CONTENTS

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES 58

Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* 58


Martin Raitiere, *Faire Bitts: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory* 64


ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES 69

*SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO (1984) [2]* 72

*SPENSER AT THE ENGLISH INSTITUTE* 73

*DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS* 74

*ANNOUNCEMENTS* 75

*SPENSER BIBLIOGRAPHY: UPDATE* 76

*INDEX TO VOLUME 15* 85

The Spenser Newsletter is published three times a year, Winter, Spring-Summer, and Fall, by the Department of English at 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 the 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. These rates are for Vol. 16, 1985.
BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES


This is a book likely to bring joy to the hearts of most Spenserians. Fowler manages to combine a serious critique of recent anti-generic trends in criticism with a mostly lucid, learned, and wide-ranging analysis of the nature, methods, and purposes of genres, modes, and subgenres.

The book’s organization is straightforward. The first two chapters deal with the theoretical problem of defining literature and assessing the position of genre in discussions of literature. The third and fourth chapters define "Concepts of Genre" and "Historical Kinds and the Generic Repertoire" (like Rosalie Colie and others, Fowler prefers the term "kinds" to "genres," but uses them interchangeably). The next four chapters discuss some of the indicators of generic intention ("names," "signals," "labels") and distinguishes mode and subgenre from genre proper: "Modes have always an incomplete repertoire, a selection only of the corresponding kind's features, and one from which overall external structure is absent. . . . Subgenres . . . are formed in just the opposite way from that which produces modes: subgenres have the common features of the kind -- external forms and all -- and, over and above these, add special substantive features" (107, 112). The next three chapters deal with the formation, transformation, and modulation of genres. The antepenultimate and penultimate chapters consider generic hierarchies, canons, and systems, with a healthy distrust of static categorizations, systems, and especially maps (one section of Chapter 13 is headed "Against Maps"): "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the whole enterprise of constructing genre maps is theoretically unsound. In mimicry of scientific procedure, it invents a spurious objectivity and permanence for entities that in reality are institutional and mutable" (249). The final chapter, followed by a short conclusion, discusses "Genre in Interpretation," and argues against the recent critical trend favoring literary indeterminacy. Here, as elsewhere, Fowler remains conscientiously balanced. While he insists that we must know cultural context to understand non-contemporary literature, he insists equally (as did Hallett Smith in his recent book recontexting Shakespeare's sonnets) that "we must not forget what age we live in ourselves. It is a delusion to suppose that we could ever become contemporaries of the original readers. And even if we could, it would be treachery to ourselves" (269).

Although his arguments are sometimes belabored, especially in Chapters 1 and 2 ("Literature as Genre" and "Ancient Misapprehensions"), more often his observations are pointed and sometimes eloquent or aphoristic. In dismissing the notion of literature as a single class of works, for example, Fowler comments: "No sooner are literature's sacred cows branded with the iron of definition than Apollo wants a new sacrifice, perhaps of goats" (2). In developing his position that genre studies involves not categorization but analysis of the changing dynamics of literary interrelationships, he proclaims that "in reality genre is much less of a pigeonhole than a pigeon" (37). In a succinct summary of a critique of reader-oriented criticism de-
veloped elsewhere by such critics as M.H. Abrams and E.D. Hirsch (to whom the book is dedicated), Fowler notes that "criticism that does not respect authorial rights is invariably unsatisfactory" (267). These represent ideas and attitudes that most Spenserians are likely to be comfortable with, and indeed much of the book will clarify and confirm assumptions implicit in much recent Sp criticism.

Fowler's references range from Homer to Pynchon and Ashbery, but many of his examples are from the English Renaissance and the eighteenth century, periods, as he notes, very conscious of genre and explicitly occupied with its development. References to Sp are numerous and often interesting, though one could sometimes wish for more development. In his discussion of the generic directions implicit in titles, for example, Fowler makes clear the generic implications of FQ's organization: "In the Renaissance, 'books' indicates epic, 'cantos' romance or romantic epic. Sp, then, in combining both terms in FQ, prepares his readers for generic mixture" (95). However, in discussing Harry Levin's suggestion that epics "with multiple heroes" (94) tend to be titled not by a hero's name, but by place (Jerusalemme Liberata; Paradise Lost), Fowler manages to ignore the wonderful difference of Sp's title, which is not Faery Land or Arthur, but the name of a queen who never appears directly in the work at all. Sp's title may require historical more than generic inquiry, but in the context of Fowler's discussion, FQ is a curiosity that seems to demand some comment.

In another context, Sp becomes a persuasive example for Fowler's argument that genres have not only primary and secondary forms (as the by now standard understanding of primary and secondary epic) but tertiary as well. "Primary epic is heroic, festal, oral, formulaic, public in delivery, and historical in subject; secondary epic is civilized, literary, private, stylistically elevated, and 'sublime'. . . . Within the secondary phase itself, however, there are wide disparities -- wider, in some ways, than between primary and secondary. . . . To do justice to such disparities, we need to distinguish a tertiary stage. This is reached when a writer takes up a kind already secondary and applies it in quite a new way" (161-62). Fowler implies that SC is a tertiary form of pastoral, and presents FQ as a clear example of tertiary epic: "Tertiary development seems often to internalize the earlier kind. . . . Thus, Paradise Lost, like FQ, has little wholly exterior action" (163).

Other references to Sp come where we might expect: in discussions of the pastoral, for example (77-82, 172), of sonnet subgenres and generic labeling (113, 131), and of epithalamic conventions (59). At least passing reference to Sp occurs more than thirty times and across the broad range of topics Fowler touches on.

Kinds of Literature is balanced, intelligent, and useful to Spenserians. I have only two serious quarrels with it. The first is Fowler's use of the term "laws" to refer to the ways in which genres change and develop over time. He rejects the pseudo-science of genre map making, and the Hegelian overtones of Jurij Tynjanov's otherwise approved "conception of literature as a completely coherent yet dynamic system" (250); but he concludes, following
the diction of his earlier discussions of generic change, that "there are literary laws of change . . . governing the formation and interaction of genres and the development of canons of genres" (277). "Laws" carries just those pseudo-scientific overtones Fowler elsewhere eschews, offering a theoretical inconsistency and a problem in tone. Throughout the book Fowler has been arguing for and illustrating the complexity, though not without order, of literary genres; to claim there are transformational "laws" at work is too rigidly systemic for the subtlety he has elsewhere observed and conveyed.

