

S P E N S E R • N E W S L E T T E R

SPRING-SUMMER 1994 • VOLUME 25 • NUMBER 2

MAIN  
DISPLAY

*Spenser Newsletter*

PR  
2368  
.Z9  
S74

EDITOR: JEROME S. DEES

SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

CORRESPONDING EDITORS:  
ELLEN M. CALDWELL, DONALD CHENEY, SHOHACHI FUKUDA,  
A.KENT HIEATT, RITCHIE D. KENDALL, RICHARD D.SCHELL.  
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: TODD K. RAMSEY

•  
CONTENTS

TO OUR READERS	1
BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES	
Benson, Pamela Joseph. <i>The Invention of the Renaissance Woman</i>	2
Lane, Robert. <i>Shepherds Devises: Edmund Spenser's Shepherdes Calender and the Institutions of Elizabethan Society</i>	5
<i>Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660</i>	7
Rooks, John. <i>Love's Courtly Ethic in The Faerie Queene</i>	9
Tylus, Jane. <i>Writing and Vulnerability in the Late Renaissance</i>	12
ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES	14
SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO, 1994	21
ANNOUNCEMENTS	26
SPENSER AT MLA, PROGRAM 1994	28

The *Spenser Newsletter* is published three times a year, Winter, Spring-Summer, and Fall, by the Department of English at Kansas State University. Please address all communications to *Spenser Newsletter*, Department of English, 122 Denison Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506-0701.

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 inquiry. He also solicits abstracts and/or offprints of articles (with full publication data, please), the receipt of which may reduce the time between publication of the article and the report on it.

Subscription rates, institutional and private: \$6.50/yr in USA, \$6.50/yr (US funds or equivalent) in Canada, \$11.00/yr US in Latin America and overseas. These rates are for Vol. 24, 1993, and for Vol 25, 1994.

TO OUR READERS

AUG 09 1994

94.34 As some of you may be aware, 1994 marks the 25th anniversary of *Spenser Newsletter*. Whether it was conceived at the International Spenser Colloquium held in Fredericton, New Brunswick on 22-24 October 1969, or had for a period prior to that been aborning in Kent Hieatt's fertile brain, is unclear to me (I like to think the former, given my tendency to ascribe the origin of almost everything of significance in modern Spenser studies to that Acidalian event). Perhaps Kent will clarify. For, at my request, he and the intervening editors of *SpN*--Don Cheney, Foster Provost, Hugh Maclean, and Darryl Gless--have agreed to supply, for a special "25th Anniversary Issue," brief accounts of their periods of editorship. These will be published in volume 25, issue 3, to appear--promise--in early November of *this* year.

We don't really know yet what to call these "accounts." From the beginning, I wanted to avoid imposing on my predecessors the burden of thinking that I had under the cover of politesse coerced them to write a formal history of the newsletter or of Spenser studies for the roughly five-year period of their respective tenancies. But at the same time I did want their "pieces" (the word that we seem most often to have resorted to in corresponding) to convey a sense of what has happened both to *SpN* and more generally in Spenser Studies in the quarter-century that has lapsed since the newsletter was modestly inaugurated with this initial, no-frills sentence: "The first issue of *SpN* concentrates on two recent conferences and on articles published in 1969." Above all, I wanted these "pieces" to carry the stamp of the personalities of their writers; hence I've left up to them what they will say and how they will say it.

The second paragraph of that first issue, after noting that those currently writing on Spenser "vary more than they used to in interests, assumptions, canons of verifiability, and critical vocabulary," and that the "few cross-paths between the many wilderness-trails which are now being blazed," make the "cartography sometimes mutually incomprehensible," then went on to hope that *SpN* "may help all of us to understand somewhat better the directions our fellows are taking." *Plus ça change . . . ?*

On a different note, astute readers may notice some apparent oddities in this issue--namely (a) some abstracts of what are not really "articles" at all, but rather portions of books and (b) some abstracts of genuine articles that one would have expected to see in these pages as much as two years ago. As for (a) I've long felt that one important goal for *SpN* is to let readers know about books that have something *substantive* to say about Spenser, even if briefly and in passing, books which otherwise could not be formally reviewed or noted, either for lack of space or for scarcity of competent reviewers. In this issue I'm carrying through on that belief, thanks largely to Anne Lake Prescott's recent omnibus review in *SEL*, which called my attention to the items abstracted. As for (b), the fact is that a number of articles managed mysteriously to fall between the cracks during the period of transition from Darryl Gless's editorship to mine, and, while I can't promise to seal the cracks, I have thought it important to recoup several lost items, some significant enough to make me wonder at the degree of myopia that would have caused either *SpN* or the MLA bibliographers to overlook them when fresh.

## BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

- 94.35 Benson, Pamela Joseph. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: The Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992. x + 325 pp. \$45.00 cloth; \$14.95 paper.

Pamela Benson's study of some early modern Italian and English defenses of women is informed, intelligent, and helpful. Much material will be new to most readers, and it is hard to imagine a Spenserian coming away from the book unenlightened.

Benson shows that the men whose texts she describes are willing to defend women yet reluctant to advocate or even notice the egalitarian conclusions to which their arguments point. "Renaissance authors," she says, faced the problem of "how to contain the political implications of evidence that women are capable of acting with prudence, fortitude, justice, and temperance" (2). Those defending women "short-circuit" their own logic so as to protect "their society and their own literary voices against new womankind" (2). We are given little evidence, to be sure, that there really was a "new womankind" in the Renaissance. In a sense there had to be, if in truth there was a new age--"Renaissance" or "early modern," take your pick--yet one may wonder if these "new" women were significantly harder to "contain" than their grandmothers. Some think that women lost status during what for men was a "Renaissance"; nor was the medieval Marie de France, say, any less accomplished in her own cultural terms than Vittoria Colonna was in hers. Still, Benson's study makes an important case that Renaissance advocates for women worked hard to avoid confessing that, if the sexes are equal, justice might require social change.

A crisp introduction argues that beneath their "stylistic and logical pyrotechnics" (3) many profeminist writers were serious in defending women, albeit happier to disrupt "the absolute notion of woman's inferiority" than to conclude definitively for equality. They had at hand two logically incompatible means of defense: first, that women are the same as men, their seeming difference a mere matter of custom, and, second, that women's innate differences in fact constitute virtues. Either argument, as Benson may not stress clearly enough, could (and can) promote equality; both, she shows, may be advanced in such a way as to deflect any unwanted consequence.

After a look at Boccaccio's "conservative although not antifeminist" *De Mulieribus Claris* (21), Benson describes defenses by Cornazzano and Vespasiano and by the more radical Sabadino, who, like his fellow northern Italians, Goggio and Strozzi, "represent[s] women as capable of moral and intellectual autonomy" (34). The next chapter demonstrates how G.F. Capella satirizes masculine bias without quite making room for independent women and how Castiglione constructs a new role for court ladies even as, with a variety of rhetorical spins, he silkily constricts the sex he professes to admire. The section on Italy concludes with a close reading of *Orlando Furioso's* entry into the debate about women,

Benson's very disagreements with other critics offering perhaps inadvertent evidence for the poem's ambiguity. The final effect, she argues, is a demonstration, through example and logic, that women are men's moral equals, even if Bradamante, intent on dwindling into a wife, "chooses not to be independent" (155).

The second half of the book begins with the humanists More, Vives, and Hyrde. On More, whose liberated thought she plausibly distinguishes from that of Vives, Benson is astute; she probably misreads him, though, when she takes his hope that Margaret Roper would "devote the rest of [her] life to medical science" as an expectation that she might "practice a profession" (170); the lady of a large household, after all, might be expected to know something about the healing arts. After a fine chapter on Elyot's *Defence of Good Women*, Benson turns to some old-fashioned "popular" texts celebrating "a docile, chaste, conventional ideal" (206). Next is a chapter on the fuss over female rule (noticing John Bale's often neglected 1548 edition of the future Elizabeth I's *Godly medytacyon* would have been useful, for its praise of women rulers reads like a maneuver in support of Catherine Parr). Last come two chapters on Spenser.

*FQ*, says Benson, is "the longest-lasting and most persuasive of all the defenses and encomia of Elizabeth's rule," Books III through V presenting the age's "most extensive and eloquent defense and encomium of the feminine and of a female monarch" (251). Unlike Ariosto and the Italian humanists who stressed the "equality (sameness) of the sexes" behind the appearance of gender (257), Spenser adopts the alternative defense that allows for sexual difference but claims as female/feminine virtues what some call vices. The feminine is "an essential principle" in the poem's scheme, "an alternate order." Spenser defends it "against male attempts to dominate and marginalize it" while championing the Queen "against those who would isolate her from her femininity by focusing only on her 'stomach of a king' and against those who would devalue her femininity by focusing on her 'body of a weak woman'" (253). He does so by imagining a "feminine cosmology," by addressing or celebrating Elizabeth, and by creating in Britomart a "new model for active female virtue" whose very chastity enables her mobility (this last is less innovative than one might think: compare the *Parement et Triumphe des dames* by the once famous Burgundian, Olivier de la Marche). The result is "a radical new notion of the feminine as a force waiting to be tapped should God elect to bless the nation by raising a queen to power, but essential to peace, justice, and order in any case" (253). I am less persuaded that this view of the feminine is very radical or new (something like it is there in alchemical thought, for example, and it is the basis for Thomas Elyot's commendation of dancing in *The Governor*). Nevertheless, Benson shows persuasively that the "feminine" was more to Spenser than a problematic concatenation of good or bad qualities belonging to females. In exploring his understanding of the "feminine," she examines the Garden of Adonis, the Temple of Venus, Britomart's story, Radigund, Mercilla, and *FQ*'s treatment of female rule.

