

S P E N S E R • N E W S L E T T E R

SPRING/SUMMER 1987 • VOLUME 18 • NUMBER 2

E. J. Gless

EDITOR: DARRYL J. GLESS
ASSOCIATE EDITORS: JERRY LEATH MILLS, S. K. HENINGER, JR.

SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

CORRESPONDING EDITORS:
ELIZABETH BIEMAN, ELLEN M. CALDWELL,
DONALD CHENEY, A. KENT HIEATT, RITCHIE D. KENDALL,
HUGH MACLEAN, WALDO F. MCNEIR, RICHARD D. SCHELL
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: DORIS HELBIG

•
CONTENTS

TO OUR READERS	30
BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES	30
Davies, Stevie. <i>The Feminine Reclaimed: The Idea of Woman in Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton.</i>	30
Hyde, Thomas. <i>The Poetic Theology of Love: Cupid in Renaissance Literature.</i>	35
Kinney, Arthur F., ed. <i>Essential Articles for the Study of Sir Philip Sidney.</i>	37
Lamberton, Robert. <i>Homer the Theologian: Neo-Platonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition.</i>	40
ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES	43
SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO	46
ANNOUNCEMENTS	53

The *Spenser Newsletter* is published three times a year, Winter, Spring-Summer, and Fall, by the Department of English at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Please address all communications to: Spenser Newsletter, Department of English, Greenlaw Hall 066A, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

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: \$5.50/yr. in USA, \$5.50 (US funds or equivalent) in Canada, \$9.00 US in Latin America and overseas. These rates are for Vol. 18, 1987.

TO OUR READERS

87.36 Having returned from a semester's leave to find the *Newsletter's* current issue nearly prepared and its finances in excellent condition, I owe gratitude to a number of people. First, my thanks to the many readers who responded so promptly, with kind words as well as checks, to our subscription-renewal letter. I also owe warm thanks to James P. Thompson, for overseeing *SpN's* operations in my absence. Both of us, along with Jerry Mills and Tim Heninger, owe special gratitude to Doris Helbig, who has attended with her customary diligence and skill to the journal's multifarious day-to-day obligations. Throughout the past two years, Doris's systematic care has rendered manageable -- even (I think) by those of us who must hereafter cope with them on our own -- the tasks of producing, mailing, copy-editing, and paying for a journal newly assisted by (and dependent upon) the sometimes truculent aid of clever silicon. Her labors, always performed far beyond the requirements of the job, will be sorely missed.

Thanks, too, to Pamela Benson, who has again provided a first-rate report on the events at Kalamazoo, and to Kevin Farley, Julian Lethbridge, and James P. Thompson, for supplying abstracts of recent articles.

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

87.37 Davies, Stevie. *The Feminine Reclaimed: The Idea of Woman in Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1986. xi + 273 pp. \$25.00.

The subtitle of this book itself qualifies any feminist expectations conjured by its title; for the word *Idea*, the Preface discloses, has Platonist overtones. In the introductory chapter, Davies traces the roots of the "Renaissance feminine" (13) to the humanist rediscovery of classical writers and their influence on the iconography and philosophy associated with Neoplatonism. In reevaluating mythical, especially pastoral contexts, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton reclaim not any particular women or their concerns, but, rather, the emblematic force of the female pagan deities. In light of a Renaissance iconography of the feminine based in part on the *Hermetica* and *The Orphic Hymns*, Davies re-interprets Book III of *The Faerie Queene*, the last plays of Shakespeare, and much of *Paradise Lost*. She discovers that female characters in these texts take on the emblematic qualities of the major goddesses -- Aphrodite, Demeter, Persephone, Diana, Isis -- and appear, against the background of such archetypal female images as moon and sea, in situations resembling ancient fertility myths and initiation rites. As if to complement these feminine images, each poet's work is largely an effort to communicate with the "woman-in-himself" (177), a longing for androgyny which is in turn represented most effectively by the figure of the hermaphrodite.

Ordering the book chronologically allows Davies to follow a continuum from Spenser's Idea of the feminine, as it was influenced by Tudor mythology and the cult of the Virgin Queen, to Shakespeare's reliance on ancient mother-goddesses and mother-

laws, to Milton's "extension of the Elizabethan humanist dream ... carried forwards into a new age of political and social upheaval and overt spiritual dissension" (178). After the introductory material, she begins each chapter with a biographical note, demonstrating the psychological relationship between the "real" world in which the poet lives and the Ideal world about which he writes. Each of the poets, striving for Unity through submission to the feminine principles of love and creation, believes his work offers a specifically feminine, if idealistic alternative to patriarchal reality, and envisions "other kinds of power than the male politics of the daylight world" (121).

Newsletter readers will find chapter 1 especially interesting. Davies argues here that instead of regarding the feminine principle as a dangerous force to be tamed or subdued, Spenser "internalises" it: "He seems to locate and see, not an image of the 'other' -- foreign, alien, antithetical -- but fugitive reflections of the psyche itself" (41).¹ Most of the chapter focuses on Book III of *The Faerie Queene* and Britomart, who comes to signify the "transcendence of male by female law" (43). A woman in the male world of action and aggression, Britomart is a Diana-figure complicated by her "allowable human desire" (55) for Arthegall and by her predicted fertility as a mother of kings. Although one could counter that this reminder that her assigned role in English history is to yield to patriarchal power and provide legitimate male heirs does offer Elizabeth a problematic message, Davies believes that Spenser's Britomart / Elizabeth draws "the 'female' element of the nation into a fuller equivalence with the 'male'" (57). As a syncretizer of the pagan goddesses, Spenser sees beyond the conflict between a Venus- and a Diana-figure to their eventual reconciliation (III.vi.25).

Davies also analyzes Spenser's treatment of what men perceive as the "dark" side of the feminine. Britomart's wounding of Marinell and his removal to the submarine, womb-world vault of Cymoent reveal the threat of feminine power in the relationship between sex and death, the womb and the grave, the pangs of generation and regeneration. In both the Marinell and the Garden episodes, Spenser identifies masculine fears, but he does not sanction them (68). Like most critics, Davies compares the Garden to the Bower of Bliss, equating the Bower with "sterile sexual fantasy" and the Garden with the "fruitfulness of joyous sexual love" (81). She spends several pages exploring the iconographical and symbolic force of Venus and the Garden; both are central to her argument that Spenser recognizes and submits to the female principle in its most paradoxical forms.

The Rape of Innocence, a general theme explored in *The Feminine Reclaimed*, involves what Frye would call typically mythical figures of innocence -- childlike, virginal, Persephone-figures. In *The Faerie Queene* one finds, among other treacheries, Amoret's imprisonment, Florimell's continual flights from assault, Chryso gone's "benign" rape (83), and the somewhat pornographic tapestries in the House of Busyrane. Yet Davies also discovers that, as with Adonis, the destructive instinct of male sexuality can be restrained if it yields, of its own accord, to female sexuality (90). The male poet, another potentially abusive figure, must question the motivation of his own work: "In attempting the role of creator-creatix of his poem, Spenser everywhere concedes the doubt that he may be acting merely as its fabricator, the Archimago or Busyrane of the poetic world" (95). Davies argues that as narrator of the tapestries displaying Jupiter's rapes, Spenser is "ironic"; he is aware that in III.xi.32 (Leda and the swan) it is insidious to depict a woman as desiring rape (97). The figure of the hermaphrodite perhaps serves

as an antidote to the many violations against women one finds in *The Faerie Queene*. Two important bisexual figures, the goddess in the Temple of Venus (Book IV) and Dame Nature (*Mutabilitie Cantos*) appear to be more Aphroditic than Hermetic; their mysterious powers are procreative. Davies' analysis of the frenetic productivity of the Garden suggests a primarily feminine emblem of the hermaphrodite at the center: "Venus and Adonis in the act of coition make up an androgyne within the feminine gender. Venus is spoken of in the active voice, Adonis in the passive; Venus represents the transforming spirit, Adonis the transformed matter. She descends upon the acquiescent male in a direct reversal of the rape motif exemplified in the behaviour of the 'Stygian gods'; thus Venus 'Possesseth him', 'takes her fill' of Adonis, at the discretion of her own lively appetite" (89). Davies prefers the 1590 ending of Book III because Scudamour and Amoret's unifying Neoplatonic embrace stresses the bisexual schema of the poem. The last stanzas compare the couple to a "faire *Hermaphrodite*," a final coalescence of male and female principles.

If Spenser questions patriarchy with his female warrior and maternal goddesses, Shakespeare also challenges paternal power while retaining the family as the basic social unit (106). In the tragicomedies, especially the "sea-world" plays, he tries "to redress the lost balance of gender" (111) and to create worlds where the "law of the fathers" submits absolutely to the "law of the mothers" (119; Davies does not seem to invoke here any Freudian or Lacanian formulae). Frye has noticed that as some of the plots of Shakespeare's last plays become less plausible, their mythical outlines become more visible, especially the plight of the Persephone-figure, or the "comic theme of ritual assault on a female figure, a theme which stretches from Menander to contemporary soap operas."² Davies' readings of *Twelfth Night*, *Dream*, *Pericles*, *Winter's Tale*, and *Tempest* extend the theme further; she finds that the resolutions of these plots rely heavily on the mythical associations of Demeter as an earth / mother-goddess and law-giver, and on the revelations of her power and promise with the "materialization" (174) of Persephone in the Eleusinian ceremonies.³ Pericles finally "abdicates his gender" (148), and in *Winter's Tale* there occurs "an inversion of the patriarchal norm" (171) as Leontes eventually submits to the "grace" of Paulina and allows her Orphic magic to revive the "statue" of Hermione (173). The hermaphrodite is also an important figure for Shakespeare, whose girls disguised as boys move between both male and female spheres, as does Viola / Cesario, to educate other characters about the limitations of insisting on a singular nature.

