of Shakespeare's Miranda," *SEL* 41, 2 (Spring 2001): 357–79, 369.

[42] OED, 2d edn., s.v. "surety," 7 a and b.

[43] Thomas Salter, *A Mirrhor Mete for All Mothers, Matrones, and Maidens, Intituled the Mirrhor of Modestie, No Less Profitable and Pleasant, than Necessary to Be Read and Practised* (London: Edward White, 1579), Cii.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Kermode, p. 123n171. Also see H. J. R. Murray's *A History of Chess* on chess as a game of warfare and the probable means by which the game became created for two players (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1913), pp. 43–7.

[46] Bryan Loughrey and Neil Taylor, "Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess," *ShS* 35 (1982): 113–8, 114.

[47] Elyot, fol. 97v.

[48] [da Odenara Damiano], *The Pleasaunt and Wittie Plaie of the Cheastes Renewed with Instructions Both to Learne It Easely and to Playe It Well*, trans. James Rowbothum (London, 1569), ⊙iii, Ai.

[49] Vives, Dii.

[50] Salter, Av [vii].

[51] Salter, Biii.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Loomba, p. 153.

[54] Vives, Cii.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] De Sousa argues that Prospero's denying Miranda his magic books demonstrates his intention to protect her from "his magical practices," since "the study of magic" was one of the reasons he was ousted from Milan (pp. 175, 161).