

SPENSER NEWSLETTER

Winter 1979

Volume 10

Number 1

INTERNATIONAL SPENSER CONFERENCE

SPENSER AT MLA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Co-editors: Foster Provost, Cherie Ann Haeger

Corresponding Editors: Elizabeth Bieman, James Neil Brown, Donald Cheney,
Alice Fox, A. Kent Hieatt, Waldo F. McNeir, Richard Schell

Sponsored by the Departments of English,
Duquesne University and Gannon College

CONTENTS

TO OUR READERS	1
INTERNATIONAL SPENSER CONFERENCE	1
Welcome by Conference Director	3
Panel 1: <u>The Limits of Cooperative Study</u> Chair: Donald Cheney	4
Panel 2: <u>A Complete and Acceptable Text for Teaching</u> Chair: A. C. Hamilton	9
Panel 3: <u>Cooperation in the Study of Spenser's Medieval</u> <u>Backgrounds</u> Chair: Alice S. Miskimin	13
Panel 4: <u>Cooperation in the Study of Spenser's Continental</u> <u>Backgrounds</u> Chair: Waldo F. McNeir	16
Panel 5: <u>A Spenser Encyclopedia</u> Chair: David A. Richardson	18
Demonstration Project: <u>Cooperation in the Study of the</u> <u>Continental Backgrounds of Shakespeare's</u> <u>Sonnets—A Model for Cooperation</u> Robert M. Giannetti	21
Major Address: <u>The Achievement of Edmund Spenser</u> C. A. Patrides	23
SPENSER AT MLA	24
ANNOUNCEMENTS	28

TO OUR READERS

This issue of the Spenser Newsletter, the first produced at Duquesne, might well be viewed as an ego-trip for the new senior co-editor, since it is largely a report on the International Spenser Conference sponsored by the Duquesne English Department in October. The senior co-editor, however, views this circumstance as a fortunate way of postponing for one issue the task of assembling reviews of current articles and books while he is becoming familiar with the details of production, circulation, and accounting. He wishes to express his deep appreciation to his predecessor, Donald Cheney, whose expert description of the entire job has made the transition easy; and to his co-editor Cherie Ann Haeger of Gannon College and her colleague Alice Fox of Miami University, whose diligent reporting of the Pittsburgh conference and of the Spenser meetings at MLA have made his own duties in the production of this first issue pleasantly small.

*

*

*

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COOPERATION IN THE STUDY OF EDMUND SPENSER: A REPORT ON THE PROCEEDINGS

by Alice Fox, Miami University, and
Cherie Ann Haeger, Gannon College

The special conference on cooperation in the study of Edmund Spenser, sponsored by the Duquesne University English Department with the assistance of the University Centennial Committee and a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, can only be described as a success. Over one hundred twenty-five scholars from Australia, Canada, England, India, Japan, Norway, Scotland, and the United States attended the conference, held 5, 6, 7 October 1978 in Pittsburgh.

The chief purpose of the conference was to find out which scholarly projects relating to Edmund Spenser might lend themselves to cooperative efforts and, conversely, what areas are best left to the individual scholar. The consensus was that literary criticism is not usually adaptable to cooperative study, but that textual, bibliographical, historical, biographical, or informational projects frequently are. Many prospective cooperative ventures cross period and disciplinary boundaries, and therefore would involve non-Spenserians and specialists in areas other than literature such as art, history, languages, philosophy, and theology, specialists who might or might not be members of the academic community.

The two most intensely discussed subjects for cooperative endeavor were the problem of keeping a complete and acceptable teaching text of Spenser's poems in print, and a project for a Spenser encyclopedia. One of the most encouraging results of the session on the text was that 76% of those attending the conference indicated willingness to use an official text of Spenser's poems. While the ideal would perhaps be a hard-bound, readable, complete, or nearly complete edition of the works with appropriate scholarly apparatus, adaptable to a broad-based audience in the way the

Riverside Shakespeare is, the problem of cost versus demand makes the realization of that ideal text impossible at this time. On the other hand, since Thomas P. Roche's Penguin edition of FQ has just appeared, the feeling of the majority was that a companion Penguin edition of the minor poems might be the realistic thing to aim for now.

The conflict of ideal vs. real was less perceptible in the discussion of an encyclopedia. It was generally agreed that, although there is a need for a Spenser Encyclopedia, the final product should be quite different from the Milton Encyclopedia in plan and scope. The participants leaned toward a one- or two-volume work (similar to the Shakespeare Encyclopedia) which would combine informative and interpretative, original and synoptic material alphabetically arranged, carefully cross-indexed, and geared to a wide audience. The topics chosen would be largely literary, but Spenser's intellectual milieu would not be excluded. The participants also emphasized the need for planning carefully and establishing strong editorial policies from the very first.

Although proposals for getting, and keeping in print, an adequate teaching text and for an encyclopedia led the list, these were not the only projects put forward for consideration. Several participants mentioned the need for interdisciplinary, topical bibliographies on such subjects as the pastoral and allegory. Other areas suggested for cooperative study include: the biography of Spenser, facsimiles and editions of renaissance texts, annual supplements to the Spenser bibliography, and facing-page translations, not only English translations of Neo-Latin and continental renaissance vernacular texts but also, perhaps more importantly, translations of Spenser into other languages. The desirability of making Spenser more accessible to a wide audience—both English and non-English speaking—was repeatedly stressed throughout the conference.

The spirit which permeated the meeting was impressive, and perhaps in the long run just as important as the proposals of cooperative projects and the emphasis on increasing the readership of Spenser. The participants continually stressed the need for as much world-wide communication as possible. Although such communication might seldom result in unanimity, it nevertheless—if this conference is any indication—will result in increased understanding and awareness of specific issues and problems. The dialogue begun at this conference might ultimately be its richest contribution to Spenser studies.

That the dialogue has just begun and will continue is evidenced by "follow-up" meetings that are already planned and implemented, such as the special MLA session on the Spenser Encyclopedia [see report on Spenser at MLA, p. 26]. Also promising is the realism that was never long out of sight at the conference. While contemplating the ideal—the ideal text, the ideal encyclopedia, the ideal list of cooperative projects—the participants never forgot (or never let each other forget for long) the very real problems of cost, logistics, personality: of financial exigency in the publishing business, or securing grants to underwrite the proposed projects; of finding the time and the place to work together; of accommodating

differences in personality, and of human nature itself. This combination of idealism and realism along with already tangible indications of an on-going dialogue seems to insure that what was begun in Pittsburgh in October 1978 will not end there.

The conference director; the Duquesne University Department of English; the chairmen of the five panels; the panelists; C. A. Patrides, who gave the major address; and Robert M. Giannetti, who presented a demonstration project, "Cooperation in the Study of the Continental Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Sonnets: A Model for Cooperation,"—are all to be congratulated.

What follows is an edited summary of the proceedings, based as much as possible on the speakers' own words.

Welcome by Conference Director

Foster Provost, Duquesne University

In his opening remarks, the director observed that literary scholarship and criticism have traditionally been the preserve of the individual. Scholars and critics today as formerly are frequently rugged individualists following fact and their own premises wherever these lead regardless of anyone else's opinion. To the degree that scholarship and criticism are arts in themselves, this undoubtedly is a good thing, and academe would be much the poorer if this individualism should ever pass from the scene. Yet there are some areas where we cannot go it alone; even as critics we are absolutely dependent to some degree on the organized efforts of groups of scholars. It is a simple fact that if we are to be scholars we sometimes have to function together as a group. That is what this conference is about.

The central questions under discussion here are these: What things can we do in groups to help each other understand the poems of our poet? Conversely, what things had we better leave for individual study?

It has not been long since the prospect of gathering more than 100 Spenserians to talk about anything would have been bleak. In this century the only prominent group of Spenser scholars up to 1976 was the group in Edwin Greenlaw's "Seminary C," a group which laid the groundwork for and later produced the Variorum. As recently as early 1976 a prominent Spenserian labeled Spenser studies a "squirreling industry," presumably a reference to our tendency to hide our acorns away from each other. But by the end of 1976 the wind was blowing the other way. A new camaraderie blossomed at Kalamazoo in May of that year at the first of the series of Spenser meetings organized there by David Richardson. In retrospect we can see that the meeting at Fredericton in 1969, organized by Judith Kennedy and James Reither, planted the seed which blossomed at Kalamazoo, and which has borne fruit in the Spenser Society, in the new essay series SPENSER STUDIES, and in the continuing series of meetings at Kalamazoo.

Now it is time to see if this scholarly friendship can lead to the solution of some of the problems we share. One of the main problems we

have is how to get a satisfactory teaching text of Spenser's poems and keep it in print; but there are other areas where we can help each other. We are assembled to try to discover and define these areas.

Panel 1: The Limits of Cooperative Study

Chair: Donald Cheney, Univ. of Massachusetts

Cheney opened the session by observing that the present individualistic, divergent, even private, views of Spenser, i.e., the present phenomenon of non-cooperative study, may be due to the success of an earlier exercise in cooperation, the Variorum edition. The post Variorum generation perhaps felt it could approach Spenser only by asking new questions. As a result, Spenserians in recent years have been the "flower-children" of literary criticism, each too absorbed in doing his or her own thing to take sides or to form schools, even for the sake of attacking each other.