Her comments on these topics are perceptive but at times confusing, even granted her excellent point that the texts she examines are undecided. One can agree that Britomart is a "refutation" of Ariosto's humanist assumption of sexual similarity and that she is "not an

advocate of women's rights" (258). But we are not told why difference cannot accompany "women's rights" (the very phrase suggesting, though, a view of subjectivity and society perhaps unavailable to the 1590s). The first few pages on Spenser's profeminist radicalism imply that he found the feminine socially valuable, but soon we hear that he "evokes the mystery of feminine otherness and the threat it poses to male stability" (260). Benson's Britomart, furthermore, can sound less like a refutation than a sister of Bradamante, her "skill at arms" a "literal representation of women's natural abilities." The problem may be that since it is unclear what is male and what female, either in Spenser's mind or in what some still call reality, Benson's two categories (women as same, women as different) keep tripping into each other so that her larger picture, compelling as it is, loses focus. If Ariosto challenges "the traditional categorization of people by gender" (129), then why is Bradamante "equal to and yet different from men" (131)?

I have other hesitations. The absence of women's voices is a pity. Even if Benson exaggerates the novelty of "female independence," indeed even if the very concepts "independence" and "autonomy" are anachronistic (to what degree was anyone "independent" in early modern Europe?), it is true that some women wrote fervently about female virtue and ability. Especially since she thinks male authors so nervous, quoting a few women might help explain their disquietude. Had she not bypassed France, for example, she might have cited Louise Labé, who urges women to seek glory through letters, or Helisenne de Crenne, whose invectives would make any male chauvinist, or even any half-doubting defender, shiver in his pignone as the pen dropped from his trotter.

Benson can seem oddly disappointed by the men she studies. No Italian profeminist "promotes social reform" (35), Sabadino does not "attempt pure historical research aimed at telling the facts" (41), and the probably pseudonymous Jane Anger fails to teach "self-esteem" (224). Sure. Yet writers attached to courts or given to paradox have seldom wanted to turn the world upside down; in terms of gender, Cromwell, Washington, and Robespierre did no better than Renaissance profeminists. And do many historians now claim--whatever their hope to be fair and accurate--that "pure research" for "facts" is possible? Finally, Benson may underestimate Spenser's ambivalence toward Elizabeth. Radigund is not FQ's only female with an uneasy relation to the queen, and some find traces of satirical political commentary resonating near the narcissistic Lucifera, the selfishly seductive Mirabella, or (if we may believe Judith Anderson) the man-snatching giantess, Argante. To be fair, though, Benson has company in reading Spenser as almost entirely encomiastic, and her views on this and other issues deserve respect. Her attractive book is filled with good things that Spenserians will want to know and think about.

Anne Lake Prescott  
Barnard C, Columbia U

- 94.36 Lane, Robert. *Shepherds Devises: Edmund Spenser's Shepheardes Calender and the Institutions of Elizabethan Society*. Athens and London: U of Georgia P, 1993. 240 pp. \$40.00.

This exciting study moves our understanding of *The Shepheardes Calender* as a statement about society very far ahead. In it Robert Lane takes on the task, now obviously necessary, of firmly grounding New Historicism (so often conceptually elusive and ideologically contrived) in real documentation--masses of it--drawn mainly from non-literary records. From the point of view of the historian of the period, Lane is of the current revisionist school as represented by Christopher Haigh; the Merrie England of Good Queen Bess that dominated histories of the reign from Camden to Neale and beyond now lies sadly rent and torn--how rent and torn is the context Lane evokes here for Spenser's poem.

Lane's *Calender* is radically distinct from Montrose's "pastoral of power" in which pastoral's tradition of social commentary has been sterilized. Rather, he sees Spenser as attempting public comment in a vicious and paranoid sociopolitical climate where hierarchy is absolute, uniformity is enforced, and submission, obedience, and especially silence are required of the commonalty. Rather daringly, Spenser addresses his poem to a broad social readership and, especially in the moral eclogues, utilizes representational forms especially familiar to the common people as well as well as invoking their rough dialect. (Lane somewhat glosses over the fact that there are several kinds of language in the poem including the brilliant *pas de deux* in Aprill between rustic and courtly rhetoric.) Real shepherds were in fact laborers (their seasonal labors appear in some of the woodcuts), and in some parts of the poem Spenser allows them to voice social comment and complaint. He does this in a climate where the regime was fixated on controlling public speech and where the laws of treason and sedition had been extended to include it. One recalls the grisly punishment of John Stubbs, whose *Gaping Gulf* inveighing against the French marriage was the last book Hugh Singleton printed before the *Calender*. In this dangerous milieu Spenser's problem is how to articulate criticism, some of it heard from the voices of the lowly, while protecting his potential role as would-be national poet. One device for effecting this is to embed critical comment in passages that invite multifaceted reading. Another (and Lane is especially acute on this) is the perverse and often misleading hermeneutic signals offered by E. K. who is frequently "a double or triple agent in the text" (69). But to venture criticism requires some sanction. Lane sees Spenser claiming this partly through Christian pastoral's appeal to Christ the Good Shepherd and, more locally, through association with the native vernacular tradition of complaint and reform associated with late-medieval Piers-figures.

Given the dangerously repressive let-this-be-an-example Elizabethan regime that Robert Lane pictures convincingly, the temerity of a youngish unknown poet's attempting to register a critical voice, however mediated, is astonishing (although the poem is only in parts critical; Lane rather discounts this). One looks forward to the evolution of *The Faerie Queene* and recalls that Malfont and Bonfont are the same poet.

The crux of this book is the long Chapter 5 on the four moral eclogues. Here Lane's sociopolitical readings of all four establish new interpretations that will almost certainly remain definitive. He illuminates these texts powerfully, particularly with reference to their fables. In the February fable of the hallowed old oak and the upstart briar, he sees Spenser indirectly criticizing the voracious royal expropriation of remaining church property and its distribution to lay clients as a way of buying loyalty. The self-indulgent May festival may echo the public-relations exercise implicit in the queen's summer progresses but, more important, the mother goat's conscious neglect of "motherly care" to engage in such frivolities implies criticism of the queen for whom the benevolent parent was a favorite self-image. In the July eclogue the tit-for-tat dialogue between high and low, the elite and the common, enacts the discourse between the privileged and the powerless that a proper social policy should enable. With the story of Algrind's fate Spenser almost directly confronts the queen, though somewhat shielded by E. K.'s professed ignorance of Algrind's identity. In the September eclogue Lane plays down somewhat the usual episcopal reading to highlight the social phenomenon of vagrancy, often the result of sanctioned enclosures by the great of former church land, and punishable by fierce laws. The explanation of the story of how Roffy defended his flock from a disguised wolf is the most convincing yet advanced, a reference to John Young's successfully foiling an attempt to seize diocesan lands on the grounds that they had been wrongfully concealed from the crown when the monasteries were dissolved (143).

But the moral eclogues are not the whole *Calender*, and social criticism, however important, is not Spenser's only function in the poem. Of the other eclogues, Lane treats April and Oct briefly, both as touching on the risky French marriage though done very indirectly. In the June debate he reads Hobbinol as recommending delight as the only proper role for the would-be court poet (a theme to be endorsed by Puttenham), while Colin insists that his role must be to praise or blame indifferently. Colin's difficulty is that, if objective criticism is to have an effect, it requires a favorable reception at court. In Oct Spenser projects a solution, one which Lane curiously ignores, preferring instead to concentrate on Cuddie as "the perfecte paterne of a Poete" while he is in fact not only the pattern of an unpatronized poet but, more important, a poet who has given up hope of any socially relevant role. Lane never mentions Colin in his discussion of Oct, yet Colin clearly transcends the impasse between Virgilian *rota* and going nowhere by acquiescing in a subject of praise as his passport to court and perhaps to influence.

There are 530 notes in this book, the majority of them substantive. The University of Georgia Press does not deserve praise for putting them at the end.

Thomas H. Cain  
MacMaster U

- 94.37 *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 235 pp. \$54.95 cloth.

*Representing Ireland* is an invaluable collection of essays for all Spenserians and essential reading for those whose interests center on Spenser's involvement in Ireland. The essays, written by literary critics and historians, are--as far as I'm aware and with the exception of Lisa Jardine's contribution--all previously unpublished. While only three of the ten essays focus directly on Spenser, most of the others either make reference to Spenser or help to enlarge and complicate current critical discussion about the English colonial project in Ireland and the Irish response to it. In a wide-ranging introduction (which comes after a chronology of political and cultural events in Ireland from 1534 to 1660), Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley summarize the ensuing essays, map the critical territory now occupied by scholars of early modern Ireland, and theorize what it means to represent Ireland from a postmodern perspective. Many of the issues they touch on are of great interest to Spenserians: How was Ireland named and figured in English discourse? Did service in Ireland represent a curse or an opportunity? How did the vice-regal government function and what opportunities for advancement and patronage did it afford? Above all, Hadfield and Maley insist that we attend to the multiple, alternative, and often contradictory ways in which Ireland was discursively shaped. In all the essays, they note, "there is a sense that Ireland was not a fixed, stable entity. It was a complex, differentiated, heterogeneous and variegated *text*" (3). In Spenser's Ireland we find no static, binary opposition between English and Irish but rather an array of indeterminate, hybrid, and porous cultural identities. As Hadfield and Maley point out, the descendants of the twelfth-century invaders of Ireland, the so-called Old English, had in many cases "degenerated" by adopting Gaelic customs and sympathies, while those Old English families who remained loyal to the crown invariably held resolutely to their Catholic faith. The New English group to which Spenser belonged is also a problematic category. Where did the loyalties of its members lie: with the mother country or with their own emerging community? And for how long--given the inevitable intermingling of groups--could they preserve some mythical pristine Englishness? It is just these crucial questions about cultural self-fashioning and unravelling in Ireland that Maley and Hadfield's introduction helps to frame.

