

SPENSER NEWSLETTER

Spring-Summer 1982

Volume 13

Number 2

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Co-editors: Foster Provost, Cherie Ann Haeger

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

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

CONTENTS

TO OUR READERS	29
BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES	29
Michael J. B. Allen, ed. & trans., <u>Marsilio Ficino</u> <u>and the Phaedran Charlioteer</u>	29
Jonathan Goldberg, <u>Endlesse Worke: Spenser and the</u> <u>Structures of Discourse</u>	34
SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO (1982)	38
ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES	45
DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS	46
ANNOUNCEMENTS	48

The Spenser Newsletter is published three times a year, Winter, Spring-Summer, and Fall, by the Department of English of the State University of New York, Albany. Please address all communications to

Spenser Newsletter
Department of English
SUNY--Albany
Albany NY 12222.

The editor solicits letters containing news of any sort which would be of interest to Spenserians, and will make an effort to print any legitimate query. He also solicits abstracts and/or offprints of articles (with full publication data, please), the receipt of which may reduce the time between the publication of the article and our report on it.

Subscription rates, institutional and private: \$4/yr. in USA, \$4 (US funds or equivalent) in Canada, \$7 US in Latin America and overseas. Overseas subscriptions may be subject to higher charges if invoicing is required. These rates are for Vol. 13, 1982.

TO OUR READERS

82.48 Once more it is time for the incumbent editors, wizened by the Spenserian sea, to let someone else sail the boat. The new captain is Hugh N. Maclean of SUNY--Albany, into whose capable hands we pass the tiller and the main sheet. His first issue will be the next one, #13.3, Fall 1982. Bon voyage, Hugh!

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

- 82.49 Allen, Michael J. B., ed. and trans. *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer*, by Marsilio Ficino. With Introduction and Translations. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981. x + 274 pp. \$26.50.

Marsilio Ficino, the fifteenth-century Florentine scholar who almost singlehandedly acquainted the Western world with the works of Plato, is universally acknowledged to be one of the most fascinating and influential thinkers of the Italian Renaissance, but students of this period have little detailed acquaintance with the greater part of his individual writings. We are, of course, aware of the extent of his influence, though perhaps it is not generally known that, even on into the seventeenth century, thinkers like Thomas Traherne copied Ficino's commentaries or made extracts from them "as a substitute for actually reading Plato," and that "throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries [references to Plato] are more likely to be to Ficino's arguments than to the dialogues themselves (Introduction, p. 17). But so far scholars have been hampered by a lack of good modern editions. The corrupt 1576 Basel edition was reprinted in 1959, and so far is our only generally available edition of all of Ficino's works. There have been editions in France and America of the *Commentary on the Symposium* (1956, 1944), in France of the complete *Theologia Platonica* (1964, 1970) and in America of the *Commentary on the Philebus* (1975). Of recent years the *Letters* of Ficino have appeared in an English translation (1975, 1978), and there has been an edition of Ficino's apprentice *Greek-Latin Lexicon* (1977). As knowledge of Latin generally recedes, there has been an acknowledged need for good translations into vernacular languages. Thus the modern editions have been equipped with translations.

In this area of editing and translating, Michael Allen has already taken a lead with his 1975 *Philebus Commentary* and is recognized as among the foremost experts in Ficino and Renaissance Platonism. Indeed, Ficino studies seem to be picking up momentum, to judge by the growing production of scholarly articles. For a long time the only full-length study of Ficino's thought was P. O. Kristeller's *Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (1943), which concentrated on a relatively few of the central doctrines of Ficino and traced their influence. Lately two more monographs on Ficino have appeared, one in Polish on his theory of aesthetics (Kuczynska, 1970) and one in Italian on his theory of astrological medicine (Zanier, 1977).

Undoubtedly, this new edition of the *Phaedrus* commentary will be a stimulus to more such studies, particularly in the field of poetry and literature.

Love, beauty, and rhetoric are the subjects of the *Phaedrus*, which takes the form of a conversation between Socrates and the young Phaedrus outside the walls of Athens, under a plane-tree by the river Ilissus. The main body of the dialogue is taken up with Socrates' argument that genuine rhetoric is based on philosophic knowledge of the truth, towards which the soul is impelled by Eros. It was the preliminary part of the *Phaedrus*, however, that chiefly interested Ficino. There Phaedrus reads a *tour de force* by the rhetor Lysias, dispraising Love on the grounds that lovers are mad. Socrates does not share Phaedrus' enthusiasm for the rhetorical skill of this piece, and delivers one of his own on the same argument. But then he is admonished by this attendant spirit to recant his blasphemies against Love. The part of the dialogue in which he does so is known as the Palinode (*Phaedrus* 243E-256A) and it is upon this that Ficino concentrated his attention when he wrote his commentaries. Socrates discourses here of the immortality of the soul and of how it is inspired by madness. Whether it be prophetic frenzy, religious ecstasy, poetic fury or erotic madness, all madness is a gift of the gods and lifts the soul to knowledge above that of the senses and discursive reason. Concentrating on erotic love (to the "radiant" Phaedrus even Plato had written a love-sick epigram), Socrates speaks rhapsodically of how love causes the soul to grow wings. He himself calls this part of his speech a "mystical hymn," and certainly he speaks here in myth and metaphor. He compares the soul to a chariot commanded by a charioteer (the reason) and drawn by two winged horses, representing the "spirited" appetite and the physical appetite. He tells of how these chariot-sould run their circuits through the universe, and of how they also mount up above the supercelestial sphere to the realm of pure idea, where they gaze upon the truth.

In his commentary Ficino devotes much attention to defining *soul* and its powers. Corresponding to the different levels of reality (or "worlds," as Ficino calls them) are different orders of gods (twelve in each world) and each of these is accompanied and attended by daimons and other souls. Human souls originally also accompanied some one of the gods and with the gods mounted up to the sight of the One Truth. However, human souls have plunged headlong down into matter and become joined to elemental, mortal bodies, bodies which are impure and therefore not totally fitted for life. As a result, our souls have acquired a vegetative power which causes them to attend to the physical and so be dragged downward; yet our souls have not lost their desire for the divine (capacity to grow wings), which is stimulated by the sight of beauty and the growth of love.