A discussion of cooperation in Spenser studies therefore cannot take the form of a summit meeting among representatives of distinct, identifiable groups. Perhaps what is needed is to ventilate informally and unsystematically some of the personally-felt needs which bring us together under a larger umbrella of general topics. We must ask, first, whether certain topics will yield diminishing returns and, more positively, whether there are questions we can now ask each other and listen for answers.

Cheney was tentatively hopeful that some questions will be fruitful and cited as a basis for optimism the increased collegiality in the last decade, even though the financial exigency in the publishing industry will require us to try to make our publications the best and most widely useful for our scholarly purposes.

Like Cheney, James N. Brown (Macquarie University, New South Wales) is optimistic about cooperation in Spenser studies. He indicated, first, that he and other Spenserians in Australia suffer from what they call "the tyranny of distance," i.e., they are far removed from North American and European academic circles and therefore find it difficult to keep up with the burgeoning studies of Spenser. The need that he and his colleagues in Australasia perceive is for rapid dissemination of information about trends in the Northern Hemisphere. He stressed that it is important for scholars in North America and Europe to be concerned about their fellows in more remote areas of the world. SpN is useful, should be continued in its present form, and should continue to be sent airmail, since there is a time lag of about four months to a year between ordering a book and receiving it.

Secondly, since shrinking funds are making publication more difficult, it is important for scholars to be in touch regarding work in progress as well as work completed. Brown sees positive results coming from as much communication as possible. We need be squirrels no longer.

Patrick Cullen (CUNY) suggested three specific projects in which cooperative research might be fruitful. The first is a project for cooperative,

topical interdisciplinary bibliographies. These would cover genres, themes, etc., and would cross party lines of discipline, language, period. Naturally difficulties would attend upon such an undertaking; for example, the problems of audience, focus, and selectivity and, most importantly, the problem of finding someone equipped to undertake such a venture. Since no one person can handle this alone, it must perforce be a cooperative undertaking. The second project would produce facsimiles of renaissance texts. Garland Press, Cullen noted, not only needs but welcomes suggestions for its series of textual facsimiles. After stressing the necessity of cooperation to insure the best selection possible, Cullen made three suggestions of his own: 1. sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English translations of classical and continental works; 2. herbals; 3. the principal texts used in renaissance schools.

The third project would be a Renaissance English Text Society to make more texts widely accessible in edited form. Although there are pressing economic concerns, NEH is fond of such cooperative ventures and Spenserians should attempt to capitalize on this fact. It would be easy to put together a list of 200 or so works that should be made available. Furthermore, we should consider putting our graduate students to work on such projects to fulfill the dissertation requirement. Although they might not find a publisher, we would have this mass of material available through University Microfilms.

Judith Kennedy (St. Thomas University) stated that from a Canadian point of view the main barriers are similar to those perceived by the Australians; distance and isolation. Except for those in large centers, Canadian Spenserians are so scattered that they cannot get to know one another. Furthermore, most institutions are so small that they cannot hire more than one or two people in a field and Spenser is rarely taught. As a result, there is little opportunity to exchange ideas on Spenser during the year.

A survey which she made of colleagues in English and related departments in Canada supports these observations:

Although in Alberta and in southern and central Ontario Spenserians can find company, they are very lonely in the Atlantic provinces, the central prairies, and northern Ontario. The same geographic pattern obtains (although the Atlantic region seems to have a slight edge over western and northern points) when it comes to availability of resources, particularly library tools basic to Spenser studies, or active institutional support for research. Several questions exploring people's reactions to possible uses of existing channels of communication revealed that most people do not favor trying to involve scholars outside the particular institution in the process of preparing theses, and that they generally disagree regarding anonymity of respondents to materials submitted for evaluation. Similarly, questions of cooperation through "do lists" published in, say, SpN or Spenser Studies, or through group projects elicited a mixed response: those in lonely areas tended to favor such suggestions, while those comfortably provided with company felt that research ideas were a matter of individual

inspiration and execution.

Finally, Canadians suggested a broad range of activities on which Spenserians might cooperate:

1. Not more than once every four years, a large-scale international conference should be held, perhaps in Norway or Australia next time.
2. Meetings of the new Spenser Society should be held independently of large meetings such as MLA or the Canadian Learned Societies, but perhaps in conjunction with other special interest Renaissance groups. Meetings should be held in smaller centers that do not regularly host large conferences.
3. During the meetings of the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English and of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies, Canadians interested in Spenser should make efforts to become acquainted (perhaps at a meeting over drinks before or after dinner) with a view to forming a Spenser association or to organizing a Canadian branch of the Spenser Society.
4. An annual supplement to the Spenser bibliography, annotated and cumulatively indexed, should be issued.
5. Microfiche records of conference papers (as for Kalamazoo) should be issued.
6. Co-authored articles and joint projects should be encouraged.
7. Major group projects (of the kind Cullen suggested), jointly funded by NEH and the Humanities Research Council of Canada should be explored.
8. Either SpN or Spenser Studies should be used for the following: a) more announcements of publications forthcoming and work in progress; b) notes and queries (this might elicit the kind of correspondence James N. Brown wants); c) a published correspondence column; d) advertisements for specialists to participate in group projects; e) a list of desiderata in Spenser studies (a "do-list"), each with the name of a proposer who would be willing to correspond with and perhaps work with someone wishing to undertake the particular study. Listing the project under the name of an individual should act as a check on the number of people undertaking a given project.
9. A fee-paying research checking service: i.e., a Spenser specialist at a major research center would undertake to receive requests to check out specific points in specific books, and would either perform or delegate this service.
10. Evaluators, assessors, and consultants should be encouraged to be even more generous with their time in making helpful suggestions for or corresponding with authors.
11. Active organizers should make conscious efforts to encourage the participation of the diffident and even the lazy. Among other things, perhaps, more journals could imitate PMLA in casting widely for first readers.

Kennedy also sent a questionnaire to 23 journals, ranging alphabetically from Comparative Literature to University of Toronto Quarterly, and spread geographically across Canada, the United States, England, and Belgium. She received answers from 20. The questionnaire included the following questions and evoked the following answers:

1. Are your assessors given the name and institution of the author of the article under review? Answer: 14 yes; 4 qualified yes; 2 no.

2. Under what circumstances, if any, do you tell authors the names of the assessors?

Answer: The predominant policy is not to reveal the assessors' names, although nine journals will honor an assessor's request (rarely made) to be identified. Only two journals identify assessors as usual procedure.

3. Do you send copies of assessors' reports to authors?

Answer: Predominantly yes. Most usually send the reports themselves or summaries or extracts. Only two journals by policy do not offer detailed criticism or suggestions unless resubmission is invited.

4. When accepting an article subject to revision, how much and what kind of detail do you give about the revisions required?

Answer: Generally, enough to enable all necessary revisions to be made.

5. When rejecting an article do you give reasons for rejection?

Answer: The predominant answer was "usually, if helpful."

6. Do you consider that editorial boards have a teaching function?

Answer: Generally, yes.

Kennedy's experience in conducting these surveys makes her confident that cooperative ventures can be successfully undertaken.

John T. Shawcross (CUNY) stated that while we all recognize the need for cooperation and that while we all can come up with a list of projects which require a joint effort, it is important not to forget that there are limits to cooperation in the study of Spenser or anyone else. Addressing himself first to areas where cooperative study is possible, he mentioned texts (like Cullen), a dictionary: a kind of Spenser OED with plenty of examples (glosses at the end of texts are inadequate); an updating of the Variorum, with attention to avoiding certain prejudices which characterize the original; A "Year's Work in Spenser Studies; a Spenser encyclopedia, which would not duplicate the Milton Encyclopedia because of the difference in perspective.

Before closing, Shawcross dealt briefly with the limits of cooperation. The major limit, in his opinion, is human nature itself and the personalities of the people involved. He pointed out the need for people who are willing to be objective and for the central figure in any cooperative project to be a strong person who is well able to add or delete material and to deal with many people.

Humphrey Tonkin (University of Pennsylvania) directed his opening remarks to the limits of cooperation. He questioned whether the end of cooperative studies will indeed be perfect knowledge and whether our only problem is to discover cost-effective methods of achieving that goal. Whether literary studies progress, in the normal meaning of that term, is open to question. Furthermore, as the sheer quantity of knowledge grows, the attrition of knowledge increases. What we are dealing with is not so much discovery and progress as a constant reassessment of Spenser's works in a changing cultural and educational context. Tonkin stressed that he is not, however, suggesting that there is no new knowledge that can be added to the

old but merely cautioning us to examine the premises upon which our cooperative ventures are to be based. He then proceeded to identify areas where genuinely new knowledge is discoverable from contemporary materials. The biography, in his opinion is the most important neglected historical area in Spenser scholarship and an obvious area for cooperative scholarship. Three subjects about which we need more knowledge: 1. The Dutch community in London and Spenser's links with Van der Noodt; 2. The history of London and Cambridge in the years when Spenser was growing up; 3. Irish history as it relates to Spenser himself. Teamwork is necessary in such a vast undertaking; best would be a team of assistants for a single biographer, a major scholar with the intellect and knowledge to sift and assess the materials turned up. What applies to biography applies to other areas as well, especially to aspects of the political and cultural background of Spenser's works.