The opening essay by John Gillingham reminds us that Spenser's *Vewe* draws upon a long-standing body of English stereotypes about the Irish. According to Gillingham, the English "attitude of superiority, hostility, and alienation" toward the Irish began not in the sixteenth but the in twelfth century when the notion of the Irish as barbarous Other was largely invented by Gerald of Wales and others writing in the context of Henry II's invasion of Ireland. Andrew Hadfield's essay discusses John Bale's *Irish Vocacyon*--the narrative of Bale's brief but stormy career as Bishop of Ossory in 1553. Hadfield shows how for Bale, as for so many English writers, Ireland tends to unsettle notions of ethnic and cultural identity. In Bale's analysis, ethnic and linguistic categories are not pre-given and stable but slippery and ambiguous. Are the English in Ireland all those who speak English or only those of English birth? Do the "tame" Irish have more in common with the English they

serve or with the "wild" Irish to whom they might be assimilated at any moment? Ostensibly committed to a clear demarcation between Protestant Englishness and Catholic Irishness, Bale's text instead uncovers only blurred, uncertain, and hybrid forms of identity. Hiram Morgan's essay on Captain Thomas Lee is a fascinating portrait of a man who illustrates Hadfield's sense of the complexities and instabilities underlying the definition of self and other in Ireland. A member of the "cadre" of army officers serving on the Irish frontier, Lee--like many of his cohort--married into Old English Catholic families, entered the fray of factional rivalries in Ireland, and became "enmeshed in clan politics," serving at one stage as an intermediary and apologist for Hugh O'Neill (132-3). Lee's hybrid identity is memorably captured in Gheeraedts's portrait which figures Lee as a combination of naked kern and sexualized English courtier. Morgan summarizes in detail Lee's three unpublished "position papers," which in their analysis of the causes of and solutions to the Irish conflict resonate interestingly with Spenser's *Vewe*.

In a pair of related essays, David J. Baker and Julia Reinhard Lupton examine the procedures and effects of what Baker calls "colonial cartography" in Ireland--a phrase which means not just visual representations of the island but any discursive practice that seeks to impose the colonist's ideology of space upon the colonial territory (90). Focusing on the epistolary travelogue of Sir Henry Sidney, Baker shows how the colonial impulse to impose order on territory by establishing clear and fixed boundaries and other spatial markers of authority is constantly defeated by an awareness of the presence of a disruptive Other. Sidney's text reproduces in its own meandering rhetorical structure the colonist's self-defeating attempt at inscribing their fantasy of "spatial order" upon the unstable entity of "Ireland." Baker shows how the limits of the cartographic project in Ireland are also seen in the *Vewe*'s discussion of the Liberty of Tipperary, an anomalous zone that resisted English law and was ruled by its own "rival monarch" to Elizabeth--the Earl of Ormond (88). In an essay whose argument is at times obscured by its theoretical density, Julia Lupton looks at the way the *Vewe* maps Ireland as a wasteland in order to justify English policy there. Connecting the *Vewe* via Ovid's *Ex Ponto*--the complaint of an exile in a barbarous land--to the *Mutabilitie Cantos*, Lupton reads the latter text in terms of Munster politics, especially the "trials of titles" to land between New English settlers and Old English lords, and an underlying imperative to reconceive of "the desert of exile . . . as the most fertile ground for both the rising poet and the new gentleman" (106).

Two other essays focus on Spenser. Lisa Jardine examines "the [early] formation of Spenser's colonial outlook" in relation to the preparations for the private colonizing venture to the Ards of Sir Thomas Smith and his son in the 1570s (65). Jardine claims that Spenser would have learned of this venture and the debates preceding it from Gabriel Harvey, whose marginal annotations in his copy of Livy's *Decades* suggest that he was present at meetings at which the Smiths and their associates argued the relative merits of the alternative colonial strategies set forth in Livy's text. The same conflicting views that structure the Smiths' project also inform the *Vewe*; in particular, Jardine finds an unresolved tension between the ideal of a model colony and the practical realities of resistance and repression in Ireland. In a tantalizingly brief conclusion, Jardine extends her reading to *FQ*, but her identification

of various figures in the poem with different ethnic and cultural groupings in Ireland (e.g., Satyrane=the Old English) requires further elaboration and refinement. Willy Maley's essay, "How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's *View*," looks at the circumstances surrounding the publication of Spenser's dialogue in 1633 and the impact it had upon English attitudes toward Ireland. Not surprisingly, perhaps, Maley finds that Spenser and Milton (despite their divergent politics) shared a similar contempt for the Irish and that Spenser's ideas in the *Vewe* shape the ideas that motivated Milton's "Observations upon the articles of Peace," especially in respect to military policy and the fate of war veterans. While concentrating mainly on the *Vewe*'s "reviews," Maley also writes in passing of its "previews, those discourses and experiences which influenced, informed and inspired it" (205). Like others, including Louis Montrose, David Norbrook, and Richard Rambuss, Maley constructs a Spenser who, as an "estranged radical" in Ireland, is "more than a mere mouthpiece for the presumed policies of the presiding regime" (201). Like many of the other contributors to this volume, Maley points the way for an urgent critical reapropriation of Spenser--one that fully grounds the writer and his works in the complex and mutable text of Ireland.

Christopher Highley  
The Ohio State U

94.38 Rooks, John. *Love's Courtly Ethic in "The Faerie Queene": From Garden to Wilderness*. University of Kansas Humanistic Studies, 58. David M. Bergeron, general ed. New York: Peter Lang, 1992. xiii, 200 pp. \$46.95.

Rooks argues that *FQ* sees courtly love as a social means to spiritual ends. The ideal courtly lover is not primarily sensual; his lady's virtue inspires him to improve himself rationally and spiritually. The courtly lover goes through stages of growth, beginning allegorically in the garden of courtly love and culminating in the wilderness with an understanding that what seems like civility to worldly eyes is actually madness.

Chapter 1, "The Bowre of Blisse," quotes extensively from a medieval tradition of artistically elaborate but morally innocent gardens in order to argue that whereas the Bower's inhabitants are excessive, its art is not. Although artificial golden grapes hang around the porch of Excesse, the "thrusting, importunate nature belongs to the real, rather than the gold grapes. . . . The purpose of the gold grapes is to guide us towards an aesthetic, rather than a sensual, appreciation of the quite ordinary real ones" (25). Whereas real ivy does tend to excess, in the gold ivy "the vital urge has been captured, controlled, transposed to another level of experience. . . . Its wantonness is stilled within an art form" (37-38). By the same token, the art of courtly love controls potential excesses of human sensuality by containing and stilling it, when a woman's virtue contains her lover's hot desires.

Chapter 2, "Florimel, Amoret, and the Failure," asks why, if the Bower itself is good, Guyon does not simply replace its corrupt inhabitants with virtuous ones. "Surely there must be enough chaste women to take over the Bowre and make this garden of love a place for

decent lovers. Counter to our commonsense expectations, this is far from being the case. It appears that most of the women in Faerie are very ready to enjoy casual sexual encounters" (51). Rooks reads the Squire of Dames' first quest as demonstrating the Squire's good intentions and the women's concupiscence. The Squire's "courtly offers of loving service are misunderstood by the ladies whom he approaches. . . . In a year, the squire has been seduced by three hundred women" who "reject courtly love in favor of a more ready gratification of desire" (52-53). Similarly, when Florimel initiates her search for Marinell, she "rejects all the courtly machinery with which she is surrounded" (54). If she had remained at court, she would have been "both easily locatable, should her lover have wished to find her, and in a position fruitfully to express her love in succoring him" (56). But Florimel's abandonment of court "propels her into situations . . . in which a succession of male characters find themselves at liberty to molest her" (61). Florimel wants a chaste love but chooses the wrong route to it.

In this Florimel resembles Amoret, whose deficient upbringing leaves her ignorant of how to conduct a non-adulterous and ennobling relationship between a married woman and an admirer. When she takes Busirane as a lover on her wedding day, she doesn't realize that according to courtly precedent, she should be the master. Busirane's dedication to Cupid indicates that he does not understand the higher love of *cortoisie*, but we should not be too hard on him, because Amoret is at fault for failing to inspire nobility: "if the lady is not of impressive moral stature and if she is not concerned rigorously to test her suitor's probity, the normal courtly progression of love will not take place" (78). Busirane does the best he can, wooing Amoret, but she is unable to give his or her desires "a fruitful, non-sexual expression. The machinery is to hand, but Amoret is unable to operate it. What can Busirane do?" (85). As proof of Amoret's inability to understand men, Rooks quotes the passage in which she is afraid even of Arthur, who is rescuing her. Rooks concludes that "Busirane's only safe course is to keep well away from her" (86).

Yet Rooks does not claim that courtly love would have solved everything; although it can fence in chaotic passions, it cannot eradicate them. Chapter 3, "The Forest Resort," argues that lovers in *FQ* end up in the wilds because they are "motivated by a powerful, forbidden passion reflected in the wild and lawless condition in which they can enjoy it" (108). By preferring passion to reason, the lovers prove themselves akin to wild men. Even Britomart becomes blinded; if she had been "content to retain her virginity safe in her father's house," she and Artegall would never have ended up in conflict (112). Rooks never ironizes or probes declarations of this sort, never sets them, for example, in a discussion of the poem's sometimes contradictory assumptions about the value of psychological conflict and the duties of women. In the category of lovers who seek out wildness, Rooks includes Aemylia, Serena, Priscilla, and their lovers. He then develops the linked character type of the "wild man knight," the man of noble blood who either is raised in the forest or goes there for a while because of disillusionment with supposedly civilized life. His ability to tame wild creatures represents his ability to tame his own passions and to rise above "worldly concerns" (119-21). The wild man knight learns that the entire world, including court, is a wilderness of "spiritual darkness" and that only reason can elevate us (138). The chapter

examines Artegal, Satyrane, Adonis, Tristram, Belpheobe, Calepine, and Timias, all of whom need the forest's education. Calepine, for example, wastes his energies lamenting that he has lost track of Serena, though he knows that she is safe in the hands of the Saluage Man. (Rooks is half right; the last time Calepine saw Serena, she was dying from a wound that the Saluage Man did not know how to heal.) Rooks interprets Calepine's lament as a sign of his soul-wasting physical attachment to Serena. When both Timias and Calepine finally gain insight into the spiritual wildness of the world, they act like the men whom the world considers wild--a mark of their true sanity.