Obviously, there is a great deal in Ficino's commentary that is not derived from Plato but from the Neoplatonists, particularly Plotinus, Hermias and Proclus. So there is considerable discussion of the spherical, airy bodies of gods and rational souls (as contrasted to elemental or mortal bodies), and of the different orders of gods in the different worlds. For example, having named the World-Soul (which exists on the third level of reality) Jupiter, on the authority of most of the Neoplatonists, Ficino then

considers why Plotinus calls it Venus (because it is disposed towards beauty), and conjectures whether it might not also be called Love or Cupid. Students of Sp will recognize here the source of much of Sp's esoteric handling of classical mythology. As an example of this kind of thinking, the following will stand:

In the intelligible world Rhea is the vital power perhaps. The Saturnian and Jovian intellect lie upon her (the first as husband and the second as son). Accompanying or following the intellect is the quickening power, Juno: she is the daughter of [its] first understanding and sister and spouse of [its] second. Neptune is the active, moving power for completing work and the distributor too of a like property in [its] effects. Pluto (and Vesta) is the fixed and fixing property. (116)

Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer is a collection of Ficinian texts, most of them from the *Commentaria in Platonem* (Florence, 1496). First we have the Palinode section of the *Phaedrus* in Ficino's 1484 edition (*Platonis Omnia Opera*), the earliest printed version, collated with a manuscript of about the same time, and with the second (1491) edition. This has no English translation. Then there is the *Commentarium in Phaedrum*, with facing translation, from the 1496 *Commentaria*, collated with the Prague MS (the only other complete fifteenth-century version), dating from the early 1490's, and with three later manuscripts. Also included are 53 *Summae* of the *Phaedrus*, which followed the *Commentarium* in the 1496 volume. The last body of texts (with English translations) are seven other passages where Ficino discusses the myth of the Charioteer-- from the *De Voluptate*, the commentaries on the *Symposium* and the *Philebus*, and the seventeenth and eighteenth books of the *Platonic Theology*. The *De Voluptate* passage is taken from Ficino's *Jamblichi de mysteriis et alia* (Venice, 1497), and the rest of the texts from modern editions.

There is a twenty-eight page introduction in which Allen first points out the central importance of the Palinode in the *Phaedrus* and gives a brief characterization of its literary devices. He elucidates the symbolic meaning of the myth of the chariot, bringing in comparisons with Arjuna's chariot in the *Bhagavat-Gita* and with chariots that appear in the writings of Parmenides and Pindar, as well as with Ezekiel's fiery chariot, the four horses of the Apocalypse and St. Paul's account of being carried up to the third heaven (2 Cor.).

Then Allen discusses the importance ascribed to this passage by the ancient Neoplatonists, who identified it as theological and dealing with "the mysteries at the heart of theogony, incarnation, soteriology, eschatology and purification" (5). Dwelling briefly on how Plato's works were introduced into the West in the early fifteenth century, Allen notes that the *Phaedrus* soon attracted special attention. It was partially translated by Leonardo Bruni in 1424 and was at the centre of a controversy between Platonists and Aristotelians that raged in the middle part of the century. The Neoplatonists believed it to be the earliest of Plato's dialogues, containing the seeds of all the rest, and hence a cornerstone of Plato's philosophy. Ficino somewhat hesitantly concurred in their opinion that

its master-theme was Beauty in all its forms, and he emphasized its poetic inspiration and style, which he took to be the perfect vehicle for philosophical thought.

Allen also sums up Ficino's career as translator and thinker in order to place these various texts chronologically in order of their composition. The "commentary" is a compilation of fragmentary essays composed at different times, for Ficino never got around to his projected full commentary on the *Phaedrus*. Allen also summarizes the commentaries and indicates important points in the argument. He then addresses himself to the other Ficinian passages where the interpretive possibilities of the myth were explored and explains why he chose these particular seven.

The Introduction has very full notes, bibliographical, historical and critical, some of which could, perhaps, better have been a part of the Introduction itself. As it is, it is very succinct, not to say cryptic, and it is somewhat irritating to have to turn as often as one does to the notes, especially since the superscript numbers are infuriatingly small. Sometimes, on the other hand, there is no footnote where one would expect it: that is, at the end of a passage where Allen has been summarizing Ficino's thought, and one would like to know to what places or works he is referring (e.g., p. 4, l. 29). On the whole, however, the argument of the Introduction is clear and impressively learned, if somewhat coagulated. Its materials could, perhaps, have been more clearly ordered. A very brief outline, at least, or more clarification of cant terms of Ficino's philosophy would have made the book more accessible to the general student of the Renaissance: as it is, anyone not thoroughly versed in Plato and unacquainted with Neoplatonism will find that this is not an introduction to those matters.

In the notes to the text Allen provides references to important passages and ideas in the Neoplatonists and other philosophers, as well as to passages in other works by Ficino where ideas recur or are modified. He identifies allusions and sometimes clarifies the ideas being expressed, though not on an elementary level.

There is an appendix describing the Prague MS. and an excellent Select Bibliography. There are also several indices (of works cited, of names, of mythological figures and of topics) but no general index where one might find where to look in the text for Allen's mentions of Renaissance figures or modern scholars.

The translations are generally reliable and workmanlike, choosing where necessary accuracy over readability. There are some idiosyncrasies and stylistic oddities, such as unexpected colloquialisms, but there are also elegant moments. The translations, however, raise the question to whom they are addressed. If Allen has in mind readers with little or no Latin, there must be times when such readers will call out for help through a relaxation of the literalness or an explanatory note. On the other hand, the reader with Latin will want some discussion of cruxes in translation and interpretation and the reasons for Allen's decisions in such moments. There are fairly copious critical notes, and these do sometimes offer explanations, but not such as would related to the translation.

In what remains of this review, passages will be pointed out where the rendering might be disputed. These passages are not chosen because the reviewers know what Ficino meant, but because they do not. P. 102, lines 1-2: the souls of the men and lower demons act *pluribus . . . intervallis et vicibus*, whereas the celestial soul *eodem efficit habitu*. Allen translates as "through a number of points in time and space" and "with a disposition that remains the same." *Vicibus* seems to refer to change of state, in contrast to *habitu*: "points in time and space" scarcely seems sufficient. P. 102, lines 13-14: Allen translates *nostra . . . anima . . . similem quodammodo totius providentiam sortiri videtur, similem quoque cum anima mundi* as "our soul seems to receive, in a way, a providence like the whole's and like the world-soul's"; is it not rather "our soul in a sense acquires a similar care for the whole, just as the world-soul does"? The trouble here is perhaps with the technical term *providentia*. Generally speaking, terms of a quasi-technical nature that can cause problems are handled easily and undogmatically (*ordo, ratio, natura*), though one feels some discomfort with *discurro* and its congeners.

P. 104, lines 34-35: speaking of the elemental body, Ficino writes, *Ideo non semper vivit neque totum penitus neque perfecte*, which Allen translates as "so it does not live forever, nor is it entirely nor perfectly whole." But *totum penitus* and *perfecte* appear to qualify *vivit*, like *semper*: "so it does not live forever, nor with the whole of itself, nor in a perfect way." P. 144, lines 1-10: the threefold structure indicated by *in mundo intelligibili . . . in celo . . . in nobis* seems to be intended as a system of contrasts, but these are somewhat lost in the translation. Lines 12-13: surely by his *utrobique . . . utrobique* Ficino is not implying that the understanding and the will prompt us to contrasting actions, but rather that both prompt to each action: so *utrobique* could be rendered "in the case of both" instead of "on the one hand" and "on the other." P. 146, lines 9-12: the translation here causes the syllogism to lose some crispness. Ficino first states the premiss that what moves in and of itself is always in motion. He then proceeds to argue: A. A soul moves through itself; B. what moves through itself is always in motion; and C. if it is always in motion, it is always alive. (*Scilicet* goes with *motu quodam intimo*, not with *si semper movetur*.) P. 158, lines 22-24: commenting on the part of the *Phaedrus* where Socrates says that, having viewed the Truth, the charioteer stops his horses at the stable and feeds them with ambrosia and nectar, Ficino glosses: *nutrit ambrosia, solido nutrimento, quatenus eos sistit in causis suis atque bonis*. The allegorical point that is being made here is admittedly difficult. But Allen's translation, "he nourishes them with ambrosia, with solid sustenance, insofar as he stops them in their causes and goods," is impene-trable. "Their" here clearly refers to the horses; but the Latin *suis* could not, and must refer to the charioteer: "he roots them firmly in his own purposes and goods" (admittedly somewhat free) conveys the idea that the Reason attaches the appetites to his own purposes and goals by delighting them in them, if this is what is meant. P. 162, lines 22-23: *impedimento procul* surely means "far from any impediment," not "as long as it encounters no impediment," for what impediment could the soul encounter in its completion? Ficino does not say that it is ever stopped by an impediment,