Regarding literary translation Tonkin said that while it may be a good thing, it may also tend to make us forget the importance of grappling with the text in the original language. However, if it is acceptable for a literary scholar to work in a single language when his subjects wandered freely in three or four, then perhaps we should be teaming up to work on French or Italian translations of FQ. Teamwork with continental scholars to make Spenser available to new audiences in other countries is an endeavor at least as worthwhile, and probably more worthwhile than, our present enthusiasm for Englishing. The object of our working together should not be the creation of an even stronger core round which more and more Spenser scholars can revolve. Rather we should direct some of our vigor to developing a wider appreciation of Spenser.

Discussion: The discussion focused on key words in the title of Panel 1, i.e., "limits" and "cooperative study." John Mulryan (St. Bonaventure Univ.), mentioning the expense of publishing illustrated articles, provided an example of the limits imposed by economic conditions. In response to a question from the floor, three members of the panel engaged in an exchange which suggested limitation of a different sort. The questioner inquired what a Renaissance English Text Society would add to what University Microfilms already provides; Cullen replied that it would add valuable commentary, and Cheney mentioned accuracy. Tonkin, however, cautioned that there is a danger in getting away from the original text and that, although such editions might be extremely helpful, there are limits to what they can do for us.

Speaking to the other side of the issue, i.e., what areas might lend themselves to cooperation, Einar Bjorvand (University of Oslo) suggested 1. the study of patristic and Renaissance exegesis and 2. the use of EDP (Electronic Data Processing) in producing specialized concordances, word lists, rhyme-word lists, etc. Germaine Warkentin (Victoria College, Univ. of Toronto), Cullen, and Waldo F. McNeir (Univ. of Oregon) discussed the problems involved in visiting Kilcolman Castle—now within a bird sanctuary—and the prospect of establishing a center for Spenser studies on the property. John MacQueen (Univ. of Edinburgh) observed that the development of Spenser

studies in North America reminds him of the development of medieval studies in Scotland. There is, however, one important difference: the American scholars studying Spenser are primarily literary scholars, while the association of Scottish medievalists has, from the first, included historians as well as professional literary scholars. Spenser lived in a specific historic period and was greatly influenced by it. Hence, some kind of cooperation with historians would be helpful. MacQueen also mentioned that since language in Spenser is a peculiar thing, a linguistic analysis would not only be interesting in itself, but might also have all kinds of value for students of Spenser.

Panel 2: A Complete and Acceptable Text for Teaching

Chair: A. C. Hamilton, Queen's Univ., Ontario

Hamilton began by saying that even though agreement might be reached on what constitutes a complete and acceptable text of Spenser for teaching, finding a publisher would be a major difficulty. During the summer of 1978 he undertook a survey to ascertain under what conditions a publisher would publish and keep in print a text of Spenser's poetry. The survey covered 34 commercial and academic publishers in the United States. Of these, 32 were strongly negative. Only two suggested terms under which an edition would be considered. The respondents cited two chief reasons for their lack of interest, viz., the small demand, and therefore the long delay before the cost could be recovered; and, secondly, the high cost itself. Almost all the publishers agreed on the need for a large subsidy. Among the other reasons cited for not considering a Spenser text was that Thomas P. Roche's recent Penguin edition of FQ would satisfy part of the need. Hamilton agreed that this edition gives us half of what we need in a complete and acceptable text.

During this session Hamilton distributed to the participants a questionnaire based on the question raised by the publishers he had surveyed. The results of this questionnaire are as follows:

Question 1: How many students are enrolled each year in classes of yours for which a complete text of Spenser's poetry is either required or recommended?

The answers disclosed that a large proportion of the participants do not have the opportunity to teach Spenser, or may do so only every third year. The figures given for Spenser as a required text varied greatly. Although one participant enrolls 50 and at least four cited figures in the 30's, the average seemed to be about 15. Many did not respond to the question concerning Spenser as a recommended text, perhaps because Spenser is not a poet to be read without instruction. Of the figures given, the highest was 200; one was 65, and one 40.

Question 2: Would you prefer a complete text a) in one volume or two, b) without glossary/commentary, c) with a minimum of glossary, d) with interpretative commentary, e) with commentary and glossary at the end or at the bottom of the page, f) in modernized spelling?

Forty-four percent preferred a one-volume text and fifty-six percent a two-volume text. The majority, an overwhelming eighty-nine percent, were in favor of glossing. Sixty percent favored a minimum of glossing. Regarding

interpretative commentary, forty percent indicated they would like to see this feature but many qualified this response by noting that, while more than a bare minimum is needed, it is hoped that the interpretation would not go to the other extreme and intrude upon the text. Seventy percent indicated a preference for commentary and glossing at the bottom of the page, twenty-nine percent thought it should be at the end of the text, and only one percent suggested that text and commentary should be in separate volumes. Seventy-seven percent were against modernized spelling, many emphatically so.

Question 3: What do you estimate to be the upper limit of cost, \$6, \$8, \$10, \$14?

No one checked \$6 and only two checked \$8. Sixty-six percent indicated \$14 and several indicated a willingness to go even higher.

Question 4: Would you use the Dodge edition if it were reprinted? Seventy-three percent replied affirmatively, although some qualified this by indicating that they would do so if all other factors, especially the price, were right.

Question 5: Would you be willing to use an "official" text?

Overwhelmingly yes. Seventy-six percent said they would be willing.

One difficulty that the questionnaire pointed up was that the choice of text depends on the class, first year undergraduate to graduate, Spenser exclusively or renaissance literature. Therefore, one of the difficulties in establishing an "official" text is finding or devising a text which would serve the needs of these diverse courses. This was one of the main questions to which the panelists addressed themselves.

S. K. Heninger, Jr. (Univ. of British Columbia) identified two distinct alternatives which arise from the question of whether the teaching text is directed to graduates or undergraduates. For undergraduate teaching, a complete text is not necessary; selections will suffice. Although it would be hard to agree on what to include, cost alone would strongly indicate that only the most important poems should be included. For a graduate text, a complete works is necessary, although this would be inordinately expensive.

Heninger raised the question whether a complete reediting of the text would be desirable or whether the Variorum text would suffice. In an undergraduate text he would wish more extensive annotation of a fundamental sort, but in a graduate text there can be less annotation since this student is already apprised of many of the vocabulary difficulties, literary traditions and sources, and is capable of digging out answers in the library. Both texts should be in the original spelling. Undergraduates need help with archaic words, allusions, historical facts; but these could be provided for in a marginal gloss for things that can be explained in one or two words, and in footnotes for more difficult allusions, sources, cross-references. Heninger concluded by saying that he opts for an undergraduate text, and reminded the group that we exist in a larger context and should work toward making Spenser more accessible to our students.

Robert Kellogg (Univ. of Virginia) raised the issue of old-spelling vs.

modern spelling in a teaching edition of Spenser. While Shakespeare's works and the King James Bible are known to us in modern spelling, Spenser's works are known in old spelling. After interpreting this as a clear, if implicit, statement of the relative value we place on Shakespeare and Spenser, Kellogg said that for him the spelling habits of compositors in the shops that printed the first editions of FQ are of little interest and their preservation in teaching texts is self-destructively pedantic. After all, it is the poet's words and not the compositor's spelling which we wish to read. The "charm" some people find in old spelling texts is in itself a clear admission that the spellings are getting in the way of the understanding of the poet's language. Spelled forms different from those to which readers have become accustomed in school are bound to distract attention from the poet's language. Spenser's holograph manuscripts produced as secretary to Lord Grey were spelled in a more modern way that was consistent with the house style of the printing shops. The reprint of the 1590 edition in 1596 tends to modernize spelling somewhat, possibly bringing it closer to the poet's own manuscript. Kellogg concluded that he knows of no evidence to suggest that the old spellings were habitual with Spenser.

Hugh Maclean (SUNY-Albany) prefaced his remarks by stating that he found himself in the position of having to take issue with his fellow panelists. Noting that any proposal for "A Complete and Acceptable Teaching Text" must attend in the first instance to the term "acceptable," he identified two practical matters that must be dealt with: audience and economic contexts. Because the audience for Spenser is so diverse, Spenser scholars should consider producing something like the Riverside Shakespeare, Longman Milton, or Robinson Chaucer, which can be used in a variety of contexts on both the undergraduate levels. Also, the text must be "acceptable" in economic contexts. It should be under \$20 and probably closer to \$15. And its scope and range must square with the publisher's estimate of total pages, price, and probable sales over an extended period of time.

Regarding the specific makeup of a "complete and acceptable teaching text," Maclean maintained that it should be virtually complete (perhaps excluding the verses from Van der Noodt's Theatre; or, following Dodge, including them in an appendix with Spenser's letters to Harvey). The matter of appearance and format is of primary importance. Generations of potential Spenserians have been discouraged by the deadly two-columned pages set in tiny type that have rendered the single-volume Oxford text notorious. An acceptable teaching text must have single-columned pages, and the type must be clear and reasonably large, with ample margins. While computerized methods will permit publication at a much reduced price, the final text must be more than merely readable: its format should have a certain style.