In her re-interpretation of *Paradise Lost*, Davies takes on the enormous task of defending Milton's portrayal of woman. Despite the obvious antifeminist tone and substance of some of his prose pieces and conversational phrases, Milton is not a crude misogynist: "Such outbursts should be understood not as a constitutional undervaluing of woman but as symptoms of thwarted idealism" (178). He reveals instead a complex of attitudes toward women, which ultimately becomes feminist in *Paradise Lost*. Although he often thinks of himself as a "Masculin Birth" (185), he sees the creative process, described in Books I and VII, as essentially bisexual. Unlike Adam, Milton does not fall into misogyny; while Adam's reason undergoes a thorough education, Eve achieves the more highly valued gnosis: "to know by insight and to be reborn through that illumination" (224). Davies' analysis of Satan, his entrance to the Garden, and his "rape" of Eve frees the reader to scrutinize his actions, often overshadowed by his magnificent speeches. She compares him to a Dis-figure who, having violated the innocence of a

female figure, blights the world forever. Eve serves as both mother and daughter, Demeter and Persephone, at once; *Paradise Lost* thus becomes a "great fertility myth" (241) and Milton actually absolves Eve from severe condemnation.

Davies' study takes on an historical perspective when it considers the Neoplatonic influences on Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, but it tends to ignore the larger contemporary debate (in poetry, prose, and drama) on the nature of the feminine and of female roles; one must, of course, narrow one's subject. Perhaps a more obtrusive characteristic of the book is its inability to clarify some of its important terms. While positing a difference between "Ideal" and real versions of the feminine, Davies allows the terms to slide into meanings which invalidate or contradict her separation of them. When she writes "Archetypally, the sea is female" (129) she seems to mean "archetypally, the sea is biologically birth-giving"; for although "amniotic fluids" (129) are applicable to females alone, they are hardly applicable to all females. When she writes "feminine," as opposed to any historical woman, she again often assumes that her audience will recognize and accept some sort of universal, biological female role (e.g., maternal, nourishing), instead of a role formulated by a male writer. Although the first sentence of the introduction reads "Woman in life and woman in art are not the same person" (1), the book does not always consider that Jungian archetypes and the foundations of most "myth criticism" are also "male art" (97). The myths and their accepted readings are neither absolute nor free from patriarchal biases.

With its bold, richly detailed, comparative readings of canonical texts, Davies' book offers new possibilities for Renaissance studies. Perhaps an update of the reception of myths in English Renaissance texts might incorporate some of the work on ancient myths recently undertaken, by classicists, feminists, anthropologists, and historians, on the social and political functions of ancient myths. Their reconsiderations of mythical representations of the feminine apply directly to some of Davies' own concerns.⁴ Throughout the book she acknowledges among the three poets a desire to overcome the great male anxiety -- womb-envy one might call it -- over the inability to give birth. Spenser deals "with the problem which has beset the male-centered society from its very origins: how man can bear children ... It is not through the denial of male aggression and rapacity that this illumination [the vision of Venus and Adonis] is revealed but through the yielding of coercive power to the female, together with the language by which it finds expression" (90). It has been suggested that creation or "miraculous birth" stories represent, among other things, masculine fears of the Rule of Women and attempts to assimilate and contain their potential sexual power; in fact, "the struggle of the male to control or usurp the reproductive function is a repetitive motif in Greek myth."⁵ Thus the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus, after he has swallowed his powerful wife Metis, finalizes the efforts of the sky-gods to control the sexuality and fertility of the earth-goddesses. In the process, "male generative creativity is displaced from phallos to head, or rather, put somewhat differently, phallos and head are associated together."⁶ In a reversal of the paradigm, Satan as Zeus may reveal the sinister nature of unilateral reproduction, in marked contrast to Adam and Eve. Davies begins to suggest this reversal in her discussion of Sin: "The point of the bisexual scheme upon which Milton structures *Paradise Lost* becomes clear at this point, where Sin like a defective Athena comes clear of Satan's head, in parthenogenesis. A mind is equated with a world, a world with a womb" (205). The birth of Sin is singular and masculine, the womb usurped and controlled by the male mind (head / phallos).

Whatever direction studies of the iconography of the feminine (or masculine) might take, much remains to be discovered about Renaissance Ideas of woman, and further efforts to describe or analyze those Ideas must begin with *The Feminine Reclaimed*.

Ellen M. Caldwell
Clarkson University

¹Although Davies finds this internalization a reflection of new and revolutionary Neoplatonic influences, one might also argue that she describes here not a recognition of the feminine or the Other through its own eyes (face to face), but merely a reflection of the masculine Self, which tends to see all the world created in his image.

²Northrop Frye, *The Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 183.

³Using two of the sources Davies reads beside Shakespeare's plays -- the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and Claudian's *de raptu Proserpinae* -- Bruce Lincoln argues that the Eleusinian mysteries may also reflect, in the Demeter-Persephone myth, what was an earlier initiation rite for women alone, a ceremony having the important social function of controlling women: "Kore's defloration changes her utterly. She has, in effect, been initiated by rape, a pattern found in a number of male-centered, misogynistically inclined cultures, and strongly suggested in numerous Greek myths. Introduction to productive sexuality seems to be only a secondary motive for such practices, the real point being the forcible subjugation of women to male control." "The Rape of Persephone," in *Emerging from the Chrysalis: Studies in Rituals of Women's Initiation* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 79. See also Eva Cantarella, "Dangling Virgins: Myth, Ritual, and the Place of Women in Ancient Greece," in *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1986), 57-67.

⁴See especially Marilyn B. Arthur, "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude toward Women," *Arethusa* 6 (1973), 7-58 and "The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the *Theogony* Prooemium," *Arethusa* 16 (1983), 97-116; Averil Cameron and Amélie Kuhrt, eds., *Images of Women in Antiquity* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983); Eva Cantarella *L'ambiguo malanno* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1981); Mary R. Lefkowitz, *Women in Greek Myth* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Le chasseur noir: Formes de pensées et formes de société dans le monde grec* (Paris: Maspero, 1981).

⁵Froma I. Zeitlin, "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*," *Arethusa* 11 (1978), 179, n. 21.

⁶Zeitlin, p. 169.

87.38 Hyde, Thomas. *The Poetic Theology of Love: Cupid in Renaissance Literature*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986. 212 pp. \$29.50.

In this learned, gracefully written book, Thomas Hyde explores what he calls "the poetic theology of love" from medieval literature through Spenser, "the last major poet to make Cupid's theology a sustaining fiction and the one whose works comprehend nearly all the phases of Cupid's career and bring it to culmination" (72). Accordingly, more than a third of the text is devoted to Spenser, whose "*Faerie Queene* does not merely use poetic theology; it is a poetic theology" (143).

"Poetic theology," Hyde writes, is "poetry's most heterodox and dangerous fiction" (72). Evidently, Hyde means something rather different from what Pico had in mind when he planned a *Poetica theologia* on the "enigmatic veils and poetic dissimulation" that hide divine mysteries from the uninitiated (Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, Norton ed., 1968, p. 17). The essential point for Hyde is that a "tension ... between confidence in fiction as a necessary veil for truth and mistrust of it as a deceit or delusion ... animates the literary career of Cupid" (28). Poetic theology on this view is always intrinsically ambiguous (a favorite adjective) in that "Eros or Cupid or Amor -- his names are usually interchangeable" is "an amphibious figure, alternately or simultaneously both mythical deity and personified passion" (13). The Renaissance authors Hyde admires steer a middle course between two extremes: "either too skeptically spurning poetic theology as empty fables (and so missing its divine truths) or, like Nero [in the pseudo-Senecan tragedy *Octavia*] too credulously accepting fictions that may be dangerous (and so deluding themselves or others)" (16-17).

As against (most prominently) C.S. Lewis, Hyde insists that Spenser's Cupid cannot be understood in iconographic terms, visual images being (Hyde believes) in general unable to convey the dialectical ambiguity central to poetic theology. It won't do to say with Lewis that the presence or absence of arrows indicates what *sort* of Cupid we are dealing with; for Hyde, there is only one Spenserian Cupid, however paradoxically diverse his conduct may appear. This point has been made before, perhaps most tellingly by Elizabeth Story Donno ("The Triumph of Cupid: Spenser's Legend of Chastity," *YES* 4 [1974], 39n). The book under review provides the evidence from literary and intellectual history to back up the unitary reading of Spenser's Cupid.

Hyde complicates the plot by arguing that every poetic theology "implicitly claims for itself the status of Scripture. That claim makes poetic theology equivocal and unstable. Reading it becomes a moral problem, a temptation" (37). By definition, "when texts pose this challenge within themselves, enacting or elaborating the potential for apostasy of their own myths and images, the result is poetic theology" (32).

