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Abstract

*Imagining Public Education in Early Modern England* argues that the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals participate in the development of early modern publicity. Although the seventeen extant manuals have a diverse set of social appeals, some of them imagine education as a concern of the many rather than the few, even if their conceptions of the “many” were far from universal. In the process of imagining a greater social participation in education, the Tudor manuals may have contributed to the ideological function of publicity as a veneer of universal accessibility over a reality involving many degrees of accessibility. In other words, at the same time that these writers were imagining a larger social function for education, they were also participating in the overall conceptual emergence of publicity itself. Chapter One examines the manuals aimed most clearly at producing social distinction. While recent studies have argued that these manuals either reinforce or subvert the established social order, I argue that they represent the intersection of distinction and publicity. Writers like Wilson and Puttenham engage with social distinction and reproduction in the forum of vernacular print not to subvert the social order but to continue these practices in a newly public way. Chapter Two focuses on the manuals which address both a professional and a public readership. These manuals contrast the social limitations of the university with the publicity of vernacular print in an allied appeal to both professional application and to the tradition of common knowledge. Chapter Three examines the two manuals with the broadest social appeals. While these authors envision strikingly inclusive ideas for education, they base their ideas of accessibility on the problematic principles of a national language and commodified discourse. Chapter Four continues to explore the idea of public education but with a focus on the examples of Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* and the statutes of London’s Gresham College. Contrary to the Habermasian school of public sphere theory, which allows only an impoverished notion of early modern publicity, the Tudor vernacular manuals indicate a lively and burgeoning discourse surrounding the imagination of public education.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

In his will of 1575, the London mercer and financier Thomas Gresham directed a large portion of his wealth at a very unusual educational endowment. Unlike other wealthy Tudors who made endowments to grammar schools or to colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, Gresham wanted his London mansion to become a college where professors would give free lectures in the academic subjects of astronomy, geometry, physic, law, divinity, music and rhetoric. Gresham left all the practical details of this educational experiment to a committee chosen jointly by the Mercers’ Company and the City of London, and when the committee received the endowment in 1596, they drafted a set of statutes directing these free lectures at the “common benefitt” of London “citizens” (21). They justified their choice of English-language lectures on the grounds that the “good that wil ensue, wilbee more publique” (Ward MS: II.21). As I will examine in a later chapter, this committee of mercers and city officials had different ideas about the exact social target of each lecture, but here I would like to consider their more general mission of making the college “more public.” In the Tudor period as now, describing something as public usually involved all or nothing. As surveyed below, despite the complexity and variability of the word public, something is normally either public or it is not. One of the peculiarities of the concept of public (or publicity) is that it implies all or nothing even when it can signify a variety of things and a range of degrees. As a result, describing something as public involves the constant danger of false universalism – the implication that public things pertain to, are accessible to, or even belong to everyone. The interesting thing about the Gresham committee, then, is that they did not submit to the
universalizing logic of publicity – even though their lectures would be free of charge, the committee felt the need to qualify their goal of the common good as *more* public.

The idea of making education more public will be a touchstone for the argument of this dissertation. Whatever the intentions of the Gresham committee, their phrase epitomizes my argument that Tudor education was connected to the long and uneven development of early modern publicity, a movement which would eventually produce a political public sphere at the turn of the eighteenth century. The political developments of the seventeenth century are well beyond the scope of this argument, and I intend to be vigilant in avoiding the conflation of Tudor conceptions of the social totality with post-Restoration ideas of the public or the public sphere. However, I have chosen to use the word “public” in the Tudor context in order to insist on a level of continuity in the idea of publicity through the Tudor and Stuart periods. As I will argue at length, the idea that the post-Restoration public sphere marked a sudden break with all social thought of the past has been the subject of recent criticism, and this dissertation seeks to augment the evidence of a long history of publicity. Since the entire concept of publicity was emergent in the early modern period, it should not be surprising that Tudor conceptions of public education were often provisional and nebulous as expressed in the phrase “more public.” This dissertation will be examining this emergent publicity in the Tudor vernacular logic manuals.

On the other hand, many of the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals are bold and forceful in defense of vernacular print as the medium for releasing the liberal arts from the institutional enclosures of the schools and distributing them for the benefit
of all. For instance, Dudley Fenner uses this exact economic terminology of hoarding to argue that the schools have created a false scarcity in education. Fenner argues not only that education should be for “the commoditie of all,” but he also claims the liberal arts as common property – “seeing the common use and practise of all men in generall, both in reasoning to the purpose, and in speaking with some grace and elegancie, hath sowen the seede of these artes, why should not all reape where all have sowen?” (A2-3). Roland MacIlmaine also accuses the universities of hoarding knowledge and encouraging “mere ignorauence amongst the common people,” but instead of promoting the vernacular in economic terms, MacIlmaine critiques the educational use of Latin in terms of Protestant reform: “I knowe what greate hurte hathe come to the Churche of God by the defence of this mischevous opinion” (15). Abraham Fraunce provides the most succinct defense of vernacular education aimed at the common people. In response to the complaints of an ageing Aristotelian that “everye cobbler can cogge a syllogisme, everye carter cracke of propositions” (sig.¶¶ 3r), Fraunce responds, “Coblers bee men, why therefore not logicians? and Carters have reason, why therefore not Logike?” (sig.¶¶ 3r). Ralph Lever also targets his manual at the unlearned – “he that is an englishman born, and understandeth no toung but his owne” (vii) – but Lever combines the goal of increased accessibility with a kind of linguistic nationalism not present in the other logic and rhetoric manuals.

Not all of the Tudor vernacular manuals have social imaginations as broad as those above. A subset of the manuals, for example, targets the specific vocational utility of lawyers, ministers, and physicians. In the first of all the English-language manuals,
Leonard Cox (1532) targets rhetoric at the professional utility of lawyers, ministers, and those “apte to be sente in theyr prynces Ambassades” (41). John Horsfall’s edition of *The Preacher* is aimed even more specifically at the vocational needs of ministers, especially “those that by the true preaching of the word of God, labor to pull down the Sinagoge of Sathan, and to build up the Temple of God” (title page). Other writers with wider social targets made secondary appeals to a professional readership, including Fraunce who often seems torn between the narrow and the broad, the professional and the public. George Puttenham also seems conflicted between his appeals to the royal court and a secondary claim to transport his reader, through the linguistic power of his manual alone, from the cart to the court. Even these vocational and elite manuals are driven to extend their appeals to a broader secondary readership, and in the process to imagine education as “more public.”

In studying the vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals, I will be building on a number of classic studies of the early modern vernacular, including Richard Foster Jones’s *The Triumph of the English Language* (1953). Jones includes logic and rhetoric manuals in his wide survey of the Tudor and Stuart expansion of vernacular print, including translations of the Bible and a wide range of classical authors from Cicero to Euclid to Galen. Jones uses these works as evidence for a major rise in the status of the English language over the course of the sixteenth century. For Jones, there were three main causes for this linguistic shift – the invention of printing, the Reformation, and “the unceasing, if not universal, desire to educate those people, high and low, who did not possess the linguistic keys to learning” (34). Since Jones is more concerned with the
effects of this educational populism than its causes – he traces the emergence of English as an artistic and “eloquent” medium – he does not interrogate this desire to educate the unlearned and unlettered. For Jones, the idea of addressing books on medicine, geometry, logic and rhetoric to a general readership was a kind of natural human response – a sympathy and duty toward others, and a reaction against selfishness.¹

This dissertation will extend Jones’s analysis of Tudor vernacular instruction by considering the vernacular manuals’ popular appeals in the history of publicity. What exactly did it mean for Tudors to imagine education as (more or less) public? Did even the most extreme calls for accessibility signify a modern conception of public education? What, indeed, does it mean to imagine education as public today? As I will argue below, the word public is a historical keyword which continues to have a complex and ambiguous set of meanings, some of which depend on how the adjectival form of public modifies a noun such as education. Returning to the examples, it is clear that the authors were not driven by a modern notion of publicity – other than a few emergent usages as in the Gresham statutes, the word public does not appear regularly in the writings of Tudor educators. As in the above examples, Tudors invoked two main social targets to express their desires to expand the social scope of education – first, some version of “everyone,”

¹ Jones simply accepts the existence of intellectual altruism and duty: “One characteristic of the sixteenth century worthy of considerable emphasis was the unceasing, if not universal, desire to educate those people, high and low, who did not possess the linguistic keys to learning. The Renaissance Englishman, looking around him, saw, on the one hand, the richest stores of knowledge in constant process of being increased but confined within the strict limits of the learned tongues, and, on the other, a vernacular which, as regards learning, offered for the most part only a vacuum. To fill this vacuum became his earnest desire and deep-felt duty. Again and again during this century we hear voices denouncing the selfishness of those of the learned who, content with their own knowledge, would do nothing to extend it to the educationally underprivileged. Declaring that man should not live for himself alone, the typical writer in English insisted upon an uncompromising altruism, and claimed such as his motives for using the native language” (34).
including explicitly gender-inflected terms like “every man;” and second, some sort of appeal to the common people, usually in an abstract sense but also including Fraunce’s more specific address to carters and cobbler.

This dissertation will examine what Tudors meant when they directed education at either the common people or everyone. Even more important than the intention of each writer is the effect of their broad social gestures – what meaning or meanings did these often universalizing statements produce? For example, did the vernacular manuals contribute to the ideological use of publicity as a false universal? My argument is not that the Tudor manuals proposed a fully modern form of public education but that they belong in the history of publicity (or perhaps its pre-history) because they pushed the conceptual boundaries of the social function of education in their own period. More specifically, they imagined and defended the notion of education as the concern of the many rather than the few, even if this did not involve any educational practice, and even if their conception of the “many” was far from universal. In the process, however, the Tudor manuals may have contributed, intentionally or not, to the ideological function of publicity as a veneer of universal accessibility over a reality involving many degrees of accessibility and exclusivity. In other words, at the same time that these writers were imagining a larger social function for education, they were also participating in the overall conceptual emergence of publicity itself. As recent studies of early modern publicity have begun to demonstrate, publicity did not develop in the political sphere
alone but emerged in a wide variety of social fields, including economics and religion, and as I will be arguing, in the field of education as well.

**Early Modern Publicity**

Before considering publicity in a variety of Tudor educational texts, it is necessary to establish that early modern publicity existed at all. This is because the most influential twentieth-century study of publicity, Jürgen Habermas’s *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962), argues that the public sphere of the early eighteenth century marked a sudden break with all political and cultural practices of the past. For Habermas, the only precursor to the political public sphere was a “literary public sphere” which itself emerged *ex nihilo* in the Restoration, apparently with no cultural or intellectual precursors whatsoever. Before this cultural sea change, the social function of literature was merely to mark the status of aristocrats – a pre-modern form of public culture which Habermas calls a “publicness (or publicity) of representation” (7).

By limiting early modern publicity to this aristocratic display of authority, Habermas extracts all of the complexity out of early modern publicity – in fact, he uses the concept of the ‘publicness of representation’ to divert all of the complex history of the concept and the word *public* to a single reductive form. For example, Habermas reduces the complex social dynamics of an institution like the Globe Theater to nothing more than a “spectacle” (38) of aristocratic authority.²

---

² In the nearly fifty years since its publication, Habermas’s thesis has been the subject of intense debate. The critiques of his early modern history will be examined in depth below, but the overall state of Habermas criticism is surveyed in Calhoun (1992). The basic historical narrative of the *Structural Transformation* is as follows. Habermas begins with a classical Marxist history of the transition from
In reducing all of early modern culture to the ‘publicness of representation,’ Habermas constructs a vision of social stasis similar to that of Tillyard’s *Elizabethan World Picture* (1943). Habermas and Tillyard were very different scholars, but they both relied on a static hierarchy in the early modern social order as the historical ‘other’ of modernity, a model which has led to the marginalization of evidence for early modern public education. While Habermas relied on a cursory sketch of early modern England, Tillyard carefully selected Thomas Elyot’s *Boke Named the Governour* (1531) as the typical example of how the early modern “world” conceived of education. On the contrary, Elyot’s pedagogy is a very specific program designed for home tutelage, including little George Puttenham, the son of Elyot’s sister Margery. Tillyard quotes Elyot’s praise of a hierarchical society, whose social degrees supposedly correspond with the hierarchy of nature, though he does not refer to Elyot’s use of the word *public* to support the social hierarchy. Perhaps Tillyard omitted this evidence because Elyot contrasts the idea of a hierarchical social “Publike” with the idea of a “commune weale,” a phrase which Elyot thinks gives the erroneous impression “that every thinge shulde be to all men in commune” (1-2). Elyot’s idiosyncratic use of public implies not social feudalism to capitalism, focused on the declining nobility and a rising bourgeoisie, but he adds the category of publicity to the historical forces of the time. The development of capitalist markets involved the creation of bourgeois subjectivity and eventually of bourgeois institutions (first cultural and then political institutions). A major part of the new bourgeois ethos was a split between public and private life: in society between a public state and a private economy; in individuals between a public life and the private home. In the eighteenth century, public political institutions (political parties, an independent print media) were founded on the Restoration literary public sphere which served as a training ground for rational-critical public discourse. In England, the literary public sphere arose in the form of London’s coffee houses (1680-1730), which disregarded social status, were inclusive in principle, and which considered culture as a public concern. After 1730, these institutions were replaced by those of the reading public (book clubs, libraries) and novels such as Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740). In the second part of the book, Habermas uses the eighteenth-century public sphere as a normative example in his critique of twentieth-century mass culture, following the tradition of the Frankfurt School.
stasis but the existence of conflicting social ideologies. Moreover, Elyot’s contrast between public and common suggests the existence of conflicting early modern definitions of publicity.

In fact, the Tudors had multiple conflicting definitions of public rather than a single static conception such as Habermas’s publicness of representation. A brief linguistic survey of Tudor usage shows that the word public was already in the dynamic state of conflict that remains today. All four of the major modern senses of public were already available to the Tudors: 1. in front of people; 2. relating to the people; 3. representing the people; and 4. accessible to the people. With such broad scope for signification, public is now used in such widely disparate senses as public nudity, public library, public parking, and public affairs. Even when public modifies a single noun such as education, the exact meaning does not necessarily become clear – is it education in front of people, relating to people, representing people, or accessible to people? Even if public education means the limited sense of accessible to people, is it the accessibility of a public library (usually based on general taxation) or like public parking (based on the ability to pay)?

The OED records all four of these complex modern senses of public as far back as the fifteenth century. The sense of representing the people does not play a major role in Tudor education, but the other three definitions deserve a brief linguistic history to delimit what exactly public could mean in the context of early modern England. First, the idea of public as in front of people (OED adj.1: “Open to general observation, view,
or knowledge”) is the first recorded English use, referring to a “public declaration” in 1394. This usage can be found in many early modern examples, including phrases such as “public example” (1557) and “public reading” (1597). This is also the sense in which the Tudor headmaster Richard Mulcaster coined the term “public education” (183) in his *Positions* (1581) to signify the instruction of “young gentlemen” outside the home rather than their traditional tutelage in the home. On its own, this is the least significant meaning of public for the argument of this dissertation, as it distinguishes things merely on the basis of whether they can be observed. However, Mulcaster’s example shows that a concern with the location of education can be part of a larger concern with its overall social function. That is, the public status of something “in front of people” can be enmeshed with its social function – for example, in the history of enclosed and unenclosed spaces, and in role of popular gaze in the “representative publicness” of the aristocracy. Although Habermas was wrong to reduce all early modern publicity to the visible authority of aristocrats, this function almost certainly persisted in the “public education” of young gentlemen like Philip Sidney in Tudor grammar schools and universities.

The second modern definition of public as relating to the people (*OED* adj.2: “Of or relating to the people as a whole”) is first recorded in the sense of “public good” in 1427. This usage can be found in early modern examples such as “public administration”

---

3 Orlin (2007) has recently extended the study of Tudor privacy, which includes Ariès (1989), as involving both enclosed spaces and personal solitude. As Orlin argues, early modern England “certainly participated in the transformations of domestic interiors what were to have their most celebrated expression in the closet or study. The early modern phenomena of private areas and private literatures are related in popular
(1493) and “public liberty” (1533). Clearly, this is a larger and more ambiguous sense of public than the first sense – this definition inhabits a large conceptual space between the concerns of “the people as a whole” and the private (or less public) concerns of individuals and smaller groups. It is the idea of “the people as a whole” which is most pressing to various articulation of early modern public education. The central focus of this dissertation will be the way that vernacular manuals imagined education in relation to “the people as a whole,” and conversely, how education functioned in the primary conception of the public. In the overall history of publicity, it is interesting to consider whether education played a fundamental role in conceiving of “the people as a whole” as “public” rather than alternatives such as the nation. Even today, the public school system (that is, tax-funded and generally accessible) seems to function as a site for imagining society as “public” in the larger sense of a social totality. This dissertation will focus on the ways that Tudors used education to imagine society as public, but my interest in the topic is informed by the way that education continues today in a complex relation to publicity.

The third major definition of public denotes that something is accessible to the people (OED adj.4: “Open or available to all members of a community”) which is first recorded as referring to a “public place” (1485). This usage is found in early modern references such as a “public well” (1617), but it is interesting that the first recorded use of “public market” is not until 1718. These examples of public accessibility are physical and spatial – a place or a thing is either open to the people generally or it is restricted to a
smaller group. As might be expected, there is no early modern example of an institution like a public library or a public school which is paid for by the community and thus accessible to everyone. The *OED* does record the term “public school” from 1580, denoting “a class of grammar schools founded or endowed for public use and subject to public management or control” (*OED* 1. “public school”), but the editors should specify that “public use” and “public management” signified various things in 1580, often specific to how an institution like Gresham College was endowed. Indeed, the most common educational use of the word *public* by the Tudors involved a highly restricted version of general accessibility: “open or common to all members of a university” (*OED* adj. 2b). The universities used the word *public* to contrast the activities of individual colleges with university-wide things like a public examination, public disputation, public hall, and a public lecture. Thus, when Thomas Bodley referred to his 1597 foundation as a “publicke library” (*OED* n. special uses 2), he meant only to distinguish it from the college libraries – that is, the library was accessible to all Oxford students, not to the cobblers, carters, stone masons and other common people of Oxford. Clearly, there is a large scope for ambiguity in the definition of public simply in the idea of “the people” – a phrase which looks universal, but in fact invariably signifies a specific group of people.

The *OED* is useful for making distinctions between multiple senses of a single word like *public*, but the system of classifying definitions in clearly numbered groups can
be misleading in the case of early modern publicity. The *OED* editors do offer the caveat that *public’s* “various senses pass into each other by many intermediate shades of meaning” and that the “exact meaning often depends on the noun qualified” (“public” A_adj.), but their classifications still give a false impression of homogeneity. For example, the sense of *accessible to the people* implies a continuous conception of accessibility throughout the historical examples of this usage – that public accessibility meant the same thing in the sixteenth century as it does through the intervening centuries up to the present. The worst limitation of the *OED*, however, is that it omits the key historical contexts for alterations in the meanings of words like *public*. The *OED’s* history of public as *relating to the people as a whole* runs from 1427 to 2003, but it completely misses the political history of the word during that time span – one gets the impression that a public concern in 1427 was more or less the same as a public concern in 2003. Completely missing from the *OED* is the development of a public sphere, a notion of the people as a whole that is not coextensive with the monarch and the state. Thus, the *OED* obscures early modern publicity in a manner exactly opposite to the way Habermas and Tillyard do. Where the latter impose a reductive and singular publicity on the Tudors, the former impose a false sense of historical continuity. These approaches are united, however, by their lack of interest in the specific complexities and contradictions of Tudor publicity.

These complexities can be glimpsed by surveying the forty-three different Tudor books with the word *public* in the title. These titles indicate that the sense of *public* as...
relating to the people as a whole was still closely intertwined with the state. In fact, the most common phrase in these titles is the obsolete “public weal” to signify the state (OED, “public weal: a nation, a State, esp. considered in terms of the welfare of its people”). This is the sense of public in Ralph Robinson’s English translation of Thomas More’s Utopia in 1551, where the Latin phrase, De Optimo Republicae Statu, is rendered as “the best state of a publyque weale.” Tillyard’s notion of a static social hierarchy does not account for More’s Utopia at all, but Robinson’s association of public with the non-hierarchical state in Utopia further undermines the idea that Elyot’s public hierarchy was the only Tudor conception of the social order. Indeed, even though Robinson uses public weal as synonymous with the state, he does so in relation to More’s literal common weal rather than the Tudor monarchy. In the history of publicity, a key factor is some kind of distinction between the monarchy/state and the public, a distinction which Robinson’s Utopia renders only in an imaginative (and often ironic) departure from the Tudor monarchy.

The relation between the state and the public weal is even more distinct in the title of an anonymous pamphlet, A Ruful complaynt of the publyke weale to Engelande

involved with the notion of education as preparation for public service in government.

Another major sense of public in the Tudor titles is in relation to religion and the Church. The distinction between public and private is made between solitary and group prayer in Henry Bull’s Christian prayers and holy meditations as well for private and publike exercise (1570). A more complicated set of distinctions is found in another religious title, The notable and comfortable exposition of John Knox ... first had in the publique church, and then afterwards written for the comfort of certaine private friends, but now published in print for the benefite of all that feare God (1583). The modern ambiguity of public is certainly evident in this title, which contrasts the idea of private friends with both the publicity of print and the idea of a public church. Does this phrase signify the church as merely accessible to and before the people, or does it signify the state church or even the church as representing the people in a significant way? This is a particularly early-modern cluster of meanings that does not register in a general survey of the word as in the OED.
In an awkward tetrameter, the public weal itself complains to England about the social effects of enclosure: “And commons of auncient tyme / They make Generall landes / and close it in wyth dyche and lyne / That poore men wringe theyr handes” (3). Although this public weal merely petitions the king to notice its plight, the pamphlet still distinguishes clearly between the state and the public weal, which it considers as synonymous with the “weale of the communaltye” (4). The anonymous author of the Rful complaynt clearly sees some daylight between the concepts of the state and the public weal, and contrary to Habermas, he conceives of the public in terms of the common people rather than the aristocracy. While most of the Tudor titles are comfortable with the identification of state and public, then, these two examples indicate at least some scope for the emergence of public, signifying the people as a whole, in distinction to the Tudor state.

Overview of the Manuals

Much of this dissertation will involve an analysis of the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals, a group of texts that has never been examined as a whole. Previous studies involving these texts have focused on one or two examples, almost always the manuals by Thomas Wilson and George Puttenham, and have not attempted to survey them as a whole. As I will explain below, there are seventeen vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals that survive from the Tudor period. This total includes only manuals which teach the terms and precepts of logic and rhetoric. Since these manuals are similar to the textbooks which were used in the grammar schools and universities – in fact they
are often direct translations – these are also the manuals which make the clearest arguments for expanding education from the Latin schools to the sphere of vernacular print. Although I have united these texts under the category of vernacular logic and rhetoric, I will argue that they are varied in both their content and in their pedagogical goals. The writers of these manuals are also a varied group, from prominent statesmen like Thomas Wilson to writers like Roland MacIlmaine, whose manual is virtually the only historical record of his existence. Only two of the writers were connected with aristocratic courts: Abraham Fraunce was patronized by the Sidney family for all of his life, and George Puttenham was an aspiring courtier. Another group of these writers were either ministers or churchmen of some sort, or in the case of Dudley Fenner, an ex-minister who was ejected from the ministry for nonconformity. The one job that none of these writers ever held, surprisingly perhaps given their subject, is schoolmaster. Some of them worked briefly as tutors in noble households, but this was a temporary position before moving on to a more stable and profitable job in the Church, government, or the law. Perhaps it is not surprising that schoolmasters like Richard Mulcaster wrote pamphlets about the proper function of Latin schools, while a more varied group was responsible for the publication of vernacular manuals.

While the logic and rhetoric manuals have some variations, they are united by their conventional academic focus on the formal elements of logic and rhetoric. The total of seventeen does not include books which provide literary examples without a discussion of form. For instance, Robert Cawdry’s *A Treasurie or Store-House of Similies* (1600) appeals to a readership of “all estates of men in general” (title page), an
interesting version of the general social target of everyone. However, the content of
Cawdry’s eight-hundred-and-sixty page book is an alphabetical list of commonplaces for
the purpose of religious devotion. Cawdry’s main purpose is to impart the moral content
of these examples rather than to teach any formal principles of composition or
interpretation.

Also excluded from this study are three of the four vernacular Tudor epistolary
manuals.\footnote{Lynne Magnusson’s recent study, \textit{Shakespeare and Social Dialogue} (1999) argues that the primary
function of the epistolary manuals is social reproduction. For instance, Day invokes Erasmus’s precepts for
familiar letters, which allow for a kind of ‘simulated egalitarianism,’ but Day reintroduces social status as
the main determinant of style. That is, the main concern in Day’s models is whether a letter is addressed to
a social superior, inferior, or an equal (a style less studied than the others). Fulwood’s manual, which is
actually a translation of a 1566 French manual, focuses on the identification of three levels of social
hierarchy – our equals (merchants, burgesses, citizens, etc.); our superiors (princes); and our inferiors
(servants and laborers). Thus, the function of these manuals would seem to be the opposite of public
education – instead of imagining a unified social totality by means of logic and rhetoric, these manuals use
written communication to clarify social stratifications. However, Magnusson also considers the possibility
that these manuals weakened the traditional hierarchy by introducing a level of performativity to social
reproduction. As Magnusson argues, “the social logic available in the epistolary handbooks also highlights
relations as enactment or performances and so opens up the ideology reinforced by repetition to an
apprehension of alternate possibilities for performance” (88). The notion of rhetorical distinction as
undermining the traditional social hierarchy will be addressed more fully in Chapter One.}

Also excluded from this study are three of the four vernacular Tudor epistolary
manuals.\footnote{Lynne Magnusson’s recent study, \textit{Shakespeare and Social Dialogue} (1999) argues that the primary
function of the epistolary manuals is social reproduction. For instance, Day invokes Erasmus’s precepts for
familiar letters, which allow for a kind of ‘simulated egalitarianism,’ but Day reintroduces social status as
the main determinant of style. That is, the main concern in Day’s models is whether a letter is addressed to
a social superior, inferior, or an equal (a style less studied than the others). Fulwood’s manual, which is
actually a translation of a 1566 French manual, focuses on the identification of three levels of social
hierarchy – our equals (merchants, burgesses, citizens, etc.); our superiors (princes); and our inferiors
(servants and laborers). Thus, the function of these manuals would seem to be the opposite of public
education – instead of imagining a unified social totality by means of logic and rhetoric, these manuals use
written communication to clarify social stratifications. However, Magnusson also considers the possibility
that these manuals weakened the traditional hierarchy by introducing a level of performativity to social
reproduction. As Magnusson argues, “the social logic available in the epistolary handbooks also highlights
relations as enactment or performances and so opens up the ideology reinforced by repetition to an
apprehension of alternate possibilities for performance” (88). The notion of rhetorical distinction as
undermining the traditional social hierarchy will be addressed more fully in Chapter One.} 6
Angel Day’s \textit{The English Secretorie} (1586) will be included because it is a
hybrid of the epistolary manual and the traditional rhetoric manual of tropes and schemes.
The other three examples, William Fulwood’s \textit{The Enimie of Idlenesse} (1568), Abraham
Fleming’s \textit{A Panoplie of Epistles} (1576) and John Browne’s \textit{The Marchants Avizo}
(1589), provide only textual models for how to write proper letters. Fulwood and
Fleming do target their books at both the common people and everyone, but again they
are not in the context of broadening the scope of school knowledge. Fleming’s book,
which is a translation of Cicero’s letters, comes closest to the program of the logic and
rhetoric manuals. Indeed, Fleming targets both “the learned and the unlearned Reader”
and “all sorts of persons of all estates and degrees,” but again his focus is on the textual content – Fleming says that the unlearned reader can use Cicero’s letters “as sufficient furniture to arme and enable them against ignoraunce, the adversarie and sworne enimie of understanding” (“To the learned and unlearned reader”). Fleming’s goal is the distribution of a classical form of knowledge, but like Cawdry the manual involves only examples and not the formal principles of rhetorical composition that were taught in the schools and universities. Fulwood’s manual has a similarly wide goal “to profit my native country,” and a prefatory poem with a wide social target of “eche degree,” both “rich and poore, both high and low” (a.iii), but like the others, Fulwood relies on examples rather than competing directly with logic and rhetoric textbooks. Browne’s manual also addresses the composition of letters, but his goal is to teach young merchants “to use greater brevity in their writing than commonly they are wont” (2). Browne, who would go on to become the mayor of Bristol in 1572, was teaching an early kind of business writing designed to improve communication in the daily affairs of merchants and their employees. As I will discuss below, Browne’s educational goals have the most similarities with Gresham College, but he limits his goals to vocational utility while Gresham College was divided on the question of vocational and public utility.

This dissertation will be less interested in the specific pedagogical content of the manuals than the social imaginations of their writers, but I will also include a brief summary of their intellectual contents. Of the seventeen Tudor vernacular manuals, eleven are on the topic of rhetoric and six are devoted to logic. Three authors produced
both a logic and a rhetoric manual, usually in quick succession, including Fenner’s condensed versions which were printed together. The vernacular rhetoric manuals can be further divided into two distinct groups: the standard rhetoric manual teaching how to compose an oration, and the manual describing and illustrating rhetorical tropes and schemes. Only four different titles of the standard rhetoric manual were printed in the Tudor period, while six of the trope-scheme manuals were printed and another survives in manuscript.

The first of the standard rhetoric manuals was produced by Leonard Cox in 1532, followed by Thomas Wilson in 1553, Richard Rainolde in 1563, and John Horsfall in 1574. Wilson and Rainolde engage most directly with the classical tradition of Cicero and Demosthenes in teaching the reader to compose an oration. Wilson’s manual comments on a variety of orations, including a series of examples of how to commend a noble personage: an oration to Henry Duke of Suffolk; an oration commending David for killing Goliath; and the example of Erasmus’s epistle to persuade a young gentleman to marriage. Rainolde’s manual, an English version of Aphthonius’s classical Greek *Progymnasmata*, also teaches oratory through a commentary on model speeches. For example, a Demosthenes speech using Aesop’s fable of the wolves and the shepherds illustrates an eight-step exercise of using a fable in a speech: recite the fable, praise the author, place the moral, explain the allegory, expand on details, remark on similarities, remark on differences, and make a conclusion. Given the limited need for classical oratory in early modern England, it is not surprising that Rainolde’s manual was dedicated to Robert Dudley and directed explicitly at “the Nobles and Peres” (a.iii), and
Wilson’s preface, dedicated to John Dudley, tells a sweeping narrative of rhetoric as restoring civilization after the Fall by enabling lords to persuade underlings “that it behoveth every man to lyve in his owne vocation” (a.iii). Wilson provides both the cultural distinction of classical oratory and an example of how to persuade social inferiors of the necessity of the established order. Clearly, both Wilson and Rainolde are addressing their manuals to the social elite.

Not all of the standard rhetoric manuals, however, were so clearly aimed at the social reproduction of the aristocracy. Leonard Cox addressed his early manual at the professional utility of lawyers, ministers, and those “apte to be sente in theyr prynces Ambassades” (41), and he even makes a secondary appeal to anybody with “any thynge to prepose of to speke afore any companye, what somever they be” (41-2). Although Cox does not articulate an extensive social vision for rhetorical education, he does defend his vernacular manual on the grounds that “the more commune that it is the better it is” (42). Cox is the earliest of all the vernacular writers to express this idea of the liberal arts as ‘commune,’ as something that should be in as wide a social circulation as possible. The ‘commune’ was the exact concept that Elyot tried to counter just one year earlier with his idea of a “public” social hierarchy. In contrast to these competing social ideas of education, John Horsfall’s edition of The Preacher is targeted directly at the vocational needs of the ministry. Horsfall describes this vocation in lively early modern terms, saying that preachers “labor to pull down the Sinagogue of Sathan, and to build up the Temple of God” (title page). In practice, however, this grand project involves the less heroic daily practice of writing well-organized sermons and interpreting the Bible in a
methodical way. It should not be surprising that these standard rhetoric manuals have the narrowest social vision of all the vernacular manuals. The practice of composing orations implies a utility limited to people who regularly speak in front of groups, whether they are professionals like lawyers, ministers and ambassadors, or the even more restricted group of nobles and peers like Robert Dudley. It is a surprise, then, to find Cox making even a modest gesture to the commune within the context of teaching oratory.

As I will argue in the chapters that follow, the seven trope-scheme manuals have a complex and varied set of social appeals. These manuals are united by their basic content of providing definitions and illustrations for a set of rhetorical tropes and schemes. When combined with a poetics manual, as in Puttenham’s *Arte of English Poesie*, the trope-scheme manual is a Renaissance ancestor of twentieth-century teaching aids like M.H. Abrams’s *A Glossary of Literary Terms.*

The first of the English-language trope-scheme manuals was produced by Richard Sherry in 1550, followed by Henry Peacham in 1577, Dudley Fenner in 1584, Angel Day in 1586, Abraham Fraunce in 1588, George Puttenham in 1589 and John Hoskyns in 1599. In addition to their different social appeals, which will be examined in the chapters ahead, these manuals differ mainly in how they illustrate the standard tropes and schemes. Sherry and Peacham use examples from a combination of biblical and classical sources. Fenner uses only biblical examples to illustrate the tropes and schemes, including his example of metaphor: “I.Cor. The

---

7 Interestingly, the seventh edition of the *Glossary* (1999), first published in 1941, has added a secondary appeal to a general readership. The preface to the sixth edition (1993) says that the book is “oriented especially toward undergraduate students of English, American, and other literatures; over the decades, however, the book has proved to be a useful reference work for advanced students as well” (vii). The
Apostle saith *Doctrine muste bee tryed by fier*, that is, the evidence of the worde spirite trying doctrine as fire doth metals” (D1). From its first edition, Day’s epistolary manual differed from the others by identifying tropes and schemes in the margins of the model letters, but his 1599 edition included a separate section of tropes and schemes. Following the epistolary context, Day’s uses plain examples in this new section as well. His example of a metaphor is neither literary nor biblical but simply “as to saie: We see well, when wee meane wee understande well” (77). Fraunce makes a major departure from earlier manuals by illustrating the tropes and schemes both in classical examples and in a series of modern vernacular poets. After Fraunce defines a metaphor, he gives six poetic examples: Homer in Greek, Vigil in Latin, Sidney in English, Torquato Tasso in Italian, Guillaume Salluste du Bartas in French, and Juan Boscan in Spanish. Fraunce’s English examples come mainly from Sidney, but his manual is significant as having one of the earliest references to Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*. Puttenham’s trope-scheme manual comes near the end of a long work on vernacular poetics, and he focuses almost exclusively on English-language poetry. Moreover, Puttenham is unique in trying to coin English equivalents for the ancient Greek terms for the tropes and schemes. Hoskyns’s manuscript manual directs its instruction at a student of the Inns of Court, but it relies entirely on Sidney’s *Arcadia* for its textual examples. To illustrate metaphor, Hoskyns does not quote poetry as Fraunce does, but he simply explains that Sidney “would not say unfeyned sighes” but instead “untaught sighes” (121). Clearly, the trope-scheme manuals
have diverse purposes, though the most common are biblical exegesis and social distinction.

The logic manuals have a very different content from the first two groups, but they also have an interesting set of social appeals. The contents of logic manuals themselves differ in many ways, including an important split between Ramist and non-Ramist approaches, but they all teach the basic precepts of logic such as the syllogism and basic forms of causality. Historians of logic are generally appalled by a decline (even an “eclipse”) in university logic instruction during the Renaissance, a simplification of the subject which seems to transcend the split between the Latin schools and the vernacular manuals. While the intellectual history of logic is outside the scope of this study, it is interesting that the same simplified logic that the vernacular manuals addressed to carters and cobblers seems to have taken over the European arts faculties as well. Chapter Two’s analysis of English Ramism will address some of the major interpretations of Renaissance logic, but my main focus will remain on the manuals’ social imaginations about the institutionalized knowledge of the university, whether this knowledge was in decline or ascendance.

The first of the logic manuals was produced by Thomas Wilson in 1551, followed by Ralph Lever in 1573, Roland MacIlmaine in 1574, Dudley Fenner in 1584, Abraham Fraunce in 1588 and Thomas Blundeville in 1599. Despite their similar basic

---

8 The consensus by specialists in logic over a Renaissance “eclipse” can be found in Ong (1958) and Ashworth (1974, 1982), but this argument was carried specifically into the history of education by Lisa Jardine. As early as 1974, Jardine studied Francis Bacon’s method in the context of logic instruction in the Tudor universities, but her own argument about the eclipse of education in the Renaissance culminated in her collaborations with Anthony Grafton in 1986 and 1990.
pedagogical contents, the manuals demonstrate and apply these concepts in widely varying ways. For example, where MacIlmaine illustrated the precepts through classical literature, Fenner uses biblical quotations, Wilson turns more squarely to Protestant doctrine, and Fraunce applies the same concepts to the law. As I have quoted above, Lever, MacIlmaine, Fenner and Fraunce make some of the strongest of all the appeals to public education. If the standard rhetoric manuals make the most consistent elite appeals, then the logic manuals seem to be targeted most broadly. This picture is complicated, however, by the fact that Wilson and Fraunce wrote both logic and rhetoric manuals with a complex mixture of appeals to the elite and the common people, while Fenner argued that both logic and rhetoric were a kind of common property. MacIlmaine also split the target of his manual between professionals and the common people. All of these varied social appeals are united, however, by their participation in the history of publicity and their attempts to imagine education as public.