Maclean disagreed with Kellogg and agreed with Heninger in the matter of old spelling. His experience with graduate and undergraduate students encourages him to persist in a strong preference for old spelling. If

students are encouraged to read at least some passages aloud, and at the same time make good use of a sensible, limited glossary provided by the editor, they will soon adjust to all but the most challenging archaisms or cruxes of the original editions.

Acknowledging that his preference for a "clean" page over a cluttered one presents some difficulties, Maclean said that the glossary had better be at the end of the volume and should encompass, if at all feasible, something of the nuances of meaning in different contexts on the model of the glossary in Dodge's edition. Although he is sympathetic with most teachers' desire to fly free of distracting editorial annotations, a complete and acceptable text must be responsive to the relatively slight acquaintance of many students with the range and character of the learning on which Spenser's poetry draws. Therefore such a text must be in some measure an annotated text. Like Heninger, Maclean prefers footnotes which do special things: clarify passages obscure by virtue of their language or archaic diction, and supply information bearing on historical, legendary, or literary sources. Footnotes should not embark on explanations of the allegory and should not anticipate the full effect of Spenser's poetry, e.g., by identifying characters before Spenser does. Generally footnotes should be descriptive and informational, not interpretative. They should be at the bottom of the page rather than at the end of the volume, chiefly because footnotes at a remove from the text don't get read as thoughtfully as those which permit the student to consider the text and note in close juxtaposition. The glossary should not be combined with the footnotes but should remain separate.

Maclean favors introductory essays or head-notes, on the order of Hamilton's essays in the Longman FQ, to each poem or group of poems. These headnotes should succinctly summarize the date and circumstances of composition, the relationship of each poem to its traditional genre, and the avenues explored by the most recent and enlightened international criticism of the poem in question. And these remarks in the head-note should be regularly keyed to especially significant items in the bibliography, in the manner adopted by Hamilton or the Carey-Fowler edition of Milton's poetry.

Regarding a textual appendix, Maclean stated that the complete and acceptable teaching text ought not ignore textual issues entirely. He would be content with an informed and succinct essay of no more than four or five pages touching on significant matters, especially the substantive distinctions between the 1590 and 1596 FQ. The essay would provide instances of those distinctions, but would refer to the Variorum for a complete list of variants and for detailed discussion of textual problems in the canon.

Since the Annotated Bibliography extends to 1972, the bibliography in the complete and acceptable text need not be exhaustive. It should at least notice early texts and editions, the range of studies in classical and Renaissance contexts that bear significantly on Spenser's art, and those books and articles published since 1950 that have been especially significant. The bibliography would be extensively subclassified and almost discursively commented on by the editor.

Maclean, having described the ideal text, went on to observe that on the evidence of existing and comparable teaching texts of Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Milton, and of Roche's recent edition of FQ, it would seem that there are two alternative approaches to providing a complete and acceptable teaching text of Spenser's poetry: 1. a single-volume edition, in hard covers, complete with introductory essay, explanatory footnotes, textual notes and extensive bibliography; and 2. a companion volume to Roche's FQ. Single-volume editions, in hard covers, of the complete works of Shakespeare and Chaucer, and of the complete poetry and selected prose of Milton, are currently in print and each sells, or until recently sold, for under \$20. Even if one grants that sales figures for a comparable volume of Spenser's poetry may not match those of the Riverside Shakespeare, it seems that, other things being equal, a comparable volume of Spenser's poetry might well be produced. But other things are not equal. Given the existence of Roche's edition (which Maclean had not seen), together with the presumed range and quality of its apparatus, Maclean felt it very unlikely that any publisher would undertake at this juncture an altogether new and complete text of Spenser's poetry. What seems more probable and well worth exploration, is the possibility that Penguin might be willing to publish a companion volume containing the minor poetry. This volume could be edited by Roche, or perhaps by a board of editors under his general direction. He urged that this latter alternative, a companion to the Penguin FQ, be aggressively explored and moved forward.

Discussion: Considerations of space forbid our reporting the long and lively discussion which followed. Perhaps the best comment on what was said by the panelists was provided in the responses to the questionnaire circulated by Hamilton. Although these responses are reported above, prior to the summaries of the panelists' remarks, they were of course not known to the panelists at the time, and undoubtedly reflect the influence of what the panelists said, at least to some degree.

Panel 3: Cooperation in the Study of Spenser's Medieval Backgrounds

Chair: Alice S. Miskimin, Yale University

Miskimin began by observing that she and the members of her panel are not "card-carrying Spenserians" but roving medievalists willing to cross the invisible lines that periodize us. We all know our own turf and tend to become politicized by it, a fact which affects cooperative study in medieval and renaissance literature rather more negatively than in any other two adjacent periods. This is chiefly because of the uncommon language that divides us as much as it connects Middle English and renaissance poetry. This panel addresses a wide range of problems growing out of a kind of territoriality or border warfare.

Judith Anderson (Indiana University) raised a number of questions relating to the general problems and assumptions that any cooperative study of Spenser and the Middle Ages must deal with. She observed that the answer to the question why it is so important to see Spenser's poetry in

relation to the works of the Middle Ages leads quickly to the related question: how medieval is Spenser? And that leads to the question: what does "medieval" mean? Before addressing these questions, she turned to the simpler and more general question of setting Spenser's works against those of his English predecessors. The purpose of any comparison of two works is to expand and sharpen our awareness of both. If one is inclined to believe, as she does, that judgment is comparative, then significant pointed comparisons between Spenser's works and related works are among our more refined means of critical definition and assessment. If comparison is generally useful, then the comparison between Spenser's work and medieval work is particularly so since it includes the possibility of actual historical influences as well as the larger and more theoretical possibility of critical and textual relevance which need not be historical. The Middle Ages have special pertinence to Spenserian abstraction and allegory, and to Spenserian form and technique, including the narrative. The Middle Ages also have special pertinence to Spenser as a corrective to an overly single-minded emphasis on other models, however important they may be.

How medieval is Spenser? The answer depends on one's knowledge of the Middle Ages. While this is obvious, the point is often forgotten, a fact which complicates the business of comparison still further. A related question is, how do we go about finding and defining relationships between Spenser and the English Middle Ages? There are affinities, persistent but elusive, between Spenser and the Middle Ages which are not always susceptible to hard proof. When we consider exact criteria for establishing a relationship, we find a double standard for determining relevance of ideas in philosophical sources and in poetic ones. We also seem to concern ourselves more with one writer's imitation of another's words than with his freer adaptation of form and technique. The overriding emphasis on direct and explicit verbal or factual echoes or borrowings and on wholly objective formal similarities such as rhyme and stanzaic form masks the extent to which studies of relationships are interpretative even when supported by historical probability and some historical fact. This is not an argument for arbitrary or meaningless analogues between Spenser's poetry and medieval works, but a suggestion that our standards and assumptions regarding the nature of valid, significant analogy need examination and refinement.

In closing, Anderson suggested a few areas for exploration: 1. the ties between theories of symbolism and practices of representation; 2. the different theologies of the Middle Ages and Renaissance; 3. theories of language in the two periods; 4. theories and statements about grammar in the Middle Ages, especially in the fourteenth century, and their influence on the sixteenth century and Spenser.

Mark Lambert (Bard College) emphasized language and word choice. He outlined an approach to Chaucer and Spenser which lends itself to cooperative study, and one to Malory and Spenser which does not. An investigation of the verbal medium in Chaucer and Spenser can get beneath the hunt for echo and motif and find new areas of comparison, new categories. For example, what sort of medieval, Chaucerian, words does Spenser not use? More positively,

what sort does he use or adapt or transfer? These are things that one can measure or count off. With Malory, however, there is not much hard proof. What is more interesting in the Malory/Spenser relationship is the investigation of tone. This does not lend itself to cooperative study in that it cannot employ concordances as the first approach does.

Elizabeth Kirk (Brown Univ.) raised the essential question, what is there that a Spenserian and a medievalist can work on better by working together? She answered that it is precisely the matter of discordant point of view which defines the territory of fruitful interaction. The point at which instinctive reactions to material are different might be exactly the place for collaboration. When two people from different areas begin to articulate the things they take for granted and discover divergent views, an important step has been taken. What is at the heart of cooperation is not giving each other answers, but provoking each other to ask the right questions.

R. W. Hanning (Columbia Univ.) declared that he is not in favor of the kind of cooperation between medievalists and Spenserians that would result in new editions and new reference books, however worthy they might be. Rather he would emphasize dialogues between scholars who have read in and thought about these areas. These dialogues would consider such things as 1. medieval history and Spenser's use of medieval historical approaches; 2. Spenser's allegory and the types of allegory Spenser could have known and used, for example the so-called allegory of the poets and allegory of the theologians, homiletic exempla, moralities on the gospels, allegories of virtues and vices, dream vision allegories—all of which represent different approaches to saying one thing under the guise of another; 3. the question of medieval comedy and its relation to Spenser; 4. language and language theories in the Middle Ages and their relationship to Spenser; 5. the Ovidian tradition in the Middle Ages and in Spenser.