In the *Romance of the Rose* and in Andreas Capellanus' *De amore*, for example, fictional "speakers all take literally the poetic theology of love; they misread the figurative expression" (45). The literary work as a whole serves to correct or ridicule that misreading. So runs the argument of Hyde's Chapter 2, "Medieval Developments," which begins the historical unfolding of the set of ideas whose logic and ontology (two favorite words) Hyde has formulated in Chapter 1, "The Poetic Theology of Love." In Chapter 3, "The *Vita Nuova* and the *Trionfi*," Hyde argues that in Dante "poetic theology is no longer an ironic dream mimicking the delusions of men in love; it has become a

way to truth" (58). This same movement is found in the poems, mainly Italian and French, covered in Chapter 4, "Renaissance Poetry." Here Hyde contends that Renaissance poems typically reverse the recognition enacted in medieval poems on love: rather than generating irony from the split between mock-deity and earthbound passion, Renaissance poets "reaffirm the association of love as an experience with Love as a cosmological force" (81). The chapter runs quickly through its set of texts, and Hyde does not always avoid textbook versions of intellectual history: "Cupid's ambiguity is in no way lessened in the Renaissance, but it comes to be seen less as a dangerous potential for abuse and self-deception than as a reflection of the sacredness of love and the dignity of man" (88).

Hyde is at his best in Chapter 5, "Renaissance Mythographers and Neoplatonists," where he notes that "before Ficino, Cupid was now a god, now a personification, but never, except by delusion or abuse, both at the same time. In Ficino, Cupid's equivocal double nature becomes daemonic, simultaneously divine and human, and becomes in addition his most important attribute" (93). For the Florentine Neoplatonist, "Cupid has become a true Silenus, uniting in one figure the human effect with its divine cause" (95). Among the mythographers, pride of place is accorded to Conti, who, "in contrast to Cartari and Giraldi ... affirms both the unity and divinity of Cupid" (107). As throughout Hyde's book, earlier authors are commended for their anticipations of Spenser's view.

In Chapter 6, "Spenser's Minor Poems," Hyde argues that in the course of these works "Spenser resolved the tension between Cupid as god and Cupid as demon decisively in favor of the god" (112). This seems a plausible account of the Colin Clout poems and (though more debatably) of the Hymns. But Hyde's effort to bring *Muiopotmos* into his story on the basis of what he rightly calls "three seemingly trivial mentions of Cupid" (117) seemed far-fetched to this reader.

Everything in the book has been leading to the long final chapter on Spenser's epic romance, but the chapter proves a disappointment. Hyde finds the culmination of the *Faerie Queene* (read, at any rate, as a poetic theology) in Book III, in the encounter of Britomart and Busyrane. He has little of interest to say of the later books. Moreover, Hyde writes as if Spenser had read the six preceding chapters of Hyde's book. Thus, "Spenser has projected the self-consciousness that blocked his theodicy into the fiction in the form of Busyrane and associated him, even more clearly than Archimago, with poetry" (174). At times, Hyde even makes it sound as if the fictive characters in the poem had read his *Poetic Theology*.

The culminating pages of the book consider Busyrane's house, "a false temple to a real god," into which Spenser has placed "nearly the whole tradition of Cupid's poetic theology" (174). There is something overly business-like about the interpretation: the Q.E.D. seems too briskly asserted. Moreover, poetic self-consciousness and meaningful ambiguity have long been staples of Spenser criticism; one has the odd sense that Hyde has gone through a long historical study to authorize his use of the critical vocabulary of a generation ago, which might otherwise seem simply old-fashioned, New Critical Talk.

Few readers will find their view of Spenser's romance changed by *The Poetic Theology of Love*. Nonetheless, Professor Hyde's book must be welcomed as a sound scholarly presentation of material that lies behind the extraordinary version of love-abuse

in *FQ* III. The good sense with which Hyde insists on having things both ways when it comes to Cupid will help readers escape some of the brilliantly engaging simplifications of C.S. Lewis. And the book can very profitably be put into the hands of students who fall under the spell of Denis de Rougemont's Wagnerian strains.

Eugene D. Hill
Mount Holyoke College

87.39 Kinney, Arthur F., ed. *Essential Articles for the Study of Sir Philip Sidney*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1986. xvii + 458pp. \$29.50.

"O may I not thus yet refresh the remembrance / What sweet joys I had once, and what a place I did hold?" A generation before the four-hundredth anniversary of his death in the Netherlands, the ghost of Philip Sidney -- pondering his literary fame -- might well have voiced the same lament given Philisides, his lovelorn namesake in the *Old Arcadia*. No longer. As Arthur Kinney writes in his preface to the Sidney volume in the *Essential Articles* series, many would now accept what was a bold claim when Theodore Spencer advanced it in 1945: "it is Sidney -- not Spenser -- who is the most central of English poets in the generation that was soon to know Shakespeare" (xvi). For editing a collection which confirms that judgment, Kinney deserves our thanks and praise. The twenty-four articles gathered here make good his promise to reveal "the entire range of Sidney's literary work and ... the great range of our current approaches to it" (xvii). But what is more rare, in the interplay of its carefully selected essays the volume creates a critical dialogue capable of prompting Kinney's readers to consider as yet unresolved questions about Sidney's poetry and culture.

Though many will turn to Kinney's book to find a single essay, the counterbalancing of judgments and approaches in this collection makes it worth reading through, at least section by section. (There are seven sections, one devoted to biography and one to Spencer's pioneering essay, and one each for *The Lady of May*, *The Defence of Poesie*, *Astrophil and Stella*, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, and *The Psalms of David*.) F.J. Levy's "Philip Sidney Reconsidered" (1972) opens the volume with a portrait of Sidney as a politically militant young Protestant whose vision of himself as leading statesman in a united, anti-Catholic Europe left him effectively powerless in a court dominated by the cautious Cecils. For Levy, Sidney's alternative was "to make poetry a respectable form of work for the members of the ruling class" (10) and "to examine critically the monarchy" which found little use for him (11). Immediately following is Alan Hager's "The Exemplary Mirage" (1981), which both challenges and complements Levy's view. The image of Sidney as "martyr to the cause of the Protestant League" is the work of the Leicester faction, Sidney himself viewing Catholics with toleration (18). For Hager, this image fashioned by others, like that of the perfected courtier he finds so skillfully employed by Elizabeth after Sidney's death, obscures Sidney's ironic and critical habit of mind, which enabled him to see the humor and the "weaknesses in our conventional understandings ... of experience" (24).

Such engaging dialogue is built into the structure of each section, most evidently into that on Sidney's *Defence*. The first three essays ponder the controlling sources of Sidney's poetics: O.B. Hardison (1972) finds "two distinct and discordant voices" (86), a neoplatonic confidence in poetry as inspired and inspiring and an "incipient neo-

classicism" which would impose reductive rules on poetic imitation; Andrew Weiner (1972) writes that Sidney the Calvinist sees inspiration as an unsullied gift from God which works upon the imagination, bypassing the corrupt senses and reason; D.H. Craig (1980) rejects neoplatonist, mannerist, and Calvinist explanations in favor of "A Hybrid Growth" which incorporates the Platonic vision of a morally compelling, extranatural beauty while being grounded in the Aristotelian stress on image-making as the poet's work, giving poetry not a shadowy but "a substantial and independent identity" (125). Yet in the subsequent essay on "Sidney's Conception of *Mimesis*" (1972), John Ulreich, Jr., argues that in the *Defence* Sidney seizes on what Plato and Aristotle share: a conception of mimesis as dynamic activity. And so "poetic making is both an Aristotelian representation of what Nature has brought forth, the conceiving imagination of man, and a Platonic figuring forth, a shadow of the invisible process by which God creates that other Nature" (151). Finally, Catherine Barnes examines "The Complex Speaking Voice" (1971), offering neither a source oriented nor a philosophical approach, but rather a rhetorical analysis of "sophisticated exercises in audience psychology" by which Sidney manipulates his readers to accept his claims for poetry (155). Kinney does not present a history of readings of the *Defence*; instead his articles form that kind of lively but serious conversation which in itself represents Sidney's own critical mind.

Kinney plainly selected articles to construct such a dialogue, but he is also willing to include readings which call the entire direction of such critical exchanges into question. Such is Richard Lanham's "*Astrophil and Stella*: Pure and Impure Persuasion" (1972). Cleverly placed after Jack Stillinger's claim (1960) that the sonnet sequence belongs to the game of courtly compliment and A.C. Hamilton's discovery (1969) of a structure anatomizing *Astrophil's* struggle between love and the demands of the active life, Lanham's essay announces -- with a refreshing directness and even glee -- that the sonnets and songs "are all essentially not poetic but rhetorical; they all aim to persuade" the lady to bed (225). Every element troublesome to critics -- the biographical problem, the questions of a controlling *persona*, of Sidney's sincerity, and of structure -- goes away when we confess *Astrophil's* impurely persuasive purpose and realize that he simply keeps on posing faces and arguments until he either wins or gives up. Similarly brilliant and perverse is Franco Marengo's "Double Plot in Sidney's Old 'Arcadia'" (1969), which finds that the disruption and violence among low characters mirrors the inner disorder and desperation in the erotic lives of the noble figures, to the credit of neither group. "Nothing 'remains strongly' in Arcadia: not wise government, not chastity, not faith, not physical or moral strength" (303). Both Lanham and Marengo serve as touchstones in this collection, reminding us of Sidney's abiding obsession with the compulsions and ravages of sexual desire, though both seem in their reductive readings to be willfully tone deaf -- uninterested in either the moral anguish (which Lanham would call a mask) or the benevolent humor which marks all of Sidney's poetry. Another sort of touchstone can be found in William Godshalk's scholarly account of "Sidney's Revision of the *Arcadia*: Books III-V" (1964), whose reconstruction of the publication of the 1590 and 1593 *Arcadias* should be read annually by critics of those works. His suggestion that the incomplete sentence which ends the *New Arcadia* may well be due to the losing of manuscript leaves -- explaining an otherwise mysterious delay in publication -- should serve to caution those who would make the unfinished line a culminating instance of Sidney's supposed problems with closure.