My second quarrel is more fundamental. It is with Fowler's unstated assumption that what white male publishers, critics, and professors have promoted as good literature is good literature; that the canon, while inevitably reflecting the biases of a given time and culture, and therefore continually undergoing modification, nonetheless reflects standards more or less universal to a given time. In short, although he carefully argues against the inherent elitism of genre criticism, he unconsciously accepts it. This is clear from one glaring error of fact he makes with regard to the canon, and from the assumptions about literary value that pervade the book. The error of fact stands out to anyone who has recently taught the literature of a traditionally oppressed or devalued group: "Little of 'the best that is known and thought in the world' comes into university courses on Women and Literature that was not already within literature's unexpanded limits. One should not expect it to. The point of thematic literature is not to enlarge literature but to restructure it and so challenge its values . . . The new paideia thus finds its raison d'ètre partly in correcting earlier formalism, partly in accommodating militant minorities" (10).

Surely the problem of logic and the condescension here are unconscious. Teaching women writers (or Black or Asian writers) is very rarely "thematic"; its purpose, express or otherwise, is not to challenge the canon's values, but the very canon itself. We are yet in the early stages of that canonical transformation, since it is only recently that devalued groups have been taken seriously by privileged white male culture. But certainly those of us with traditional backgrounds who have been brought into teaching whatever minority culture we represent have often been stunned by a writer ignored by the standard canon. At that point, Fowler's implicit elitism, and the elitism that remains an unavoidable element of genre criticism, may well make us nervous. Whose literature, whose genres, are we talking about, anyway? Has anyone studied the development and transformation of the blues form with anything like the seriousness given the sonnet or even William Carlos Williams' open lyric line? Even Fowler indirectly acknowledges the problem without really confronting it. In discussing Walter Scott's immense popularity and Jane Austen's relative obscurity during their own time, he notes that although both authors may have inherited generic material from the popular regional novelist Maria Edgeworth, "Austen's superiority in construction was less obvious" than Scott's vivid handling of detail, "and inevitably her novels were associated with the domestic, feminine, 'lower' elements in Edgeworth's oeuvre" (228).

For the patriarchally-educated traditionalist that resides somewhere
in most Spenserians, however, Fowler's book is a welcome delight.

Susanne Woods
Brown University


In this clever if doubt-provoking book Maureen Quilligan continues her earlier exploration of allegory, its association with wordplay and the politics of reading, and the strategic uses of its self-conscious fictiveness. Her focus is on moments in *Comus* and *Paradise Lost* when the alert reader will hear Sp. This is not a source study, however. Rather, Professor Quilligan is interested in how Milton's incorporation of Sp relates to the reader's gender and how that political fact is in turn related to what Lawrence Stone sees as the development in the seventeenth century of the nuclear patriarchal family and to the consequent further submersion of women.

Chapter 1, "The Rhetoric of Reading," examines the passage in *Areopagitica* in which Milton mistakenly places Guyon's Palmer in Mammon's cave. Quilligan sees the misreading as in fact an astute intuition of two presences, the tempted reader and the unmoved hero, and perceives within the intertextual moment complex puns on *saperare* and *sapience*. The next chapter, "The Sin of Originality and the Problem of Fiction," opens with Milton's "signaling the presence of the Spenserian text within his own" by allegory recalling Sp's *Errour*, to whom his own Sin is clearly related, and by the sort of wordplay (Sin/sign, waist/waste/vast, and foul/fold) with which Sp indicates the polysemous duplicity of fallen language. Thus Sin and Spenserian etymological allegory together indicate the text's fictiveness at this point and consequently touch on the issue of originality in poetry and in the cosmos. Satan is not only the progenitor of Sin and Death; he is the father of the pun (one might object that the enfleshed Logos himself punned on the name Peter, but perhaps Quilligan would see that as a result of incarnation). There follows a discussion of Malbecco's transformation and the serpentification of devils in *Paradise Lost* X.

In Chapter 3, "Ineffability, Prophecy, and the Problem of Truth," Quilligan compares St. George's view from the hill of Contemplation with Milton's more prophetic and visionary invocation to light in *Paradise Lost* III. The speech Milton gives God some lines later, we are told, is bracketed by Spenserian and fictive scenes -- the episode with Sin and the Paradise of Fools -- in order to preserve this intervening material as "true." (Again, the reader may hesitate. Such techniques could just as well undercut the impression of literal veracity, whatever Milton's insistence on his poetry's truth, and Quilligan's quotation marks around "true" suggest that her own response includes prudent distancing).

The last chapter treats "The Gender of the Reader and the Problem of Sexuality." It examines first the "troublesome femaleness of Milton's muse," identified by gender "for the first time" in Book VII, leading some readers
to grumble, perhaps, that all muses are female and that even male chauvinists don't mind learning from females like Diotima, Sybil, Wisdom, and the prophet Deborah. Sp, says Quilligan, implies a female reader in FQ III, for there landscape and sexuality are perceived from a feminine perspective. In FQ IV, moreover, we observe Elizabeth's shift from inspirer to privileged reader. Milton reworks FQ III.xii for Comus, and in Paradise Lost VII he invokes a muse's inspiration, but he rejects as readers Bacchus's Maenads, whom Quilligan associates with "frenzied Protestant prophetesses." To be a fit reader a woman must evidently forswear inspiration and accept male mediation, thus preserving a domestic hierarchy in a world that has seen all others shaken. Both poets, furthermore, take the "crucial shift" in women's work as a "crucial epic theme." The book ends with an eloquent elaboration of Dryden's remark that at the close of Paradise Lost Adam and Eve wander out into Sp's landscape.

Professor Quilligan is an intelligent reader whose quick mind is a pleasure to watch; but her intriguing and suggestive study seems to me sometimes to edge closer to Errour than to Sapience.

Some of my disagreements are doubtless picky. Sp does not, strictly, locate Fairyland in America (67). Acrasia is primarily a witch, not a queen (69). Tantalus falls sooner from ill-considered haute cuisine than from something he ate (61). Not all Renaissance political thinking rejected female rule (182); Knox hated it, Bale praised it, and Henry VIII and François I appointed female regents. Is the "idea of the Trinity" "invisible" (88) except as parody in an epic that includes one Father, one Son -- whenever begotten -- and one dove-like Spirit? The author says (157) that FQ VII "uniquely refers to an event in Christ's human history other than the Passion," but II.x.50 mentions the Nativity. A Midsummer Night's Dream II.i.156-67 provides a "neat reversal" of some phrases in the proem to FQ IV (214). Literally? Then we have evidence for a more precise dating of the plan. If not, what does "reversal" mean? And was Orpheus an "exemplary husband" (221) whose "husbandly love" angered the Maenads (206)? His reaction to losing his wife was to sing and to invent homosexuality (see Ovid and Comes); no wonder he infuriated women. Grill the pig is here associated with "the Indian culture Europeans found in America" (67), but Europeans could disagree on this, and two years earlier Raleigh's friend Harriot had praised the Virginians' "excellencie of wit" and hoped that they would soon "bee brought to civilitie, and . . . true Religion." Grill's reluctance to shape up might just as easily recall the stubborn Irish. Finally, I find no occasion on which a dismemberment is "written out of FQ by Sp's revisions of Ovid" (221). True, Adonis is making a fine postdismemberment recovery in FQ III.vi, but his perpetual if periodic recuperation began in ancient Greece when he became the vegetation or solar figure familiar in Renaissance handbooks.