Discussion: Maren-Sofie Røstvig (Univ. of Oslo) raised several questions: what about neo-Latin poetry? should the consideration of Spenser's medieval background be restricted to English backgrounds? to what extent are there scholars capable of dealing with medieval continental backgrounds? Hanning replied that to confine oneself to a single tradition and to assume there are no continuities is risky. John MacQueen (Univ. of Edinburgh: since medieval works which could be regarded in some way as Protestant were of special interest in the sixteenth century, might this not be something of a guide in going backward from Spenser to the Middle Ages? Kirk replied that the Cawley edition of Chaucer is interesting in this context since it points to the transformation of the medieval tradition in the sixteenth century. Suzanne Woods (Brown Univ.) asked to what extent it is possible to talk about instructive or provable parallels between Spenser and Chaucer, and how this dialogue can be established. Anderson replied to the first part of the question that the only way to proceed is to deal with specific models and examples. Regarding the second part, the only answer is to take the risk and begin to talk to one another.

Panel 4: Cooperation in the Study of Spenser's Continental Backgrounds

Chair: Waldo F. McNeir, University of Oregon

In his initial communications with his panel, McNeir said, he had told them that, in his opinion, the study of Spenser's continental backgrounds would probably always be the province of an individual specialist in comparative literature rather than a consortium of scholars. But in considering the possibilities of cooperative approach, we ought to consider Spenser's real or theoretical relation to medieval romances and allegorizers; to Dante, the stilnovisti, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and their successors, humanists, historians, and Neoplatonists, Castiglione, the forerunners and followers of Ariosto and Tasso in epic romance—the spectrum of the Renaissance in Italy; his relation to the French rhetoricians, Marot, Rabelais, the members of the Pleiade and their satellites, to Du Bartas, and Montaigne; his relation to Spanish romanceros and cancioneros in dramatic and non-dramatic literature, Boscán and Garcilaso de la Vega, the Celestina, picaresque writings, and Montemayor; to Erasmus and later Dutch humanists; to Luther and Gerson of the German Reformation, to Calvin and Zwingli of the Swiss Reformation; and, finally, Spenser's relation to continental fetes, masques, bergeries, entries, and progresses. Of course such a program could not be attempted in a single day or a single session, but the panel would attempt to deal with some pieces of it, namely, Dante, Ariosto, and the renaissance emblem books.

Ricardo Quinones (Claremont Men's College) indicated that he would shift away from the previous panel's concern with influences and address historical connections and questions of linguistic, poetic, thematic concerns, and philosophical position, especially as they appear in Dante and Spenser. He suggested three areas for further study: 1. the critical background of Spenser's aesthetic stance as a sixteenth-century renaissance poet, one who leaped over the fifteenth century, as his Italian counterparts did, back to the classics of the fourteenth century; 2. the thematic similarities of Dante and Spenser; and 3. their philosophic tradition. While he does not insist that we look for direct influence, Quinones does ask that we investigate the possibilities of historical connection, i.e., points of contact and similarity of purpose between those writers on whom Spenser was dependent, those whom he acknowledged to be his masters and predecessors in the development of his own vernacular poetics and philosophy, and those writers who knew and continued Dante's thought. This is not so much a question of influence as of tradition. By looking at these points of contact between such distant writers, one at the very point of departure of the Renaissance and the other initiating the high English Renaissance, we can come closer to understanding the significance and complexity of the Renaissance movement in literature.

Daniel Javitch (New York University) noted that numerous studies of Spenser's use of Ariosto have appeared since R. E. Neil Dodge's first article on the subject in 1897. By now, most of the episodes, situations and characters in FQ that were imitations of the Orlando Furioso or that were inspired by the Italian poem have been identified. Past American studies might disagree with one another in the process of interpretation, but they share one

presupposition, i.e., that so major a case of imitation and influence can only be explained in terms of similarities and affinities between the Furioso and FQ. Illustrating how this manifests itself in the studies of McMurphy, Alpers, and Marinelli, Javitch asserted that his survey of the criticism on the subject revealed little cooperative effort in past studies of Spenser and Ariosto. If the misguided trend which has heretofore obtained were reversed, future work on the subject might not necessarily be more cooperative, but it might reach a better understanding of Ariosto and also of poetic imitation in the Renaissance. What must be emphasized is that Spenser's relation to Ariosto is an adversary one, that his imitation is an aggressive act of rivalry prompted largely by the superior and privileged viewpoint which his Protestant beliefs granted him. The salient differences between the two poets do not and should not impede our understanding of Spenser's imitatio, as previous studies wrongly presuppose. On the contrary, what needs to be made clearer is that Spenser's emulation of Ariosto was determined by fundamental differences between them. Creative poetic imitation, more often than not, consisted of an implicit criticism of the model, or an assertion of superiority to the model stemming from the privilege of historical or religious hindsight. Javitch believes, therefore, that future work on Spenser's emulation of Ariosto can benefit from the insights provided by recent studies of poetic imitation in the Renaissance.

John Mulryan (St. Bonaventure Univ.) felt that a consideration of the problems in Spenser's continental backgrounds would not be complete without some attention to his background in classical mythology as derived from continental sources. One can hardly conceive of a study requiring more cooperation—from art historians, linguists, experts in heraldry, political philosophers, classicists, archaeologists, editors, printers, bibliographers, and bibliophiles. The mythological materials that Spenser could have drawn on exist in a variety of languages and in a bewildering range of forms—emblem books, mythographies, tapestries, tales told over someone's knee, school textbooks, pictures glanced at in great houses, images and ideas gleaned from the poet's reading. Mulryan's own interests lie in four areas: the mythographies, the renaissance dictionaries, the editions and translations of the classics, and the emblem books. Lotspeich and Starnes and Talbert have familiarized Spenser scholars with the importance of the mythographies and dictionaries to Spenser studies. Much remains to be done with editions of classical authors and the commentaries imbedded within them; this is a virgin area of scholarship.

Mulryan feels that the emblem tradition will prove to be one of the most fruitful areas of investigation into Spenser's use of mythology, mainly because most of the emphasis up to now has been, not on continental but rather on English emblem books, which he considers sad derivatives of the grand tradition in France and Italy. The combination of picture, motto, and explanatory poem in the emblem book seems eminently adaptable to Spenser's verbal iconography, and the general availability of copies suggests that they should be examined before more exotic sources of Spenser's imagery are considered.

On the question of cooperation, unless the renaissance scholar is familiar with Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, and German, at least some elements of the emblem tradition will remain closed to him. Cooperation with art historians would certainly reduce the chances of a scholar's mistaking an established tradition in art as being an iconographic phenomenon unique to Spenser or to the emblem books. The bibliographers in the various languages and the experts in the subject matter of the emblems—moral philosophy, political history, classical culture—could be called upon to identify the provenance of the emblem books and the relation of their verbal meaning to renaissance culture generally.

In the time remaining, Mulryan showed slides from renaissance emblem books written and illustrated by Italians, Germans, Frenchmen, and Hungarians, all published during Spenser's lifetime. He pointed out their putative relationship to FQ, but noted that much of this information is also to be found in the mythographies, the dictionaries, the classical editions, and so on. He stressed the sheer volume of mythological information on the continent and its ubiquity. It is clear, Mulryan concluded, that a great deal of moralized mythology was available to Spenser in the emblem books of the continent, and that the combined interpretation of word and picture which they employ provided the poet with an excellent source for his moral allegory.

Discussion: Once again, considerations of space prevent a full report on the lively question period. The chief topic of discussion was whether and why the medieval panel, which preceded this one, had subordinated the historical approach, as might be inferred from Quinones' declared intention to get back to a historical consideration (p.16). Hanning, speaking on behalf of all the medieval panel, said that it was not a matter of ignoring historical connections, but of assuming that everyone at the meeting would recognize the existence of those connections. The point of the panel, therefore, was to question whether there are further steps to take.

Panel 5: A Spenser Encyclopedia

Chair: David A. Richardson, Cleveland State

Richardson opened the discussion by describing the general goals of such a project as a Spenser Encyclopedia and the plans currently afoot for exploring the prospects of undertaking it. In 1751, he said, Diderto published Volume One of a great cooperative project: the French Encyclopedia, or Rational Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts. In the "Preliminary Discourse" to that volume, d'Alembert named two goals for the vast undertaking: 1) an encyclopedia of general principles exploring the order and interrelations of all human knowledge; and 2) a systematic dictionary of facts and details informing these general principles.

On a smaller scale, these goals hold for literary encyclopedias, too. We see them in the new Enciclopedia Dantesca (1970-76) and, most recently, in A Milton Encyclopedia (1978-). Edited by Professors Hunter, Shawcross, and Stead-

man, this Milton project includes eight volumes prepared over a full decade by more than 150 scholars. Its purpose is "to bring together all of the important information and opinion concerning the life and works of John Milton."

As Spenser studies grow exponentially, we recognize a parallel need to synthesize knowledge about this Elizabethan poet and his work. It is hard enough to master all the relevant detail, the solid facts sought by Variorum editors and later Spenserians influenced by that monumental reference tool. It is even harder to keep a grip on critical theories and modes of interpretation—on general principles and perspectives that are generating more discussion and publication every year. A Spenser encyclopedia is one way to clarify and assimilate this vast body of scholarship, but such an undertaking would clearly have to be a cooperative venture.