There is little to criticize in the way of omissions or inappropriate choices in Kinney's volume. Costs forced the *Essential Articles* series as early as the Spenser volume (1972) to exclude sections of books, and Kinney extends this ban to articles which later appeared within a book, with only two exceptions. This policy generally serves him well, though in the section on the *Arcadia* it produces an awkward 1974-1981 gap, resulting in the loss of one "essential" approach to Sidney's fiction: Richard McCoy's challenging study of what he calls an "ideological uncertainty about the legitimacy of self-assertion" which produces a "recurrent pattern of contradiction and irresolution" in Sidney's work (*Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia*. [New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979], p. x; cf. *SpN* 80.06). Also missing is any essay directly addressing the problem of structure in the *New Arcadia*. Readers should turn to Nancy Lindheim's study of these rhetorical and narrative structures in the *Arcadia* which express "Sidney's need to control and arrange experience ... without giving up his perception of its chaos or unmanageability" (*The Structures of Sidney's Arcadia* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982]; cf. *SpN* 83.104). The two articles on stylistics in the *Astrophil and Stella* and *Psalms*, though entirely competent, contribute least to the critical dialogue which distinguishes Kinney's book. Colin Williamson's examination (1980) of tensions formed by the rhyming pattern and the syntax or sense of the sestets in *Astrophil and Stella* concludes by noting a parallel between such formal conflicts and the "overlapping and interlocking areas of human feeling" (270), but it offers no analysis to link the two. Likewise Coburn Freer's critical commentary on "The Style of Sidney's Psalms" (1969) identifies a bond with "the metaphysical and devotional poets who follow" Sidney (441) but never explores it.

Reading *Essential Articles* will heighten our awareness of questions yet to be answered about Sidney's work and its relation to late Renaissance culture. Weiner's essay on the *Defence*, like G.F. Waller's on "Calvinism and Courtly Philosophy in the Sidney Psalms" (1974) and concluding remarks, raises the difficulty of the effect on Sidney's poetry of his faith and his loyalty to the Protestant League, as well as the effect of that poetry on the religious verse of the next century. Many have distanced themselves from Weiner's conclusions, but no study has yet dealt adequately with Sidney's understanding of the "infected will" and of the overarching design of Providence. More fundamental still is the unresolved conflict among readings of Sidney as neoplatonic idealist, as frustrated rebel, and as playful, ironic critic of literary and courtly convention. Lately, as John Ulreich writes in this collection, Ronald Levaoy has taken this last image of Sidney to its endpoint: "Levaoy concludes that, like poetry itself, Sidney's treatise 'nothing affirms, and therefore never lieth'" (136). The old heroic Sidney of Greenlaw, Myrick, and Lewis seems a bit too much the Victorian gentleman -- the Sydney Carton who invariably does the far, far better thing. Yet the more recent figure, either trapped within the circle of Elizabethan power or floating above it uncommitted to any vision of life or art, seems too much the modern, American professor -- caught within a political structure where verbal representation is the means to power, unable to prosper without frankly abandoning principles or adopting a wholly ironic pose. In our work, the Sidney of moral imagination, believing that poetry exceeds all other human arts because it moves us to virtuous action, has yet to come to terms with the Sidney who discerns the radical and comical limits of our human vision in poetry and in the heroic life.

Several essays here offer some guidance. Spencer's hardworking young poet who progressed from experiment in classical and Italian forms to the simple, direct, and

"reverberant music" of *Astrophil and Stella* (56), who can invest "conventional form with a more than conventional weight" (47), counters the merely ironic or frustrated Sidney with the demonstration of a mature and maturing art. Alan Sinfield's essay on "Power and Ideology" in the *Arcadia* (1985) -- the boldest and best work in the book -- counters reductive tendencies in new historicist readings of Sidney. His study of the *Arcadia* in the context of the Elizabethan state suggests that as state servant and as writer Sidney could offer effective criticism of absolutism and of state ideological manipulation. Finally, John Ulreich's stress on a unified and energetic conception of poetry reveals a Sidney whose mind is not only syncretic -- balancing contradictory perspectives "in tension" -- but also synthetic -- "fusing" conflicting visions "so that they interpenetrate" (139). If Kinney's excellent volume provokes discussion of a Sidney in whom complexity in life and art occasions both moral action and an abiding, comic vision of the limits of that action, it will have done a great service.

William Craft
Mount Saint Mary's College

87.40 Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neo-Platonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. 375pp. \$38.00.

This book is excellent both for classicists and Spenserians, for the latter not only because Homer is the (direct or indirect) source for many episodes in *The Faerie Queene* but because the modes of understanding epic which Lamberton explores are crucial to the comprehension of Spenserian allegory. The work continues the tradition of examination of classical myth and allegory begun by Felix Buffiere, Jerome Carcopino, Franz Cumont, and Jean Pepin. Beginning with the early Neo-Pythagorean allegorists, it proceeds to cover Homeric commentary in 'apostolic' and 'post-apostolic' times: that of Philo, Numenius, Clement and Origen in Jewish-Christian tradition; and that of Plotinus, Porphyry, Julian, Sallustus, and Proclus in neo-Platonic tradition. The last section examines Homer's relation to the Middle Ages, showing how he was treated by the Arabs, the Greek church fathers up through pseudo-Dionysius, the Latin fathers including Augustine and Boethius, and late-medieval figures such as the Chartrean Neo-Platonists and Dante.

Lamberton's book defends interpretation and opposes the arid inheritance of generic or formalistic criticism of the epic which became popular in Western culture after the rise of Renaissance Aristotelian analysis. Herein, in part, lies the relevance of the book to Spenser who, as heroic poet, writes more as the interpreter-of-epic than as epic formalist. The Homer whom Lamberton describes, allegorized and rendered philosophical or theological, becomes, by virtue of periods of 'misinterpretation,' the source both of powerful commentary and subcreation. Although Lamberton does not discuss Spenser directly, he provides insight into the origin of the sort of etymological allegory represented by Orgoglio and Acrasia; Sansfoy, Sansloy, and Sansjoy; Una and Duessa, and the like. This sort of verbal figure has often seemed to Spenser's readers a tiresome leftover from some previous 'dark ages' -- a cooking together of Prudentius and Isidore of Seville perhaps. But Lamberton shows that the division of words into "syllabic and subsyllabic elements" and the tracing of etymologies of these elements to determine a word's figurative meaning goes back at least as far as Plato's *Cratylus*. Thus

Praetextatus makes Homer's Cronus become Time (Kronos / XPOVOS) who devours all things on the basis of an etymological pun, and Spenser imitates this ancient mode as it was understood in classical times as well as his own. (cf. Lamberton 264; index, s.v., "etymological allegory").

The ancient concept of levels of meaning in Homeric epic is relevant to Spenser's fusion of historical, philosophic, and religious allegory. For example, Porphyry finds moral allegory in Homer's presentation of the conversation between Odysseus and Athena (*Odyssey* 13.361-440), Proclus finds mystic meaning in Zeus's gathering of the gods (*Iliad* 20.4-25), and Porphyry makes the cave of *Odyssey* 13.102 represent the physical universe. Furthermore, the fusion of history and fable evident in *The Faerie Queene's* peculiar combination of Arthurian and Elizabethan history and classical myth was also found in Homer. Porphyry claims to have discovered the historical cave of the nymphs, and yet many find it also a cosmic allegory. The procedure for 'using' Homer adopted successfully by the Pythagoreans, Stoics, Neo-platonists, and Chartreans culminates not in the figures whom Lamberton describes but in Spondanus, the Renaissance commentator, and in Spenser, the Renaissance poet, both of whom lie beyond this book's scope.

Although Lamberton does not treat Spenser directly, his book suggests a number of observations. Spenserian studies have been, and despite various sophisticated recent disguises, continue to be bedeviled by source studies, conceived as putative guides to artistic intention. Lamberton suggests how to use sources and which ones to use. Even if we ignore W.K. Wimsatt's warning about the intentional fallacy, we ought to respect the semiotic principle that a work 'means' only in relation to the range of works and commentaries known to its audience, and that an author's private or esoteric knowledge is therefore irrelevant. Spenser's court audience of nobles, courtiers, and clerics undoubtedly knew Homer and Virgil, but it could not use many of Spenser's other 'sources' as semiotic controls. Prior to Harington's translation in the mid-1590's, *Orlando Furioso* was not a household word, and even then it was known primarily in the form represented in Harington's translation and commentary. John Brinsley, who provides a good -- and very conventional -- description of what grammar schoolmasters should know in *A Consolation for our Grammar Schools* (1622), advises them to know Spondanus on Homer (74) and Fabricus on Virgil (66). Since Spondanus uses the Judeo-Christian and the Neo-Platonic commentators studied in *Homer as Theologian*, Renaissance schoolchildren must have known the poet as mediated by commentary derived from the kind Lamberton describes. When readers read *The Faerie Queene*, I and II, for instance, they read them against Virgil and Homer but also against their interpreters.