In truth, Professor Quilligan has difficulties with Ovid. She calls Malbecco's transformation "Ovidian," which is doubtful, and Paridell's affair "Petrarchan," although the seducer's scribbling in spilt wine is thrice recommended by the "Typhis . . . amoris" himself. Primarily, I think, she runs into trouble because she usually ignores Renaissance mythography and hence writes as though Ovid were an unmediated, stable, and sole authority. Sp adds his own
variations, but he is less revisionary than Quilligan implies, and often what she calls "rewritings" (e.g. Actaeon's retention of his "Hunters hew") are listed as possibilities in authorities like Comes or C. Estienne. Her Ovid is our own familiar paperback Roman, quoted in the English of Humphries or Gregory, and holding steady at his end of the "inter" in intertextuality. The Renaissance Ovid was less authoritative and more elusive.

Professor Quilligan stresses Sp's and Milton's puns, and again admiration for real ingenuity may be tempered by skepticism. Although Milton certainly plays with "sapience" and "taste," I doubt he and Sp pun much on sapere and eating, and the extended discussions of "evil sapience" and "the hellish nature of ingesting wisdom" (72, 91) do not distinguish enough between sapientia and scientia. Since the root sap- has to do with taste and savor, not with ingestion, it seems likely that Eve's greedy eating is not so much a sapere pun as a further complex irony. As Raphael tells Adam in Book VII, it is too much eating of knowledge that turns Wisdom to Folly (11. 126-30). More worrisome is the claim that intensification of wordplay at the end of Paradise Lost II signals the presence of allegory and Sp, an attractive if unnecessary argument rendered less convincing by the etymological punning and play she herself notes earlier in the poem (to refer to the words in question as "nearly puns" is a bit evasive). Yes, Sin enters with puns (and one could, since book-vomiting Error is relevant, add a pun on her "voluminous" folds -- gatherings? -- but to the seeing of puns there is no end. Adam and "adamantine chains"? Satan's role as father and "penal fire"? Probably not). Yet the epic has opened with wordplay on taste (sapience) and fruit (fruor), this last an Augustinian pun that infolds more than the "apple" and "result" noted on p. 74 and that may lie behind the fallen Adam's wish "with ardor to enjoy thee." In other words, an impression of increased punning can be created by increased listening.

Whatever one's doubts, however, Professor Quilligan raises very important questions. Clearly she is right that Milton's Sp connects somehow with fiction, allegory, and origin, and not surprisingly she refers several times to John Guillory's recent and clever Poetic Authority, which considers many of the same themes. Inevitably, Quilligan's Milton's Sp is not Guillory's Milton's Sp. Whereas Quilligan's Sp enters with Sin in Paradise Lost II, Guillory's Sp's Mammon makes Pandemonium in Book I. And where Guillory finds FQ II in Comus, Quilligan senses the defeat of Busyrane. There is nothing embarrassing about such divergences, but they do give one pause. The problem of "hearing" intertextuality, for example, is almost paradigmatically indicated when Quilligan says on p. 173 that "we may hear Milton's rewriting of Sp's Sapience." A note thanks B. Rajan for pointing this out. Yet how easy is it for us to "hear" this echo if the author needed to have it drawn to her attention even after reading about it, I assume, in the book by A.K. Hieatt she cites elsewhere?

Then there is the matter of how the "pretexts" one hears affect each other within a text. For example, Du Bartas, whose phrasing often appears in Paradise Lost, offered Milton in his "Furies" a precise, clear, and still famous precedent for combining this particular sacred history with personification allegory. There is even a certain poignancy in the fact that Milton's image of the brooding dove, acting out the originality so much discussed by Guillory and
Quilligan, is probably what used to be called a borrowing (from Du Bartas's "First Day"). When I read Milton I hear the bits from Du Bartas because I have read and written about him. Those scholars with the sense to avoid doing so will "hear" a different mix of voices. How we hear Milton's Sp, moreover, depends in turn on how we read Sp. Quilligan's reader in Mammon's cave is more moved than Guyon, thus generating Milton's phantom Palmer, but several other critics have remarked on the unappetising nature of the place. Elsewhere she says it is "more comfortable" to ignore Errour's sliminess. But some of us like slime. And so forth. In other words, intertextual studies often rely on equations with nothing but variables, and although this should not discourage us, it should keep us flexible. Those of us who trace how Renaissance poets treated each other need a rhetoric, I think, that without cowardice or weaseling nevertheless incorporates our subjectivity and ignorance more openly, just as, for instance, a Calder or a Moore incorporates empty space.

What of the sexual politics of reading? Quilligan writes interestingly about the reader implied by each poet, although it is not clear if she thinks Sp precedes or reflects the social history she describes. Indeed, since Chaucer could openly address women and so, even after the shift in domestic economy, could Pope and Richardson, the suspicion arises that the royal reader in FQ and the "covered" mediated female reader in Paradise Lost have more to do with immediate circumstances and social class than with the history of the family. After all, female readers, except reigning queens, have always until recently been legally disadvantaged even when they could more freely weave, brew, or patronize poets. And nowhere in the book, astonishingly, is there mention of Artegaill's humiliating use of the "distaff vile" at Radegund's, or of Sp's accompanying instruction to women to know their place. What is missing, I think, is a stronger sense of complexity, of exceptions and contradictions, in poetry and history. One night in 1662 Pepys read Du Bartas's "Imposture." Interestingly, he reports that his wife had been reading it first. The work recounts Eve's credulous frailty, but, like the fallen Adam, the husband approved the wife's taste, and Pepys heartily praises the poem. Does Mrs. Pepys's leadership in this matter blow her "cover" and therefore condemn her as a bad reader? What a paradox for the poor lady! Real life may be more ambiguous than Milton's Spenser allows.