Therefore, two panel discussions have been scheduled at major conferences in 1978, where Spenserians and other renaissance scholars are invited to voice their opinions and share their views: at this conference, and at the MLA conference in New York in December /Reported under "Sp at MLA, below —ed./]. Both panels address themselves to basic questions. Do we really need a Spenser encyclopedia? If so, is the time ripe, or should we wait until we have a clearer overview of Spenser scholarship? Even if this is a good time, does Spenser's poetry (in contrast to Shakespeare's and Milton's) pose unique problems that make an encyclopedia impracticable? And, if an encyclopedia is a realistic, desirable goal, what pragmatic questions need to be resolved about topics, the nature of articles, editors, editorial policies, audience, and publication?

Walter R. Davis (Notre Dame Univ.) addressed the need for an encyclopedia. He said that despite limitations inherent in even the most ambitious literary encyclopedia, a Spenser encyclopedia would have real value both for Spenser studies in particular and for Renaissance studies in general. For example, we are approaching saturation in the study of Spenser's allegory, but much work remains to be done in annotating and editing, and in collecting and disseminating information. Furthermore, existing reference works, which are more like readers' guides to Spenser, do not provide all the information we need, while the Variorum is largely the sum of past annotation. And annotated editions, for the most part restricted to FQ, are necessarily slanted. An encyclopedia could offer more extended glosses.

In addition to such usefulness for Spenser studies, a Spenser encyclopedia would also be useful for renaissance studies in general. Together with the Milton Encyclopedia, it would fill many of the needs for a general renaissance encyclopedia. Even in overlapping areas, the two would approach similar material from different points of view. Milton in the context of English civilization in the 17th century, Spenser in the context of English literature in the 16th century. A Spenser encyclopedia should include general topics bearing directly on Spenser's life and works: renaissance philosophy, ideas, religious doctrine, church history, political history, English foreign affairs, iconography, mythography, and so on. Since it should omit topics irrelevant to Spenser, it would not cover all areas (e.g., renaissance

science) or even all of the sixteenth century. Nonetheless, it could be a substantial contribution to renaissance studies in general.

Turning to the relation of an encyclopedia to the Variorum, Davis pointed out that the aims and methods of the two are so at variance that there need be little fear of duplication. As a record of past criticism, Var. was not free to ask new questions, let alone give new answers to old ones; and was selective, concerned chiefly with sources and analogues.

An encyclopedia would not be so limited. While it could summarize some of the matter in Var., it should insist on original articles. It will succeed if it asks the right questions and enough questions.

As for the relation to a planned supplement to Var., ed. T. K. Dunseath, nothing can yet be said since information on the supplement is still unavailable.

(The discussion, too long to report fully, elicited suggestions that renaissance science—geography, cartography, medicine, mathematics—should not be excluded, nor should renaissance culture or the principal contemporary continental figures.)

Edward G. Quinn (CCNY) addressed the questions of scope and audience. He cited two options, typified by the Milton encyclopedia—massive, significant, scholarly, involving years of work by many contributors; and the Shakespeare—smaller, involving fewer years of preparation, costing less, directed to a broader audience. With the first, we talk to ourselves; with the second we can extend Spenser readership, making him more accessible to undergraduates, graduates, our colleagues. The last might promote the cause of Spenserians within academe, where they are not much in demand.

The first order of business for extending Spenser's readership is a text; the second is an encyclopedia, which must be readable, comprehensible, and profitable—the last a very real consideration if we are to sell it to a university press.

Addressing the matters of format and style, Quinn said that any format keyed to the Var. would radically limit the audience. Also, long, comprehensive articles, though they offer depth, sacrifice ease of reference, and thus work against broad readership. To achieve the latter, the encyclopedia should be carefully cross-indexed. Of even more importance is the matter of style; to achieve readability, the encyclopedia should be copy-edited by a non-scholar.

The nature of the editorial board is crucial: it should consist of a lunatic, a lover, and a poet: the lunatic a fact-hound, a relentless cross-indexer and checker; the lover a successful wooer of contributors, major figures in the field who will accept the fact-hound's queries), an eminent person with "mensch" qualities; the poet someone who can replace the scholar's poet with the poet's poet.

(Discussion too extended to report)

William B. Hunter, Jr. (Univ. of Houston), viewing the Milton Encyclopedia as a possible model, pointed out that the massiveness of the Milton project was necessary in view of the enormous amount of available biographical information, the extent of his prose works, and the scope of his activities. A Spenser encyclopedia should be shorter, perhaps one or two volumes, with a dominant literary focus, since Spenser is not central for western civilization. There would be little overlap with the Milton project, except perhaps in such broad areas as background of ideas, or sources in religion and philosophy. A Spenser encyclopedia would be valuable not only for those interested in Spenser himself, but also for those interested in social history. Background information, however, should be restricted to information clearly relevant to Spenser.

Concerning prospective topics, Hunter called for this major problem to be dealt with at the outset. Is an encyclopedia to cover comprehensive subjects, more narrowly defined ones, or some combination? The Milton Encyclopedia chose the latter. Cross-referencing was achieved by asterisks within the various articles, rather than through an index. In the case of Spenser, half or more of the encyclopedia would have to be devoted to FQ. The topics should include both original materials and summaries of information already known.

The division of work would require strict editorial supervision, and editors would have to wield the ax in order to avoid overlap (and would have to explain to contributors why certain materials were axed). In assigning topics, one person must be in charge; keeping the other editors informed, that person should manage to prevent duplication and to enlist the real experts.

(Discussion: here again the editors must regretfully wield the ax, and suggest that those who wish to know what was said write David A. Richardson at Cleveland State for a copy of the brochure "A Spenser Encyclopedia," from which this report was abstracted.)

Cooperation in the Study of the Continental Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Sonnets—A Model for Cooperation

Robert M. Giannetti, Executive Director of the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania, presented this demonstration project for possible adaptation by Spenserians. Cautioning that his model is the result of research still in progress, he first traced the history of his own research on Shakespeare's sonnets and his growing awareness of the need for cooperative research. Then, after outlining specific cooperative efforts that might be undertaken in the study of Shakespeare's sonnets, he made practical suggestions about the organization and funding of cooperative research. Finally, he reflected on the psychology of cooperation and the impact it may have on the humanities.

Giannetti first surveyed the difficulties, limitations, and needs in the area of research on Shakespeare's sonnets. Among the difficulties are the sheer bulk of the material written on the sonnets and the fact that most of this is historically and biographically directed. He suggested that

criticism of the sonnets take a new direction, led by such cooperative ventures as these: 1. the systematic production of bilingual critical editions of the key sonneteers who followed in the wake of Petrarch on the continent; 2. the development of a modern bibliographical guide to the Renaissance that would compare and contrast, or assess the merits of, modern editions currently available; 3. a major, comprehensive history of the continental lyric; 4. an annotated international bibliography of scholarship on Petrarch and Petrarchism; 5. a thoroughgoing study of the Platonic elements of Shakespeare's language in the sonnets; 6. the investigation of what books or manuscripts of the continental sonneteers might have been available to Shakespeare; 7. a source book of both prose and poetic passages which might constitute for the sonnets a kind of Road to Xanadu.

How are these projects to be realized? Since there is more here than any single individual or institution can accomplish, an explicitly articulated strategy is essential. Giannetti suggested a fourfold attack: 1. conferences to identify areas appropriate for cooperative research; 2. publishing and widely disseminating the results of such conferences, to scholars, but also to potential backers, the funding agencies; 3. establishing agenda for action and a steering committee to select an overseer who would keep track of interrelated tasks and would mount an organized and systematic effort to keep the philanthropic community aware of the program, in preparation for 4. seeking external funding either from private donors, corporations, and foundations, or from the NEH Division of Research Grants.

Commenting on the relative advantages of the two sources of funding, Giannetti noted that with private donors institutional needs frequently take precedence over those of the individual scholar or project. Seeking funding from NEH bypasses these problems. Furthermore, NEH offers a number of specific programs ideally suited to cooperative research, including 1. the Research Materials Program, which supports atlases, bibliographies, dictionaries, encyclopedias, linguistic grammars, concordances, catalogues, and guides; 2. the Editing Program, which provides funds for the production of authoritative, newly annotated texts; 3. the New Translation Program, which underwrites new, annotated translations.

Successful fund raising depends upon the implementation of certain strategies. With NEH, collaborative effort by scholars themselves rather than university fund-raisers is perhaps most effective. Another strategy consists of compiling a list of all public and private sources of funding that either have supported or might potentially support research in Shakespeare or Spenser, and systematically communicating the results of a conference such as this to them, not for an immediate gift but to lay the groundwork of trust and confidence that will gain a better reading of future proposals. The NEH is a public agency and as such must be responsive to its constituency in a way that private foundations need not be; therefore, scholars should use their collective pressure to influence and shape grant-making policies. Most properly, this would take the form of the Spenser Society or any other scholarly organization offering to help the NEH staff in selecting a slate of outside reviewers from the field of Spenser studies, so that as rotational needs arise, vacancies may be filled through some broadly participatory

process. Scholars should be responsive to the governmental expectation that clearly identifiable results will be achieved. It is imperative that scholars establish priorities in the same way that a funding organization does and identify a specifically defined task that can and will be accomplished through the joint effort of both affiliated and unaffiliated humanists.