Perhaps it would be better to regard Spenser not just as a poet imitating ancient epic but as one creating a fusion of poem and commentary. For example, Error with her cave could have appeared to echo Dido with her cave, interpreted in mediaeval-Renaissance Virgilian comment and related classical commentary on the *Odyssey* as the temptations of adolescence or the voluptuous life. That is, the hero at the beginning of his journey is forced by a rainstorm into the 'embraces' of a female figure whose lair is a cave. The surface plot similarities between the Error episode of *The Faerie Queene* and Aeneas' encounter with Dido in the cave outside of Carthage, or Odysseus' analogous meeting with Calypso in a similar place, are obvious enough. But, as physical beings, of

course, Dido and Calypso are beautiful whereas Error is ugly. Yet as a moral emblem in the commentaries, the queen of Carthage represents the ugly *libido* (considered to be original sin by Christian theology) and Calypso likewise appears as the unfulfilled life "on the level of the senses" which requires one to return to the Ithaca of a higher love (107). Thus Error's moral and physical ugliness, recalling epic *commentary on plot*, fuses with the cave, rain, and female figure, recalling previous *epic plot*, to represent the role of *libido's* sting in humankind's descent from moral or spiritual health. For the Renaissance reader, the pleasure of reading Spenser came, in part, from watching original work *and* commentary re-created in a new work.

Future research based on Lamberton will undoubtedly examine how Homeric Neo-Platonic tradition informs Spenser. One may, tentatively, suggest that it does so in four ways:

First, by *straightforward analogy*: *The Faerie Queene's* Acrasia reflects Porphyry's (and subsequent commentaries') version of Circe as the transformation of the soul by the life of pleasure. As Lamberton explains, Circe represents the "pursuit of pleasure," "irrational nature," and "the urge for pleasure" of "life in and through the flesh." Acrasia here is Circe's meaning made explicit, and Guyon plays the role of Hermes or reason (115-19).

Second, by *subcreation fusing classical model and commentary*: Porphyry's Polyphemus represents Odysseus' effort, through suicide, to cast off sensuality (130-31). Porphyry says, "it was not in the nature of things for Odysseus simply to cast off this life of the senses by an attempt to put an end to it abruptly" (i.e. the blinding of Polyphemus who stands for Odysseus' self). While Polyphemus' blinding is a metaphor for suicide in Porphyry's account (131), Spenser, following conventional Christian interpretation of giants, makes Orgoglio stand for pride or presumption, but the consequence of the Polyphemian encounter with Orgoglio is to be thrust next into the Cyclops' classical allegorical meaning, Despair or the threat of suicide. *The Faerie Queene's* equivalent, Orgoglio, allied with Duessa, reflects Red Cross's proud sensuality leading directly to suicidal Despair in a Polypheman cave (I.viii-ix).

Third, by *subcreation reflecting only commentary*: The cave of the Naiad nymphs of *Odyssey* 13.103-12, becomes in Porphyry the place where form or mind is imposed on matter, where souls enter the material universe. This notion is represented by other myths in Spenser's Garden of Adonis where 'Adonis' as form is drawn by Venus to shape matter while Cupid and Psyche join in a higher love (3, 47-50).

Finally, *a whole interpreted epic action* may reappear in Spenser. Proclus makes Odysseus' journey the wanderings of the soul seeking mystical union with the *nous*: Odysseus seems to be the understanding (*dianoia*); his true goal is union with the *nous*, and he contains noetic *logoi*. But in order to understand them, he must descend into the world of *phantasia* and fabricate mental images of them. The final union, though, can be reached only through a turning back within himself to contemplate the noetic realities which lie behind these experiences (225). This structure comes to be reenacted in Christian terms by Red Cross when, after following Duessa's life of illusion for a time, he finally achieves the Mountain of Contemplation and the unitive, Pentecostal betrothal to Una.

This book provides Spenser scholars with plenty to think about if they take it seriously. The whole process of knowing what works and commentaries Spenser's audience knew and how it used them as controls on interpretation is just beginning. Lamberton's view of the use of commentary as part of the act of creation in mediaeval writing by Boethius, Bernard Sylvesteris, and Dante provides the Spenserian with an excellent place to start giving the Spenserian form of the Homeric epic the serious historical-critical reading it deserves.

Paul A. Olson
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

- 87.41 Billigheimer, Rachael V. "'Passion and Conquest': Yeats' Swans," *CollL* 13 (1986): 55-70.

Yeats' solitary swan in "Coole Park and Ballylee" can be traced to Spenser's "The Ruines of Time," just as his "Leda and the Swan" may owe something to Spenser's version FQ II.xi.32. (J.T.)

- 87.42 Cheney, Patrick. "Moll Cutpurse as Hermaphrodite in Dekker and Middleton's *The Roaring Girl*," *Ren&R* ns 8 (1983): 120-134.

Moll Cutpurse's hermaphroditism derives from a Platonic and Neoplatonic tradition, popularized by Spenser in *FQ* IV where Venus is portrayed as being both male and female, the *Venus armata*; the hermaphrodite is a figure of love representing the union of contraries, or the pagan mystery of *concordia discors*. (J.T.)

- 87.43 Cheney, Patrick. "Alcestis and the 'Passion for Immortality': Milton's *Sonnet XIII* and Plato's *Symposium*," *MiltonS* 18 (1983): 63-76.

Milton's "late espoused Saint" and his desire to participate in Platonic love or for union with the ideal draws on the traditional Christian type of Neoplatonism found in Sidney and in Spenser's sonnets, notably Spenser's *Sonnet XLV*. (J.T.)

- 87.44 Cheney, Patrick. "Jonson's *The New Inn* and Plato's Myth of the Hermaphrodite," *RenD* ns 14 (1983): 173-194.

Jonson's reference (*The New Inn* III.ii.75-82) to the Platonic hermaphrodite draws upon the "faire Hermaphrodite" of Spenser's *FQ* III. (J.T.)

- 87.45 Farmer, Norman, Jr. "Spenser's Homage to Ronsard: Cosmic Design in *The Shepheardes Calender*." *StLF* (1986): 249-63.

Most criticism of the *The Shepheardes Calender* ignores the significance of the woodcuts to the cosmic structure of the work. The pictures, however, connect the individual themes of the eclogues to a guiding astrological purpose. Evidence that

Spenser was familiar with astrology may be found in the marginalia of Gabriel Harvey's books on astrology, which indicate that Spenser had read French astrological poetry, especially Du Bartas and Ronsard. Moreover, when E.K. asks the reader to "vnfold great matter of argument couertly," the evidence suggests that astrology is meant.

Spenser knew the "proper profession of Urania" -- poetry expressing astrological perfection. The relationship between the stars and their influence on human affairs is mirrored in *SC* by the woodcuts and the text. The woodcuts appeal (following Ficino) to the lower soul and the text to the higher: "what is announced through the pictures (the sensible body of the poet's meaning) is intended to have a specific bearing upon matters dealt with in the texts (the poet's equivalent to the 'alma rationalis')." The scheme of the zodiac is also mirrored in the text. Of the twelve signs, half are "night" and the other half "day." "The design of the book is thus identical with God's design of the cosmos" The reader apprehends this cosmic design through the woodcuts, not the text. (K.F.)

87.46 Fogleman, Bruce. "'Pan with Us': The Continuity of the Eclogue in Twentieth-Century Poetry," *CML* 6 (1986): 109-125.

The genre of the eclogue, of which, "in the English tradition, Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* represents the apex of pastoral development," has undergone a revival in the twentieth century at the hands of Yeats, Pound, Williams, Auden, Ransom and others. What Spenser added to the Greek and Roman pastoral conventions was "more complete development of character, increased psychological insight, and more intense, more personally focused voices of the poems' central figures," traits which "anticipate the predominant strains in pastoral nearly four centuries later." (J.T.)

87.47 King, John N. "Milton's Bower of Bliss: A Rewriting of Spenser's Art of Married Love," *Ren&R* ns 10 (1986): 289-99.

"When Milton came to reconfigure the ironies of the Bower of Bliss in the 'Blissful Bower' where Adam and Eve enjoy the fruits of prelapsarian love, he restored to full vitality the doctrine of chaste love that Spenser parodies in the seductive arbors and groves of Acrasia. ... the artful praise of the bowers of chaste lovers that Milton shares with Spenser reaffirms the purity of married love articulated by English Protestants and the prayer book." (J.T.)

87.48 Lomax, Marion. "*The Faerie Queene* and *The Book of Revelation* as Sources For Spectacle in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*." *N&Q* 33, no. 3 (September 1986): 378-9.

Cites *FQ* III.xii.2,3,19 and *Rev* 8:5-10 as sources of the stage direction describing the "appearance of the Lady's spirit to her lover" (378) in Middleton's play at IV.iv. (J.L.)

87.49 Morgan, Gerald. "Holiness as the First of Spenser's Aristotelian Moral Virtues." *MLR* 81, no. 4 (October 1986): 817-837.

Following the Aristotelian Aquinas and the rest, Spenser makes Holiness a moral not a theological virtue; for the object of Holiness (or religion which is the same thing) is

worship, unlike the theological virtues whose object is the last end. Worship is a means to the last end (821). Holiness is the point of contact between human effort and divine provision and thus provides the metaphysical foundation which alone makes the following moral concepts meaningful and real (830). The meaning of Holiness is defined through Aquinas, shown to be coextensive with Book I, and its logic to direct the narrative sequence in detail. (J.L.)