Chapter 4 calls *FQ* 6.9-11 an anti-pastoral, defining pastoral as a threadbare and contemptible convention in which "lymphatic lovers" have "vapid affairs" (160). Pastoral romances "ask us to take appearance for reality. . . . We are to understand that characters undergo a process of purgative degeneration and consequent regeneration without any of the sordidness and suffering involved in coming to terms with one's folly and the world's vanity" (165). Yet Rooks's definition of pastoral romance hardly fits the *Arcadia* or the Virgilian eclogues upon which *FQ* 6 draws heavily. (In *Eclogue* 1, Virgil defines pastoral for the first time in terms of its ability to help Meliboeus face exile and economic hardship after having been dispossessed of his farm.) Because Rooks does not see that using a shepherd to help a traveler face the non-idyllic truth about his or her life is a traditional pastoral move, Rooks can assume that when Spenser's Meliboe discourages Calidore from seeking permanent happiness among the shepherds, the advice represents Spenser's rejection of pastoral. In pastoral romances, Rooks says, "content and discontent . . . [are] the result of one's environment. . . . Happiness and goodness are not really spiritual accomplishments. No one is required to suffer, to lose, or even to cease to gratify, their taste for fleshly delights; they receive a dose of the country and all is well" (171). Having restricted himself to this parodic definition of pastoral romance, Rooks concludes that when Calidore woos Pastorella with courtly methods, Spenser is "draw[ing] a version of the pastoral romance as it is, rather than as it pretends to be" (175). If Rooks understood that a genre or mode consists of more than its explicit declarations, he could generate a subtler argument about Spenser's use of the pastoral tradition. As it is, he directs his energies towards convincing us that Calidore differs from the pastoral heroes in finding that "love is not a holiday but the very substance of life" (178). Even after learning this truth, Calidore remains reprehensibly sensual until he learns from Colin that the most virtuous lover will remain alone. Rooks writes approvingly, "There is no suggestion that [Colin] is likely to see his lady; indeed, the suggestion seems to be that his only prospect of seeing her is in the imagination. Yet we do not find him languishing; we do not find the wasting desire to see, to be present with the beloved" (192). Colin's example enables Calidore to leave Pastorella and subdue the Blatant Beast. The reason *FQ* 6 ends with Acidale under attack from the wilderness is that remorse has struck the author, who believes that he has "invited the Beast's attack by allowing too much of pleasure, desire and loose delight into his account of lovers' dear debate" (198).

Rooks's book suffers from less-than-close readings, from a lack of either collaborative or corrective engagement with theories that have changed Spenserian criticism in the past

fifteen years and that clearly could intersect his argument, such as the various new historical and gendered approaches, and from a tendency to interpret Spenser's moral and social stances simplistically--making the poem more transcendently Augustinian in its renunciation of the flesh and more doggedly misogynist in its Neoplatonic demands upon women than it actually is, for example. Although Rooks's interpretation of Spenser is strongly Neoplatonic, he oddly never acknowledges this philosophical debt or converses with the scholars who have examined the various versions of Neoplatonism that inform *FQ*. Rooks does do a conscientious job of situating Spenser's courtly love in relation to medieval texts, and the parallels that he draws between these and *FQ* are useful.

Dorothy Stephens  
U of Arkansas

94.39 Tylus, Jane. *Writing and Vulnerability in the Late Renaissance*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993. 307 pp. \$39.50.

This book's most impressive achievement is to have brought together a group of European writers whose comparability is by no means obvious: Benvenuto Cellini, Teresa of Avila, Tasso, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Corneille. According to Tylus, what these writers had in common, though each of them worked with it differently, was an ambivalent relationship to ecclesiastical and secular authorities whose protective "shade" they both needed, and needed to resist. She finds each of them struggling to secure a measure of protection, but also of political and literary autonomy, relative to powerful institutions that "increasingly wanted to control the process through which culture was created" (8). In order to trace a "dialectics of vulnerability" through the period from 1550 to 1660, Tylus focuses on the minor literary genres of autobiography, pastoral and tragicomedy, because it is there that a writer's own relation to patrons, readers, and other artists is most likely to be explicitly or covertly "staged." Spenser figures here as a pastoralist, in terms of the politics of patronage that is played out in *SC* and "Virgil's Gnat," in Timias' relationship with Belphoebe, and on Mount Acidale in *FQ* 6.

This study is New Historicist in its premises, and Tylus's indebtedness to an earlier generation of New Historicists is both obvious and gracefully acknowledged. I found her extensive footnotes wearying at times--especially in the Spenser chapter, where they incorporate residues of an earlier version of its argument (published in *ELH* 55 [1988]; abstracted in *SpN* 89.89). And yet I would not want to be without her careful and often trenchant assessment of the limitations and biases of earlier scholars' work. Her critique of Thomas Greene's approach to the issue of vulnerability seemed to me especially telling, as well as her briefer critique of Stephen Greenblatt's approach to the power dynamics of authorship. In her introductory chapter she argues, contra Greene, that "vulnerability is a historically contingent phenomenon in the Renaissance, the function of social, political, and economic pressures rather than of the literary text or the project of rebirth per se" (27). And thus, for example, Petrarch did not need to envy Virgil's invulnerability; indeed, Tylus finds that he preferred the peripatetic and vulnerable stance of Horace. But whereas the early

humanist writings of Petrarch and Boccaccio take a daringly open, vulnerable stance toward authorities of all kinds, Erasmus and his contemporaries "became aware of the potential dangers of an 'open' humanist discourse" (7-8) and sought to shield themselves from powerful authorities by refusing to adopt a fixed standpoint or to own the arguments they put in the mouths of fictive personae--Erasmus' Folly, More's Hythloday. And in the late Renaissance, the period her study focuses on, Tylus finds "increasing skepticism" (28) toward the centralized authorities of church and state and an ever stronger assertion of authorial independence as she moves from writer to writer until, with Corneille, we can almost glimpse the emergence of our modern notion of authorship.

Not quite, however: Tylus finds that instead of resorting to notions of literary property and individual genius, all of these writers attempted to mitigate their dependence on the court and/or the church by defining themselves as members of communities that could assert a degree of collective independence from these institutions, as well as from impersonal market forces. Thus, for example, Cellini invokes a Florentine community of artists and artisans to redress the failure of royal patronage, and in *A Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare is found to have mounted a "defense of the professional stage" (162) by way of "a carefully crafted challenge to the cultural poetics of the Jacobean court" (173). Whereas in Stephen Greenblatt's version of the Renaissance, the artist comes across as an isolated individual confronting "a faceless and monolithic authority," Tylus calls attention to the ways in which all of the writers she treats had recourse to "collectivities that were not identical to the institutions they served" (6).

A second dynamic she highlights in all of these writers involves the attempt to deal with vulnerability by feminizing it: Tasso, Shakespeare, and Corneille displace their own vulnerability onto female characters with whom they identify; meanwhile for Teresa, female gender is empowering to the extent that it helps her to invoke the protection of a paternal deity against the power of the Counter-Reformation church. In Spenser's pastorals Tylus uncovers an even subtler gender dynamic: she finds the poet of *SC* invoking "a resolutely homosocial universe" of poets, readers, and patrons in an attempt to "preserve himself from the queen's emasculating shade" (141).

In her chapter on "Spenser's Pastoral Communities," Tylus takes a fresh look at the dynamics of Elizabethan patronage by way of a number of Spenserian texts that seem to her to reflect a darker and more negative view of Queen Elizabeth as patron than was ascribed to Spenser by earlier New Historicists. Whereas, for example, according to Louis Montrose's reading of *SC*'s Aprill, the poet who decks his queen in "royal array" is both staging her imperial greatness and calling attention to his own role in conferring it upon her, Tylus gives us a poet whose relationship to England's "Elisa" is not--even potentially or ideally--one of fruitful reciprocity. Insofar as it falls under her jurisdiction the "pastoral theater," like the bower of Belpheobe in *FQ* 3, is a place of alienation and sterility; the poet finds the posture of England's Virgil untenable, and turns to the figure of Orpheus for a model of resistance to the potentially stifling power of "England's Proserpine." It is only by recreating Elisa in the image of Venus for an admiring male audience of his fellow

shepherds that Colin can attempt to rescue himself and them from the blighting shadow she casts over their labors. In a similar vein, Tylus's re-reading of "Virgil's Gnat" has Spenser complaining "not about [the Earl of] Leicester but *to* Leicester," and thereby aligning himself with a traditional system of masculine patronage. She finds the queen behind both the ungrateful shepherd of the pseudo-Virgilian fable and "the infernal queen" whose authority is undermined in a version of the legend of Orpheus that borrows from Ovid to restore the heroic poet to the company not only of Eurydice, but also of a band of heroes with whom he roams the Elysian fields.

Tylus's readings produce a subtle network of intertextual references that makes them difficult to paraphrase, though not to follow. I did not always find them persuasive, but they are always intelligent and interesting. My only reservation about her approach is that the social and political pressures to which she ascribes these writers' concern with vulnerability are often inferred from their writings through a kind of intertextual detour: Spenser's attitude to Queen Elizabeth is arrived at by way of his reading of Virgil; Shakespeare is said to have thrown down the gauntlet to King James by making the figure of Apollo in *WT* "perversely dependent for his lines on the Apollo of Robert Greene" (171). In this way Tylus's practice of cultural poetics is at times oddly akin to the comparatist formalism from which she distances herself in her opening chapter's critique of Thomas Greene.