Regarding the practical problem of organization, one should first check into the resources of existing organizations (such as the Spenser Society) and determine whether they can be adapted to the needs of cooperative research. If they cannot, a new organization must be established to supervise the cooperative process. Whichever course is taken, the primary goals consist of establishing priorities and then going after funding for a reasonable part of the overall plan. Since at this phase the demands on the steering committee will be great, a regular paid staff with an Executive Director is imperative. If a grant is quickly obtained, the staff could be supported through this. If not, the staff could be drawn from unaffiliated humanists, faculty on sabbaticals, or retired faculty, or all three. At this time one of the important jobs of the steering committee would be to issue regular progress reports to participating scholars; and one of the important jobs of those in the teaching profession would be to introduce the cooperative effort to graduate students with the aim of allowing post-graduate collaboration to develop.

The key requisites in cooperative study are: 1. competent and cogent setting of priorities from the start; 2. adequate communications; 3. regular follow-up; 4. orderly and controlled integration and coordination of diverse elements and personnel; 5. adequate fund-raising; and 6. use of all available resources, institutional and non-institutional, and of both affiliated and unaffiliated personnel.

Giannetti closed his presentation with some reflections on the basic psychology of cooperation and the effect it may have on how new knowledge in the humanities is nurtured and developed. Expressing faith in the possibility of cooperation even in the face of retrenchment and scarcity, he saw the chief psychological advantage to the profession as being a prospective long-term reduction of defensiveness, combativeness, and territorialism, all of which separate scholars and tend to turn scholarship into the fine art of persuasion rather than the cooperative quest for truth and understanding.

The Achievement of Edmund Spenser

Major Address, by C. A. Patrides, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

Conceived as a reminder of our own priorities, the address was in the main a resuscitation of testimonies—both favorable and adverse—by the creators of literature in English. Beginning with Virginia Woolf, focusing on Yeats, and invoking the poetic experiences of Pope and Keats among others, Patrides argued that we should not disregard the emphasis which writers invariable place on Spenser's incontestably great talents as a poet rather than as a thinker. Of course Spenser's achievement in sustained thinking

was by no means minimal; his espousal of "the form of history" educates the reader to be vigilant in the present because cognizant of the past, and confident in the future because admonished by both. Yet the reader credits "the form of history" solely because of the achievement of "the form of poetry"—a grandiose vision enacted through the stunning deployment of language neither "old" nor "rustick" but (as Yeats Pronounced) "more full of youthful energy than even the language of the great playwrights." Spenser's nominal shortcomings such as his proverbial redundancy, his excessive alliteration or assonance, and particularly his explicit moral design, argue that he is maculate; but they are in the last analysis transcended by a measured poetic flair so impressive—and so influential on all subsequent poets and on some of our finest prose writers—that a part of Leigh Hunt's judgment in 1833 must necessarily be endorsed: "not to like Spenser is not to like poetry."

SPENSER AT MLA

The following meetings at the ninety-third annual convention of the Modern Language Association of America, held in New York on 27-30 December 1978, contained items of interest to Spenserians:

207. Joan Larsen Klein: "Spenser's Conflation of Gula and Bacchus in Books I and II of The Faerie Queene."

Klein suggested some of the ways in which sixteenth-century mythologies and emblem books illuminate our understanding of Bacchic figures in FQ, especially Gluttony in the procession of the deadly sins (I,iv) and Genius in the Bower of Bliss (II,xii), both of which are conflations of the medieval figure of Gula and the renaissance Bacchus. Sp's figure of Gluttony in the procession prefigures his Genius in the Bower.

298. Spenser's Mutabilitie Cantos: Their Relation to the Faerie Queene?
Discussion leader: Waldo F. McNeir, Univ. of Oregon.

Humphrey Tonkin (Univ. of Pennsylvania) observed that although MC may well be a continuation of FQ—the completeness at the end of Book VI, like that of the 1590 Book III may be a deliberate illusion—still we do not know how MC relates to FQ. Since MC is highly unified, and since we do not know that the numbering and canto-division are Spenser's, it might be useful to view MC as a separate poem in the genre of the Ovidian epyllion. Hero and Leander and The Squire's Tale offer precedents for publication of "unperfite" fragments; perhaps Sp deliberately composed MC as a fragment or translated it into one—a hypothesis which accommodates the intensely Spenserian character of the form of MC as well as its components. MC is mythmaking on a grand scale, but does not allude to Gloriana or to chivalry; it seems to translate the argument of FQ onto a new plane. Perhaps MC is not a conclusion but a beginning, anticipating the shift from the world-view of FQ to a more cosmic view which is often attributed to Milton in the latter's turn away from an Arthurian.

Elizabeth Bieman (Univ. of Western Ontario) argued that we can have MC both ways: of the same world as FQ but rising above all but the hills and temples of vision in the earlier books, and in its final two lines looking

higher yet. Even the last two lines need not be a turning away from the mutable lands of faery and mankind, a kind of Chaucerian retraction. The prayer, taken alone, has the quality of a Nunc Dimittis; but it has a context deliberately recalled as it recapitulates vi and vii. It carries the triumphant quality of the whole, the quality of a grand Te Deum.

Assuming that all the evidence we have is what is in the 1609 edition, she argued 1. that the "six, seven, eight" numbering is significant; 2. that the variant spellings of "sabaoth" and "sabbaoth" in the last two lines do indeed signal a Spenserian pun, one that makes sense as it stands; 3. that the picture of "Stedfast rest of all things firmly stayed / Upon the pil-lours of Eternity" points to a vision of security that is neither static nor escapist; 4. that the healthy nature-mysticism which pervades FQ is in no way antithetical to the theocentric mysticism of the prayer, which culminates the focusing process; 5. that eight is the baptismal number, as well as the number signifying resurrection.

Carol V. Kaske (Cornell Univ.) agreed that MC can and should be taught in isolation, but that it is a part of FQ. The narrator's suggestion (vi, 37) that he is singing "of hilles and woodes, mongst warres and knights" probably means that MC is within FQ, perhaps more precisely in the middle, as Book VII would be. Sir Peridure, III, viii, 27, would be the hero, as suggested by Alice Fox.

Moreover, ending FQ with a description of heaven as in MC would satisfy symmetry (MC's two cantos and pendant two stanzas repeat FQ's two installments plus pendant MC, as suggested by Blissett; also, the end is tied in with the beginning, in that the speaker's wish for heaven reads like a displaced fulfillment of the promise of heaven to RC on the Mount of Contemplation); it would satisfy genre (as epic or romance, FQ must end on a note more positive than negative: this MC does, but Book VI does not); and it satisfies piety (the Sp we know would want to end on a religious note like medieval poets generally and like his master Chaucer in CT).

Finally, Bieman and Tonkin notwithstanding, the optimism at the end of MC is not about this world but about four continuities leading to the next world: 1. terrestrial things perpetuate themselves by succession until the Last Day; 2. heavenly bodies survive as individuals until the Last Day; 3. the speaker's soul may be granted to survive as an individual beyond the Last Day to share in; 4. the qualitatively different Now-ever-standing-still of God.

347. At the business meeting of the Renaissance English Text Society (RETS), one problem discussed was the need not only to identify texts and editors but to secure an audience of purchasers. Cherie Ann Haeger (Gannon College) suggested that RETS ask members of groups like the Spenser Society to identify works that they need and that they or their libraries would purchase either independently or through membership in RETS. In the discussion of a membership drive, Paul Ramsey (Univ. of Tennessee, Chattanooga) suggested that RETS might get mailing lists and publicity through groups like the Spenser Society and through such publications as SpN. [Further information on RETS will be found on p. 28.]

394. At the annual meeting and luncheon of the Spenser Society, held on December 29th at the N.Y.U. Club, Humphrey Tonkin (Univ. of Pennsylvania), Judith Anderson (Indiana Univ.), and Donald Cheney (Univ. of Mass., Amherst) discussed the Proem to Book Six of FQ. The first three stanzas, in Tonkin's view, deal with the problem of reconciling opposites: chivalric poem vs. pastoral, "hard" vs. "soft" views of nature, invention vs. discovery. Sp seems to be looking for some kind of symbol or verbal icon that will unite two ways of viewing the past. Anderson was struck by details of syntax in stanzas 4-6. The tension between the present age and "plaine Antiquitie," which is implicit in stanzas 1-3, is explicit in 4-6. This adversary relationship is enforced in the syntax by the repeated use of "yet" and "but." The distinction between the "glasse so gay" and the "mirror sheene" is an index of the relationship between the present age and the past. Donald Cheney, who chaired the discussion, spoke of the shape of the Proem. It is a bridge between V and VI. There is a movement in the stanzas from exuberance to a call for a guide. Each of the seven stanzas suggests something of the structure of FQ so far. Following these three presentations, there was a lively discussion among the panel and between the panel and the others attending the luncheon.

At the business meeting, chaired by Judith Anderson, the President for 1979, the membership elected Donald Cheney Vice-President, and Elizabeth Bieman, Hugh Maclean, and Waldo F. McNeir to the Executive Committee for 1979. The membership also ratified the following amendment: THE PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY, UPON THE COMPLETION OF HIS TERM, SHALL BECOME AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR ONE YEAR. The amendment was designed to give continuity in the Society's leadership. Dr. Anderson announced that the Executive Committee has designated Thomas P. Roche, Jr. (Princeton Univ.) to be both Secretary and Treasurer for 1979.