but rather that through its own negligence it falters. P. 168, lines 26-30: the translation implies that the soul will go on philosophizing in another life as a result of philosophizing in a prior life; but the sense of the Latin seems to be rather that the soul will migrate into a purer body if it philosophizes (*efficiet* having as its object *migraverit* rather than *philosophari*). P. 180, lines 5-6: "Plato's other points, especially as they bear on the mental disposition of the lover, are sufficiently obvious either here or in the *Symposium*," seems a contorted way of translating *Cetera satis vel hic vel in lebro de amore patent, ingenioso presertim et amatori*. *Ingenioso* and *amatori* seem obviously to mean "to the man of wit" and "to the lover": so, "Plato's other points, especially as they relate to the man of wit and the lover . . ." P. 180, lines 11-12: isn't the point here not to explain *influx* (that has already been done), but to explain *necessitate*? In fact, that is what is explained. P. 188, lines 14 ff.: "This once more incites the concupiscible power" should be "this [i.e., the concupiscible power] once more incites," as *hec* refers to *vis concupiscibilis*, since it is singular and feminine.

All this is not intended as carping criticism, for it is clear that in a text of this difficulty any translator is bound to trip up in places. It does, however, illustrate the need felt by these reviewers for some discussion in footnotes of decisions made by the translator, where there is a choice between an obvious reading and a less obvious one. In these cases Allen has made the less obvious choice, perhaps for good reasons, but one would like to know those reasons.

In summary, this is on the whole a careful and learned piece of work, and one that will be eagerly welcomed by students of Ficino and of Renaissance Neoplatonism.

Patricia Vicari and John Warden
Scarborough College, University of Toronto

- 82.50 Goldberg, Jonathan. *Endlesse Worke: Spenser and the Structures of Discourse*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981. xv + 177 pp. US\$ 14.50.

This is at once a study of Book IV of FQ and a sustained presentation of what its author announces in his first sentence as "a way of reading Spenser." The way is that of structuralist or "post-structuralist" criticism, most explicitly that of Roland Barthes' *S/Z* with its concept of the "writerly text"; and although it is likely to seem rocky or labyrinthine to many Spenserians, I think it is well worth the travelling. Goldberg argues convincingly (in a few polemical footnotes) that Sp criticism to date has stopped short of accepting the full consequences of its insights into the conspicuous irrelevancies and provisional rhetorical formulations characteristic of Sp's fictions. Where others have typically ended by hinting at some finally coherent structure, formal or conceptual, Goldberg provides a relentless portrayal of a Sp determinedly refusing closure, a Scheherazade endlessly fabulating against the threat of a catastrophic sabbath's sight. To the extent that critics have tended to take positions at one point or other on the spectrum from Mutability to Jove, Goldberg's may be labeled the most determinedly metamorphic reading of the poem thus

far; in Nohrnberg's terms he is the quintessential disciple of Proteus rather than Pan.

Before considering the various stages of his argument, it may be helpful to note briefly its scope. He has admittedly chosen to discuss Book IV since it is so clearly "an appropriate site" (xi) for his kind of commentary. He disavows any desire to provide a general theory of poetic narration, and in fact he says very little even about the other books of FQ; yet for various reasons it seems that his approach to Book IV is a way of reading all Sp and perhaps all poetry. He cites Frank Kermode (*The Genesis of Secrecy*) and Stephen Marcus (on Freud's fiction of the 'case history') in speaking of the strong, universal compulsion of readers--and of human beings generally--to master books and everyday experience by imposing order and coherence where mere random circumstance is felt to be intolerable and threatening. He advances Sp's poem as a text that denies or undermines such reading: "*The Faerie Queene* is a powerful text and its fascination results from its otherness, the writerly qualities that free it from the responsibility to reproduce reality as it is ordinarily perceived" (29). Yet if such an act of ordinary perception is itself a distortion of reality, a product of the fact that as Kermode puts it, "We are all fulfillment men, *pleromatists*" (cited by Goldberg, xii), it seems a valid question whether the description of FQ as a writerly text defines it as belonging to a class that does not include all other texts, or at least all other powerful texts, or texts powerfully read. Perhaps the "readerly text" proves to be as elusive as that other thing that Sp's poem is so often said not to be: the naive allegory. We may say that there are no naive allegories, only naive readers; no readerly texts, only similarly naive readers who reductively choose to replace the text's signifiers by a set of other signifiers which they capriciously consider to be the signified.

The principal strength of this study, in short, is its use of a critical vocabulary which the author has found to be well adapted to the description of Sp's poem; a vocabulary which permits the consolidation of critical advances in recent decades during which we have all become more sensitive to the dangers of reductive reading. From the New-Critical warnings against the heresy of paraphrasing *any* text, to more narrowly defined strictures of Tuve or Alpers against the wrong ways of imposing meaning on allegory or romance, twentieth-century discussion of literature has frequently seemed better able to describe error than to proclaim truth. Goldberg expeditiously manages to talk about Sp's poem for chapters on end, saving his discovery of errors for the occasional footnote. This is no mean achievement, as will be clear to readers familiar with the argumentative style of much recent criticism. Though there are limitations to what he can say about the poem, they are limitations that he chooses and names explicitly from the outset, by steadfastly refusing to produce any heuristic model to structure his argument--unless it is the model of Sp's persistent subversion of such models, his recurrent revision of precedent formulae, stories, or texts.

Goldberg begins by examining the 1596 revision of the original ending

to Book III and its implications for the later book and for the new poem as it appeared in 1596. "The fundamental quality of narration in Book IV, that book whose place in the poem is made by the displacement of an ending, is, then, not a progression toward a conclusion, but a deferral, leaving an ending 'to be perfected' in 'another place'; the fundamental quality, as the narrator calls it, is 'endless worke' (xii.1.9)" (8). Goldberg speaks briefly (one would like to hear more) of the degree to which this egregious instance of plot deferral casts doubt on the definiteness and closure of earlier books; at least the reader of 1596, it seems, would recognize that from the outset the poem has been infinitely digressive, and endless series of new beginnings. As Harry Bailly had said of *Sir Thopas*, Sp's original model, "Thou doost nocht elles but dependest tyme," one digression generating another subordinate to it. From the beginning, Sp's reader has watched with similar exasperation the rising stakes of his investment in the poem, as the narrator pulls more and more fragments from his everlasting scryne. By 1596, Goldberg suggests, such exasperation may be giving way to something like despair, for poet and reader alike: "The troubled and weary narrator of book IV, watching the central figures disappear, viewing the endless reshuffling of faceless knights and ladies, operating on the edge of an abyss in which he too may be lost, is encountering as well that void where the reader plays before this vast and powerful indifference of the text, learning the pleasures of being made subject to it" (29).