I have perhaps wearied my own reader with these reservations, but I hope I will not thereby discourage her or him from looking at this provocative book. That I have quarrelled with it so much is due, finally, to the significance of its topic and the engaging vigor with which it is argued.

Anne Lake Prescott
Barnard College,
Columbia University
Sidney's *Arcadia*, advancing the interesting thesis that Sidney firmly rejected the political theories of the Huguenot Monarchomachs or "king-fighters." His attribution of the anonymous *Vindiciae contra tyrannos*, one of the most aggressive Huguenot tracts, to Hubert Languet makes his argument still more audacious since, if Raitiere is correct, then Sidney deliberately repudiated the beliefs of a close friend and assiduous political mentor; the singularity of this rejection is duly emphasized. The book briefly addresses the question of Sp's literary and intellectual associations with the Sidney circle, but its essential concern is the literature of Sidney.

To establish Sidney's position in this controversy, Raitiere focuses on three sections of the *Arcadia*. The first concerns Amphialus' justification of his rebellion against Basilius with the theory of the subaltern magistrate. A central tenet of monarchomach thinking, this principle allowed the aristocracy to assume authority if the monarch neglected his governmental duties. This theory was, as Michael Walzer explains in *The Revolution of the Saints*, part of "an unsuccessful effort to transform feudal status into constitutional position." Raitiere draws parallels between Amphialus and Anjou but pursues them rather half-heartedly because he feels here and elsewhere that "to read this text as a topical historical allegory is to trivialize it" (101 n18). Indeed, these parallels are not very strong or specific. The equivocation between traditional ancestral claims and rationalistic principles is a persistent weakness of Huguenot theory which is not unique to Anjou's rebellion. Moreover, Amphialus is made a far more attractive figure than Anjou (whom Sidney despised), a difference which Raitiere readily concedes. Raitiere correctly insists that Sidney repudiates both the rebellion and its justification at this juncture in the text, but he attributes an overall consistency to Sidney's viewpoint which is not sustained by the text as a whole. As I have argued elsewhere, the *New Arcadia*'s episodic structure and sympathetic characterization of Amphialus undercut a coherent assessment of his rebellion. Raitiere cites two instances of vainglorious single combat as proof of Sidney's low regard for chivalric bravado while ignoring a great many more which glamorize it.

Raitiere's third chapter, on Sidney's negative view of Sparta, is more original and convincing. He contends that the Helots' continual revolt against their Lacedemonian rulers is designed to discredit Sparta, the classical model often invoked by republican theorists for their ideal, the mixed state. Sidney is said to treat Venice, the Renaissance embodiment of this ideal, with the same skepticism, contending in a letter that its system of government was more attractive "in imaginacioun than practice" (54). For Sidney, the mixed state was inherently unstable because, like most of his contemporaries, he considered sovereignty indivisible, as Raitiere convincingly demonstrates (54).

The last two chapters present a thorough analysis of the provocative poem recited in the *Old Arcadia*'s Eclogues by Philisides, Sidney's "fictionalized self-portrait," as a tribute to "old Languet," who first taught him the song. The poem includes a lengthy beast-fable describing the oppressive ascendency of a human monarch over the animal kingdom. Each beast contributes a distinctive virtue to this new creature, and their oppression is thus self-inflicted. Although the poem is ordinarily read as an indictment of tyranny, Rai-
tiere points out that several of the constraints imposed are not so bad: the book's odd title comes from the "faire bitts" by which man "did bind" the horse (83). In Chapter 4, Raitiere emphasizes the enigmatically cautionary conclusion which advises that the enslaved must "in patience bide your hell, / Or know your strengths"; these alternatives represent, according to Raitiere, "a solution in acquiescence . . . rather than confrontation or action" (69). He concedes that the fable's Aesopian language is open to a whole range of interpretations, and I find more than a hint of veiled aggression.

Raitiere's emphasis in this chapter on the fable's cosmic implications is more compelling, for he shows how it works as a creation myth, linking the achievement of civility and human nature itself to an act of violent subjection. The cruelty and deception of this initial action may be repugnant, but its results are eventually beneficial. Citing Hannah Arendt's gnomic utterance, "In the beginning was the crime," Raitiere aligns Sidney with those other shrewd apologists for Renaissance despotism, Bodin and Machiavelli. For such thinkers, civil peace and stability are the supreme good, an end which not only justifies but requires a ruthless assertion of authority from the start. Raitiere draws an especially astute parallel between man's subjugation of the animals in Philisides' poem and Euarchus' establishment of order in Macedonia in the face of the "worst kind of Oligarchie" by "some even extreme severitie." Subsequently, "Euarchus was able," Raitiere explains, "to mitigate the violence of inauguration: 'then shined forth indeede all love among them, when an awfull feare, ingendered by justice, did make that love most lovely'" (88).

Persuasive as it is, this parallel also demonstrates the weakness of Raitiere's conclusion because his analysis of Euarchus, like that of Amphialus, is finally too selective. By focusing on only a few of the Arcadia's sections and episodes, he oversimplifies their general significance and ignores the notoriously problematic and open-ended nature of this text. Raitiere's praise of Euarchus' accomplishments in Macedonia is certainly justified, but he overlooks the difficulties arising from that monarch's condemnation of the princes, another perfectly characteristic instance of his "extreme severitie."

Raitiere's analysis of the Arcadia's political ideas would also benefit from a deeper sense of the historical context as well as a more thorough textual analysis. He derides Languet's theories as a form of moral absolutism, saying that, "like many theocrats, Languet remained constitutionally oblivious to the ambiguities of power, trusting that the cause would somehow automatically transcend the limitations inherent in its instruments" (123-24). The biased, somewhat hectoring tone and the tendency to abusive polarization (e.g., his contrast between the "inclusive and even enthusiastic Platonist" and "the prim desiccated Aristotelians"[130]) often make his analysis too schematic. His disparagement of theocrats not only ignores the equivocal sophistication of Calvin's thought; it also overlooks Sidney's strong theocratic beliefs, manifest in a letter concerning the Protestant cause on the Continent: "If her Majesty wear the fowntain I woold fear considering what I daily fynd that we shold wax dry, but she is but a means who God useth and I know not whether I am deceaved but I am faithfully persuaded that if she shold withdraw her self other springes
woold ryse to help this action. For me thinkes I see the great work indeed in hand, against the abusers of the world, wherein it is no greater fault to have confidence in mans power, then it is to hastily to despair of Gods work" (Works, III, 166-67). Raitiere points to Elizabeth's intervention in Sidney's quarrel with the Earl of Oxford as proof of the monarch's capacity to mediate "the natural distinction between 'greater' and 'lesser' subjects" (108), but his cursory discussion of this incident glosses over its intractable contradictions while trying to have it both ways: he claims that both Sidney and Elizabeth vindicate "the precedence of the political order to the feudal and private one" (88), an empty resolution which ignores the issues and the intensity of their quarrel, and, although Elizabeth successfully prevented a duel, she did not settle the vexed conflict between the privilege of status and the subject's "native, & le-gall freedom."