Jane Hedley  
Bryn Mawr C

#### ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

- 94.40 Axton, Richard. "Spenser's 'faire hermaphrodite': Rewriting *The Faerie Queene*." *A Day Estivall: Essays on the Music, Poetry and History of Scotland and Poems Previously Unpublished in Honour of Helena Mennie Shire*. Ed. Alisoun Gardner-Medwin and Janet Hadley Williams. Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1990. 35-47.

Exploring the reasons for Spenser's cancellation of the "hermaphrodite stanzas" in the 1596 edition, argues that the change indicates "a new movement in Spenser's moral thought and new poetic strategies to accommodate the shift." Spenser's continuation of the story of Scudamour and Amoret beyond their happy reunion "turns out to be a bleak piece of writing." After publication of Books I-III in 1590 he "appears to have pondered deeply the Ovidian experience of love in a traditional courtly mode which he had drawn prematurely into a marriage knot." In prolonging the stories of his two lovers, he reconsiders their relationship in light of the Chaucerian notion of "maistrie," developing Scudamour as a "cruel captain of Cupid, whose service is mere mastery," and constructing a story which "leads to a narrative black hole, into which Amoret has vanished." The strange image of a single "faire hermaphrodite" is at the heart of Spenser's enterprise, for in rethinking it, Spenser finds "the tenor for his larger imperial theme, and explores in the story of Britomart and Artegall the relation between male and female qualities in the person of a 'governor.'"

- 94.41 Bates, Catherine. "'Of Court it seemes, men Courtesie doe call': the *Amoretti*, *Epithalamion*, and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI." *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 136-72.

In this final chapter of a book that deals also with Elizabethan court pageantry and with works by Lyly and Sidney, argues that Spenser's account of a purely "private" courtship in *Am* and *Epith* is "shot through" with allusions to the court and to Queen Elizabeth, inviting an obvious parallel between the wooing of his beloved and his difficult "courtship" of the sovereign. The "ambivalence" of the two poems "seems to enact Spenser's sense of the complexity of his position as a poet on the margins of Elizabeth I's court." This ambivalence allows him to "scrutinize from every angle" the power politics inherent in "courtship"--a situation that "involves a carefully graduated series of . . . strategies that include giving (and being seen to give), accepting, and giving in return." In *Am*, Spenser "experiments with alternative roles: with humiliation, failure, loss, together with acceptance, reward, and triumph--all of them aspects of his position as an 'Elizabethan subject.'"

As for *FQ* 6, Spenser makes it "the site of a sustained meditation on the relations between a poet and his patron, one which manages to celebrate the patronage system while simultaneously and subtly reviling it." Throughout the book, motifs of return, cycle, and circularity conflict with themes of fragmentation, division, and disruption. "The enclosed world of a bower or ring is irrevocably interrupted; . . . images of return (the return of words to meanings, of children to parents, of Calidore to court) conflict with a relentless centrifugal movement away from the center; . . . ties or bands which should tie things up, contain and circumscribe them, often prove ineffective and brittle; and, finally . . . the cyclic structure of the poem as a whole (veering toward closure as it attempts to return to its pastoral origins) is flawed by the open-endedness created by the Blatant Beast."

- 94.42 Bellamy, Elizabeth J. "Colin and Orphic Interpretation: Reading Neoplatonically on Spenser's *Acidale*." *CLS* 27.3 (1990): 172-92.

Contends that to read "Neoplatonically"--as distinct from offering a "Neoplatonic reading"--is to apply a Neoplatonic exegesis that is "not fixed and static, but rather continually moving," in such a way as to permit us to interpret the "grammar" of an episode and to identify its "deep structure." Its application to the Mt. *Acidale* episode reveals it to be "a myth about the origin of poetry." Puts forth a three-part argument: (1) that *Acidale*'s pastoral location is "sylvan prime matter (the *hyle* of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*)" and as such the source of poetic inspiration; (2) that Colin is a Mercury figure, a mediator between the sensible and the intelligible; (3) and that Spenser's "Fourth Grace" is a Venus figure who, as a "hybrid" goddess combining Venus and Diana, Love and Chastity into one figure, is a "center beyond the reach of language." She is without "visionary essence," but is "a relation between essences." *Acidale* "leads us to the very center of interpretation itself, only to reveal that the 'center' of interpretation is all around us." The episode is not about the "failure" of poetry, but rather "emerges as perhaps *the* mystery" of *FQ*, "neither fully concealing nor fully revealing the power of poetry to ascend to the highest hypostases."

- 94.43 Brennan, Scott. "Notes on the Role of Speech in *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI: *Courtesie*." *Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics* 1.1 (1990): 1-12.

Using a methodology developed for the ethnographic study of speech use, examines relations between speech and action, the two elements which constitute courteous behavior in Book VI: as a "defining quality" of Courtesy, speech "must be in harmony with action and never serve as a false front." Compares Calidore's encounter with Tristram and the Lady in canto ii with Calepine's encounter with Turpine to illustrate this point and to show how Spenser exploits the use of speech in distinguishing social status. The "entirely negative" example of Turpine ("an extreme case of complete disassociation of word from deed"), however, sets forth a pattern that becomes increasingly prevalent in the course of the book: even Calidore, when talking to Meliboe, "uses speech to create a facade which masks the nature of his designs." By book's end, "speech and action have become so disassociated that the former can no longer be taken as an indication of the latter, which spells the doom of Courtesy."

- 94.44 Farmer, Norman K., Jr. "The World's New Body: Spenser's *Faerie Queene* Book II, St. Paul's Epistles and Reformation England." *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice*. Ed. Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup. Aldershot, Hants and Brookfield, VT: Scolar, 1993. 75-85.

If we are to read *FQ* with fidelity to the ideas and issues of Spenser's time, we must resist the secular bias and ideological restraints of postmodernist criticism and read the poem from the perspective of the Protestant Reformation and the effects of the Elizabethan settlement upon the late sixteenth-century Anglican notions of the nation state. Only thus may we appreciate the degree to which the poem is a comprehensive allegory of the "world's 'new' body," the England of Elizabeth where individual religious responsibility and civil rule were for all practical purposes the same. The central subject of Book II is the tempering or composition of "body," and Spenser strictly observes the crucial distinction that St. Paul makes between "flesh" or *sarks* (flesh-substance common to men and beasts) and "body" or *soma* (the vehicle of man's resurrection, as in I Cor. 6:15). Read in light of this distinction, Book II falls into three equal parts: the first four cantos figure aspects of the *sarks* world; the second group figures the humour and character of each of the four elements that make up the *sarks* body--fire, water, air, and earth; and the third set figures the Pauline body identified as *soma*. Book II culminates in the conclusive victory of *soma* over *sarks*. Alma's castle dominates the final third of Book II as an image of the perfectly tempered body.

- 94.45 Ferguson, Arthur B. *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1993. 119-31, passim.

In analyzing the "hybrid concept" of "poesie historicall," a concept embodying the "hope of bridging the gap between history as ascertained fact and the various imaginative evocations of a metahistorical past commonly identified with poetry," claims that Spenser seems to have recognized more clearly than his contemporaries the importance of defining

the concept. However, Spenser is no more able to escape the "intractable dichotomy" posed by the concept than is anyone else, dividing himself between "poet historical" in *FQ* and "historiographer" in *Vewe*, even though, through appeal to the principle of "probability," he, along with Bacon comes closer to resolving the dichotomy than do others.

94.46 Forey, Madeleine. "'Lycidas' and Spenser's 'November' Eclogue." *N&Q*, n.s. 40.3 (September 1993): 313-14.

Verbal similarities between the two works suggest that Spenser's eclogue is a significant source for Milton: "Lycidas" echoes Spenser's diction (compare its lines 8 and 165 with lines 147 and 77 of Nov respectively); but Milton rejects the "closure" toward which Nov moves.

94.47 Glasser, Marvin. "Spenser as Mannerist Poet: The 'Antique Image' in Book IV of *The Faerie Queene*." *SEL* 31.1 (Winter 1991): 25-50.

Explores correlations, based on a Mannerist aesthetic, between examples of visual art, drawn primarily from paintings by Francesco Parmigianino, Rosso Fiorentino, and El Greco, and the verbal art of *FQ* 4. Argues that the chief impression we receive of Book IV is one of spatial and temporal dislocation and that "vagaries of sex, space, and time become tropes for a new existential approach to reality." The Mannerist draws for his subjects and forms upon an inner self in continuous volatile dialectic with a classical tradition that he seeks to transcend through rhetorical gestures: despite the apparent wilfulness of its manner of composition, he strives for strict control of the total image. Likewise in Spenser we find "deep-rooted conventions of the epic form together with rhyming stanzas, archaisms, the sensuous plasticity of descriptive detail, and the traditional symbolism of circles" counterbalancing the poem's instability, flux, and multitudinousness. The poem is "an anatomy of a psyche characterized by quantum shifts of energy," but there is also the sense of a finite entity, a Prince Arthur, fixed in a circular pattern. Another iconic analogue between Mannerist painting and Book IV is a "verticality" which conveys a sense of "struggle between the aspiring and despairing soul." Spenser's "antique" and "antic" narrative style is designed to "set up the illusion both of movement through linearity (in the world of human events) and of the coterminousness of disparate spiritual states (in the realm of God)." Book IV offers a "fragmented existential narrative."

94.48 Hagstrum, Jean H. *Esteem Enlivened by Desire: The Couple from Homer to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1992. 321-24.