87.50 Petronella, Vincent F. "The Place of Ecstasy in *The Merchant of Venice*." *CEA* 42, no. 2 (Winter 1985): 68-77.

Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* pictures Renaissance neoplatonic ideas of how the soul reaches the divine through ecstasy. The soul ascends toward heaven through four basic "frenzies" -- poetry or music, ritual or divine mysteries, prophecy, and love -- and descends again to the body. The process provides a deeper knowledge of the divine to the soul in life. Shakespeare's play uses these frenzies to help the figures reach the "place" of ecstasy, Belmont, the hill overlooking worldly Venice. The play is a "divine comedy of ecstasy" and the ordinary convention of comedy -- separation and reunion -- is varied to show a soul's separation from, and reunion with, the body. Spenser's *Hymne in Honour of Beautie* also shows the reader how the soul may come to see the divine by praising the "wontlesse fury" of love. (K.F.)

87.51 Revard, Stella P. "'L' Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso': Classical Tradition and Renaissance Mythography," *PMLA* 101 (1986): 335-350.

The sister goddesses of Milton's "L' Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" may reflect the Renaissance mythographers representation of the close relationship between the Muses and the Graces, as in Spenser's "Aprill:" in the *Shepherd's Calendar* 102-12 where the Muses play while the Graces dance. (J.T.)

87.52 Taylor, Anthony Brian. "Debts to Golding in Spenser's Minor Poems." *N&Q* 33, no. 3 (September 1986): 345-347.

Details the following debts to Golding's *Metamorphosis: Ruines*, Sonnet 12, 1-4 to *Met* 1. 173-6; *VG*. 249-64 to 3. 47-8, 86-7 and 8.478-9; *Tears*, 7-12 to 2. 207-8; *Muiopotmos*, 277-80 to 6. 128-9; 297-99 to 6. 159-60; 316-17 to 6. 93-5; *Visions of Bellay*, 136-8 to 9.83-4. (J.L.)

87.53 Taylor, Anthony Brian. "Spenser and Golding: Further Debts in *The Faerie Queene*." *N&Q* 33, no. 3 (September 1986): 342-345.

Identifies the following debts of *FQ* to Golding's *Metamorphosis: FQ* II.iv.v.1-3 to *Met* 3. 443-4; III.ii.xxx.2-4 to 10. 461-3; III.xii.xxxvi.5-6 to 10. 484-6; III.vii.xlvii.2-5 to 1. 173-6; III.viii.xxxv.1-4 to 2.36-8; III.xii.viii.1-4 to 4. 26-7; V.viii.xlvii.1-4 to 7. 215-18; V.x.xxxvii.1-4 to *Preface*, 100, 109, 110; VI.xii.xxxii.1-5 to 9. 81-6. (J.L.)

- 87.54 Tromly, Frederic B. "Lodowick Bryskett's Elegies on Sidney in Spenser's *Astrophel* Volume." *RES* ns 37, no. 147 (1986): 384-388.

The two elegies written by Bryskett and published with "Astrophel" in 1595 were written at different times for different purposes: "The Mourning Muses" on the occasion of Sidney's death; the "Aeglogue" seven years later for the *Astrophel* volume. This latter honours not only Sidney but also Spenser whose influence it self-consciously displays. (J.L.)

- 87.55 Wall, John N., Jr. "'Fruitfullest Virginia': Edmund Spenser, Roanoke Island, and the Bower of Bliss." *RenP* (1985): 1-17.

Historical and textual evidence suggests that Spenser drew on contemporary accounts of voyages to the New World to picture the Bower of Bliss in *FQ* II. In many details Spenser's Bower resembles Roanoke Island; Spenser seems to use descriptions of the island by Barlowe and Ralph Lane, as well as John Whites' paintings of natives, to describe the Bower, and so defines "the significance of his own work as an imaginative construct." Also, unlike Thomas More, whose Utopia lacks a physical original, Spenser's Bower is made real by its existence in the world. This locates "Faerie Land in the world of possible experience; the more we know of new places ... the more possible it becomes that Faerie Land may come to be, or come to be discovered."

Spenser's *FQ* stresses moral responsibility in the New World. Guyon is the image of the moral discoverer who nurtures, instead of plundering, the new wealth. In reality wealth was plundered, but Spenser creates "not an image of Roanoke Island itself, but a Roanoke Island of the mind, a landscape such as the 'art' of the English imagination might conceive Roanoke Island to be." (K.F.)

- 87.56 Wentersdorf, Karl P. "Allusion and Theme in the Third Movement of Milton's *Lycidas*," *MP* 83 (1986): 275-279.

The association of Venus and Eros with dolphins in Milton's *Lycidas* 164 alludes to Spenser's *FQ* 3.11.42.5-6. (J.T.)

- 87.57 Woodbridge, L. "Amoret and Belphoebe: Fairy Tale and Myth." *N&Q* 33, no. 3 (September 1986): 340-342.

The story of the conception and birth of Belphoebe and Amoret derives from the Sleeping Beauty fairy tale which has its "remote origins" (341) in the Latona myth. Spenser draws on the fairy tale version, but exploits the remoter associations of Latona. (J.L.)

SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO (1987)

- 87.58 The Spenser at Kalamazoo XII sessions for 1987 were organized by Donald Stump, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Chair); Pamela J. Benson, Rhode Island College;

Jerome Dees, Kansas State University; Margaret Hannay, Siena College; and William Oram, Smith College.

87.59 A. Kent Hieatt (University of Western Ontario) mirthfully opened the sessions, which included a section on Spenser and his Age, by chronicling the successes of Spenserians against their age: January 13, 1599 is now the official terminus of the Middle Ages according to the Constitution of the Medieval Congress (we have Kent's word for it). He also gave a highly symbolic reading of the breaking of the brickle glass of the rear view mirror of his car (the obscure cause of momentous events in the last days of the preparation of the *Spenser Encyclopedia*) and nearly discouraged all comments from the floor by reminding the audience that even the most eloquent could not be entered on one's c.v.

87.60 Mark Heberle (University of Hawaii) presided at the first session, *Spenser I: Marital Visions, Marital Nightmares*.

87.61 Sayre N. Greenfield (University of Tulsa) in "The Wailing Male and Busirane's Amoret" took issue with critics who read Busirane's torture of Amoret as a representation of the lady's own fear of sexuality. "The sexual psychology of the episode is not Amoret's, but her feminine psychology as displayed by Busirane and as imagined by Scudamour, distorted by their poetic, masculine vision." The Narrator's attribution of the masque to the fantasies in wavering "wemen's" wit is a pun (we men's). The details of the setting (tapestries, whirlwind, empty rooms, fire, motto) are all "typical metaphors of male desire" in love sonnets. The masque tries to make Amoret suffer because the Petrarchan vision of love demands it. Scudamour fears that passion for him must be torturing Amoret because he imagines that the female mind must revolt against its passions. He is the one under Busirane's power. Amoret's heart only appears to be removed from her breast. She is actually steadfast.

87.62 Mary A. Prior (Moorhead State University) argued that the Radigund episode in Book V, usually read as a rebuke to woman's ambition, "effectively complicates and undercuts the ostensible rebuke" and "foreshadows a notion of marriage that involves neither ruler nor subject." Before encountering Radigund, Arthegall's justice acknowledges only hierarchical relationships. His experience with the Amazon is due to his rigid attachment to hierarchies and manifests his fear of female dominance in marriage: he accepts her condition that the loser obey the victor and suffers his marriage nightmare. In her rescue of him, Britomart "shatters" the model of hierarchical marriage: her behavior does not illustrate the social inferiority of women because her actions have made law and sovereignty irrelevant to marriage. Arthegall goes on to fight in defense of embattled female rulers. Justice has been freed from its hierarchies.

87.63 In his response, John M. Webster (University of Washington) admired Greenfield's explication of male misconceptions in the Busirane cantos, but asked why the episode must be "a specifically male versus female matter at all." He pointed out that Britomart, who solves the problem, combines both male and female and that the evils she responds to are not sex specific, and he suggested that Spenser is exploring how Chastity in either sex can "control and shape positively the transformational powers of love." Webster praised Prior's analysis of Arthegall's justice and its limitations and quarreled with her conclusion that Spenser is undermining the traditional hierarchical and

dependent marriage relationship. He suggested that Britomart might be angry at Arthegall because he was too equalitarian; he ought to have asserted his hierarchical right. He suggested that both papers are representative of the reluctance of all critics "to imagine that our poets ever got anything 'wrong,'" but that the greatness of the text is Spenser's capacity to be true to the structural dilemmas which underlie his culture. In the area of psychology he advocates sexual equality; in that of social structures he is committed to hierarchy.

87.64 Benjamin G. Lockerd, Jr. (Grand Valley State College) took a Jungian approach in "Nature and the Marriage of Matter and Spirit." He found the pattern of the *hierosgamos* or "Sacred Marriage" in which opposing theological principles are united through the psychological integration of masculine and feminine elements to be operating in *The Mutabilitie Cantos*. Jove polarizes the two sexual principles by assuming a pseudo-masculine stance and degrading the feminine; he also attempts to reject everything earthly and radically divides spirit and matter. Mutabilitie represents the feminine extreme; she would engulf the spiritual in the material rather than uniting them in a life-giving dynamic complementarity. Nature is the true resolution who integrates spirit and matter in a dynamic stasis that maintains multiplicity within unity; the Sacred Marriage produces the image of Christ at the moment of the Transfiguration, the revelation of the Son's difference-in-unity with the Father.