Faire Bitts displays impressive erudition and scholarship, together with a solid grasp of sixteenth-century political theory; and it engages issues which are central to an understanding of Sidney's literature and Renaissance thought. What one misses in this book is a fuller sense of the turbulent historical context of these conflicting theories and the rich density and confusing amplitude of Sidney's Arcadia.

Richard C. McCoy
Queens College, CUNY


As shown under "Selected Bibliographic Sources" (xxxiii-xxxv), this reference work, which lists and annotates 1400 Sp studies during the first third of the present century, is an outgrowth of the seminal Sp bibliographies done as doctoral dissertations at Duquesne University under the direction of Foster Provost: Bernard Vondersmith, criticism of FQ 1910-1947 (1970); Carolyn Burgholzer, criticism of FQ 1948-1968 (1970); and William L. Sipple, twentieth-century criticism of Sp's minor works (1974). This bibliography corrects, updates, and assimilates the proto-bibliographies of Carpenter (1923) and Atkinson (1937); it serves as an informative prologue to McNeir-Provost (1975). As the author states, "The McNeir-Provost bibliography and this reference guide bring twentieth-century Sp scholarship [through 1972] into two volumes that are compatible in focus, attitude, and completeness" (xi). This work is more judicious in the area of General Criticism than McNeir-Provost (items 454-1226), excluding "marginal items," books and articles that refer in a general way to Sp but do not contribute substantially to knowledge of the poet and his works. Useful and necessary "cross-references direct the researcher to reprints, revised editions, and related items." The arrangement of the detailed Index (217-44) "parallels that in the McNeir-Provost bibliography" (vii-viii). Sp's works are listed with full titles, without the accepted acronyms (xxxi-xxxii); the titles of scholarly journals are listed with the standard acronyms (xxxvii-xxxviii).

In an important way that is very welcome this reference guide differs
from any other Sp bibliography and is easier to use: it is organized chrono-
logically with an alphabetized list for each year. The annotations make pos-
sible the identification of some trends and early approaches to Sp that have
been continued, modified, or used from a different perspective in later years.
Master's theses and doctoral dissertations are listed; the published editions
of dissertations are annotated. Interestingly, many papers of Edwin Green-
law's celebrated "Seminary C" at Johns Hopkins University are included; some
of these papers were expanded in print. Sp criticism was never to be so clear-
cut and uncomplicated again.

In his valuable Introduction (xi-xxix) the author notes that early
twenty-first-century critics were much concerned with the scanty data of Sp's bio-
ography, painstakingly putting together a good deal of speculation as well as
most of the known facts. Already the disintegrators of Sp were claiming, un-
silenced by rational demurrers, that "Edmund Spenser" was a pen-name used by
Francis Bacon; but such illusions became fewer as the century advanced. The
Baconians and anti-Stratfordians are still whittling at Shakespeare, and they
receive more attention in some journals than they deserve. Professor Sipple
writes easily and well of the criticism in his period on Sp's minor works,
more briefly of the early criticism on FQ, and of early studies on language,
prosody, and imagery in Sp's works. Studies in the pastoral tradition and the
sources of SC in the early part of the present century were beneficial. Most
of the scholarship on the short poems in the Complaints volume assessed Sp's
varied themes of the world's vanity, pointing to his mature dissatisfaction
with the world. CCCHA was recognized not only as the longest eclogue in the
language but also as an accomplished poem showing Sp's mastery of the genre. The
unique qualities of the sonnet sequence in Amor were perceived as well as the rela-
tion of Amor to Epith; but the calendrical and numerological structures of
these works were not yet much understood. The commentaries on 4H usually bal-
anced Platonic idealism and Christian imagery. Indicative of trends in early
criticism on FQ are those writers who "debate, argue, and compromise in these
areas: (1) the philosophical and literary sources of FQ; (2) the elements of Sp's
style; (3) the whole FQ and its structure; (4) the historical allegory of the
poem; and (5) the influence of FQ on poets of the last three centuries (Shakes-
peare, Jonson, Milton, Thomson, Wordsworth, Keats)" (xxvii). Later critics are
debating, arguing, and compromising in the same areas, although more sophisti-
cated interests have replaced concern with Sp's historical allegory.

In this bibliography seventeen items in 1900 increase to more than fifty
in the 1930s, with seventy-two in 1934 and eighty-one in 1935. It is not sur-
prising that twenty-three items of Greenlaw's historical scholarship between 1904
and 1932 are annotated and listed in the Index. Greenlaw was a colossus among
early Spenserians, generating more interest in Sp than anyone else in this cen-
tury; and his influence long outlived him. Others who had a hand in editing the
Variorum are prominent in these pages: Ray Heffner, Henry Lotspeich, Charles G.
Osgood, F.M. Padelford, Rudolf Gottfried. The well-known works of Ernest De
Selincourt, R.E. Neil Dodge, Frederick Hard, Merritt Hughes, Émile Legousie, C.S.
Lewis, and W.L. Renwick command attention. The quarrel of Josephine Waters Ben-
ett and Brents Stirling over the sources and extent of Sp's Platonism can be
traced. Mrs. Bennett was a learned and fractious lady; Stirling was obdurate.
The great Spenser Encyclopedia now in progress will obviate an updating of H.S.V. Jones's once useful but long obsolete Spenser Handbook (1930). Nothing relevant to Sp studies in the period covered by this reference guide is missing, much of historical value in its own right, much of critical value because it points toward what was to come. At the same time, it is interesting to find represented the work of many scholars not ordinarily or primarily associated with Sp, such as D.C. Allen, Douglas Bush, E.K. Chambers, Lewis Einstein, F.J. Furnivall, W.W. Greg, C.H. Herford, George Lyman Kittredge, Hyder Rollins, Caroline Spurgeon, E.M.W. Tillyard, and J. Dover Wilson.

Very few misprints occur in this book. It can be browsed with profit by anyone interested in the English Renaissance. It should be perused and reflected on by all those, especially younger scholars, who profess an interest in Sp or undertake criticism of his works.