The sentence just quoted may be taken as exemplary of some of the problems raised by a critical method which strenuously avoids reductiveness or closure while nevertheless occasionally feeling the need to say something that sounds like the end of a chapter (which this is). The reader is likely to feel vaguely puzzled as to the meaning of these remarks. Is it a question of pronominal referents (subject to what? void or indifference or text?), or of something lost in translation (maybe "play" or "indifference" had richer connotations in their French sources)? Can one speak of being subject to something that is indifferent? Isn't there something kinky about enjoying such subjection? It seems that the entire series of present participles, from "watching" onwards, is increasingly vague as to the action being performed. Though it is certainly rather mean-spirited to dwell at length on what is at worst a rather fuzzy, overly rhetorical period at the end of a series of admirably perceptive observations, it seems worth noting how deeply runs our need to complete or summarize a pattern or argument. It seems impossible, finally, to avoid giving excessive weight to *some* critical construct, whether it be "Christian humanism" or "text." If the preceding commentary has not demonstrated fully the congruence of all the crucial terms with the vocabulary of the poem being discussed, the reductiveness of the critic is likely to become apparent when he chooses where to conclude.

Goldberg goes on to discuss the ways in which Book IV is not only a continuation of Chaucer's *Squire's Tale* but also at the same time a tale of indefinitely alternating and proliferating squires. Sp's own submission to a prior text and to a senior poet (as squire must submit to knight and carve at table before the father) involves the completion of a tale which is itself fraught with the anxieties of a bounded will and a sense of

antecedent forms. Goldberg's commentary on the Chaucerian text emphasizes the frustrated will of the Squire's talking falcon, whose loss of her beloved tercelet is itself the illustration of a prior text: "thilke text . . . That 'alle thyng, repeyrng to his kynde, / Gladeth himself.'" Such a choice of Chaucerian motifs provides an extremely suggestive introduction to similar motifs in Sp, from Amoret's loss of Scudamour to Timias' of Belpheobe (the latter finally resolved by means of a marvelous bird). Where another critical approach (like that of A. K. Hieatt in his *Chaucer, Spenser, Milton: Mythopoeic Continuities and Transformations*, 1975) could have connected these texts by way of an emphasis on the fatal consequences of possessive love (the falcon cites the stubborn independence of "brides . . . that men in cages fede" as an example of the innate "newfangelnesse" that has cost her her love), Goldberg is able to trace a parallel course by means of the repeated elements of *occupatio* in the texts--the submission of one voice or will to another's, in explicit citations of earlier and therefore "authoritative" words. As he makes clear in an important footnote reference to a lecture by Thomas Greene (116), he is well aware that his structuralist method and vocabulary run parallel to what historical criticism can similarly say about the Renaissance attempt to pursue an essentially irrecoverable past text. But Goldberg's choice of terms here sets up a line of discussion followed in subsequent chapters developing the generalized elements in this first intertextual issue: Desire, and the "authority" associated with the Other. Jacques Lacan's concept of *méconnaissance* as an act of willful misunderstanding or misreading that is at once a true, if subjective understanding, permits a highly illuminating treatment of Belpheobe's "misdeeming" of Timias and the related patterns of will and authority that are traced throughout this book of squires. As Chaucer had been emblematic of the chronologically prior "author" of Sp's text, so is Elizabeth the figure of political authority who shares a punning kind of authorship with the poet. Even if some of this punning is hard to find explicitly present in the text, it provides (in my opinion) a strikingly successful treatment of the blending of erotic and political anxieties in the poem. The rather casual, paradigmatic rearrangement of Chaucerian characters into a marriage *quaternio* gives way to increasingly problematic courtships and marriages in the later cantos of the book. The queen who is urged to "hearke to love, and reade this lesson often" (IV.Proem 5) becomes the authorizing reader of a tale in which a figure of her personified virginity sees (as Redcross had seen in I.i) a squire in the arms of another (who is, in fact, her twin sister). With the complex envies and mis-seings of this most wandering, "error"-fraught of books, comes a pattern of conflicting texts that Goldberg traces in convincing detail.

Goldberg's prefatory remarks mention that this book received its "definitive form" in the summer of 1979; doubtless because of this fact, it nowhere mentions another, usefully complementary study of Sp in structuralist terms, Patricia Parker's *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode*, which was published in the fall of 1979. Parker's inclusion of a chapter on Sp alongside treatments of Ariosto, Milton, and Keats as well as modern poets provides what Goldberg notably does not: an attempt to suggest that Sp is unusually receptive to the special language of

structuralism, as a result of his commitment to the material of the romances, to the mode of romance, and also, perhaps, to the romance languages which inform his punning etymologies to so striking a degree. Her commentary on Sp's use of a word like "dilation," in ways which reinforce its relationship to Ariosto's *differire*, suggests a common nexus of connections to the later attempt to recover the divergent meanings of "differ" and "defer" in Derrida's notorious *différance*. Parker's book is a useful prelude (or antecedent text) to the reading of Goldberg's, if only to provide justification (for those who find it necessary) of what may otherwise seem an irritatingly modish vocabulary. Spenserians who allow such irritation to keep them from a careful reading of *Endlesse Worke* will deprive themselves of a valuable insight into Spenserian narration in general and into the characteristic turnings and "errors" of Book IV in particular.

[D. C.]

SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO (1982)

- 82.51 The seventh annual meeting of *Spenser at Kalamazoo* was opened by Professor Thomas P. Roche, Jr. (Princeton), who reminded us that the sessions were begun in 1976 by young Spenserians whose enthusiasm for these gatherings has not diminished, though they themselves are rapidly becoming middle-aged. All four sessions, sponsored by the Spenser Society, are the work of a planning committee: Russell J. Meyer (University of Missouri--Columbia), Alice Fox (Miami of Ohio), Donald Stump (V. P. I.), and John C. Ulreich, Jr. (University of Arizona).
- 82.52 The first session, *Death and Transfiguration in The Faerie Queene*, was chaired by Walter Davis (Notre Dame), and its program comprised an interesting study of sources for the epic. One essay shows new ways that the poem reflects a commonly recognized text; the second offers a text commonly available as a new source for Sp's fainting Guyon; a third demonstrates the way an uncommon text provides a temptingly extensive reading of the figure Natura in the Mutabilitie Cantos.
- 82.53 J. J. M. Tobin (University of Massachusetts--Boston) showed new depths of indebtedness in "Spenser's Use of *The Golden Asse* of Apuleius" throughout FQ. Beyond the Garden of Adonis and Isis Church episodes, Tobin claims that the Cave of Mammon, a third major episode of the poem, is "fundamentally Apuleian." Among the many interpretations of Guyon's trial in the Cave, the case for it as a test or purging of both avarice and curiosity is strong: Guyon, like Psyche, is endangered by these vices. Tobin also points to specific verbal echoes in the Mammon stanzas, from both the Adlington translation and the original text, word-play by the "macaronically punning Sp." Thematic, narrative, and lexical echoes also exist in other parts of FQ: in the Busirane-Amoret episode, which recalls Meropis's mutilation of Socrates; in the nature of Britomart who, like Psyche, "*sexum audacia mutatur*"; in Pastorella's Charité-like suffering; in the name of the Blatant Beast; and finally in the scopophilia shared by Calidore who sees unbidden the vision on Mount Acidale and Lucius who, in the form of an ass, witnesses the Judgment of Paris. Thus Tobin feels "that Sp often turned to

The Golden Asse, chiefly but not only to the tale of Cupid and Psyche, for material," and that, like his fellow writers Sidney and Shakespeare, he used the source both specifically and allusively, for purposes "descriptive, narrative, and allegorical."