87.65 In her response, Carol Kaske (Cornell University) found Lockerd's analysis of Nature sympathetic. "That the Goddess Nature represents a *coincidentia oppositorum* is the essence of her evocative power." She objected, however, to his characterization of Jove as symbolic of spirit and suggested that a three-level Neoplatonic order applies: the supercelestial God of Sabbaoth, the celestial Jove, and the terrestrial Mutabilitie. "By acting masculine, Jove does not necessarily demonstrate that he is or symbolizes spirit." Spirit is pure, the realm of the blessed gods is immortal and corrupt. It will last until "the final Sabbath 'when all shall changed be.' Thus Jove himself is an example not of spirit but of the *coincidentia oppositorum* which Nature personifies."

87.66 Sara Thorne-Thomsen (Virginia Polytechnic Institute) presided at *Spenser II: The Anxiety of Influence*.

87.67 Peter DeSa Wiggins (College of William and Mary) defined Spenser's response to Ariosto as ambiguous. He distinguished between Spenser's allusions to *The Orlando Furioso* which publicize his independence of his predecessor, and his imitations, which acknowledge privately the pervasive, formative pressure of the earlier poet's vision. In his conspicuous allusion to Angelica's curing of Medoro's wound when Belphoebe cures Timias's wound, Spenser turns self-indulgent passion into purging and restorative chastity; Spenser repudiates the *Furioso*. But Belphoebe's discovery of Timias also pays tribute to Ariosto by imitating Astolfo's descent from heaven to encounter Senapo; Spenser uses Ariosto's depiction of the clash of irreconcilable perspectives to point out a crucial limitation on monarchic power. The moralist in Spenser rejects the psychologist, but the psychologist in him will pay tribute to the *Furioso* nonetheless.

87.68 In "Prothalamion and *The Faerie Queene*: Spenser's 'Spousall Verse' as a Defense of Allegorical Love Poetry," Patrick Cheney (Pennsylvania State University) argued "that Spenser, at the end of his career, defends the poetic process he has used throughout his

career. Cheney found a three-part structure in the poem analogous with the threefold poetic process that informs allegorical writing and reading in *FQ*: (1) the poet and reader see the realities of their day: the poet fails with *FQ*; (2) a retreat to world of allegorical ideals: a vision of nymphs and return to imaginative effort in creation of allegory and Orphic hymn teaching the swan-brides the value of marriage; (3) a return to reality transformed to perform virtuous action: the swans turn into brides who are ready to marry (they have learned from allegory) and autobiography, which breaks the allegorical vision, "reveals that the poem is about the place of allegorical love poetry in Spenser's life." The poem reinvigorates Spenser's Orphic spirit and demonstrates his national value; he comes home to London.

87.69 Gordon Teskey (Cornell University) in his response spoke of the metaphor of influence that underlies both papers: *influxus* meaning the movement of an inferior tributary stream into the superior stream and *influxus* the astrological term denoting dominion of the superior over the inferior. The poet asserts his independence from the dominion of convention by distortion that leaves the identity of the author influencing his work recognizable. Applied to Wiggins' paper, this metaphor explains why Spenser must make the influence from which he deviates identifiable, whereas Cheney's paper suggests that "Prothalamion" purifies the whole stream of Spenser's allegory and that in it he confronts himself as an overwhelming precursor.

87.70 In "Spenser's *Amoretti*: The Poet-Lover as Artificer," Lisa M. Klein (Indiana University) argued that "the *Amoretti* dramatize the redemption of the lovers, and of the poetry itself, from captivity to Petrarchanism." Themes of submission and captivity echo throughout the sequence, as do the words "leaf," "life," and "love" which indicate "the oneness of the poet and his work and their reliance on the beneficent response of the woman" which would free the poet's verse from pining Petrarchanism. Spenser uses ironic twists of Petrarchan motifs, humor, and shifts in tone to mock Petrarchan convention, even while he is captive to it, and shows both the lover and his mistress playing roles in a "conventionalized and often comic drama of love." The poet must "repudiate idolatry [of the lady] (22) and embrace an ethic of mutuality and submission"; he represents his conversion in sonnets 67 and 68 in which the Petrarchan fleeing deer submits to his hand and he accepts the freeing captivity of Christian love. The bird poems represent "love as mutual and liberating captivity without reverting to Petrarchanism."

87.71 Anne Lake Prescott (Barnard College) expressed "a few stray quibbles" with Klein's paper before expanding on her acutely observed "gathering of leaf, life, and love." She agreed that sonnet 68 demonstrates love's true hierarchy but argued that, because of the poet's discrete association of the lady with Christ throughout the sequence, sonnet 68 represents not a repudiation of idolatry, but a clearing of vision -- redemption through a creature who figures forth the maker's own beauty. On the subject of leaves, Prescott suggested that "the leaves Spenser submits to Elizabeth in his opening sonnet form not only a bouquet or book but a wreath." Since as the ends approach each other they must resemble each other, "there is a limit to what anyone in such a sequence can permanently learn." In *Amoretti*, as in the liturgical year, we must reckon with circular time; this may account for the sequence's closing sorrows and reversions.

87.72 Susan Burchmore (Baldwin-Wallace College), presided at *Spenser III: Maps and Diagrams -- The Body, the Soul, and the State*.

87.73 Wayne Erickson (Georgia State University) "challenged the widespread critical assumption that Faeryland is coextensive with the world of the poem" and sought to highlight "the interplay among [Spenser's] generic, political, and historiographical motives." He argued that Spenser situated "Faeryland within a larger fictional universe that supplies several distinct historical moments from which the quests originate and to which they return." Faeryland, equivalent to Elizabethan England, is surrounded by other lands (Mercilla's, Belge, Wales, etc.) and periods (sixteenth-century Lowlands, fifteenth-century Britain, mythic Eden lands, etc.). In Faeryland the epic heroes "may shift historical periods and approach the prophetic future"; they may engage in "a process of dynamic self-realization" and return to their historical destinies outside Faeryland. A "sophisticated historian and antiquary on the leading edge of revolutionary historical speculation," Spenser sustains a critical perspective in creating epic history.

87.74 Norman K. Farmer, Jr. (University of Texas, Austin) redefined the term temperance as the disposition of the four elements into one unified whole (Aquinas) and suggested that the thrust of Book II is made clear by reference to St. Paul's distinction between flesh (sarks), man's trust in his own knowledge and experience, and body (soma), the temple of the Holy Ghost. He argued that in portraying Guyon's encounter with Amavia-Mordant-Ruddymane and his swoon Spenser uses "flesh" and similar words that indicate subjection to death and decay whereas when Guyon enters Alma's Castle Spenser shifts to the word "body" to indicate that the castle represents the "perfect corporal body," one that "will be reunited with the soul." In his faint he undergoes a mysterious conversion from *sarks* into *soma*, like Christ who "is the instrument whereby the 'flesh' nature is tempered to become the 'body' nature. The history of England that Arthur and Guyon read figures "the wholeness of the nation's body ... the incarnate 'body' of Christ" of which all Englishmen are members.

87.75 In his response, Richard Helgerson (University of California, Santa Barbara) considered what the significant differences in Spenser's text that both speakers claimed to have discovered might mean, supposing they really are there. He suggested that Farmer's flesh-body distinction shows Spenser making political use of theology; "he was aligning himself, his poem, his class ... and his nation on the right side of a legitimating distinction," but Book II also shows that this distinction of virtuous from vicious cost heavily in blood. He asked whether the settings that Erickson distinguished reflect critically on one another and whether they indicate that "Spenser is himself a critical pluralist." The histories that Arthur and Guyon read, a test case, seem to raise questions that arise from the difference Erickson has identified, although the significance of such distinctions has still to be defined.

87.76 In "'Some other wayes aduize'; Spenser's Pre-Baroque Psychological Model," J.W. van Hook (University of Arkansas) argued for Spenser's awareness of a mode of cognition that had just been developed in Italy in the work of Girolamo Fracastoro and Jacopo Mazzoni and that inspired the Italian seventeenth century's Baroque poetics. Although in the House of Temperance in Book II Spenser upholds the Aristotelian model of cognition, which defined imagination as an inferior faculty that needed to be subjected to the rational mind, in Arthur's encounter with Maleger he favorably represents the pre-

Baroque model of "meraviglia" when the perplexed Arthur falls into a state of "wonder" (II.xi.40, 44) and reaches the "ingenious and oddly logical" decision that he must drown Malegar. His "wonder" fuses both imagination and reason; a single act of cognition, it is superior to either faculty on its own. Spenser's use of "wonder" suggests that this theory was available to Donne and shows Spenser's rhetorical audacity.

87.77 In her response, Suzanne Woods (Brown University) pointed out the importance of the topic of Renaissance notions of cognition for modern criticism. She suggested that if the Elizabethans had a theory of the unconscious, then we can legitimately find subversions and describe them. If they did not, then we should probably begin by looking at what the Spenserian context shows he thought he was doing. The clues to Elizabethan awareness of the unconscious may lie in the theories of imagination that van Hook discussed; the notion of the imagination may be a precursor to that of the unconscious.

87.78 Robert Stillman (University of Tennessee) presided at *Spenser IV: The Kathleen Williams Lectures on Spenser and His Age*.

Papers on The New Historicism by A.C. Hamilton and Louis Adrian Montrose initiated this lecture series in memory of Kathleen Williams. The series of invited papers by leading scholars and critics will be a fixed feature of Spenser at Kalamazoo in the coming years. The speakers in 1988 will be Harry Berger, Jr., and A. Leigh DeNeef.