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES


In the light of Sp's allusions to the moon in Epith and Pro, and of the non-appearance in Catullus 61 of the "greeting of Hesperus," it appears that "the bright evening star" in Epith 286 refers, not to Venus (or Hesperus) but to the "full moon rising at sundown."

84.137 Buxton, John, "'Certaine Signes Here Set In Sundry Place': Spenser's Advice to His Readers," RES, 34, no. 136 (November 1983), 395-402.

Notices Sp's various means of "instructing or advising his readers how to read" FQ. In particular, the Proem to Book II and the episode on Mount Acidale in Book VI emphasize that "any true understanding of poetry can come only to him who is willing to submit, without questioning, to the imaginative experience which the poet offers" (401).


"Sp typically resolves artistic dilemmas by more or less successful assimilations of the alternatives to one another" (383); he prefers "revision by augmentation" to "excision and replacement" (384-85). This is reflected in formal or tonal inconsistency, and in multiple (often contradictory) treatments of a single subject, as with the actual beginning of FQ II and the account in the Letter, the "pristine" and "tangled" chronicles of II.ix-x, or the incongruous presence of Time in the Garden of Adonis together with a second incongruity, an Adonis who is "very much alive" and who "balances and complements the first" (389). These and other unresolved ambivalences indicate Sp's sense that "what we know of permanence and what we know of change are complementary and even necessary to one another" (390).

Suggests that Sp's allusion to Aldebaran and Cassiopeia in FQ I.iii.16, described by F.R. Johnson as "careless handling of astronomical data," was in fact written "to be understood without external reference"; the passage "makes an appeal to the reader's visual memory" to indicate that Kirkrapine returns home "an hour or so... before dawn... in the beginning of Libra, the autumn equinox."


Given conventional representations of the heavens in Sp's era, the "hissing snake" that threatens Orion in FQ II.ii.46 more probably refers to Hydra than to Scorpio.


Challenges readings of FQ III.xii that explain Amoret's suffering in terms of her fear of masculine domination or of "latent lesbianism," or that assign special significance to the malign influence of courtly love. Argues instead, citing Janet Spens, and Edwin Greenlaw (SP 26 [1929]), for a view that "does justice to the narrative [and] to the facts of human nature and human history," and that takes account of Sp's emphasis on the "sweet countervayle" (FQ 1590 III.xii.47) by which united lovers "deprive each other of the bitter pains of love and find its fruit is sweet" (410, 412).


The February eclogue, allegorical in religious and political contexts, is also "an allegory about poetry as an imaginative and moral experience... a commentary on the function of the poet." Thenot, "a type of poet [like Sidney and Chaucer] whose fable creates a figurative image," is "the eclogue's spokesman for allegorical poetry."


"In the early cantos of FQ II we see Guyon as a knight of adventure; in canto xii we see him finally as a good knight of temperance"; but canto x, which presents him "as an eager, intellectually inquisitive knight," is essential "to our complete and total understanding of Sir Guyon."


A lively parcel-review of recent books on Sp by DeNeef, Goldberg,
Guillory, Hulse, and Quilligan, together with the Cullen-Roche Sp Studs IV; generally, if the structures of books about him have gone to the demnition bow-wows, "the Spenserian canon is strong enough to survive" (42).

Challenging the view that the "circular imagery" of FQ VI effectively achieves closure for the poem as a whole, argues that Book VI is informed by a uniquely "disjunctive strategy" which affects time, space, narrative, and character; and that, with special reference to Calidore's desire for Pastor ella, "the disjunction between his courteous manners and self-seeking aims fits the occasional, disjunctive features of Book VI" (79).

"The randomness of Calidore's quest" reflects Sp's recognition that "courtesy is a social and therefore a reactive virtue . . . a part of its exercise must lie beyond the individual's control" (72-3). The linkage (ix.36) of Calidore with Paris, the failure of Calidore to return to Pastorella, and the hero's eventual attachment to the Blatant Beast "in what appears to be a travelling circus act" (81), together with the recurrent implication that "courtesy is circumscribed by occasion" (82), support the view that "the primary feature" of the book's organization "is disjunction" (85).

Argues that "the correct approach to Renaissance literature is through Renaissance attitudes to rhetoric . . . in particular to . . . epideictic," notably the initially Aristotelian "link between epideictic and ethics" (500-502). Together with the influence of Xenophon's Cyropaedia, the allegorization of Virgil, and Averroes' twelfth-century paraphrase of the Poetics, the educational tradition of training in debate contributed to "the Renaissance reverence for epideictic," which "remained the key system in the construction of exemplary fictions" (506, 520).

In these contexts, and given the continuing emphasis on the moral function of the poet, "both the theory and practice of Renaissance epic . . . encouraged an analysis of human behavior, under the banner of praise and blame, into individual virtues"; Renaissance readers saw each character "not as a complex, autonomous personality but as an illustration of a virtue" (522-23). Sp, like other Renaissance poets forming "a perfect image out of diverse components . . . also intends to form us in that image and likeness"; as he "'forms' or constructs an example, the reader finds it and is morally 'formed' by it; it is a process of encoding and decoding" (526).

Modern readers must "reconstruct Renaissance ways of reading, which [accepting the combination of narrative variety with a unified moral system] could unite" diachronic attention to the fable, "reading as an experience in time," with synchronic construction of "a unified picture of human, especially ethical, behavior" (528-29).
Following the "Spenser at Kalamazoo" program, three papers related to Sp were presented at a special session, "Spenseriana," chaired by Shirley Clay Scott (Western Michigan Univ.). Rita Verbrugge (Univ. of Michigan), in "Britomart as Patriarch," argued that FQ III is primarily about the spiritual ideal of chastity rather than about love and marriage. Britomart, "like the patriarchs in the lineage of Jesus [as described by the Patristic writers], had a potential to live in . . . virginity, but she, like them, finally accepted the 'duty of marriage' because of her chaste relationship with a providential God" and her obedience to her destined role in Elizabeth's genealogy.

Linda M. Vecchi (Univ. of Western Ontario), in "Spenser's Complaints: Is the Whole Equal to the Sum of its Parts?" observed that the poems in the Complaints volume have usually been treated separately rather than as an organic whole, and suggested that they should be viewed as Sp's progressive revision and extension of the medieval complaint genre, since they are, as Ponsonby observed, "all complaints and meditations of the worlds vanitee."

Marc Beckwith (Ohio State Univ.), in "Barnabe Googe's Zodiac of Life Reconsidered," declared that Googe's translation of Marcellus Palingenius' Zodiacus Vitae has been overrated. It is neither graceful nor completely accurate: Googe frequently alters his original to make it more Protestant, eliminating both Palingenius' Catholic doctrine and his reverence for pagan philosophers.