Previous Studies of Early Modern Publicity

My argument is that the Tudor manuals participated in the emergence of publicity before the political conflicts of the 1640s and 1650s, and before the formal separation of state and civil society after the Restoration. My goal is to extend recent scholarship which provides a long history of publicity, including not only the political sphere but also cultural practices such as education. These recent studies have broken into two main camps over the question of the history of modern publicity— one group, which I will examine here, argues that Habermas’s timeline should be extended back to the 1640s but
Disagreement between these groups concerns matters of causation: what historical factor or factors would allow for a fundamental shift in the concept of publicity? Does the printing press itself change the idea of publicity by creating a new sphere of print culture? Is the public sphere a result of political conflict in the wake of the Reformation? Or is early modern publicity a combination of these factors and perhaps others?

The groundbreaking study of early modern publicity is Alexandra Halasz’s *The Marketplace of Print* (1997), whose primary topic is not publicity but the commodified discourse in Tudor pamphlets. Halasz critiques Habermas’s early modern history of commodification on the same grounds as this study critiques his overall history of publicity – as a simplified historical ‘other’ to modernity. As Halasz puts it, Habermas relies on a sudden historical ‘fall’ into commodification – he “retrospectively grants a kind of innocence to earlier forms of capital, their organization of the marketplace and their influence on both the state and the public sphere” (43). As this quotation indicates, Halasz sees commodification of discourse as the primary historical cause of modern

---

9 For a survey focusing on the first camp, see the special edition of *Criticism* (Spring 2004), edited by Loewenstein and Stevens. In this volume, Pask (2004) stresses that a true literary public sphere could not exist until after the political settlements of 1660 and 1688 created the possibility for new institutions like the coffee houses and new genres like the familiar letter, the diary and the novel. Yet, Pask portrays the familiar letters of Dorothy Osborne and William Temple (1652-4) as the beginning of a modern literary privacy and thus presumably as part of a precursor literary public sphere. Still in the first camp, but with a more fundamental revision of Habermas, the sociologist Zaret (2000) argues that public discourse was a product of the combination of print culture and the political unrest of the 1640s. For Zaret, Habermas’s timeline is based on an outdated sociology of social ‘differentiation’ and a rising early modern bourgeoisie. In a political argument that goes well beyond the scope of this dissertation, Zaret argues that the printing press, and not capitalism or Protestantism, was the fountainhead of European democracy, but that it took the political crisis of the 1640s to initiate a truly public form of political communication.
publicity. For Halasz, it is the false universality of the commodity that makes possible the false universality of the modern public sphere: “the potentially generalized access commodification seemed to promise precipitated the very responses – of exclusion and inclusion – that underwrite the public sphere Habermas describes historically” (45). Clearly, this is an important argument for the study of vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals as instances of an imagined public education. Halasz would argue that the manuals do not imagine publicity but that they merely express the ideology of the print market – education, just like any other topic, could not resist the (falsely) universal logic of vernacular print. Without denying the power of this argument, and the clear evidence that publishers simply wanted to sell as many books as possible, this dissertation will argue that commodification on its own does not explain all instances of early modern publicity or even all examples of Tudor public education. As I will argue in Chapter Three, commodification is particularly helpful in understanding the way that Dudley Fenner describes the accessibility of his manual.

Most studies of early modern publicity since Halasz have not focused on the economic status of printed discourse. Coldiron (2004) is the only scholar to study Tudor print in relation to public sphere theory, arguing that the field of “public sphere print culture” in the early period of print (1476-1527) was constituted largely by French culture.10 On the whole, however, studies of the public sphere have avoided the relation

---

10 Despite the nationalist rhetoric of early print, the printers (including de Worde and even Caxton) and their materials were largely French, and nearly half the poetry printed before 1557 was translated, mostly from French. Thus, the early print public sphere was a “contact zone” between cultures, even a site of hybridity between England and France. Early print created a “public internationalism” in England not
between publicity and the introduction of printing to England, perhaps fearing the charge of technological determinism. In what should be a model of cross-period collaboration, historians of Tudor and Restoration England, Lake and Pincus (2006), have studied the status of political communication from 1500 to 1700. Although they radically revise Habermas’s theories of causation and periodization, Lake and Pincus retain his basic concept of a political public sphere. They propose, however, a diachronic narrative of two public spheres: first, a “post-Reformation public sphere … from the 1530s through the 1630s” (273); and second, a “post-Revolutionary public sphere” which “started with the outbreak of England’s Civil Wars” (279). For Lake and Pincus, this public sphere was the creation of the politics of Reformation England and not the religious content of religious reform – it was the creation of political conflict between state-sponsored religion and its opposition, configured variously over time between the major groupings of Protestant, Catholic, and Puritan:

[ Appeals ] to the people or to the Protestant Nation were prompted in large part to meet the threat posed to the state by Catholicism. Accordingly, they elicited a variety of Catholic replies; Catholics challenged the legitimacy of the regime and its treatment of Catholic subjects by preaching, printing pamphlets, circulating manuscripts, and spreading rumors. These challenges were met in their turn not merely by repression – although repression in plenty there was – but also by replies using the same media and the same styles of argument. (274)
For Lake and Pincus, then, the public sphere is a specific kind of political discourse. It involves different kinds of media (preaching, print, manuscript, rumor), but it always involves political discourse appealing to an authority outside the state or monarch. Here, the public sphere is a product of both the opposition and the state appealing to the political authority of “the people” and the “nation.” Lake and Pincus argue that this post-Reformation public sphere continued and intensified through the Civil War but that it retained the same basic structure of public political discourse as in the Tudor period. With the Restoration, however, Lake and Pincus see a major transition to a public sphere along the lines of Habermas, involving cultural institutions like the coffee houses, and a new political culture of Tory and Whig economic theories.

Clearly, the Tudor public sphere is a very different thing for Lake and Pincus than it is for Halasz. For Lake and Pincus, the early Tudors actually constructed a political public sphere in opposition to the legitimate state. For Halasz, the Tudor public sphere was an ideology of accessibility, a conceptual byproduct of economic forces which expanded the influence of capital, markets and the logic of the commodity. These very different arguments do share one important characteristic of public sphere theory – they both seek to explain the public sphere in terms of a single historical factor. For Halasz, the prime mover is the economic realm, where Lake and Pincus focus their attention entirely on the political realm. For the purpose of this dissertation, Halasz’s model of ideology does provide a larger explanation for publicity outside of economics, while Lake and Pincus imply that Tudor publicity was entirely contained within the sphere of

on a “foundational foreignness” in early print.
religious politics. Indeed, Lake and Pincus provide no assistance for the analysis of Tudor public education unless it comes into direct contact with both religion and politics. By isolating religious politics from the larger contexts of Tudor publicity, Lake and Pincus effectively isolate their study from the field of early modern publicity, even from the larger relation between publicity and Reformation thought.

This dissertation needs a theory of publicity that can account not only for politics and economics but also leave room for the specific fields of religion and education. The most important precursor to this study, then, will be Michael McKeon’s *The Secret History of Domesticity* (2005), which casts a wide social net for its long and complex history of publicity. Crucially, in place of Habermas’s “once-and-for-all watershed between the traditional and the modern,” McKeon proposes “a local, multiple, reversible, overlapping, and uneven development” (14) beginning in the medieval period. At the core of McKeon’s long development of publicity is an increasing separation between the concepts of public and private. On this topic, McKeon retains Habermas’s dialectical understanding of publicity and privacy, in which the separation of the state from civil society caused a paradoxical increase in both the separation and the interdependence of the public and private realms: “an opposition that is also an interpenetration” (48). Having dismissed Hannah Arendt’s notion of similar public-private splits in the “Greek distinction of the *polis* from the *oikos*” and the “Roman republic and its concern with *res publica*” (7), McKeon endorses Habermas in arguing that the public sphere is fundamentally different from all historical precedents. As McKeon concludes, the “Aristotelian opposition of the public and private lacks the dialectical dimension” of the
public sphere while the “medieval relation lacks the antithetical separation on which a dialectical conflation depends” (48). Thus, McKeon’s history of public and private separation replaces Habermas’s publicness of representation as an analysis of the early modern period, and McKeon portrays the early modern as a transitional period rather than the end of a long era of social stasis.

McKeon focuses his pre-seventeenth-century argument on the theme of privatization (or “downward mobility”) in the fields of politics, economics and religion. In politics, McKeon identifies privatization in what he calls the “devolution of absolutism,” an extended decline in absolutism’s patriarchal “analogy between the state and the family” (11), and its eventual replacement by political notions of individual subjectivity and contract theory. McKeon’s account of privatization in the economic realm begins with medieval common law, which conceived of all property as belonging ultimately to the monarch, and ends with Locke’s formulation of property as (relatively) private. As McKeon argues, in the process of separating property from the monarch, the idea of property becomes “depoliticized and turned into an economic rather than a political category,” a process which further separates public and private in the form of “the public sector with state ‘politics’ and of the private sector with ‘economics’” (17). This separation of public and private in economic theory occurred well before the Restoration, as McKeon demonstrates in a wide variety of seventeenth-century sources, including early mercantilist works such as Edward Misselden’s *The Circle of Commerce* (1623).
In addition, McKeon identifies the privatization of religion in some of the key elements of the Reformation. After examining major issues such as the shift from Church authority to individual salvation, McKeon finds a public-private dialectic in Calvinism by considering grace as both private, in the sense of being internal to the elect, and public in the sense of works as providing an outward sign of election. As McKeon succinctly states it, through “discipline in their private callings, the elect become ‘public’ saints” (35). The culmination of this privatization of religion comes in a theoretical separation of Church and state, where the state is coded as public and religion as private: “despite the legislative vindication of religious dissent, the predominant face of religion in the modern world is not a public one” (39). The privatization of politics, economics and religion is McKeon’s major argument concerning the pre-seventeenth-century period, while the remainder of his large book is dedicated to the continuing developments of public and private in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

This dissertation, of course, is less interested in early modern privacy than in an accompanying rise in early modern publicity. McKeon argues that the increase in early modern privacy facilitated a greater separation of public and private and hence a stronger overall conception of publicity – if politics, economic and religion became increasingly private concerns in early modern England, this opened up a larger contrast with a field of public concern, newly conceived as an aggregate of its private parts. 11 Although

11 McKeon explains this important distinction as follows: “If modernity involves the systematic multiplication and authorization of private entities – rights, opinions, interests, desires, ethical subjectivities, genders – it also is obliged to reconceive the nature of the realm of the public, which can, precisely by virtue of its impersonality, acknowledge and comprehend this indefinite potential of private entities. I speak now not of ‘the state’ – the institutionalized and bureaucratized public realm of
McKeon does not preclude the possibility of Tudor publicity with a clear watershed break, he does not address Tudor publicity in relation to his thorough examination of Tudor privacy. McKeon’s analysis merely suggests that there was a time lag between early modern privatization and the accompanying emergence of publicity. But why should there be such a long development of early modern privacy, including such major historical shocks as the Reformation, and the emergence of modern publicity? For most of his book, McKeon rejects the sudden changes of historical watersheds, but in the case of publicity he does rely, at least partially, on a sudden break before and after the civil wars. For McKeon, English publicity before the 1640s was dominated by the concept of absolutism - “a tacit identification of the public interest with the national interest, of the national interest with that of the sovereign, and of the sovereign with transcendental founts of authority” (343) – but the civil wars caused a crisis in the overall ideology of absolutism. Before the civil wars, publicity was entirely conflated with the sovereign, but the political conflicts of the 1640s and 1650s placed a kind of historical wedge into this public/sovereign and split it into two pieces, an early version of the separation of state and civil society. This account of the emergence of publicity is very different from McKeon’s long and uneven development of privacy, and he does not make any attempt to

government and its apparatus – but of a category of publicness that is as unprecedented as the system of proliferating privacies it comes into being to embrace. What is required of such a public is the dynamic flexibility of a whole that will accommodate an unlimited and perpetually changing number of parts. The modern public is able to do this because it derives its own, virtual entity from the parts that compose it. Its primary boundaries are defined neither by space nor time nor superhuman authority but by the reflexive self-affiliation of its individual parts. These parts are persons, actual individuals that comprise a virtual population whose makeup shifts constantly according to the patterns of participation, mobility, and circulation that move its component parts through the system of dialectical recapitulation – the public-private differential – of modern life” (324).
reconcile the two narratives. Students of Tudor publicity might see here the creeping return of a Habermasian break with the past, one which works simply to exclude evidence from before the break. An unfortunate result of McKeon’s argument here is that he does not begin his analysis of publicity until the 1640s, and his excellent analysis of later publicity simply does not consider any prior evidence. This is a major loss for an understanding of early modern publicity, which needs to be connected to the longer historical narrative of publicity and the public sphere with the same broad social scope that McKeon brings to early modern privacy.

The central argument of this dissertation, of course, is that Tudor education participated in the emergence of early modern publicity. McKeon briefly cites the Elizabethan clergymen, William Perkins and William Gouge, as articulating the social imagination of Tudor pedagogy in terms of patriarchal hierarchy – the family is a microcosm of society, and “living in a family teaches people how to live in a commonwealth” (337). I will use the Tudor manuals to extend this picture of Tudor pedagogy and to connect it with the history of publicity. Contrary to McKeon, I will argue that there was no sudden change in educational publicity during the civil wars but that a long and uneven history clearly connects with future developments, including what McKeon calls the “formal domestication” of knowledge – the development of common knowledge in a complex relation to the common people.

Contrary to Pocock’s argument that early modern knowledge was dominated by the status of land ownership, McKeon argues that the emergence of publicity created the concept of common knowledge, “the generalization of a virtual collectivity of knowledge
from the actual knowledge of interested individuals” (386). Following his usual method, McKeon lays out a long historical narrative of common (and disinterested) knowledge as cutting across many social fields, including the political, scientific, economic and aesthetic. As McKeon argues at length, these distinct fields were united by their search for disinterested knowledge “through the quantitative method of collective generalization” (386). Early scientific experiments began in “the local, particular, and ‘private’ realm of common sense impressions” but ended in the “qualitative abstraction of the general and the common that is embodied in the ‘public’ laws of nature” (352).

Similarly, both aesthetics and economics involved the abstraction of common knowledge (or common value) from the individual to the general, from the qualitative to the quantitative. Just as aesthetic theory sought to abstract and refine sense impressions, Adam Smith’s theory of the commodity abstracts and quantifies the notion of value, and “the market” becomes a “measure of disinterestedness” (381). In the political realm, a common and disinterested knowledge was involved in “seventeenth- and eighteenth-century efforts to theorize a political system of government of, by, and for ‘the people’” (353). McKeon traces the roots of these increasingly public forms of knowledge back to the seventeenth century, but the culmination of publicity in each field does not arrive until the late eighteenth century in famous figures like Adam Smith and William Wordsworth.\footnote{McKeon’s economic history builds explicitly on Mary Poovey’s \textit{History of the Modern Fact} (1998) which locates the development of modern knowledge in merchant pamphlets of the 1620s. For Poovey, the modern knowledge of merchant pamphlets confronted the early-modern knowledge of rhetoric – first, double-entry bookkeeping imported the prestige of rhetoric but then replaced its persuasive devices with probability and formal precision; second, mercantile writers of the 1620s began to claim knowledge based}
While the thinkers of the late eighteenth century seem far removed from Tudor education, McKeon’s history of formal domestication does provide a connection between the two periods. McKeon identifies the roots of public knowledge in an early modern privatization (and downward mobility) of knowledge and authority from the great to the common. The modern privatization of knowledge in particular seems to begin for McKeon with the Reformation. As McKeon argues, the “formal accommodation of divine spirit (or precept) through human materiality (or example) that was central to Christian thought was given optimistic reinforcement at the level of content, by the Protestant will toward internalization and privatization” (328). As quoted above, McKeon ties the Reformation to the long-term privatization of religion, including a devolution of religious authority that corresponded with the devolution of political absolutism. Here, McKeon connects the privatization of religion more directly with the privatization of knowledge, including Francis Bacon’s suggestion “that ‘elite’ social status may corrupt and infect, rather than solicit and improve, the understanding, an idea that invites a language of epistemological leveling” (350). Indeed, in Bacon and some early members of the Royal Society, McKeon finds a nascent version of the later developments of common and disinterested knowledge. Early scientific thought first approached the idea of common knowledge “through the idea of an individual observer of leveled understanding” – this was common knowledge through the common people –

on professional expertise rather than rhetorical arguments and authority; and third, Thomas Mun adopted the plain style of Tacitus as a critique of both scholasticism and humanism. Unfortunately, Poovey’s early modern section relies on Bender and Wellbery’s (1990) reduction of all pre-modern rhetoric to a mindless imitatio designed to reproduce authority.
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and only later did they attempt to overcome (private) interest “though a method of collective generalization” (350): common knowledge as group knowledge. McKeon identifies a dialectic between these two forms of common knowledge that runs through the spectrum of eighteenth-century thought. These two species of common knowledge were not opposed, as it might seem, but complementary – the “movement of formal domestication downward to ‘the common’ was increasingly understood to facilitate thereby an upward movement of generalization or abstraction to ‘the common’ that suffused the realm of the private with a distinctively if metaphorically ‘public’ species of importance” (360). Thus, Samuel Johnson feels no contradiction in praising Gray’s *Elegy in a Country Church-Yard* (1751), in which “the criterion of the common-as-general may be felt to suggest also that of the common-as-commoner” (357) – the poem appeals to a common reader through the representation of common people.

Clearly, the history of common knowledge is an important context for the study of Tudor vernacular education. Rather than the patriarchal analogy, the dialectic between the common-as-commoner and the common-as-general is the dominant social trope in the prefatory addresses of the Tudor vernacular manuals, almost a full two centuries before Gray’s *Elegy*. Many previous studies of the Tudor manuals have noticed their invocations of both the common and the commoners, but the significance of these references has been elusive. Based on these invocations, Howell (1956) argued that Dudley Fenner’s goal was to bring logic and rhetoric to the “general public” (187), and Christopher Hill (1965) used Abraham Fraunce’s defense of logic for cobblers and carters to call his manual a “common man’s logic” that “leveled men’s wits” (200). As I will
argue in the chapters that examine these manuals, both of these statements are incorrect. Howell mistakes Fenner’s address to the common-as-general for an actual social address, and Hill mistakes Fraunce’s invocation of the common-as-commoner for an actual interest in cobblers and carters. The more fundamental mistake, for Howell and Hill, is in equating Tudor invocation of the common with modern invocations. Conversely, McKeon’s mistake is in treating Tudor commonality as utterly different from his history of formal domestication.

Instead, this dissertation will examine the Tudor addresses to the common in the context of early publicity. Although the Tudor manuals are early in the history of publicity, they deserve the same detailed examination that McKeon gives to his examples from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. More generally, Tudor culture deserves to be connected with the long history of publicity and public thought instead of being roped off behind the political events of the seventeenth century. Every time a political date is used as a watershed for cultural publicity – whether it is 1688, 1660 or the 1640s – the cultural and intellectual evidence simply does not correspond. Even Habermas allowed for a relative autonomy between the political and the cultural by allowing for a literary public sphere in advance of the political public sphere. The study of early modern publicity does not need to claim that the Tudors had access to a fully modern notion of publicity, but it does need to counter the tendency of public sphere theory to reduce the Tudors to a historical other, separated by some kind of watershed break. This practice is not only detrimental to Tudor history, but it limits our understanding of publicity in general. In fact, Tudor publicity is important precisely because it is emergent, inchoate
and provisional. Tudor manuals addressed the common and the commoners, but they also combined these addresses with traditional hierarchies. In short, the Tudor manuals, along with other Tudor educators, participated in the early history of publicity by imagining education as more public.

It is not possible, then, to say that rhetoric was directed at the social elite and logic at the common people. In fact, as I will argue in Chapter One, even the manuals apparently aimed directly at producing distinction for the social elite also make claims about the potential social mobility of commoners. When the seventeen vernacular manuals are taken as group, there is no simple explanation for their social function as a whole – they are aimed at social distinction, professional utility, biblical interpretation, and varying combinations of all three. Cutting across these diverse social functions, however, is a consistent theme of publicity. As I will argue in the upcoming chapters, an appeal to the public function of education appears in all types of manuals. Chapter One will examine the manuals aimed most clearly at producing social distinction and reproduction. While recent studies have argued that these manuals either reinforce or subvert the established social order, I will argue that they represent the intersection of social reproduction and publicity. Writers like Wilson and Puttenham take social distinction and reproduction into the forum of vernacular print not to subvert the social order but to continue these practices in a newly public way. Chapter Two will turn to the manuals which address both a professional and a public readership. These manuals contrast the social limitations of the university with the publicity of vernacular print in an allied appeal to both professional application and to the tradition of common knowledge.
Chapter Three examines the two manuals with the broadest social appeals. While these authors envision strikingly inclusive ideas for education, they base their ideas of accessibility on the problematic principles of a national language and commodified discourse. Chapter Four continues to explore the idea of public education but with a focus on the examples of Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* and the statutes of London’s Gresham College. As these manuals indicate, there was no dominant early modern principle for the imagination of public education.

Before I begin examining evidence of social addresses in the Tudor manuals, I should explain more clearly what I mean by the imagination of public education. I have already situated my approach to the history of publicity and the public sphere, but it may not be clear how this applies to the prefaces of Tudor logic and rhetoric manuals. Essentially, I am interested in the way that these manuals conceive of the social participation in education through the printed book. My argument is that these writers imagine their readerships as public in a variety of ways – that is, they describe their readers in terms of a common group, not differentiated, or at least less differentiated, by social categories such as rank. When writers like Puttenham do distinguish by rank, it is often to promise social mobility to the lowest sort, and hence to use education to overcome the inherited division of rank. The clearest examples of the imagination of education as public come in the three most public manuals: Abraham Fraunce’s *The Shepheardes Logike*, Dudley Fenner’s *The Artes of Logike and Rhethorike*, and Ralph Lever’s *Witcraft*. In various ways, these three manuals imagined the liberal arts as a general concern – as the concern of the commons and the commoner. While these writers
share the social limitations of the public sphere more generally, they anticipate the social logic of publicity as accessibility in principle. In the prefaces to their vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals, these writers draw on the same concepts that will inform future conceptions of publicity, eventually in the form of a political public sphere.

As I have argued above, previous studies of early modern publicity have examined the topics of politics, religion and economics, but this dissertation is the first study of publicity through the lens of early modern education. The chapters that follow will demonstrate that this combination reveals valuable insights about both education and publicity. For the topic of publicity, early modern education extends the evidence for a long historical development of public thought, offering a valuable corrective to reductive models of sudden change in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Contrary to theories of a static and unquestioned Tudor social hierarchy, the vernacular manuals combine education with various conceptions of social commonality. Rather than envisioning society on a vertical axis, the vernacular manuals consistently invoke a horizontal social axis of accessibility and commonality. Halasz has argued that the publicity of Tudor print is a function of its position in the marketplace, but the public addresses of the vernacular manuals often exceed the realistic potential of the book market and claim education itself as a principle of universal accessibility. More precisely, it is the idea of logic and rhetoric as a common intellectual inheritance – as linguistic modes of reading, interpreting and knowing – that drives the many invocations of educational commonality. Rather than viewing the vernacular manuals as merely an effect of the market, I suggest that education should be considered along with politics,
religion and economics as an intellectual sphere which drove the early modern imagination of publicity. For the specific field of early modern education, the vernacular manuals evince an often overlooked strand of Tudor pedagogy which existed alongside the well-known invasion of humanist schools by the social elite. This strand of what might be called Tudor public education suggests that the study of education as a form of social reproduction needs to be considered within a wider social context which includes evidence such as these understudied vernacular manuals. Overall, Imagining Public Education in Early Modern England aims to bring the fields of early modern education and publicity into collision in order to illuminate the textual imagination of social commonality in printed logic and rhetoric manuals.
Chapter 2
Publicity and Social Reproduction

Since the 1980s, the study of Tudor vernacular manuals has been revitalized by the critical interest in social distinction and social reproduction. Inquiry into the social functions of the manuals has largely replaced the longstanding sober tradition of intellectual history which traced in sequence the influence of each manual on the practice and understanding of rhetoric. In particular, the concepts of distinction and reproduction have produced excellent readings of Wilson’s *Arte of Rhetorique* and Puttenham’s *Arte of English Poesie*, readings which have blown the dust off these texts and placed them in compelling social and political contexts. While these readings have been salutary on the whole, there have been drawbacks to this critical movement as well. As I will demonstrate in subsequent chapters, many of the most interesting vernacular manuals have simply dropped off the critical radar because they do not address the social elite – in fact, Puttenham and Wilson have come to stand for the entire corpus of the early-modern English-language manuals, and distinction and reproduction have come to signify the only possible social functions for vernacular education. This is obviously a problem for a dissertation arguing that the vernacular manuals are significant for their imagination of public education. While I am thankful to recent critics for breaking the ground with respect to the social function of vernacular manuals, it is unfortunate that

---

13 The major studies of the social functions of logic and rhetoric manuals have been Whigham (1983), Parker (1987), Crane (1993), Rebhorn (1995) and Magnusson (1999).
their studies have eclipsed the history of public education with a large body of research on the distinction and reproduction of social elites.

Before moving on in subsequent chapters to a consideration of manuals emphatically concerned with public education, I would like to reexamine the arguments that Wilson’s and Puttenham’s books are concerned principally with social reproduction and distinction. I certainly do not want to discount these approaches – in fact, Wilson clearly articulated social reproduction as his goal, and Puttenham is clearly interested in distinction – but I would like to consider the role of publicity as a competing factor in both books. Even these two manuals, I will argue, are influenced by various forms of publicity which complicate and often contradict their primary goals. For example, although Wilson describes rhetoric as a tool for social reproduction, he also disparages courtiers who use rhetoric and poetry for social distinction and imagines these functioning in a distinctly public way. Even Puttenham, who directs his manual specifically at the court, ends his book by claiming to offer radical social mobility for his readers. While previous studies have read this invocation of social mobility as subversive, I will argue that invocations of both social mobility (involving the common-as-commoner) and an educational public (the common-as-general) are the influence of an emerging ethos of publicity rather than a subversion of courtliness. Wilson and Puttenham are significant for my argument because they show that the idea of public education was not necessarily subversive or radical but could be interwoven with a

---

14 The traditional of intellectual history in logic and rhetoric has often dismissed the vernacular manuals as derivative and non-influential. However, the Tudor vernacular manuals have been considered extensively by Howell (1956) and were given a short treatment in Mack (2002).
commitment to social reproduction. Indeed, we might see publicity, at least in some of its forms, as an emergent type of social reproduction. Although Wilson and Puttenham do not imagine education as public in the same way as the English Ramists and the other later Elizabethans, even they participate in the history of public education.

Before examining Wilson and Puttenham in detail, I will begin with a brief overview of how elite distinction and social reproduction are figured in the manuals. This section is necessarily brief because it is difficult to find many examples which appeal explicitly to the social elite. I have argued that the standard rhetoric/oratory manuals seem best suited to the needs of the elite, but Cox and Horsfall direct their teaching specifically at vocational utility for professionals. Rainolde’s *Foundacion of Rhetorike*, on the other hand, does address the aristocracy directly. In his dedication to Robert Dudley, Rainolde says that the contents of his model orations are “right profitable to bee redde, for knowledge also necessarie,” including such topics as “the duetie of the subiecte, the worthie state of nobilitie, the preheminent dignitie and Maiestie of a Prince” (epistle). Unlike almost every other vernacular manual, Rainolde actually envisions the noble patron as a potential reader of the book. Rather then simple elite distinction, however, Rainolde sees rhetoric as a tool for educating the governing nobility. As

---

15 Along with his interest in aristocratic education, Rainolde also includes a significant account of natural eloquence and reason. I will examine natural reason more extensively in Chapter Two on the English Ramists, who used natural reason in their imaginations of public education. It is interesting, then, that Rainolde, begins his treatise on aristocratic education with the same notion of natural reason: “Nature hath induced every man, with a certain eloquence, and also subtilitee to reason and discusse, of any question or proposition propounded, as Aristotle the Philosopher, in his Booke of Rhetorike dooeth shewe. These gifts of nature, singuler doe flowe and abounde in us, according to the greate and ample indumenta and pentuousnes of witte and wisedome, lodged in us, therefore Nature it self being well framed, and afterward by arte and order of science, instructed and adorned, must be singularie furthered, helped, and aided to all excellencie, to exquisite invention, and profounde knowledge, both in Logike and Rhetorike” (i).
Rainolde says, “In moste fortunate state is the kyngdome and Common wealthe, where the Nobles and Peres, not onelie daiely doe studie to vertue, for that is the wisedome, that all the grave and wise Philopers (sic) searched to attaine to” (epistle). This appeal to the nobles and peers could be seen as an extension of the “advice to princes” genre of humanist education. Although this is the least public of all the educational genres, Rainolde still considers the education of the elite as in the general interest of the kingdom and commonwealth. On the surface, at least, Rainolde’s concern is with elite knowledge rather than elite distinction.

The trope-scheme manuals are not, for the most part, directed at the social elite at all. The trope-scheme manual with the most elite context is Abraham Fraunce’s *Arcadian Rhetorike*. As I will argue in Chapter Two, Fraunce’s works have a complex and varying social imagination, despite his lifelong patronage by the Sidney family. Like his other works, the *Arcadian Rhetorike* is dedicated to an elite patron, this time to Mary Sidney, the Countess of Pembroke, but unlike the others, the rhetoric does not include any other prefatory material. Another indication of the rhetoric’s elite and cosmopolitan tone is the fact that Fraunce illustrates the tropes and schemes through a wide selection of European vernacular poetry, including Sidney’s *Arcadia*. In an interesting variation on Fraunce’s manual, John Hoskyns’s manuscript manual, “Directions for Speech and Style,” (1599) also illustrates the rhetorical figures through Sidney’s *Arcadia*, but it is directed specifically at a young law student, who Hoskyns calls a “gent of the Temple” (116). As I will explain below, neither Fraunce nor Hoskyns is as specific as Puttenham
about rhetoric as a tool for producing social distinction, but theirs are the two manuals with the closest family resemblances to Puttenham.

In his preface to *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (1550), Richard Sherry seems to be interested in vernacular poetry as well – in both the “excellent monuments of our ancient forewriters, Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate” (5) and in the recent works of “that ornament Syr Thomas Wyat” (6) – but his manual itself does not use these poets or speak to a socially elite audience. In fact, as Sherry says about his teachings, “unto greate wittes occupyed wyth weightye matters, they do not greatelye pertayne, yet to such as perchance shal not have perfecte instructours, they may be commodious to helpe them selves for the better understandynge of such good authors as they reade” (11-12). Sherry does not even address the social elite, but he pitches his manual below level of “greate wittes,” an academic or intellectual elite. Instead Sherry pictures his readers as people without access to ‘perfecte instructours’ either in schools or as private tutors. He does not give any more specifics about this group, but presumably the wealthy would be able to afford whatever schools or tutors they wanted, and Sherry’s readers would thus be neither socially nor intellectually elite. Sherry’s actual examples are taken from both classical literature and the Bible, and he does not express a clearly religious goal for his teaching like some of the other authors. Thus, Sherry leaves us with one of the most amorphous and unclear ideas for a readership out of all the vernacular manuals.

---

16 Although Sherry argues that plain speech should be the norm, he also concedes that writers sometimes use uncommon or elevated speech: “But syth it chaunseth that som tyme ether of necessitie, or to set out the matter more plainly we be compelled to speake otherwyse then after common facion … we must nedes turne to the helpe of schemes and figures: which verily come no sildomer in the writing and speaking of eloquente english men, then either of Grecians or Latins” (13).
There is one trope-scheme manual that is definitely concerned with distinction, but it is the distinction of humans from animals rather than social distinction among humans. As Henry Peacham says in his *Garden of Eloquence* (1577), God gave men learning not only to govern themselves “but also to subdue the monstrous beastes to his will” (A.ii). For Peacham, language both raises humans above the animal kingdom and brings individuals together into communities: “the Lord God hath joined to the mind of man speech, which he hath made the instrument of our understanding, & key of conceptions, whereby we open the secreates of our hartes, & declare our thoughts to other (sic)” (A.ii). Thus, Peacham uses the capacity for speech as a way of uniting humans as a group (and as a way to “other” the animals). In the process, Peacham imagines linguistic education for “the common use and utillity of mankind” (A.ii). Although this is the most public idea of rhetoric we have seen thus far, Peacham does not focus on the social implications of his notion of language. He is primarily concerned in making a metaphysical split between humans and animals, and he does not elaborate on the precise social functions of education. Peacham speaks only of a general desire to “profyte this my country, and especially the studious youth of this Realme,” on the assumption that “no man can reade profytably, or understand perfectlye, eyther Poets, Oratours, or the holy Scriptures” (a.iii), without the aid of the rhetorical figures.

Other than Wilson and Puttenham, the books described above are the strongest examples of manuals which appeal to the social elite. It is understandable, then, that the burden of evidence that the manuals were intended to produce elite distinction and reproduction has fallen on the works of Wilson and Puttenham. Rainolde’s *Foundacion*
of Rhetorike and Fraunce’s Arcadian Rhetorike are the most similar in their social vision, but neither of these manuals makes a clear articulation of a desire to produce either distinction or reproduction. Rainolde could be grouped with Erasmus in the genre of “advice to princes,” and Fraunce simply does not state the purpose of his multilingual vernacular rhetoric. On the whole, however, the social reproduction argument has simply focused on Wilson and Puttenham and ignored the other fourteen Tudor manuals. As I will discuss below, even Wilson presents some serious difficulties for a basic model of social reproduction, but it would be even harder to argue that Fenner, Lever, MacIlmaine and the others were primarily concerned with distinguishing and reproducing the social elite.

There is one previous study, however, that attempts to unite all of the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals through the concept of social distinction. In Framing Authority (1993), Mary Thomas Crane devotes one chapter to a survey of the rhetoric manuals and another to the logic manuals. While this does not leave room for a detailed reading of any single manual, it allows for the kind of overview that has been missing in the other social interpretations of vernacular manuals. Crane does not build directly on previous studies of the manuals, such as Whigham and Parker, but instead she cites the poststructuralist readings of humanism by Cave (1979) and Greene (1983). Jumping off from these studies, Crane invokes Derrida, Barthes and Foucault in order to tie the vernacular manuals to a larger humanist linguistic anxiety, grounded on a “newly troubling perception of ‘the ungrounded contingency of language’” (12). As this quotation indicates, Crane endorses both the notion of a universal hermeneutic anxiety
and the idea that “these anxieties were, for a number of reasons, particularly intense in northern Europe in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries” (13). In England particularly, Crane finds a close relation between the rise of Tudor absolutism and the logic and rhetoric of humanist pedagogy. Despite her different theoretical foundations, then, Crane seems to be arguing for a familiar kind of social reproduction – the goal of the vernacular manuals is to produce a linguistic authority, order and hierarchy that corresponds with, and perhaps buttresses, the established political order. While Crane stresses the role of hermeneutic anxiety in creating a need for authority, she does not fundamentally alter the assumption that the purpose of the vernacular manuals was to produce authority and order.

Crane does take a major departure from the social reproduction argument, however, by treating the authority of the manuals as accruing to the humanist authors of the manuals rather than to their potential readers. This departure is hidden somewhat by Crane’s similar attention to the production of social authority and distinction in the manuals themselves. Crane does clearly state, however, that the social function of the manuals was “to establish an authentic language and powerful presence for secular teachers and bureaucrats” (13). Crane sees humanists as occupying a semi-independent social field, a kind of social class comprised of “secular teachers and bureaucrats” (13) who were sustained by the cultural capital of humanist education. Thus, Crane does not read the vernacular manuals as mere linguistic arms of state power and hegemony,
involving the maintenance or subversion of the established order, but as cultural capital.\textsuperscript{17} The primary goal of the vernacular manuals, for Crane, was “to transfer the authority, matter and control of Latin into English speech” (25), and the central problem for the authors was “how one properly manifests one’s intellectual capital, the possessions of a humanist education in classical literature, while speaking in the vernacular” (25). It cannot be emphasized enough how different Crane’s notion of social reproduction is from the other studies; instead of perpetuating the power of the state and the social elite, Crane’s humanists are looking out for their own interests. Although I believe that neither version of social reproduction explains the vernacular manuals as a whole, each version explains one aspect of their social function.