- 82.54 In his response, Andrew Ettin (Wake Forest) congratulated Tobin in drawing new connections between FQ and a commonly recognized source. He concurred with the reading which compared the Amoret-Busirane episode with Meroe's treatment of Socrates, but warned that there are numerous other probable sources even for this. Less satisfied with the connection claimed between the Judgment of Paris and Sp's Acidale, Ettin also declined most of Tobin's lexical comparisons, in particular the Latin puns. Two questions were raised in the short discussion that followed: what was Sp's attitude toward Apuleius, and how important to the poet was Apuleius' commentator, Beroaldus?
- 82.55 Offering a new source for one specific episode in Sp's epic, Hugh MacLachlan (Wilfrid Laurier) aligned himself with those critics who see Sir Guyon's collapse after his trip through Mammon's Cave as evidence of spiritual imperfection. In "The Death of Guyon and the *Book of Homilies*," MacLachlan shows that Sp describes the unconscious Guyon in the language of death, not of exhaustion; the familiar "Sermon on Good Works" from *The Elizabethan Book of Homilies* uses the same language to describe one who takes inordinate pride in deeds and who lacks a "true and lively" faith. Guyon seems to demonstrate true faith in the early cantos, but "the word used repeatedly in the sermons to describe 'lively' faith is 'confidence'--confidence in God, not in one's own natural powers to reject evil." By the time he meets Mammon in the forest the young knight, no longer accompanied by the holy palmer, has exhibited a growing self-assuredness in his own powers of temperance and in the supreme value of that virtue. MacLachlan goes on to say, "Critics misread Guyon's successful rejections of Mammon's temptations, not realizing that to reject Mammon, as Guyon does, is not automatically to choose God Morally he passes the test, but spiritually he fails it. And this is why, for the moment, he 'dies.'"
- 82.56 Robert L. Kellogg (University of Virginia) complimented MacLachlan's analysis of Sp's language, especially of Prince Arthur's equivocal use of such terms as "corse" and "carkasse." Kellogg expressed discomfort, however, with the Protestant dogmatism which, he conceded, might be Sp's flaw rather than MacLachlan's. He himself prefers to see Guyon as "incomplete," not as "flawed."
- 82.57 The discussion of the essay dealt mainly with the character of Guyon, though without a specific focus. In answer to claims that he had been too harsh in his judgments, MacLachlan asserted that we are meant to admire Guyon just as we are supposed to be charmed by the Bower of Blisse. We must be trapped in order to be shown that there is more than temperance, more than beauty. In another context, MacLachlan identified Guyon with Redcrosse, citing Susan Snyder's article which connects the two knights through the etymology of their names. Thomas Roche suggested that sessions on single characters could teach and delight at future Kalamazoos.

82.58 Harold L. Weatherby (Vanderbilt) proposed a new source for Sp's treatment of *Natura* in the *Mutabilitie Cantos*. Far more obscure than the ubiquitous *Elizabethan Book of Homilies*, John of Damascus' homily on the Transfiguration, possibly available to Sp in a 1577 Greco-Latin edition, provides elegant analogies with the poet's unusual metaphor. Although his *Nature* owes her allegorical personification to western literary tradition, Sp identifies her, through metaphor, with the risen Christ. In his essay "Spenser's Dame Nature and the Transfiguration: The Possible Influence of John of Damascus," Weatherby points out that the western notion of nature as imperfect and mutable works against this image; the eastern orthodox beliefs, however, especially as presented by the Damascene, support it in several ways. the doctrine of *theosis*, that God "was made man that we might be made God," explains the identity of Christ with Nature, while the idea of man as microcosm, an image shared by east and west, strengthens the mystic identification: "Christ by deifying and transfiguring the microcosm deified the cosmos by extension." Thus, as Weatherby goes on to say, "What has seemed to some commentators a puzzling or even exorbitant metaphor . . . turns out to be an eastern theological commonplace."

Futher parallels include an interpretation of the Transfiguration as both an epiphany and a prophecy, demanding "both enjoyment and anticipation, which are precisely Sp's responses to Dame Nature's radiance." Confrontation of this paradox might explain Sp's shift of mood between *Cantos* seven and eight. Further, the hexameral tradition reflected by the numbering of the *cantos* is, in the east, directly tied to the Transfiguration. Thus, although he would not discount Sp's eclecticism, he can make a strong claim that "the Greek Fathers offer . . . a coherent theological and symbolic model very nearly identical with Spenser's."

82.59 In response, Ettin expressed delight in the clarity of Weatherby's presentation, saying that if we accept his thesis--and Weatherby does acknowledge it as problematical--then the *Mutabilitie Cantos* have greater theological unity than we have thought. Even so, we need further accumulation of evidence, in lieu of a signed charge card from the Cambridge library. Ettin's major reservation is that there seems to be more allegory than theology in the poetry itself: "perhaps the allegory works against the theology," for in spite of the unusual metaphor, we do not perceive *Natura* as Christ. One of the dangers of source studies is that they can leave the poem behind: Ettin would have liked Weatherby to say something about the feminine nature of the goddess, or the images that liken her to a lion.

82.60 During the discussion that followed, Weatherby pointed out that as seen in MacLachlan's essay and his own, Sp's attitude to Nature seems to have undergone a major change between Book II and the *Mutabilitie Cantos*. Further, there was general agreement that more work was needed to establish Sp's links with Greek Christianity. Jon Quitslund (George Washington) offered the information that Launcelot Andrewes, Sp's schoolmate, was well-read in the Eastern Fathers, but still he concurred with Ettin and others that in the poem itself, Nature does not seem divine.