The editor of SpN unaccountably neglected to notice, in "Spenser at Kalamazoo (1984)" [84.92-118], Norman Farmer's (Univ. of Texas, Austin) useful and entertaining presentation, "The Illuminated Spenser: Illustrations to The Faerie Queene and The Shepheardes Calender," which took place at the final evening session, as a preview of his current work on Sp's illustrators. For this lapse the editor offers his apologies to Professor Farmer, who has kindly supplied the following abstract.

Among the pictures shown in this illustrated lecture were colored slides of Benjamin West's Una and the Lion (1772), William Bell Scott's painting of the same subject done some 100 years later, Washington Allston's Una in a Wood (from the Wadsworth Atheneum), and George Stubbs' ceramic plaque depicting Isabella Salstonstall as Una (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge). Also discussed were Allston's The Flight of Florimell (Detroit Inst. of Arts), painted in 1819, and a painting by Samuel F.B. Morse depicting Una, the Dwarf, and Arthur; these were followed by West's The Cave of Despair and John Singleton Copley's large painting from the National Gallery in Washington, Red Crosse, Fidelia, and Speranza. William Etty's two versions of Phaedra and Cymoiches (Princeton Univ. Museum; Forbes Collection), J.H. Mortimer's Sir Arthegall and Talius (Tate Gallery), and George Frederick Watts' Mammon were also discussed. The lecture concluded with pairs of slides demonstrating comparatively the responses to SC: the original woodcut artist (1579), Louis du Guernier (Tonson ed., 1715), Pierre Fourdrinier (1732), A.J. Gaskin (1896), Walter Crane (1898), Paul Nash (1930). Du Guernier's iconography was clearly influenced by Pope's pastorals.
Some 175 registrants attended the 43rd session of The English Institute at Harvard University, 31 August -- 3 September, 1984. Paul Alpers (Univ. of California, Berkeley) directed a three-paper program on "The Lyric Spenser."

In "Pastoral and the Domain of Lyric," Alpers argued that if SC's historical importance is that it inaugurated Renaissance poetry in England, its poetic achievement, as "a complete and substantial book of short poems that stands on its own terms," consists in its having enabled Sp to achieve a kind of literary authority -- an independent "domain of lyric," in the sense of the legal concept of demesne -- because his "literary assumptions and practices" in the pastoral kind distanced SC (as comparison of the sestinas in Arcadia and SC indicates) from the courtly and social problems of motivating lyric that hampered Gascoigne and Sidney. Sp employs the pastoral mask, not to deal with social danger, but for "rhetorical adequacy"; giving full value to the idea of performance and to a conception of song "as produced by responsive listening," the rhetoric assigned in the last four eclogues to Diggon Davie, Cuddie, and Colin variously turns "the moral and cultural oppositions that in other writers compromise lyric into sources of lyrical accomplishment and presence."

In "Spenser's Undersong," John Hollander (Yale Univ.), initially acknowledging the work of Harry Berger on Pro, considered the seminal influence on poetry in English of the poem's refrain, noting its "anxious" concern (unlike the refrain of Epith) with Time outside the poem, and its affirmation of the river "as the flow of English poetic eloquence." Elsewhere in Sp's verse (e.g., "August" 128, CCCHA 169, and especially Daph 245) the term "undersong" may mean accompaniment, principal theme, periodic point, or droning undercurrent, or all at once in fragmented recurrence (as of moving water or the flow of tears). William Browne, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats (and Emerson), inter alia, variously employ the term, often in the presence of moving water, to denote "sound going on underneath discourse," as "the most important matters are necessarily half-hidden"; this "ancillary sound [or refrain] recurrently rises into mastery," in effect "becoming the argument it was measuring out."

Patricia Parker (Victoria Coll., Univ. of Toronto), in "Suspended Instruments," speaking with particular reference to FQ II.xxi.80 in the context of Psalm 137, discussed three inter-related tensions in (chiefly) FQ: (1) "a particularly pastoral lyric tension between power and song," the potential suspension of an Elizabethan poet's song "in an alien political context"; (2) the sexual tension centering on dominant women who recall Cybele in their threat to males' lyric and virile instruments; (3) the politico-sexual tension of an Elizabethan "politics in which political and [Petrarchan] erotic codes interpenetrated to a remarkable degree," emphasizing the male lover's subject status which only the poet's mastery can counter. FQ explores the implications of the fact that its form, "narrative in its forward, linear quest," is "composed of lyric stanzas which ... potentially suspend or retard." FQ comprehends "the psychological dynamic of the overpowering of a potentially castrating female, the covert political allegory of the overgoing of a lyricism associated with Elizabeth, and an aesthetic and moral unease about the possible impotence of lyric 'charm'."
Dissertation Abstracts

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


Sp's poetic imagery is indissolubly united to his conceptual meaning: examination of the resonances of the lion imagery (its visual rhyme) and of the meanings implicit in that imagery (its conceptual rhyme) reveals that the unity of those resonances consistently reflects the architectonic unity of FQ. The concentrated significance of Sp's use of the lion as an icon for justice and love in his epic can be exfoliated by ordered reference to the four traditional levels of allegory and to classical, Christian, and romance tradition. The lion image succinctly embodies the royal metaphor which informs so much of FQ's mytho-historical allusiveness and which furnishes secular analogues to the sacred meaning associated with the Lion of Judah, the metaphoric image of Christ which arcs over scripture from Genesis to Revelation. Interpretation of Una's lion, of Redcrosse as Sp's recasting of medieval literature's Knight of the Lion, of Britomart, Cambina, Mercilla, and the leonine Dame Nature herself depends upon these secular and sacred allusions.


CCCHA, one of the longest pastorals written in the late sixteenth century, expresses the classical spirit of pastoral in an unique form which combines Neo-Latin, Renaissance, and medieval genres. The Renaissance poets made love the most important activity in the bower, but no one had attempted to explain its function in the pursuit of peace. By creating a shepherd philosophy in which Cupid has the power of the Logos, Sp demonstrates that even the unrequited lover can find happiness in a pastoral community if he follows Cupid's rules.

The method is "earnest unto game." Through such stylistic devices as the use of a narrator, comic irony, parodic transformation of romance conventions and the creative use of pastoral tropes, the poet directs us to issues of which the shepherds are unaware. The biographical material is presented wittily: the ecloga nautica discloses the appreciative understanding that Raleigh and Sp had for each other; and a delicately constructed myth of locality reveals a sensitive exemplum of Raleigh's seduction of Elizabeth Throckmorton and the tragic cost of defying intransigent authority.