The most intriguing part of Crane’s book for this dissertation is her approach to the “commonplace.” Crane argues that New Historicism’s emphasis on aristocratic individualism has overshadowed another strand of English humanism which stressed the common over the individual, including “concepts of a socially constituted subject, common ownership of texts and ideas, and a collective model of authorship” (6). This “common” humanist culture, which developed alongside and in conjunction with the modern subjectivity of the Renaissance, was centered on the commonplace method of reading and writing:

\textsuperscript{17} Unfortunately, Crane does not engage with the theory of cultural capital with the same detail that she gives to the poststructuralists. After founding her book on a theory of intellectual authority, Crane seems to assume that authority just becomes cultural capital and can be transferred easily between social locations like the schools and print culture. For a theorist like Bourdieu, however, cultural capital is not a function of the content of education but of the institutional practices of schools themselves, including such important elements as credentials. In treating the manuals as cultural capital, Crane does not address such major theoretical obstacles, which may not be insurmountable but which deserve much more attention than they are given.
In theory at least, all texts formed a common storehouse of matter, validated by existing cultural codes, from which all educated people could gather and through which all educated subjects were framed. This common textual matter provided a form of symbolic capital that could be accumulated without threat to the existing hierarchy, and the social mobility that it enabled could be imagined as a collective project which did not involve dangerous singularity or personal aggregation of power. This capital could be manifested through the strategic use of commonplaces and aphorisms in letters, treatises, translations, and poems which, when published, made that capital the common property of an even wider audience. (6)

For Crane, then, the purpose of the commonplace was the creation of cultural capital for humanists – commonplaces, it seems, could function simultaneously both as “capital” and “common property.” The function of the common in commonplaces was to identify people as humanists and to bring them together as a social unit. The commonplace provided a common culture and a common knowledge for humanists as a group. As we have seen above, Crane combines the social theory of cultural capital with a poststructural theory of knowledge as a construction of authority and anxiety. In order to function as a common social currency, Crane argues, commonplaces also construct a common knowledge, “that of the doxa or cultural code” (38). For Crane, all of the vernacular manuals are involved in constructing this common knowledge, this “doxa,” as
a way of producing authority and, thus, cultural capital for the group. Despite the varying content of individual manuals, and the varying local goals of individual authors, Crane unites all of the manuals under the idea of a common humanist knowledge.

I would like to distinguish at this point between the idea of common knowledge and Crane’s idea of common humanist knowledge. As I have argued thus far, the Tudor vernacular manuals were written for a variety of purposes and from a variety of social positions which cannot be brought together under a single umbrella such as humanist knowledge. Crane makes a valiant attempt to unite the vastly different social visions of George Puttenham and Dudley Fenner, but this is truly an intellectual odd couple – an aspiring courtier and a Puritan minister cannot be simply lumped together as a humanist class because they both promote rhetoric. Crane’s notion of humanist solidarity seems more appropriate for the social context of early Tudor humanists like Erasmus, who used (Latin) print culture to promote humanism. Lisa Jardine’s recent book, *Erasmus: Man of Letters* (1993), demonstrates how Erasmus used printed prefaces to establish a humanist tradition by building and promoting personal relationships among leading humanists.  

Kathy Eden has also recently traced the connection between Erasmus’s pedagogy and the

---

18 Both Jardine and Crane trace this humanist solidarity back to Rudolph Agricola’s Latin logic textbook *De inventione dialectica* (1515). Where Crane reads Agricola’s commonplace logic as the intellectual basis of a common humanist knowledge (and cultural capital), Jardine tell a more conspiratorial story where Erasmus duped the universities into using Agricola instead of the scholastic textbooks. This, of course, is part of Jardine’s long-standing argument (Jardine 1974a, 1974b, 1974c, 1975, Grafton and Jardine 1986) that humanism was an intellectually empty program designed exclusively for the social distinction of the elite. The Erasmus book is the most recent installment of Jardine’s conspiratorial detective story, and Erasmus has replaced the early Italians as the primary villain of the narrative. Agricola is only a pawn in Erasmus’s strategy, as Erasmus himself published the first edition of the *De inventione*, along with his co-conspirators such as Martin Dorp. For Jardine, it seems that this conspiracy to murder scholasticism was the thing that brought humanists together as a group. More’s *Utopia* (1516) and its paratexts are also bound up in the drama over the 1515 publication of Agricola.
humanist intellectual tradition. Eden argues that the proverbial form of Erasmus’s *Adages*, and especially the content of his opening example, “friends hold all things in common” (“amicorum communia omnia”) (25), epitomizes his idea of intellectual tradition. More specifically, this program is about reconfiguring “the collected intellectual wealth of the classical tradition” as “the common ownership of property among friends” (25). For Erasmus, then, “common” seems to have signified sharing within a group rather than the involvement of any conception of the universal. Common knowledge, in this case, can certainly be seen as the cultural capital of a social group like the humanists.

My argument is that the Tudor vernacular manuals have a completely different conception of common knowledge than what is evident in these examples from Erasmus. While both groups used printed texts, the Erasmus circle used Latin publications to widen the scope and influence of their intellectual influence. The vernacular manuals do not involve such a cohesive intellectual circle, and they do not attempt to build a tradition by promoting each other. Crane is mistaken, then, in applying the Erasmus model to the Tudor vernacular manuals – Puttenham and Fenner were certainly not “friends” in the same way that Erasmus and More were. The vernacular writers are still concerned with the idea of common knowledge, but they do not use the model of common knowledge between friends. Instead, as I will argue below, they develop various versions of public knowledge, involving both the common-as-general and the common-as commoner. Significantly, there is almost no residue of the Erasmian tradition of the common property of friends. In the vernacular manuals at least, the entire conception of the
common is different – instead of reaching horizontally to like-minded individuals, the vernacular writers imagine their pedagogy as stretching downward to commoners but also as creating a “common readership” for their pedagogy. Before I examine the strongest conceptions of common education in Chapters Two and Three, the remainder of this chapter will look at the more provisional examples of Wilson and Puttenham. Studies of these manuals have focused on their function as social distinction and reproduction, but I will argue that even these manuals invoke both the common-as-commoner and the common-as-general.

Thomas Wilson and the Common People

It should not be surprising that Thomas Wilson has been central to the study of the vernacular manuals. While most of the manuals had only one or two editions, Wilson’s logic and rhetoric manuals went through a combined total fifteen Tudor editions. Furthermore, Wilson’s career had the same meteoric energy as his pedagogy, far surpassing any of the other manual writers. From a relatively common birth to Lincolnshire yeoman farmers, Wilson attended humanist schools (at Eton under headmaster Udall, then King’s College, Cambridge, M.A. 1549). He then went on to prominent political positions. After returning from his Marian exile in 1562, he became ambassador to Spain and the Low Countries, and from 1577 until his death in 1581, he

---

19 The logic manual, The Rule of Reason, had seven Tudor editions. The first three editions (1551, 1552 and 1553) were printed by Richard Grafton, and the four Elizabethan editions (1563, 1567, 1580, 1584) were printed by John Kingston. The rhetoric manual, The Arte of Rhetorique had eight Tudor editions. Only the first edition (1553) was printed by Grafton, while there were seven Elizabethan editions, six from Kingston (1560, 1562, 1563, 1567, 1580, 1584) and one printed by George Robinson in 1585. Of course, these were by far the most successful of the Tudor vernacular manuals, and they have received the most critical attention, including Howell (1956), Wagner (1960), and Mack (2002).
rose to some of the highest levels of governance – as privy counselor, secretary of state, and Dean of Durham. Before this high-flying career took off, however, and soon after he left Cambridge, Wilson published his two vernacular manuals, *The Rule of Reason* (1551) and *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553). Although the logic manual was published first, I will start by examining the rhetoric manual because it contains the most striking description of social reproduction in all of the manuals.

The well-known passage from the *Arte of Rhetorique* sounds like a manifesto for rhetoric as a tool of social reproduction. After conventionally invoking the stories of Orpheus and Amphion to claim rhetoric as the originator of civilized community, Wilson adds his unique account of rhetorical persuasion as a tool for maintaining the social order:

> For what manne I praye you being better able to maintayne him selfe by valeante courage, then by living in base subjection: would not rather loke to rule like a lord, then to lyve lyke an underlynge: if by reason he were not perswaded that it behoveth everye man to lyve in his own vocation, and not to seke anye hygher rowme, then woreunto he was at the first appoynted? Who would digge and delve from morne till evening? Who would travaile and toyle with the sweate of his browes? Yea, who woulde for his kynges pleasure adventure and hasarde his life, if witte hadde not so wonne men, that they thought nothing more nedefull in this world, nor anye thing wherunto they were more bounden: then here to live in their duty, and to traine their whole lyfe accordynge to their callynge. (20)
I quote at length here because this passage has been the source of evidence for the vernacular manuals as tools of social reproduction. It is hard to imagine a clearer description, and thus a better early modern example, of rhetoric as a tool of social reproduction. Although Wilson advances various Protestant doctrines throughout his works, here he describes a person’s “callynge” as a product of persuasion rather than any divine plan. Instead of merely repainting an Elizabethan ‘world picture’ of a natural social hierarchy, Wilson argues that the hierarchy must draw on rhetorical persuasion to quell a natural ambition for advancement to a “higher rowme.” Who, indeed, would rather dig and delve in base subjection than rule like a lord? Fortunately, Wilson tells us, the art of rhetoric exists to persuade these manual laborers to be satisfied “to live in their duty.”

The task for critics has not been to demonstrate the existence of social reproduction here – Wilson could not be much more explicit about the precise social function of rhetoric – but to establish the broader significance of Wilson’s articulation of social reproduction, dedicated to John Dudley (Earl of Warwick), and written by this recent university graduate who would go on to become the secretary of state. This task might seem quite straightforward: the ambitious young Wilson is looking for advancement, and he touts the value of his schooling for the elite. Wilson’s idea of rhetoric as a tool for social order is so appealing to his elite readers that it vaults him into his position as ambassador, and he goes on to work in high political office where he continues to uphold the social order.
Recent studies, however, have focused on the complexities of Wilson’s idea of rhetorical persuasion as a forum of social reproduction. In his *Ambition and Privilege* (1984), the groundbreaking study of the social function of Tudor vernacular manuals, Frank Whigham used Wilson as an example of “courtesy literature,” a genre following in the tradition of Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier* (1528). For Whigham, writers of courtesy literature like Wilson intended, in various ways, to bolster the category of nobility in response to increased social mobility, but their printed texts had the unintended consequence of making educational distinction more accessible. As Whigham argues, English writers (also including Puttenham, Elyot, Ascham and Bacon) proceeded with a “fully conservative self-consciousness,” but they unintentionally converted rhetoric from a tool of “rule, of domination and self-determination” into a vendible and transferable “commodity packaged for the open market of the literate” (2). Whigham actually begins his entire study of courtesy literature with the above passage from Wilson’s rhetoric, even though the English manuals are a small part of his argument as a whole. Whigham argues that this passage “intends to voice the dominant Elizabethan ideology,” but, in fact, its “account of rank as achieved brings into view patterns of exploitation and submission” and “makes it possible to ask new questions about the origin of social structure” (2). Thus, the English reception of courtesy literature signified a major shift in the dynamics of social hierarchy, from a static hierarchy based on inheritance and authority, to an active hierarchy involving rhetoric and persuasion.

Before moving on, I would like to demonstrate exactly how Whigham makes the case for Wilson’s unintentional subversion of the dominant ideology. Whigham’s
argument is important not just on its own but because it laid the foundation for
subsequent readings of the social function of vernacular manuals. A crucial factor for
Whigham is that Wilson articulates a kind of watershed between traditional and modern
forms of social reproduction. For Whigham, “Wilson makes possible a new conception
of the hierarchical social order: not as a sealed set of ranks, nor even as an order based on
merit (another new strategy with its own problems), but as a system dominated by those
who can convince others that they ought to submit” (3). But at the same time, by
describing persuasion as a tool of social reproduction, Wilson also reveals its
mechanisms in the full light of vernacular print (in what we might call a public forum).
By doing so, Wilson also provided his readers with “an awareness, however foggy, of the
inorganic exploitation” (3) of social hierarchy itself. Thus, Wilson simultaneously ushers
in a new form of social reproduction and undermines it from the start. If Wilson’s goal
was to use persuasion to mystify the social order, his manual actually demystified (or
“defogged”) the social hierarchy for his many readers. Wilson intended to reinforce the
the traditional social hierarchy with persuasion, but by publishing the Arte in the
vernacular he unintentionally revealed the pulleys and levers of rhetorical persuasion.

Interestingly, Whigham’s mechanism for change is not the ideology of the author
but the printing press, or print culture more generally. In fact, Whigham does not analyze
ideology per se – he does not examine the complexities and contradiction of Wilson’s
ideology – but instead, he looks at the intersection of ideology with the market forces of
print culture. In the history of publicity, Whigham’s argument can be seen as relating
print culture with the emergence of a certain kind of public sphere. In Whigham’s model,
print culture becomes a new sphere for creating social hierarchy, with at least a relative autonomy from the hierarchy of inheritance. We might see Whigham’s “courtesy literature” as an early chapter in the long history of English poetry as cultural capital. This is certainly an important argument that has not been made strongly enough in relation to the emergence of vernacular literature and culture in early modern England. Again, I do not want to dismiss the notion of social reproduction but to qualify it in terms of early modern publicity. In particular, I would like to qualify Whigham’s idea that Wilson (and the others including Puttenham) intended to uphold the traditional social hierarchy but unintentionally subverted this hierarchy by displaying it in vernacular print. My argument is that publicity was not a secret but a fact of life for the Elizabethans. It seems dubious at best that an author like Wilson was unaware of the social implications of the printed book. In fact, Wilson and the other writers go to the opposite extreme in their prefaces by imagining their books as speaking to everyone. As I consider the evidence from Wilson and Puttenham, it will become clear that the idea of unintentional publication of the tools for producing social distinction needs to be replaced.

Subsequent studies of the Tudor manuals have not taken up Whigham’s model of the unintentional publication of social reproduction, but they have continued to argue that the manuals both reinforce and subvert the social hierarchy. The most extensive analysis of early modern rhetoric as a form of social order is Wayne Rebhorn’s *The Emperor of Men’s Minds* (1995), which studies early modern rhetoric (Latin and vernacular, English and European) as a discourse of absolutist power. In stark contrast to their classical sources, Rebhorn argues, the primary goal of early modern rhetors was to bolster
absolutist power by means of rhetorical persuasion. At the same time, however, Rebhorn finds a constant resistance running throughout both the Latin and vernacular texts of early modern rhetoric. The stated goal of rhetoric was to uphold the social order and the legitimate ruler, but often “the discourse of rhetoric disjoins the orator from the prince or king in a variety of ways, and as a result he often appears a distinctly subversive figure” (83). Rebhorn suggests a number of reasons for this subversive undercurrent within the discourse of rhetoric, including an ideological ambivalence within the writers themselves, most of whom used rhetoric as a tool of social mobility. On the one hand, the writers wanted to rise up the social hierarchy – a goal which “would be meaningless if the hierarchy within which it occurred lacked validity” – but on the other hand, “social mobility denies the principle of fixity involved in hierarchy, and if it does not dissolve hierarchy, at the very least it renders it fluid and unstable” (115). For Rebhorn, then, it is the social mobility of the writers themselves that subverts the absolutist discourse of rhetoric.

Given his overall approach, it is not surprising that Rebhorn’s evidence from the vernacular manuals is focused on the same passage from Wilson as above. Instead of seeing Wilson himself as a conservative, however, Rebhorn uses the passage to argue that Wilson is not just ambivalent but actively subversive. Rebhorn says that Wilson actively resists the authority of both king and social hierarchy in his “antiauthoritarian” description of subjection and manipulation. For Rebhorn, Wilson even subverts the biblical logic of labor as God’s punishment by implying that labor is a choice, less a matter of necessity than “the result of the orators’ ability to persuade people to do things
they would not of their own accord” (106). By making the social function of rhetoric explicit, Wilson reveals that the social hierarchy is not natural but constructed, not inherited but acquired, not essential but performative. Rebhorn’s conclusion is thus very similar to Whigham’s notion that Wilson revealed the pulleys and levers of social reproduction – the difference is that Rebhorn explains this as an ideological result of social mobility rather than an unintended consequence of print culture. In both cases, Wilson’s rhetoric manual functions primarily to unmask (and thus subvert) the persuasive mechanism of social reproduction. For Whigham, Wilson simply leaked the information to the press, while for Rebhorn, Wilson is a kind of radical hero.

My overall argument, of course, is that publicity was neither a secret nor a radical new idea in the 1550s. Even the explicit articulation of rhetoric as a tool of social order was probably not such a subversive act. The passage does not seem to have troubled its Tudor readers in any of the manual’s eight editions – certainly, such an epoch-changing idea could not have gone completely under the radar of the dominant ideology. On the contrary, Wilson did not begin his rapid career advancement until after the publication of multiple editions of the rhetoric. The details of both the book’s reception and of Wilson’s career challenge the idea, both in Rebhorn and Whigham, that his preface represented a major subversion of the social order. Wilson’s passage certainly stands out for its explicit description of the relationship between rhetoric and the social order, but it should be considered in the larger context of Wilson’s works, and in the still larger context of the vernacular manuals as a whole. Indeed, in Wilson’s two manuals alone, there is a complex mixture of ideas on the social functions of linguistic education.
Even the preface to Wilson’s *Arte* is not entirely devoted to rhetorical persuasion as social reproduction. The preface begins with three dedicatory Latin poems to John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and a dedication which cites the classical orator, Cineas, in order to portray rhetoric as a tool for avoiding military conflict through international diplomacy. This is certainly a political context for rhetoric but not a clear support of domestic absolutism. Wilson’s examples of oratory – commending a noble personage, and his translation of Erasmus’s epistle to persuade a young gentleman to marriage – have a largely aristocratic context, but Wilson’s third book on style explicitly critiques the use of language and literature for elite distinction. In fact, Wilson champions plain language in direct contrast with the language of social distinction. Citing Cicero as his authority, Wilson holds a moderate notion of plain language, advising his readers to “speake as is commonly received,” neither “over fine” nor “over careless,” but “usyng our speache as most men do” (fol. 86r). The concern here is with the common-as-general rather than the common-as-commoner.

Indeed, when it comes to language in particular, Wilson privileges the common-as-general over the elite. He ridicules the “farre journeid jentlemen” who return to England wearing foreign clothes and “pouder their talke with oversea language” (fol. 86v). Wilson’s problem is not with foreign words themselves – elsewhere he defends the use of inkhorn terms – but with the way these gentlemen use them as a powder of social distinction. Wilson is not concerned only with foreign vernaculars but also with the “unlearned or foolishe phantastical” who gives the appearance of learning either by peppering his speech with “darke woordes” in Latin, or else by talking “nothyng but
Chaucer” (fol. 86v). Rather than pandering to the social elite, Wilson continually contrasts the true learning of university graduates like himself with the veneer of learning put on by gentlemen and courtiers who draw on language and literature as tools for producing distinction. Wilson’s antipathy for elite distinction is understandable from a recent university graduate whose life had been devoted to the study of language and literature, and yet, Wilson advocates plain and common language rather than the display of even “true” learning as distinction. The clearest explanation for Wilson’s plain language is not rhetoric absolutism or humanist cultural capital, but the influence of publicity.

---

20 Crane argues that a constant common-uncommon dialectic in the vernacular rhetorics is part of the humanist attempt to produce cultural capital. However, Crane focuses on rhetorical commonplaces (or “sayings” such as proverbs and adages) and not on the production of plain language as in Wilson. For Crane, the tension between the common and the uncommon in these commonplace sayings is part of the complex status of knowledge as cultural capital: “A rhetoric based on sayings retained its grounding in matter, as well as the decorum that comes from according with the doxa. However, because sayings are also distinguished from common discourse by the figures, they allowed the rhetorician to offer to initiate his students into a socially marked discourse, superior to the speech of common people and effective in manipulating the emotions of those commoners. In the case of some sayings, the social marking could retain an extremely complex and flexible ambiguity, sharing in the property of homely occupations, and also in the cultural capital of classical education. Finally, should this power seem threatening, both teacher and student could take refuge in their supplemental status as mere ‘gatherers’ and could call on the defensive importance of gathering when reading dangerous texts” (52).
Wilson’s *Rule of Reason*

Philologist [*Grammatice*], the British tongue has spoken to us
That the British tongue might run on broad wheels.
Now logic has come, and proclaims itself in our vocabulary,
That reasoning can have our sounds.
Formerly, you, England, were taught by foreign tongues,
Now you can learn in your own language.
All men praise the philologist, because he refines the words.
What sort of logic will there be governing us with reason?
Thomas Wilson has brought this to our ears
And thus he was useful to his fatherland.

(Walter Haddon, dedicatory poem to *Rule of Reason* (1551)
trans. Tatem: Sprague 221).

Wilson’s *The Rule of Reason* (1551) is even more divided between its appeal to the common-as-general and to the common-as-commoner. Unlike most of the vernacular manuals, the *Rule* often invokes the general in nationalistic terms. For instance, Walter Haddon’s dedicatory Latin poem highlights the linguistic domestication of the book: “Now logic has come, and proclaims itself in our vocabulary / That reasoning can have our sounds. / Formerly, you, England, were taught by foreign tongues, / Now you can learn in your own language” (in Sprague 221). The idea of

---

21 My argument builds on the previous work of Patricia Parker (1987) who has argued for the *Rule of Reason* as social reproduction, indeed, a direct translation of the rigid Tudor social order into a similar linguistic order. For instance, Parker argues that Wilson wanted to stamp out all linguistic ambiguity, both in his literary example taken from Udall’s *Ralph Roister Doister*, and in his concern over the ambiguity of the word *nobles*, a word which was poised “between an aristocratic order and a new, more mobile monetary one” (100). In this reading, Parker sees new economic forces as threats to the Tudor social order, and Wilson’s manual is a kind of pure ideology – a linguistic mode of order and power – coming to the aid of the old guard. Whenever Wilson does not appear to reinforce the established social order, Parker explains the resistance as an unintentional product of the semantic cornucopia of language.
domesticating logic to England runs throughout Wilson’s preface as well, beginning with a gardening metaphor for the contents of his manual as “fruictes … of a straunge kynde (suche as no Englishe grounde hathe before this tyme, and in this sorte by any Tillage brought forth” (iii). Unlike national purists like Ralph Lever, Wilson has no qualms about importing and domesticating foreign learning (or foreign fruits). Moreover, Wilson’s preface, although it is dedicated to King Edward, specifically invokes a broad national readership

I have assaied through my diligence to make Logique as familiar to Thenglishman [sic], as by diverse mennes industries, the moste part of other the liberall sciences are. For considering the forwardnesse of this age, wherein, the verie multitude are prompte and ripe in all Sciences that have by any mannes diligence, been set furth unto theim: weighyng also that the capacitee of my countrey men the English nacion, is so pregnaunt and quicke to achive any kynde, or art of knowledge, wherunto it maie attain, that thei are not inferiour to any other. (iii-iii)

The role of the common people here is in stark contrast to their portrayal in the Rhetorique – instead of serving as the object of rhetoric, the common multitude is the subject of logic; instead of acting as the passive recipients of persuasion, commoners are the active learners of knowledge. Instead of comparing the relative knowledge of groups like scholars and gentlemen, Wilson speaks of international competition between the multitudes of nations. Instead of relying entirely on terms like “the verie multitude,” Wilson also invokes the “Thenglishman” and “my countrey men the English nacion,”
suggesting a sense of national intellectual pride measured in relation to the collective learning of other countries. In other words, the passage above imagines education as public – that is, it imagines education through a conception of common knowledge. Wilson paints education with a broad social brush, using national terms to signify “everyone” (at least every man) in principle. In the Rule of Reason, then, Wilson depicts logic as a common knowledge based on common participation.

Many scholars have been struck by Wilson’s nationalism, but they have not seen it as just one among many invocations of publicity – a readership designated as general rather than in specific social terms – in the vernacular manuals. In the context of publicity, nationalism can be seen as a way of mediating between the individual and the group, the microcosm and the macrocosm. There seems to be no significant difference, in Wilson at least, between signifying the group as national and alternatives like “everyone,” or Wilson’s “multitude.” The other significant aspect of Wilson’s address is how he differentiates his readers within the overall group. Wilson begins by excluding King Edward as too learned (not too noble) for this logic manual, and he goes on to describe his potential readers in terms of intellectual ability rather than social rank:

But to fede and satisfie the thirst and desire of suche English men, as for defaulte of thesaied tongues, could otherwise not come to the knowledge of Logique I have iudged it laboure worthe, to geve the preceptes and

---

22 For instance, Howell (1956) describes Wilson as the “patriotic” (13) founder of a national tradition in logic, and Mack (2002) places Wilson in a “broader tide of linguistic nationalism” (79), but these are intellectual histories of rhetoric that merely gesture at the larger social context. Crane is critical of such attempts to reduce Wilson’s goals to nationalism, and she rightly stresses that content of the Rule is
rules therof in Englishe, that all men accordyng to the gift, that to every one is measured, maie be the more provoked, to folowe the examples of your Maifeste, aswell in studiousnes and desire of knowledge, as also in theexercise of al vertue, and pryncely worthinesse, wherin your grace hath made a goodly entrie. (3)

Here we see a more pragmatic side of Wilson than his national gestures, allowing now for a diversity of ability within his readers. He thinks of his readers in terms of hierarchy, but it is a hierarchy of “giftedness” rather than social rank – the book is aimed at “all men” but only according the “gift that to every one is measured.” We might see this as representing a historical shift from a hierarchy of birth to a hierarchy of merit, but Wilson leaves the concept of giftedness rather ambiguous – the gift “is measured” in the passive voice, potentially corresponding with hierarchies of grace, birth, and so on.

In the context of publicity, we might see this statement as both more realistic and less public than Wilson’s nationalism. Publicity works best when it ignores pragmatic details of inclusion such as ability – true publicity ignores such reality in favor of a pure vision of inclusion and accessibility. A longstanding crux in public sphere theory is concept of accessibility in principle – is this merely an ideology of universality, or does it function as normative? Does the principle of accessibility function as a smokescreen, or does it lead the way to real accessibility? In the early modern context, it does not really matter how accessibility will function historically, but it is still interesting to see the

comprised almost exclusively of Protestant doctrine. For instance, Wilson uses a syllogism to “demonstrate” the conclusion of “Ergo faith only doth justify” (71).
formation of the concept of accessibility in principle. In addition, the concept of common
knowledge often seems to rely on the notion of common participation, which itself must rely on the “public” idea of accessibility in principle.

As I have outlined in the introduction, the history of common knowledge often involved not just the common-as-general but also the common-as-commoner. The prefatory material of the Rule of Reason relies on general notions of the nation and the multitude, but Wilson’s logical examples often emphasize the practical knowledge of artisans. For example, Wilson says that a logical argument can no more proceed from its contents alone “then stones or timber shal profit the Mason or Carpenter, which knoweth not yet how to woorke upon the same” (9). Wilson is particularly drawn to the knowledge of artisans in his attempt to explain the utility of logic: “although one have clothe, yet can he not have the use of it, excepte the Tailer cut it out. And although the Miller grinde, yet we are like to dine without bread, except the Baker, dooe his parte also in the batche” (105). Wilson shows no interest in teaching logic to artisans, but he seems interested in how practical knowledge functions, including the division of knowledge between the miller and the baker. Wilson definitely tries to move back and forth from this knowledge of commoners to his common knowledge of logic, but he does not really press on the idea of the common as later writers would. Wilson actually uses artisan commoners as examples of specialized practical knowledge rather than common knowledge.

23 Halasz (43) gives an excellent account of the issue of the public sphere as accessible in principle. The critique of the public sphere as excluding women has been made by Fraser (1992).
As might be expected, the *Rule of Reason* does not imagine education in a modern sense of publicity. The prefatory materials begin with the bold intention of bringing logic to the English multitude, but Wilson soon qualifies this apparent target of a public or common readership. Wilson is not comfortable with the modern notion of publicity as accessibility in principle, and he explicitly qualifies his national address in terms of intellectual giftedness. Finally, although Wilson is interested in the relation between common knowledge and common people, he does not forge a strong connection between the two. In the *Rule of Reason*, then, Wilson does participate in the movement to imagine education as public, but he does so in a provisional and limited manner. It is interesting that Wilson began with the social vision of the *Rule of Reason* and then wrote about the social function of rhetorical persuasion just two years later in the *Arte of Rhetorique*. It is difficult to reconcile these two social visions published so closely together by the same author. The *Rule* takes a cautious but definite step towards promoting public knowledge, while the *Arte* treats the common people as mere objects of the persuasive power of rhetoric. Perhaps the different subject matters explain the difference for Wilson, though his idea of rhetoric as a tool of social order is unusual in the vernacular manuals. Perhaps Wilson simply adopted a strong allegiance to state power in the two years between the manuals, or as Rebhorn argues, perhaps his purpose was actually to unmask the mechanisms of state power. However, this dissertation proposes that Wilson’s *Rule* is part of the provisional early stages of English publicity. Wilson must have been unsure about promoting the education of the English multitude, even if he does not express
conventional doubts about either the dangers or the impossibility of popular education. 24 My sense is that Wilson was trying to impress his elite readers by articulating a broad social function for education – the Rule takes a stab at a kind of public education for the multitude; and the Arte experiments with the idea of controlling the same multitude with persuasion. Perhaps Wilson was using the educational manual to demonstrate his capacity for thinking like a governor. It is hard to tell if either one of these ideas was more impressive or effective than the other, as both manuals went through multiple Tudor editions. One thing is for certain: the manuals did not upset Wilson’s elite patrons nor hold back his career. In fact, the success of these manuals seems to have launched Wilson on his high flying political career.

Despite Wilson’s career advancement, there is one sad twist to the success of his vernacular manuals. As Wilson reports in a prefatory addition to the Arte, dated December 7th, 1560, his manuals caused him to be imprisoned and tortured during his Marian exile in Rome: “I was charged in Roome toune [Rome town] … to have written this booke of Rhetorique, and the Logike also, for the which I was coumpted an heretike” (v). Wilson’s regret for writing the manuals is understandable under the circumstances, but he also goes on to question the safety of his readers. Instead of simply celebrating public knowledge, Wilson now worries that he has created a threat to the safety of his

---

24 Jones (1953) points to many examples of the resistance to popular instruction. As he explains, “translators and other vernacular writers are so much on the defensive as to indicate a steady opposition to the use of English. A consistently apologetic note attends the inevitable defenses of their use of the native tongue” (41). Jones is also struck by the apparent lack of concern that an uneducated readership would be able to access the content of school learning. Only Nicholas Udall, it seems, expressed the objection that “not only a simplified vocabulary but also simplicity of thought is essential for the understanding of uneducated people” (40). Of course, the reality of pedagogy is not relevant if the primary purpose of a book is to imagine education as public and to create the appearance of common knowledge.
readers: “Who that toucheth pitch shall be filed with it, and he that goeth in the Sonne, shalbe Sonne burnt, although he think not of it. So thei that wil reade this, or soche like Bookes, shall in the ende bee as the Bookes are” (vi). Wilson’s experience in Italy has made him wary of the entire publicity of print, not just for the author whose name is on the book but for readers who are marked by the contents of a published book. Even after the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth, Wilson is still worried about the possibility that “the worlde should tourney (as God forbid)” (vi), and a Catholic monarch should return to the throne. In the world of post-Reformation politics, Wilson decides that public education is more of a public menace than a public benefit.

George Puttenham: Social Mobility from Cart to Court

If Wilson’s Arte of Rhetorique has been the example of rhetoric as a tool for maintaining social order, Puttenham’s Arte of English Poesie (1589) has served as the major example of a text offering elite distinction through language. Unlike the other manuals, there is no denying that Puttenham’s Arte is directed at an elite readership, in fact at the royal court, its courtiers and Queen Elizabeth herself. Puttenham aims the rhetorical figures directly at the courtly context by touting their utility in what Whigham calls “the cut-and-thrust of ambition” (142). While most of the Arte is focused on linguistic distinction and its uses within the cut-and-thrust of court life, however, Puttenham ends the book by offering social mobility for the common man. In a well-known article, Louis Montrose (1983) argued that Puttenham’s manual had a complex relation with humanist social mobility, mediating the contradiction between nobility
based on birth and the realities of social mobility. I would like to extend Montrose’s argument by focusing on the role of the common man in Puttenham’s description of social mobility. The striking thing about Puttenham’s closing image is not social mobility per se, but his description of his manuals as transporting his “common reader” from the cart to the court. Contrary to Montrose, this is not a clearly pastoral and therefore imaginary depiction of social mobility – Puttenham does not draw on the ambiguous social status of the pastoral shepherd as Abraham Fraunce did a few years earlier (as I will examine in Chapter Three) – but it uses the more realistic images of carts and carters. Although Puttenham does not make any gestures toward the education of the common-as-general, even he is drawn to the common-as-commoner in the context of his courtly manual designed for his own preferment.

The dominant social location of Puttenham’s Arte is certainly the royal court. Puttenham stresses many times that his manual is not meant for the academic context of schools and universities, not for the “peevish affectations” and “primitive languages” of

---

25 Montrose actually equates Puttenham’s Arte with the genre of pastoral, as both perform a Levi-Straussian imaginary resolution of real-world contradiction – first, between Christian equality and social hierarchy; and second, between nobility of birth and social mobility. Since writers of pastoral were usually from humble backgrounds, they used the pastoral mode both for self-fashioning and self-display. Puttenham, however, developed this practice into a modern form of social distinction based on literary aesthetics rather than moral content. When Puttenham draws on the commonplace of Orpheus and Amphion as originally civilizing society through poetry, he draws historical myth into the idea of humanist education as a means of civilizing and ennobling the student. As Montrose argues, it “was by virtue of their education – their training in grammar, rhetoric, logic, and the art of English poesy – that men of humble origins and means might make a claim to the title of gentleman, and might hope to attract the patronage and employment that would give some substance to their social pretensions. Not unlike Puttenham’s poet, pastoral itself progresses from the literal pastoralism of the countryside to the metaphorical pastoralism of the court by means of verbal formalization. Its base origins are refined or disguised by art; it is made presentable for courtly service. Thus, there is a homology between aspiring gentlemen-poets and the pastoral form in which they so often choose to write” (433).
scholars, but for the pleasant language of the court. Book Three, which combines the
topics of rhetoric and poetics is directed explicitly at a courtly readership:

And because our chief purpose herein is for the learning of ladies and
young gentlewomen, or idle courtiers, desirous to become skilful in their
own mother tongue, and for their private recreation to make now and then
ditties of pleasure – thinking for our part none other science so fit for them
and the place as that which teacheth \textit{beau semblant}, the chief profession as
well of courting as of poesy – since to such manner of minds nothing is
more cumbersome than tedious doctrines and scholarly methods of
discipline, we have in our own conceit devised a new and strange model of
this art, fitter to please the court than the school, and yet not unnecessary
for all such as be willing themselves to become good makers in the vulgar,
or to be able to judge of other men’s makings. (243)

Rather than the tedium and discipline of schools, Puttenham pictures his instruction of
poetics and rhetoric in an idealized court marked by pleasure, leisure, recreation, and a
very unacademic mixture of the genders. Here, vernacular poetry is placed in a clear
setting of elite distinction as both pleasure and leisure. Other sections stress the more
combative element of linguistic distinction, but this is still very much part of the courtly
world.

On the other hand, Puttenham’s social vision is not confined exclusively to the
court but also involves the maintenance of a tripartite social hierarchy. Puttenham’s
theory of artistic decorum corresponds directly with this social hierarchy, dividing poetic
topics into “high, low, and mean” (237) subjects. High subjects concern the doings of both “the gods and divine things” and the “noble gests and great fortunes of princes” (237). Mean subjects concern the “life and business” of “lawyers, gentlemen, and merchants, good householders and honest citizens” (237). Base subjects involve “the doings of the common artificer, servingman, yeoman, groom, husbandman, day-laborer, sailor, shepherd, swineherd, and such like of homely calling, degree, and bringing up” (237). Like Wilson’s description of the social function of rhetoric, Puttenham is extremely precise about the social application of his program. Puttenham’s “base subjects” are predictably the largest group, comprised of servants, manual laborers, and “common” artificers. Interestingly, Puttenham’s high subjects are confined to gods and princes, and everyone else is subsumed by the category of “mean subjects,” including gentlemen along with such proto-bourgeois characters as merchants and honest citizens. Suddenly, Puttenham seems less interested in fine distinctions among courtiers and aristocrats.

Puttenham’s notion of plain language also gravitates toward these “mean subjects” including both gentlemen and merchants. When he endorses a plain language as “the most usual of all his country,” it is both “that which is spoken in the king’s court or in good towns and cities in the land” (229). Puttenham urges his reader not to “follow the speech of a craftsman or carter or other of the inferior sort, though he be inhabitant or

26 Rather than social reproduction, this tripartite decorum is similar to Halpern’s (1991) account of Mulcaster as effecting a “social transformation” of his students: “The schools’ exclusionary function was thus complemented by a hegemonic one in which the behavioral disposition of the ‘middle sort’ was imposed on a relatively broad array of … it helped reform both the ruling and the subaltern classes along the lines of a proto-bourgeois model” (26).
bred in the best town or city in the realm, for such persons do abuse good speeches by strange accents or ill-shaped sounds and false orthography” (229). Although Puttenham endorses “usual” speech, then, he does not include the most common forms of speech by this inferior sort of language user. Instead, he recommends the speech of “the better-brought-up sort, such as the Greeks call charientes: men civil and graciously behaviored and bred” (229). Puttenham further disqualifies the speech of the geographical margins - “the marches and frontiers, and in port towns,” the “uplandish village or corner of a realm,” the “terms of northern men,” and “any speech used beyond the river of Trent,” before finally shrinking the map of approved speech to “the usual speech of the court and that of London and the shires lying about London within sixty miles and not much above” (229). This social and geographical hegemony, excluding most of actual users of language, is Puttenham’s idea of a common language. To use Puttenham’s terms, this notion excludes all of the “base” speakers and conceives of common language as that spoken by the “mean” people within a sixty-mile diameter of London. Puttenham is a good reminder that there are many different definitions of the plain and the common. Indeed, Puttenham is drawing on the same kind of false universal as the idea of public as accessible in principle. His language is usual in principle but unusual in fact.