- 82.61 Anne Prescott (Barnard) presided over the second session, *Spenser's Relations with the Aristocracy*. Presenting "A Whig Reading of the Mercilla Episode," Richard F. Hardin (Kansas) claimed for Sp "more sympathy with contemporary republican thought than is usually realized." Augmenting his interpretation of the *Lucifera* and *Mercilla* passages with evidence from a sonnet prefaced to Lewkenor's *Contarini* and with the poet's "Brief Note of Ireland," Hardin shows that *Mercilla* is not a celebration of the queen, but rather "is an ideal of which Elizabeth in many ways partakes." This ideal includes vigilance, participation with the politically active (not just decorative) nobility, and especially the sort of mercy that validates royal virtue, attributes which, in Sp's view, Elizabeth possesses in part but should cultivate further.
- 82.62 Acknowledging Hardin's approach to be interesting and valuable, W. Nicholas Knight (Missouri--Rolla) nonetheless took strong issue with his conclusions. *Mercilla*, he feels, embodies or suggests much more than a cruel and necessary mercy; she "may be Queen Elizabeth, an ideal ruler, the personal Eliza over Mary Queen of Scots, an icon of mercy or sovereign justice, *Astraea*, or Equity in action, or English political necessity clothed in the trappings of judicial misericordia, or the queen as represented by Chancery, Chancellor, or Courts of Equity, or in fact include all of the above and still be literally even more." Sp is a poet, not a politician: his inventions transcend specific cases.
- 82.63 Jon Quitslund (George Washington) gave the second and final paper for this session, "Ornaments of All True Love and Beautie: the Patronesses of the *Four Hymnes*." Suggesting that Sp found much of his subject matter in "the experience and attitudes of other people," Quitslund claims that Anne Dudley, Countess of Warwick, and Margaret Clifford, Countess of Cumberland, "exercised a subtle influence upon the content and design of the *Hymnes*." His essay centers on the education and life experiences of Margaret Clifford, Sp's younger patroness. Her expressed disillusion with the actuality of romantic love, coupled to knowledge of its neoplatonic ideal and attended by strong religious convictions, may well point the way from the first pair of *Hymnes* to their retraction in the second.
- 82.64 John Webster (University of Washington) responded with an essay of his own, "Two by Two and One by Four: the Structural Dilemma of Spenser's *Four Hymnes*," in which he suggests how Quitslund's biographical information might be used. Reminding us of the two general ways of interpreting the *Hymnes*--the disjunctive, which accepts the last two as literal retractions of the first pair, and the unitive, which sees the four as poetically consistent--Webster shows how Margaret's life provides strong support for the former interpretation. Even though Sp's customary method "is to incorporate, not to disjoin, in his vision of an ideal world, Quitslund has shown him capable also of recognizing the "limits and sadness" of actual life. "Sp's reputation as a humanist poet of order and analogy is already safely established; Professor Quitslund's work gives now reasons to praise Sp as a poet of sympathy and consolation as well."
- 82.65 In discussion, the question was raised of how well Sp knew the facts of the two countesses' private lives. On the one hand, such must have been

the stuff of courtgossip; on the other, Sp was for the most part in Ireland, not at court. Further discussion followed on the disjunctive and unitive readings of the *Fowre Hymnes*, revealing in the audience a strong sympathy for the latter.

- 82.66 Session III, *Continental Connections and the Early Poems*, was chaired by Susan Fletcher (U.C.L.A.), who complimented the group's scholarship for its range and versatility before introducing Brenda Thaon (University of Montreal). Thaon's essay, "Spenser and the Elizabethan Art of Verse Translation," places Sp in the mainstream of Elizabethan theories of translation, theories which accommodate adaptation, imitation, experiment, and frank improvement. Although one theory held that these techniques developed one from the other in the maturing of a poet, this was not true of Sp. Examples of revised translations (from the 1569 *Theatre for Worldlings* to the 1591 *Complaints*) show changes which improve the poetry at the cost of literal accuracy, but Sp never translated slavishly. There are many "Spenserian" lines in his early translations which are found repeated in his later poetry. Thus the translations were experimental from the beginning, in both language and prosody: "not one of his translations reproduces the rhyme and meter of its original." With examples from SC, Amor, and FQ, Thaon shows that Sp has used translation and adaptation for his own purposes, and that those purposes are consistent with the main theories and practices of his time--ranging from an almost medieval disregard for the text to moments of exactness, but centering primarily in the practice of a conscious originality.
- 82.67 In the brief comment that time permitted on this essay, Carol V. Kaske (Cornell) praised it as an essential kind of criticism, capable of much expansion. It reminds us, she said, that "Sp is Sp even in translation," tying in with John Webster's point about the urge to unification in most of our readings of the poet.
- 82.68 John W. Moore, Jr. (Penn State) presented a discussion of "The 'December' Eclogue and the Ending of the *Calender*," first reminding us of the diverse interpretations of the ending of SC. Reinforcing and illustrating one of Thaon's main points--that Sp adapts in tone as well as content to further his own aims--Moore points out the difference between Robin's prayer to Pan in Marot's *Eglogue* and Colin's in "December." Though both are patterned by a review of the poet's life, they differ in three marked ways: Robin asks for a specific gift while Colin asks only to be heard; love, unimportant in Robin's life, has been central and painful in Colin's; and finally, Robin has devoted his life to praising Pan and inspiring others to do the same while Colin has sung to compete with Pan and win glory for himself. Moore says Sp's point is that Colin now--through the vision of the "November" eclogue--realizes his tragic error and simply wants to say so. Instead of seeking fame and pleasure, he should have sought to care for others who "need a great poet who will persuade them that the immutable beauty of heaven is the most desirable goal of all human striving." Such contrition is in itself pleasing to Pan.
- 82.69 Susan Fletcher responded to Moore's essay, first with a survey of what it says, and then with rather strong objections to it. "Is 'December'," she asked, really as translucent and stern as Professor Moore makes it out to be?"

Following Bruce R. Smith (*Spenser Studies*, I), Fletcher advises "a reading strategy that combines the imaginative sympathy of pastoral romance, the moral rigor of the almanac-calendars, and the perspicacity of classical eclogues," pointing out that such a demanding exercise prepares us to approach the complexities of FQ.

82.70 The third paper of the session, presented by Seth Weiner (U.C.L.A.), is entitled "The Impress of Renaissance Musical Theory on Spenser's Pro-sodic Thinking." Weiner explains that Sp's anxiety about the reception of SC might have been based in part on its coinciding with the great fashion in quantitative verse experiments among the poet's friends, except that SC was regarded as "consonant with the quantitative enterprise." These comments, coupled with Weiner's extensive research into "a highly abstract conception of musical speech that cut across all distinctions between quantitative and accentual poetry," a conception represented by the work of Gioseffo Zarlino (*Le Istitutioni Harmoniche*, 1558), has led him to claim that SC "complements the quantitative experiments and is an attempt to make the same 'translation' using accentual rather than quantitative means." Although actual musical evidence is slight, it would seem that SC was treated as "an attempt to recapture the ancient union of words and music." If this is so, it is another of the delightful paradoxes in the history of ideas: that such "weighty lore" is behind both negligible trivia like "Blindfoulded Pretie God" and also a whole new direction in English poetry.

82.71 Carol Kaske acknowledged that Weiner's essay suggests a common mystical undergirding for SC and the quantitative experiments, something beyond a mere "humanistic tinkering with forms," though she feels that Weiner misinterprets Webbe's view of the poem. Finally, she admitted to sharing the majority view that, in dallying with these verse experiments, Sp was wasting his time. At that, considerations of the hour and sensations of hunger porlocked further discussion.