87.79 A.C. Hamilton (Queens University) began his talk with a tribute to Kathleen Williams. "Those who did not know her appreciate the fine intelligence and sensibility she displayed in teaching us how to read Spenser; those who did, also loved her because she was a fine person, all the more because she remained passionately Welsh in an alien English environment, ardently socialist in ... southern California, and a strong woman at a time when her sex denied her academic advancement in the United Kingdom."

He then explained that he had chosen New Historicism as his subject because he was "in some despair over the lack of progress in English studies despite -- or perhaps because of -- the rapid changes that seemed to be bringing us back to where we started." He asked "what should be done -- what must be done -- for the sake of our discipline, to prevent the New Historicist from becoming the old Historicist writ large?" He praised New Historicism's attempt to reassert a relationship between literature and society in the face of New Critics' and Literary Theorists' denial of the relevance of context and praised its divergence from Old Historicism in its insight that literature is interactive with other discourses and is not an upholder of ideology but that it "often appropriates and subordinates that ideology for the often very subversive purposes of its own fiction." He pointed out that the *history* of the New Historicism may be illusory, however, because the definition of history used by New Historicists is so broadly cultural and "so belligerently contemporary that the New Historicism may never prove sufficiently historical to allow us to escape the paralysing, alienating, and dehumanizing tyranny of the present." Although it appears to be a means of gaining perspective, the New Historicism may offer us only "a mirror image of ourselves." He objected to its denial of Aristotle's claim that poetry is "more philosophical and more significant than history" and argued that the activities of the New Historicism "are only preliminary to literary criticism ... For only after the New Historicist has revealed the proper historical dimensions of a literary work

... only then may the critic begin to treat a literary work as literature in relation to the modern reader."

87.80 Louis Adrian Montrose (University of California, San Diego) began by defining literature as neither an aesthetic or moral order that transcends the pressure of material needs and interests nor an inert discursive reflection of objective reality that lies elsewhere, rather it is "socially produced and socially productive." His goal is to resituate canonical works of Elizabethan literature among the multiple forms of writing and performance, and among a range of social practices and institutions, operative in the Elizabethan world. His limitation is that he is historically situated and cannot produce an objective description of the Elizabethan cognitive experience. (His own talk is an example of the instantiation of the "critic's values, beliefs and experiences" and is inevitably impure.) Given this definition, goal, and limitation, the title of the meeting implies that "our subject is the discovery and invention, within the New Historicist critical text, of a relationship between 'Spenser and his Age' -- an activity that simultaneously, if not always intentionally, discovers and invents, reveals and constructs, a relationship between our present and an Elizabethan past." Although they share this common ground, New Historicists' construal of these relationships may differ substantially. "*The New Historicism* is no more a homogeneous and self-contained entity than is Spenser's 'Age.'"

Montrose offered as an example of different construals of relationships his objections to Greenblatt's conclusions in *Renaissance Self Fashioning* that *FQ* is "wholly wedded to the autocratic ruler of the English state" and that Spenser's art "questions its own status in order to protect power from such questioning." Montrose asserted that in *FQ* the encomium displaces the royal image "by another, more privatized female image," that the narrative "constitutes the Queen and the Poet as distinct and implicitly opposed centers of cultural authority," and that the text reverses "the relationship between sovereignty and subjection when the writer makes his sovereign his subject." Montrose objected to Greenblatt's opposition of "Art" and "Ideology." Tacitly applying the principles he enunciated at the beginning of his talk, Montrose argued that ideology is heterogeneous and that "conceptual spaces" exist "within the ideological field from which the dominant can be contested" and that "ideology only exists as it is instantiated in particular cultural forms and practices, including those categorized as 'art.'" In its representation of the sovereign and addresses to her, the Spenserian text "calls into question the status of the authority it represents."

In opening the discussion Robert Stillman noted that the size of the crowd would have made Kathleen Williams feel quite honored. He also noted how much the speakers had in common and how few foundational disagreements there were. Both took Greenblatt to task, both seemed concerned to confront New Criticism with the New Historicism, and both defended Spenser from the assertion that there is a monolithic ideology that humbles texts. He suggested that one difference between the approaches lay in each speaker's identification of the source of the power that Spenser's text appropriates; Hamilton would say that Spenser the man takes a stand, whereas Montrose would see a struggle within the individual depending on which aspect of the self, which kind of group identity, was engaged, and he was troubled by "the privileging of the authorial intention."

The discussion following the talks was so lively and so lengthy that Kent Heiatt did not deliver his closing comments, much to the disappointment of the audience.

Pamela J. Benson
Rhode Island College

87.81 At a session of the Medieval Congress separate from the meetings arranged by Spenser at Kalamazoo, Sheila T. Cavanagh (Brown University) delivered a paper titled "Gazing Still': Emblematic Women in *The Faerie Queene*."

She argued that in *FQ* I, Duessa successfully deludes Red Cross into believing in her virtue, until she is stripped of her finery (I.viii.46-48). Once her body, so "fowle deformed" is revealed, however, the assembled company feels confident that her power is terminated and they set her loose. The incident reflects a common assumption that female danger can be mitigated if the layers of clothing or deception which protect women can be stripped away. This attitude toward women evinces itself also in situations involving the most virtuous female characters. Only "fully" exposed women of either moral persuasion can be trusted, although even with them, their "neather parts" remain loci of extreme anxiety.

Portrayals of heavily iconographic, emblematic women represent one of Spenser's most common methods of dealing with this pervasive dilemma. In the emblems, women are presented, almost exclusively, as naked goddesses, rather than "real" or clothed. Objectified as bodies, their portrayals draw the viewer's eye to highly marked sexual characteristics, rather than to symbols evoking the deities' authority. An emphasis on the maternal nature of the breasts and the suggested juvenile lack of pubic hair, however, also distance the audience from any confrontation with adult, female sexuality. Spenser retains this dual separation of women from sexuality and authority when emblematic women, such as Mercilla and Alma, keep their clothes on, but offer their minds and bodies to passing knights for intimate investigation. Revealing all their knowledge reduces female power over the men, while the absence of genitalia in Alma's Castle, for instance, reaffirms a denial of acceptable female sexuality. The prevalence of emblematic women in *FQ* demonstrates an intense need to keep female figures restrained and solidly fictive. The parallel representations of "good" and "evil" women further suggests that gender is a more significant characterizing feature than moral or immoral behavior.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

87.82 SPENSER AT MLA, 1987. The following programs have been arranged for the annual MLA convention, to be held in San Francisco, December 27-30, 1987.

The Spenser Society will sponsor two programs, as well as a luncheon. One, titled *Spenser and Pastoral*, will include three papers: "The Shepherdes Calender: Spenser's Dialogic Experiment" (Roland Greene, Harvard University); "Home-Making in Ireland: Virgil's Eclogue I and Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*" (Julia M. Lupton, Yale University); "Spenser's Pastoral of Desire: the Scene of the Poet's Failure" (Robert E.

Stillman, University of Tennessee, Knoxville). Richard Mallette (Millsaps College) will respond to the papers; Patrick Cullen (Graduate Center, CUNY) will preside.

The second program, titled *Edmund Spenser: Elegy, Allegory, and Abduction*, has been arranged by Richard C. Helgerson (University of California, Santa Barbara) who will preside. It will include three papers: "Chains of Abduction: Kidnapping and Courtship in *The Faerie Queene*," (Sheila T. Cavanagh, Brown University); "Eulogies to Elegies: Spenser's Resistance to Praise and the Power of Song" (Richard M. McCoy, Queen's College, CUNY); "Spenser's Giants: the Politics of Allegory" (Susanne Wofford, Yale University). Louis Adrian Montrose (University of California, San Diego) will respond to the papers.

Annabel Patterson will be the speaker at the annual Spenser Society luncheon.

There will also be a Special Session intended to re-open an "old" subject in Spenser studies by including both medievalists and Renaissance scholars. The session, titled *Chaucer to Spenser: Assimilation and Transformation*, will include four papers: "Dogmatism and Mutability in The Legend of Holiness" (Darryl J. Gless, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill); "The Iconography of Spenser's Virgin Queene" (John N. King, Bates College); "Guillaume de Lorris's Dorigin and Britomart: The Allegory of Love Revisited" (Elizabeth D. Kirk, Brown University); and "Skepticism and the Limitations of Language as Topoi in English Literature of the Later Middle Ages" (Russell A. Peck, University of Rochester). Lynn Staley Johnson (Colgate University) will preside.

87.83 Call for Papers. Spenser at Kalamazoo will sponsor three open sessions during the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, May 5-8, 1988. Abstracts may be submitted on any topic dealing with Spenser. As in the past, the Spenser at Kalamazoo committee welcomes submissions by newcomers and by established scholars of all ranks. Reading time for papers should be no more than twenty minutes.

Please submit abstracts in five copies and include home and office phone numbers and complete address. Maximum length: 750 words. Direct all correspondence to: Margaret Hannay, Department of English, Siena College, Loudonville, NY 12211; (518) 783-2362.

A fourth session will be devoted to the second annual Kathleen Williams Lectures. The lecture, by Harry Berger, Jr. (University of California, Santa Cruz) is titled "'Back by the Hindergate': An Aging Boy Returns to the Garden." There will be a response, by A. Leigh DeNeef (Duke University).

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
GREENLAW HALL 066A
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL NC 27514

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 177
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

David L. Miller
Dept. of English, Drawer AL
Univ. of Alabama
Tuscaloosa AL 35487 18.3