Puttenham’s attitude to the common people throughout the Arte makes his closing image of social mobility from cart to court even more striking. Yet, a small motif runs through the manual of the carter as socially dynamic, as if the physical mobility of a cart were symbolic of the upward social mobility of the carter. Puttenham’s description of classical comedies involves both the physical mobility of “carts … made for the
removable stages to pass from one street of their towns to another” (125) and the symbolic social mobility of actors such as Roscius in Roman comedies, who “by the change of a vizard … might play the king and the carter” (122). The image of a cart even makes it into Puttenham’s section on schemes and tropes, when he illustrates *hysteron proteron* (or the Preposterous) by the common saying, to “set the cart before the horse” (341). The idea of a Puttenham’s reader advancing from the cart to the school to the court – which in fact sets the cart before the Horace – may not be literally preposterous (after comes first) but it is socially preposterous (outrageous) in the context of a courtly manual.

While Puttenham’s closing image of social mobility may be a preposterous ending for a courtly manual, it does not seem to function as a symbolic resolution of Elizabethan social mobility. Moreover, Puttenham’s carter does not seem like a particularly subversive figure in the context of Puttenham’s concluding address to Queen Elizabeth:

> And now, most excellent Queen, having largely said of poets and poesy … and so having apparelled him to our seeming in all his gorgeous habiliments, and pulling him first from the cart to the school, and from thence to the court, and preferred him to your Majesty’s service, in that place of great honor and magnificence to give entertainment to princes, ladies of honor, gentlewomen, and gentlemen, and by his many modes of skill to serve the many humors of men thither haunting and resorting,
some by way of solace, some of serious advice, and in matters as well
profitable as pleasant and honest. (378-9)

Puttenham’s reader becomes a poet in “your Majesty’s service,” entertaining the court
and providing learned advice. This is not altogether different from the conventions of the
“advice to princes” genre of humanist education, though the humanist is pictured giving
advice in person rather than through a book. Rather than an act of subversion, this seems
like a description of a standard type of early Tudor humanist career that people like
Puttenham and Gabriel Harvey were still trying to cultivate.

The question still remains why Puttenham claimed to be pulling the poet through
the full social spectrum from cart to court. Puttenham himself certainly did not have to
make such a radical social climb, though many humanists from Cardinal Wolsey to
Thomas Smith and Thomas Wilson had done so, and many others like Harvey had tried.
George Puttenham, on the other hand, was the son of Robert, a Hampshire gentleman,
and Margery, the sister of Sir Thomas Elyot, and grew up in close proximity to the Tudor
elite. In their recent edition of the Arte, Whigham and Rebhorn have tried to connect
Puttenham with the cart in a different way, by arguing that an Elizabethan “cart” was
used both in manual labor and in the punishment of criminals. Perhaps Puttenham’s
recent experiences of discipline and punishment, they argue, “would have made the hated
cart a particularly vivid image for him” and given him “strong motives to put this cart
behind him (rather than him behind it)” (24). While this is a clever reading of “cart to
court,” it seems like another attempt to reduce the social meaning of Tudor rhetoric to the
mind of a single author – as in Rebhorn’s earlier work, to explain social mobility in rhetoric manuals as an author’s subversion of the dominant ideology.

My argument is that social mobility was a fact of life for the Elizabethans, especially for Elizabethan humanists, and not a subversive secret. Indeed, it would be difficult to avoid the topic of social mobility when addressing the topic of humanist education. For example, when Puttenham refers to the intellectual stars of education, he does not refer to dukes and earls but to Tudor politicians, William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon. Cecil was born with some high connections, but Bacon, like most Tudor university graduates, came from a middling background – in his case, as the son of a Suffolk yeoman. Both Cecil and Bacon had gone to grammar schools, then to Cambridge and Gray’s Inn, before their political careers, and Cecil had gone on to be chancellor of Cambridge since 1559. Puttenham does not exactly highlight the social mobility of their careers, but this must have been common knowledge for his readers. Rather than downplaying their social mobility, Puttenham is concerned with downplaying the intellectual role of the school and portraying their success as the pure force of eloquence and oratory. Puttenham says he has heard “more grave and natural eloquence” from Cecil and Bacon “than all the orators of Oxford and Cambridge” (224). Without addressing their backgrounds directly, Puttenham goes on to say that it “maketh no matter whether the same eloquence be natural to them or artificial (though I think rather natural), yet were they known to be learned and not unskillful of the art when they were younger men” (224). This anecdotal reference to their natural eloquence is clearly meant to minimize the role of schooling in social and political advancement. The same is true for
Puttenham’s personal anecdote about Bacon’s study of eloquence involving a rhetoric manual rather than the school: “I have come to the Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon, and found him sitting in his gallery alone with the works of Quintilian before him” (224). This autodidactic image involves a great man alone with the great book, the same kind of social vision that Puttenham had for his own book. In this case, Puttenham is not interested in purging social mobility but in purging the school from the practice of linguistic distinction.  

In transferring linguistic distinction from the schools to vernacular print, we might say that Puttenham is making distinction (more) public. This is similar to Whigham’s argument for the social function of ‘courtesy literature,’ except for his idea that publicity was an unintended consequence of publication. I would argue that publicity has affected the social vision even of the Arte—a text that seems overwhelmingly devoted to the practices of courtly distinction. Contrary to Rebhorn, the social complexity of the Arte should not be reduced to Puttenham’s own ambivalence about social mobility. Instead, I would argue that social mobility has permeated Elizabethan culture to such an extent that it is unavoidable, even in the context of courtly distinction. Moreover, Rebhorn cannot

27 It would not be easy for Puttenham to purge the school from linguistic distinction and authority altogether. For example, Puttenham provides English translations for all the classical schemes and tropes instead of using the conventional Greek terms. He fears a hostile reception of his vernacular figures from his intended audience of courtiers, who “if they happen to hit upon any new name of mine (so ridiculous in their opinion) as may move them to laughter, let such persons assure themselves that such names go as near as may be to their original” (242). To such busy carpers and privy nippers, Puttenham responds that if he “should have kept the Greek or Latin still, it would have appeared a little too scholastical for our makers, and a piece of work more fit for clerks than for courtiers” (242). Puttenham defends his terms from these courtiers with reference to humanist learning, distinguishing between the opinions of “the learned” who may object to the novelty of his terms, and courtiers who are “not learned in the primitive languages” (242) and thus have no knowledge of the origins of his terms. Even in the process of coining new English terms, then, Puttenham cannot separate himself entirely from the context of Latin humanism.
account for the fact that Puttenham envisions social mobility beginning from the lowly position of the carter. Why would Puttenham’s ambivalence about his own social mobility be translated into a claim about the extreme social mobility from cart to court?

Although Puttenham shows no interest in the common-as-general, he joins his contemporaries through an interest in the common-as-commoner. Puttenham did not really care about the career prospects of England’s carters, and he certainly did not see his own career, his own prospects for social mobility, as comparable to theirs. No, Puttenham simply wanted to make the boldest possible claim for the social potential of his linguistic pedagogy. The social mobility of the carter is Puttenham’s version of public humanism, his uniquely limited articulation of the social function of education. If the manual can transport even a carter to the court, think what it could do for the son of a yeoman farmer or a relatively prosperous son of a rope maker? As I will argue in subsequent chapters, Puttenham’s public vision of education is a far cry from the grand social visions of later manuals, serving only to further the interests of Puttenham himself. This goes to show how unlikely it was that social mobility was a subversive idea, even in the courtly context. It is extremely unlikely that Puttenham, starved for preferment, would conclude his text by risking a subversive statement.

The point of this chapter was not to discount the pursuit of social distinction and reproduction in Wilson’s and Puttenham’s manuals but to argue that even these elite-focused manuals were influenced by publicity. For Puttenham, this influence is relatively limited, but it does shed light on the critical crux of Puttenham’s socially mobile carter. Rather than resolving the contradiction of social mobility, Puttenham is highlighting the
possibility of social mobility for his own ends. Wilson’s two manuals are even more
difficult to explain in the context of social reproduction. Although Wilson makes by far
the clearest statement for rhetoric as a tool for social reproduction, he also critiques the
practice of literary distinction by social elites, and he invokes the common-as-general in
his ideas of plain language and logic pedagogy. In the next chapter, I will connect
Wilson’s public imagination of the common to even stronger versions by the English
Ramists, but it is clear that Wilson did not have a simple goal of elite reproduction. By
the same token, neither Wilson nor Puttenham were continuing the Erasmian program of
promoting humanism as the common intellectual property of scholars. Although Wilson
and Puttenham were the closest of all the vernacular writers to the social and political
elite, they imagined their readers as a combination of the common-as-commoner and the
common-as-general. However provisional their conceptions were, both Wilson and
Puttenham also participated in imagining education as public.
In the previous chapter, I argued that even the most elite of the Tudor vernacular manuals were not focused entirely on producing elite distinction and social reproduction. Without denying that Puttenham’s primary interest was producing courtly distinction for his readers, and for himself in the process, I argued that his social interest also strayed down to the level of the common man, most importantly in his closing image of the carter. Puttenham’s interest in social distinction was paired, then, with a concern with the potential social mobility of the common-as-commoner. When Wilson invokes the common-as-commoner in his rhetoric, it is in the context of social stasis rather than mobility – rhetorical persuasion, he argues, is the only way to convince diggers and delvers to accept their social roles rather than aspiring to live like lords. These commoners are the objects rather than the subjects of rhetorical knowledge. Yet, Wilson’s theory of plain language appeals to the idea of the common-as-general rather than to the elite, and his logic manual involves the common knowledge of the nation and the participation of commoners as subjects rather than objects of knowledge. While I began with the topic of elite distinction and reproduction, the rest of Chapter One tried to complicate the social imaginations of these manuals in terms of the common and the public. By appealing to the common and the commoner even in their elite contexts, Wilson and Puttenham show that publicity was not secret, illicit, or subversive for the Tudors but a fact of life that needed to be addressed and managed. Common people and
common knowledge are not only present in the manuals of this chapter, but are central organizing principles of the manuals.

The preface to Abraham Fraunce’s *The Lawiers Logike* (1588) begins, as one might expect from the title, by detailing the utility of university logic in the study and practice of law, but it ends with a bizarre and seemingly out-of-place debate over the accessibility of logic to artisans and laborers. This abrupt shift takes place when Fraunce imagines the entrance of a “raging and fieryfaced Aristotelian” who spouts a particularly noxious combination of misogyny and elitism, associating the educational reform movement of Petrus Ramus with the twin social evils of prostitution and adult education. Since Lady Logic has been “ravished of strangers, and made common to all,” says the Aristotelian, “Herby it comes to passe, that everye cobbler can cogge a syllogisme, everye carter cracke of propositions” (sig.¶¶ 3r). After parrying the prostitution metaphor, a standard trope of early modern defenses of exclusivity, by removing the sexual connotations from a Lady Logic who is merely kind to all, Fraunce takes on the more literal and socially specific topic of the accessibility of logic for artisans and laborers: “Coblers bee men, why therefore not logicians? and Carters have reason, why therefore not Logike?” (sig.¶¶ 3r). If we accept the terms of this debate, the social question for Elizabethan education was not whether working men could study logic, but only if the inexorable accessibility of this knowledge was good or bad.

This remarkable passage attracted the attention of twentieth-century intellectual historians, including Perry Miller (1939), who seemed transported into romance by Fraunce’s heroic defense of Lady Logic: “Only the brave deserve the fair,” said Miller,
“in logic as in love, and if the goddess of reason was now granting her favors exclusively to the young Ramists, it was because they alone were laying trophies at her feet” (143).

Christopher Hill, on the other hand, zeroed in on Fraunce’s defense of logic for working men as evidence that the manual (and Ramism in general) was a “common man’s logic” that “leveled men’s wits” (292). Neither writer, however, has registered the many difficulties of treating the Lawiers Logike as a common man’s logic, the most glaring of which is that the manual is explicitly addressed to an elite group of lawyers and law students: “To The Learned Lawyers of England, especially the Gentlemen of Grays Inne” (sig.¶ r). The contradiction in the social address of the Lawiers Logike would seem to leave its readers at an impasse – is this really a lawyer’s logic or a common man’s logic? If the manual is actually directed at the gentlemen of Gray’s Inn, why does Fraunce end his preface by defending the educational rights of cobblers and carters? What, in other words, is the relation between the professional and the public in Fraunce’s pedagogy?

This chapter will focus on the relation between the professional and the public in the Tudor vernacular manuals. Of the seventeen Tudor logic and rhetoric manuals, five are addressed specifically to the needs of professionals. Cox (1532), MacIlmaine (1574) and Blundeville (1599) speak generally to professionals, including lawyers, ministers, physicians, and politicians, while John Horsfall’s The Preacher (1574) and the Lawiers Logike (1588) are targeted specifically. One might expect that these professional manuals would have little concern with the overall social function of education – indeed,

28 Many of the foundational twentieth-century studies of Ramism have quoted extensively from Fraunce. In addition to Miller, see Tuve (1947), Howell (1956), and Ong (1958), and for a valuable summary and critique of this early work, see Hotson (2007).
we might consider vocational training as private rather than public – but a secondary
public concern runs throughout these manuals as well, most emphatically in those by
MacIlmaine and Fraunce, who adapted and translated the work of the French educational
reformer Petrus Ramus (Pierre de la Ramée) (1515-72). Ramus’s own career at the
University of Paris involved a violent struggle over the intellectual authority of Aristotle,
culminating in Ramus’s grisly murder during the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, when
he was a window at the University of Paris, decapitated and thrown into the Seine. In the
Massacre at Paris (1593), Christopher Marlowe portrayed this murder as the result both
of Ramus’s Protestantism and his challenge to intellectual absolutism. After accusing
Ramus of disrespecting Aristotle, Marlowe’s Dukes of Guise and Anjou stab Ramus
themselves, saying “Nere was there Collars sonne so full of pride” (9.56). Marlowe
neatly links the themes of social and intellectual authority in this scene, then, and joins
the movement to make Ramus a Protestant intellectual martyr. In Fraunce’s preface, this
fight over Aristotle’s authority seems outdated, the fight of a previous generation, and the
Aristotelian is a crotchety figure of ridicule holding on to the old battle. There is
certainly nothing of the imminent menace of Ramus’s murder in Fraunce’s critique of the
Aristotelian, and the scene acts instead as a sort of comical interlude between Fraunce’s
preface and his main text.

The comparison between Ramus and Fraunce raises questions about Michael
McKeon’s account of the early modern devolution of absolutism. This model clearly
does apply to Ramus’s conflict with Aristotle as a figure of intellectual absolutism – an
educational issue which is clearly overdetermined by other social factors such as politics
and religion. Marlowe’s depiction of Ramus’s murder is typically astute in showing that the intellectual debate over Aristotle is a thin façade for relations of power. As Fraunce’s preface indicates, however, intellectual absolutism was not a major issue in the Tudor vernacular manuals, and this seems to be true for Tudor education in general. Even the ensuing issue of Cicero as a stylistic authority for Latin composition had been on the wane since Erasmus and the early Tudor educators. We might say that intellectual absolutism had already been overthrown in England by the Elizabethan period, and the problem is to identify what happened in the wake of this change.

This chapter proposes that the professional-public dynamic of the Tudor manuals emerged after the dissolution of intellectual absolutism and did not participate meaningfully in the conflict. In fact, the professional and the public are allied in these manuals against what they consider the hoarded and enclosed knowledge of the universities. Thus, these manuals, even ones with an overriding professional focus, unexpectedly draw on the classical/Christian tradition of common intellectual property. While Ramus himself was involved in an institutional struggle involving the intellectual absolutism of Aristotle, the Tudor vernacular manuals involved a new conflict between

29 Without drawing on public sphere theory, Halpern (1991) made a similar argument for the devolution of educational absolutism. For Halpern, Erasmus’s practice of imitation replaces absolutism with interpellation – that is, the stylistic imitation of multiple models instead of a single authority, as in Ciceronianus (1528), lays an intellectual foundation for what Halpern calls a “civil” political model. Halpern argues that humanist grammar schools did not simply reproduce the Tudor elite but “transformed” existing social groups into a proto-bourgeoisie. The civil-bourgeois political model supplemented coercion from above with “hegemony and self-regulation” – corporal punishment was supplemented with “persuasion;” and “single authority” was replaced with multiple authorities, along with Erasmus’s method of imitation to produce an individualized composition. Contrary to the fears of conservatives, multiple models did not produce ideological anarchy but a “regulated production of difference” which invested the individual subject with some degree of autonomous power. Since Erasmus’s practice of producing copia tended to “neutralize the content” of the literary works in the syllabus, the product of his pedagogy itself was also “form” – the acquisition of a linguistic style.
institutional knowledge itself and the broader goal of professional and public knowledge. Of all the writers considered in this chapter, Fraunce goes the furthest in imagining education as public, drawing on Ramus’s reforms but then developing an account of their social implications outside the university. While most of the manuals simply gestured in the direction of common knowledge, Fraunce attempted to forge a common man’s logic out of the social tropes of pastoral poetry.

I.

From their inception, the Tudor vernacular manuals had focused on the utility of logic and rhetoric for professionals. The first English-language rhetoric manual, Cox’s Arte is addressed explicitly to lawyers (“advocates and proctoures in the lawe”), ambassadors (those “apte to be sente in theyr prynces / Ambassades”) and ministers (“techars of goddess worde”) (41-2). Since the goal of classical rhetoric was to improve the composition of speeches, it makes sense that Cox would address these professions involving oratory. Similarly, John Horsfall’s 1574 edition of The Preacher, translated from Niels Hemmingsen (1565), applies the precepts of classical rhetoric specifically to the composition of sermons. Horsfall calls his manual a “Christiana Rhetorica, that is to say an arte out of whiche the true and faithful Ministers of Christe, may learne playnely, and orderly, to breake and distribute the worde of God unto the people, and flocke committed to their charge” (“To his brethren”). Crucially, Horsfall specifically addresses other ministers who will then interpret and teach (“breake and distribute”) a text for a
larger group. This is very different than Dudley Fenner’s notion (as we will see later) of teaching hermeneutic skills to the congregation rather than to other ministers. For Horsfall, knowledge still runs fundamentally through the professional minister and then to “the people,” drawing on the conventional Christian metaphor of the shepherd and his flock. As we will see below, this is different from Fraunce’s invocation of both literary shepherds and actual rural people.

The last of the Tudor manuals with a professional aim is Thomas Blundeville’s *The Art of Logike* (1599), whose late date of publication deserves some comment since the text is more typical of the mid- than late-century manuals. The detail of Blundeville’s life are rather vague – for instance, the *Oxford DNB* credits him with translating Johannes Sturm’s *A Ritch Storehouse* (1570) when its actual translator was Thomas Browne. Blundeville appears to have been born in the 1520s, and was thus a contemporary of Thomas Wilson and Ralph Lever rather than the English Ramists.\(^{30}\) The title page to

\(^{30}\) *A Ritch Storehouse* is dedicated to Philip Howard, Earl of Surrey, and signed, “By your Lordships to commaunde, Thomas Browne, from Lyncolnes Inne” (A.iii). The Blundeville entry in the 2004 edition of the *DNB* does not explain this discrepancy, and it seems to have been carried over from an earlier mistake. *A Ritch Storehouse*, a translation of Sturm’s *Nobilitas literata* (1549), is not a logic or rhetoric manual but a pedagogy manual along the lines of Elyot’s *Boke Named the Governor* (1531). The idea of *A Ritch Storehouse* is that classical studies of history, politics and poetry will lead to a virtuous nobility who are qualified to be political counselors for the prince. Wilson received his B.A. from Cambridge in 1547, as did Lever in 1548, and although there are no records for Blundeville, his academic interests suggest that he too went to Cambridge at this time. Unlike the next generation of English manuals, these three were not influenced by Petrus Ramus but by the Aristotelian tradition and the earlier humanist logic manuals by Agricola and Melanchthon. Blundeville was born in Norfolk in the early 1520s and probably finished his education at Cambridge and/or Gray’s Inn in the early 1540s. At this point, he tutored math, along with John Dee and Henry Briggs, in the households of Nicholas Bacon and Francis Wyndham. He published some minor works in the 1560s before inheriting the family estate in 1568, publishing his notable history, the *Order and Method of Writing Histories* (1574), and only later in life publishing his *Art of Logic* (1599) and his *Theoriques of the Planets* (1602). Judging from both internal evidence and Blundeville’s own prefatory remark, “I wrote this booke many yeares past” (A4v), it appears that he composed the logic manual along with his earlier works in the 1560s or 1570s. Because of Blundeville’s reference to Lever, Howell concludes that the logic was composed shortly after 1573, but Howell also notes that Lever’s manual was circulated in manuscript as early as 1549.
Blundeville’s logic begins by advertising a “very necessarie Booke for all young students in any profession to find out thereby the truth in any doubtfull speech,” but it goes on to qualify the book as “specially for such zealous Ministers as have not been brought up in any University, and yet are desirous to know how to defend by sound arguments the true Christian doctrine, against all subtil Sophisters, and caviling Schismatikes” (55). Any professional will benefit from the ability to turn doubt into truth, but this is especially necessary for the professional goals of unschooled “zealous Ministers.” Like Horsfall, Blundeville conceives of his vernacular pedagogy not for a general readership but specifically for the ministry. An interesting side note to Blundeville’s manual is that when William Stansby reprinted it in 1617, he cut the special mention of zealous ministers: logic now is simply “necessary for all Students in any Profession.” This would seem to be the intervention of a printer who was trying to widen the market for his product. Yet, Stansby does not widen this market to “everyone” in an attempt to sell as many books as possible. Perhaps he was more realistic or pragmatic than the authors and publishers of the public manuals I will read below, but although Stansby identifies a niche market for educational books he does not simply submit to the historical forces of publicity and commodification.

On the other hand, both Blundeville and Cox do gesture at the common, and they draw on the same source as their justification. In his prefatory remarks, Cox simply says that “every goode thynge, after the sayenge of the Phylosopher, the more commune that it is the better it is” (42). Writing almost seventy years later, Blundeville feels more compelled to defend the role of the vernacular manual in relation to the university. He
says that not everyone is able “in these costly dayes, to finde eyther himself or his childe at Universitie,” and vernacular manuals can help such people to “attaine unto right good knowledge, and be made therby the more able to glorify God and to profit his country” (A3v). In his desire to help these “unlearned, that are desirous of learning,” Blundeville says, “my hope is not to offend the learned, who, I am sure doe well allow of Aristotle, in saying, that every good thing, the more common it be, the better it is” (A3v). Ironically, in the historical context of intellectual absolutism, both Cox and Blundeville refer to Aristotle as the authority for making education “more common,” and they do so even while they are focusing their address primarily on professional use. While Cox imagines his readers as lawyers, ambassadors and ministers, Blundeville thinks especially of training ministers who cannot afford the cost of university. It is hard to separate Blundeville’s religious and secular aims, especially once Stansby had removed the specification to ministers, but it seems that the religious motivation is what carries Blundeville to imagine both fathers and children reading his manual in order to achieve “right good knowledge.”

The use of Aristotle as the authority for the commonality of knowledge is even more interesting in these manuals since the quotation is not actually from Aristotle, and

31 On the other hand, Blundeville does not combine his logic with Protestant doctrine in the way that Wilson does. Blundeville’s logical examples are abstract rather than topical and make only token references to England and its people. Perhaps the most English example in Blundeville is when he explains the compositive method: “he that will teach the nighest way from Norwich to London by order compositive will bidde him first goe to Windham, from Windham to Atleborough, from Atleborough to Thetford, from Thetford to Newmarket, from Newmarket to Barkway, from Barkway to Ware, from Ware to London” (55). Blundeville does not imagine a public utility for logic, then, although he actually uses the word public when he describes the effects of abstract moral virtues such as temperance as “publike utilitie and peace” (59).
he did not defend common property like other Greek philosophers. Kathy Eden (2001) has recently connected Erasmus to a long classical/Christian tradition of common knowledge, passing back through Augustine, early Christian cenobitic monasticism, and to its classical roots in Pythagoras and Plato. Although Pythagoras began this tradition with a general notion of common property, later thinkers often distinguished between common material property and common intellectual property. Erasmus, for instance, stressed the notion of common intellectual property in both the form and content of his adages, including his opening adage, “amicorum communia omnia” (friends hold all things in common). As I will argue below, the Tudor manuals invoke the tradition of common intellectual property (even if some attribute it to Aristotle), but they take it in different directions. Significantly, the Tudor manuals do not speak of common property among friends as in Erasmus, as vernacular print takes them away from the context of a humanist community throughout the European universities. As I have argued above, the Tudor manuals speak of the common not as in the commonality of “friends” but in terms of the common people (common-as-commoner) and in terms of everyone (common-as-general). The professional manual writers, including Cox and Blundeville, seem to think of the common as an extension of the professional as a way of disseminating knowledge outside of the university. The relation between the university and the common would be developed more extensively in the English Ramist manuals.

32 See Eden (2001), especially chapters five and six.
II. The English Ramists

The two manuals which target both professional and public readerships are Roland MacIlmaine’s *The Logike* (1574) and Abraham Fraunce’s *The Lawiers Logike* (1588). Along with Dudley Fenner’s *The Artes of Logike and Rhethorike* (1584), which I will examine in a later chapter, these are the vernacular Tudor editions (and adaptations) of the work of Petrus Ramus. As we have seen, Ramus himself was killed in 1572 for a combination of intellectual, religious and social factors. Despite Marlowe’s suggestion that Ramus was murdered for being the overreaching son of a collier, however, the content of Ramus’s pedagogy does not extend to social functions outside the university but is confined to a reform of the scholastic logic tradition in university arts faculties. Following a tradition of reformed textbooks, which included Rudolph Agicola’s *De inventione dialectica* (1515), Ramus produced a series of Latin textbooks which illustrated the precepts of logic through quotations from Virgil, Cicero, and other classical poets and orators.\(^3\) It is important to stress that the main thrust of Ramus’s work was the reform of university pedagogy and not the creation of a common man’s vernacular logic. Although Ramus did publish vernacular manuals in French, his *Dialectique* (1555) and *Rhétorique* (1555), these were neither a large part of his overall work, nor were they prefaced with appeals to French cobbler, carters and shepherds.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) Recent studies involving the relation between Ramus and Agricola include Mack (1993), Jardine (1993), and Crane (1993).

\(^4\) In the only prefatory material for the *Dialectique* (1555), the dedication to Cardinal Lorraine, Ramus positions his work in a long history of academic logic, including Aristotle, Plato and Euclid. Peter Sharratt (1987) has expressed reservations about Ramus’s overall interest in the vernacular, arguing that “Ramus did publish some books in French: the *Dialectique*, the *Rhétorique*, and the *Gramere*, and more were planned, but one wonders if his untimely death is a sufficient explanation for the lack of almost anything else in French” (22).
As in French Ramism, the focus of English Ramism was on the university, mostly Cambridge in the 1570s and 1580s, but there were a total of seven different vernacular Ramist manuals printed in early modern England – by MacIlmaine (1574), Fenner (1584) and Fraunce (1588) under Elizabeth, and after a hiatus of thirty-two years, Granger (1620), Wotton (1626), Spenser (1628) and Fage (1632) under the Stuarts.\footnote{The extent of Cambridge Ramism was established in the early work of Lisa Jardine. See Jardine (1974a, 1974b).}

There has been a recent resurgence of interest in the works of Ramus and his followers, but no scholar has taken up the idea of Ramism as a common man’s logic. Kearney (1970) added some evidence of Ramist populism in Scotland from the 1560s and 1570s, finding “overtones of social and political radicalism” in Ramist critiques of Aristotle: “Saint Thomas baptized Aristotle, and the Jesuits canonized him, Ramus exorcized him” (50). In addition to the critique of intellectual absolutism, Kearney found in Ramism a “practical utility of knowledge against the contemplative trends of Aristotelians,” and this practicality itself “smacked of social radicalism during a period when the gentleman was held up as the social ideal” (52). More recently, however, Hotson (2007) has argued that the practical utility of Ramist pedagogy made it a commercial education rather than a common man’s logic. Hotson argues that Ramism was actually short-lived throughout Europe except for a small pocket of north-western Germany. Ramus’s reforms made practical sense in the smaller colleges (or gymnasias), founded by local citizens in Dortmund and surrounding cities, which “served the specifically mercantile needs of those commercial cities” (79). These colleges were drawn to Ramus’s plans to include practical subjects like math in earlier stages but also to
his overall simplification and streamlining of the core subjects of logic and rhetoric in order to teach “basic powers of organization, expression, argument, and communication useful in their own right and indispensable for a wide variety of practical affairs” (81). For Hotson, Ramism was a series of practical reforms that made sense in schools founded by commercially-minded citizens. There is obvious overlap between the Ramist professional manuals and this evidence of practical utility, but Hotson does not address the vernacular manuals or their appeals to the common man.³⁶ It seems that Ramus’s pedagogy was taken in a few different directions after his death by his followers in different regions. English schools did not take on the practical elements of Ramism the way that the northwestern Germans did, but the English professional manuals tried to forge a similar kind of practical application.

The presence of Ramism in the English schools has been interpreted very differently by Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, who argued that Ramism was the culmination of Renaissance humanism as a tool for producing elite distinction. Grafton and Jardine argue that humanism destroyed the intellectually rigorous university program of scholasticism and replaced it with mere distinction and reproduction. Even initial Italian humanists like Guarino (b.1374), who advertised their program as forming moral character, were in reality teaching Latin rhetoric and philology to young aristocrats to instill distinction and obedience: a “cultural seal of superiority” and a “properly docile

³⁶ Although Hotson focuses almost exclusively on German Ramism, and specifically the influence of Ramism on Johann Alsted’s Encyclopaedia (1630), his book is an invaluable counterpoint to previous studies of Ramism in England and New England. In particular, Hotson debunks many of Walter Ong’s speculations that Ramism enveloped the entire European mind.
attitude towards authority” (xiv). With Grafton and Jardine, then, we are back to the most simple and reductive version of education as and engine of distinction and reproduction. Worst of all, since Grafton and Jardine do not engage with the complexities of educational reproduction explored by theorists such as Bourdieu, they end up blaming all of modern intellectual elitism on the humanist curriculum instead of schooling itself. In the process, they must idealize the reign of medieval scholasticism as an educational Golden Age which was destroyed by manipulative humanists from Guarino to Erasmus and finally Ramus. The extremity of the Grafton/Jardine thesis is perhaps best indicated by Walter Ong’s review of the book, where he resists the notion that all of humanism (including the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum) was founded on the same principles as the work of Ong’s own bête noir Ramus. Needless to say, Grafton and Jardine do not cite any of the vernacular Ramist manuals as evidence that Ramism produced the ultimate form of elite distinction – in fact, even their single example of an English Ramist, Gabriel Harvey, needs to be shoehorned into their overall thesis of distinction and obedience. As they concede themselves, Harvey was neither very distinguished nor very obedient.  

37 The initial reception of the book was very negative on the historical argument, though most reviewers were impressed by the new evidence of reading practices from student notebooks. Since most reviewers were in history departments, however, Grafton and Jardine’s claims about the history of literary reading drew no commentary. Adams (1990) wrote the first full-length article to challenge the notion that Harvey’s interest in the active life did not mean he was immoral and secular. Bushnell (1996) provides a strong critique of Grafton and Jardine as failing to situate their argument among the many twentieth-century critiques of Burkhardt, including Bush (1939), C.S. Lewis (1954), Caspari (1954) and McConica (1965). After modifying and expanding the Harvey thesis in 1990, Grafton seems to have abandoned the topic of Ramism, while Jardine has continued her conspiratorial argument in an earlier period, where the mastermind of modern intellectual depravity is now Erasmus instead of Ramus. See Grafton (1999, 1997) and Jardine (1996, 1993).
It is very difficult, then, to find any serious precursors to the study of Ramism and the common man. Most studies of Ramism focus on its institutional history, mostly in university arts faculties, and do not consider the vernacular manuals as important factors. Another influential study of Ramism was Walter Ong’s 1958 book which argued that Ramism marked a “decay of dialogue” in the European mind, part of a wider fall from oral into visual culture. Although the shift from orality to literacy remains an active topic today, Ong’s specific arguments have been consistently debunked by recent scholars.  

Like Hotson and Grafton and Jardine, Ong focuses on Ramism in schools and does not help us in our analysis of a relationship between Ramism and the common man. Abraham Fraunce has received some individual attention, but this has been largely in the context of studies of Philip Sidney rather than in the social history of education. There have been no sustained studies, then, of Ramism’s appeal to the common man. As I will discuss in the section on Fraunce below, even Miller and Hill make only passing remarks on the social imagination of Ramism. In this and the next chapter, then, I will examine the role of the common man in the works of all three of the Tudor vernacular Ramists.

---

38 Hotson’s introduction provides an excellent critique of twentieth-century studies of Ramism in England and America, including Ong’s dominant influence. Other scholars have pointed to (Father) Ong’s clear bias in favor of medieval orality over modern literacy, a specific kind of phonocentrism. For example, Ong says that the “pre-Ramist commonplace tradition could be richly sonorous rather than merely ‘clear,’ for it was the echo of a cognitive world experienced as if filled with sound and voices and speaking persons … With Ramus, the voice goes out of the world” (212). In reference to Ong’s well-known later work, *Orality and Literacy* (1982), Jonathan Sterne has argued that Ong’s Christian “theology of sound,” which privileges sound over sight, has recently been debunked by a scientifically-based phenomenology of sound. As Sterne argues, these scientific findings buttress Derrida’s critique of phonocentrism, the notion that language is filled, in Ong’s words, with “speaking persons” (Sterne 2-19).

39 Studies of Fraunce as a poet in the Sidney circle include Smith (1906), Koller (1940), Buxton (1966), Duncan-Jones (1971), Taylor (1986), Petrina (1999), and Garrido (2005). Recent critics (Goegelin 2005, Drysdall 1993, and Manning 1991) have also studied Fraunce’s emblem books.
For MacIlmaine and Fraunce, at least, the common man is often crowded out by an appeal to the practical application of logic for professionals.

III. Roland MacIlmaine’s The Logike

Of all the English-language Ramists, we know the least about the life of Roland MacIlmaine, and his social motivations must be gleaned almost entirely from the manual. Although there are no records of his birth, we can safely assume that he was Scottish since he graduated from St. Andrew’s University (B.A. 1569, M.A. 1570) before he edited, translated and adapted Ramus’s logic. The connection between MacIlmaine and London vernacular printing seems to have come through the publisher, Thomas Vautrollier who had lived in Edinburgh and was connected with Thomas Young, tutor to the young James VI.\(^4\) Vautrollier’s role also strengthens the Protestant connections of the work as he was among the French Huguenot immigrants who came to England upon Elizabeth’s accession. From the 1560s, Vautrollier specialized in printing translations of important works in French, including Calvin’s *Institutes* and many other works of Calvin and Luther. But Vautrollier also printed a wide series of educational texts, especially after June 19, 1574, when he was granted a series of ten-year patents for Latin texts, including lucrative titles like Beza’s Latin New Testament and many staples of the humanist curriculum including Cicero and Ovid. It was as part of this series of patents that Vautrollier was given the rights to print Ramus’s Latin textbooks, and he appears to

---

\(^4\) Evidence for Vautrollier comes from the *Oxford DNB* (Pettegree 2004).
have hired MacIlmaine both to edit the Latin edition and to prepare the English translation as well.

Like much of the evidence thus far, Vautrollier’s endeavors present a complex mixture of the Protestant and the humanist, the vernacular and the Latin. Recently, Goeglein (1996) has made a strong argument that the *Logike* should be read as a Protestant manual. Goeglein points out that the *Logike* was printed only two years after the Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of 1572 when Ramus’s “martyrdom stimulated a flood of vernacular editions whose prefatory writings appropriate the Huguenot for the cause of the Reformation in England” (75). The engraved image of Ramus on the title page (See Diagram 1 on next page), like his appearance in Marlowe’s *Massacre*, was part of the attempt to establish Ramus as a Protestant intellectual martyr. Goeglein has taken this religious context to mean that the main purpose of the *Logike* was to initiate “a priesthood of all believers, as it were, by giving to laymen a hitherto forbidden entrée to dialectical knowledge” (76). Although this is an interesting angle to take on the *Logike*, Goeglein does not include very much evidence from the manual itself. She does not, for instance, address the fact that the manual is directed to the professional concerns of doctors and lawyers as well as ministers, and teaching a minister to give better sermons is not the same as teaching the congregation to interpret the Bible. Goeglein also does not mention that MacIlmaine substitutes only sixteen biblical quotations out of the over one hundred classical examples he has taken from Ramus – moreover, the sixteen substitutions are not prominently placed among the remaining eighty-four classical examples.
As I will argue in the next chapter, Dudley Fenner’s manual substitutes each and every classical example with a biblical equivalent and truly shifts Ramist logic to a religious context.

In contrast, MacIlmaine’s preface involves a split focus between the professional and the public. MacIlmaine includes a series of specific examples of how logic could be applied in the daily lives of professionals, but he also addresses the manual to the common people. Unlike Horsfall and Fraunce, who adapt the content of their manual to the specific needs of professionals, MacIlmaine leaves Ramus’s combination of poetry and logical precepts unchanged, and his specific ideas for application remain in the preface. MacIlmaine says that the manual will help the lawyer to “pleade his cause, in provyng or disprovyng after as his matter shall require” (14), and he recommends the Ramist method for ministers: “sett forthe shortly the forme of the text, whiche thou hast taken in hand to interprete: next to parte thy text into a fewe heads that the auditor may the better retaine thy sayings” (13). Like Horsfall, MacIlmaine addressed his manual to the minister rather than the congregation, just as he addresses the professional concerns of lawyers and physicians.