Spenser's "achievement" in *Am* and *Epith* marks a "high point in erotic literature," even though he does not explore marriage "in depth" (a task awaiting the arrival of the novel). In *Epith*, Spenser may have envisioned in marriage and intersexual friendship "the free working out of one's salvation unenslaved by mutability," but "he did not say so," and though Spenser never provided a portrayal of the domestic scene, he was "more personal"

than any predecessor and achieved "an erotic music" and a "vision" that is "vastly more compelling" than those of his contemporaries.

**94.49** Harvey, Elizabeth D. *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 32-44.

In Chapter I of this study of the way male authors "create a feminine voice that seems to be--but is not--linked to a whole set of feminine characteristics (a sexualized body, an emotional make-up, an imagination)," provides a reading of the Radigund episode in *FQ* 5 within the contexts of Renaissance conceptions of gender and the episode's intertextual relation to Ovid's *Heroides*. Suggests that Spenser's confusion of Omphale and Iole probably derives from Deinara's epistle. Finds Artegall's efeminized captivity in part a figure for the "author": the knight's imprisonment by "a cruel and capricious queen," in which he is "forced to earn a meagre existence by repetitive and effeminate work, and constrained to negotiate the possessive and unwanted attractions of the Queen," provides "dangerous parallels with Spenser's own situation." In concluding that Spenser's "cross-dressed voice" in this episode stands, among his other "often effusive" celebrations of Elizabeth, as a "disguised and 'silent' complaint," differs from Josephine A. Roberts' reading in "Radigund Revisited" (abstracted in *SpN* 92.90).

**94.50** Johnson, William C. "Spenser's 'Greener' Hymnes and Amoretti: 'Retraction' and 'Reform.'" *ES* 73.5 (1992): 431-43.

Argues that not only are the two works thematically similar, but also the specific handling of those themes is far more closely parallel than previously suggested. Suggests that we understand "retraction" as deriving from *retractare*, "to undertake anew" and that the word is applicable both to the two pairs of hymns and to the relation between them and *Am*: Spenser is re-forming his previously used sonnet materials into their hymnic counterparts. In the two works, Spenser utilizes an amazing number of exact and near-exact line-, rhyme-, and word-repetitions, with analogies between the sonnets and the first two "secular" hymns being more considerable than between the sonnets and the "heavenly" pair. Both the sonnet sequence and the hymns show that heavenly love is infinitely good, but earthly love is also good because it imitates the infinite. If Spenser intended to trace the Neoplatonic *scala*, he limited the central drama to the first of the six traditional rungs. In both the "greener" hymns and sonnet sequence, the dramatic movement is more a modulated flow, rising and falling, than any sharp ascent or direct linear progression. Both hymns and sonnet sequence provide numerous rhetorical tactics for winning love; all utilize Petrarchan and Neoplatonic conventions; all depict poetic concerns interwoven with the amorous ones of the lovers. The general direction taken in the two "greener" hymns and in the sonnets is from awareness of Self and of the Self's projection to awareness of Other--the "we" and "us" of the later sonnets and the presence of the real Lady.

- 94.51 Mazzola, Elizabeth. "Marrying Medusa: Spenser's *Epithalamion* and Renaissance Reconstructions of Female Privacy." *Genre* 25.3 (Spring 1992): 193-210.

Spenser's poem investigates the experiential arena of marriage newly conceived in the Renaissance as an intimate, personal, private space. Unlike in the Romantic period and later, in its Renaissance beginnings privacy was a refuge which had to be processed poetically if it was to be recorded at all; such processing often took the form of sonnet sequences, portrait miniatures, lyric performances. Spenser works differently, seeking to make his private intimate experience intelligible and valid by refashioning his wife as a "reader of privacy," someone who will recognize him in his solitude. *Epith* is a "private expression which admits no one; rather than providing access into intimacy, the poem enlarges the gap." Spenser construes the public arena as a useful, necessary tool for the negotiation of private affairs. For him, privacy served as a place where "self-representation" might safely suspend itself, and his poem creates an environment of what Georg Simmel calls a "teleologically determined non-knowledge of the other"--an empty private experience.

- 94.52 McCabe, Richard A. "Self-consuming Discourse: Spenserian Poetics and the 'New' New Criticism." *Review* 13 (1991): 185-99.

In reviewing Harry Berger's *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), and concentrating almost wholly on *SC*, finds its author's brand of "new" new criticism "fraught with procedural difficulties," and charges him with failing to realize his aim of establishing a relation between the "aesthetic" and the "political": rather than "de-aestheticize" Spenser, Berger "re-aestheticizes" him, reducing him to a literary critic writing criticism in verse. Among the book's problems are a failure to define "close reading" and specify clearly its methods, a failure that leads to "a circularity of movement from literature to politics and back to literature again which progressively strips the chosen passages of the keen social relevance detected by Milton." Berger "repeatedly veers away from his own best insights," refusing to engage with the poem's political implications. Although Berger is on "surer ground" in his treatment of pastoral misogyny--his insistence on reflexive "metapastoral" heightens the "psychological complexity" of *SC*'s bucolic drama--still, finally, the book fails to engage adequately Spenser's acute awareness of social and political issues.

- 94.53 Mueller, Robert J. "'Infinite Desire': Spenser's Arthur and the Representation of Courtly Ambition." *ELH* 58.4 (Winter 1991): 747-71.

Argues that Arthur registers both Spenser's objection to the management of courtly ambition and his fascination with absolute power. Finds a close analogy between *FQ*'s allegorical structures and those of the 1581 Whitehall pageant *The Four Foster Children of Desire*. Gloriana, like the person of Elizabeth portrayed in the pageant, is an "absent figure" who "is the creation of Arthur's quest for her." Arthur's "infinite desire" (2.9.3.9) is equated with Elizabeth's "endless stream of courtiers," as implied in the pageant. Arthur differs from his fellow knights who have come *from* Gloriana's court in his condition of

"frustrated seeking." In contrast to the knights of each book who quest for "virtue" (though Britomart is a partial exception), his quest is for "absolute truth." By naming particular virtues as the subjects of his books, Spenser "fully participates" in a "cultural program of celebrating a power whose nature must be kept carefully concealed." The poem, in its desiring, questing mode, continually obscures the force that lies behind its own structures. The faery queen remains outside the poem (just as Elizabeth in the Whitehall pageant remains outside of and hidden from the pageant's action). Only Arthur, the questing knight *manqué* and the one character written into the poem who does not enact his own place in it, signals the absent image of the poem's truth. Arthur's place in the poem is to represent a lack. He figures desire itself and hence points to the principle of power dramatized in the pageant at Whitehall. Arthur's dream discloses an absolute ideal, which Redcrosse and Guyon do not share: for him there can be no respite from the experience of unsatisfied desire. He suggests the "fundamental disjunction" between the poem's didactic aims and the revelation of truth.

94.54 Quint, David. "Bragging Rights: Honor and Courtesy in Shakespeare and Spenser." *Creative Imitation: New Essays on Renaissance Literature in Honor of Thomas M. Greene*. Ed. David Quint, et al. MRTS, 95. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992. 391-430.

As a seminal statement of the new role that the noble was to play in the newly powerful institution of the court, Castiglione's *Courtier* examines conflicting and ambiguous notions of who has the right to boast: the older, aristocratic "magnate," exemplified in Shakespeare's Hotspur, or the newer courtier, satirized in Spenser's Braggadoccio. Both drawn from the literary figure of the *miles gloriosus*, each reveals the biases of social formation that lie behind them. In Hotspur, Shakespeare depicts (and parodies) the nobility's resistance to being disempowered and emasculated, two examples of that transformation being represented by the "perfumed" emissary who demands Hotspur's prisoners (I.iii.35-63) and by Falstaff. In Braggadoccio, Spenser ridicules the courtly upstart, who is merely borrowed outward finery, lacking in the martial courage and experience of the true-blooded nobleman. When Spenser has Braggadoccio ignore Belpheobe's definition of a "decentralized" honor at 2.3.40.1-41.2, he is setting the stage for an examination of two independent networks of topical reference: Braggadoccio as a figure for Simier in the Alençon marriage negotiations points forward to Timias as a figure for Sir Walter Raleigh. "By pairing Timias with Braggadoccio, Spenser's allegory may attempt to show us what Raleigh was *not*, but the contrasting characters may rather constitute the composite of two sides, one of them disreputable, of Raleigh's own character and courtiership." Both Shakespeare and Spenser "document the emptying out of a language of aristocratic self-assertion into a mere boasting that transforms both magnate and courtier into a single comic type. In the face of royal power, this boasting falls into the other extreme of silence: the silence of Hotspur's corpse ventriloquized by Prince Hal, the silence of Timias who would rather die than speak his desire."

- 94.55 Read, David T. "Hunger of Gold: Guyon, Mammon's Cave, and the New World Treasure." *ELR* 20.2 (Spring 1990): 209-32.

Argues that in the Cave of Mammon episode Spenser has been influenced by several accounts of the Spanish conquest of the new world, most prominently Richard Eden's collation of Peter Martyr's *Decades de Orbe Nove* as revised and completed by Richard Willes in 1577. "Gold-hunger, slavery, treachery, cruelty, sacrilege--these are the landmarks of the literary terrain devoted to the *Conquista* and it is through this terrain that Guyon descends in canto vii. Spenser has carefully devised a setting that refers in numerous oblique ways to the Spanish New World; he places Guyon in this setting and lets its pressures work on him." Suggests that Mammon's cave is to be perceived as a mine: in stanzas 35-37 Spenser has "literalized the 'hellishness'" of contemporary descriptions of the Spanish mines. Suggests that Guyon is for Spenser a kind of "anti-conquistador, confronting the vices of the Spanish New World from a peculiarly English perspective": his "emprise" is "the pursuit of the *Spanish* empire, or rather all of the implication of that empire in the Elizabethan's mental world." Although Spenser probably does not wish us to see Guyon pursuing "his own golden chain" in the name of "right usance," nevertheless the values that distinguish an English model from the Spanish "have a way of collapsing . . . into similitudes with that same model; this is perhaps the greatest peril in Guyon's whole 'emprise.'"