82.72 In the fourth session, in a reprise of the fine practice begun with John Shawcross' paper in 1979 and continued by Judith Dundas' 1980 presentation and Thomas Roche's reading of *Astrophel and Stella* for the Sidney sessions of 1981, a major scholar presented a single essay. The paper, entitled "Spenser's Fortieth Birthday and Related Fictions," was given by Donald S. Cheney, Jr. (Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst). In it, Cheney shows how Sp created fictions by fragmenting and recombining biography (Sidney's, Raleigh's, Arthur Gorges'), autobiography, and literary sources. He also argues that the darkening world of the second half of FQ can be understood more fully than before through a comparative reading of the minor poems of the 1590's, all written by a poet in his forties trying to balance the demands of public and private life.

Dealing first with the poet-lover of Amor, Cheney finds a voice made awkward and embarrassed by the effort decorously to juggle private feelings and public praise: it is as if the poet's own Elizabeth must be protected from the envy of Elizabeth the queen. The queen's fierce jealousy of her courtiers' private lives also colors CCCHA, in which Raleigh appears as "the Shepheard of the Ocean" in disgrace with Cynthia, and rivers must go underground to marry. Even more complex refraction and recombination

informs Daph and the pastoral elegy Astro, where time, despair, and death are created into poetry. Throughout all these poems real problems of love, art, and life in the Elizabethan court are made fictions through refraction and allusion, so that an effort to read them as straight biographical allegory produces only clumsiness.

The same techniques are used in the second half of FQ to attain even greater complexity and a more delicate balance. The image of "Scudamoret" sweetly envied by Britomart is removed from the end of Book III, while Spenser's continuation of Chaucer's "Squire's Tale" in the story of Cambell and Triamond is a dark narrative with undercurrents of the personal made bright only by art: the invention of Cambina. Finally, the story of Timias and Belphoebe reflects the ugly complexities of love and envy where neither private emotions nor public vassalage are enough.

- 82.73 Responding, William Oram (Smith) reviewed contemporary historical criticism of Sp, contrasting its complexities to the simple allegorical readings of the past, praising Cheney for the "subtlest work so far" in showing "how biographical material . . . gets remade and represented in the world of the poem." Cheney has made it more apparent than ever before how little idealization there is in the fictions Sp has created from his own and his contemporaries' lives. Cheney's other contributions are that he brings together the minor poems of the 1590's and the second half of the epic, especially to show how both continue to work with "the problem of the poet's proper place"; and that he furthers our understanding of Elizabethan court life. Oram's one caveat is that Cheney sometimes exhibits "a tendency to overinterpret too little evidence." To support this point he takes issue with Cheney's reading of the Ovidian image in Alcyon's name in Daph. Heroically porlocking himself--he had planned a continuation of Cheney's suggestion about the "refraction" of historical figures into the fictions of poetry--Oram concluded that Cheney's essay is "important" and "suggestive."

Subsequent discussion seconded this praise, reflecting the complexity of Cheney's presentation. Questions ranged from why Arthur fails to recognize Timias when he finds his young squire mad in the forest, to a discussion of the hermaphrodite or androgyne as symbols, to the uncomfortable presence of Elizabeth as both "hearer and overhearer" in the latter part of FQ.

- 82.74 In his closing remarks, Professor Roche told us that, like Peter at the Transfiguration, we have "seen all and understood all and nothing." The topics of the seventh session's essays would not surprise the editors of the *Variorum*, but we are new people, saying new things about old concerns. Still, he said, "we may find a bit or a piece to elucidate the mystery of Sp, but we never find it all"; this is what will keep us coming back through our forties and beyond, in joy and expectation every year.

Anne Shaver
Denison University

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

- 82.75 Brown, James Neil, "A Calendar! A Calendar! Look in the Almanac!" *N & Q*, 27 (1980), 162-165.

Inadvertently entered in item 82.06, *SpN* 13.1 (Winter 1982), p. 16, as "A Crow! A Crow! Look in the Almanac." For annotation, see 82.06. Dr. Brown has some interesting speculations (not in the article) as to how this error arose. In the interest of accuracy, we eat the crow(s).

- 82.76 McCanles, Michael, "*The Shepherdes Calender* as Document and Monument," *SEL*, 22, No. 1 (Winter 1982), 5-19.

The commentary and glosses of SC "establish the genre of this volume not as pastoral poetry but rather as a scholarly edition of pastoral poetry. . . . These poems are both documents expressing the meaning of men's yearning for escape from time, and monuments whose (fictional) endurance through time mutely testifies to the futility of this escape. . . . The reader is caught up in the movement of human life which the edition predicates of itself as monument and of the world of pastoral poetry it documents: a movement toward consciousness and transcendence over past perspectives of time" (18). This effect is focused by the reduplication of the author's persona in Colin and Immeritō, and by the fact that E. K. calls attention to Immeritō's poetry as words about time.

- 82.77 Reid, Robert L., "Spenserian Psychology and the Structure of Allegory in Books 1 and 2 of *The Faerie Queene*," *MP*, 79, No. 4 (May 1982), 359-375.

"Close consideration of the internal allegory of the main figures of books 1 and 2 will reveal Spenser's consistent conception of the embodied soul as a tripartite hierarchy of powers, as three ascending levels of vision and desire: on the lowest level is sensory awareness or appetites (seated in the belly); on the middle level are the nobler passions (seated in the heart); and at the top, governing the two forms of lower desire, is reason (seated in the brain). This hierarchical scheme derives largely from Plato's *Timaeus* and *Republic*, but each of the three stages, especially the functioning of the heart and brain, is radically developed by the insights of later theorists" (360).

- 82.78 Stillman, Carol, "Nobility and Justice in Book Five of *The Faerie Queene*," *TSL*, 23, No. 4 (Winter 1981), 535-554.

"By recognizing nobility as a topic in Book Five, we can perceive a logic to the ordering of the first five cantos and a connection with the political allegory of the later episodes that existing approaches to Book Five have failed to locate. Beneath its veil, the first half of the legend of Artegal sets up England's gentlemen performing, or attempting to perform, their ancestral duties as guardians of justice" (535).

DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

Fuller descriptions of these dissertations may be found in *DAI*; *SpN* provides here only portions of the authors' abstracts in most cases, sometimes in the very words of the abstracts (without acknowledgment), sometimes in paraphrase. Copies of the dissertations themselves may be purchased through University Microfilms; see a recent issue of *DAI* for current prices and ordering information.

- 82.79 Demaris, Colleen Herrmann. *"Be Bold . . ." but "Not too Bold": The Epic Stature of Britomart in Spenser's The Faerie Queene*. University of Kentucky, 1981. 145 pp. *DAI*: 42:3145A. Order No. 8129739.

Suggests that Britomart may be considered the central and controlling figure in *FQ*. The many-sided characterization of Britomart and the variety of her adventures subsumes both the portrayals and the actions of the other females in the work.

The first chapter discusses the contradiction of Britomart's dual nature--she is a "lady knight"--and points to the integration of the two roles into one whole rendering as a fictionalized "human being." The second chapter deals with the problem of Sp's "intent," as outlined in his Letter to Raleigh, and his execution of it. Chapter three compares and contrasts Britomart with the other leading female figures (Una, Amoret, Belphoebe, Florimell, and Radigund) and cites specific textual instances of the superiority of her depiction as a woman. Chapter four compares and contrasts Britomart with the other titular knights (Red Crosse, Guyon, Cambel and Triamond, Artegall, and Calidore) and establishes that she alone possesses all the virtues which they individually and separately symbolize. Chapter five compares and contrasts Britomart and Prince Arthur, with particular emphasis on textual evidence to show that Britomart excels Arthur in the expression of "Magnificence," or, according to Sp, the sum total of all the virtues.