MacIlmaine’s most unique and striking example of professional application, however, is his description of how The Logike could benefit the physician. As I have indicated, other Tudor manuals targeted professionals, but MacIlmaine is the only writer to suggest the application of logic for the practice of a physician:

Yf thou be a Phisition and willing to teache (as for example) of a fever, this methode willethe thee to shewe first the definition, that is, what a
I quote at length here because MacIlmaine is uncommonly precise about the practical application of Ramist logic. He tells the physician to treat a fever as an object of knowledge and to approach it just like any other object of Ramist logic – define the fever, classify it, and then run it through the logical topics of cause, effect, subject, adjunct, and so on. The cause (efficient) of the fever may be hot meats, and the symptoms (matter) may include melancholy, choler, or some sort of rotten humor.

MacIlmaine’s logical topics are the traditional ones of Aristotelian logic, and must have been standard tools for university-trained physicians, but they take on an interesting new dimension in the context of a Ramist manual where logic is taught through poetry. As I have mentioned above, the vernacular logic manuals are usually quite abstract, with “practical” examples having the flavor of modern math problems, and MacIlmaine stands
out for the specificity of his practical application. As I will discuss below, Fraunce’s

*Lawiers Logike* has even more specific practical application by including legal examples throughout the manual. MacIlmaine, however, retains only Ramus’s poetic examples for the basic illustrations of topics, as in this example of causality from Ovid:

> When curable thou shalt appeare therfore,
> By my science thy healthe for to attayne.
> Geve eare, this is my counsaill evermore,
> From slouthe and Idlenes thou do abstaine.
> For thiese to fylthy lust thy mynde provokethe
> And do maintaine that, which they have once
> wrought
> Thiese be the causes with foode that nourishethe,
> This evill which now is pleasante in thy thought. (in MacIlmaine 19)

Since MacIlmaine follows Ramus in providing no commentary for this or any other example throughout the main text of his logic, it would have been up to the physician to transfer the concept of causality from “sloth causes love” to “hot meats cause a fever.”

Thus, the core concept of causality, in MacIlmaine as in Ramus, remains in the form of a logical precept and a poetic example. MacIlmaine’s preface indicates how a professional application might work, but he does not provide professional examples throughout as Fraunce would do for law. We might say, then, that MacIlmaine uses his preface to imagine the professional application of Ramist logic, while he retains the academic format of logic in his main text. As a result, there is a kind of academic/professional
hybridity to the *Logike* – a translation of a school logic textbook, but one whose preface targets doctors, lawyers and ministers. As we will see in the Fraunce section below, the split between the academic and the public has its roots in Ramus’s theory of natural logic.

MacIlmaine does not draw a clear line between the application of logic to the professions and to the common people. First of all, after his appeal to lawyers, ministers and physicians, MacIlmaine adds that the manual would help the “Orator declayme,” the “Mathematician sette for the his demonstratons,” and provide a general utility in “wrytyng, teaching, & in learnyng” (14). Rather than applying logic to a specific profession as Fraunce does with the law, MacIlmaine offers more of a general sense of practical applicability. Here, MacIlmaine’s logic is similar to Ramist logic as Hotson portrays it functioning in the vocational and commercial context of northwest Germany. While this is certainly not an idea of education as producing elite distinction, it is also not quite a picture of public education involving cobbler and carters. One might call MacIlmaine’s manual more of a mercantile or proto-bourgeois idea for the vocational application of academic education.

At times, however, MacIlmaine does go even further than the vocational in his idea of the social function of education. In fact, his preface opens with an idea of common intellectual property:

Seing it is the dewt of all Christians (beloved Reader) to labour by all meanes, that they maye profyte and ayde their bretherne, and to hyde or kepe secrete nothing, whiche they knowe maye bring greate utilitie to the common wealthe: I thought it my dewtie (having perceyved the greate
commoditie whiche this booke bryngethe to the Reader of what state and qualitie soever he be) to make thee and all others to whose knowledge it shall come pertakers thereof. (7)

It is a Christian duty, MacIlmaine says, to share useful knowledge with the community, and the purpose of the book is to make the common reader a partaker of common knowledge. Here, MacIlmaine is specifically connecting the notion of common knowledge with the idea of a commoner as reader – “what state and qualitie soever he be.” Unlike the invocations of common knowledge we have seen thus far, MacIlmaine also refers explicitly to a community of Christian “bretherne.” This example indicates the complexity of relating the history of common knowledge to the emergence of the public sphere. On the one hand, MacIlmaine is clearly drawing on the Christian version of the common knowledge tradition that Eden traces through Augustine’s view that “all those who live good Christian lives share whatever is true as their common intellectual property” (134). On the other hand, MacIlmaine explicitly connects the common-as-general (the “common wealthe”) with the common-as-commoner (“the Reader of what state and qualitie soever he be”), and he could be seen as an instance of modern knowledge within the evolving and devolving hierarchies of Elizabethan education. Indeed, if the only evidence we had of Tudor education were Elyot’s *Governour* and MacIlmaine’s *Logike*, we might think that there had been an educational watershed from aristocratic to public education. The major element separating MacIlmaine from the Christian tradition of common knowledge is his focus on professional and practical applications rather than a search for truth – indeed, it seems as if MacIlmaine has grafted
the ideas of professional and vocational utility onto this tradition of common intellectual property.

MacIlmaine’s idea of common knowledge is also striking for its contrast with the educational practices of the university. MacIlmaine critiques the university not for its curriculum but for how the institution limits the social accessibility of knowledge. For example, MacIlmaine says that the classical languages are not an intellectual necessity but a tool for limiting accessibility: “What then did Cicero? he laborethe in the Latin tongue … thinking it no shame to borrow from the Hebrucians and Grecians” (16). The actual reason that the universities oppose the teaching of “any liberall arte in the vulgar tongue,” for MacIlmaine, is that they “woulde have all things kept close eyther in the Hebrewe, Greke, or Latyn tongues” (15). The phrase “to keep close” (OED a. and adv. 4c) could refer to the hiding of a letter or to the broader notion of keeping things secret or private, but the word “close” itself was more of an early modern keyword, carrying such politically charged meanings as the private enclosure of land (OED n1.2) and the religious cloister (OED n1.3d). It is against the complex early modern semantics of the word “close” that MacIlmaine sets up his idea of the liberal arts as “open.” Where the universities actively (en)close knowledge, the Logike imagines itself as opening the canon of logic to a larger community.

MacIlmaine’s conception of an open university, as one might expect in his book, is directly tied to the use of printed vernacular manuals. But MacIlmaine actually claims that his manual represents a distillation of the Bachelor of Arts to its pure essentials – he
claims that his manual is not a second-rate substitute for university study but a compressed version of the same thing:

this lytle booke … beyng well perused is able to bring more profytt (I speake after experience) then all thy fower yeares studie in Plato or Aristotle as they are now extant. And besides the great utilitie wiche thou shalt apprehende of this booke, the facilitie and easynes of the same is not a little to be commendeth …. Every place of invention and every sort of disposition is made so clere and manyfest with examples chosen out of the most auncyent Authors, that almost by thy self (yf thou have any quicknes of spirite) thou mayest attayne in the space of two monthes the perfecte knowledge of the same. (14-15)

MacIlmaine’s *Logike* is a kind of “scholar’s digest” of the arts curriculum, a university in a “lytle booke.” Not only does he bring profit and utility, but he eliminates waste. Given a bright reader and the guidance of MacIlmaine’s own experience, he estimates that he has cut the university degree down from four years to two months. His little book contains all the essential information “in Aristotle’s 17 books of logic, in his eight books of Phisike” and “in his 14 books of Philosophy, in Cicero his books of oratory” and also “in Quintilian” (7-8). In compressing four years of study into two months, MacIlmaine also fits the content of over fifty books into one, offering a reader’s digest of the “most auncyent Authors” as well.

Crucially for my argument, MacIlmaine targets his program of compressed knowledge not only at the professions but also at the common people. After chiding the
“envious” universities for hoarding the liberal arts, MacIlmaine argues that their more sinister function is in laboring “only to roote out all good knowledge & virtue, and place mere ignoraunce amongst the common people” (16). When MacIlmaine refers to the common people, he seems to be referring not just to professionals but to the larger sense of the common from his opening address to his Christian brethren. The idea of a common person (“what state and qualitie soever he be”) is linked to his idea of common knowledge (“to hyde or kepe secrete nothing, whiche they knowe maye bring greate utilitie to the common wealthe”). This is the precise social dynamic that I have been identifying in the Tudor vernacular manuals as an early form of public sphere discourse, and as connected with McKeon’s pre-history of the public sphere. Rather than Eden’s classical/Christian tradition of “friends” holding things in common, MacIlmaine conceives of knowledge in terms of both the common-as-commoner and the common-as-general.

MacIlmaine’s idea of common knowledge certainly draws on the classical and Christian tradition of common intellectual property, but my point is that MacIlmaine takes this tradition in a new direction. In contrast to the intellectual enclosure of the universities, MacIlmaine calls for knowledge that is both professional and common, where common does not signify that which is common to a small community of friends or believers, but both the commonwealth and the common person. In other words, MacIlmaine’s education is becoming more public – it is reaching outside of limited communities and towards the social whole. The reality of how vernacular manuals were used is less important than their conceptions, their social imaginations, of education. In
In this ideological realm, at least, the Tudor vernacular manuals begin to substitute public notions of the common for previous traditions of commonality. My argument connects with McKeon’s formal domestication, but his account of the early modern period does not involve the factor of a professional address. In fact, it seems as if the Christian/classical tradition of common intellectual property is not simply altering direction but is branching out—first, toward the practical application of the professions; and second, toward McKeon’s modern split between the common-as-general and the common-as-commoner.

Despite MacIlmaine’s gestures to the common people, the dominant theme of his manual is the professional application of logic. He does not stress religion like Fenner, and as we will see in the next section, unlike Fraunce he does not examine foundational concepts of Ramism such as natural logic. Although his primary interest was professional, however, MacIlmaine constantly gestures outside of the professions. For example, when discussing the utility of logic to the physician, he includes the following example of the practical utility of logic:

After this methode Heraclitus the Philosopher examyned the phisitions whiche came to heale hym, and because they were ignorant and could not aunswered to his interrogations he sent them away, and woulde receyve none of their Medicens: for (sayd he) yf ye can not shewe me the causes of my sicknes, much lesse areye able to take the cause awaye. (14)

Instead of a physician using logic to examine a fever, we now see a philosopher using logic to examine the physician. Suddenly, the tail seems to be wagging the dog. On the
other hand, we might see this as a metaphor of MacIlmaine’s overall project of bringing academic knowledge to bear on the professions. If Heraclitus sends away the physician in this case, it is because he cannot demonstrate a knowledge of causality. But this example also suggests that logic is useful for people who are not actually physicians, lawyers and ministers. Heraclitus is not exactly the “common person” in an intellectual sense, but he does represent here a practical use of logic outside of the professions. This final example is not MacIlmaine’s clearest articulation of the professional and the public, but it does give a sense of the academic context in which most of the Tudor vernacular manuals are written. As I will argue in the next section, Fraunce’s conception of public education is deeply embedded in the academic context as well.

IV. Abraham Fraunce’s *The Lawiers Logike* (1588)

As I noted in the introduction to this chapter, the preface to Abraham Fraunce’s *The Lawiers Logike* (1588) is marked by a similar split in its social address between professionals and common people. Fraunce’s cobblers and carters have been invoked in major studies by Miller, Hill and Howell, but without an examination of the *Lawiers Logike* as a whole. Although this manual is focused overwhelmingly on the application of logic to law, Fraunce’s cobblers and carters are actually remnants of an earlier version of the book called *The Shepheardes Logike* (c.1584). Fortunately, this text survives in a manuscript collection of Fraunce’s early work on logic done while he was a student at Cambridge. The following section demonstrates that the split between the professional and the public in Fraunce’s work is mainly between his earlier and later works – thus, the
references to a broader society in the *Lawiers Logike* are small remnants of his earlier social vision.

The details of Fraunce’s biography are patchy, but there is a relatively clear picture of his overall life due to his connections with the Sidney family. There are no records of Fraunce’s birth (1561?), but he attended the Shrewsbury School until 1576 before he moved on to St. John’s College Cambridge (B.A. 1580, M.A. 1583) and then to Gray’s Inn (1583-88). Fraunce almost certainly owed this long study period to the patronage of the Sidney family, who were involved with the Shrewsbury School during his tenure and likely gave Fraunce a pension for his further education. Unfortunately for Fraunce, he was about six years younger than Philip Sidney (1554-86), and did not make a connection with him until 1581, “when I first came in presence of that right noble knight sir Philip Sydney” (sig. ¶), but Fraunce did continue to receive patronage from Mary Sidney well after the death of Philip. In addition to his legal and logical studies, Fraunce composed academic drama and pastoral poetry as part of this intellectual milieu. As we saw in Chapter One, Fraunce’s *Arcadian Rhetorike* (1588) drew heavily on vernacular poetry, including Sidney’s *Arcadia*, in a way that suggested an elite social context. The *Lawiers Logike*, published in the same year, draws on the pastoral poetry of Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calender*, but the logic is directed explicitly at professional legal application. It is instructive to note that a single author could publish logic and rhetoric

---

41 The main biographical details for Fraunce, gathered by Smith (1906) have not been expanded or altered for a century, with the recent exception of his date of death. The baptism records from Fraunce’s parish are illegible, and his name was not entered into the Shrewsbury School register until 1572, when all the students were re-entered into the list. The most likely scenario is that Fraunce was born around 1561 and
manuals in the same year and yet direct them at such different social purposes. For Fraunce, at least, rhetoric appealed to elite distinction while logic had more potential for professional application. This division between rhetoric and logic was not always the case even for the English Ramists, as I will discuss in relation to Fenner below.

Fraunce had just graduated from Gray’s Inn when he published the *Lawiers Logike*, then, and he geared the manual specifically at lawyers and law students. In fact, the *Lawiers Logike* is completely steeped in both the intellectual and social contexts of legal education. Yet, at the same time, Fraunce has to defend the novelty of his idea to bring the university study of logic to the subject of law. Fraunce defends university education against a “great Tenurist” who considers the university degree to be a mere stamp of social distinction: an “easie, elegant, conceipted, nice and delicate learning,” which qualifies a graduate not for the rigors of law but only to “better make new-founded verses of Amyntas death, and popular discourses of Ensignes, Armory, Emblemes, Hieroglyphikes, and Italian Impreses” (sig. ¶ 2). The idea of university study as nothing but the ‘delicate learning’ of elite distinction goes back at least to this ‘great Tenurist,’ who sounds uncannily like an Elizabethan Lisa Jardine. Of course, Fraunce did write poetry, and he did study emblems to impress his elite patrons, but Fraunce responds that the central features of his university studies were intellectual discipline and rigor. Fraunce says that his university work “did yet so racke my ravaging head, and bring low my crased body” that it brought on the “perpetual vexation of Spirite, and continual consumption of body, incident to every scholler” (sig. ¶ 3r). Again, this Elizabethan

attended Shrewsbury School between 1568 and 1575 before matriculating from St. John’s as recorded on 111
defense of intellectual labor, as pertaining to the body as well as the mind and spirit, has a very modern ring to it. Fraunce himself seems to be refuting the claim that the Elizabethan universities can be reduced to a delicate form of social distinction.

On the contrary, Fraunce claims that his logic manual encodes the intellectual discipline of his university study, and that it will transport this work ethic to the undisciplined students of the Inns of Court. If law students would study logic, Fraunce claims,

then would there not bee so many upstart Rabulae Forense, which under a pretence of Lawe, become altogetheather lawlesse, to the continuall molestation of ignoraunt men, and generall overcharging of the countrey, with an overflowing multitude of seditious cavitellers: who, when their fathers have made some lewde bargayne in the countrey, run immediately to the Innes of Court, and having in seven yeares space met with six French woordes, home they ryde like brave Magnificoes, and dashe their poore neighboures children quyte out of countenance” (sig.¶ 3v-sig.¶¶ r).

For Fraunce, logic is a way of disciplining the *nouveau riche* who send their sons to the Inns of Court. Rather than mere distinction, logic is a tool for managing social disorder caused by the social mobility of commerce, or “some lewde bargayne in the countrey” as Fraunce puts it disparagingly. Fresh out of Gray’s Inn himself, Fraunce describes the law as a weapon that that these newly moneyed families use to bully their neighbors. This is a picture of social disorder that needs the discipline and order of logic instruction. Of
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course, Fraunce was a social upstart himself, but he made it to Gray’s Inn through a combination of hard intellectual labor and patronage, not by buying his way in. We might see Fraunce as voicing a desire for a traditional social order involving both patronage and intellectual discipline in contrast to this picture of social chaos in the combination of commerce and the law.

As we saw above, Fraunce was not the first to write a preface directing logic at a professional application, and MacIlmaine had even pitched Ramist logic at the professions fourteen years earlier. Fraunce, however, takes the idea of professional application one step further by including legal examples throughout the main text of the *Lawiers Logike*. He does not replace the poetic examples, but he follows them in each section with a comparable example from a legal case. For instance, Fraunce demonstrates the syllogism using both Spenser and the law. The poetic example comes from the July eclogue:

Hee that leaveth his flocke to fetch a lasse, is no good sheepheard:

But Paris did leave his flocke to fetch a lasse,

Therefore Paris is no good sheepheard. (Fraunce 7)

Fraunce follows this Spenserian syllogism with a similar one derived from a legal document:

Hee that dooth minister venim to poyson any one, is a murderer:

But Saunders ministred venim to poyson one,

Therefore, Saunders is a murderer. (Fraunce 7).
Recent critics have argued that such combinations of logic and poetry are significant in the history of linguistic education, and are not, as Ong and his followers have claimed, evidence that Ramists were unable to “appreciate” poetry. As I will discuss further below, Meerhoff (2001) has argued that Ramus’s poetic examples demonstrate the existence of logic in the deep structure of language itself. By identifying an underlying logic in the deep structure of language, Fraunce is able to equate the studies of poetry and law – the surface topic is different, but the underlying approach to knowledge is the same. Although MacIlmaine did not include professional examples in his main text, he seemed to be operating on the same assumption that the logical precepts that he illustrated in poetry could be transferred to a professional application. Fraunce simply goes further than MacIlmaine in demonstrating the professional application, and as I will discuss now, he also spells out the underlying natural logic

V. *Homo Dialecticus*: Natural Logic and *The Shepheardes Logike*

There is no question that the main thrust of the *Lawiers Logike* is the production of professional knowledge out of a conventional logic textbook – the question remains, however, why the book opens with the defense of teaching logic to cobblers and carters. Given the professional context of the book, one might think that Fraunce wanted to apply logic to shoes and carts as well, but he remains focused on professional-textual knowledge throughout the book. Does Fraunce really want to make a common man’s logic that will level men’s wits? Or is this some sort of token gesture to the common man that is actually about something else? To answer this question as specifically as possible,
it is necessary to compare the *Lawiers Logike* with some of Fraunce’s earlier works. In fact, the invocation of cobblers and carters is a remnant of Fraunce’s earlier social vision for education which has survived, if only barely, into the preface of the *Lawiers Logike*.

Fortunately, the evidence of this earlier social vision survives in Fraunce’s manuscript, *The Shepheardes Logike* (c.1584). The manuscript is divided into three main sections: the first and longest is the logic manual itself, “The Sheppardes Logike,” which follows Ramus’s structure but with all of the standard classical examples replaced by quotations from Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calender*. The second section, “Of the nature and use of Logike,” is a treatise on Ramus’s theory of natural logic, and the third section is entitled, “A brief and general comparison of Ramus his Logike with that of Aristotle, to the ryghte Worhipful his verye good Master and Patron Master P. Sydney.” This final section is a longer version of the Aristotle-Ramus debate from the preface to the *Lawiers Logike*, and it situates the debate in the precise context of Cambridge University. When Fraunce wrote the *Lawiers Logike*, he incorporated elements from all
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42 The manuscript of *The Shepheardes Logike* is British Library Additional MSS. 34361. Unless noted, all references to the text will be to the McCormick edition (1968). McCormick suggests that the treatises were composed between 1581 and 1583, but that the dedication to Dyer indicates that the manuscript was not prepared until after Sidney’s death in October of 1586. Smith (1906) had suggested a similar timeline but expressed surprise that, if this were the case, the manuscript would not mourn the recent loss of such a famous figure as Sidney.

43 This same work survives also as a decorated Latin manuscript, now as Bodleian Library *MS Rawlinson D345*. This manuscript was originally designed by Fraunce for presentation to Philip Sidney, likely for his departure from England in February 1582 to escort the Duke of Anjou to Antwerp. In “Of the nature, Fraunce says that this work was first composed in Latin before he translated it into English, “bryeelye contractinge and abridginge that my former speache” (176), and though Smith speculative that it was originally a “college declamation” (26), Fraunce gives no such indication. Fraunce himself illustrated the vellum cover with the scene from Virgil’s *Aeneid* where Achaemenides pleads to be taken aboard Aeneas’s ship – underneath this supplicating figure, Fraunce has inscribed the initials “A.F.” The basic facts about this manuscript are detailed by Smith (1906), and Duncan-Jones (1971) uses the manuscript in her study of Fraunce’s *imprese*. 
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three sections, and he simply combined the poetic examples with legal examples on each topic.

The root of Fraunce’s complex educational populism can be found in his reception of Ramus’s concept of natural logic. Fraunce’s most sustained examination of natural logic is his treatise, “Of the nature and use of Logike,” but the idea also runs throughout the *Shepheardes Logike*, and it is integrated into the introductory sections of the *Lawiers Logike*. In its most basic form, natural logic is a metaphysical assumption that all humans are born with the power of logic – a notion of humanity we might call *homo dialecticus*. As Fraunce describes it, natural logic is an “ingraven gift and facultie” (*Lawiers* 2), which “eyther God hathe drawen or nature layed down in mans mynde” (*Shepheardes* 176). By contrast, precepts like causality and the syllogism are “artificial logic” (or an “art of logic”) which has been fashioned out of, and must always conform to, the raw material of natural logic in the human mind. Fraunce took this metaphysical concept of natural logic from Ramus, but he developed its social implications much further and more explicitly than Ramus did. This is another example of the complex influence of publicity on early modern education – a preexisting concept like natural logic contains ideas of the universal and the common, but these qualities are only implied in Ramus’s own work. Under the influence of publicity, Fraunce then picks up this preexisting concept and develops its social implications explicitly. If one practiced a pure intellectual history, it would look like Fraunce simply continues the concept of natural logic, but in fact he activated its social implications.
It is the concept of natural logic that draws Fraunce to consider logic in terms of the common man. Fraunce opens the *Shepheardes Logike* with a dedicatory poem praising the social reach of logic:

Some arts we bynde, to some one kynde of Subject Severallye,
As this to counte, and that to mounte above the Cristal Skye,
To measure land with skilful hand, to frame, or fyle the tonge,
Or to delyte the weary sptyte, with sweete and pleasant Songe.
But Logikes lyght doth shyne outryght, her streames do flow so far
From Kings aboade to Palinode, from sheepecote unto star.
Noe Reason then why munkish men shuld keepe her from abroade
Of idle fooles opprest in Schooles, and alwayes overtroade.
By this wee preach, by this wee teach, shee in the heaven sittes,
Yet sheapheards swayne doth not disdayne, but meekly hym admyttes.
That this is true, Loe here a new, and fresh Logician,
Who minds to prove what is her love, to symple countrey man,
By those that keepe in fyeld theyr sheepe, a sheapheards Logik framde;
Soe be yt ought or be yt nought, the lesse cause to bee blamde. (56)

This poem does seem like it could be a manifesto for a common man’s logic. Instead of cobblers and carters, logic is now directed to the shepherd and the “symple countrey man.” Like MacIlmaine’s closing critique of the universities, Fraunce accuses the schools of hoarding the knowledge of logic. Instead of MacIlmaine’s term “to keep
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44 The implications of the split between natural and artificial reason are considered in Goeglein (1996). For
close,” however, Fraunce uses the now obsolete sense of “opprest” (*OED* v.1c) to convey secrecy and concealment, and he explicitly associates the schools with the religious cloisters of “munkish men.” In contrast to this institutional closure of logic, Fraunce imagines Lady Logic as a sun goddess who opens this knowledge to the social whole “outryght.” As in MacIlmaine, then, Fraunce envisions a vernacular manual as “opening” the school to the common people.

More than in any other example from the Tudor manuals, however, we are left to question what the common people really mean here. Unlike the other examples, the *Shepheardes Logike* explicitly invokes the pastoral genre, where simple country men signify many things other than actual rural people. In Renaissance pastoral, of course, the pastoral shepherd is usually a courtier wearing shepherd’s clothing, and the genre’s purpose, as Puttenham said, was “under the veil of homely persons and in rude speeches to insinuate and glance at greater matters” (127). Fraunce may indeed be glancing at greater matters, but he does not feature the specific image of the aristocrat-as-commoner. In fact, by drawing his examples from Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calender* instead of Sidney’s *Arcadia*, Fraunce distances himself from the courtly context of his own patrons. Fraunce’s first example from Spenser pictures Colin as a typical lovelorn sophisticate of Renaissance pastoral, but his second example quotes Diggon Davy from one of the ecclesiastical eclogues. Where Colin is worried about Roslinde as the cause of his “ruthefull woe,” Davy is worried about “ill haivour” as the cause of bad “doctrine” (in Fraunce *Shepheardes* 81). While there are some courtly elements in the *Shepheardes* natural logic, see also Miller (1939: 177), Meerhoff (2001) and Adams (1990).
Calender, especially in the April eclogue, critics have recently stressed the social complexity of the poem, including its connections with Spenser’s schooling.\textsuperscript{45}

Fraunce’s Shepheardes Logike is even further removed from the courtly setting than the Shepheardes Calender. Even in this most pastoral of all the Tudor manuals, there is no interplay between the signification of pastoral shepherds as aristocrats and as commoners. Even the Shepheardes Logike, then, does not function, as Montrose argued in relation to Puttenham, as an imaginary resolution of the contradiction between aristocracy and social mobility. If Fraunce’s simple county men are not aristocrats in shepherd’s weeds, however, then what exactly are they? Could Fraunce be using shepherds to signify actual country men – that is, does he imagine actual shepherds as potential readers of the Shepheardes Logike? Did Fraunce really write a vernacular logic with the purpose of leveling the wits of shepherds?

At various points throughout the text, Fraunce does invoke the common man as a user of logic. One of the most interesting examples comes when Fraunce suggests that scholastic logicians are so hopelessly addled by technical language that they would be able to learn more logic from the “simple contry laboringe man” than \textit{vice versa}:

send for a poore and sylley husbandman, ask him what hope he hathe of his harvest to come; he will roundly make answere, and that not

\textsuperscript{45} Helgerson (1983) and Montrose (1985) stressed the April eclogue’s invocation of Queen Elizabeth, but Goldberg (1989) has continued a long tradition of tying the Calender and its gloss to figures from Spenser’s schooling, including Gabriel Harvey and Richard Mulcaster. Goldberg reads this educational milieu through the more specific context of homosocial pedagogy, especially between Spenser and Harvey. I would argue that the Calender is even more firmly rooted in Spenser’s experiences at a “sizar” or work-study student at Pembroke College, Cambridge. Although the main text’s expressions of poverty are focused on the October eclogue, both the school and the theme of social ambition are present throughout the poem.
instructed by learninge, but taught by nature, that ther is no hope at all of any firtillitye this yeare to ensue, because the weather hathe bene soe unseasonable …. The causes of plentye, saithe the countryman, be taken awaye; therfor the effect must nedes be removed. (179)

Where the scholastics are lost in the thickets of obscure terminology, the unencumbered and unschooled farmer has a clear understanding of basic cause and effect – when the “causes” of fertility are gone, so is the “effect.” As Meerhoff has argued, Ramus’s natural reason assumes that “theoretically, every human being has at his disposal the resources of the syllogism, and makes use of them correctly every time he produces a coherent discourse” (207). For Ramus, such terminology as cause and effect, and even such fine distinctions as that between efficient and final causes, are inherent in the deep structure of all language use. It is Fraunce, however, who spells out the social implications of this theory – since logic inheres in language all language users are logicians, “taught by nature” not “by learninge.”

Most of Fraunce’s references to the logic of simple country men were removed or truncated in the revisions for the Lawiers Logike, but the idea does survive in fragments. For example, the passage about the “sylley husbandman” still appears, though it is reduced to an observation that “every common person or silly soule useth Logike in some part” (5). The Lawiers Logike also includes a reference to the country man in its description of the wide social diffusion of logic: “Men reason in schooles as Philosophers, in Westminster as Lawyers, in Court as Lords, in Countrey as worldly
husbands” (4). Even in the context of the Lawiers Logike, then, Fraunce continues to develop the social implications of natural logic. The social scope of logic is not limited to schools here, but it includes law courts, aristocratic courts, and even the rural countryside.

On the other hand, in the earlier version of this same passage, Fraunce had extended the social scope of logic not only down the hierarchy of social rank but also across the even stronger educational boundary of gender. After listing the users of logic as philosophers, lawyers, lords, and farmers, the Shepheardes Logike version goes on to say that “not so muche as the mylke mayde without reasoning sellethe her mylke” (64). The worldly husband, along with the carters and cobblers, survived the transition to the Lawiers Logike, while the milkmaid did not, as if the explicit inclusion of women in natural logic was taking universalism one step too far when the anticipated audience was the gentlemen of Gray’s Inn. Perhaps what is most remarkable, however, is that Fraunce retained any of the social universalism in the switch from the Shepheardes Logike to the Lawiers Logike. While the professional does crowd out the common to some degree, Fraunce clings to his lowly readers – his cobblers, carters and shepherds – at various points throughout the Lawiers Logike. The shift from the Shepheardes Logike to the Lawiers Logike does not provide a clear explanation for Fraunce’s use of the common man. The one thing it does show is that Fraunce was tenacious in his appeal to the common man, retaining much of the material even in the new professional context.

The history of publicity provides a broader context for Fraunce’s specific combination of pastoral tropes and appeals to the common man. As we saw in the
introduction, Michael McKeon surveyed a wide social history of publicity, involving an increasing modern separation between the public and the private. McKeon does an excellent survey of privatization in early modern culture, including the political, religious and economic spheres, but he does not include evidence of the emergence of publicity before the 1640s. Thus, when he approaches publicity in literary genres, he relies mostly on evidence from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. On the topic of pastoral, McKeon argues that there was a pastoral revolution at the turn of the eighteenth century, when authors like Pope (1709), Swift (c.1709), Tickell (1713) and Gay (1714) changed the signification of common people in pastoral poetry from the elite public world to actual rural settings and people. The full development of this revolution, for McKeon, comes in Gay’s *The Shepherd’s Week* (1714) which places the pastoral in the English nation, with its own domestic proverbs, folklore, and ballads, and also in a rural setting coded as feminine. A century later, the Romantic poets would again transform the pastoral to signify a radically private interior subjectivity, and thus a still more realistic version of country people. By contrast, McKeon argues that the “broad tendency of Renaissance pastoral” involved a “sociopolitical and cultural allegory, an accommodation of the great through the little, the courtly through the rustic” (414). For McKeon,
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46 McKeon’s study of pastoral in his *Secret History of Domesticity* builds on his earlier argument (1998) about the long history of the genre. In the earlier work, McKeon argues that the rise of agricultural capitalism in seventeenth-century England was the cause of the eighteenth-century revolution in English pastoral. Ancient pastoral worked dialectically (as in structural anthropology) in opposing the simplicity of the country and the cultivation of the city. Virgil and Horace use the opposition to interrogate both terms – they show the two worlds are actually intertwined, as in Virgil’s second eclogue where “ambition” is inseparable from pastoral values of competition and craftsmanship. Kermode and Williams agree that Renaissance pastoral is mainly about abstraction, idealization, and the allegory of the courtly aristocracy – for Williams this is bad, and for Kermode it is good. In response to the socio-economic forces of the seventeenth century (urbanization, population growth, enclosure, female domesticity), eighteenth-century
Renaissance pastoral signified only the social elite, but it became progressively more realistic, and hence more rural, after the Restoration and eighteenth century.

I would argue that Fraunce’s *Shepheardes Logike* is an early example of McKeon’s downward social movement in pastoral signification. Even more than the *Shepheardes Calender*, Fraunce’s pastoral world seems drawn to the signification of actual rural people rather than using them to signify the social elite. Emphatically, Fraunce does not use shepherds to signify the great through the little and the courtly through the rustic, yet we might still understand his use of pastoral as a kind of sociopolitical and cultural allegory. My argument, then, is that Fraunce’s pastoral logic is an allegory for public education. When the metaphorical signification of the shepherd breaks down, it is in the direction of country not courtly people. In other words, Fraunce’s education moves in the direction of the common man. As I argued in the introduction, Tudor education is connected with McKeon’s history of “formal domestication,” which eventually produced a robust theory of common knowledge in the eighteenth century. Earlier versions of common knowledge, however, involved a complex and uncertain relationship between common knowledge and the common person – the common-as-general, and the common-as-commoner. The early modern development of common knowledge, furthermore, involved the privatization (or downward mobility) of knowledge and authority from the great to the common.

Pastoral poems, like Goldsmith’s *Deserted Village* (1770), located corruption not in the city but in rural improvement. Stephen Duck went the furthest in dramatizing a “realist” class conflict within the rural itself.
The argument that Fraunce’s Ramism constitutes a common man’s logic must also confront the objection that his works involve a fundamentally academic mixture of logic and poetry. Why, in other words, does Fraunce retain Ramus’s poetic examples when he addresses his work to cobblers and carters? Unlike later conceptions of artistic education for the working man, including those proposed by Victorian figures like John Ruskin, Fraunce is not attempting to introduce an appreciation of high art to his carters and cobblers. To find the connection between poetry and the common people, we must turn again to the theory of natural logic. Previous studies of natural logic in Ramism have focused almost exclusively on the topic of poetry rather than on the common people. Meerhoff (2001), for instance, has recently argued that natural logic is the justification for the combination of logic and poetry in Ramus’s own works – natural logic inheres in every human being, but the best examples of it are found in the greatest works of classical antiquity. As Meerhoff explains, the “innate gifts (dotes ingenitae) present in everyone from birth must be developed by frequent contact with the authors who knew how to exploit them with an uncommon mastery” (207). Along with Mack (1998), Meerhoff has argued that Ramus’s analysis of poetry identifies logic in the “deep structure” of poetry. In relation to the English Ramists in particular, Goeglein (1996) has argued that poetry in Ramist logic performs a “semiotic function” of constructing “a single or global field of meaning” (100). It is this single field of meaning, Goeglein argues, that allows Ramists to make “knowledge applicable to lawyers, physicians, Protestant ministers, and mathematicians” (100) – and, we might add, to cobblers and carters as well. Goeglein makes a similar argument to my own, that natural logic
involved both a professional and a (more or less) public social function. By focusing on MacIlmaine and Fraunce, however, Goeglein seems to have overlooked that Ramus’s own work did not have the same social address, and that Ramism went in many other directions, including Fenner’s Puritan manual which Goeglein does not mention.

Goeglein, then, tries to explain the social functions of MacIlmaine and Fraunce entirely in terms of natural logic – she argues that natural logic leads inevitably to these professional and public manuals. My argument is that these same manuals, and especially Fraunce’s, drew on the concept of natural logic, but that they developed their own versions of the social implications of natural logic and Ramism more generally.