- 94.56 Strickland, Ronald. "Not So Idle Tears: Re-Reading the Renaissance Funeral Elegy." *Review* 14 (1992): 57-72.

In reviewing Dennis Kay's *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990 (reviewed in *SpN* 91.06), comments at length on shortcomings resulting from the book's "narrowly aestheticist theoretical framework," which "enforces a linear, progressive evolution on the genre" but tends to "foreclose" the possibility of influence from "discursive forces outside the confines of the genre itself." In his treatment of Spenser and Donne as exemplars of an emerging "belle-lettristic elegy" (in contrast to the Tudor "public, epideictic elegy"), Kay misses excellent opportunities--particularly in his treatment of *Astrophel*, but likewise in *Daphnida*--to explore "the cultural and political issues which circulated in and around the elegies." Kay's book leaves "much significant work" yet to be done.

#### SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO, 1994

The program for 1994 was organized by Robert E. Stillman (U of Tennessee, Chair), Elizabeth J. Bellamy (U of New Hampshire), Jon Quitslund (George Washington U), Anne Shaver (Denison U), and Lauren Silberman (Baruch C, CUNY). William Oram (Smith C) delivered the welcoming remarks.

Session I, *Who is Edmund that all These Swains Commend Him? History and "The Faerie Queene,"* was chaired by Lauren Silberman (Baruch C, CUNY).

94.57 In "Di-Spensing Authority: The Unconsummated Historiography of *The Faerie Queene*," David Stern (Rutgers U-CAC) first showed how the chronicle history of Britain that appears in *FQ* in three parts (the *Briton monuments*, Merlin's prophecy, and Britomart's and Paridell's joint narration of the descent of Brutus) occurs either as "textual ruptures" that render problematic the boundaries between these prophecies and the main body of the text, or, in the case of Paridell's narration, expose the self-aggrandizing motives of the historian. Then, turning to "the marriage of historian and subject that produces historical meaning" in the Elizabethan court, Stern argued that Spenser's relationship with Elizabeth creates a further complication for his historical text. Spenser obtains a provisional authorial power over Elizabeth by "repeatedly gesturing towards his *power* to define her, but he never actually performs the act."

94.58 Focusing on the Renaissance fascination with genealogy, Elizabeth Mazzola (Union C) asked, in "Apocryphal Texts, Epic Duplexes, Eastern Empires: Spenserian Genetics in *The Faerie Queene*," Why does Arthur yield his messianic position, ceasing to allegorize England's destiny in the poem and becoming, instead, just another piece of its history? The *Elfin Chronicles* (and their version of what Mazzola referred to as an "elf-consciousness") absorb and correct Arthur's story, replacing what the Prince does not know with a version of what cannot be known: a history that happens to someone else. Mazzola argued that canto x of Book II marks one of the few times in *FQ* where allegory does not yield to figuration. But the modern nation assumes its shape by reading, not by remembering--and Arthur's private trauma can be converted to collective memory only if he can be made to disappear, "his personal trauma converted in canto x into the fact that he has been forgotten."

94.59 The response of Gordon Teskey (Cornell U), who was unable to attend the conference, was read by Lauren Silberman. Teskey praised both Stern and Mazzola for addressing "how we understand Spenser's understanding himself in relation to history." Teskey observed that both papers pose a version of the following question: How can the intricate genealogical debates that sustained the Wars of the Roses lay hold on the relation between the needs of the present and the substance of the past with the firmness of the stories from Geoffrey of Monmouth? Teskey pointed out the operation of irony subtly at work in both papers' accounts of Spenser's genealogical moments: "what irony is to allegory, genealogy is to any vision of political order gathered from history."

94.60 In "Gendering Biography: Spenser as a Man," a preview of his forthcoming biographical study of Spenser, Gary Waller (U of Hartford) inquired What difference did it make, not least to his poetry, that Spenser was born and socialized into practices labeled as male? Positing "the intimate link between the male psyche and ideologies of virility and domination" as being fundamental to *FQ*, Waller focused on the Elizabethan revival of virility and its "fantasies of gender" as they are played out in romance. More than just "literary" conventions, Waller described these chivalric rituals as "emblems of the desires and anxieties about gender that lie at the core of a culture's myths of violence." Arguing

that men and women "are not stable signifiers" in *FQ*, Waller offered the examples of Britomart and Belpheobe "who embrace the values of male struggle and violence."

**94.61** In her lively response, Theresa M. Krier (U of Notre Dame), though agreeing in general with Waller's sketch of identity formation for aristocratic men, shifted the ground from ideology to poetic works and processes, arguing that it is "the textualized Spenser" that can *lead* us to "the historical Spenser." Krier suggested that Waller's articulations of masculinity become "too fixated psychically," too bound within "the rigid dichotomies of gender structure." Seeking to put in "a good word" for the chivalric romance Spenser loved, Krier, following the Wife of Bath in "claiming the privilege of a sphere of my own experience over bookishness," offered her own focus on chivalry as a reflection of her ownership, riding, and training of a horse: "I want the material practices round and about horses to be included in our talk about chivalric heroism."

**94.62** Much of the discussion responded to Waller's focus on Spenser's women as one of the many "cultural contradictions" that come through the surface of the poem; Lauren Silberman suggested that Waller ponder the question, "What cultural contradictions would Spenser *consciously* have approved of?"

The chair of Session II, *Tending Lambs and Hanging Sheep: Authority and Submission in Spenser's Canon*, was Marianne Micros (U of Guelph).

**94.63** In "Pastoral In and Out of History: Immerito's Courtly Limitations and Colin Clout's Divided Self in *The Shepheardes Calendar*," James Gibbons (Rutgers U) argued that in *SC*, "Immerito," far more sympathetic to the values of the pastoral than E.K., serves as an emblem for Spenser's "profound ambivalence toward his own aspiration as a courtly poet writing for his monarch." Gibbons suggested that Spenser enters the pastoral not through Immerito, but through Colin Clout, who, feeling too ambitious for the pastoral world but scorned by Rosalind, "embodies a divided poetic consciousness." Spenser's ambivalence toward his own courtly aspirations reveals itself in Colin's capacity for self-negation (first evidenced by the breaking of his pipe in Jan), which "asserts a poetic self in resistance to culturally legitimated forms of poetic discourse which cannot adequately fulfill the poet's desires."

**94.64** The argument of W. Russell Mayes, Jr. (U of Virginia), in "*Aqitante Calescimus Illo*: The Inspiration Debate in Spenser's *October Eclogue*," was that in this eclogue Spenser is presenting three theories of poetic inspiration: Piers's "Petrarchan" theory that poetry is inspired by love; Cuddie's "bacchic" theory that poetry is inspired by wine; and E.K.'s "vatic" theory (in his "Argument") that true (prophetic) poetry is inspired by God. Mayes argued that Spenser's readers in 1579 would have known that "all claims to prophetic ability were regarded as politically suspect during Elizabeth's reign," hence her law prohibiting prophecies. Although, as Mayes suggested, Cuddie's theory is based on a misreading of Horace, the tone of E.K.'s description of Cuddie as "the perfect paterne of a Poet" is difficult to assess. In the final analysis, the inspiration debate is left unresolved: the

unreliable figures of Cuddie and E.K. support the "politically subversive idea of divine inspiration, while Piers, described by Mayes as "the image of Protestant Ministers," advocates a theory of Petrarchan inspiration--a tension that, as Mayes concludes, characterizes much of Spenser's own poetic career.

94.65 In her response, Lynn Staley (Colgate U) observed that "the conclusions that both Mayes and Gibbons arrive at have to do with Spenser's understanding of his own role in the community." Then seeking to locate Spenser's interest in the court as a site of control and inspiration within English literary history, she argued that the problematics of Gibbons' and Mayes' papers originate in the Middle Ages because they reveal so much about how the sixteenth century understood its own poetic roots. Chaucer's poetry, like Spenser's "displays a pervasive awareness of his public identity."

94.66 A lengthy and lively discussion followed, beginning with the warning that we shouldn't confuse prophecy and fortune-telling. In 1568, Elizabeth forbade "prophecy-as-fortune-telling" in a law whose wording actually points in the direction of witchcraft; and in a later law she forbade "Christian-preaching-as-prophecy." But there was widespread agreement with Mayes that, for Spenser, "prophecy" was not incompatible with Protestant preaching. Anne Lake Prescott, pointing out that Renaissance punctuation was often arbitrary and didn't always follow pauses, suggested the following reading of E.K.'s gloss: Cuddie may be "the perfect paterne of a Poet [who isn't patronized enough]." Judith Anderson, in what she called the spirit of "muddying things up more," agreed with Prescott that some commas were arbitrary, but they still mostly correspond with pauses or hesitations in speech. Carol Kaske then read the passage with a pause, and the audience (though joking that it was a "low blow" actually to have a text to read from) agreed that the meaning was narrowed. Bill Oram asked Mayes to consider the following question: "Is it necessary to make Piers 'Petrarchan'?" Lynn Staley added that the name "Piers" is freighted with English, not Italian contexts, and we should be reminded of the figure of Piers Plowman.