- 82.80 Fumerton, M. Patricia. *The Stylistics of Extremes: Spenser's The Faerie Queene and Jonson's Drama*. Stanford University, 1981. 252 pp. *DAI*: 42:2140A. Order No. 8124068.

Sp's *FQ* and Jonson's plays and masques embody an unconventional poetic that juxtaposes contraries through parataxis. Sp and Jonson independently devise the poetic in an effort to reconcile a conflict they share with the aristocracy of the English Renaissance. On the one hand the poets and the aristocracy expound humanist ideals of the mean: decorum, temperance, and equity. On the other, they delight in extremes: the intense sensuality and self-flattering ideality evident in tournaments and masques as well as the impetuous and uncompromising violence of the chivalric man of action. By paratactically juxtaposing contraries that are aspects of aristocratic extremism, Sp and Jonson create a stylistics of extremes meant to delight their audience and themselves. But at the same time they teach Aristotle's "mean relative to us." In *FQ* and Jonson's drama, the techniques of parataxis, negation, inversion, and the antimasque/main masque confrontation cause an abrupt juxtaposition of contraries that evokes an entertaining and teaching experience of extremes. They teach the mean through indulging a delight in extremes.

- 82.81 Hagdopoulos, Marianthe Yianni. *The Faerie Queene and the Greek Romance*. University of Oklahoma, 1981. 242 pp. DAI: 42:3164A. Order No. 8129430.

Examines the various ways in which Greek romances became part of the artistic and moral considerations that shaped FQ. FQ bears the unmistakable traces of Sp's knowledge of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*, and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. The poet derived these materials directly from the current continental and English translations of the Greek romances and from well-known English intermediaries.

In the legend of Holinesse the *Aethiopica* figures as a model of epic structure based on the framework of separation and reunion of the two lovers during a providentially designed journey to the heroine's homeland. Cites incidental borrowings of Greek romance materials for the building of the allegory of Temperance in the Amavia and Phedon stories, and for the allegory of justice in the episode of Britomart's visit to the temple of Isis.

In the legend of Courtesie, however, Greek romance is not simply a source of fictional material for allegory, but an enlivening influence on Sp's art of romance. Here Sp attempts an elaborate recreation of the major narrative motifs, the uses of Fortune, the structure, and the tonality of the Greek romance. The result is a romance mode that works as a rich metaphor of experience which surveys reality from a perspective born out of a debate between the Art of chivalric idealism and the Nature of the sensory world of the Greek romance.

The acclaim of Underdowne's three editions of Heliodorus' romance partly explains Sp's choice of the *Aethiopica* as one of the major sources for Book I. The impact of Sidney's *Arcadia* on the literary climate of England in the years between the first and second installments of FQ is greatly responsible for the fresh viewpoint of Book VI, where Sp is inspired by the challenge of Sidney's work.

- 82.82 Marx, Stephen Rudolph. *The Pastoral Debate of Youth and Age: Genre and Life Cycle in Renaissance Poetry with Special Reference to Edmund Spenser's The Shepheardes Calender*. Stanford University, 1981. 347 pp. DAI: 42:3611A. Order No. 8202018.

Argues that the debate of youth and age, a common Renaissance pastoral convention, distills the essential thematic and formal traits of the larger bucolic mode. While offering a rhetorical, historical, and psychological analysis of the specific sub-genre, the study proposes a new way of reading all pastoral poetry.

Pastoral is usually regarded as an idealized vision of rustic life generated by a rejection of the city or the court. This study develops the theory that pastoral is generated by a rejection of adulthood and middle age. The Arcadian world, spatially situated at the peripheries of civilization, represents stages of human development temporally situated at the peripheries of the life cycle. Pastoral ideals take two contrary strains, corresponding to youth and old age. Many bucolic conventions articulate latent desires for adolescence, childhood, and infancy; but literary tradition also casts the elderly herdsman in a crucial Arcadian role. He personifies ideals of experience opposite yet complementary to the innocence of youth.

Since pastoral ideals are based on passing stages of life projected as places or states, they are necessarily liable to be outgrown or discredited from alternate points of view. This accounts for the repeated denial of the ideals of youth and old age in poems of "anti-pastoral" complaint.

Most bucolic poems share the formal dialectical structure of debate. This structure was explicit in the medieval version of the pastoral eclogue known as *debator conflictus*, and it remains submerged in the work of later pastoralists, including Sidney, Shakespeare, Drayton, Marvell, Milton, and Blake. The debate structure leads the reader from an idyllic through a dualistic world-view to a disturbing relativity of perspective.

The overlapping characteristics of pastoral and debate disclose the underlying unity of SC. Sp shaped his twelve eclogues in conformity with traditional thematic and formal traits of the pastoral debate of youth and age. He also extended that convention to achieve novel purposes: to portray the generational strife of his particular historical moment and the inner conflicts of young men undergoing passage from childhood to maturity in search of personal identity.

- 82.83 Miller, Jacqueline T. *Authority and Authorship: Some Medieval and Renaissance Contexts*. Johns Hopkins University, 1980. 263 pp. DAI: 41:264A. Order No. 8014277.

Investigates the sometimes complementary, sometimes conflicting concepts of "authority" and "authorship," and the motives that work to merge or separate them, in several medieval and Renaissance texts. Authority, both when it resides with the author and when it does not, implies restraint as well as freedom, limitation as well as power. This study examines the Chaucerian dream vision as a form generated by an authorial stance that alternately asserts its superiority to, and seeks to hide behind, traditionally accepted sources of order and truth. Explores Sp's attitude toward external models and his own form of expression in FQ. Treats the love sonnets of Sidney and Sp, and their relation to Herbert's lyrics. Investigates the ways problems of creative autonomy and authoritative sanction can be employed as rhetorical techniques that mediate between the speaker and the object of his poetry.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 82.84 The two-volume edition of William Wells' *Spenser Allusions in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, SP, 68, No. 5 (Dec. 1971) and 69, No. 5 (Dec. 1972), 351 pp. in all, can be purchased for the original price of \$8.50 while the supply lasts. Write to Jerry Leath Mills, Editor, *Studies in Philology*, Department of English, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Greenlaw Hall 066A, Chapel Hill NC 27514. Checks should be made to *Studies in Philology*.

For a brief account of the Wells *Allusion Book*, refer to the *Annotated Bibliography* (1975), items 1190 and 1191.

- 82.85 The 41st session of the English Institute (Harvard University, Aug. 26-29, 1982) will include a paper by Margaret Ferguson of Yale University entitled "The Afflatus of Ruin: Meditations on Rome by Du Bellay, Sp, and Stevens," at 9:30 a.m., Saturday, Aug. 28th, in Longfellow Hall, old Radcliffe Campus.

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

David L. Miller
Dept. of English
Univ. of Alabama
University AL 35486

13.3