In fact, there is nothing inevitably or inescapably public about natural logic in Ramism as a whole. Even in Fraunce’s logic manuals, which express the social implications of natural logic more than any other Ramist works, the main text of the logic retains a mixture of academic logic with Spenser’s vernacular pastoral. Rather than the world of common people, the main text returns to the social world that Fraunce actually inhabited – a combination of academic study and courtly distinction. It is this intellectual world that Fraunce portrays as the home of natural logic: “Reade Homer, reade Demosthenes, reade Virgill, read Cicero, reade Bartas, reade Torquato Tasso, reade that most worthie ornament of our English tongue, the Countesse of Pembrookes Arcadia, and therein see the true effectes of natural Logike” (4). This is a similar combination of classical authors with English and continental vernacular poets to those Fraunce included in his Arcadian Rhethorike. While I have argued above that Fraunce’s examples from Spenser lend themselves to the signification of commoners rather than courtiers, the
actual examples of logic and of Spenser’s poetry have a strongly academic focus. The examples of syllogisms that I quoted above indicate just how academic and technical Fraunce’s combination of logic and poetry is – that is, the syllogism concluding, “Therefore Paris is no good shepherd” (7) would not do much good for the common shepherd. A few examples from Spenser’s April eclogue also combine the academic with the courtly worlds. For example, Fraunce suggests that the April eclogue uses method to order Elisa’s beauty into its component parts:

Tel me have yee seene her angelyke face?
Lyke Phaebbe faire
Her hevenlye havyour her prynclye grace
can you wel compare?
The red rose medled with the white yfeare,
In eyther cheke depaynted livelye cheare
Her modest eye
Her majestye
Wher have you sene the lyke but there? (in Shepheardes 127)

Fraunce’s commentary on this passage is focused entirely on form and structure. He says that the passage proceeds from the general topic of Elisa’s beauty to the specifics of her “several subjectes, as face, eye, cheke, etc” (127). In 1947, Rosamond Tuve was enthusiastic about Fraunce’s identification of method in this passage, arguing that “there is no denying the fact that in Hobbinol’s song in the April eclogue of the Shep. Cal. there is – just as Fraunce points out – first a general proposition declaring the intention of
praising Eliza, then praises from *causes*, then *adjuncts*, then other arguments incident to
Eliza” (338). Spenser and Sidney scholars since 1947 have been less certain about the
influence of Ramist method on their poetry, but Dolven (2007: ch.5) offers a similarly
methodical reading of Sidney’s description of female beauty in the *Arcadia.*

As Meerhoff and Mack have argued in relation to Ramus’s own works, the
demonstration of natural logic involves the search for formal structure in poetry – a kind
of deep structure that inheres in the meaning of poem. The purest structural reading of
poetry in all of Ramism is not found in Ramus’s works, but in a kind of appendix to
Fraunce’s *Lawiers Logike* which illustrates Virgil’s second *Eclogue* through a tree
diagram. Fraunce explains that Spenser’s poem was not structured methodically enough
for a tree diagram, and he was forced to return to the classical terrain of Virgil’s pastoral.
Fraunce includes a Latin text of the poem, “for their pleasure that disdain the English”
(120), then his own English translation, and then a three-page tree diagram of the poem.
A single page of the total diagram will suffice to show how Fraunce translates his poetic
source into the visual diagram (see diagram on next page). Ramus himself often used
tree diagrams, and he performed logical analyses of Virgil and other poets, but there is no
record of him applying a tree diagram to a poem in this way. Thus, Fraunce develops the
Ramist combination of poetry and logic further than Ramus himself. In the diagram,
Fraunce is able to render a pastoral poem into a visual classification of its formal
elements. He selects the topic of Corydon’s “adjuncts,” his qualities, and then subdivides
them – Corydon says he is rich, a good singer, attractive, and generous. Corydon’s
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47 For Ramism and the works of Spenser and Sidney, see mainly Dolven but also Duncan-Jones (1972) and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Frutus</th>
<th>Ethanide</th>
<th>Frutus</th>
<th>Ethanide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Frutus</td>
<td>Ethanide</td>
<td>Frutus</td>
<td>Ethanide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Frutus</td>
<td>Ethanide</td>
<td>Frutus</td>
<td>Ethanide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buxton (1966).
generosity can then be subdivided into examples of his gifts - kids, fruits, boughs, and a basket of flowers - and finally, the flowers are enumerated as well. This structural breakdown is what Fraunce considered to be the natural logic inhering in the poem, and his diagram shows the form which the Ramist analysis of poetry through logic took.

Remarkably, no previous study of natural logic has pointed to Fraunce’s tree diagram for this poem. Despite the fact that this poem-as-tree-diagram is a perfect illustration of an increasing visual orientation of culture, Ong did not include Fraunce’s diagram as evidence for the decay of oral culture. Mack and Meerhoff do not examine Fraunce’s diagram, nor does Tuve or Goeglein, nor any of the previous studies which feature Fraunce himself. Perhaps in the wake of Ong’s influential thesis, scholars were afraid or embarrassed to mention the fact that Fraunce had rendered a poem into a visual diagram. Without mounting a full-scale defense of poetic diagrams, I would merely suggest that the practice is not obviously contemptible, and it could be situated in the long history of formalist-structuralist readings of poetry.

For the purposes of this dissertation, however, the primary significance of Fraunce’s diagram is that it illustrates the way that Ramist logic could translate a text, including a complex example like Virgil’s eclogues, into an orderly classification of its knowledge content. The same process of turning a poem into a tree diagram could work for any text, including professional texts like legal cases (as Fraunce demonstrates as well), and thus logic could be applied to any subject involving textual knowledge, even as MacIlmaine demonstrates, the diagnosis of a fever. Contrary to Goeglein’s argument,
however, the idea of natural logic did not lead Ramus or all Ramists to the professional and practical application of knowledge. It was up to English Ramists like MacIlmaine and Fraunce to develop the social implications of natural logic in their own ways. As we will see in the next chapter, Fenner took Ramism in a different direction altogether. Although MacIlmaine and Fraunce targeted their prefaces at the professions and the public, they both retained Ramus’s poetic illustrations throughout the main text. While Fraunce also added legal examples, his combination of logical precepts and poetry maintains much of the academic flavor of university study.

This chapter began with a consideration of the *Lawiers Logike* as addressed both to lawyers and to the common man. We have seen now that the Ramist theory of natural logic explains this conundrum to a certain degree because it has the ability to point both at the professional and the public. However, I have also demonstrated that natural logic could remain a fundamentally academic, even philosophical, concept without a strong inclination towards either the professional or the public. It was the English Ramists, then, and not Ramus or his influences such as Agricola, who oriented humanist logic outside of the universities. Ramus himself fought to detach logic from the absolutist intellectual authority of Aristotle, but the devolution of intellectual absolutism had already occurred by the time the Tudor manuals were written. Even before the English Ramists, writers like Cox, Horsfall and Blundeville had targeted logic and rhetoric outside the universities, but MacIlmaine and especially Fraunce fully developed the joint address to both the professional and the public. I use the term *public* instead of *common* because MacIlmaine and Fraunce took the modern direction of appealing to both the
common-as-general and the common-as-commoner. They both drew on longstanding traditions of common intellectual property, but they departed from this material by aiming their manuals at both the professional and the public. Although MacIlmaine and Fraunce imagine education at times in strikingly public terms and articulate a common man’s logic more clearly than any previous writers, as I will argue in the next chapter, Ralph Lever and Dudley Fenner make even bolder claims about the publicity of knowledge and education. However, for all the complexities and qualifications in their addresses to the common people, MacIlmaine and Fraunce were clearly involved in the movement to imagine education as more public.
Chapter 4
The Public and the Common

The previous chapters have examined how the idea of public education developed in relation to the professions and to elite distinction. I have argued that the manuals have consistently aimed towards publicity even when oriented mainly towards smaller groups. There has thus been a kind of tension between private and the public – the smaller restricted community (i.e. the court, professionals) and the larger unrestricted community (the common people, everyone). Sometimes, the public has seemed like a secondary concern, almost an afterthought as in Puttenham’s closing appeal to the socially mobile carter. In Fraunce and Blundeville, however, the professional and the public are more of an allied couple, and the manuals have no trouble alternating their appeals between them. One thing that unites all of these vernacular manuals is their opposition to the social limitations that the universities place on education. The vernacular manual has been used as a way of imagining education outside of the university setting, of transporting the setting of education to the court and of producing knowledge in applied professional examples. The most extreme example we have seen thus far is Fraunce’s Shepheardes Logike, whose pastoral image of socially universal knowledge was later moderated into the professional-public split of the Lawiers Logike. This chapter will look at two further examples resembling the Shepheardes Logike more than the Lawiers Logike – the social target in these manuals is public only.

This chapter will examine the two strongest articulations of public education in the published Tudor vernacular manuals. These two manuals, Ralph Lever’s The Arte of
Reason, rightly termed, Witcraft (1573), and Dudley Fenner’s The Artes of Logike and Rhethorike (1584), could be argued to share the social vision of the Shepheardes Logike, but unlike Fraunce these authors did not make any secondary appeals in their published versions. Both Lever and Fenner promote a robust vision of common knowledge and education, but they have very different strategies for achieving that goal. Lever envisions common accessibility through the national language, arguing that everyone will understand logic if only the terminology involves plain and common English words. Lever, then, invokes a specifically national tradition of a common language as a principle of common knowledge. Fenner’s vision of common knowledge, on the other hand, involves a complex mixture of the ancient and the modern, the private and the public. While he does not formulate a fully economic theory of the commodity, Fenner, unlike the other manual writers, does articulate a discourse of commodification. While Fenner’s manual includes ideas of hermeneutic regulation, his preface is focused on the commodity as a principle of common knowledge. By imagining common knowledge in terms of nationalism and commodification, Lever and Fenner participate most clearly in the emergence of modern publicity, not as part of a modern political public sphere but as an early and provisional cultural precursor of modern publicity. Lever and Fenner are neither fully modern, nor are they the exotic social others of Habermas’s watershed history – on the contrary, they are interesting precisely for the complex continuity and difference of their thought in the early history of modern publicity.
In addition to their employment of the discourse of publicity, Lever and Fenner also share a strain of religious non-conformism, though religion is less evident in Lever’s work than in Fenner’s. Lever was born in Lancashire in about 1530 but was brought up mostly in the humanist schools – at Eton and then St. John’s College, Cambridge (from about 1544 until his M.A. in 1551). This timeline connects Lever with the influence of John Cheke at that college in the 1540s, and makes him roughly the contemporary of Thomas Wilson (M.A. King’s College, Cambridge 1549). After Lever returned from his Marian exile in 1558, he worked as a tutor for the Earl of Essex, but instead of following Wilson’s career path by working for the state, Lever entered the Church, eventually receiving a prebend at Durham Cathedral in 1567. It seems that Lever was never at home in the institutional structure of the Church, however, and he resigned five years later after a series of conflicts. It was precisely at this time that Lever published his *Witcraft* (1573), though there is reason to believe that Lever composed the main text as early as 1549. As we will see, Fenner would have more intense conflicts with the Church of England than Lever, but Lever had similar problems and conflicts with the institutional Church.

---

48 In his preface, Lever remarks that Martin Bucer had read the manual before his death in Cambridge in February 1551. Howell argues that Lever composed the manual during his M.A. at St. John’s between 1549 and 1551. In addition to the mention of Bucer, Howell argues that the content and tone of Lever’s preface indicate that he composed the manual before seeing Wilson’s *Rule of Reason* (1551), as Lever defends not just the advisability but also the possibility of writing logic in the English language (Howell 58-9). Although this may be a product of Lever’s linguistic theory, his seventeen-page defense of his vernacular pedagogy is more focused on the fundamental possibility of doing logic in English than any of the other manuals.

49 The details of Lever’s church career are summarized by Marcombe (2004) in the *Oxford DNB*. 
Lever’s preface is also less intense than many of the others in its critique of the institutionalized education of the universities. Lever does criticize Cambridge humanism when he expresses a preference for Aristotle over “Ciceronians and suger tongued fellows, which labour more for shewes of speech, then for knowledge of good matter” (viii). This line could be mistaken for Francis Bacon’s well-known opinion that humanism valued words over content, but where Bacon was concerned with content, Lever was concerned with language. Lever’s objection was that Latin education would destroy the English language, or as he puts it, it would make “a mingle mangle of [our] native speache” (vii). Furthermore, in defending vernacular education, Lever confronts the objection that social order requires limiting accessibility to knowledge and education. In response to the idea that vernacular education would “minister unto many matters of contention and strife,” Lever says that contention lies not in knowledge but in scholars themselves, as “incident to the nature of sharp wits” (viii). Instead, Lever claims that “learning hath no enemies, but them that are ignoraunt, and those which know not what profite commeth of knowledge” (viii). Unlike other vernacular manual writers, then, Lever does not aggressively accuse the universities of hoarding knowledge and enclosing the common fields of education despite his orientation towards expanding knowledge in the vernacular. Instead of making sweeping claims about the institutions, Lever seems to prefer to offer individual and personal critiques of both “sharp wits” and the “ignoraunt.”

---

50 Bacon’s critique of English Ciceronianism can be found in his *Advancement of Learning* (1605), 22-3. Many recent studies have quoted Bacon’s statement about the humanist preference for words and style over content. Halpern (1991) has suggested that Bacon also makes a witty tribute to humanist teachers like Roger Ascham, “from which Bacon only halfheartedly tries to extricate himself” (19). By contrast, Lever’s
This might suggest that Lever associates the problems of education with individuals rather than as an entrenched institutional problem. Yet, Lever does suggest that the universities have limited the social scope of education, either to produce the linguistic distinction of “suger tongued” Ciceronians, or in a misguided idea that social order requires limited education. When we come to Fenner, however, it will be clear that Lever had a comparatively moderate position in relation to the institutions of both school and Church.

Lever was certainly not moderate, however, in his idea about reforming the logic textbook to conform to his linguistic nationalism. The foundation of Lever’s manual is the belief that the art of logic will be generally accessible if it is written entirely in a “common” language – that is, omitting all “inkhorn terms:” all words imported into English, whether through Greek, Latin, French, or any other language. If translating Latin logic into the vernacular was one step in rendering education in a common language, Lever’s practice takes a second step by conceiving language as even more common. But when it came to writing a vernacular logic manual, Lever’s plan presented him with a problem. How could he teach the art of logic, taken out of the classical languages, without using any terms from Latin or Greek? Since there were no equivalents for most of logic’s specialized terms, the only solution was to create new words, and if only existing words were permissible, all neologisms must be formed by making new compound words. For example, since the word *logic* had a Greek origin, Lever was forced to rename the subject (and his book itself) by putting together the
words *wit* and *craft*. Apparently, Lever was more concerned with linguistic purity than with the unfortunate linguistic similarity of the book’s title to “witchcraft.”

Lever’s use of compound words caught the eye of Richard Foster Jones, who included *Witcraft* in his survey of sixteenth-century English usage. For Jones, Lever was the most extreme and persistent of a group of sixteenth century compounders, including John Cheke, Arthur Golding, Robert Recorde, and George Puttenham. As we saw in Chapter One, Puttenham’s distaste for inkhorn terms was due to their connection with the university instead of the more elite linguistic circles of London and the court. Puttenham demonstrates that compounding was not necessarily aimed at producing common knowledge but could be used to produce elite distinction as well. Indeed, where Lever’s English terms like *backset* (predicate) and *saywhat* (definition) aim at plainness, Puttenham’s new English rhetorical terms have the distinct sound of the court – for example, his renderings of irony as “the dry mock,” sarcasm as “the bitter taunt,” and charientismus as “the privy nip,” conjure the specific cut-and-thrust of the Renaissance court.

Cheke’s biblical translations, on the other hand, have the same purpose as Lever’s logic of making knowledge more accessible to the common people. As Jones argues, in 1542 Cheke accused Bishop Gardiner of using inkhorn terms in order “to render the English version [of the Bible] useless to the common people through the obscurity of its diction” (109). Although his writing was never as extreme as Lever’s, Cheke’s biblical translations did sometimes resort to compounding English words: “where the authorized

with the classical tradition.
version now reads ‘lunatic,’ Cheke’s translation reads ‘moond’ … where ‘centurion,’
’hunderder’; where ‘publicans,’ ‘tollers’; where ‘parables,’ ‘biwordes’” (121). Along
with familiar texts, including the Shepheardes Calender, in which Spenser tried to revive
ancient English usage, Jones identifies Cheke and Lever as motivated by a “nationalistic
spirit,” but one which has been overemphasized since its actual influence was “so limited
… as not to merit much attention” (139). Indeed, it would be very surprising if Lever’s
Witcraft had any “influence” on the history of the English language, and Jones is
probably right to dismiss him on these grounds.

Jones does not, however, consider Lever’s linguistic participation in the
emergence of early modern publicity. In fact, Jones focuses more on the linguistic
difficulties of using compound words than the social implications of language, even in
such an important example of Cheke’s notion of biblical accessibility. However limited
the “influence” of Lever’s linguistic nationalism on the history of the English language,
my argument is that Lever’s work is a significant record for the early imagination of
education as a public endeavor. In his preface, Lever argues that ancient English words
are more accessible, even when compounded, to all English speakers:

For he that is an englishman born, and understandeth no toung but his
owne, shal at the first, eyther conceive the meaning of our words by
himself, or else soon learne them upon an other mans instruction and
teaching: but for these inkhorne termes, it is certaine, that he shall neither
understande them by himselfe: nor keepe them in remembraunce when he
is taught theyr signification of others, because the worde can make him no helpe. (vi–vii)

Whatever the merits or influence of Lever’s linguistic methods, his purpose here is significant – he imagines an educated linguistic community as coextensive with the broader community of “English men.” Lever’s ‘nationalistic spirit’ is another way of expressing the value of both the common-as-general and the common-as-commoner. In order to imagine logic as common knowledge, Lever uses the example of the common man, the “englishman born” who has not been schooled in a classical or foreign “toung.” This is Lever’s version of Fraunce’s Shepheardes Logike as aimed at cobbler, carters, and simple country men, but Lever, who is suspicious of sugar-tongued humanists, does not invoke pastoral imagery in his construction of the common man. Instead, Lever resorts to this nationalistic image of the unschooled Englishman as the conduit between the commoner and the common.

Lever uses the unschooled Englishman as an example of the accessibility of his pedagogy. Ask him, says Lever, “what conceiveth in his mind, when he heareth this word a backset, and what he doth conceive when he heareth this terme a Predicate” – the word backset will suggest “a thing that must be set after,” and the word predicate will suggest “nothing at all” (vi). Lever’s assumption is that familiar words will help the common man to “conceive” the term and thus to understand and remember it, while a word like predicate would block both understanding and memory. One wonders how an unschooled Englishman in 1573 would have responded to a sentence with multiple new compound words: for example, “If the backset be sayd of the foreset, and be neyther his
sayewhat, propertie, nor difference: then it is an Inbeer” (73). There is only so much that a mind can conceive and suggest at once. In anticipation of such difficulties, Lever includes a five-page glossary of compound words at the end of the book, but it would still take commitment from his reader to become familiar with these terms.

Again, however, the important thing for my argument is not the efficacy or influence of Lever’s language but his conception of the social function of language. Even if nobody ever used a backset or a saywhat, the point is that Lever bent over backwards to adapt his manual to his stated readership. Witcraft certainly makes no token gesture towards the education of the common man, and Lever knew that he was inviting ridicule in the process. After begging the “gentle Reader” not “to scoffe” at his compound words, Lever says that the subject of logic forces him to break the rule, “Loquendum ut vulgus, that is to say, he that speaketh, must use such termes as the common people is in use withal” (vi). Since logic has no terms in use with the common people, the best option is to use common words as building blocks for new terms. This method shows a strong commitment to the idea of common language, and Lever follows through with this language throughout the manual.

As in the previous examples in this dissertation, the most important part of Lever’s work is not the intellectual content but the social imaginary of his pedagogy. Lever’s content is mostly conventional, though he does seem to make his examples as concrete and material as possible. For example, two of Lever’s syllogisms are as follows:

All hawks have talons.

No tame foul by nature hath a talon.
No tame foul by nature is a hawk. (116)

Nothing learned by imitation is natural

Every language is learned by imitation.

Therefore, no language is natural. (116)

The first example is taken from nature, albeit from the aristocratic context of falconry, and the second deals with linguistic education itself. These are not exactly the common man’s syllogisms, but they are more concrete than Fraunce’s pastoral examples of good and bad shepherds. Crane argues that such examples are not only concrete but that they appeal to common sense just as Lever appeals to common language. This, argues Crane, is “the point of Lever’s book” – the “reader will find that, in fact, he already practices the ‘art of reason’ without understanding the terms” (33). While Lever’s content does seem commonsensical, however, it still teaches the basic precepts of logic like the syllogism – only Lever’s examples are more “common” than those in other manuals.

Lever continues to use common, concrete examples throughout his main text. For example, Lever explains several instances in which one thing is said to go before another. One example of this order, where “letters are lerned afore syllables, and syllables afore words” (57), refers to linguistic pedagogy itself. Other examples refer to different kinds of social order, including the basic order of kings, “As, King Henry the eight, was in time afore King Edward the firt [sic]” (Lever 56), and the connection with the king and the hierarchical order of society – kings, Lever says, also come “before” their subjects in “worthynesse: as the king is afore his subject in honoure: the maister afore his servant, by
estimation” (57). This example shows how the social is often implicated in potentially abstract precepts such as “things going before others.” In these examples, the idea that a master goes before his servant seems as natural as the idea that letters are learned before syllables. This example also shows that Lever’s attempt to make logic accessible to the common man was not in service of an overall program of social equality or leveling. As the comparison with Fenner will show, Lever combined his linguistic nationalism with a consistently moderate social imaginary. Lever’s examples invoke a range of concrete examples, and they do not form a consistent or forceful social vision for the main text itself.

Lever does include one particularly vivid example involving a commercial metaphor for logic, and I will use this as a starting point to discuss the topic of commodification in both Lever and Fenner. In this passage, Lever explains the utility of commonplace logic by comparing it to the organization of a merchant’s goods:

For as the good and ready marchaunt provideth store of sundry wares, and sorteth every kinde by it selfe, adding special markes for his better direction, that he may with convenient speede fit and serve his customer when he calleth: So the quick and sharpe reasoner, must gather general rules together, and place them in order, that he may have in a redinesse, when need shall be, store of reasons, for proofe or disproofe of matters in doubt. (Lever 137)

If Lever had begun the book with this example, we might describe him as imagining the commodification of education in conjunction with his idea of linguistic nationalism, and
we could see Lever as articulating a strikingly modern form of print-capitalism. As we have seen, however, Lever’s main text is a hodge-podge of social ideas, more medieval than modern in its images of kings, hawks, masters and servants. This comparison of logic with the organization of a merchant’s sundry wares does not appear, in fact, until page 137 of Lever’s densely packed 233 pages. If Lever’s goal was to advertise his logic as a valuable commodity, he should have put this metaphor in the front window next to his linguistic nationalism instead of hiding it on a dusty shelf. Indeed, Lever does not market the book very effectively considering he claims that his pedagogy will be accessible to every common Englishman.

Although Lever’s commercial metaphor is buried in the middle of his text, it does suggest the larger connection between printed manuals and the commodity. The idea of commodification has not been a major factor in previous studies of the vernacular manuals, even though the rise of modern commerce is often considered as a factor in the subversion of traditional social hierarchies. The most extensive argument concerning the commercial context of the manuals is Crane’s study of the commonplace method as cultural capital. Crane argues that Lever’s goal was to convert university logic into both a commodity and cultural capital. Crane begins by connecting Lever’s merchant passage to the commodification of education, but after citing Bourdieu, she proceeds immediately to the idea that the manual was meant to produce cultural capital for its reader – as she puts it, to accumulate “private property” for “the student” (32). In my Introduction, I argued that Crane did not provide a theoretical framework for transferring Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital from the school to the printed book, and here we can see some
of the difficulties that ensue.\textsuperscript{51} Crane’s casual use of the word “student” here is symptomatic of a larger conflation between the economic concepts of commodity and capital – for Crane, it seems that a commodity is the same thing as capital. On the contrary, however, capital is not just a commodity but something that produces further value, further commodities. In a printing house, the books would be commodities, while the press itself would be capital. With respect to education, books can be commodities, but institutional factors like credentials are the most powerful forms of intellectual capital. One might argue that all knowledge is a potential form of capital, but especially when the subjects are liberal arts like logic and rhetoric, credentials are usually more valuable than skills.

The distinction between commodity and capital gets at one of the major questions of this dissertation. What is happening to a liberal arts education when it is published in a vernacular book instead of being offered only as the curriculum of schools? What is the status of knowledge when it is offered in a logic or rhetoric manual, and how did Tudor

\textsuperscript{51} As I outlined in the Introduction, Crane takes liberties in applying Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital to the Tudor logic manuals. One problem visible here is that Crane had argued initially that the manuals produced cultural capital for their writers and thus formed the basis of a humanist class. More generally, Crane starts with Bourdieu’s theory, but she modifies it by adding a kind of mechanical arm reaching out from the school into print culture. To put it more plainly, Crane argues that the intellectual capital of logic is produced initially in the university, and the goal of the vernacular manuals is “to transfer the authority, matter, and control of Latin into English speech” (25). The pragmatic problem of the vernacular manual writer is “how one properly manifests one’s intellectual capital, the possession of a humanist education in classical literature, while speaking or writing in the vernacular” (25). In a nutshell, what Crane does is to replace Bourdieu’s materialist emphasis on the educational institution with a poststructuralist emphasis on the agency of language itself. The result of this modification is a theory of cultural capital as “authoritative” (or authentic) discourse. In Crane’s theory, authority is a medium for the transferal, manifestation and translation of academic cultural capital out of the schools and into print culture. The obvious benefit of this theory is that it allows Crane to study evidence such as vernacular manuals using the logic of cultural capital, but her expansion also sacrifices the social and material specificity of the concept. If cultural capital is interchangeable with authority, or the inevitable product of it, then all claims for
writers and readers perceive this knowledge in various social and intellectual contexts? Throughout this dissertation, I have maintained that the vernacular manuals participated in many different contexts, but that appeals to social elites and professionals were almost invariably combined with an impetus toward the common or public dispensation of knowledge toward the training of the many rather than the few. The most consistent element in all of the vernacular manuals is a criticism of the social limitations of the Latin schools accompanied by a plan, or at least an imagination, of how the knowledge purveyed by these schools could be made more accessible. From the outset, I have argued that the concept of cultural capital does not provide a sufficient general explanation for a set of texts that seek to make knowledge more common by transferring it from the schools to vernacular print.

By contrast, the concept of commodity does seem applicable to the social function of printed vernacular manuals. In the first place, the manuals are material commodities themselves, and their writers and publishers produce them with the goal of selling them in a book market. It should not be surprising that a writer like Lever compares the contents of his book with a merchant’s wares. Perhaps it is more surprising that there are not more descriptions of the universal utility of education for all potential buyers, a kind of one-size-fits-all idea of education as commodity. Lever’s book demonstrates just how weak the discourse of commodification was in the vernacular manuals. In addition to the passages considered above, this point is made clear when Lever explains the production of common knowledge:

knowledge, status, or any other kinds of authority are also attempts to produce, or at least relocate, cultural
So that after a man hath conceyved anye newe devise in hys heade, and is desirous to have the same published, and made common to manye, he findeth ever some shifte, by one meane or other, to make the same knownen. And bycause there is none so good a waye to do it by, as speache, man maketh that hys chiefe meane. Thus ye may see the originall groundworke, and beginning of artes. Man firste doth conceyve trim devises in his head, and then (as the Poetes doe feigne of Jupiter) is pained as a woman in travaile, till he have uttered and published them, to be sene, and commended by others. (Lever v)

This is not exactly an image of mechanical reproduction and the mass production of knowledge. There is something almost primitive in this description of knowledge as conceived in a man’s head and then published in speech “bycause there is none so good a waye to do it.” The description of knowledge as “delivered” in speech sounds like it could be the words of Socrates rather than an early modern author writing for vernacular print. And yet, Crane reads this passage as taking part in the early modern commodification of knowledge – for Crane the “trim devises” in the head of Lever’s thinker “are worthless in their natural state” and are “of no use until ‘framed’ into a form that others may commend and buy” (35). In Crane’s theory, it seems, any desire to share or distribute knowledge involves commodification, just as any claim to authoritative knowledge involves the creation of cultural capital.
Studies of early modern publicity have also largely steered clear of the topic of commodification. Lake and Pincus, for instance, argue that publicity was a self-contained creation of political discourse in the wake of the English Reformation. Incredibly, Lake and Pincus do not even consider the social goals of Protestantism as a factor in the political discourse of the English Reformation. Clearly, McKeon has a superior approach to the emergence of publicity across a variety of social fields, including not just the political but also the religious and the economic. McKeon’s analysis of early modern economics, however, is limited to the development of private property: the downward mobility of property from the monarch to the individual. And as I argued in the introduction, McKeon limits his study of public-private separation before the 1640s to the development of privacy. Hence, the topic of commodification does not enter into McKeon’s analysis until he considers the works of Adam Smith, written near the end of the eighteenth century. Yet, for McKeon, Smith’s description of the commodity merely continues the long-standing mechanism of publicity as mediating between the specific and the general, in this case between “objects of consumption and use” and “objects of circulation and exchange, or commodities” (381). For McKeon, then, it seems that commodification did not exist, or at least that people were unaware of its existence, until the commodity was fully theorized by Smith.

As I mentioned briefly in the introduction, Halasz has critiqued the tendency of public sphere theory to treat early modern print culture as somehow innocent of the taint of commodification. While McKeon obviously presents a more complete picture of the early modern period than Habermas, his analysis of commodification still seems to rely
on a similar view of early modern commercial innocence. As I will consider below in relation to Fenner, Halasz has argued not only that Tudor print commodified discourse but that anxiety about commodification is a structuring force of modern publicity. Moreover, for Halasz, Habermas’s idea of a modern public sphere relies on a failure to connect early modern commodification with the emergence of modern publicity. As Halasz argues,

While it is easily enough demonstrated that the public sphere Habermas locates in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was not, in fact, generally accessible and that its idealization into a normative model obscures the construction and workings of a specifically bourgeois (and male) hegemony, that critique does not sufficiently address the ways in which the potentially generalized access commodification seemed to promise precipitated the very responses – of exclusion and inclusion – that underwrite the public sphere Habermas describes historically. It is, I am arguing, the possibility of broad access that informs the range and ambivalence of the responses to the commodification of discourse (45).

Habermas’s public sphere theory has been bedeviled from the beginning by the objection that the eighteenth-century public sphere was not really accessible to everyone. The response to this objection has been that the public sphere was accessible in principle if not in fact, and what Habermas was describing, and extolling as normative, was the
Halasz extends this debate by arguing that accessibility in principle – the “potentially generalized access commodification seemed to promise” – is the essence of the public sphere. For Halasz, then, commodification created the Habermasian public sphere – it “precipitated” the very terms of “exclusion and inclusion” which “underwrite the public sphere Habermas describes historically.”

The question for this dissertation, however, is the more specific relation between commodification and publicity in the Tudor logic and rhetoric manuals. Thus far, I have been arguing that publicity does not seem to be clearly entwined with commodification in the manual writers’ imaginations of their projects. However, perhaps the public discourse of the manuals is a product of their status as commodities, and the authors simply do not articulate the logic of commodification explicitly. It would not be a giant stretch, for instance, to argue that the professional application of logic and rhetoric was an attempt to create value for these manuals in the book market – to create exchange value by first creating use value. We might also see Puttenham’s picture of the courtly as creating exchange value by invoking elite distinction itself. Rather than dismissing the commodity status of the manuals, I have been treating it as a given and then looking for other factors specific to each individual manual. MacIlmaine, for example, combines the Christian tradition of common property with his idea of professional utility without articulating concepts such as commodities, markets, and exchange value. As I argued

---

52 This debate has recently centered on Fraser’s (1992) feminist critique of the eighteenth-century public sphere as inclusive in principle but gender-exclusive in reality. The original reception of the Structural Transformation in Germany, including that of the Frankfurt School, was that Habermas focused on the bourgeois public sphere to the exclusion of a proletarian public sphere (Calhoun 1992: introduction). For
above, as well, Lever seems to picture his book as producing common knowledge as if it were a kind of oral conversation (“bycause there is none so good a waye to do it by, as speache”) rather than a printed book for sale in a market. Lever is promoting phonocentrism, then, even as he is participating in the historical shift to the age of printing, even as he is attempting a radical transfer of logic from the Latin schools to a particularly accessible form of the vernacular – even, that is, as he is attempting to transform logic from the cultural capital of schools to a commodity sold on the open market.

If the Tudor manuals were commodifying education simply by printing it in the vernacular, the authors were not generally aware that this was happening – they did not articulate a discourse of commodification. In fact, these authors are often more concerned with the common-as-commoner than with the common-as-general. As I argued in Chapter Two, Fraunce seems more focused on the figure of the logician-commoner than he was on logic as common knowledge, and his address to the professional utility of lawyers seems to have been a concession to the realities of the book market. Fraunce seems to have been motivated more by the theory of natural logic than by the theory of the commodity. This is not to say, of course, that Fraunce’s books were innocent of commerce and commodification, but merely that they had not been subsumed by these discourses. This topic of commodification brings us to Dudley Fenner, whose manual was published 1584 before many of the others, but who I have left for the end because his writing evinces a particularly complex mixture of religion and

an example of a defense of Habermas’s description of the eighteenth-century public sphere, see McKeon.
economic discourse with the genre of the vernacular manual. As I will argue in the following section, Fenner, the well-born Puritan minister from Kent, wrote the only manual that clearly advertised education as both commodity and capital.

The Common and the Commodity: Dudley Fenner’s *The Artes of Logike and Rhethorike* (1584)

Judging from his life and career, Fenner would not seem to be the likeliest person to articulate the commodification of vernacular education. Like most of the manual writers, the precise details of Fenner’s birth are not available, but he was almost certainly born in Kent around 1558. Records for Fenner begin at Peterhouse College, Cambridge, where he entered in 1575 as a “fellow commoner,” a title which denoted a child with wealthy parents. Cambridge Ramism was on the rise at this time – Gabriel Harvey became University Praelector of Rhetoric in 1574, and he gave his well-known *Ciceronianus* lecture in 1576. After one or two years at Cambridge, Fenner either withdrew or was expelled, and he promptly joined Thomas Cartwright’s non-conformist ministry to the Merchant Adventurers in Antwerp. By 1583, he was back in his native Kent as minister for Cranbrook, a parish which Patrick Collinson has studied for its

(2004).

Lisa Jardine’s early works (1974a, 1974b) firmly established the existence of Ramism at Cambridge in the 1570s and 1580s. In the early 1970s, Jardine had to counter two long-standing notions: first, that the sixteenth-century English universities continued to teach medieval logic only (Costello 1958); and second, that they now taught humanist rhetoric only (Kearney 1970, and later in Feingold 1997). Instead, Jardine argued the now-established view that the medieval English logic course was “reformed” along with the Church in the 1530s. After 1535, the university statutes (and textbook records and Holdsworth’s *Directions*) indicate that logic continued to be the main study of the B.A. course, but now it would be taught through the “humanist dialectic” of Agricola and Melanchthon. In the 1540s, Seton published a widely used introductory manual to the Agricolan logic. Evidence from 1578 and 1590 shows that Ramus’s manual was used about as often as Seton’s. In 1584, William Temple published a commented edition of Ramus’s logic, printed by Thomas Thomas at the Cambridge Press.
history of non-conformism. Fenner plays a small part in Collinson’s parish history, though, since Archbishop Whitgift removed Fenner from his position after only one year, along with a handful of other Presbyterian critics throughout England. At this point, Fenner was effectively exiled to the Low Countries, where he preached again to English merchants, wrote pamphlets against episcopacy, and produced his Ramist manual. Joining Fenner in exile were his wife and four daughters – Morefruit, Freegift, Faintnot, and Wellabroad - who may have inspired Ben Jonson’s parody of such Puritan names in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614). Fenner managed to compile an impressive Puritan resumé for someone who died, in 1588, before his thirtieth birthday.

Fenner makes some striking innovations to the Ramist manual as well. Howell noted Fenner’s two major innovations: he was the first English Ramist to translate the rhetoric and to include it along with the logic; and he substituted biblical quotations for all of Ramus’s standard examples from classical poetry and oratory. For example, where Ramus used Ovid’s *Remedia Amoris* (2.135-40) to demonstrate a causal relationship between sloth and love, Fenner uses scripture to demonstrate that God “caused” mankind. Where Ramus published commentaries on Virgil and Cicero, Fenner again substituted biblical materials, producing commentaries on the “Lord’s Prayer” and the “Epistle to Philemon.” These innovations are probably what have sidelined Fenner from the history of early modern education, as he does not fit easily into the history of Ramism or into long-term narratives about the history of English humanism. In fact, the most sustained study of Fenner to date is not a history of logic and rhetoric but Collinson’s study of
Fenner as a minister in Cranbrook. Yet, Fenner’s manual has the same underlying structure as other Ramist manuals, only with a different set of textual illustrations. Fenner’s manual is actually a feat of compression, including both the Ramist logic and rhetoric, usually published separately in England, while still leaving half of the quarto free for his treatise on “The Order of Household” and then the two biblical commentaries. As we will see below, Fenner’s combination of the academic Ramist manual with this religious material is what creates such a complex social imaginary for his pedagogy.

Before addressing the religious material, however, I will attend to Fenner’s striking commercial metaphors for the social accessibility of education. Fenner was not a merchant himself, but he seems to have adopted the commercial language of Antwerp for his defense of vernacular education. Fenner uses economic metaphors to contrast the inaccessibility of the Elizabethan Latin schools with the accessibility of his vernacular manual. In developing these metaphors, Fenner argues that Greek and Latin originally became the languages of European education because they were the most widely-used imperial languages – “these tongues being most general by reason of the spread that the Grecian and Romane Empyre had made of them” (A2). Because of the widespread use of Greek and Latin, Fenner argues, “they were fittest to be made the storehouse of the worlde for these commodities [i.e. the liberal arts]” (A2). Clearly, Fenner is drawing on the idea of common intellectual property – a “storehouse of the worlde” – rather than institutional schooling. For Fenner, the classical languages were intended to open knowledge rather than to close it, even if the accessibility of the classical languages was a product of “Empyre.”
Fenner’s main concern is with expanding the accessibility of the liberal arts by opening the educational storehouses of the Latin schools. But instead of advocating an equal distribution of the storehouse for everybody, Fenner calls for an open educational marketplace:

A storehouse I say, not to keepe them [i.e. the liberal arts] for the Romanes and Grecians alone, or for the expert in these toungs theyr free denizons: but at the least that by their traffick, it might with their gaine of the prayse and glory, become common to every particular nation, that everie one who had neede, might buie of the same. Wherefore seeing the end was with their gaine the commoditie of all, let them not still keepe in this corner to make it rare & excesisively deere, least not the people curse them: (A2-A3).