Studies the figure of Helen of Troy and her analogues as either emblems of doubleness or characters of ambiguity in the Homeric epics, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Sp's *FQ*, and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*. In so far as the figure of Helen is reduced to a static emblem of doubleness, the poets create various female characters on to whom they transpose the dynamic and complex ambiguity that was once hers.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

84.158  SPENSER AT MLA, 1984. The Renaissance Singers of State University College of New York, Potsdam, under the direction of Professor Mary Lou Hultberg, will give a concert of settings of Sp's poetry at 11:00 a.m. on Saturday, 29 December, at the Folger Shakespeare Library, immediately before the Spenser Luncheon at the same location. Several of these settings are very seldom performed, and two works will be entirely new.

Inquiries should be addressed to Professor Alice Fox, Department of English, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056. Full details of the program will appear in the Winter 1985 issue of *SpN* (16.1).

84.159  SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO, 1985, will be held in conjunction with the 20th International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Michigan, 9-12 May 1985. At least one of the four Sp sessions will be devoted to the minor works, or to relations between the minor works and *FQ*.

Guidelines for submission of manuscripts are (1) the manuscript must be of exceptional quality and submitted in its final form; (2) the manuscript must not be under consideration elsewhere while it is at the Brown University Press; (3) a single copy of the manuscript (not the ribbon copy), the author's *curriculum vitae*, and a covering letter stating that the manuscript is being submitted as a candidate for the prize should be sent to Brown University Press, Box 1881, Providence, Rhode Island 02912.

84.160  We extend congratulations to Ruth Samson Luborsky, who has been awarded a two-year Research Resources Grant from NEH to continue work on *English Books with Woodcuts: 1536-1603*. The catalogue is being prepared in collaboration with Professor Elizabeth Ingram.

84.161  Brown University Press continues its program of First Book Prize Awards, for outstanding manuscripts in all major fields and disciplines by exceptionally able men and women who have not previously published book-length works. Recently completed doctoral dissertations will be considered only if they have been duly revised for publication in book form. Certain of the prize-winners not affiliated with Brown University may be enabled to participate in teaching and scholarly research at Brown in their respective humanistic disciplines.

Guidelines for submission of manuscripts are (1) the manuscript must be of exceptional quality and submitted in its final form; (2) the manuscript must not be under consideration elsewhere while it is at the Brown University Press; (3) a single copy of the manuscript (not the ribbon copy), the author's *curriculum vitae*, and a covering letter stating that the manuscript is being submitted as a candidate for the prize should be sent to Brown University Press, Box 1881, Providence, Rhode Island 02912.

SPENSER BIBLIOGRAPHY: UPDATE

84.162  This item continues the project inaugurated with Item 80.29 (*SpN* 11.1) and subsequently continued in *SpN* 11.2, 11.3, 12.3, 13.3, and 14.3.
The following checklist includes Spenser items published during 1982 plus a number of earlier items not included in previous updates. Items reviewed in the Spenser Newsletter are referred to by year and item number; 82.10 refers to the tenth item in the 1982 volume.

I. Works: Editions


II. Collections of Essays


III. Bibliographies


6. Moore, John W., Jr. "Spenser Bibliography Update, 1980." SpenN, 13, 3 (Fall 1982), 67-76. 82.112

IV. General Spenser Criticism


23. Thaon, Brenda M. "Spenser and the Elizabethan Art of Verse Translation." In Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1982, pp. 82-103. 82.66-67


V. General Criticism of The Faerie Queene


43. Miller, David L. "'The Pleasure of the Text': Two Renaissance Versions." NOR, 9, 2 (Fall 1982), 50-55.

44. Mulryan, John. "Demonic Patterns in Tasso and Spenser." JRMMRA, 3 (January 1982), 143-52. 83.112


49. Tobin, J. J. M. "On Spenser and Apuleius." In Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1982, pp. 1-8. 82.53-54


VI. Criticism of Individual Books of The Faerie Queene

1. The Faerie Queene, Book One


57. Reid, Robert L. "Spenserian Psychology and the Structure of Allegory in Books 1 and 2 of The Faerie Queene." MP, 79, 4 (May 1982), 359-75. 82.77


59. Weatherby, Harold L. "'Pourd out in Loosnesse.'" SST, 3 (1982), 73-86. 83.21

2. The Faerie Queene, Book Two


61. Gleckner, Robert F. "Edmund Spenser and Blake's Printing House in Hell." SAQ, 81, 3 (Summer 1982), 311-22. 83.109


64. May, James E. "Water Imagery in The Faerie Queene, Book II." BWVACET, 7 (Spring 1982), 2-8. 84.80

3. The Faerie Queene, Book Three


69. Demaris, Colleen Herrmann. "'Be Bold... but 'Not too Bold': The Epic Stature of Britomart in Spenser's The Faerie Queene." Kentucky, 1981. DAI, 42:3145-A. 82.79


4. The Faerie Queene, Book Four


5. The Faerie Queene, Book Five


77. Hardin, Richard F. "A Whig Reading of the Mercilla Episode." In
Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1982, pp. 36-49. Response by W. Nicholas Knight, pp. 50-53. 82.61-62


79. Stump, Donald V. "Isis Versus Mercilia: The Allegorical Shrines in Spenser's Legend of Justice." SST, 3 (1982), 87-98. 83.19

6. The Faerie Queene, Book Six


81. Armesto, Laura S. "Mynde and Hart: Spenser's Triumph as Vatic Poet in Book VI of The Faerie Queene." BSUF, 23, 2 (Spring 1982), 28-41. 83.58


7. Two Cantos of Mutabilitie


VII. The Minor Poems

1. The Shepheardes Calender


97. Weiner, Seth. "The Impress of Renaissance Musical Theory on Spenser's Prosodic Thinking." In Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1982, pp. 121-31. 82.70

2. Complaints


3. Colin Clouts Come Home Again


103. Shore, David R. "Spenser's Colin Clouts Come Home Againe: The Problem of Poetry." ESC, 8, 3 (September 1982), 262-81. 83.115

4. Amoretti and Epithalamion

A. Amoretti


B. Epithalamion


5. Fowre Hymnes


109. Quitslund, Jon A. "'Ornaments of All True Love and Beautie': The Patronesses of the Fowre Hymnes." In Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1982, pp. 54-70. Response by John Webster, "Two by Two or One by Four: The Structural Dilemma of Spenser's Fowre Hymnes," pp. 71-81. 82.63-64


VIII. Prose
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