94.67 In the session's final paper, "The Protocol of Submission: Timias as Raleigh in *The Faerie Queene*," Martha J. Craig (Purdue U) focused on Raleigh's "politically expedient" pose of submission to Queen Elizabeth as reflected in Spenser's depiction of Timias's "desperate self-punishment" in *FQ* 4. Reviewing Raleigh's marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton and their subsequent incarceration in the Tower, Craig discussed Raleigh's "pose as an abandoned courtier." She suggested that not only did Spenser know Raleigh personally, but he also had read John Hooker's description of the decline of the Raleigh family in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, as well as the *Chronicles*' account of Raleigh's heroism under ambush at a country ford near Youghall in 1581. Craig argued that Spenser conflated these and other stories and adapted them to the story of Timias's fight with the forsters in *FQ* 3. It is Spenser's Timias, claimed Craig, "who performs the submission Raleigh's unapologetic posturing and poetry failed to obtain." With relevance for Book VI, Craig also disclosed that "Serena" was Raleigh's pet name for his wife, who we know read Spenser because her copy of *FQ* has been found with her and her son's annotations.

94.68 Thomas H. Cain (McMaster U) responded by praising Craig for her use of Holinshed, particularly the passages urging Raleigh to submit, but he disagreed with Craig's speculation that in the 1596 poem Spenser may have modified the Timias story of Book III to accommodate it to the episode in Book IV. Cain also saw in Book IV's river catalogue Spenser's "oblique encouragement of Raleigh's showy El Dorado project as a practical step toward regaining royal favor." With the Timias story, Spenser was willing to take some risks for his friend--"but only," warned Cain, "to a point." Cain concluded that Spenser felt that Raleigh's name was no longer to be flaunted openly in the poem: "As the glowing icon of Tristram shows, Spenser was now aware that his real hopes must be fixed on Essex."

94.69 In the discussion that followed, a number of questions were posed. Bill Oram asked Craig why Spenser chooses to bring Timias back again in Book VI. Judith Anderson asked Craig for her account of the episode of Serena and the cannibals. Thomas P. Roche, Jr. asked why Spenser made Serena "pal" of Calepine. Other questions included Why doesn't Serena connect more with Timias? and Why are there no one-to-one correspondences with Elizabeth Throckmorton in *FQ*?

94.70 In the eighth annual Kathleen Williams Lecture, "Spenser and the History of Allegory," Walter Davis (Brown U) began with the provocative assertion that the "theory and practice of allegory are in desperate need of historicizing." Claiming that Spenser's practice in *FQ* "radically altered the history of allegory," Davis argued that three general phases of allegory can be discerned in *FQ*: (1) the use of partial or total traditional Scriptural exegesis in Books I and II (such as the four senses of the Dragonfight); (2) the opening up of the text to "individual interpretation" by readers, "instead of indoctrination" (such as the episodes of the Bower of Bliss and of Busirane's castle); (3) the linkage of point of view to exegesis, of interpretation "varying according to who sees what from what stance" (such as the episodes of the Temple of Venus and Mount Acidale). Davis concluded his lecture by asserting that, after Spenser, allegory did not change into symbolism. Rather, Coleridge simply fashioned the secular symbol out of a prior religious allegory. According to Davis, Coleridge's formulation of the symbol "is a late portion of the history of allegory," not the sign of its demise: "that formulation depends on Spenser's accomplishment."

94.71 Carol Kaske began a lively discussion by pointing out that Kathleen Williams herself would say that Book VI "is not allegory but myth." When asked what he would make of the heavy thematizing of art in the Bower of Bliss, Davis replied that, in his estimation, the Bower of Bliss is about the *difficulties* of art, not bad art. Anne Prescott offered that it is laurel that grows in the Bower of Bliss, not myrtle. Judith Anderson suggested that Bart Giamatti's work on the Bower might be more relevant for Davis's work on allegory than Stephen Greenblatt's. She followed up by asking if he could comment on various critics who have written on allegory in the last fifteen years. Reiterating his belief that the theory of allegory "has not been well articulated," Davis answered that Walter Benjamin (and Gordon Teskey's work on Benjamin) has inspired his own work on allegory, as has the work of Joel Fineman. He has been less satisfied with Quilligan's "non-allegorical readings of allegorical texts." When asked what happens to narrative in Spenserian allegory, Davis said that he did

not want to say that allegory and narrative aren't opposed. When asked about allegory's precedents in morality drama, Davis replied that we are in need of a history of stage allegory.

E.J. Bellamy  
U of New Hampshire

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

**94.72 CALL FOR PAPERS.** Spenser at Kalamazoo, 4-7 May 1995. Submit abstracts on any topic dealing with Spenser. Submissions by newcomers, as well as by established scholars, are encouraged. One session will focus on connections between Spenser and Sidney, so papers on this topic are welcome. Deadline: 15 September 1994.

Reading time for papers should be no more than twenty minutes. According to rules established by the Medieval Institute, those submitting abstracts for one session may not submit an abstract or paper for other sessions in the same year. Because Kalamazoo has traditionally encouraged experiment, preliminary exploration, and discussion, papers should not have already been published or read elsewhere.

Please submit abstracts in five copies and include home and office phone numbers and complete address. Maximum length: 750 words. Direct all correspondence to Robert E. Stillman, Department of English, 301 McClung Tower, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 37996-0430. Phone: 615-974-5401 (work); 615-637-6524 (home). FAX: 615-974-6926.

**94.73 CONFERENCES.** International Association for Neo-Latin Studies Ninth International Congress: The Impact of Italian Humanism: Continuations and Transformations, 29 Aug.-3 Sept. 1994, Bari. Address: Mauro de Nichilo, Dipartimento di Italianistica, Università di Bari, 70121 Bari, Italy.

Ninth International Conference on Medievalism, 28 Sept.-1 Oct. 1994, Montana State U. Address: Gwendolyn Morgan, Dept. of English, Montana State U, Bozeman 59717.

Aesthetics and Ideologies: Collisions, Conjunctions, Collusions, 6-8 Oct. 1994, Michigan State U. Address: Judith Stoddart, 201 Morrill Hall, Michigan St. U., East Lansing, MI 48824.

Medieval-Renaissance Conference, 6-8 Oct. 1994, Wise. Address: John Mahony, Dept. of Lang. and Lit., Clinch Valley C, Univ. of Virginia, College Road, Wise, VA 24293.

Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies, 3-6 Nov. 1994, Rochester. Address: Thomas DiPiero, Dept. of Mod. Langs. and Cultures, 303 Gavett Hall, U of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627.

Southern Conference on British Studies, 9-12 Nov. 1994, Louisville. Address: John L. Gordon, Jr., Dept. of History, U of Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173.

South Atlantic Modern Language Association, 11-13 Nov. 1994, Baltimore. Address: Robert F. Bell, 104 Manly Hall, U of Alabama, Box 6109, Tuscaloosa, AL 35486-6109.

Fourteenth Barnard College Medieval-Renaissance Studies Conference: Alternative Realities: Medieval and Renaissance Inquiries into the Nature of the World, 3 Dec. 1994, Barnard C. Address: Catharine Randall Coats, Dept. of French, or Antonella Ansani, Dept. of Italian, Barnard C, 3009 Broadway, New York, NY 10027.

Renaissance Society of America, 30 Mar.-1 Apr. 1995, New York City. Address: Laura Schwartz, Renaissance Soc. of America, 24 West 12th St., New York, NY 10011.

Baseball and the Sultan of Swat: A Conference Commemorating the National Pastime and the Hundredth Birthday of Babe Ruth, 27-29 Apr. 1995, Hofstra U. Address: Natalie Datlof, Hofstra Cultural Center, Hofstra U, Hempstead NY 11550. (After all, the late A.B. Giamatti, eminent Spenserian, was also Commissioner of Baseball.)

Fifth International Milton Symposium, 9-14 July 1995, U of Wales, Bangor. Address: Thomas N. Corns, School of English and Linguistics, U of Wales, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG, Wales.

**94.74 SPENSER ON SALE.** Professor Naseeb Shaheen writes that although his *Biblical References in The Faerie Queene* is technically out of print, he has extra copies that he will make available to readers of *SpN* at the original 1976 price of \$12.50 + \$1.50 for shipping and handling, a total of \$14.00 per volume. These are hard bound volumes still in their original shrink wrappings. Spenser scholars desiring a copy should send a check for \$14 to Dr. Naseeb Shaheen, Department of English, Memphis State U, Memphis, TN 38152.

**94.75 EDITORIAL.** Readers old enough to recall that in its founding years Elizabeth Bieman was Co-Editor of *SpN*, and in fact served as senior editor for a year when Kent Hieatt was away on sabbatical leave, may wonder at the absence of her name in item 94.34. Having written me at the time of her retirement from teaching and from *SpN*'s board of corresponding editors that she was at that point divesting herself of all "official" involvement in Spenser studies, Elizabeth is content to have Kent write the account of those early years.

SPENSER AT MLA, PROGRAM 1994

Session I: Spenserian Authorship.

Chair: Richard McCoy (CUNY)

Elizabeth Jane Bellamy (U of New Hampshire)  
 "Edmund Spenser, Gayatri Spivak, and the Post-Colonial  
 Critique of Authorship"

\*\*

Patrick Cheney (Pennsylvania State U)  
 "'Compassing the Weighty Prize': The Rival Poetics  
 of Spenser and Marlowe"

\*\*

Richard Rambuss (Tulane U)  
 "Spenser's Lives, Spenser's Careers: Fashioning  
 the Poet's Poet"

Session II: Allegory in *The Faerie Queene*

Chair: Gordon Teskey (Cornell U)

Jim Ellis (York U, Ontario)  
 "Allegory and the Masochistic Subject of  
*The Faerie Queene*"

\*\*

Andrew Escobedo (U of California, Berkeley)  
 "Allegory's Other Material"

\*\*

Paul Suttie (Edinburgh U)  
 "Who Knows What *The Faerie Queene* Means?"

\*\*

Roy Sellars (U de Genève)  
 "Allegory and Filth in *The Faerie Queene*"

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
122 DENISON HALL  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
MANHATTAN KS 66506-0701

Nonprofit Organization  
U. S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Permit #525  
Manhattan, Kan. 66502

Serials Acquisitions  
Thomas Cooper Library  
Univ. of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208 25.3