As we have seen in previous examples, hoarding was the main topos for vernacular criticism of the social exclusions of schools. Fenner’s storehouse is a continuation of this tradition, but he adds an explicit contrast with the image of a market – in fact, he describes hoarding in terms of “cornering” the market in order to inflate prices. For Fenner, the existence of “traffick” leads to a greater accessibility of knowledge – the liberal arts will become “common” to every “nation” so that “everie one who had neede, might buie of the same.” Instead of linking the common to the English nation, as Wilson and Lever do in their manuals, Fenner thinks of the common in the international terms of every nation and a storehouse of the “worlde.” This internationalism is likely a product of Fenner’s Protestant context, but it creates a striking picture of international commerce
when combined with Fenner’s economic terminology. Fenner wants to take the liberal arts out of the private storehouses and put them up for sale, essentially to transfer education from the school to the marketplace. It would be hard to imagine a clearer early modern articulation of the commodification of knowledge.

Fenner was the only one of the vernacular manual writers, then, who clearly connected the common with the commodity. Although every one of the printed manuals was sold as a commodity, Fenner was the only writer to refer to this economic function – to make commodification explicit. Where the others drew heavily on the Christian tradition of common intellectual property, and where Fraunce developed his elaborate pastoral imagery, Fenner simply points to the material fact that the accessibility of vernacular manuals is bound up with commerce and markets. There is something refreshingly honest about Fenner’s economic metaphors in the context of the other manuals’ address to commonality, especially such abstract renderings as in the *Shepheardes Logike*. On the other hand, there is also a sense of loss when Fenner turns the promise of common knowledge over to the marketplace – it involves admitting that the promise of public education is nothing more than commodification. In fact, it is just like admitting that the public sphere is nothing more than the commodification which a public market entails – things are generally accessible in principle, but restricted and exclusive in reality. In the case of Fenner’s manual, however, the commodity seems like the best way of describing the author’s imagination of public education. When Fenner thinks of knowledge as common, as commonly accessible, his first thought is to place it in the marketplace.
Despite the market metaphor, however, Fenner does not fully realize the implications of the commodity as a tool of exchange, a fact that can be seen in his use of the word *commoditie* to signify use rather than exchange. This now-obsolete usage of commodity does not carry the fully modern sense of an object whose use value has been translated into a common exchange value – the absolute commensurability of everything. Unlike Adam Smith, then, Fenner did not use the commodity as a way of mediating between the particular and the general, between the utility of a particular object and its general exchange value. The Elizabethans did have access to the modern sense of commodity (*OED* noun 6.a), including its usage in such non-technical discourse as Shakespeare’s *Comedy of Errors* (1594), but Fenner does not use the word to bridge the gap between the common-as-use and the common-as-exchange. We might see Fenner’s adherence to educational utility instead of exchange as a kind of resistance to the full commodification of his pedagogy, a resistance that makes sense, as we will see, in the context of Fenner’s manual as a whole.

Even in his preface, Fenner is not entirely satisfied with his description of educational accessibility in the marketplace. In Fenner’s imagination, pedagogy pauses only briefly in the marketplace, in fact, before proceeding to a primary site of economic production in the farmer’s field. In this section, Fenner makes a very different claim about common intellectual property:

Let them [the hoarders] take heede also of open injustice, for seeing the common use and practise of all men in generall, both in reasoning to the purpose, and in speaking with some grace and elegancie, hath sowen the
In the first sentence of this passage, Fenner extends the notion of accessibility a step beyond the market – instead of claiming only that people should be able to buy education, he is now making the much bolder claim that the liberal arts belong to “all men in generall.” More specifically, Fenner invokes the notion of common intellectual property through the image of a common field. This produces an interesting mixture of Christian and economic commonality in the line, “why should not all reape where all have sown?” This line apparently refers to the parable of the talents in Matthew chap.25: “thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strayed” (37).

Unfortunately, this strain of Christian communalism does not appear in Eden’s history of the classical/Christian tradition of common property. In fact, it appears that Fenner is forging a new Christian iteration of common property along with a resistance to the enclosure of common fields. Fenner assumes, in this metaphor, that logic and rhetoric were not produced in schools but were the products of common language usage – since all people have sown the seeds of the liberal arts, everyone should have the right to reap these common fields.

The final sentence of this passage, however, abandons the notion of common property in favor of a market system. Instead of returning to the marketplace, the market has come to the corn field, transforming it from a common field into the private property
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of real estate. In this final sentence, Fenner seems to concede the inevitability of intellectual enclosure, and he tries to situate this private property within his public market, where accessibility rests on the ability to buy, to purchase “these artes, as corne fieldes proper to themselves.” As in his earlier market, the ability to buy is Fenner’s principle of accessibility, but here he adds the social specificity of rank (“some of every sort”) and a concept of intellectual ability (“cunning”). Fenner even broaches the question of education as cultural capital – how, we might ask, could logic and rhetoric compare with a corn field? What kind of crop could these subjects yield, and what kind of value could they produce? However, it does seem odd that Fenner claims common property and then immediately retreats to his market-based, or commodified, principle of accessibility. He had no qualms about depicting the schools as ivory storehouses, yet he backs off quickly from the idea of schools as enclosing landlords. Even more than before, there is a tone of fatalism to this concession in terms of “at least,” as if a commodified access is all one could realistically expect. Yet, Fenner also seems comfortable with his market metaphors, as with mercantile language in general, and

54 There is some ambiguity in the phrasing of “though by theyr cunning” – does Fenner mean to say that some of every sort should be able to glean “as though” they had purchased these arts? Fenner has a consistent problem with pronoun ambiguity in his writing, and it not entirely clear either whose cunning he is talking about, either the hoarders or the gleaners. My reading is that some of every sort should have access to education as though through their cunning, they had purchased these arts as corn fields proper to themselves.

55 This is another instance where Crane misses the distinction between commodities and capital. Crane devotes only a small paragraph to Fenner, where she quotes his market metaphor as evidence that his metaphor transforms logic and rhetoric into a “useful commodity” (36). In addition to following Fenner’s reduction of a commodity to utility, Crane also misses his shift in metaphors from the market to the farmer’s field. Thus, a book which argues that the vernacular manuals are cultural capital misses the only example which explicitly compares education with capital. Just briefly, the corn field metaphor makes Fenner sound like an early modern Pierre Bourdieu. But unlike Bourdieu, Fenner does demonstrate how his pedagogy produces value - he does not show how it compares with a corn field, in short, how it functions as capital.

---
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perhaps the common property argument was just an opening salvo meant to set the bar as high as possible.

Fenner’s economic metaphors are crucial for this dissertation because they illustrate the simultaneous modern separation and interpenetration of public and private. As a commodity, Fenner’s pedagogy is both more public and more private, more common and less common. As I argued in the Introduction, early modern publicity involved just such a paradoxical development of both public and private. We might say that Fenner’s education market is “public” in the sense that it is open to all (accessible in principle), but it is “private” in the sense that it is based on private property (the ability to buy) – it is “public” like a public auction and not like a public library. Fenner thus points to the essence of commodification as a principle of accessibility. His overall goal is to release logic and rhetoric from the enclosures of the schools, and to transfer education from the few to the many. This is a truly public impulse, whatever the complex realities of the program that follows. Yet, at the same time, Fenner’s idea of the commodity concedes the privatization of education as well. He holds up the common field as an idea of accessibility, but he ends with the notion that only some of every sort should be able to afford his educational commodity.

Fenner’s commodification of education brings us back to McKeon’s narrative of the early modern privatization of economics. McKeon has argued that the continuing ambiguity of public and private are endemic to modern capitalism and its political economy, which associates the market with “the ‘public’ as it is distinguished from the ‘private’ affairs of the household,” but which also links the market with “the ‘private’ as
it is distinguished from the ‘public sector’ of the state” (10). As McKeon argues, the modern notion of private property developed only in the course of the early modern period:

Although English common law conceived of all property to be held in fee from one’s lord – which early on meant, ultimately, from the king – the property of commoners was seen customarily as a use-right that might under different circumstances be both inclusive and exclusive, both shared with others and conditionally ‘privatized’ to some or one. The quintessential (and momentarily paradoxical) mark of private property is unconditional alienability: to own something is to be able to disown it. It has been argued that this right had been available to the English people since the later Middle Ages. Yet the view of property as a matter of delimited use-rights rather than of disposable or alienable things was the accustomed view in early modern England, and it was compatible (at least in this respect) with contemporary elaborations of natural-law theory, according to which God had originally granted dominion over the earth and its resources inclusively, to all humanity; special contractual arrangements made it conditionally available for exclusive use as well. (16)

As this passage indicates, McKeon’s analysis of early modern economics is focused entirely on property – the privatization or downward mobility of property from the monarch to the individual. Property in medieval common law was fundamentally
absolutist – people held land “in fee” and as “use-rights” but it was ultimately the property of the monarch. Beginning with this absolutist theory of property, McKeon traces the privatization of property rights until the development of modern private property in the works of John Locke.

While the devolution of absolutist property is undoubtedly an important factor in early modern economics, it does not directly address common fields and commodities. In Fenner’s work, the notion of private property emerges from the tension between common property and the commodity, from the common field and the commodified field. Practically speaking, the shift from common “use-right” to private property was probably more important to early modern people than the theoretical shift away from the ultimate property rights of the monarch. Furthermore, as I have argued above, McKeon looks only at the development of early modern privacy and not at its corresponding. As a result, McKeon does not consider the early modern commodity in his account of the emergence of both modern privacy and modern publicity. However, as we have seen in Fenner’s manual, privacy and publicity did not develop separately, and they cannot be analyzed in isolation. McKeon’s idea of the privatization of absolutist property does not account for Fenner’s economic metaphors because it does not address factors such as common fields and commodification.

Fenner’s defense of the accessibility of vernacular education is not limited to his economic metaphors. His preface, entitled “To the Christian Reader,” announces the general intention of making logic and rhetoric “common too all” (A2), and the main thrust of the preface is to defend this radical idea from a series of criticisms. In addition
to his metaphors of the market and the farmer’s field, Fenner also envisions the idea of educational accessibility in a series of further metaphors. For example, an objection to vernacular education is that it puts a sword in a fool’s hand: “Neither let them object against us,” says Fenner, “A sword in a fool’s hand: for besides that weapons are not restrained & tyed to masters of fence, nor singing to musitions onely” (A3). Rather than conceding that logic, rhetoric, and swords might be better handled by experts, Fenner defends accessibility thorough a sophisticated use of the implied arguments of metaphors. He first confronts the metaphor on its own terrain, implying that since even swords are not restricted to experts, why must the liberal arts be restricted to professional readers? But Fenner does not stop with the sword comparison – he then shifts from the martial to the musical in order to defuse the implied danger even further. Here we might even grant Fenner an argumentative touché. More generally these metaphors point to the distinction between professional and public education, implying that the liberal arts have some function (we are not told what) outside of professional utility. As we will see below, however, in Fenner’s manual, we can safely assume that the distinction is between the professional and public interpretation of the Bible. When Fenner addresses this issue more specifically, he clarifies the issue of accessibility further, suggesting that not everyone should be given a sword of the same size or quality.

Fenner does not argue quite as effectively when the objection to educational accessibility is put in terms of the university. As Fenner recounts, some people have objected to the wide accessibility of printed vernacular manuals, saying that it is “strange & newe, yea unprofitable and inexpedient” that such treatises are “made common to all
which are wont to sit in the *Doctours* chayre” (A2). Unlike the fencing metaphor, Fenner does not actually refute this claim about the power of vernacular manuals. The implication here seems to be that Fenner’s readers will presume that they have the same qualifications as a university graduate. This would not be a huge leap for someone who has read MacIlmaine’s claims to have compressed the entire contents of the university degree into his manual, but it overlooks the material fact that one needed (and still needs) credentials rather than simply knowledge in order to “sit in the *Doctours* chayre.” This is the key distinction between treating the vernacular manuals as commodified knowledge or cultural capital. Perhaps Fenner (or his publisher) was happy to leave the impression that the book had the potential of leading to the doctor’s chair. Alternatively, perhaps Fenner’s silence can be read as part of his resistance to an excess of educational accessibility. However, when Fenner does talk about limiting the excesses of education, it is mainly in terms of regulating interpretation rather than limiting the social participation of education.

Even when Fenner addresses the ordering and regulation of education, he still maintains a relatively hands-off approach. Still in his preface, Fenner defends himself from the charge of intellectual disorder:

> the simple plainnesse of these treatises, which draw men to no curious or doubtfull discourses but onely put them in minde of that which they may easily seeke and know in most familiar examples with great fruit and delight, shall sufficiently answere for themselves in this behalfe: praying all men to use them with some studie as their callings may suffer, to
strengthen their judgement, to discerne of the sayinges and writinges of other men, to keepe better that which they learne, and not beyonde their gifte and calling, to adventure to a further use then they can reach unto.

(A3)

Fenner actually includes two different kinds of regulation: first, he seems confident that his manual will regulate itself— that is, the humility or “plainnesse” of the treatises themselves will translate into an intellectual humility on the part of their readers. The linguistic content of the text is seen as regulating the reader, but this is a very different notion of social control than is usually associated with the Tudor vernacular manuals.\(^5\)

Fenner is not completely satisfied with the ability of his humble discourses to “answere for themselves,” however, and he urges his readers to practice self-regulation as well. Since there is no mention of public regulation to supplement private regulation, the idea of control takes on a kind of Foucauldian sense of internalized discipline. But Fenner ends with a very un-Foucauldian idea of the pragmatic limitations of discursive control: “if I goe beyond the capacitie or reach of the unlearned,” says Fenner, “they are to be desired either to stay till they have somewhat laboured in these artes, or els not to trouble themselves at all with this discourse, but leave it to those for whose satisfaction chiefly it is written” (A3). The pragmatic limitations of ability (or “capacitie”) do not seem to trouble an insouciant Fenner, who is happy enough whether or not the unlearned

\(^5\) Graham (1994) briefly quotes Fenner on the combination of plainness and hermeneutic order, connecting Fenner to a larger Reformed notion of stylistic plainness as signifying truth. Luther argued that scripture “offers plain and certain truths on all essential matters” (6), and Calvin developed the notion of scripture as “self-authenticating” (7).
can actually access his manual. Like Thomas Wilson thirty years earlier, Fenner turns to the idea of intellectual ability to limit the potential scope of education and interpretation. But even when Fenner is limiting the scope of his readership, the focus of regulation is moved onto, and into, the individual. Along with imagining education as public, then, Fenner must also deal with the privatization of authority and regulation to the individual. Again, we can see the constant tension between the public and the private that inheres in the imagination of public education.

The Bible, the Minister and the “Order of Housholde”

The contents of Fenner’s main text reveal that the manual’s purpose was specifically to teach the interpretation of the Bible. After a brief summary of Fenner’s logic and rhetoric instruction, this section will examine how Fenner places both the form and content of his pedagogy in the Christian household. Fenner’s striking revision to the Ramist logic and rhetoric manuals was his wholesale substitution of biblical materials for Ramus’s standard illustrations from classical poetry and oratory. Although Fenner retains Ramus’s formal approach to teaching logic and rhetoric, the biblical content steers Fenner’s entire manual toward instruction in biblical interpretation. For example, where Ramus used a Horatian *Ode* (3.21.17-20) to demonstrate that the effect of drunkenness is a loss of inhibition, Fenner uses the following illustration:

---

57 In his study of the Tudor grammar schools, Halpern (1991) argues that the early modern discourse of capacities was fundamentally a class mechanism for excluding poorer boys and for justifying social hierarchy through the principle of merit. Hanson (2005) has responded that the Tudor humanists were actually remarkably inclusive in their social recruitment of talent.
As, So GOD loved the world as hee gave his only begotten sonne, that 
whosoever beleeveth in him shoulde not perishe, but have eternal life.

Where our happinesse is the thing caused: the love of GOD, and faith the 
efficient cause. Christ the materiall cause, and eternall life the formall 
cause. (B2)

While Fenner follows the same structure of logical topics as Ramus, his biblical 
substitutions make a major difference in the ideological message of the text. The formal 
approach is the same, but Ramus’s manual has a distinctly classical and literary content, 
while Fenner’s manual is distinctly religious, even theological.

In his Arte of Rhetorike, Fenner moves to an illustration of tropes and schemes, 
but he follows the same procedure of substituting biblical for classical examples. For the 
topic of metaphor, Fenner draws again on a biblical quotation: “I.Cor. The Apostle saith, 
Doctrine muste bee tryed by fier, that, is, the evidence of the worde spirite trying doctrine 
as fire doth metals” (D1). And when Fenner goes on to define an allegory as a sustained 
metaphor, he uses a familiar biblical example: “23.Psalme, the care of God towards his 
Churche, is set forth by the woordes proper to a shephearde” (D1). In these examples, 
one can see how figurative language was not simply a stylistic ornament for Fenner but a 
linguistic support for his theology – fire is used to materialize the idea of spirit, and a 
shepherd signifies the idea of a caring deity. Fenner’s manual does not simply teach 
logic and rhetoric, then, but it teaches a way of reading the Bible using logic and rhetoric 
– it is a manual for teaching individuals to read the Bible more effectively, teaching a 
kind of “Biblical literacy.” In this sense, the Artes is a companion piece to the vernacular
Bible in an educational program of public Christianity – that is, a Christianity practiced by the larger community rather than the institution of the Church. As I will argue below, however, Fenner’s public Christianity actually involved a complex mixture of private readers and public authorities.

Fenner also teaches Ramist “method” as a tool for biblical interpretation. As in Ramus’s own books, method plays a bigger role in Fenner’s application of logic than it does in the logic manual itself, where it appears only in a small closing paragraph. Fenner describes method as the arrangement of axioms from the general to the specific: “so ordered as that the easiest and most generall bee set downe first, the harder and lesse generall next, until the whole matter be so conveied” (D). Ramus illustrated method in his logic manual using the structure of Virgil’s *Georgics*, and Fenner suggests instead that some books of the Bible, including “Acts.1.Chap.1” (D), have a similarly methodical structure. Fenner’s application of logic can be found in the three treatises following the sections on logic and rhetoric. The household manual, as we will see, is structured according to a series of dichotomies, and his biblical commentaries follow the Ramist tradition of using method to analyze the structure of written discourse. Where Ramus published commentaries on Virgil and Cicero, Fenner again substitutes biblical materials, this time the “Lord’s Prayer,” and Paul’s “Epistle to Philemon.” Fenner’s main purpose in these texts is to identify a formal structure, a kind of outline for each text as a whole. For example, Fenner divides the “Lord’s Prayer” into five structural dichotomies: the first division is between an introduction (“entraunce”) and a main text (“prayer it selfe”) (D); a second dichotomy divides the main text into a “request” and a “thanksgiving” (D); a
third dichotomy divides the request concerning God into the “right use of Gods name” and “that the woorde have passage” (D2); and the fifth dichotomy divides the request concerning ourselves into the topics of “concerning the things of this life” and of “this life to come” (D2). Fenner does the same kind of structural analysis for the “Epistle to Philemon,” but in this case he sums up the text with a small tree diagram:

This diagram really clarifies what is happening when the Ramist method is applied to a written discourse. Fenner starts with what he determines to be the most general structure of the text (introduction and main text), and he proceeds through dichotomies to the more specific level of individual verses. Interestingly, Fenner only uses dichotomies in the breakdown of structure, though Ramus and other Ramists like Abraham Fraunce allowed for any number of distinctions at each stage. Fenner’s clearest difference from other Ramists, however, was his application of logic and rhetoric directly to biblical materials. Instead of functioning to produce humanist academic knowledge of classical texts, Fenner’s Ramism produces Christian religious knowledge. Of course, logic and rhetoric had long been tools of Christian hermeneutics, but Fenner applied a distinctly Ramist
approach to these subjects, including the infamous Ramist method. Given the sensitive nature of biblical interpretation, it is understandable that Fenner included some regulation and authority in his idea of public education.

The true limits of Fenner’s concept of educational accessibility do not appear until the text of his household manual, which appears after the sections on rhetoric and logic. This work strays outside of my central topic of logic and rhetoric manuals, but it is a sober reminder that the prefatory imaginations of public education are just that – they are rhetorical constructions of social participation rather than literal descriptions of public education. Like the commodity, then, early modern public education is based on a principle of accessibility combined with a more complicated reality. Fenner is unusual in including a picture of this complicated reality in his vernacular manual in the form of his “Order of Household.” As Fenner explains, this text is an “Oiconomia,” an “order for the government of the matters of an householde, accordinge too the worde of God” (A).

Hutson (1994) briefly mentions Fenner in a chapter on the early modern household, but Fenner’s biblically-authorized household does not fit clearly within her study of the early modern reception of Xenophon. Crane, on the other hand, entirely overlooked the existence of the household manual. 58 Indeed, the biblical origins of Fenner’s household might seem self-consciously traditional, but his treatise also involves a specifically early-modern split in educational authority between the household and what Fenner calls a

58 Crane mistakenly thinks that Fenner only “initially intended” (note 93: 217) to include the household manual along with the other items. In fact, it was Robert Pepper’s 1966 anthology, *Four Books on Tudor Education*, which Crane cites, that failed to include the “Order of Householde.” This is an easy enough mistake to make in a broad survey such as Crane’s, but along with her omission of the farmer’s field
“publike” ministry. Furthermore, Fenner uses a distinctly Ramist methodical structure for the ordering of the household into a hierarchy of twenty-six dichotomies, beginning with a division of the household into the “governours” and the “governed” (A). The “Order,” therefore, involves a mixture of biblical ideas about the household with distinctly early modern issues such as Ramist method and public authority.

Many of Fenner’s biblical examples are used to set up the household according to a form of patriarchal absolutism. For example, a subsection of the household deals with gender – the husband, says Fenner, is “the chief or foregovernour,” and the wife is “a fellow helper” (B2) – and a subsection of the “governed” (or “inferiors”) distinguishes between children and servants (C3). Fenner does not generate a tree diagram out of these dichotomies, but if he did it would be a kind of corporate hierarchy, or chain of command, regarding the status and responsibilities of each person in the household. At every level of this chain of command, Fenner justifies the distinction based on biblical illustrations – for example, the idea that the man is in charge is illustrated as follows: “1.Tim.3.5. *For if any man knoweth not how to governe his owne house, how shal he care for the Church of God?*” (B2). The idea of the woman as helper is illustrated by a series of quotations, including “Tit.2.5. *That they be temperate, pure tarying at home, good, subject to their husbands, least that the word of GOD be blasphemed,***” and the danger of giving authority to women is that “they be given to gadding & to meddle with matters not fitte for their labour and travel: 1.Tim.5. *They wil go from house to house &c.*” (B2). Fenner also uses dichotomies to structure the idea of household education,
which is divided most generally between “instruction” and “reforming” (A3), and the topic of reforming is illustrated as follows: “Pro.13.24. Hee which keepeth backe his rod, hatheth his sonne, but he which loveth him, dooth give him instructions betimes” (A3). As these examples indicate, Fenner has combined biblical patriarchy with the Ramist method to systematize the hierarchical order of the household.

One might think that Fenner’s textual practice of invoking tradition would tie his treatise to this ancient ideology and prevent him from latching on to contemporary developments such as notions of privacy and publicity. But following Hill (1964), McKeon has argued that early modern patriarchal absolutism was given a contemporary boost by the Protestant critique of religious absolutism, which temporarily “reinforced the authority of the household patriarch” though it ultimately involved “weakening the appeal of patriarchalism” and “interfamilial hierarchy” (34). Using his usual encyclopedic breadth of evidence, Hill demonstrates that the household patriarch was the social limit for the democratic imagination of most early modern English Protestants. Hill quotes from Gouge’s 1626 domestic manual that says only Anabaptists overlook the difference betwixt masters and servants (475). The Protestant household, then, is an exception in McKeon’s overall argument for a general devolution of absolutism in early modern culture. The early modern household, including the one advocated by Fenner, had to contend not only with the actual monarch but with the strengthened authority of each patriarch as the king of his own castle.
An increased patriarchal authority would seem to boost the privacy of the household, but Fenner immediately counters this private authority when it comes to the issue of education. Fenner places the religious instruction of children in the home, but he is not content to place the authority for biblical instruction in the hands of the household patriarch, and instead he comes up with the notion of a public authority. In Fenner’s household, the patriarch must arrange for the “dayly instruction” of children in the scriptures, but this instruction is only to prepare them and then to help them review what they have “learned from the publike ministery” (A3). The topic of how much children can understand the Bible leads Fenner to make a further distinction about the authority and expertise of this public ministry:

2.Tim.3.15 *Thou hast knowen the Scriptures from a child*. Which cannot be spoken of a through [sic] knowledge, no nor such as belongeth to the olde men, who should be sound in faith: much lesse suche as belongeth to a Minister: but such as this, in being made acquainted with it, and caused to marke as he was able, the course of it, and to learne for use and practise, suche as his parentes were able to note unto him, and he fitte to receyve by daily practise. (A3)

Elsewhere in the household manual, Fenner simply quotes from the Bible as evidence, but here he glosses the illustration in order to clarify a hierarchy of expertise – children can “know” the scriptures to a certain degree, but not as much as “olde men” (but not old women) whose experience in the world seems to accord them some authority.
However, the highest form of expertise and authority for Fenner “belongeth to a Minister,” and he urges laymen not to “go beyond their calling” (A3). Fenner goes on to defend the need for a specialized or “set ministery” (A3v) through a long series of biblical quotations stretching almost two pages. Despite this length, Fenner does not provide any specifics about the expertise of ministers other than to say they are needed in order “with reverence and understanding to heare & receive the word” and in order to be “touched according to the matter” (A3v). Even though he clearly wants an authoritative ministry, Fenner’s opposition to the institutional Church makes him loath to draw a solid boundary between the ministry and laymen, and he often tortures his sentences by using pronouns to avoid contrasting the terms minister and layman. In one such case, Fenner tries to solve this problem by drawing on the distinction between public and private. He starts off by using pronouns – “For obedience in life it behoveth them to teach them, call on them, & see them do this which they learne” – and he closes by saying that the purpose of this instruction is “that the publike ministery and the private use of the word be not contemned” (A3v). In order to describe the proper interaction between a non-institutional ministry and the household, then, Fenner is led to the conceptual distinction between public and private.

The question that remains is what significance lies in Fenner’s distinction between the public authority of the ministry and the private use of the word. For McKeon, a key change in early modern conceptions of public and private involved the clear “separation” of the domestic from the economic:
On the one hand, the classical management of the *oikos*, of the household economy, was transformed into a model for the management of the greater household – that is, for “political economy” – whose implications were yet very different from those of the medieval analogy between the family and the state. On the other hand, the residue of this transformation – the household divested even of its economic function – became the model for the ‘domestic sphere.’ Both of these emergent categories retain in the modern world their classical associations with privacy, even as each stands in oppositional relation to the other. (10)

Fenner’s household precedes the creation of this modern domesticity, but his distinction between public and private religious education can be seen as an early articulation of this split in terms of the household.

This chapter began with the claim that Lever and Fenner’s manuals are both the most public and the most modern of all the Tudor manuals. By invoking nationalism and commodification, these manuals participate directly in two of the central themes of the modern public sphere. As we have seen over the course of this chapter, their notions of publicity are inchoate and provisional Lever’s linguistic nationalism is built on a shaky assumption that a common traditional language will be accessible to the average English man, even if those words are compounded into strange new forms. Fenner describes education through a strikingly modern discourse of commodification, but he regulates this educational market through the authority of both the minister and the early modern household. In the history of publicity, we can see Lever and Fenner as combining
emergent ideas with the dominant early modern ones in complex ways. I have tried to avoid the anachronism of applying a modern concept of the public sphere to the Tudors by focusing on the complexities of the textual evidence, on their difference as much as their continuity with modern publicity. The topic of commodification is particularly important in this regard, since Habermas and other students of a post-Restoration public sphere have largely overlooked the evidence of commodification in Tudor culture. Fenner’s manual provides a good demonstration of why we need to attend to the specifics of early modern commodification; he does not theorize the commodity as in modern economics, but he is not innocent of the idea that printed manuals are implicated in the book market; he articulates the discourse of commodification but not a fully modern discourse of commodification. By ignoring such subtle positions, public sphere theorists in the tradition of Habermas have long overlooked the complex emergence of early modern publicity in favor of a reductive account of a watershed separating the Renaissance from the Restoration. In contrast, both Lever and Fenner use the vernacular manual to imagine education as common, and in the process they participate more than any of their fellow manual writers, in imagining the publicity of a knowledge which had hitherto been the property of schools.
Chapter 5

The Practical and the Public

The first three chapters of this dissertation have examined the imagination of public education in the particular context of the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals. Chapters One and Two argued that the idea of public education did not emerge in a vacuum but in tension with more restricted forms of education – that is, elite distinction and professional utility. Chapter Three examined the two printed manuals which imagined public education extending beyond these purposes, as tied fundamentally to some form of commonality. Lever and Fenner’s manuals, along with Fraunce’s *Shepheardes Logike*, represent the broadest conception of public education among the vernacular manuals, using linguistic nationalism, the commodity, and even the pastoral mode as ways of conceiving of education and knowledge as common. These three ideas of the common – the national, the commodified, and the pastoral – represent ways of detaching education from restricted contexts such as the professions and elite distinction, and most importantly to the writers themselves, from the schools and universities. To put it another way, the idea of public education requires a principle of commonality, even if limits are also placed on the idea of social participation. In this way, the idea of public education is like other examples of publicity, such as the public market, which involve a principle of accessibility along with a mechanism of exclusion such as price. In addition to the principle of commonality, the idea of public education often involves invocations of the commoner – a cobbler, a carter, an unschooled Englishman – as a symbol and synecdoche for commonality. Thus, when Fraunce and the fiery-faced Aristotelian argue
over teaching logic to cobblers and carters, they are not really considering the needs of the commoner but are debating the more abstract notion of common knowledge.

This chapter will continue examining the idea of public education in early modern England, but will focus on two examples drawn from the larger cultural field within which the vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals are also located. I will examine first the Gresham College statutes (1596), written by an obscure group of London citizens, and second, *The Advancement of Learning* (1605), a plan for university reform by the famous Francis Bacon. Despite the vastly different reputations of these authors in intellectual history, their plans have a number of things in common. Most importantly, both the Gresham statutes and the *Advancement* argue that university knowledge should be given practical applications – that is, it should be made productive, active, and useful to society. The idea of practical application is not identical in these two sources – the Gresham statutes focus on a narrow idea of commercial utility, while Bacon has a broader sense of social utility – and they have different strategies for achieving their goals, but they share the same goal of achieving some kind of material productivity out of academic knowledge.

As I noted in my introduction, the Gresham statutes claimed that the purpose of the college was to make education “more public” by aiming it at the common benefit of London’s citizens. Although the college did make some gestures toward the common people, I will argue that the trustees who composed the original statutes were more interested in commerce than commoners. Bacon also used the word *public* in the *Advancement*, but only in his request to receive “publique designation” (61) for his
program – that is, he requested patronage from King James, to whom the book is dedicated.\(^5\) This is the limit of Bacon’s interest in the publicity of education, as his program involves not a wider social participation in education but a reorientation of knowledge in service of material productivity. As this is a very different idea of public knowledge than the examples throughout this dissertation, it will serve not only as a bookend but as a counterpoint to the vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals.

**The Statutes of Gresham College (1596)**

Studies of Gresham College have been written almost exclusively by historians of science. An early example of this work is F.R. Johnson’s article on Gresham College in the first edition of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* (1940), arguing that the college was an institutional precursor of modern science.\(^6\) A generation later, Christopher Hill argued that the college was not only a precursor of a modern scientific community but that it functioned as a kind of community college for London artisans. In addition to the
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\(^5\) Bacon’s use of “publique” to designate the monarch and the state is broadly in line with Habermas’s idea of pre-modern publicity – that is, the idea that the monarch and aristocracy are inseparable from the conception of publicness. In this sense, there is evidence that Bacon sought the “public designation” not only of the king but also of influential nobles, for whom he made elaborate presentation copies of the book. As Kiernan (2000) notes, “Six letters written to accompany presentation copies of *AL* are extant – one to his young confidant Tobie Matthew, others to important public figures: Thomas Bodley (1545-1613), the chancellors of the universities, Thomas Sackville, earl of Dorset (1536-1608), and Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury (1563-1612); Thomas Egerton, Lord Chancellor and Baron Ellesmere (1540-1617); and Henry Howard, earl of Northampton (1540-1614)” (31).

\(^6\) In place of a sudden scientific revolution, Johnson looked for a history of “landmarks” in collaborative scientific study in England, including Thomas Linacre’s medical lectureships (1518), the John Dee circle (pre-1583), and Thomas Hood’s mathematical lectures (1588). But Johnson argued that the most significant landmark was the establishment of Gresham College and the hiring of Henry Briggs, who was connected with the major mathematical thinkers of the time. Briggs, Gunter and Gellibrand were among the Gresham professors who kept the college as a physical center of scientific association through the early seventeenth century. These professors also collaborated with the Royal Navy through John Wells (1606-
statutes, Hill found evidence that some artisans did attend Gresham lectures in the
seventeenth century:

Gresham College was a centre of advanced science as well as of adult
education. In 1601, Richard More, a master carpenter, told his fellow
artisans to read Billingsley’s *Euclide* and to attend Briggs’s lectures every
Thursday if they wanted to learn modern methods of mensuration and
quantity surveying based on geometry. Richard Delamain, a joiner who
acted on this advice, acquired enough mathematics from lectures and
discussions at Gresham to become a teacher of the subject himself, and to
invent a slide rule. Another who educated himself at Gresham was
Edmund Wingate (1596-1656) a lawyer who in 1630 published a textbook
of arithmetic with a commercial emphasis, which went through many
editions. (45)

For Hill, Gresham College was the realization of public adult education in early modern
England. Instead of cobblers and carters learning logic, Hill found evidence of carpenters
and joiners learning geometry from lectures on Euclid. However, while these three men
are intriguing examples of a common man’s scientific education, they seem to have been
the exceptions rather than the rule at the college. Whatever scientific teaching happened
at the college seems to have been haphazard and tied to individual professors rather than
to the overall mission of the institution. Recent historians of science have generally been
disappointed with the lack of evidence of proto-scientific pedagogy at Gresham College.

35), and they were involved in the voyage of Captain Thomas James in search of the Northwest Passage
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Cormack (1997) argues that there is no substantial evidence of scientific pedagogy at Gresham: “no attendance records for classes at the college, no graduates per se, and no notebooks that might indicate keen attention to Gresham lectures” (205). Feingold (1999) argues that Briggs was an important mathematician, but that there is no evidence that his Gresham lectures were influential. Even Hill concedes that the daily reality of the college in the seventeenth century did not involve artisans going to scientific lectures, though he attributed this failure to university-trained professors and “royal intervention” which counteracted “the original character of Gresham college as an institution of popular adult education” (59). It seems that Hill was too sanguine about how “popular” the statutes were, taking the trustees’ claim to be making education more public as an interest in carpenters and joiners.

By focusing on how Gresham College influenced science in seventeenth-century London, previous studies have overlooked the context of its foundation and of the original composition of its statutes. In fact, what happened at the college in the seventeenth century reveals a combination of several competing educational goals, including those of the founder, the original trustees, and the professors. The trustees and the professors continually bickered over how the college should function, and they both appealed so persistently to the founder’s intentions that a professor eventually published Gresham’s will in 1724.61 This conflict between the trustees and the professors was also a battle of two competing ideas of education: the professors wanted to continue the

---

61 The will was published by Andrew Tooke as An exact copy of the last will and testament, of Sir Thomas Gresham, Kt., etc.
academic practices of the university, while the trustees wanted to make university education more practical. The wishes of the trustees were constrained in various ways, but their true purpose in making education more public was to produce commercial utility. These original trustees were not scientists or scholars but mercers and civic officials who tried to create as much commercial productivity as possible out of the materials they were given by Gresham. Before examining the arguments of the trustees and professors, then, I will look briefly at the foundation of the college in Gresham’s will.

When Sir Thomas Gresham (1518-79) endowed Gresham College in his 1575 will, he had long been a wealthy London merchant and financial adviser to the crown. Ten years earlier, Gresham had already secured his legacy as the primary founder of London’s Royal Exchange. Born as the son of a Lord Mayor of London, Gresham went to Cambridge in the mid-1530s, roughly the same time as famous educators such as John Cheke (B.A. 1530), Roger Ascham (B.A. 1535) and political figures such as Thomas Smith (B.A. 1530) and William Cecil (c.1535-38). Given these connections, it would have not have been surprising that Gresham decided to make an educational endowment, but instead of the more common route of endowing a school or a scholarship, Gresham chose lectureships in London. Gresham left the administration of the college mostly to the trustees, but he did limit their scope by prescribing academic subjects. Gresham’s will of 1575 endowed seven lectureships – in astronomy, geometry, physic, divinity, law, music, and rhetoric – which were to be given free of charge in Gresham’s London mansion, transformed into the college building. These guidelines were minimal, but they did limit the extent of commercial application for the college’s pedagogy. Gresham
himself was a London citizen and mercer just like the trustees, but he was from a previous generation and was a Cambridge graduate who did not oppose university-style education like trustees did, as we will see in the statutes.