An item of interest at the business meeting was Roche's announcement that he has written to the gamekeeper at Kilcolman Castle (see discussion under Panel 1, p. 8 above) expressing our concern for the ecological problems of the bird sanctuary (visiting Spenserians disturb the mating habits of the birds). Roche indicated our desire to continue to visit the castle and our hopes that we can work out a compromise. The gathering felt that this was entirely in the spirit both of the Bower of Bliss and of the Garden of Adonis.

597. At the session on A Spenser Encyclopedia, chaired by David A. Richardson (Cleveland State), Walter R. Davis (Notre Dame Univ.) and Edward G. Quinn (CCNY) summarized what they had said in Pittsburgh (see pp. 19-20, above); Richardson summarized the remarks of Hunter at the same conference (p. 21, above), and added that Hunter has strongly advised having three editors—more would be unwieldy—of contrasting views and complementary skills. Richardson himself suggested a larger advisory board in addition to the main editorial board, to write articles, to be anonymous reviewers of contributions, to focus critical differences and clarify whatever consensus and main currents may exist in Sp studies.

A. C. Hamilton, speaking on topics, said that the encyclopedia should

concentrate on topics indispensable to all students of literature, excluding if need be topics directed more to students of history, theology, political science. Obviously religious backgrounds for poems with a religious element must be included; but if cost so dictates, some exclusion of intellectual backgrounds, of various wider considerations, must be enforced in order to include topics on Sp in relation to medieval and Italian romance, Sp as "poet's poet" in relation to Cowley, Pope, Keats, Dylan Thomas, etc., Sp and the arts, such as emblems, iconography, various pictorial traditions. Turning to "critical approaches," a term he is not happy with, he suggested that the topics be critically rather than historically oriented—providing essays which examine what knowledge is needed for adequate understanding and appreciation of Sp's poetry rather than offering knowledge for its own sake. Examples include the historical, generic, New Critical, psychological, archetypal, structural, feminist. An encyclopedia should look forward, not back as a *Variorum* must do. An ideal article would have a separate section appended for listing major books and articles on the subject and devote the main body to progress from the best that is known at the present to new understanding.

Michael Payne (Bucknell Univ.), speaking as former Director of the Bucknell Univ. Press, said that the Milton Encyclopedia is likely to pay its way despite the number of volumes, and expressed the strong interest which his Press takes in the prospect of a Spenser Encyclopedia. He expressed the surprising view that there might be economic advantages in a multi-volume work rather than a single-volume one, because presses like Bucknell's which publish in conjunction with a commercial publisher derive economic advantages by employing commercial facilities during the time when they might otherwise be idle—an arrangement to which a series of small volumes might lend itself better than one or two very large ones. Also, there is some doubt whether there is a distinction between a scholarly and a popular audience, particularly if libraries are likely to be the chief purchasers. We might learn from the British, who have maintained the necessary fiction of a common reader who is interested in scholarship.

On this view, the best approach to a Sp encyclopedia might be simply to determine what the pedagogical and scholarly needs are and plan a work with a format organically related to those needs, allowing problems of production to take second place. Small is only sometimes beautiful.

Speaking as a teacher of Sp whose chief interest is in other figures, he noted that he has had many students who would have been delighted with an encyclopedia to help them with questions about the state of Renaissance psychology, about the extent of Sp's knowledge of Aristotle, about the extent of the Saracen threat in Spenser's time, about how to read allegory, e.g., from details to abstractions or vice versa, about what iconography is.

Foster Provost (Duquesne Univ.), addressing a series of specific items, advocated the Variorum as the only edition acceptable as the text which all contributors must employ; hoped that the encyclopedia could have a full index including topics, and one planned from the beginning of the project; suggested that the authors of articles be engaged in designating names and topics to be

indexed and cross-referenced (there was advice from the audience that this and many other problems could be eliminated by computer typesetting); called on the prospective editors to form a sound editorial policy as to who shall decide on the assignment of spinoff articles; suggested that the problems associated with including a bibliography or bibliographies be thoroughly studied, and that the introductory essay, when written, relate this tool to other reference works on Sp and in the general field of renaissance literature.

As a direct result of this panel, Richardson received a communication from Richard J. Schoeck (Univ. of Colorado), currently at work on a DICTIONARY OF THE RENAISSANCE IN ENGLAND, expressing his strong approval of and support of the project, and offering to contribute wherever he can.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spenser at Kalamazoo. See inside back cover.

Children's Versions of Stories from FQ. Anne Shaver (Denison Univ.) and Brenda Thaon (Univ. of Montreal) are collecting these, and request that Spenserians send titles or any information they may have about Sp's motifs in children's literature to Professor Shaver, Dept. of English, Denison Univ., Granville, Ohio 43023.

Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association. The annual meeting will be held in Flagstaff Arizona on April 20 and 21, 1979. Plenary speaker, S. K. Heninger, Jr. (Univ. of British Columbia), who will address himself to "The Meaning of Symmetry." For information, write to James Fitzmaurice, Box 15700, Center for Integrated Studies, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011.

Renaissance English Text Society. RETS was founded to publish scarce literary texts, chiefly non-dramatic, of the period 1475-1660. Originally during each subscription period two single volumes, or one double volume, were distributed to members, who may purchase previous publications, while supplies last, at membership rates. The subscription rates are \$10 each for Series 1 and 2, and \$15 each for Series 3 & 4; student memberships, to persons providing proof of student status, are \$10 for all series. Beginning in 1978, with publication of Series 4, members will be billed \$15 annual dues (students \$10) regardless of whether there is a volume published during the year; all subscriptions will be used for printing and publishing costs, and members will be credited with the amount they have paid toward each series when it appears. Institutional members will be billed at the time of publication.

Subscriptions should be sent to James M. Wells at the Newberry Library, 60 West Walton St., Chicago, Ill. 60610. Institutional members are requested to provide, at the time of enrollment, any order numbers or other information required for their billing records; the Society cannot provide multiple invoices or other complex forms for their needs. Non-members may buy copies, at higher rates, of Vol. 1 from Mr. Wells; Vols. 2,3,4 from the Univ. of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60637; and of Vols. 5-6 and 7 from Univ. of So. Carolina Press, Columbia, S. C. 29208.

Spenser at Kalamazoo

1979

Our Ladies Shepherdes,

directed by Walter R. Davis (Notre Dame)
Musical interludes and dramatic readings from
The Shepherdes Calender
8:00 p.m., Thursday, 3 May 1979

SESSION I

Spenser and the Visual Arts

10:00-12:00 noon, Friday, 4 May 1979

Chair: Patrick Cullen (CUNY)

1. *Emblematic Perspective and the Visionary Experience in Spenser*
Jonathan Z. Kamholtz (Cincinnati)
Commentary: Judith Dundas (Illinois)
2. *Mammon's Grotto: Allegory and Architectural Decor*
David H. Evett (Cleveland State)
Commentary: Joseph A. Wittreich, Jr. (Maryland)
3. *The Illustrations to The Shepherdes Calender*
Ruth Luborsky (Drexel)
Commentary: S.K. Heninger, Jr. (British Columbia)

SESSION II

The Shepherdes Calender:

Coherence in Variety

3:00-5:00 p.m., Friday, 4 May 1979

Chair: Elizabeth Bieman (Western Ontario)

4. *The English Poets and the English Poet*
Theodore L. Steinberg (SUNY — Fredonia)
Commentary: R. Rawdon Wilson (Alberta)
5. *Variety and Coherence in the Verse of The Shepherdes Calender*
Susanne Woods (Brown)
Commentary: Thomas P. Roche, Jr. (Princeton)
6. *Dual Structure in Spenser's Eclogues*
Walter R. Davis (Notre Dame)
Commentary: Andrew V. Ettin (Wake Forest)

Third Annual Meeting of the Porlock Society

10:00 p.m., Friday, 4 May 1979

SESSION III

The Shepherdes Calender:

Sources and Themes

10:00-12:00 noon, Saturday, 5 May 1979

Chair: Judith Anderson (Indiana)

7. *Supplantation in the Elisabethan Court: The Theme of Spenser's February Eclogue*
Ronald B. Bond (Calgary)
Commentary: Louis A. Montrose (California — San Diego)
8. *Astrology in The Shepherdes Calender*
J.M. Richardson (Lakehead)
Commentary: Carol Kaske (Cornell)
9. *Paradoxes of Creation and Sterility: The Singer and His Landscape in Virgil's First and Spenser's June Eclogues*
Michael Laing (Toronto)
Commentary: William Sessions (Georgia State)

SESSION IV

Names in

The Shepherdes Calender

3:00-5:00 p.m., Saturday, 5 May 1979

Chair: Humphrey Tonkin (Pennsylvania)

10. *Names in The Shepherdes Calender: A Mare's Nest*
John T. Shawcross (CUNY)
Panel: A.C. Hamilton (Queen's)
Robert Kellogg (Virginia)
Alice S. Miskimin (Yale)

Program Committee

David A. Richardson (Cleveland State)
Russell J. Meyer (Missouri)
John C. Ulrich, Jr. (Arizona)
Alice Fox (Miami)



For 1979 program & registration,
please write to
Professor Otto Gründler, Director
The Medieval Institute
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
Tel. (616) 383-4980

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 55
ERIE PA. 16501

David L. Miller
Dept. of English
Univ. of Alabama
University, Ala. 35486 10
10.3