Although Gresham chose to endow lectures in London instead of founding a new university college, his choice of subjects suggests that he wanted continuity rather than a sharp break with the university tradition. Adamson (1980) found evidence that Gresham even proposed the foundation of a second college in 1577, this time at Cambridge and in partnership with the Mercers, “to be known as ‘Sir Thomas Gresham and the Mercers’ College” (15). At the actual Gresham College in London, however, Gresham’s purpose was to transfer knowledge from the university to the city, but unfortunately he gave no indication of whom exactly he envisioned attending these lectures in his mansion on Bishopsgate Street. It was left to the Gresham trustees, then, to imagine a more specific audience for each of these seven lectures. Upon the death of Lady Gresham in 1596, the Mercers’ Company and the City of London formed a committee to draft a set of statutes that would describe how the college would run, including specifics such as who would give the lectures and who might attend. The choice of professors is recorded in a series of letters from the end of January 1596, in which the trustees appeal to the “learned judgments” of the universities to “discern of men of most sufficiency in the said faculties” (Ward 34). From a list of recommended candidates, the Gresham trustees chose a slate of seven professors and directed them to begin the lectures in Trinity term of 1597.
Right from the beginning, however, there was conflict between the trustees and professors over the nature of the lectures. When the professors refused to give the lectures in 1597, the trustees altered the lecture requirements from three per week in five academic terms, to two per week in four terms. Under these new conditions, the professors actually did begin lecturing in October of 1598, but now the trustees seem to have been unhappy with the conduct of the lectures. They suspended the professors’ salaries for eighteen months and made recourse to the Privy Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Star Chamber, and there is even a record of a plan for the parties to seek a compromise in the chambers of Francis Bacon. By 1600, however, the dispute seems to have cooled down, as the college continued to function with no further changes to the lectures. Adamson’s history of the college is well researched but too often simply sides with the frustrated trustees against the professors, who he calls lazy, obdurate, and even “independently minded” (16). Yet, Adamson does refer to the larger educational context at one point:

It is unfortunate that the Gresham trustees were rendered impotent at the outset of the College’s existence for it is clear that they envisaged the College as an institution that would provide useful education to the untutored citizens of London. A comparison of the two sets of Ordinances discussed by the trustees in 1597 and 1598 and of the arguments put forward for vernacular lectures indicate that the formalists and Latinists who wanted, it seems, little more than a transplanted Oxford or Cambridge college, were forced to retreat from their position. The second set of
Ordinances, for example, provides for vastly more vernacular lecturing than the first set, for the sensible realization had prevailed that of the citizens of London ‘few or none understand the Latin tongue.’ (16)

When Adamson suspends his moral judgments of the professors, he describes the real issue: the professors wanted to continue both the specific academic pursuits and the working conditions of the universities. Even though Gresham College did not have “students” *per se*, the professors seemed to think of lecturing as a similar practice whether the hall was filled with undergraduates or London citizens. When the trustees called for various reforms to the content and frequency of lectures, the professors pointed to Gresham’s will as an indication that he wanted university-style lectures in London.

Although the professors did begin lectures in 1598, many of them continued to resist the oversight of the trustees. For example, the first professor of physic, Matthew Gwinne, seems to have flaunted the trustees’ wishes, first by basing his lectures on the aphorisms of Hippocrates, and then by publishing them in Latin in 1605 under the title, “Two Orations at Gresham College 1598.”62 Gwinne is a good example of how the Gresham professors clung, stubbornly perhaps, to the academic context of the universities but were not lazy or perverse as Adamson describes. In fact, Gwinne seems to have been a lively and diligent scholar throughout his career. When he received his B.A. from St. John’s College, Oxford in 1578, he was made a fellow and later a “regent master” of the college. In 1584, Gwinne took up the study of physic and later practiced as a physician.

---

62 Gwinne’s Latin pamphlet is published as part of the appendix to Ward’s *Lives* (1740: 87-119). Adamson gives a detailed, if often biased, account of the evidence of the ongoing conflict between the trustees and professors.
in and around Oxford. In 1593, Gwinne was made a doctor of physic and personal physician to Sir Henry Upton, England’s ambassador to France. But Gwinne also remained a part of the academic community through the 1580s and 1590s. In 1588, he was chosen as junior proctor of the university, and in that capacity, on September 23rd of 1592, he defended the moderns against the ancients in a disputation before Queen Elizabeth. The university records indicate that Gwinne’s “wittie handleinge of the matter, and discreete behaviour, seemed much to please her majesty” (Ward 260). Gwinne had also been an associate of the Sidney group, and he continued his poetic interests after beginning at Gresham College in 1598, publishing poetry, a Latin tragedy called *Nero* in 1603, and a Latin comedy entitled *Vertumnus* in 1605. The previous year had seen Gwinne back at Oxford for a royal visit, this time criticizing tobacco in a disputation before King James in the morning before the entourage moved to Magdalen College in the afternoon for a performance of *Vertumnus* by the St. John’s men. About the same time, Gwinne was admitted to the college of physicians in London and appointed by James as the physician to the Tower. I quote Gwinne’s biography and works at length to show the type of scholars who were nominated for the Gresham professorships. It is not surprising that someone like Gwinne was dedicated to university-style education during his time at Gresham College, even when the professorship involved giving lectures in London.
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63 The connection between Gresham professors and the broad content of the university arts course was not confined to Gwinne or to the physic professorship. All of the early Gresham professors held a master of arts from either Oxford or Cambridge, and they often pursued more than one subject throughout their careers. The first Gresham professor of astronomy, Edward Brerewood, published on a number of subjects, including logic and modern languages, and write commentaries on Aristotle’s *Ethics*, and two treatises on
The professors’ motives in the conflict at the foundation of Gresham College are quite clear, but the intentions of the original trustees are more difficult to discern. As I have argued, the trustees were somewhat limited by Gresham’s choice of subjects, which came from the university context and which called for university-trained professors such as Gwinne. Still, the trustees tried to use the statutes to steer the college away from the academic knowledge of the universities. In doing so, the trustees were continuing the tradition of critiquing university education that we have seen in many of the vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals. As we have seen, however, there could be different motivations behind this critique, from Puttenham’s desire to produce courtly distinction, to MacIlmaine’s goal of compressing university knowledge into a little book of professional expertise, to Fenner’s claim that the liberal arts should be affordable to all. Like many of the vernacular manuals, the Gresham trustees also invoked the idea of common knowledge; in the passage I quoted at the beginning of the dissertation, the trustees claimed to be making education “more publique” by targeting the common benefit of London’s citizens. This is a civic variation of common knowledge – addressed not to “everyone” but to “every citizen” – a necessarily more modest claim since a college could not claim as wide a potential audience as a printed book. Although the size

the Sabbath during his time at Gresham College. The next astronomy professor, Thomas Williams, was given a testimonial from Oxford stating that he was a master of arts, and “in our judgement is very fit publicly to profess any of them” (Ward 76). Indeed, it is often difficult to decide which lectureship a Gresham professor held simply by looking at a list his publications. On the other hand, there are three pre-civil-war Gresham professors who seem to fit more closely with the model of Gresham college as a prototype of the Royal Society. The original geometry professor, Henry Briggs, and his protégés Henry Gellibrand and Edmund Gunter, seem to have focused exclusively on mathematics and to have been interested in applying geometry to the improvement of navigation. Briggs even credited his Gresham lectures with inspiring his simplified technique of applied logarithms (Ward 123).
of the trustees’ imaginary public was smaller, we can see the same socially-universal rhetoric in their appeals to the common and the (more) public.

But what exactly did the trustees mean by these invocations of the common, and in this case, of the public? We have seen that a more specific social function often lies beneath a sweeping opening gesture at the common benefit of everyone. The evidence from the statutes indicates that the trustees themselves were primarily interested in the commercial application of education. Previous studies have not seen the commercial emphasis of the trustees, but this is because it is hidden by the complex attempt to pitch all seven of the lectures as practical and for the common benefit. However, the trustees were clearly most interested in the commercial potential of the law, geometry and astronomy lectures. Crucially, the law lecture is directed not at the professional use of lawyers but at the practical legal needs of “merchants and other citizens” (vi). Where Fraunce distinguished between education for lawyers and for the common man, the trustees make a distinction between lawyers and merchants. Where Fraunce claimed to be transporting the discipline of university study to Gray’s Inn, the trustees take the opportunity to critique the impracticality of university education. The trustees direct the law professor specifically “not to read after the manner of the university” but to choose legal topics “that best serve to the good liking a capacity of the said auditory, and are more usual in common practice” (vi). It was conventional to contrast the arcane study of the universities with common knowledge, but the trustees use the notion of ‘common practice’ to denote the commercial use of law by merchants. This is a highly specific
notion of practical education as productive in the civic and commercial context of London.

The other main instance of the commercial aim of the Gresham trustees is their description of the geometry and astronomy lectures. The geometry professor is instructed to teach both “theoretical” and “practical” geometry, while the astronomy professor is directed to teach “the use of the astrolabe and the staff, and other instruments for the capacity of mariners,” and to “apply them to use, by reading geography, and the art of navigation” (viii). This passage has been central in studies of the college by historians of science, but the trustees who wrote this description were not scientists and mathematicians but merchants and citizens. Their interest in “practical” geometry and astronomy, like their interest in practical law, was based on its commercial value. The trustees’ interest in mariners and navigation connects them primarily with the realm of international commerce rather than practical science. This is what the trustees really mean when they call for education to be more public and for the common benefit of citizens. When they say public, common and practical, they mean commercial.

On the other hand, the Gresham trustees did not have commercial applications for the subjects of rhetoric, music, physic and divinity. Gresham’s will required them to provide lectures in these subjects, and the statutes show that the trustees tried to find some other kind of utility for each of them. As I have shown in previous chapters, the subject of rhetoric had a number of possible applications outside of the universities. Cox aimed rhetoric at the professions in general, while Horsfall tailored his manual for the specific vocational purpose of writing sermons. The Gresham trustees, however, had no
interest in teaching rhetoric to professionals, nor did they attempt to find a commercial application for the topic. The statutes have almost nothing to say about how rhetoric should be taught. The description of the rhetoric lecture is limited to the prosaic details of when it will be given: “twice every week in the term time upon Saturday” (viii), mornings in Latin and afternoons in English. These instructions are even less descriptive than those for the music lecture, which the trustees were able to fit into their philosophical division between “the theorique part” and the “practique,” the latter in the form of “voice or of instrument” (viii). The Gresham trustees understood rhetoric and music as inevitably impractical subjects without potential commercial application. The fact that Thomas Gresham endowed these subjects is the most visible sign that he did not have the same philosophy of education as the trustees.

We have already seen an example of the first Gresham physic professor, but the statutes indicate how differently the trustees pictured this lecture. The statutes explicitly warn the professor to avoid the academic “exposition of some part of Galen or Hippocrates.” Instead, he was supposed to aim the lecture broadly at “every man,” who “for his healths sake, wil desire to have some knowledge in the art of physic” (viii). For the trustees, the practical value of a physic lecture was to teach a basic knowledge of first-aid. If they really wanted to provide this kind of practical instruction, however, it seems that Matthew Gwinne was the wrong man for the job – his strong connection with university humanism implies a completely different approach to physic than the one described in the statutes. For my argument, however, the most important element of the
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64 For examples of the potential utility of rhetoric for early modern merchants, see Magnusson (1999): 114-189.
physic lecture is the casual way that the trustees describe its relevance to “every man.”

Where the statutes specified merchants for the law lecture and mariners for the astronomy lecture, they broaden the target of the physic lecture to “everyone.” This gesture shares the generality of the prefatory invocations by Lever and Fenner. It is even harder to imagine “everyone” showing up for a Gresham lecture than it is to imagine a universal readership for a vernacular manual – a college lecture has a material reality that the imagined readership conjured in the preface to a book lacks – and the implied address here was probably much smaller than literally everyone, even “every man.”

The final example of the social imagination of the Gresham trustees is their description of the divinity lecture. Again, the question of commercial application is not relevant for this subject, and the trustees are not interested in the professional training of ministers. Instead, the divinity professor is directed to instruct the “common people” in order to avoid the “common adversaries of the popish church, and other authors of new sects and strange opinions, who endeavor to pervert the minds of ignorant people” (v). Here again is the familiar educational target of the common people, this time also figured as the “ignorant people.” Given their description, it is unlikely that the Gresham trustees wanted to follow Fenner’s example of teaching hermeneutic skills to the common people. In other words, the common people are not the subjects but the objects of education, or perhaps indoctrination, in this example. In the absence of a commercial application for divinity, the trustees fell back on the idea the utility of religion for social order. Hill has argued that care was taken throughout the seventeenth century to avoid controversy in the
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Gresham divinity professorship, with the exception of the early 1630s when the Puritan Richard Holdsworth held the post and “started the Gresham lectures by referring to Jesus Christ as ‘the good merchant’” (56). For the most part, however, the divinity lecture was a tool of social order, like Wilson’s version of rhetoric as the means to persuade the common people of their place in the social order. The Gresham divinity lecture, like Wilson’s idea of rhetoric, was less an example of public education than a tool for ideological control.

Various people continued to debate the proper function of Gresham College throughout the seventeenth century, and the central issue continued to be the accessibility of the lectures. The most vivid appeal to the original intentions of Thomas Gresham appeared in an anonymous 1647 quarto entitled *Sir Thomas Gresham His Ghost*, featuring the founder returning from his grave and adopting the heroic couplet to take up the complaints of a group of contemporary “Sea-Men and other Artists” (3). Gresham’s ghost confirms that he intended the college for the benefit of such men. As they say,

The good old Knight Sir Thomas Gresham gave
His House (for publick good) that such as have
Desire to learne might duly there be taught:
How is’t neglected how is’t brought to nought? (3)

Here the notion of “publick good” comes directly out of the mouths of a group of mariners and artisans who seem to be concerned with their own interests rather than the general idea of commercial gain. Contrary to what the ghost confirms, there is no record that Thomas Gresham was concerned with such commoners. Even the trustees, who also
used the word *public*, and who directed the astronomy lectures at mariners such as these sea-men, were more concerned with the interests of commerce than those of commoners. In fact, the trustees thought of the “publick good” of commoners and commonality only when they could not think of a more specific commercial application, and then, they conceived primarily of using religion to control ignorant commoners such as these “sea-men and other artists.” The only subject that the trustees conceived as common knowledge was physic, but professors like Gwinne were apparently not interested in teaching even this subject to “every man.”

As the notion of publicity developed through the seventeenth century, it seems that Gresham College continued to be a symbol for the possibilities of public education. Although a full account of the college into the eighteenth century is beyond the scope of this chapter, one can see an outline of changing ideas of public education, beginning with Gresham himself and continuing through the history of conflict over the social function of the college.65 As we move to the section on Francis Bacon, it should be noted that Gresham College was heavily influenced by scientific thought in the middle of the seventeenth century, especially in the years leading up to the foundation of the Royal Society. The most ambitious plan to reform Gresham College as a whole was put forward by William Petty in 1649, calling for the college to become a center of scientific research rather than education. Petty called for the dissolution of the divinity, rhetoric

65 Another anonymous pamphlet, *An Account of the Rise, Foundation, Progress and Present State of Gresham-College in London* (1707), uses the college as a symbol for unlimited potential of knowledge and power through public education. Again, the writers of this pamphlet project their idea of education directly onto “that Noble and Publick Spirited person, Sir Thomas Gresham” (1).
and law professorships and an overall reorientation of the college as a research
institution. As Adamson explains, “Petty suggested various improvements to the residual
scientific lectures and in place of those abandoned he envisaged a professor of
magnetism, one of optics and one to investigate the techniques, processes, problems and
requirements of all the common trades such as leather working, metal working, dyeing
and tanning” (23). As Petty’s plan indicates, the commercial orientation of the original
trustees was not incompatible with the development of scientific research. Petty has no
trouble reconciling the scientific with the commercial, but he seems to have no interest in
continuing the mission of the college to make education more public.

Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* (1605)

Like the Gresham trustees, Francis Bacon was concerned with making academic
knowledge more practical, but Bacon has a very different notion of how this should be
done. Most importantly for my argument, Bacon does not even gesture at the notion of
making education more public by increasing the social participation in academic learning.
When Bacon criticizes the universities, it is not for their social exclusivity but for their
failure to make education productive. In a familiar opening passage, Bacon describes his
book as a “generall and faithfull perambulation of learning” to determine which “parts
thereof lye fresh and wast, and not improved & converted by the Industrie of man” (61).
We have seen many examples of Tudor critiques of the universities as hoarding
knowledge by enclosing the common fields of education, but the purpose of Bacon’s
survey of learning is to create more enclosure – for the unproductive parts of learning to
be “improved” and “converted.” This, of course, was the exact language of early modern agricultural innovation, whose most notorious example was turning tillage into pasture in order to produce higher profits from wool. As More’s Utopia describes the scenario, the English sheep seem to have turned the tables on the farmers – “they have become so greedy and fierce that they devour human beings themselves” (18). Like the agricultural improvers, Bacon is not concerned with the situation of individuals (either students denied access to the universities, or farmers eaten by sheep) but with the overall productivity of the system.

The closest comparison to this example in the vernacular manuals, of course, is Fenner’s description of the liberal arts as corn fields. In Bacon’s metaphor, we are back in the fields, but the social relations are very different. Where Fenner’s main concern was accessibility and social participation in knowledge – why should not all reap where all have sown? – Bacon’s sole concern is with production: how can he reap the highest possible yield from these intellectual fields? Where Fenner concedes that an open market is the most accessibility one could realistically expect, Bacon seems to take it for granted that both land and knowledge are forms of capital. Where Fenner was the first of my examples to articulate that education was a commodity, Bacon gives the clearest description of education as intellectual capital. In the early modern context, there could be no better metaphor for intellectual capital than the agricultural improvement of land.

Bacon’s purpose in writing the Advancement, then, is to “improve” the universities so that they produce a higher intellectual yield. While this metaphor is evocative, it does not tell us exactly what Bacon had in mind for university reform. If the
universities were now tilling the soil, what is the intellectual equivalent of converting them to pasture? In the vernacular manuals, we have seen that professional application is a common example of productive knowledge, but this is certainly not the goal of Bacon’s *Advancement*. Bacon explicitly distinguishes his idea of active knowledge from the professions when he laments that the “great Foundations of Colledges in Europe” are “dedicated to Professions, “while none are “left free to Artes and Sciences at large” (57). Like the Gresham trustees, Bacon is interested in applying knowledge outside of the professions. As I argued above, however, the trustees had a limited imagination of how academic knowledge could be useful to the citizens of London. The best they could come up with, it seems, was to teach astronomy to mariners for navigation and to introduce commercial law to merchants. By contrast, Bacon’s commercial plans for education seem extremely ambitious, focusing as they do on the overall state of knowledge.

Before examining Bacon’s specific recommendations for reform, I will briefly mention one more educational goal that Bacon rejects: that is, social distinction. Despite his high birth, or perhaps because of it, Bacon seems entirely uninterested in education as a tool for producing distinction. In another well-known passage from the *Advancement*, Bacon dismisses the linguistic excesses of humanism, “that delicate and polished kinde of learning” (23), as another obstacle to the productivity of knowledge. For Bacon, English humanists such as Roger Ascham privileged style over substance, language over knowledge, form over content; as Bacon concludes, “In summe, the whole inclination and bent of those times was rather toward copie, than weight” (23). Bacon draws on an
anti-Ciceronian topos, conventional in England at least since Erasmus’s *Ciceronianus* (1528), but he marshals the argument toward his program for educational productivity.

At another time, we might quibble with Bacon’s reduction of Ascham, and indeed all humanism “of those times” to stylistic “copie,” but the point here is that Bacon contrasts stylistic education to his program’s emphasis on the “weight” of practical knowledge. Elsewhere in the *Advancement*, Bacon makes a similar critique of humanist commonplace books, which bear “merely the face of a *Schoole*, and not of a *World,*” and which refer only to “Pedantical Divisions without all life, or respect to Action” (118). The contrast here is no longer in terms of style and substance (“copie” and “weight”) but between the institution and the active world. At this point, Bacon starts to sound like some of the vernacular manuals in their calls to release logic and rhetoric from the confines of the university into the world. As we have seen, however, there have been various rationales behind these calls to “open” the university. As in previous examples, it is not entirely clear what Bacon’s purpose is in transferring knowledge from the school to the world. What exactly does it mean, for instance, to consider knowledge with respect to life and action? Indeed, the answer to this question is not readily apparent when one leafs through the pages of the *Advancement of Learning*.

In fact, the bulk of the text is comprised of a rather abstract classification of academic knowledge. Throughout his survey of learning in Book Two, Bacon performs a methodical breakdown of educational topics from the general to the specific. For example, he begins by dividing “humane learning” into the three parts of man’s understanding: “HISTORY to his MEMORY, POESIE to his IMAGINATION, and
PHILOSOPHIE to his REASON” (62). Each of these topics is then subdivided, as poesie, for example, is broken into “NARRATIVE; REPRESENTATIVE, and ALLUSIVE” (74). As readers of this dissertation will recognize immediately, this is the Ramist method of dividing and subdividing an object of inquiry. We have seen Fraunce apply method to poetry and Fenner apply it to the household, but Ramus himself applied method primarily to the academic subjects of logic and rhetoric. Bacon takes Ramus’s approach to knowledge to the extreme by applying it to all of the academic subjects instead of individual ones. Unfortunately, Bacon did not construct a single tree diagram for the Advancement as Ramus did for his surveys of logic and rhetoric – perhaps the diagram would have been too big for such an ambitious project, but it would have made a fascinating piece of evidence.

It might appear, then, that the Advancement is actually an “academic” exercise of method, more at home in the school than the world, and not concerned with action at all. In a recent article, Wallace (2006) has stressed Bacon’s connection with Ramism and the history of method in humanist schooling. Compared with seventeenth-century educators like Milton (1644) and Cowley (1661), who include actual agricultural knowledge in their program (and call for literal “field trips”), Wallace argues that Bacon’s pedagogy is situated resolutely in the school. Without denying Bacon’s reliance on the Ramist

---

66 Wallace relies on Grafton and Jardine’s account of humanist method in the Tudor schools as involving “classroom aids (textbooks, manuals, and teaching drills) which were to compartmentalize the bonae litterae and reduce them to a system” (169). While I have been critical of the Grafton/Jardine account of Ramism as a tool for producing elite distinction, there is no doubt that Ramism involved a systematization of humanist pedagogy. Jardine’s first book (1974) made the strongest connection between Bacon and the tradition of humanist method.
method, a reliance which is actually a plagiarism of Ramus’s approach to the analysis of academic subjects, I maintain that Bacon uses method for a different purpose than Ramus does himself. While Ramus’s reforms were focused resolutely on academic knowledge itself, Bacon often looks outside the university. Granted, Bacon does not suggest empirical observations in either a field or a laboratory, but his agrarian metaphor indicates his overall interest in the material productivity of knowledge. This is how Bacon theorizes academic knowledge as capital – he sees the university as producing valuable and useful things, just like a field produces corn, or once it has been “improved,” it produces more market value out of wool.

Bacon’s enclosure metaphor is his most striking image for the productivity and capitalization of education, but it does not connect obviously to his classification of knowledge in the Advancement. While he “surveys” the intellectual fields to find areas in need of improvement, he does not give an example of how these areas will be improved – he does not give us the equivalent for sheep and wool. However, Bacon does include another metaphor that makes a more direct connection between classification and utility:

For if a secretary of Estate, should sort his papers, it is like in his study, or generall Cabinet, he would sort together things of a Nature, as Treatises, Instructions, &c. But in his Boxes, or particular Cabinet, hee would sort together those that he were like to use together, though of severall Natures: So in this general Cabynet of knowledge, it was necessary for me to follow the divisions of the Nature of things, whereas if my selfe had
beene to handle any particular knowledge, I would have respected the

*Divisions fittest for use*” (133).

In this case, a bureaucratic filing system represents the combination of classification and
utility. Wallace argues that this passage shows that “Bacon is wholly concerned with the
mechanics of instruction” (171), as if “fittest for use” clearly signifies classroom
pedagogy. On the contrary, I would argue that this passage is concerned with
distinguishing between theoretical and practical knowledge. Although the meaning of
“fittest for use” is not entirely clear, the context of the passage is political rather than
pedagogical. In fact, the secretary’s cabinet symbolizes Bacon’s distinction between the
pedantic knowledge of the school and the active knowledge of the world. There are
actually two cabinets: a “generall Cabinet” based on “the Nature of things;” and a
“particular Cabinet” based on “Divisions fittest for use.” For Bacon, the general cabinet
is theoretical and metaphysical (corresponding to “the Nature of things”) as Bacon sees
traditional academic knowledge, and the particular cabinet is productive like his reformed
and improved university.

Still, Bacon’s conception of productive knowledge is confined to the realm of
metaphor, and even in this realm he has not connected the universities clearly with the
world. Wallace is correct that the *Advancement* does not include examples of knowledge
as gleaned from the empirical observation of the world. Nor does Bacon follow the
vernacular manual writers and the Gresham trustees in imagining specific practical
applications for academic knowledge. Bacon is interested neither in the professional
application of subjects like law and physic, nor in the specific possibilities of applied
knowledge by mariners, merchants, cobbler or carters. Instead, Bacon is committed to re-conceiving productivity entirely through classification and metaphor. Thus, Bacon’s clearest expression of the potential productivity of university knowledge is also in the form of metaphor, although this time Bacon draws on the classical metaphor of Livy’s fable of the belly:

For if men judge that learning should bee referred to action, they judge well: but in this they fall into the Error described in the ancient Fable; in which the other parts of the body did suppose the stomache had beene ydle, because it neyther performed the office of Motion, as the lymmes doe, nor of Sence, as the head doth: But yet notwithstanding it is the Stomache that digesteth and distributeth to all the rest: So if any man thinke Philosophie and Universalitie to be idle Studies; hee doth not consider that all Professions are from thence served, and supplyed. And this I take to bee a great cause that hath hindered the progression of learning, because these Fundamental knowledges have bene studied but in passage. (57)

Rather than suggest a greater dissemination of knowledge, Bacon reconfigures knowledge in order to make the university the center of a system – a body of knowledge, whose active parts rely on an apparently idle center. In this way, knowledge can be active, productive and practical, while still remaining in a socially limited institution. In the terms of the vernacular manuals, Bacon’s knowledge is still hoarded and enclosed, and his reform is to make this knowledge more productive.
As in Bacon’s pro-enclosure metaphor for his reform, he is not concerned with connecting productivity with common knowledge and educational inclusiveness. Bacon’s only concern with the social whole is as a system, which he visualizes through the body metaphor. The fable of the belly was a common apologia for the concentration of wealth and power, as voiced by Agrippa in *Coriolanus* (c. 1609-10), but Bacon appropriates the image for the institutional concentration of knowledge.\(^6\)\(^7\) The body is now a metaphor for knowledge rather than for social relations, and the limbs are no longer people but projects. By using a classical fable, Bacon draws on a convention of humanist education, and Wallace might argue that this situates Bacon’s program in the context of the humanist classroom. But again, Bacon’s program is distinguished by its overall goal of productivity and practical application in the active world. Although Bacon draws on many conventional ideas in the *Advancement* – and sometimes appears to be merely rearranging the intellectual furniture – he does so in service of an innovatively ambitious program of practical knowledge.

To conclude this chapter, I would like to consider one more early modern depiction of Gresham College, this time in Part Two of Thomas Heywood’s play, *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1606). Although the central event of the play is Thomas Gresham’s foundation of London’s Royal Exchange in 1565, its most striking event is a scene where Gresham grinds a pearl worth 15,000 pounds into powder and then drinks it in a glass of wine. Immediately after drinking the pearl, Gresham decides to
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\(^6\) Rebhorn (1995) does not refer to Bacon’s use of the belly fable, but he demonstrates that it was a commonplace in Renaissance rhetoric. For Rebhorn, while the fable itself is an ideological confirmation of social hierarchy, it was open to complex manipulation and appropriation by its Renaissance users.
take his startled onlookers, including two Lords and a Russian prince, on a tour of
Gresham College. He tells the group, “please you but to see my schoole / Of the seven
learned liberal sciences, / Which I have founded here neare Bishopsgate” (301). This
scene thus concerns not only merchant wealth but its relation to educational foundations.
Although Gresham defends his destruction of the pearl as a necessary demonstration of a
professional capacity for risk, and not “prodigal of my wealth” (301), Heywood invites
the reader to compare Gresham College with the pearl scene as a simple (and literal) act
of conspicuous consumption. This statement points to the larger early modern
understanding of merchant wealth, including issues of production and consumption. 68

In the play, as in much of early modern culture, the production of Gresham’s
wealth is as mysterious and fantastic as this spectacle of consumption. This chapter has
argued that the question of productivity has been central to the educational goals of both
the Gresham trustees and Francis Bacon. While the trustees limited their plans to the
direct commercial application of subjects like law and astronomy, Bacon tried to resituate
academic knowledge within a productive system but in doing so elided the distributive

68 My argument here builds on Jean Howard’s (2002) study of the play as a “chronicle comedy” based on
the historical source of Stow’s Survey of London. Howard argues that Heywood adds the international
merchant figure to Stow’s nostalgic depiction of London’s citizens as industrious artisans, civic-minded
lord mayors and prosperous guildsmen. Thus, Heywood’s Gresham is not the historical person but an
ideological figure, a “royal citizen” (174) who negotiates the old and new commercial ideologies. For
developments of Howard’s analysis of the play, see also Crupi (2004) and Casellas (2007).

Heywood’s position on the college becomes clear when he has Gresham boast about the college
that he is “not like those that are not liberal / Till they be dying; what we meant to give, / We will bestow
and see done whilst we live” (301). Heywood’s audience would almost certainly have known that the
college had just opened a few years before the play in 1598, amid much controversy, and was not giving
lectures when Gresham was still alive and in the play’s setting of 1565. Since Gresham was not actually so
liberal while he lived, this must be a critique of Gresham’s endowment of the college as memorial and
status symbol after his death. Critics have long dismissed Heywood’s play as a mercantile hagiography of
Gresham, but its treatment of Gresham College suggests that the play engages with a more complicated
civic politics.
aspect of education. Compared with the vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals, these ideas of practical application seem to make education more private rather than more public – the trustees seem concerned with the private interests of merchants like themselves, while Bacon wants to enclose all of knowledge and turn it into a private enterprise. Yet, the Gresham trustees advertised their program as public education, and they oversaw free lectures that may have been more public than they envisaged. Bacon did not appeal to public education as accessibility in principle, but he did consider education as public in the sense of relating the social whole. By ending my study of Tudor public education with Gresham College and Bacon, I am not charting a narrative of inevitable progress or decline in educational publicity, then, but indicating the complex dynamic of public and private that run through the social imagination of early modern pedagogy.

My final section on Bacon has pointed to a distinction between knowledge and education that has not been a feature of earlier chapters. For the writers of vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals, knowledge and education seem to have been coextensive. These writers conceived of education in the model of common distribution, where education is something that meets people’s needs. This is why the most ready comparison in the manuals is between hoarding and common distribution, as in Fenner’s images of fields and storehouses. Bacon, however, does not rely on the same equation between knowledge and education, and the social tends to recede and even disappear in his work. In other words, Bacon’s reform of academic knowledge elides its social
recipient, just as the social body in Livy’s fable becomes a socially unspecific body of knowledge.

I began this dissertation by insisting that the history of publicity extends backwards to the Tudors rather than beginning suddenly in the seventeenth century. I have thus adopted Michael McKeon’s history of public knowledge as involving appeals to the common-as-general and the common-as-commoner to explain the odd prevalence of cobblers, carters and other common people in many of the Tudor manuals. However, I have taken the concept of public knowledge from an era when it had been developed in respect to topics such as science, democracy and economics, when the concept seems much more defined and developed. There is certainly no Tudor equivalent for the commonality of knowledge in modern science or the commonality of participation in democratic politics. Most importantly for my argument, in the context of the Tudor logic and rhetoric manuals, the idea of common knowledge is inchoate and provisional, and it often seems inseparable from the commonality of education – that is, the manual writers imagine vernacular print as distributing the utility of education more or less equally without changing the status of knowledge/education as a hoarded property of the university. In Bacon’s *Advancement*, we can see a very different conception of academic reform, where the knowledge of the universities is not distributed but transformed, activated, and “improved.”

Over the course of this dissertation, I have offered the notion of public education as an alternative to previous readings of the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals. In Chapter One, I pushed against the most prevalent reading of the manuals as a linguistic
mode for producing elite distinction and social reproduction. Without denying that logic and rhetoric were used for these purposes, I argued that the production of authority and distinction, issues which have dominated recent studies, are minor features of the manuals as a whole. In Chapter Two, I examined the manuals which target logic and rhetoric at a specific professional application for lawyers, ministers and physicians. In this context as well, I argued that public education resisted the dominant thrust of this group towards the professional utility of a small vocational group. In Chapter Three, I examined the tension between public education and the commodification and capitalization of discourse. I developed a contrast between the common and the commodity – that is, between the longstanding tradition of common knowledge and the early modern commodification of printed discourse. Finally, Chapter Four looked at two examples where the commodification and capitalization of education seem to have overwhelmed, or at least transformed, the urge toward public education that I identified in the Tudor manuals.

In all of the chapters, then, I have described public education in opposition to other social forces – distinction, reproduction, authority, order, professional utility, commercial utility, commodification, and capitalization. Indeed, I have discussed many instances where the manual writers themselves oppose these forces with the idea of communality. In fact, the manuals constantly associate practices like distinction and authority with the university and then differentiate themselves from these narrow social goals. In the Tudor evidence, then, there is a strong sense of conflict between the practices of the university and the goals of vernacular manuals, between hoarded
knowledge and common knowledge. However, I have also discussed instances of tension, conflict and contradiction within the manuals themselves, where the notion of public education is in constant tension with opposed social forces such as distinction, authority, and the drive to produce professional and commercial utility. Wilson’s rhetoric manual includes both the image of persuasion as a tool of social order and the idea of plain language as involving a commonality of education. The works of MacIlmaine and Fenner, as I have argued, address both professionals and commoners as allies in the fight against the universities. Fenner’s manual probably involves the highest rate of conceptual contradiction, where common knowledge is set against both commodified knowledge and the hierarchical authority of the household and the minister. In these cases, the publicity of education is not opposed to something else but is entangled with political, religious and economic forces.

When I have discussed the specific context of education, I have rejected the conventional explanations of social reproduction, elite distinction and cultural capital. However, perhaps these approaches should be revised rather than rejected. Instead of opposing Tudor public education to concepts such as distinction, reproduction, commodification and capital, the chapters of this dissertation indicate that publicity should be read in relation to these practices. Perhaps there is a public form of distinction, a public method of social reproduction, and a public production of education as either a commodity or capital. In other words, the history of publicity should encompass the entire range of relevant educational thought. This may or may not include topics like the expansion of Tudor grammar schools, and the foundation of scholarships to increase the
social participation of schooling. While I have been examining public “education,” my
topic has been primarily printed manuals rather than schools or other forms of education.
When I discuss the imagination of public education, I am not referring to actual
educational practices but to a printed discourse about the social possibilities of education.
By referring to the “imagination” of public education, I hope I have distinguished
between the concept of education and the material practice of education, most notably
institutional schooling. Although all of the manual writers I have discussed went to
university, it is significant that none of them worked as schoolmasters or at the
universities. This is an indication of the different goals behind schooling and the desire
to write a vernacular logic or rhetoric manual. There is a kind of utopianism in the Tudor
manuals as a whole, motivated perhaps by the novelty of vernacular print in conjunction
with more specific religious, political or economic goals. Instead of working in schools
and universities, the manual writers on the whole took up a specific opposition to the
social practices of schools, often in terms of the common people and the common
knowledge which together I have been calling public education.

An alternative way of discussing the manuals as a form of education would be
through the notion of public discourse, a concept which emphasizes the textual form of
the vernacular manuals. Michael Warner (2002) has theorized a sophisticated account of
the relation between the content of public discourse and the reality of its circulation.
Warner argues that public discourse is not only imaginary but also performative – it tries
to specify the reality of its circulation by calling a readership into existence. As Warner
argues,
Public discourse says not only: “Let a public exist,” but: “Let it have this character, speak this way, see the world in this way.” It then goes out in search of confirmation that such a public exists, with greater or lesser success – success being further attempts to cite, circulate, and realize the world-understanding it articulates. Run it up the flagpole, and see who salutes. Put on a show, and see who shows up. (82)

Print a common man’s logic, and see who buys it. There is certainly some extent of this performativity in the public addresses of the Tudor vernacular manuals. In fact, the concern with the reality of circulation probably explains why Fraunce’s work was published as the *Lawiers Logike* and not the *Shepheardes Logike*. However, my focus has been on the primary conceptualization of education as public rather than the reality of its potential circulation. I have not, for instance, considered the literacy rates of English cobblers and carters in the 1580s as a background to Fraunce’s work. Instead, I have considered these commoners as part of Fraunce’s imagination of education as public, perhaps an earlier and less material version of Warner’s idea of public discourse. Indeed, a major challenge for the study of early modern publicity is the need to work with a theory that has been developed by scholars of the eighteenth century like McKeon and Warner. While their work is invaluable to our understanding of how publicity functions and how it developed after the Restoration, it is important not to map the relative coherence and reality of publicity from the 1680s back to the 1580s. By referring to the imagination of public education rather than public educational discourse, I have focused on the emergent status of early modern publicity.
I would like to conclude this dissertation by reinforcing the fact that there is no single idea behind the invocation of the public in the Tudor vernacular logic and rhetoric manuals. There is an interesting and productive variety of social thought that informs the manuals’ many prefatory invocations of commoners and commonality. These social invocations are in direct relation to the variety of social locations from which the manuals were written. Even the three manuals with the broadest invocation of educational publicity drew on the three diverse social principles of the pastoral, the national and the commodity. I find these invocations of the public most intriguing precisely because they are so various, and because they combine education with the political, religious and economic spheres. Contrary to the Habermasian school of public sphere theory, which allows only an impoverished notion of early modern publicity, the Tudor vernacular manuals indicate a lively and burgeoning discourse surrounding the imagination of public education.
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